	FILED
	FILED <sub>10/23/2024</sub> 10/18/2024 COMMISSION OR PREAL DECEMBOOC
	OMMISSION ON PRACTICE FORME COUR OF THE SUPREME TO FORMATION OF THE STATE OF MONTANA OF THE STATE OF MONTANA Case Number: PR 23-0496
1	BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON PRACTICE
2	OF THE SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA
3	In the Matter of Austin ) ODC File No. 21-094 Miles Knudsen, an )
4	Attorney at Law,) Supreme Court Cause No.Respondent.) PR 23-0496
5	)
б	
7	)
8	)
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
10	DAY 1
11	
12	On the 9th of October, 2024, beginning at
13	9:00 a.m., the above-captioned matter was heard
14	before the Commission on Practice of the Supreme
15	Court of Montana in the Courtroom of the Montana
16	Supreme Court, 215 North Sanders, Helena, Montana,
17	before Holly E. Fox, Court Reporter and Notary
18	Public.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## Before the Commission on Practice In the Matter of Austin Knudsen

In th	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen			October 09, 2024
		Page 2		Page 4
1	A P P E A R A N C E S		1	The following proceedings were had and testimony
2				taken:
3	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF ODC:		3	* * * * * * * * *
4	TIMOTHY B. STRAUCH Special Counsel		4	
5	P.O. Box 1099 Helena, Montana 59624-1099		5	
6	tstrauch@montanaodc.org		6	CHAIR OGLE: Good morning, everyone. We're
7	APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT:		7	going to get started here now.
8	CHRISTIAN CORRIGAN			My name is Randy Ogle. I'm the chair of this
9	Solicitor General Office of the Attorney General			panel of the Commission on Practice. Other panel
10	215 North Sanders Helena, Montana 59601		10	members hearing this case today are Mike Lamb, to my
11	christian.corrigan@mt.gov		11	left, and Elinor Nault, to my left; and to my right
12	MARK D. PARKER Attorney at Law		12	is Carey Matovich and Troy McGee.
13	Parker, Heitz & Cosgrove, PLLC 401 North 31st Street, Suite 1600		13	I'd like to make a few comments before we get
14	P.O. Box 7212 Billings, Montana 59103-7212		14	started with the hearing. This is the time set for
15	markdparker@parker-law.com		15	the hearing in the case of Austin Miles Knudsen
16	TYLER GREEN Attorney at Law			versus or rather the Office of Disciplinary
17	Consovoy McCarthy PLLC 222 South Main Street, Fifth Floor			Counsel against Austin Miles Knudsen. And this is
18	Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 tyler@consovoymccarthy.com			Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496 and ODC File
19	SHANE COLEMAN			Number 21-094.
20	Attorney at Law Billstein, Monson & Small PLLC			First of all, as to the Commission on Practice,
21	1555 Campus Way, Suite 201 Billings, Montana 59102			just a little bit of background for those of you who
22	Biiiings, Montana 59102			are not familiar with the commission. The
23				Commission on Practice is a commission of 14 people
24				appointed by the Supreme Court from around the state
25			25	of Montana. There's nine attorneys, five
		Page 3		Page 5
1	INDEX	. ugo o		-
2				nonattorneys on the commission. The commission is
3		Page		entirely nonpartisan and nonpolitical. The mission
4	RANDY COX			of the Commission on Practice is to enforce
5	Direct Examination By Mr. Strauch Cross-Examination By Mr. Corrigan	16 80		disciplinary rules for all attorneys in the state of Montana. And the way the commission works, if a
6	Redirect Examination By Mr. Strauch	118		complaint is filed against an attorney, of course
7	AUSTIN KNUDSEN Direct Examination By Mr. Strauch	120		the attorney has an opportunity to respond to that
8	Cross-Examination By Mr. Corrigan Redirect Examination By Mr. Strauch	188 216		complaint. The commission the complaint is then
9	BOWEN GREENWOOD			investigated by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.
10	Direct Examination By Mr. Corrigan Cross-Examination By Mr. Strauch	230 238		If the Office of Disciplinary Counsel feels there's
11	Redirect Examination By Mr. Corrigan	242		merit to the complaint, it then is referred to a
12				review panel, who reviews it to see if it warrants
13	EXHIBITS			having a complaint filed. And if it does warrant
14				having a complaint filed, the complaint is then
15	No. Description	Page		filed. The respondent has an opportunity to respond
16	1-8, 10-35	15		to the complaint and contest it, and then it would
17	JJ, KK P, with attachments A, B, D	80 30		be referred to an adjudicatory panel for a hearing.
18	40	122		And that's what brings us here today.
19				
20				entirely nonpartisan, nonpolitical. And one of the
21				important things to notice, those of you who are
				familiar with this case, is that the complaints
22				
22 23			23	alleged in the complaint by the Office of
				alleged in the complaint by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel do have some political
23			24	

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 6		Page 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	legislative session and some bills that were passed by the Legislature in that session. But we're not going to be getting into any political issues in this case. We are going to deal only with the allegations in the complaint, and, in particular, whether any of the rules that attorneys are bound to abide by have been violated. There's been an extensive background in this case to this point. A complaint was filed a little over a year ago. Mr. Knudsen had an opportunity to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an officer of the court, that he took back in 1988 [sic], both written and orally; and the Supreme Court's July 14, 2021, decision in the McLaughlin litigation. Those are the two areas under Rule 3.4(c). 5.1(c), Charlie, responsibility for subordinate lawyers' misconduct. The evidence will show that a number of the statements at issue here were made by the Attorney General's subordinates, and under the rule, he has responsibility for those under certain
	respond to the complaint. There's been discovery.		circumstances, which we intend to prove.
13 14 15	There have been multiple motions filed in this case by both parties. Those have been dealt with. And we're not going to be plowing old ground over the motions that have previously been filed and considered. We're going to keep this hearing	13 14 15	Rule 8.2, Alpha: Reckless statements concerning the qualifications of a judge. Here, the many justices of the Montana Supreme Court; indeed, the entire Supreme Court.
	orderly, and we're not going to get into political		Rule 8.4(a), as the commission knows, for any violation of a rule of professional conduct there's
	issues.		a standalone violation of 8.4(a).
	And so with that, we're ready to get started.		And lastly, 8.4(d), conduct prejudicial to the
20	Does the Office of Disciplinary Counsel wish to	20	administration of the system of justice.
	make an opening statement?		ODC will prove violations of each rule by clear
22	MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.		and convincing evidence.
23	CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed.		Thank you.
24	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> May it please the commission, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, counsel,	24	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Does the respondent wish to make an opening
25	wir. Chanman, members of the commission, counsel,	25	Does the respondent wish to make an opening
	Page 7		Page 9
	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of	1	statement?
2	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena	2	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
2 3	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby	2 3	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed.
2 3 4	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal.	2 3 4	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
2 3 4 5	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the	2 3 4 5	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian
2 3 4 5 6	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal.	2 3 4 5 6	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the	2 3 4 5 6 7	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie: Knowing disobedience of an obligation under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct. ODC simply wants you to conclude as a matter of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie: Knowing disobedience of an obligation under the rules of a tribunal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct. ODC simply wants you to conclude as a matter of law that every allegation or every action taken,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie: Knowing disobedience of an obligation under the rules of a tribunal. Members of the commission, Mr. Chairman, here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct. ODC simply wants you to conclude as a matter of law that every allegation or every action taken, every statement made by the Attorney General,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie: Knowing disobedience of an obligation under the rules of a tribunal. Members of the commission, Mr. Chairman, here there are two rules of the tribunal that the ODC is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct. ODC simply wants you to conclude as a matter of law that every allegation or every action taken, every statement made by the Attorney General, constitutes a violation of the Rules of Professional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Tim Strauch, special counsel for the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. With me today is Sheena Broadwater, the chief investigator; and Shelby Streib, its chief paralegal. Mr. Chairman, the detailed complaint against the Attorney General alleging 41 areas of misconduct. In the course of this hearing we will go through some, but not all, of the statements made by the Attorney General in court filings comprising the 41 counts. The rest of the AG's statements are laid out in each count of the complaint and highlighted in the corresponding court records that will be admitted during the course of this hearing. I would invite the commission, upon its deliberation, to review those exhibits in rendering its decision. In the interest of expediency, however, I will not be going through every single statement. The rules at issue are Rule 3.4(c), Charlie: Knowing disobedience of an obligation under the rules of a tribunal. Members of the commission, Mr. Chairman, here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	statement? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Please proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Christian Corrigan, and I serve as Solicitor General for Attorney General Austin Knudsen. My colleagues Tyler Green, Shane Coleman, and Mark Parker all also represent the Attorney General in this matter. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel has a heavy burden to meet, yet ODC will not offer you a single new fact in support of its unprecedented complaint against the sitting Attorney General. Every filing, statement, and letter in this case was public. Each occurred in plain view of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court, the attorneys involved, and the citizens of Montana. Yet the evidence will show not a single one of them reported the Attorney General or his staff for misconduct. ODC simply wants you to conclude as a matter of law that every allegation or every action taken, every statement made by the Attorney General,

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 10		Page 12
1	First, there are 13 counts of the complaint that	1	professional conduct by his subordinates. Because
	concern Rule $3.4(c)$ . To find a violation of		ODC's evidence will not show any underlying
	Rule 3.4(c), ODC must prove by clear and convincing		violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct by
	evidence that the Attorney General knowingly		clear and convincing evidence, all 35 counts against
	disobeyed an obligation under the rules of the		the Attorney General for those charges must likewise
	tribunal except for an open refusal based on an	-	fail.
	assertion that no valid obligation existed. The		Now, taking a step back, the events giving rise
	rule exemption is critical and it bears repeating.		to this complaint were highly controversial and
9	ODC must prove that there was no open refusal based		unprecedented, and I understand that you may not be
10	on an assertion that no valid obligation existed.	10	comfortable in the end with the way the
11	The evidence will show that the AG openly	11	Attorney General represented the Legislature, and
12	asserted his client's position, and his client was	12	you may even think the Legislature's concerns were
13	the Montana Legislature. And the Legislature's	13	unfounded and highly partisan. But that doesn't
14	position was that it did not have a valid obligation	14	mean the Attorney General violated his ethical
15	to comply with a court order that violated a	15	obligations. This was high stakes constitutional
16	separation of powers and basic principles of	16	litigation in a clash between coequal branches of
	fairness. The Attorney General asserted that	17	government. The Attorney General himself is a
	position all the way until his client's appeals were		constitutional officer. In this litigation he
19	exhausted at the United States Supreme Court.		represented the Montana Legislature, another coequal
	Next, the complaint asserts six counts in		branch of government. The Legislature, and by
	violation of Rule 8.2(a). For these claims ODC must		extension, the people of Montana, have a right to
	prove by clear and convincing evidence that the		zealous legal representation. Disciplining the
	Attorney General or his subordinates made a		Attorney General, as the Attorney General has argued
	statement that the Attorney General knows to be		in briefing before, based on the facts and
	false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or		circumstances you will see here would severely
	8		5
	Page 11		Page 13
1		1	
	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity		prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its
2	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the	2	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases.
2 3	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis	2 3	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the
2 3 4	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates	2 3 4	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to
2 3 4 5	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a).	2 3 4 5	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that
2 3 4 5 6	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of	2 3 4 5 6	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was
2 3 4 5 6 7	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by	2 3 4 5 6 7	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of Rule 8.4(a) where it makes it misconduct for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Corrigan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of Rule 8.4(a) where it makes it misconduct for a lawyer to attempt to violate the Rules of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Corrigan. Mr. Strauch, if you'd call your first witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of Rule 8.4(a) where it makes it misconduct for a lawyer to attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or induce another to violate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Corrigan. Mr. Strauch, if you'd call your first witness. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chair, members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of Rule 8.4(a) where it makes it misconduct for a lawyer to attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or induce another to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Corrigan. Mr. Strauch, if you'd call your first witness. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chair, members of the commission, yes, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. The evidence will show that the Attorney General had a reasonable, good faith basis for making every statement that ODC alleges violates Rule 8.2(a). Next, the complaint alleges 13 violations of Rule 8.4(d). That rule requires ODC to prove by clear and convincing evidence again that the Attorney General engaged in conduct that was prejudicial to the administration of justice. But ODC cannot show that any action taken by the Attorney General delayed or altered the course of the proceedings or resulted in direct disruption of pending proceedings. And if even if ODC can point to some type of disruption, it must show by clear and convincing evidence that there's a nexus between the AG's conduct and that adverse effect. It cannot. Finally ODC alleges nine counts of violations of Rule 8.4(a) where it makes it misconduct for a lawyer to attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct or induce another to violate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	prejudice the Legislature's ability to assert its interests in these types of cases. Finally, as my friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned in his opening, ODC is going to anchor much of its legal case on the fact that Attorney General Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as a member of the bar to abide by the Rules of Professional Conduct. As I said earlier, ODC cannot show that he violated that oath, much so that he did so by clear and convincing evidence. But in January 2021 Austin Knudsen took an oath when he was sworn in as Montana's Attorney General. He took an oath to the people of Montana to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity. He is the chief legal officer of the state, and he litigated this case to defend the state's interests, which mean zealously advocating for the people's representatives until every appeal was exhausted. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Thank you, Mr. Corrigan. Mr. Strauch, if you'd call your first witness. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chair, members of the

	Page 14		Page 16
			-
1	CHAIR OGLE: Any response?	1	your Honor, ODC is withdrawing objections shown on
2	MR. CORRIGAN: No objection. Our witnesses	2	the respondent's exhibit list to the following
3	have been excluded.	3	exhibits, and I did notify respondent's counsel of
4	CHAIR OGLE: All right. So any witness who	4	this yesterday. If they wish to move for admission
5	might be called to testify in this case, please step	5	during our case-in-chief, I have no objection to
6	outside and wait outside until you're called.	6	that. It's respondent's Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, F,
7	MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, it's my		G, H, I, J, O, Q, T, with the I would just note
8	understanding that this hearing is being live		that T appears to be an exact duplicate of
	streamed, and so I think that admonishment needs to		Respondent's H. W, X, AA, BB, DD, EE, FF, GG, HH.
	apply to anyone who may be watching the live stream;	10	CHAIR OGLE: Very well. Thank you. It's
	is that right?		noted for the record.
12	CHAIR OGLE: I believe so, yes.	12	MR. STRAUCH: Thank you.
13	MR. STRAUCH: Thank you.	13	<b>Mark S Indie One</b> Thank you.
	Mr. Chairman, ODC calls Mr. Randy Cox.	14	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF RANDY COX
15	THE WITNESS: Is there an oath,	15	BY MR. STRAUCH:
	Mr. Chairman?	_	Q. What is your name, sir?
17	CHAIR OGLE: Please.		A. My name is Randy Cox.
	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.		Q. And your address please?
18	• •		
19	(Witness sworn.)		A. I live in Missoula, Montana.
20			Q. And, sir, you're an attorney licensed in
21	MR. STRAUCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.		Montana?
	Mr. Chairman, we have just a couple of I hate		A. Iam.
	to call them housekeeping measures, but we'd first		Q. When were you admitted in Montana?
	of all like to move for admission of exhibits, ODC		A. 1979.
25	exhibits, to which there has been no objection. And	25	Q. Tell us or tell the commission, please,
	Dogo 15		Dogo 17
	Page 15		Page 17
1	I'm prepared to list those.	1	Page 17 a little bit about your personal background.
2	I'm prepared to list those. CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.	2	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a
2	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would.	2 3	<ul><li>a little bit about your personal background.</li><li>A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school</li></ul>
2	I'm prepared to list those. CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.	2 3	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a
2 3 4	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would.	2 3	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went
2 3 4 5	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> I would yes, sir, so I can	2 3 4	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went
2 3 4 5 6	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.	2 3 4 5	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went
2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,	2 3 4 5 6	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law
2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm prepared to list those. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think they're in the record. Go ahead and list them, if you would. <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32,	2 3 4 5 6 7	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can</li> <li>formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,</li> <li>16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32,</li> <li>33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions</li> <li>on with regard to judicial notice of those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted.</li> <li>(Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial notice of them, but I would like to move for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by President Bush to the federal bench, we changed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial notice of them, but I would like to move for admission formally for the record. That is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by President Bush to the federal bench, we changed the firm name to Boone Karlberg. I stayed there in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial notice of them, but I would like to move for admission formally for the record. That is Exhibit 18, 21, 23, and 24.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by President Bush to the federal bench, we changed the firm name to Boone Karlberg. I stayed there in a litigation practice until the end of 2021, when I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial notice of them, but I would like to move for admission formally for the record. That is Exhibit 18, 21, 23, and 24.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: They're admitted as well.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by President Bush to the federal bench, we changed the firm name to Boone Karlberg. I stayed there in a litigation practice until the end of 2021, when I retired from active practice, but I continue to work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I'm prepared to list those.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think they're in the record.</li> <li>Go ahead and list them, if you would.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: I would yes, sir, so I can formally move for admission.</li> <li>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. We'd move for admission.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: We have had prior motions on with regard to judicial notice of those documents, and that has been granted by order. So the motion is granted. They're admitted. (Exhibits 1-8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22, 25-35 admitted.)</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, there was some orders to which there were objections. The commission did take judicial notice of them, but I would like to move for admission formally for the record. That is Exhibit 18, 21, 23, and 24.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a little bit about your personal background. A. Personal background. Born and raised on a ranch on the Lower Smith River. Went to high school in Cascade. Went to college at Montana State University, where I obtained a degree in 1975. Went to then I attended Northeastern University Law School in Boston until graduating there in 1979. At this point I was fortunate enough to work for Senior United States District Judge W.D. Murray, a federal judge in Butte. Do you need this closer? THE CLERK: Let me turn on the mic. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. THE CLERK: Sorry about that. THE WITNESS: No worries. So went to work for Judge Murray, was two years in Butte, and in the fall of 1981 moved to Missoula to join the firm then known as Boone Karlberg and Haddon. After, Sam Haddon was appointed by President Bush to the federal bench, we changed the firm name to Boone Karlberg. I stayed there in a litigation practice until the end of 2021, when I

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 18		Page 20
1	chief legal officer.	1	Bar Examiners maybe six or seven years ago.
	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) And, Mr. Cox, you and I	2	Somewhere around there.
	know each other; correct?	-	Q. Okay. And you're if my memory serves
	A. Indeed.		right, you're a member of ABOTA?
	Q. We mostly on the opposite side of cases; is that right?		A. Yeah. There's certain honorary
	A. Pretty much always, yeah.	6	organizations that are are invitation-only. There's three of those that I'm a member of. One is
	Q. Yes, sir. And I understand that you	7	the American Board of Trial Advocates. Another is
	represented the court administrator, Beth	8	the International Society of Barristers. And the
	McLaughlin, in the two Supreme Court proceedings	9	third is the American Academy of Appellate Lawyers.
10	that underlie this case; namely the Brown case and	10	Because, along with trying as many cases and
11	McLaughlin case; is that correct?	11	handling as many as I did, I also handled somewhere
12	A. Yes. Brown versus Gianforte, and then the	12	
	original proceeding of Beth McLaughlin versus the	13	on the order or 60 appeals to this Court and to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
14		14	Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Q. And I believe you mentioned it briefly.
15	Montana Legislature and the Department of Administration.	15	
16			5 8
	Q. Would you tell the commission a little bit		A. I'm the chief legal officer and an executive vice president in a company based in
18	about your experience as a trial lawyer, please?		
	A. Yes. Almost the entirety of my career was		Bozeman called Wildfire Defense Systems that works
20	devoted to litigation practice. I started out	20	in 22 states and in two Canadian provinces. That
21	working, had Sam Haddon as a mentor, which was my	21	
22	good fortune because Judge Haddon was a superb trial		little over 400 people.
23	lawyer. I then went on, developed my own litigation		Q. And you're still licensed today as an
24	practice. It was predominantly on the defense side		attorney?
25	of civil litigation. Represented everything from	25	A. I am.
	Page 19		Page 21
	Page 19		Page 21
	drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of		Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?
2	drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.	2	<ul><li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
2 3	<ul><li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li><li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li><li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in that regard was likely Kristin Juras, now lieutenant</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena issued by the Montana state legislature and directed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in that regard was likely Kristin Juras, now lieutenant governor and we, along with other speakers like</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena issued by the Montana state legislature and directed to the Department of Administration for a broad</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in that regard was likely Kristin Juras, now lieutenant governor and we, along with other speakers like Anthony Johnstone and some others, put on this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena issued by the Montana state legislature and directed to the Department of Administration for a broad swath of judicial branch emails, particularly those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in that regard was likely Kristin Juras, now lieutenant governor and we, along with other speakers like Anthony Johnstone and some others, put on this program, and I taught at it for a number of years.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena issued by the Montana state legislature and directed to the Department of Administration for a broad swath of judicial branch emails, particularly those emails that she had received or sent or deleted or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>drug manufacturers to railroads, all manner of all manner of litigation.</li> <li>Q. How many cases do you think you've tried in your career?</li> <li>A. Somewhere around 50 or 60.</li> <li>Q. Outside of being a trial lawyer, are there other professional achievements you're proud of?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What are they?</li> <li>A. I was, for 25 years, a member of the Board of Bar Examiners and was its chair for 12 years.</li> <li>During the course of that, we developed what's known as the Montana Law Seminar. That was adopted at the time that the Court granted the Board of Bar Examiners' petition to adopt the uniform bar exam.</li> <li>And the Court said that would be okay, but we needed to create the Montana Law Seminar, which is a one-day program now required for anyone having admission or seeking admission to the Montana bar. I helped develop my other major helper in that regard was likely Kristin Juras, now lieutenant governor and we, along with other speakers like Anthony Johnstone and some others, put on this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Were you subpoenaed to testify here?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Just briefly, in case certain commission members don't know, who is Beth McLaughlin and what does she do?</li> <li>A. Beth McLaughlin is the administrator of the Court and, in that role, manages the business of the Court. She could well describe it a lot better than I do.</li> <li>Q. What led you to becoming involved as Beth's lawyer? And I don't wish you to divulge attorney-client privileged information. But what were the circumstances?</li> <li>A. I can start the story with the with a phone call from Ms. McLaughlin. I'll call her Beth, if that permissible.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>A. Beth called me on a Friday evening and explained to me that very shortly before she called me she had received a courtesy copy of a subpoena issued by the Montana state legislature and directed to the Department of Administration for a broad swath of judicial branch emails, particularly those</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page	22 Page 24
<b>1</b> Q. Let me show you what's been admitted as	1 judicial standards commission, things that have
2 Exhibit 6. It will be in the book in front of you	2 either legal or sometimes even constitutional
3 as well.	<b>3</b> protections from disclosure.
4 A. Yes, I have it.	4 Q. We're talking about judicial branch
5 Q. And is Exhibit 6 that subpoend that Beth	5 employees' potentially their medical emails?
<ul><li>6 called you about?</li></ul>	6 A. Oh, yes. Indeed.
7 A. Yes.	7 Q. We're talking about emails pertaining to
8 Q. Was that subpoena served on Ms. McLaughlin?	8 youth-in-need-of-care cases?
9 A. No.	9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Who was it served on?	10 Q. Very sensitive information?
<b>11 A.</b> On the acting director of the Department of	11 A. Well, as an example and, again, Beth can
12 Administration, Misty Ann Giles.	12 describe it a lot better the
13 Q. And how did Beth get a copy of it?	13 youth-in-need-of-care emails will often have
14 A. It was dropped off to her office somehow.	14 court orders in them that have where names are
15 I don't know how it got there. But it was described	15 disclosed, and you just can't do that.
16 as a courtesy copy.	16 Q. Children's names?
17 Q. A courtesy copy?	17 A. Children's names and parents' names. Sure.
18 A. Yes.	18 Q. So you got the call.
<b>19</b> Q. And that would have been on Friday the	19 What did you do next, Mr. Cox?
20 the 9th?	20 A. I had to to well, in talking with
21 A. Correct. 9th of April.	21 Beth, I agreed to represent her. And I was then
22 MR. STRAUCH: Sheena, could you scroll	22 I then contacted two of my partners, one of my
<ul><li>23 down well, first of all, stop.</li></ul>	23 associates, and one of my paralegals saying,
24 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) The subpoena, Exhibit 6,	24 Whatever plans you had for the weekend, you no
<ul><li>25 looks like it requires the director to produce</li></ul>	<ul> <li>25 longer have because you need to come to the office</li> </ul>
25 looks like it requires the director to produce	25 Tonger have because you need to come to the office
Page	23 Page 25
1 emails on that day, Friday the 9th, at 3:00 p.m.;	1 on Saturday morning. We've got a project.
2 correct?	<b>2</b> Q. Saturday the 10th?
3 A. Yes.	3 A. Saturday the 10th. Yes, sir.
<b>4</b> Q. When approximately did did	4 Q. Okay. And did you, on Saturday the 10th,
5 Ms. McLaughlin call you?	5 in addition to calling in your partners, your law
6 A. Around well, she called me at around	6 partners and associates, to work, did you attempt to
7 6:00 probably, 6:30. She had received it, I	7 reach out to the director or potentially her lawyers
8 believe, after 5:00 p.m.	8 to find out their intentions with respect to the
<b>9</b> Q. Okay.	9 subpoena and your client's concerns?
10 MR. STRAUCH: And, Sheena, toward the	10 A. I did. Hard to do on a Saturday, as you
11 bottom of the page, please. The date.	11 might imagine. But I ended up sending at least one
<b>12</b> Q. (By Mr. Strauch) What is the date of the	12 email. But I just was trying at that point I
<b>13</b> subpoena sent by Senator Regier?	13 didn't know that there had been emails already
14 A. April 20 or, I'm sorry, April 8, 2021.	14 disclosed. And I know you're going to get to that.
15 Q. April 8th. Okay.	15 But I wanted to get the project stopped to say
16 What was your understanding of your	16 there's there's a lot of information you can get,
17 client's concerns as the court administrator	17 but you have to get it in an orderly process, and it
<b>18</b> regarding this subpoena, Exhibit 6?	18 has to be screened for privileged and confidential
19 A. I think they're best described in a	19 information. And I thought that once we raised
20 declaration that that we put into a petition the	20 those issues that likelihood was that people would
21 next day. It's Beth's declaration. And the concern	21 say, Oh, okay, we can do that, we just need to do it
22 as stated in there was that, if you just take a	22 fast.
23 broad swath of these emails, they are likely to have	<b>23</b> Q. What project were you trying to stop? I
24 some very highly confidential and sensitive	
	<b>24</b> missed you on that?
25 information in there youth court, medical,	<ul><li>24 missed you on that?</li><li>25 A. The production of the emails that were</li></ul>

<ul> <li>Page 26</li> <li>subpoenaed.</li> <li>THE WITNENSS: It keeps happening, doesn't</li> <li>tift.</li> <li>THE CLERK: I just want to make sure it's</li> <li>G. (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the</li> <li>production of the emails: -</li> <li>A. Right. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>Q And the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena vent</li> <li>the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena vent</li> <li>the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena vent</li> <li>the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena vent</li> <li>the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena vent</li> <li>the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Nike Manion was counsel for the</li> <li>I. Legislature Legislature - Leg</li></ul>	to the department. this is a series of emails th? Saturday and Sunday? Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? as counsel at the Department e Manion. Thank you. u're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
2       THE WITNESS: It keeps happening, doesn't       2         3       it? How about I just hold it here?       3         4       THE CLERK: I just want to make sure it's       3         5       tight.       3       C. Thank you. And this is a series of emails         7       production of the emails       3       C. Thank you. And this is a series of emails         9       Q. Hoy the director to the Legislature?       A. Right. That had been subpeenaed.       9         9       Q by the director to the Legislature?       A. Nike Manion was counsel at the Department to a diministration or a manager of the         10       A. Right. So keep in mind the subpeena and, of course, they would       A. Well, So keep in mind the subpeene and, of course, they would         10       accomplish this process of saying, Hey, guys, of a solution that Ms. McLaughlin's accomplish this process, accound the lawel accound the subpeena and, of course, they would receive         7       4	to the department. this is a series of emails th? Saturday and Sunday? Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? as counsel at the Department e Manion. Thank you. u're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
2       THE WITNESS: It keeps happening, doesn't       2         3       it? How about I just hold it here?       3         4       THE CLERK: I just want to make sure it's       3         5       tight.       3       C. Thank you. And this is a series of emails         7       production of the emails       3       C. Thank you. And this is a series of emails         9       Q. Hoy the director to the Legislature?       A. Right. That had been subpeenaed.       9         9       Q by the director to the Legislature?       A. Nike Manion was counsel at the Department to a diministration or a manager of the         10       A. Right. So keep in mind the subpeena and, of course, they would       A. Well, So keep in mind the subpeene and, of course, they would         10       accomplish this process of saying, Hey, guys, of a solution that Ms. McLaughlin's accomplish this process, accound the lawel accound the subpeena and, of course, they would receive         7       4	to the department. this is a series of emails th? Saturday and Sunday? Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? as counsel at the Department Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>3 if? How about Just hold it here?</li> <li>4 THE CLERK: I just want to make sure it's</li> <li>5 ifght.</li> <li>6 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the</li> <li>7 production of the emails -</li> <li>8 A. Right. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>9 Q by the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>2 A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena went</li> <li>1 to the director of the Department of Administration.</li> <li>2 Q. Thalk you. And this is a scrub addition was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>2 Q. Thalk you. And this is a scrub addition was not equipped or</li> <li>1 workatever obligations one has when served with a</li> <li>1 the peartment of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>10 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>2 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>2 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>2 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>2 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 fart, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>2 office may was a dubing these documents, would you ornally attempt to</li> <li>2 ornifered documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>2 ornifered documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>2 ornifered ad prive us a chance to review it, add</li> <li>3 will pull out the stuff that's privilege of</li> <li>2 ornifered ad agive us a chance to review it, add</li> <li>3 weill pull out the stuff that's privilege of</li> <li>3 cornified ad produce adaw back these - anything that's been</li> <li>3 cornified and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>3 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's - the</li> <li>3 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>4 mormal and with that's the meanily that's been</li> <li>5 off the best.</li> <li>3 cornified and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>3 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's - the</li> <li>3 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li></ul>	this is a series of emails th? Saturday and Sunday? Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? is counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. I're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li><b>4</b> THE CLERK: I just want to make sure it's 5 tight.</li> <li><b>5</b> (D) (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the 7 production of the emails</li> <li><b>6</b> (C) (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the 7 production of the emails</li> <li><b>7</b> (D) (A) (Right. That had been subpoenated.</li> <li><b>9</b> (Q) by the director to the Legislature?</li> <li><b>10</b> (A) (Right. So keep in mind the subpoenatent.</li> <li><b>11</b> to the director of the Department of Administration,</li> <li><b>12</b> who really was nothing other than a manager of the 3 email systems, like an ISP, internet service.</li> <li><b>13</b> email systems, like an ISP, internet service.</li> <li><b>14</b> provider. And they were the ones who had been 15? served the subpoena. And, of course, they would 16 have whatever obligations one has when served with a 17 subpoena to produce records.</li> <li><b>13</b> Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that</li> <li><b>14</b> be Department of Administration was not equipped or would not review the judicial branch emails for the 21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's 22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li><b>1</b> and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 things that the court administrator would be 4 familiar with and attured to wouldn't necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in 6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for privilege.</li> <li><b>1</b> and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 things that the court administrator would be 4 familiar with and attured to would neit necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in 6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for privilege.</li> <li><b>1</b> and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey, 1 filed 1 first filed one on 3 the 10th.</li> <li><b>1</b> geoses?</li> <li><b>1</b> thet with and attime of the outh?</li> <li><b>1</b> Gottact halwyers on the other side and say, Hey, 1 with the su</li></ul>	th? Saturday and Sunday? Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? is counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. u're you were trying to ess of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>5 tight.</li> <li>6 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the production of the emails is A. Right. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>9 Q. An Kight. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>9 Q. An Wolk Mike Manning?</li> <li>10 A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena went in the director of the Degartment of Administration.</li> <li>11 to the director of the Degartment of Administration.</li> <li>12 Q. I misspoke. Mike Manion. Thank you.</li> <li>13 email systems, like an ISP, internet service in the Department of Administration was to equipped or is subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that 19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or owould not review the judicial branch emails for the 21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's 20 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>13 and it might not occur to them that that's a 21 protected communication. So all kinds of different 31 things that the court administration would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't recessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be 5 nortice what seaponsive?</li> <li>10 and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 did issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially 5 weneed to claw back these anything that's been 4 produced and give us a chance to review it, and 5 well pull out the stuff that's privileged or 20 confict the lawyeers on the other side and by the Department of 20 confict and produce what's seponsive?</li> <li>21 MR. STRAUCH: Here. Twe got a copy for 22 you.</li> <li>22 Ma</li></ul>	Everts? counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? Is counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. I're you were trying to ses of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>6 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Trying to stop the 7 production of the emails</li> <li>8 A. Right. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>9 Q by the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>10 A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoenavent.</li> <li>11 to the director of the Department of Administration,</li> <li>12 who really was nothing other than a manager of the</li> <li>9 cand who's Mike Mannion?</li> <li>10 A. Mike Mannion was counsel at the Department of Administration,</li> <li>11 of the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>12 and they were the ones who had been</li> <li>13 more subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>14 provider. And they were the ones who had been</li> <li>15 served the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>16 the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>10 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>12 offfice may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>21 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>3 A. Well, of course, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>3 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 with eyt case, subpoena to an onparty for potentially</li> <li>16 in these.</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's - the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 for inders. Not do you normally attempt to</li> <li>20 off course, yeah. I mean, that's - the</li> <li>21 mormal</li></ul>	counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? Is counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. I're you were trying to ses of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>7 production of the emails</li> <li>8 A. Right. That had been subpoenned.</li> <li>9 Qby the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>10 A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena went</li> <li>11 to the director of the Department of Administration.</li> <li>12 who really was nothing other than a manager of the</li> <li>13 email systems, like an ISP, internet service</li> <li>14 provider. And they were the ones who had been</li> <li>15 served the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>16 have whatever obligations one has when served with a</li> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>19 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>12 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>12 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administration would by</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>16 fact, they were reviems those and ministration rough documents, would you or ray when side and say, Hey,</li> <li>3 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>19 provileged documents, would you comment to again that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you or review it, and</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 with bost is Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other. Side is nod, it tooks like, Tod</li> <li>24 they might documents for the these</li> <li>25 off or some medical problem and wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>15 noted by the Department of Administration administration and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>14 provide documents, would you command</li></ul>	counsel for the tive legislative counsel? Manning? Is counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. I're you were trying to ses of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>A. Right. That had been subpoenaed.</li> <li>G. A. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena went</li> <li>1 to the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>Q. And who's Mike Manion, Thank you.</li> <li>Who really was nothing other than a manager of the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>f and the subpoena. And, of course, they would receive -</li> <li>Q. And, which may otherwise do?</li> <li>Q. And, which may otherwise do?</li> <li>A. Well, and ther disclored and individent of a doministration in the subplema number of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the protecte communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>things that the court administration was out eccessarily be</li> <li>f fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>we need to claw back these - anything that's been</li> <li>produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>we need to claw back these - anything that's been</li> <li>mean to use sit to do that. The normal course</li> <li>mean to the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>we need to claw back these - anything that's been</li> <li>mean to use who the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>we need to claw back these - anything that's been</li> <li>mean to use sit to do that. The normal course is too that. The normal course is oo that. The</li></ul>	tive legislative counsel? Manning? as counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. a're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>9 Qn by the director to the Legislature?</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department to Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department to administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And who's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration.</li> <li>9 Q. And was it your concern then that</li> <li>9 (P. And Wo's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>9 (P. And Wo's Mike Manion was counsel at the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>9 (P. Hat was it your concern then that</li> <li>9 (P. Hat was the dore erecords.</li> <li>9 (P. Hat was the dore erecords requests to or role at that's at</li> <li>9 (P. Hat was the dore erecords requests to or portected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>9 (P. Hat with and attured to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>9 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>9 (P. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 (vit) cases, and up not a conoparty for potentially</li> <li>9 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>9 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>19 well end to taw the ere mormal course is to that. The normal course is to that. The no</li></ul>	Manning? as counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. u're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>10 Å. Right. So keep in mind the subpoena went</li> <li>11 to the director of the Department of Administration,</li> <li>12 who really was nothing other than a manager of the</li> <li>13 email systems, like an ISP, internet service</li> <li>14 provider. And they were the ones who had been</li> <li>15 served the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>16 have whatever obligations one has when served with a</li> <li>17 subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that</li> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>20 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's</li> <li>22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldh't even</li> <li>27 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>29 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>31 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>41 might and to eccur to them that that's a</li> <li>29 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>20 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>21 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>22 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>23 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>29 oc infidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>21 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>22 officatial and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>23 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>24 ordination on the other side and say, Hey.</li> <li>25 well public the stabilit 7. the email thread</li> <li>26 the best.</li> <li>27 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>28 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>29 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 Mich best.</li> <li>22 chair the book is Exhibi</li></ul>	As counsel at the Department Manion. Thank you. I're you were trying to ass of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
11       of Administration.         12       who really was nothing other than a manager of the served the subpoena. And, of course they wold         13       email systems, like an ISP, internet service         14       provider. And they were the ones who had been         15       served the subpoena. And, of course, they wold         16       have whatever obligations one has when served with a         17       subpoena to produce records.         18       Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that         19       the Department of Administration was not equipped or         20       owold not review the judicial branch emails for the         21       optic record about somebody seeking time         25       off for some medical problem and wouldn't even         12       and it might not occur to them that that's a         2       protected communication. So all kinds of different         3       things that the court administration if, in         6       fartiliar with and a tituned to wouldn't necessarily be         7       proiteged documents, would you normally attempt         12       ordinetial and produce what's responsive?         13       A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the         14       normal course is to to that. The normal course         15       not the baw	e Manion. Thank you. he Manion. Thank you. he're you were trying to less of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>12 who really was nothing other than a manager of the anali systems, like an ISP, internet service</li> <li>13 email systems, like an ISP, internet service</li> <li>14 provider. And they were the ones who had been</li> <li>15 served the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>16 have whatever obligations one has when served with a 1</li> <li>17 subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that</li> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or 20 would not review the judicial branch emails for the 22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time 25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>29 and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 things that the court administration would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in 6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for privilege.</li> <li>20 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many eviv! cases, and in that setting, when the other 10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially 11 privileged documents, would you normall y attempt to 2 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, hey, swe need to claw back these anything that's perivilege or 14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and 15 well pull out the stuff that's privileged or 14 produce what's responsive?</li> <li>14 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the 18 normal course is to do that. The normal course is to do that. The normal course is to do that. The normal course 19 is in't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for 19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for 20 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>15 wells pull out the suff that's privileged or 12 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>16 the best.</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean that</li></ul>	a're you were trying to ess of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? <b>irst filed one on</b> Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
13       email systems, like an ISP, internet service       13       And here again you're you were trying to         14       provider. And they were the ones who had been       13       And here again you're you were trying to         14       provider. And they were the ones who had been       14       accomplish this process of saying. Hey, guys, c         15       served the subpoena. And, of course, they would       16       have whatever obligations one has when served with a         17       subpoena to produce records.       18       And here again you're you were trying to         18       O. Okay. And was it your concern then that       19       is that a fair statement?         18       A. Ves. And if I it's not uncommon for ar       19         19       they might sea a record about somebody seeking time       20       10       it's the normal and including Beth McLau         20       office may otherwise do?       23       A. Well, of course. They would receive       24       into that process.       25       Q. And we were trying to         24       they might not occur to them that that's a       2       protected communication. So all kinds of different       3       things that the court administrator would be       1       with the Supreme Court on Sunday the 11th?         2       protected communication. So all kinds of different	a're you were trying to ess of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? <b>irst filed one on</b> Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
14       provider. And they were the ones who had been       14       accomplish this process of saying, Hey, guys, c         15       served the subpoena. And, of course, they would       15       slow down, can you give us a chance to review         16       A. Welk produce records.       17       Is that a fair statement?         18       Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that       17       Is that a fair statement?         19       the Department of Administration was not equipped or       16       accomplish this process of saying, Hey, guys, c         20       Okay. And was it your concern then that       14       accomplish this process of saying. Hey, guys, c         20       We Department of Administration was not equipped or       17       Is that a fair statement?         21       they might see a record about somebody seeking time       20       16's the normal and including Beth McLau         22       off for some medical problem and wouldn't even       20       20       And then did you file an emergency petition         23       and it might not occur to them that that's a       2       9000000000000000000000000000000000000	ess of saying, Hey, guys, can we give us a chance to review ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>15 served the subpoena. And, of course, they would</li> <li>16 have whatever obligations one has when served with a</li> <li>17 subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that</li> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>20 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's</li> <li>22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>29 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's hee</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 show down, can you give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>16 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 (In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 if's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 CHAR OGLE: Yen and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>25 Origination for that in the court record in the real trance in there.</li> <li>26 Originating and produce what's responsiv</li></ul>	ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
16       have whatever obligations one has when served with a       16       things?         17       subpoent to produce records.       18       Is that a fair statement?         18       Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that       17       Is that a fair statement?         19       the Department of Administration was not equipped or       18       A. Yee. And if I it's not uncommon for an         20       would not review the judicial branch emails for the       19       branch of government to get records request         20       offer any otherwise do?       20       16's the normal and including Beth McLau         21       they might see a record about somebody seeking time       24       into that process.         25       Off for some medical problem and wouldn't even       25       Q. And then did you file an emergency petition         21       and it might not occur to them that that's a       2       1       with the Supreme Court on Sunday the 11th?         2       protected communication. So all kinds of different       3       the gay you pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th.         4       familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be       noted by the Department of Administration if, in       fa fainiliar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be       1         3       o. otde sayses, and in that setting, when the other       10	ent? t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>17 subpoena to produce records.</li> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that 19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or 20 would not review the judicial branch emails for the 21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's 22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive 24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time 25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even 26 they might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 things that the court administration if, in 6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for 7 privilege.</li> <li>20. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many 9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other 20 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially 11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to 22 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey, 33 we need to claw back these anything that's been 34 produced and give us a chance to review it, and 35 well pull out the stuff that's privileged or 36 confidential and produce what's responsive? 37 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the 38 normal course is to do that. The normal course 39 civil cases, and in that settift that's privileged or 30 confidential and produce what's responsive? 31 A. Yes. Mat if books like, Todd 32 the best. 32 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted 32 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted 33 At you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd 34 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd 35 the thest. 36 that best. 37 A. Of Levis and Mike Manning [sic]? 38 A. Yes. Ata if a fait statement? 39 Civil cases, and Mike Manning [sic]? 30 Chall Podice: Any objection? 30 Chall Podice: Any objection? 30 Chall Podice: Any objection? 30 Chall Podice: Any objection? 31 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection? 31 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection? 32 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection? 33 Chall Podice And Mike Manning [sic]? 34 Chall Podice And Mike</li></ul>	t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>18 Q. Okay. And was it your concern then that</li> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or</li> <li>20 would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's</li> <li>22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might sea a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>27</li> <li>1 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>2 O. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 well pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>14 mormal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>14 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>15 wit to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>10 fact, they went to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	t's not uncommon for any nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>19 the Department of Administration was not equipped or would not review the judicial branch emails for the just turn them over wholesale and hope for complete exhibit. P and M. Chairman, P, as it is in the sum of the st. 22 on the st. 23 of the best.</li> <li>19 branch of government to get records request it's the hormal ourse is to do that. The normal course is the best.</li> <li>10 In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted2 if is in the bods is Exhibit 7 the email thread 2 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>14 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>15 Branch of government to get records request and hope for admitson of the 2 complete chibit.</li> <li>14 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>15 Branch of government to get records request and hope for admitson of the 2 complete chibit.</li> <li>15 Branch o</li></ul>	nt to get records requests. And d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>would not review the judicial branch emails for the</li> <li>type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's</li> <li>office may otherwise do?</li> <li>A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>Page 27</li> <li>and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>privilege.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>civit cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>we'll pull out the stuff that's responsive?</li> <li>A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>we'll pull out the stuff that's responsive?</li> <li>A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>g. Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>ti's in the bost.</li> <li>Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>ti's in the bost.</li> <li>Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>ti's in the bost.</li> <li>Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>ti's in the bost.</li> <li>a that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>the trans and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>the tabus addited for the station of the</li> <li>the tabus addited</li> &lt;</ul>	d including Beth McLaughlin in ministrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>21 type of sensitive information that Ms. McLaughlin's</li> <li>22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>Page 27</li> <li>1 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything tha's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 sin't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 is in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>22 tyets and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>21 went of Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>22 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	ninistrator. And so there's a gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get this file an emergency petition Page 29 art on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>22 office may otherwise do?</li> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>26 Q. And then did you file an emergency petition</li> <li>27 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say. Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's responsive?</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 sin't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>10 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>23 C. Hat You sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	gets followed, and it wasn't And we were trying to get thisfile an emergency petitionPage 29urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one onYes. Saturday the 10th. evening.And do we have Exhibit P,Sheena, the respondent'sHere. I've got a copy forYes.Yes. Sa it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>23 A. Well, of course. They would receive</li> <li>24 they might see a record about somebody seeking time</li> <li>25 off for some medical problem and wouldn't even</li> <li>26 Page 27</li> <li>1 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 anormal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>22 tit's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 being followed here. And we were trying to</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	And we were trying to get this         file an emergency petition         Page 29         urt on Sunday the 11th?         irst filed one on         Yes. Saturday the 10th.         evening.         And do we have Exhibit P,         Sheena, the respondent's         Here. I've got a copy for         'es.         Respondent's Exhibits. P is         P, as it is in the         ncomplete. And under the rule         like to add the Exhibits A, B,
24they might see a record about somebody seeking time 2524into that process. 2525Q. And then did you file an emergency petition24into that process. 25Q. And then did you file an emergency petition25Q. And then did you file an emergency petition26Page 271and it might not occur to them that that's a 2 protected communication. So all kinds of different 3 things that the court administrator would be 4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be 5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in 6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for 7 privilege.1with the Supreme Court on Sunday the 11th? 22A. Well, I filed I first filed one on 3 the 10th.34Q. Beg your pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th. 5A. Yes. Late in the evening. 65A. Mod, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many 9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other 10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially 11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to 12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey, 13 we need to claw back these anything that's been 14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and 15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or 16 confidential and produce what's responsive? 171May I approach? 1114CHAIR OGLE: Yes. 1515MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P 16 16 in there.15we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or 16 confidential and produce what's responsive? 171616In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted 22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread 23 that you	file an emergency petition Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? irst filed one on Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
25       off for some medical problem and wouldn't even       25       Q. And then did you file an emergency petition         Page 27         1       and it might not occur to them that that's a       2         2       protected communication. So all kinds of different       3         3       things that the court administrator would be       4         4       familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be       5         5       noted by the Department of Administration if, in       6         6       fact, they were reviewing those documents for       7         7       privilege.       6         8       Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many       9         9       civil cases, and in that setting, when the other       6         10       side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially       1         11       privileged documents, would you normally attempt to       12         12       contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,       13         13       we need to claw back these anything that's been       11         14       produced and give us a chance to review it, and       14         15       we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or       15         16       in there.       17	Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? <b>irst filed one on</b> Yes. Saturday the 10th. <b>evening.</b> And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>Page 27</li> <li>1 and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	Page 29 urt on Sunday the 11th? <b>irst filed one on</b> Yes. Saturday the 10th. <b>evening.</b> And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ol> <li>and it might not occur to them that that's a</li> <li>protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>privilege.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>mormal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>for to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>G. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>t's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>with the Supreme Court on Sunday the 11th?</li> <li>with the Supreme Court on Sunday the 11th?</li> <li>Well, I filed I first filed one on</li> <li>the loth.</li> <li>Q. Beg your pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th.</li> <li>M. Well, I filed I first filed one on</li> <li>the loth.</li> <li>Q. Beg your pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th.</li> <li>M. STRAUCH: And do we have Exhibit I</li> <li>please?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>exhibits aren't here.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Here. I've got a copy for</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>in there.</li> <li>And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>and D, we would move for admiss</li></ol>	urt on Sunday the 11th? <b>irst filed one on</b> Yes. Saturday the 10th. <b>evening.</b> And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other risde and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Chair QGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	irst filed one on         Yes. Saturday the 10th.         evening.         And do we have Exhibit P,         Sheena, the respondent's         Here. I've got a copy for         'es.         Respondent's Exhibits. P is         P, as it is in the         ncomplete. And under the rule         like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>2 protected communication. So all kinds of different</li> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other risde and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 Chair QGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	irst filed one on         Yes. Saturday the 10th.         evening.         And do we have Exhibit P,         Sheena, the respondent's         Here. I've got a copy for         'es.         Respondent's Exhibits. P is         P, as it is in the         ncomplete. And under the rule         like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>3 things that the court administrator would be</li> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 (In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>3 the 10th.</li> <li>3 the 10th.</li> <li>4 Chair OgLe: And ow have Exhibit 1</li> <li>3 the 10th.</li> <li>4 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Yes. Saturday the 10th. evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>4 familiar with and attuned to wouldn't necessarily be</li> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>4 Q. Beg your pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th.</li> <li>5 A. Yes. Late in the evening.</li> <li>6 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>7 MR. STRAUCH: And do we have Exhibit 7.</li> <li>8 please?</li> <li>9 THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>9 charlen of a dmission of the</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>4 Q. Beg your pardon. Yes. Saturday the 10th.</li> <li>5 A. Yes. Late in the evening.</li> <li>6 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>7 MR. STRAUCH: And do we have Exhibit 7.</li> <li>9 THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>9 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [s</li></ul>	evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>5 noted by the Department of Administration if, in</li> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Here. I've got a copy for</li> <li>10 exhibits aren't here.</li> <li>11 MR. STRAUCH: Here. I've got a copy for</li> <li>12 you.</li> <li>13 May I approach?</li> <li>14 CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	evening. And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>6 fact, they were reviewing those documents for</li> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 (In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	And do we have Exhibit P, Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for 'es. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>7 privilege.</li> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>7 MR. STRAUCH: And do we have Exhibit I</li> <li>8 please?</li> <li>9 THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>10 exhibits aren't here.</li> <li>11 MR. STRAUCH: Here. I've got a copy for</li> <li>12 you.</li> <li>13 May I approach?</li> <li>14 CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>8 Q. And, Mr. Cox, you and I have tried many</li> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	Sheena, the respondent's Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>9 civil cases, and in that setting, when the other</li> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul> <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>The mail statempt to</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>The mail statempt to</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sheena, the respondent's</li> <li>The mail statempt to</li> <li>The mail statempt to</li> <li>May I approach?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>The in there.</li> <li>MR, STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>MR, Man, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>and D, which were part of that in the court recompleter.</li> <li>So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>10 side issues a subpoena to a nonparty for potentially</li> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>10 exhibits aren't here.</li> <li>11 MR. STRAUCH: Here. I've got a copy for</li> <li>12 you.</li> <li>13 May I approach?</li> <li>14 CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	Here. I've got a copy for Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>11 privileged documents, would you normally attempt to</li> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> </ul>	Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>12 contact the lawyers on the other side and say, Hey,</li> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Yes. Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>13 we need to claw back these anything that's been</li> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>13 May I approach?</li> <li>14 CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>14 produced and give us a chance to review it, and</li> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>14 CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>15 we'll pull out the stuff that's privileged or</li> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>21 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>15 MR. STRAUCH: Respondent's Exhibits. P</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	Respondent's Exhibits. P is P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>16 confidential and produce what's responsive?</li> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>16 in there.</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	P, as it is in the ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>17 A. Of course, yeah. I mean, that's the</li> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>17 And, Mr. Chairman, P, as it is in the</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>18 normal course is to do that. The normal course</li> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>18 respondent's book is incomplete. And under th</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	ncomplete. And under the rule like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>19 isn't to just turn them over wholesale and hope for</li> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>19 of completeness we'd like to add the Exhibits A</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court reco</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	like to add the Exhibits A, B,
<ul> <li>20 the best.</li> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>20 and D, which were part of that in the court recordsolution of the court records</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>21 Q. In Exhibit 7, which has been admitted</li> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>21 So with with Exhibit Exhibit P, plus PA,</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	ut of the of the flar
<ul> <li>22 it's in the book is Exhibit 7 the email thread</li> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>22 B, and D, we would move for admission of the</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>23 that you sent to Ms. Giles and, it looks like, Todd</li> <li>24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?</li> <li>23 complete exhibit.</li> <li>24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?</li> </ul>	-
24 Everts and Mike Manning [sic]?24 CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?	nove for admission of the
25 A. Yes. I mean, it's a series of emails that25MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.	: INO ODJECTION.

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 30		Page 32
1	THE COURT: All right. It's admitted.	1	actually know.
1	(Exhibits admitted.)		Q. All right. Somebody associated with the
	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Cox, is Exhibit P,		Legislature, however?
3			•
4	with the Exhibits A, B, and D that I just stuck on		A. Yes. And I I knew she existed because
5	top of the table there, is that the petition that	5	
	you filed?	6	of maybe even the day before of the subpoena
	A. Yes.	7	from the Legislature to the Department of
	Q. And you filed that on Saturday the 10th?	8	
9	A. Sent it yes, by putting it into the		Q. And with with your emails to
10	electronic system at the clerk of the Supreme Court.	10	President Blasdel and Speaker Galt and
	Q. Okay. So you don't walk a paper to the	11	
	Court? You filed it electronically?		accomplish there?
	A. Yes.	13	A. Same thing I had been trying to accomplish
	Q. Exhibit D it's PD. What is PD?	14	, <b>I</b>
15	A. So PD is a letter that I sent April 10,	15	that they were seeking, but without turning over
16	2021, to Misty Ann Giles at the Department of	16	confidential, private, privileged material.
17	Administration care of her counsel, Mike Manion, and	17	Q. Why were you trying to resolve something
18	also to Todd Everts at the Legislature's legal	18	with all these folks that weekend rather than just
19	services division.	19	litigating the issue?
20	Q. And this was was this letter one of the	20	A. I was trying to avoid litigation. I was
21	attachments to one of your exhibits that we saw in	21	trying to avoid disclosure of documents, which
22	Exhibit 7?	22	actually could have led to liability on the part of
23	A. Yes.	23	
24	Q. All right. Thank you.	24	information. And it seemed it seemed to be the
25	Directing your attention to Page 2	25	best thing to do to try to get this back onto an
	Page 31		Page 33
1		1	
1	of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the		ordinary track for production of records. That's
2	of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what	2	ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.
2 3	of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns	2 3	ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do. Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation
2 3 4	of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?	2 3 4	<ul><li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li><li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails? <b>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</b>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I wrote late in the day on Sunday, April</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and we're complying with the subpoena as its written.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I wrote late in the day on Sunday, April 11th, to President Blasdel, Speaker Galt,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and we're complying with the subpoena as its written. And I think yes, this is Exhibit 7</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I wrote late in the day on Sunday, April 11th, to President Blasdel, Speaker Galt, Senator Regier, Ms. Abra Belke, and Mr. Todd Everts.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and we're complying with the subpoena as its written. And I think yes, this is Exhibit 7 she said that part of the records had already been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I wrote late in the day on Sunday, April 11th, to President Blasdel, Speaker Galt, Senator Regier, Ms. Abra Belke, and Mr. Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. All right. And who's Ms. Abra Belke?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and we're complying with the subpoena as its written. And I think yes, this is Exhibit 7 she said that part of the records had already been turned over on Friday and the remainder would be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>of D-2 excuse me of Exhibit PD, so D-2, the top paragraph, does that express what</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin, the court administrator's, concerns are regarding these emails?</li> <li>A. Yes, best as I was able to repeat them.</li> <li>Q. And the third paragraph on D-2, does that propose an orderly process for the clawback and review that you were proposing?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. In this timeframe, Mr. Cox, did you email other government officials other than Ms. Giles and her attorney to try to resolve or attorneys to try to resolve the court administrator's concerns regarding confidentiality?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. And just do you recall who those persons were? You won't find it in an exhibit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. I'm finding it in my own papers.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I wrote late in the day on Sunday, April 11th, to President Blasdel, Speaker Galt, Senator Regier, Ms. Abra Belke, and Mr. Todd Everts.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>ordinary track for production of records. That's what I was trying to do.</li> <li>Q. Trying to avoid protracted litigation between branches of the government?</li> <li>A. Protracted litigation made no sense.</li> <li>Q. Did you tell them what you intended to do if you were not able to reach a resolution with them?</li> <li>A. Both on the 10th and the 11th, in emails and letters, what I said was if if we can't get if we can't get an agreement to a procedure for the production of records that safeguards private information, we will file an emergency petition with the Montana Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Did any of these folks make any effort to resolve your concerns?</li> <li>A. No. I mean, Director Giles wrote me back and said on Sunday the 11th and said, Look, we're not equipped to deal with your concerns, and we're complying with the subpoena as its written. And I think yes, this is Exhibit 7 she said that part of the records had already been</li> </ul>

	e Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 34		Page 36
1 <b>A</b>	. Yes.	1	petition. And I think that by the time I talked to
	0. Okay. And that was on Sunday the 11th at	2	
-	bout 11:23 a.m., it looks like?	3	
		4	Q. So you you contacted you left the
5 Q	At the bottom Exhibit 7, Page 1, there's		voicemail for one of the Supreme Court justices?
	in email from you, Mr. Cox, to the director and the		A. I did.
7 le	egislative lawyers, plus it looks like a couple of	7	Q. And in your deposition you were questioned
8 y	our partners, Matt Hayhurst and Tom Leonard; is	8	about that, and the Mr. Parker, who was
9 tl	hat right?	9	questioning you, basically said, Did you check the
	. Yes.	10	
	And you do advise them that you had tried	11	Do you recall that?
	o copy them on the petition that you filed on		A. Yes.
	Saturday?		Q. And what when he asked you that
	. Yeah. We we filed that pretty late, and		question, what did you understood that meant, check
	hen I know that the email the email was the		the boxes as a lawyer calling a judge?
	email to the administrator anyway was rejected. I		A. Okay. So there's a prohibition against ex
	lon't think that the administrator that the one	17	
	o Mike Manion was rejected. But I'm not sure about hat.	18	that you can't contact a judge about anything ever. I am entitled to make an ex parte contact that the
	All right. But you did try to get it to		law allows, and what the law allows is a
	hem Saturday?		non-substantive that is, no discussion of the
	. Yes.		merits notification to the Court of, in this
	0. And and your best recollection is the		case, the emergency petition.
	one to Ms. Giles herself got bounced back, but the		Q. Okay. By "non-substantive" do you mean
	one to Mr. Manion went through?		you're not arguing to Justice Rice, advocating your
	U U		
	Page 35		Page 37
1 A	. I think so.	1	client's position in that phone call, are you?
2 Q	Did you contact the clerk of the	2	A. That would be forbidden.
3 S	Supreme Court, Bowan Greenwood, that weekend about	3	Q. So from the time that you filed the ex
<b>4</b> f	iling the petition?		parte motion on Saturday late, and you had left a
5 A	. I did.		message for Justice Rice, did you have any other
-	And what did you learn as a result of your	6	further communications with the Court after you
	conversation?	7	······································
	. What I learned wasn't surprising, actually.		A. No, I don't remember any.
	What I learned was that there is no mechanism in		Q. Now, are you aware that Justice Sandefur,
-	blace to let the Court know that an emergency motion	10	
	has been filed. I guess I was a little surprised by	11	provided a discovery response to the
	hat, but but what he said was, We don't even locket it in until Monday morning. And so that's	12	j 1 8 j
	what I learned.	13	spoke with Justice Sandefur on Saturday, April 11th? Are you aware of that?
	And are you being critical of Mr. Greenwood		A. I have read what he wrote in that response.
	n any way?		Q. And did you mention that in your deposition
	. Not at all.		when the Attorney General's lawyers were questioning
	. Who else did you contact at the Court that		you?
	you can recall?		A. I did not.
-	. I contacted Justice Rice.	20	
21 Q	. How did you contact Justice Rice?	21	A. Because I simply did not remember it, and I
22 A	. I called his cell phone, and he did not	22	still do not remember it to this day.
	nswer. I left a voice message for him in which I	23	ε υ
	ndvised him that we had filed an emergency who I		about that call, you still have no recollection of
25 r	represented and that we had filed an emergency	25	it?
1		i i	

П	n the Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 38		Page 40
	1 A. I do not.	1	case. It's been admitted as Exhibit 1.
	2 Q. Now, you mentioned back on Exhibit 7 at	2	And would you please look at Exhibit 1,
	3 the top, please, at the top email you did mention		Page 3, the April 11, '21, entries toward the bottom
	<ul> <li>4 that Ms. Giles had gotten back to you on Sunday</li> </ul>		of the page?
	5 morning by email. And one of the things that she		A. Yep. I have them.
	<ul><li>6 mentioned is, in the sentence the last sentence</li></ul>		Q. Does that indicate that you filed a motion,
	<ul><li>7 of the first paragraph:</li></ul>	7	a supplemental emergency motion that you just
	8 I am happy to provide copies of the PST	8	mentioned and
	<ul><li>9 file of what we turned over on Friday and then to do</li></ul>	9	A. Well, it I mean, it does. It shows that
1	• the same on Monday with remaining documents.	10	there's the original emergency motion and the
	1 So what did you learn when you got this	11	supplementation of the emergency motion. And I know
	2 email Sunday morning? This would have been after	12	only that that the that both of them show
	3 you filed your emergency petition. What did you	13	being docketed on the 11th.
	4 learn?		Q. Appreciate that clarification.
	5 A. What I learned was that before Beth	15	So the motion that you sent in
	6 McLaughlin even got the courtesy copy of the	16	
	<ul><li>7 subpoena, documents had already been turned over by</li></ul>	17	
	8 the Department of Administration to the Legislature.		A. Yes.
	9 Q. And she's telling you the rest are going to		Q. And then the supplemental motion that you
	0 be produced on Monday.	20	
	1 A. Yes.		A. Correct.
	2 Q. Despite the concerns that you've raised.		Q. Thank you.
	3 A. Right. She said, We're not really equipped	23	Did the Court enter a temporary order
	4 to deal with she said, We're not well-suited to	24	granting your ex parte petition?
	5 ascertain those issues.		A. It did.
	Page 39		Page 41
		1	
	Page 39 1 Q. She didn't offer to stop the production? 2 A. No.		MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.
	<ul><li>1 Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li><li>2 A. No.</li></ul>		MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please. Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of
	<b>1</b> Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?	2 3	MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please. Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> </ol>	2 3 4	MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please. Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>4 emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Exhibit 10, please. Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li><li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did</li> </ul>
1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> </ul>
1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty</li> </ul>
1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>4 emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>5 A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>6 of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>7 be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>8 Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>9 you have new concerns?</li> <li>O A. Yes.</li> <li>1 Q. And what were those?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order</li> </ul>
1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take up the issue.</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1	<ul> <li>1 Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>2 A. No.</li> <li>3 Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>4 emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>5 A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>6 of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>7 be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>8 Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>9 you have new concerns?</li> <li>0 A. Yes.</li> <li>1 Q. And what were those?</li> <li>2 A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>3 could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>4 And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>5 that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>6 Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>7 development?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information to the attention of the Court, and so we</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information to the attention of the Court, and so we</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	<ul> <li>1 Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>2 A. No.</li> <li>3 Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>4 emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>5 A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>6 of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>7 be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>8 Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>9 you have new concerns?</li> <li>0 A. Yes.</li> <li>1 Q. And what were those?</li> <li>2 A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>3 could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>4 And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>5 that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>6 Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>7 development?</li> <li>8 A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>9 information to the attention of the Court, and so we</li> <li>0 prepared a supplemental pleading that laid out the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the Brown case and respond to the petition?</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1, please. The</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the Brown case and respond to the petition? MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1-3, please.</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1, please. The</li> <li>register. Supreme Court register.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the Brown case and respond to the petition? MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1-3, please. April 14th entries.</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information to the attention of the Court, and so we</li> <li>prepared a supplemental pleading that laid out the</li> <li>new information.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1, please. The</li> <li>register. Supreme Court register.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) And Page I'm showing</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the Brown case and respond to the petition? MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1-3, please.</li> <li>April 14th entries. THE DEPONENT: Judging by you directing me</li> </ul>
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	<ol> <li>Q. She didn't offer to stop the production?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. She didn't offer to give you back the</li> <li>emails so you could review them for confidentiality?</li> <li>A. No, just that she would provide me a copy</li> <li>of what had been turned over and what was going to</li> <li>be turned over on Monday.</li> <li>Q. So as a result of that new information, did</li> <li>you have new concerns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what were those?</li> <li>A. Well, this wasn't just something that</li> <li>could could wait. They were already out there.</li> <li>And, of course, we subsequently learned, of course,</li> <li>that they were out there in the media.</li> <li>Q. What did you do to address that new</li> <li>development?</li> <li>A. I wanted to bring the additional</li> <li>information.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1, please. The</li> <li>register. Supreme Court register.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 10, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 10 a copy of the supreme court's, quote/unquote, temporary order entered on April 11th of '21?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turning to Page 3, Paragraphs 2 and 3, in addition to temporarily staying the subpoena, did the Court give the Legislature an opportunity to respond and brief your ex parte petition?</li> <li>A. Yeah. This I mean, this is pretty normal that the Court is going to enter an order just freezing things and saying, We need time to consider this. So the Legislature gets some time, McLaughlin gets some time, and then we'll take then we'll take up the issue.</li> <li>Q. But specifically giving the Legislature time to respond to what you had filed on an ex parte basis; correct?</li> <li>A. 14 days.</li> <li>Q. Did the Legislature intervene then in the Brown case and respond to the petition? MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 1-3, please.</li> <li>April 14th entries. THE DEPONENT: Judging by you directing me</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 42		Page 44
1	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Thank you. After the	1	that you filed in the Supreme Court on April 12th?
	Court issued the April 11th temporary order, did the		A. Yes. Monday.
2			MR. STRAUCH: And Exhibit 2.
3	director obey the order and stop the production of	3	
	further emails?		Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Cox, Exhibit 2 is the
	A. Yes. By that time the administrator had		register of actions from that McLaughlin litigation,
6	hired Dale Schowengerdt, who at that time was with		the original proceeding that you're mentioning?
7	the Crowley law firm. And what Mr. Schowengerdt put		A. Yes.
8	into the court record was the administrator will		Q. Okay. And you here again you
9	follow the court order.		represented the court administrator Beth McLaughlin
10			in that action?
11	already produced before then?	11	A. I did.
12	A. Numbers vary. Some estimates or some		Q. Okay. When did you find out that the
13	some said 2,000. But in a subsequent declaration	13	Attorney General would be representing the
14	the Lieutenant General Kristin Hansen said 5,000. I	14	Legislature in connection with these matters?
15	don't know which is correct.	15	A. On Monday, I believe, when when I
16	Q. So somewhere between 2,000 and 5,000.	16	think by when they they filed something in the
17	According to what you were told by the Legislature	17	Brown litigation to, you know, strike my my
18	in court filings, somewhere between 2,000 and 5,000	18	petition. And so there you had it.
19	judicial branch emails were produced to the	19	Q. Did you did you get a letter from the
20	Legislature?	20	Attorney General's Office? Exhibit 11?
	A. Yes.	21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And were those returned at that time?	22	Q. And is Exhibit 11 a letter dated April 12,
	A. No.	23	
	Q. Do you know what was done with those emails	24	Chief Justice Rice of the Montana Supreme Court?
	after the director of administration produced them		A. Yes. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.
	1		
	Page 43		Page 45
-	Page 43	_	Page 45
	Friday?		Q. Beg your pardon?
2	Friday? A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in	2	<ul><li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li><li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li></ul>
2 3	Friday? A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to	2 3	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a</li> </ul>
2 3 4	Friday? A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	Friday? A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry.</li> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: <ul> <li>The Legislature I'm reading the</li> <li>Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: <ul> <li>The Legislature I'm reading the</li> <li>Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I <ul> <li>highlighted language there:</li> <li>The Legislature of the</li> <li>Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as</li> <li>binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not</li> </ul></li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here. And so to to solve that concern and to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here. And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here. And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: <ul> <li>The Legislature I'm reading the</li> <li>Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the</li> <li>Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced.</li> </ul></li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. <ul> <li>That letter notifies the chief and you</li> <li>copied on this that that the Department of</li> <li>Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: <ul> <li>The Legislature I'm reading the</li> <li>Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the</li> <li>Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul></li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of Administration, since they were the recipient of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced. Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of Administration, since they were the recipient of the subpoena.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40 years of litigation practice in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of Administration, since they were the recipient of the subpoena.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 12, please.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40 years of litigation practice in Montana had you ever seen opposing counsel send a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of Administration, since they were the recipient of the subpoena.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 12, please.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is Exhibit 12 a copy of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40 years of litigation practice in Montana had you ever seen opposing counsel send a letter to a court to challenge a court order like</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Friday?</li> <li>A. I don't. I do not, other than in the in the declaration by Kristin Hansen, she put a link to media that had that had disclosed a bunch of the of the emails Saturday, Sunday, and Monday.</li> <li>Q. So what then did you what did you do next after after these developments? Did you file an original proceeding?</li> <li>A. Well, yes, I filed the emergency motion in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation, which made sense because it arose out of the whole email controversy which had blown up in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation. And so then the Court, in its temporary order, said, We've got some concerns about procedural issues here.</li> <li>And so to to solve that concern and to not be involved in the Brown versus Gianforte litigation anymore, I filed an original proceeding that was titled McLaughlin versus the Montana Legislature and, I think, the Department of Administration, since they were the recipient of the subpoena.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 12, please.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Beg your pardon?</li> <li>A. Signed by Lieutenant General Hansen.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And that letter hang on for a second. Sorry. That letter notifies the chief and you copied on this that that the Department of Justice is going to be representing the Legislature?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn to Page 2. The last paragraph. I highlighted language there: The Legislature I'm reading the Legislature does not recognize this Court's order as binding and will not abide by</li> <li>A by it.</li> <li>Q by it. The Legislature will not entertain the Court's interference in the Legislature's investigation of the serious and troubling conduct of members of the judiciary. The subpoena is valid and will be enforced. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40 years of litigation practice in Montana had you ever seen opposing counsel send a</li> </ul>

шι	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 46		Page 48
1	A. No.	1	Q. Okay. I misspoke. So, one, did they send
	Q. Had you ever read a licensed lawyer's		one additional subpoena to Ms. Giles after the
	statement to a court that its client will not obey		-
	an order?	3	Supreme Court quashed the first one? A. Yes.
	<b>A.</b> No.		Q. For the same emails?
			A. Yes.
	<ul><li>Q. What was your reaction?</li><li>A. It it took me aback. I I didn't</li></ul>		
		/	Q. Did they send a subpoena now directed to
	it took me a while to process it because it was so	8	your client, Ms. McLaughlin, for the emails? A. Yes.
9	contrary to everything that I knew about the rule of	-	
10	law and courts and Marbury versus Madison. And I		<ul><li>Q. After the Court said, Don't?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
11	just I mean, I couldn't I truly couldn't		
12	understand it. It also meant that my hopes of		Q. And in addition to subpoenaing emails from
13	trying to work something out and avoid litigation		Ms. McLaughlin, what else did they subpoena when they sent her a subpoena?
14	were probably zero.		
	Q. And in addition to saying this, did the		A. It was it was pretty broad. Telephones
	Attorney General's Office conduct itself thereafter in a manner consistent with what was said here?	16	that were used. I don't know. Desks, typewriters.
17		17	
	A. Well, the office certainly took the		Q. Not just emails, but telephones and any
19	position that the Court had no business ruling on the validity of the locidleting submeans and that	19	electronic devices that might have transmitted those
20	the validity of the legislative subpoena and that,	20	emails? A. Yes.
21	in essence, this was a matter solely within the		
22	purview of the Legislature, and that was that.	22	Q. Did the Legislature move to dismiss the
	Q. Well, did the did the Attorney General's	23	
	Office the subpoena had been quashed. Did the		the McLaughlin case? A. Yes.
23	Attorney General's office return the emails?	25	A. 165.
	Page 47		Page 49
	Page 47		Page 49
	A. No.		Q. Exhibit 13?
2	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to</li></ul>	2	Q. Exhibit 13? A. Yes.
2 3	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And would you and this is the</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen,</li> </ul>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order, which would not be followed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Pages the bottom of Page 8 to Page 9, if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order, which would not be followed.</li> <li>Q. Did they did the Attorney General's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Pages the bottom of Page 8 to Page 9, if you'd take a look at that? It's the conclusion.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order, which would not be followed.</li> <li>Q. Did they did the Attorney General's Office for the Legislature or through the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Pages the bottom of Page 8 to Page 9, if you'd take a look at that? It's the conclusion. And this says this reads, says that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order, which would not be followed.</li> <li>Q. Did they did the Attorney General's Office for the Legislature or through the Legislature did were more subpoenas issued now</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Pages the bottom of Page 8 to Page 9, if you'd take a look at that? It's the conclusion.</li> <li>And this says this reads, says that the Legislature submitted a letter to the acting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office try to set up what you've described as the normal procedure for the owner of the documents that had been subpoenaed to take dominion of them and review them for privilege and confidentiality? Did they do that?</li> <li>A. No. I did have a conversation with Dale Schowengerdt about that process, but that was with the Department of Administration, not with the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. Did it happen?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they file more pleadings to contest your ability to regain control for your client over judicial branch emails?</li> <li>A. I I think that in the very next pleading they filed, the argument was made that what the court administrator was seeking was another order, which would not be followed.</li> <li>Q. Did they did the Attorney General's Office for the Legislature or through the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 13?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And would you and this is the Legislature's motion to dismiss the petition dated April 14th; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who are the lawyers or, excuse me, did the Attorney General's Office file an appearance for the Legislature in that case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Specifically through Kristin Hansen, lieutenant general, and Derek Oestreicher, general counsel?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Kristin Hansen is now deceased, God rest her soul; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read this motion when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Pages the bottom of Page 8 to Page 9, if you'd take a look at that? It's the conclusion. And this says this reads, says that the</li> </ul>

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 50		Page 52
1	A. Yes, sir.	1	have the right to it. I mean, ultimately those
	Q. And then on the next page it says not only	2	
3	are they not going to follow the April 11th order,	3	
4	but that your petition seeks another order, which	4	
	will not bind the Legislature and will not be	5	
6	followed.		Q. What did it mean now that you knew 5,000
7	Is that what you were talking about?	7	
	A. Yes, it was.	, 8	Administration, the Legislature, and the AG's
	Q. What did that tell you, this brief?	9	office?
	A. Same thing. It just is we were on this	-	A. That there were potentially protected,
	path by their choosing, and that was just what was	11	private, sensitive information that was now, in
	going to happen. My attempts to get things worked	12	essence, in the public domain.
	out simply were gone.	13	
	Q. In other words, you were you were going		
	to have to engage in this litigation to get these	15	
	emails back?		A. Right. It's the judicial branch emails
	A. Yes.	17	
18	MR. STRAUCH: Exhibit 14, please.		Q. Okay. Things like employees' medical
	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) This is a declaration of		
20	the lieutenant general, Hansen, April 14th; correct?	20	records?
	A. Yes, sir.	-	A. Yes.
	Q. Paragraph 2. This paragraph, is that the		Q. Things like youth-in-need-of-care records
	paragraph that you were mentioning that verifies		that had kids' names in them?
	that emails were, in fact, sent to the media?		A. Those were the administrator's concerns.
	A. Yes.		Q. Those names never get out in the public, do
			2. Those manages he for get out in the prone, as
	Page 51		Page 53
1	Q. Paragraph 5. That confirms that on	1	they?
1 2	Q. Paragraph 5. That confirms that on April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the		they? A. Not that I'm aware of.
		2	5
2 3	April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the	2 3	A. Not that I'm aware of.
2 3 4	April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li><li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena;	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li><li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li><li>A. That's what it says.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in both cases, actually. For a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did the Attorney General's Office then send another</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know what they looked like when they went there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know what they looked like when they went there.</li> <li>Q. Let me ask you this: Should the judicial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did the Attorney General's Office then send another letter to the Court, Exhibit 16?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know what they looked like when they went there.</li> <li>Q. Let me ask you this: Should the judicial branch's sensitive and protected information been in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did the Attorney General's Office then send another letter to the Court, Exhibit 16?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is this A letter Exhibit 16 a letter</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know what they looked like when they went there.</li> <li>Q. Let me ask you this: Should the judicial branch's sensitive and protected information been in the possession of the Attorney General's Office?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did the Attorney General's Office then send another letter to the Court, Exhibit 16?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is this A letter Exhibit 16 a letter from the Attorney General's Office, April 18th of;</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>April 9th, on that Friday, that the director of the Department of Administration produced over 5,000 emails that day in response to the subpoena; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Paragraph 8. Paragraph 8, the Attorney General's Office confirms that, in fact, it is holding the emails that were produced; correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says there.</li> <li>Q. And according to the Attorney General's office, quote: No sensitive or protected information has been disclosed. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Do you agree with that claim?</li> <li>A. I'm in no position to agree or disagree with it. I have simply no way to know. But they had been spilled out into the media. I don't know what they looked like when they went there.</li> <li>Q. Let me ask you this: Should the judicial branch's sensitive and protected information been in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Not that I'm aware of.</li> <li>Q. Now, having the benefit of the Legislature's response to the petition that you filed, did the Court enter a new temporary order enjoining and quashing the legislative subpoenas, Exhibit 15?</li> <li>A. On April 16th the Court issued a further order in in in both cases, actually. For a bit we had parallel dockets running.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And Exhibit 15 is that order?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. And it enjoins and temporarily quashes the subpoena issued to your client?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. And it sets a briefing schedule; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. After that order, the April 16th order, did the Attorney General's Office then send another letter to the Court, Exhibit 16?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is this A letter Exhibit 16 a letter from the Attorney General's Office, April 18th of;</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 54	Page 56
1 Supreme Court, end quote?	1 The self-interest is so apparent any
2 A. Yes.	<ul><li>attempt by this Court to decide the question runs</li></ul>
3 Q. Did you read that letter?	<ul><li>a afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li></ul>
4 A. I did. I don't remember when I got it.	4 Did I read that correctly?
5 But I I did read it.	5 A. Yes.
6 Q. All right. I'm going to direct your	6 Q. What is the MCJC?
	7 A. Montana Code of Judicial Conduct.
	<ul><li>8 Q. Clearly accusing the Court of misconduct</li></ul>
<ul><li>8 The Court here lays claim</li><li>9 A. I have it.</li></ul>	
10 Q. Yeah. The Court here lays claim to the	10 right?
11 sole authority over provision of due process for all	11 A. Yes, sir.
12 branches of government, which is ludicrous.	<b>12</b> Q. Are you aware of any judicial misconduct or
13 And then it goes on to say:	<b>13</b> self-interest in that proceeding?
<b>14</b> This statement by the Montana	14 A. No.
<b>15</b> Supreme Court it doesn't say that, my	<b>15</b> Q. Are you aware of any factual basis to say
<b>16</b> assertion this statement is wholly outside the	<b>16</b> such things to the Montana Supreme Court?
17 bounds of rational thought.	17 A. No.
<b>18</b> Did I read that correctly?	<b>18</b> Q. Did the Court grant or deny that motion to
19 A. Yes, sir.	19 disqualify?
<b>20</b> Q. Did those statements in this letter give	20 A. Ultimately denied it.
21 you any confidence that the Attorney General's	<ul><li>21 Q. And for the record, it's Exhibit 18. It's</li><li>22 been admitted. We don't need to look at it.</li></ul>
22 Office would stand down and obey orders?	
23 A. No.	<b>23</b> After the Court denied the motion to
<ul><li>24 Q. In your 40-plus years of practice in</li><li>25 Montana have you ever seen counsel of record send a</li></ul>	<ul><li>24 disqualify, did the Attorney General then send</li><li>25 another letter to the Court? This would be</li></ul>
25 Wolitana have you ever seen counsel of fecold send a	25 another letter to the Court? This would be
Page 55	Page 57
Page 55 1 letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like 2 this?	Page 57 1 Exhibit 19. 2 A. Yes.
1 letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> <li>jurisdiction and including, quote, the impropriety</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page I'm going to draw your attention to</li> <li>just a couple things here. Page 5, top of page.</li> <li>I'm reading, quote:</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> <li>jurisdiction and including, quote, the impropriety</li> <li>of this Court presuming to, quote/unquote, settle</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page I'm going to draw your attention to</li> <li>just a couple things here. Page 5, top of page.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> <li>jurisdiction and including, quote, the impropriety</li> <li>of this Court presuming to, quote/unquote, settle</li> <li>its dispute with a coordinate branch of government.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>the who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page I'm going to draw your attention to</li> <li>just a couple things here. Page 5, top of page.</li> <li>I'm reading, quote:</li> <li>This matter has arisen because evidence of</li> <li>judicial misconduct has come to public light.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> <li>jurisdiction and including, quote, the impropriety</li> <li>of this Court presuming to, quote/unquote, settle</li> <li>its dispute with a coordinate branch of government.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Does that did the Honorable</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>letter to a court, the Montana Supreme Court, like</li> <li>this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then</li> <li>file, after sending this letter, a motion seeking to</li> <li>disqualify all of the Supreme Court justices, all of</li> <li>them? Exhibit 17.</li> <li>A. Yes. A week and a half or so later, yes.</li> <li>Q. And Exhibit 17 is the Montana Legislature's</li> <li>motion to disqualify all Supreme Court justices</li> <li>dated April 30th of '21; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who on Page 17, 1, at the top</li> <li>who whose names are on this brief for the</li> <li>Legislature from the Attorney General's Office?</li> <li>A. Austin Knudsen, Kristin Hansen, Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. Did you read Exhibit 17 when it was filed?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page I'm going to draw your attention to</li> <li>just a couple things here. Page 5, top of page.</li> <li>I'm reading, quote:</li> <li>This matter has arisen because evidence of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Exhibit 19.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 19 a letter written by the</li> <li>Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen dated</li> <li>May 19, 2021, directed to the Supreme Court</li> <li>justices?</li> <li>A. And including Judge Harris, who was sitting</li> <li>by designation.</li> <li>Q. Is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did you read that letter when it came out?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 1, third paragraph, it says that</li> <li>the Honorable Attorney General says that his</li> <li>lieutenant and his other Lieutenant General Hansen</li> <li>and his other subordinate, Derek Oestreicher,</li> <li>made excuse me delivered, quote, strong</li> <li>statements. And including about the Court's</li> <li>jurisdiction and including, quote, the impropriety</li> <li>of this Court presuming to, quote/unquote, settle</li> <li>its dispute with a coordinate branch of government.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> </ol>

In	the Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 58		Page 60
1	he was aware of the, quote/unquote, strong	1	the Montana Supreme Court said?
2	statements of the subordinates in his office?		A. No.
3	A. Seemed a direct endorsement of those		Q. Are you aware of any factual basis to say
4			these kinds of things that the Honorable
	Q. Did he do anything, to your knowledge, in	5	
6		_	A. No. No.
7			Q. Did the Attorney General's Office then file
8		8	petition for rehearing?
9		9	A. Yes.
10		10	
11			petition for rehearing dated May 26th in the
	A. Not that I'm aware of.		McLaughlin case; is that right?
	Q. Page 2, first paragraph. Bottom paragraph:		A. Yes.
14			Q. Did you read that document when it was
15			filed?
16			A. Yes, and responded to it.
17			Q. I'll draw some attention to some of the
18		18	
19			numeral 2(a):
20		20	The Court overlooked and misstated material
20			facts.
22			A. Yeah. That's taken from the rule on
	A. Yes, sir.		petitions for rehearing.
	Q. So the Attorney General is admonishing the		Q. Misstated?
	Court?		A. That's what you have to prove on a petition
20	Court:	25	A. That's what you have to prove on a petition
	Page 59		Page 61
_	Page 59	_	Page 61
	A. I don't want to characterize it. I just		for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.
2	A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.	2	<b>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</b> Q. Page 6. The highlighted language:
2	<ul><li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li><li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li><li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li><li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li><li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect. Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect. Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect. Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	2 4 5 6 7 8 9	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect. Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard. Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect. Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any improprieties by the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any improprieties by the Court in the proceeding?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any improprieties by the Court in the proceeding?</li> <li>A. No. Everything was argued and hashed out</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any improprieties by the Court in the proceeding?</li> <li>A. No. Everything was argued and hashed out and decided and ultimately by the Supreme Court.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No. Everything was argued and hashed out and decided and ultimately by the Supreme Court?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No. Everything was argued and hashed out and decided and ultimately by the Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Ultimately by the U.S. Supreme Court?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 177 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I don't want to characterize it. I just think that it can be easily read and understood.</li> <li>Q. There's a footnote at the bottom of that page?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. The Attorney General, the Honorable Attorney General Austin Knudsen, is telling the Court that a statement that it made in its order is inaccurate almost to a word, quote/unquote; right?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. In your 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you ever seen counsel of record say such things like this to the Court?</li> <li>A. Not a lawyer, no.</li> <li>Q. Not a lawyer, is that what you said?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any invalid orders?</li> <li>A. No. Everything was argued and hashed out and decided and ultimately by the Supreme Court?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>for rehearing in order to get a matter reheard.</li> <li>Q. Page 6. The highlighted language: Here the justices are institutionally and personally interested in the outcome so their ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice participated in the polls conducted by the MJA, which is the Montana Judges Association. Quote, respectfully, public regards records tell a different tale, end quote. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Page 8, Note 4, the footnote at the bottom: And it is perverse perverse to suggest that this Court will determine whether its own polling practices are misconduct. Is that what that says?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 13. Conclusion: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense.</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 62		Page 64
2	Q. Again, in 40-years-plus of practice in Montana have you seen counsel of record say such things to the Court in a brief?	2	A. Yeah. Good question. My initial response was, Huh, okay. Well, if they're going to dismiss them there isn't much I can do about that
	things to the Court in a brief? A. No.		them, there isn't much I can do about that. But there was. Because once we went back
	Q. Are you aware of any factual basis to say	4	
	such things?	5	says that you can't just go a ways in a case and
	A. No. To the contrary.	7	then say, Never mind, under some circumstances. One
	Q. Exhibit 21. Is that's the order that	8	of them is capable of repetition yet evading review.
	came out in the Brown litigation June 10th of '21;	9	I don't remember the other ones, but we wrote them
10	correct?	10	in our brief, made the decision to oppose it because
11	A. Yes.	11	the questions that were there clearly looked like
12	Q. And the Supreme Court actually affirmed the	12	they were going to come back around, and they
	Montana Legislature's position; did it not?	13	
	A. I it did.	14	Q. Well, Mr. Cox, had the Legislature when
15	Q. The Supreme Court agreed with the	15	they filed this motion saying, We stand down, had
16	Legislature that SB 140 was constitutional?	16	anybody returned the emails to the court
17	A. That was the holding in the majority of the	17	administrator?
18	Court.		A. No.
19	Q. Now, shortly after that order was issued in		Q. That was still left out there, wasn't it?
20	Brown, what actions did the Montana legislative		A. Yes.
21	excuse me Montana Legislature and		Q. And those emails were still in the hands of
22	Attorney General's Office take regarding its second		the Attorney General's Office?
23	subpoena to your client?		A. Yes.
	A. Not sure what you're referring to.		Q. Did they say they were going to return them
25	Do you want to orient me, please?	25	here in this motion?
	Page 63		Page 65
	Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your		A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.
2	Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?	2	A. I don't remember that they did or didn't. I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li><li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the</li></ul>	2 3	A. I don't remember that they did or didn't. I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li><li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li><li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> <li>A. The motion to dismiss is moot. No, we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 24 for the record. We don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> <li>A. The motion to dismiss is moot. No, we opposed it. And the Court denied the motion to dismiss, and then ultimately ruled on the actual petition.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 24 for the record. We don't need to look at it necessarily is the order dated July 14th, '21, in the McLaughlin petition. Now, after that July 14th order came out</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> <li>A. The motion to dismiss is moot. No, we opposed it. And the Court denied the motion to dismiss, and then ultimately ruled on the actual petition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So but you've said here numerous</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 24 for the record. We don't need to look at it necessarily is the order dated July 14th, '21, in the McLaughlin petition. Now, after that July 14th order came out and let's back up. Let's go to the end of that,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> <li>A. The motion to dismiss is moot. No, we opposed it. And the Court denied the motion to dismiss, and then ultimately ruled on the actual petition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So but you've said here numerous times that you were trying to avoid litigation. So</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 24 for the record. We don't need to look at it necessarily is the order dated July 14th, '21, in the McLaughlin petition. Now, after that July 14th order came out and let's back up. Let's go to the end of that, the where the Court orders what needs to happen,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Exhibit 22. Did it move to dismiss your petition as moot?</li> <li>A. Yes, because the actual issue of the validity of legislative subpoenas in general, and these particular ones were still pending. And so what this was was a declaration, essentially, of never mind, they're moot, we quit.</li> <li>Q. The Legislature was saying, We withdraw the subpoenas?</li> <li>A. They did withdraw the subpoenas one subpoena recipient at a time by in writing.</li> <li>Q. And then they said to the Court, Since we've withdrawn the subpoena, the whole case is essentially irrelevant?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the position they took.</li> <li>Q. Was the Montana Legislature's motion to dismiss granted?</li> <li>A. The motion to dismiss is moot. No, we opposed it. And the Court denied the motion to dismiss, and then ultimately ruled on the actual petition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So but you've said here numerous</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I don't remember that they did or didn't.</li> <li>I assume they did not say that, but I can't tell you by memory.</li> <li>Q. Didn't it, in fact, require an order of the Supreme Court ordering them to return the emails?</li> <li>A. Ultimately the Court ordered the return of all copies.</li> <li>Q. And as of the time of this the record will reflect that the Court denied the motion to dismiss it's Exhibit 23 on June 29th. After the Court denied this motion to dismiss in late June, had the emails been returned to the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the Court ultimately grant your client's petition in McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 24 for the record. We don't need to look at it necessarily is the order dated July 14th, '21, in the McLaughlin petition. Now, after that July 14th order came out and let's back up. Let's go to the end of that,</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 66		Page 68
1	Q. Thank you. Paragraph 57. Does this	1	petition for rehearing of the July 14th order?
	Exhibit 24 Paragraph 57 indicates that the		A. Yes.
	subpoena is quashed; correct?		Q. Exhibit 26. And this is Exhibit 26 is
	· ·		-
	A. Yes.		the Legislature's petition for rehearing August 11
	Q. And then keep going down. It enjoins the		of '21?
	Legislature and its lawyers from disseminating,		A. Yes, sir.
7	publishing, reproducing, or disclosing in any manner		Q. Did you read that when it was filed?
8	any documents produced pursuant to the subpoena?		A. I did.
	A. Yes.		Q. Let me draw some attention to statements
	Q. Paragraph D, the Legislature is ordered to	10	
	immediately return immediately return any	11	
12	materials produced pursuant to the subpoena, or any	12	
13	copies or reproductions thereof to your client, the	13	conduct.
14	court administrator, Beth McLaughlin?	14	Did I read that correctly?
15	A. Yes.	15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. Did the Legislature order its lawyer, the	16	Q. Page 13:
17	AG's office, immediately return the emails as	17	The Court's dismissive treatment of the
18	ordered?	18	Legislature's investigation into the records
19	A. No.	19	retention practices of judicial officers blinks
20	Q. Did you send a letter to the		reality.
	Attorney General's Office about that issue?	21	
	A. Yes.		A. Yes.
	Q. Exhibit 25. And this is an email and	23	Q. Page 16. Citing the McLaughlin case, a
	letter that you sent to the Attorney General's		statement made by the Court, the Attorney General
	office for the return of the documents; is that		says, quote:
	Page 67		Page 69
1		1	
	right?	1	That is a stunning counterfactual denial,
2	right? A. Yes.	2	That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote.
2 3	right? A. Yes. Q. And did the Attorney General's office	2 3	That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?
2 3 4	right? A. Yes. Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?	2 3 4	That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5	right? A. Yes. Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter? A. No.	2 3 4 5	That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct? A. Yes. Q. Page 18.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>right?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a letter, in a brief was filed with the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any questionable judicial</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a letter, in a brief was filed with the Montana Supreme Court, that the Attorney General would not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any questionable judicial conduct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a letter, in a brief was filed with the Montana Supreme Court, that the Attorney General would not obey the July 14th order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any questionable judicial conduct?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a letter, in a brief was filed with the Montana Supreme Court, that the Attorney General would not obey the July 14th order?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any questionable judicial conduct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did the Attorney General's office return the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14, '21, order was issued, did the Attorney General or any of his subordinates openly notify the Montana Supreme Court that he was refusing to comply with the order?</li> <li>A. No. I was told that they were going to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court and that they were going to hold on to the records until that had been dealt with.</li> <li>Q. Well, I didn't ask what you were told. I'm sorry. Are you aware whether the Attorney General's office or any of his subordinates openly notified the Montana Supreme Court in a letter, in a brief was filed with the Montana Supreme Court, that the Attorney General would not obey the July 14th order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>That is a stunning counterfactual denial, end quote. Correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 18.</li> <li>A. Page 18 of the Court's order or Page Q. I'm sorry. Yeah. Page 18 of the exhibit. Thank you.</li> <li>A. Of the exhibit. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Sorry. These advisory statements must be withdrawn, quote/unquote.</li> <li>A. That's what it says.</li> <li>Q. Page 19: Apart from that, the opinion contains numerous misstatements. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever seen counsel of record say such things in a brief to the Court?</li> <li>A. It wasn't quite as incendiary, but no.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any questionable judicial conduct?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
	Page 70 Page 72
1 A. No.	1 For example, did the Court say,
<b>2</b> Q. Are you aware of any factual misstatements?	<ul><li>2 parentheses, Unless you seek a petition for writ</li></ul>
3 A. No.	3 with the Montana Supreme Court?
4 Q. Are you aware of any factual basis to say	4 A. No. I mean, there's procedure for staying
<ul><li>5 such things to the Montana Supreme Court?</li></ul>	5 an order, but filing a petition for writ of
6 A. I am not.	<ul> <li>6 certiorari isn't one of them unless you file a</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>request with the issuing court saying, Please stay</li> </ul>
7 Q. Did the Court deny the petition for	
8 rehearing?	8 the order until the Supreme Court is active.
<b>9 A.</b> Yes.	<b>9</b> Q. Did the Attorney General's office ask the
<b>10</b> Q. Exhibit 27, for the record. We don't need	<b>10</b> Montana Supreme Court to stay its July 14th order?
<b>11</b> to look at it. It's an order dated September 7th of	11 A. No.
<b>12</b> 2021 denying the Legislature's petition for	12 Q. Did the Attorney General's office ask the
13 rehearing.	<b>13</b> U.S. Supreme Court to stay the Montana
14After the September 7th of '21 order came	<b>14</b> Supreme Court's order pending its decision on a
<b>15</b> out, did the Legislature or the AG's office	15 petition?
<b>16</b> immediately return the emails?	16 A. No.
17 A. No.	<b>17</b> Q. Is it accurate to say the Attorney General
<b>18</b> Q. Did you send a letter to the	18 unilaterally decided how and when it would comply
<b>19</b> Attorney General's Office about that again?	<b>19</b> with the July 14th order?
20 A. I did.	20 A. Well, they didn't comply with it.
<b>21</b> Q. Exhibit 28. Is that your letter to the	21 Q. Are you aware of any orders from any court
22 Attorney General's Office, September 8th of '21,	22 relieving the Attorney General from their
<b>23</b> asking them again to return the emails as ordered?	23 obligations, his obligations, under the July 14th,
24 A. Yes.	24 '21, Montana Supreme Court order?
<b>25</b> Q. Did the Attorney General's Office return	25 A. No.
	Page 71 Page 73
1 the emails in response to that letter?	Page 71 Page 73 1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a
<ul><li>1 the emails in response to that letter?</li><li>2 A. They did not.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>4 A. There was an email back dated</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>4 A. There was an email back dated</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>5 September 10th that from from Derek</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>5 September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>6 Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>rertiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Mow, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>4. Saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>4 saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>5 strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>T this letter dated September 10th?</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>4 saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know why?</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> <li>19 Q. So if you want review by the highest court</li> <li>20 of the land of the United States, you need to ask</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know why?</li> <li>A. I'm pretty sure that Mr. Oestreicher told</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> <li>19 Q. So if you want review by the highest court</li> <li>20 of the land of the United States, you need to ask</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know why?</li> <li>A. I'm pretty sure that Mr. Oestreicher told</li> <li>me that there was going to be a petition for writ</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> <li>19 Q. So if you want review by the highest court</li> <li>20 of the land of the United States, you need to ask</li> <li>21 them for the right to be heard. That's what's</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know why?</li> <li>A. I'm pretty sure that Mr. Oestreicher told</li> <li>me that there was going to be a petition for writ</li> <li>certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> <li>19 Q. So if you want review by the highest court</li> <li>20 of the land of the United States, you need to ask</li> <li>21 them for the right to be heard. That's what's</li> <li>22 called a petition for a writ of certiorari; is that</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>the emails in response to that letter?</li> <li>A. They did not.</li> <li>Q. Did they respond at all?</li> <li>A. There was an email back dated</li> <li>September 10th that from from Derek</li> <li>Oestreicher, and he said he would talk to Kris</li> <li>Hansen about it next week.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 29? Is that the email you're</li> <li>referencing?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did they get back to you as he said?</li> <li>A. Not that I remember.</li> <li>Q. After the July 14th, '21, order, the order</li> <li>saying immediately return the emails was issued</li> <li>strike that.</li> <li>Did they return the emails after you sent</li> <li>this letter dated September 10th?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know why?</li> <li>A. I'm pretty sure that Mr. Oestreicher told</li> <li>me that there was going to be a petition for writ</li> <li>certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. And is that basis or rationale listed as an</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 Q. Did the Attorney General's office file a</li> <li>2 petition for a writ of cert with the U.S.</li> <li>3 Supreme Court?</li> <li>4 A. Yes.</li> <li>5 Q. Exhibit 30.</li> <li>6 Now, this is a petition for writ of</li> <li>7 certiorari. Mr. Cox, for the benefit of the lay</li> <li>8 folks on the commission, when you file an appeal in</li> <li>9 Montana, it's what's called an appeal of right; is</li> <li>10 that correct?</li> <li>11 A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>12 Q. Meaning if you file an appeal, the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court has to take it, essentially?</li> <li>14 A. Yes. Generally speaking, yes.</li> <li>15 Q. The U.S. Supreme Court is not, for the most</li> <li>16 part, an appeal of right; is that right?</li> <li>17 A. Correct. There are some appeals of right,</li> <li>18 but by and large, it's discretionary review.</li> <li>19 Q. So if you want review by the highest court</li> <li>20 of the land of the United States, you need to ask</li> <li>21 them for the right to be heard. That's what's</li> <li>22 called a petition for a writ of certiorari; is that</li> <li>23 right?</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 74	Page 76
1 filed?	1 of day.
2 A. Yes, sir.	2 Did I read that right?
	3 A. Yes, sir.
<b>3</b> Q. And let me draw some attention to	
4 statements made in it. Now, to be clear, these are	4 Q. Are you aware of any untrue statements by
5 statements made you see Mr. Knudsen's name there	5 the Montana Supreme Court?
6 on the petition?	6 A. I think the Court's opinions were very
7 A. Right.	7 careful, and I don't know of anything that was
8 Q. These are statements made by the highest	8 stated that was untrue.
9 chief general legal officer in the state of Montana	<b>9</b> Q. Are you aware of any judicial self-dealing
10 to the highest court in this country; is that right?	10 by the Montana Supreme Court?
11 A. Yes.	11 A. No.
<b>12</b> Q. Page 18. Bottom of the page. Speaking of	<b>12</b> Q. Are you aware of any inappropriate behavior
13 the Montana Supreme Court, the highest court in the	13 by the so-called six McLaughlin justices?
14 state of Montana, to the United States	14 A. No.
<b>15</b> Supreme Court, the highest court in the state of	<b>15</b> Q. Are you aware of any judicial branch
<b>16</b> our of our country, the Attorney General says,	16 misbehavior?
17 referencing the Montana Supreme Court:	17 A. No.
<b>18</b> Judicial self-dealing on this scale might	<b>18</b> Q. Are you aware of any factual basis to say
<b>19</b> be unprecedented in the nation's history.	<b>19</b> such things to the highest court in this land
20 Did I read that right?	<b>20</b> regarding the highest court of this state?
21 A. Yes.	21 A. No, sir.
<b>22</b> Q. Page 34. Speaking of the Montana	<b>22</b> Q. Did the Supreme Court of the United States
23 Supreme Court, quote:	<b>23</b> deny the Attorney General's petition?
24 It reached out to facilitate a case brought	24 A. Yes. We wrote a response, and in the
<ul><li>25 by its appointee to conceal its misbehavior.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>normal course of things, the Supreme Court denied</li> </ul>
25 by its appointee to concear its inisoenavior.	25 normal course of things, the Supreme Court demed
Page 75	Page 77
1 Did I read that right?	1 the petition for writ of certiorari.
<ul><li>1 Did I read that right?</li><li>2 A. Yes.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ol> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ol> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>Make and the media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 45 of the exhibit, quote:</li> <li>It permitted them in italics, that</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> <li>case from the beginning all the way through the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:</li> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 45 of the exhibit, quote:</li> <li>It permitted them in italics, that</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> <li>case from the beginning all the way through the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom:         <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 45 of the exhibit, quote:</li> <li>It permitted them in italics, that</li> <li>meaning the Montana Supreme Court it permitted</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> <li>case from the beginning all the way through the</li> <li>Supreme Court of the United States? Was there a way</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, in Footnote 7, the bottom: <ul> <li>In addition to being untrue, these</li> <li>statements and, again, he's referencing</li> <li>statements by the Montana Supreme Court in</li> <li>addition to being untrue, these statements are</li> <li>panegyric to a panegyric to insincerity, came</li> <li>after the nonparty justices stayed their own</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenas.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 43. The six McLaughlin justices of</li> <li>the Montana Supreme Court refused to withdraw. They</li> <li>charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed</li> <li>themselves out of an investigation prompted by their</li> <li>own inappropriate behavior, end quote.</li> <li>Did I read that right?</li> </ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Page 45 of the exhibit, quote:</li> <li>It permitted them in italics, that</li> <li>meaning the Montana Supreme Court it permitted</li> <li>them to resolve the legal question of legislative</li>	<ol> <li>the petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>Q. And that</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: For the record, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>members of the commission, the notice of denial from</li> <li>the U.S. Supreme Court, March 24, 2022, is</li> <li>Exhibit 31.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) When did the</li> <li>Attorney General's office finally return emails?</li> <li>A. A relatively short time after the denial of</li> <li>cert. A couple of weeks.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if all emails were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know.</li> <li>Q. Do you know if the emails that went to the</li> <li>media were returned?</li> <li>A. I have no way to know if they were or they</li> <li>were not.</li> <li>Q. Was the proverbial horse out of the barn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Based on your involvement, was there a way</li> <li>to have avoided all of the dispute in the McLaughlin</li> <li>case from the beginning all the way through the</li> <li>Supreme Court of the United States? Was there a way</li> <li>to avoid that?</li> </ol>

mι	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 78		Page 80
1	A. Which was to stop things, put together a	1	discovery responses pursuant to an agreement with
2	program where we would, even on an expedited basis,	2	
3	review emails, pull privileged material, prepare a	3	CHAIR OGLE: Mr. Strauch?
1	privilege log of what we kept, and turn the rest	4	
5	over.	5	CHAIR OGLE: They're admitted.
6	Q. And I think you said you would normally	6	(Exhibits JJ and KK admitted.)
7	expect that to occur in litigation?	7	MR. CORRIGAN: I have a copy for each
	A. I've done that dozens upon dozens of times	,	member of the commission, as well as the witness.
	in litigation.	9	Can I approach?
	Q. In very adversarial cases, I assume?	10	CHAIR OGLE: Yes.
	A. Even against you.	11	CHAIR OOLE. 103.
	Q. Thank you.	12	CROSS-EXAMINATION
	A. Very adversarial.	13	BY MR. CORRIGAN:
	Q. You're saying I'm not a nice guy?		Q. Mr. Cox, you you testified that the
	A. I did not say that. I said you're very	15	legislative subpoena that was at issue in your
16	adversarial.	16	emergency motion was issued to the Department of
17	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, may I ask for	17	Administration and not your client; correct?
18	the commission's indulgence for a moment?		A. Correct.
19	CHAIR OGLE: Yes.		Q. Did the Legislature first attempt to get
20	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, members of the	20	
20	commission, I may have neglected to move for		A. Yes.
22	Exhibit P with its attached exhibits that we added		Q. And and did
	to it. If I did, I move for admission.		A. Well, let's be clear. Not no, that's
24	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> It is admitted.		not an accurate statement.
25	MR. STRAUCH: I have no further questions		Q. Did the Legislature attempt to get some
	Page 79		Page 81
1		1	
1	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the		documents from your client that were covered under
2	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you.	2	documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?
2 3	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay. We've been going for	2 3	<ul><li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li><li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling,</li></ul>
2 3 4	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to	2 3 4	<ul><li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li><li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li><li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li><li>Q. And had your client deleted those</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li><li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li><li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed</li> </ul>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? <b>MR. CORRIGAN:</b> Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox. You may proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox. You may proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Is it housed within the Department of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock.</li> <li>(Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.)</li> <li>THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094.</li> <li>The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox.</li> <li>You may proceed.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, by agreement with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Is it housed within the Department of Administration?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox. You may proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Is it housed within the Department of Administration?</li> <li>A. Told you I don't know the answer to that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox. You may proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, by agreement with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, I'd like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Is it housed within the Department of Administration?</li> <li>A. Told you I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. So you were the one who filed, I think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of this witness, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. Thank you. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. We've been going for about an hour and three quarters. Do you want to forge forward with cross-examination, or do you want to take a brief break? MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, I'd request just a brief break. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a break. We'll reconvene here in, say, 15 minutes, 11:00 o'clock. (Break taken from 10:40 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.) THE COURT: We're back on the record in the matter of Austin Miles Knudsen, Supreme Court Cause Number PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. The respondent is going to start his cross-examination of Mr. Cox. You may proceed. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, with the commission's permission, by agreement with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, I'd like to introduce two new exhibits pursuant to the good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>documents from your client that were covered under the subpoena?</li> <li>A. Some documents related to judicial polling, polling of the state district court judges.</li> <li>Q. And had your client deleted those documents?</li> <li>A. She had. And that's what she told the Legislature.</li> <li>Q. When you reached out to suggest negotiating a resolution to this, was one of your proposed suggestions to get the documents from your client instead?</li> <li>A. There would be a way to do it. I don't know if that's what I suggested, but there would be a way to do it because deleted off of one machine doesn't mean gone for good. So Beth could have gone to the the IT department and said, Do a search.</li> <li>Q. And where is the IT department housed?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Is it housed within the Department of Administration?</li> <li>A. Told you I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. So you were the one who filed, I think</li> </ul>

mı	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 82		Page 84
1	subpoena to the Department of Administration;	1	subject to an exception; correct?
	correct?		A. Yes, sir.
	A. Yes.		Q. And so you contacted Acting
	Q. What day of the week was April 10th?		Chief Justice Rice with a phone call and a
	A. Saturday.		voice mail on the evening of Saturday, April 10,
	Q. And did the Court grant your emergency	6	2021; correct?
	motion that was the subject of that did the	7	A. I think so. I think it was the 10th.
8	Court strike that.		Q. If I could move to we've already moved
9	Did the Court grant your emergency motion?		to admit it. I could have you pull up Exhibit I
10	A. On Sunday evening.	10	believe it's KK, Justice Rice's discovery response?
	Q. And that Sunday evening would have been	11	Sorry. JJ.
	April 11, 2021; correct?	12	<b>THE WITNESS:</b> Yeah. We know that to be
13	A. Yes.	13	true from what he said was the time stamp on his
14	Q. And you filed all of Administrator	14	email.
15	McLaughlin's subsequent court filings in this matter	15	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) And I think you testified
16	all the way through the United States Supreme Court;	16	that you believed there was an emergency which
17	correct?	17	justified this ex parte conversation?
18	A. I did.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Prior to representing Supreme Court	19	Q. And after you contacted Acting
	Administrator McLaughlin, had you practiced before		Chief Justice Rice ex parte with a phone call, did
	the Montana Supreme Court before?		you contact counsel for the governor or anyone at
	A. Many times.		the Montana Legislature to inform them that that ex
	Q. And in your experience, does the Montana		parte communication had occurred?
	Supreme Court generally accept filings on weekends?		A. I did not.
25	A. I don't know. I've never tried to do it.	25	Q. But you had been in contact with staffers
	Page 83		Page 85
	Page 83		Page 85
	I'd never had a situation like this one.		for the Department of with the Department of
2	<b>I'd never had a situation like this one.</b> Q. So if you file something on a weekend with	2	for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?
2 3	<b>I'd never had a situation like this one.</b> Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the	2 3	for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct? A. I had sent them emails.
2 3 4	<b>I'd never had a situation like this one.</b> Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?	2 3 4	<ul><li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li><li>A. I had sent them emails.</li><li>Q. And you had contact information for</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li><li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li><li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li><li>A. I had sent them emails.</li><li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li><li>A. I had sent them emails.</li><li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or Acting Chief Justice Rice at the time, in order to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication other than in this case where you didn't inform</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or Acting Chief Justice Rice at the time, in order to it facilitate the Court reviewing your motion over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication other than in this case where you didn't inform opposing counsel of that communication?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or Acting Chief Justice Rice at the time, in order to it facilitate the Court reviewing your motion over the weekend; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did. There was no other way to get that to the Court's attention that I knew of.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication other than in this case where you didn't inform opposing counsel of that communication?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. And what would the circumstances be that would justify not notifying opposing counsel of that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or Acting Chief Justice Rice at the time, in order to it facilitate the Court reviewing your motion over the weekend; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did. There was no other way to get that to the Court's attention that I knew of.</li> <li>Q. All right. And ex parte conversations, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication other than in this case where you didn't inform opposing counsel of that communication?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. And what would the circumstances be that would justify not notifying opposing counsel of that communication?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>I'd never had a situation like this one.</li> <li>Q. So if you file something on a weekend with the Montana Supreme Court, you don't know if the Court sees it before Monday morning?</li> <li>A. I I don't. And that's why I asked the clerk, Mr. Greenwood.</li> <li>Q. And had you ever had a filing accepted on a weekend before that April 11th?</li> <li>A. I never tried filing on a weekend before, that I remember.</li> <li>Q. And so during the weekend of April 10th and 11th, 2021, you knew that if you simply filed something with the Montana Supreme Court over the weekend, the Court likely wouldn't see it until Monday morning?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. And I think you testified earlier that you had an ex parte communication with Justice Rice, or Acting Chief Justice Rice at the time, in order to it facilitate the Court reviewing your motion over the weekend; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did. There was no other way to get that to the Court's attention that I knew of.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>for the Department of with the Department of Administration at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I had sent them emails.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for attorneys at the Attorney General's Office at that time; correct?</li> <li>A. I could have found it.</li> <li>Q. And you had contact information for legislative staff at the time; correct?</li> <li>A. Sent some to Todd Everts.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience as a litigator, is not standard practice that anytime you're involved in a case and need to contact chambers, that you either include opposing counsel on the communication or at least inform them that the communication occurred?</li> <li>A. Sometimes.</li> <li>Q. Have you ever had an ex parte communication other than in this case where you didn't inform opposing counsel of that communication?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. And what would the circumstances be that would justify not notifying opposing counsel of that</li> </ul>

	the Matter of Austin Knudsen		Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024
	Page 86		Page 88
1	being handled so the Court could schedule.	1	court?
2	Q. And just to be very clear, the Montana		A. So that's what the discovery response says,
2 3		3	
4		4	
	A. Until I filed the petition against them,	5	
6	that's true.	6	So he would not consider such a request.
	Q. And you also contacted the clerk of the	7	
, 0	Montana Supreme Court; correct?	8	know Justice Sandefur, you know he's a man with many
٥ ۵	A. I did.	9	questions.
	Q. Did your emergency motion that you filed on		Q. Why would you call Justice Sandefur first
	Saturday, April 10, contain any mention of your ex		out of all the justices?
	parte phone call to Acting Chief Justice Rice?		A. I I knew Justice Sandefur from having
	A. It did not.	13	
	Q. Did you ever publicly disclose your ex	14	
	parte communication with Acting Chief Justice Rice?	15	
	A. Not until people started asking me about	16	Supreme Court, and from his, you know, judicial
	it. Mr. Parker, Mr. Strauch.	17	campaigns and seeing him speak at various places.
	Q. And to your knowledge, did the Montana	18	And he was the first person I thought of to raise
19	Supreme Court, in any of its filings, ever disclose	19	this issue with. And then he pushed me off to
20	its ex parte communication in any of its written	20	Justice Rice.
21	orders or written opinions in Brown v. Gianforte or	21	~
22		22	
	A. No, but it was a non-substantive emergency		chief justice in the Brown case?
	communication that created no prejudice. That fits		A. I don't know. And yeah. And, of
	within the rules.		course, I'm dealing with what I've already said, is
	Page 87		Page 89
1	Q. I think you testified earlier that your	1	I don't remember this conversation.
2		2	
3		3	
4			how many ex parte conversations have you had with
	A. I've testified that it was. I subsequently	5	
	learned from Justice Sandefur's written discovery		A. Not many. Not many, I'll tell you that.
7			Q. Would these be the only two that are at
8	Much the same sort of thing. I don't remember it.		issue here?
9	I still don't remember it.		A. I don't think so.
		10	
11		11	
	April 10, 2021?	12	
	A. I do not.		
	Q. So what would have been the purpose of your		Justice Rice?
	call to Justice Sandefur?		A. No, I wouldn't characterize what he said
	A. By what they've said, he was the first	16	
17	person that I contacted. And he essentially shunted	17	
18		18	things. If you've been if you've tried a case
19	that I talked	19	with him, you know about this
20	Q. Did you seek emergency relief directly from	20	
21	Justice Sandefur?	21	
	A. No.		A. Justice Sandefur. I did. Thank you.
	Q. I can point to I believe	23	And so he's just remembering what he said
	Justice Sandefur testified that he said he could not		and reciting it here, not what I said.
	grant a TRO on his own and it required the full		O But you had no conversation with

- Justice Sandetur testified that he said he could not 24 25 grant a TRO on his own and it required the full
- 25 Q. But you had no conversation with

Int	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 90		Page 92
1	Justice Rice; it was simply a voicemail that you	1	Q. From her.
2	left him?		A. Basically, put it in context, I had
	A. That's true.		contacted her and said, This is a problem. If these
	Q. But according to Justice Sandefur, you had	4	
5	a somewhat or strike that.	5	
6	According to Justice Sandefur, you had a	6	
7	five minute or so conversation?	7	And had she wrote back and said, Look,
	A. He said approximately five minutes.	8	essentially, we have the subpoena. We're complying
9	Q. And according to Justice Sandefur, he	9	with it exactly as its written. We are not able to
10	instructed you the proper way to convene the	10	do a review. We're not well-suited to do a review
11	Supreme Court on a weekend to get your motion heard?	11	to see if any of the stuff is somehow privileged or
	A. Does it say that?	12	
	Q. I believe he told you you needed to contact	13	
	Acting Chief Justice Rice.	14	And that's when she said she would provide
	A. It says Justice Sandefur informed me that	15	copies of the PST file of what we turned over on
16	Justice Rice was the acting chief justice in the	16	Friday news to me and then do the same on
17	Brown case and that he, meaning me, could contact	17	Monday with the remaining documents.
18	him, meaning Rice, if so inclined, but that	18	
19	Justice Sandefur doubted Justice Rice would have a		you?
20	different procedural view.		A. Yes.
21	Q. And was contacting Justice Sandefur or,	21	Q. Did this email cause you to do strike
	excuse me, was contacting Acting Chief Justice Rice		that.
23	essential to the Court hearing your emergency motion	23	Did this email cause you to take any type
24	as quickly as possible?	24	of additional action?
	A. I thought it was.	25	A. Yeah. We filed a supplemental petition.
	Page 91		Page 93
1		1	
	Q. When did you decide that an ex parte		Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email
2	Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.	2	Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting
2 3	<ul><li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li><li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li></ul>	2 3	Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li><li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li><li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that</li></ul>	2 3 4	Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting</li><li>Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li><li>A. No. That had been the day before.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday,"</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman. I think foundation has to be laid here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an email on Sunday, April 11, 2021, at 11:23 a.m., from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman. I think foundation has to be laid here. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Then why don't you lay further foundation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an email on Sunday, April 11, 2021, at 11:23 a.m., from Misty Ann Giles, the director of the Department of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman. I think foundation has to be laid here. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Then why don't you lay further foundation.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Cox, you just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an email on Sunday, April 11, 2021, at 11:23 a.m., from Misty Ann Giles, the director of the Department of Administration.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the information conveyed in this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman. I think foundation has to be laid here. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Then why don't you lay further foundation.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Cox, you just testified that it was not this email, the subject of ODC Exhibit 7, that propelled you to contact</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an email on Sunday, April 11, 2021, at 11:23 a.m., from Misty Ann Giles, the director of the Department of Administration.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the information conveyed in this email?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman. I think foundation has to be laid here. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Then why don't you lay further foundation.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Cox, you just testified that it was not this email, the subject of ODC Exhibit 7, that propelled you to contact Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Chief or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. When did you decide that an ex parte conversation was appropriate? Or communication.</li> <li>A. So let's put this in time perspective.</li> <li>Saturday evening we filed the petition. I knew that just filing wasn't likely to be good enough. That was and that the Court needed to be aware of, and it would do whatever it would do. I mean, if the Court said, "Eh, tough luck, talk to us on Monday," well, they could do that.</li> <li>And then so my concern was what I perceived to be an emergency for all the reasons that we stated over and over. And then that emergency situation was underscored the next morning when I learned that a bunch of emails had already been produced.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Could I bring back up ODC's Exhibit 7 that was put in front of you before?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So on Page 1, this is an email on Sunday, April 11, 2021, at 11:23 a.m., from Misty Ann Giles, the director of the Department of Administration.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the information conveyed in this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And for the record, it wasn't this email that propelled you to contact Acting Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Justice Sandefur ex parte?</li> <li>A. No. That had been the day before. MR. CORRIGAN: I'd like to move for admission of Exhibit CC. CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch? MR. STRAUCH: Well, your Honor, I think he needs to lay some foundation here. This is a deposition transcript, and the witness has testified, so we object MR. CORRIGAN: So this is a prior inconsistent statement offered for impeachment directly discussing ODC Exhibit 7, the email from Misty Ann Giles. It's not MR. STRAUCH: Same objection, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>I think foundation has to be laid here. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Then why don't you lay further foundation.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Cox, you just testified that it was not this email, the subject of ODC Exhibit 7, that propelled you to contact Chief Justice Rice ex parte or Chief or</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 94		Page 96
1	impossible.	1	A. Presumably, it was. Yes.
	A. Right.		Q. And was that deposition transcribed?
3	MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, this is direct		A. Yes.
4	impeachment of that statement.	-	Q. I'd like to hand you a copy of your
5	MR. STRAUCH: Well, again, Mr. Chairman,	5	deposition.
6	under the impeachment rules, the witness is allowed	6	Forgive my clumsiness here for a moment.
7	to see what's being said, to confront the evidence,	7	MR. CORRIGAN: May I approach?
8	but it doesn't make the exhibit itself admissible.	8	CHAIR OGLE: Yes.
9	So same objection.	9	Do you have a copy of it, Mr. Strauch?
10	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So did you testify that	10	MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chair.
	just a little bit before noon on Sunday you learned	11	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Could you turn to I
12		12	believe it's Page 5 of the exhibit, but it is
13	that's what propelled you to contact	13	transcript Page 16 of the of the mini.
14	Chief Justice Rice ex parte?	14	A. Okay. I have the same thing we've just
	A. That is what I said. It was clearly	15	been talking about.
16	mistaken because I didn't know the dates that are	16	
17	set forward by Justices Rice and Sandefur.	17	A. It is.
18	Q. So you thought that your conversations with	18	Q. And you simply say that you misremembered
19	Justices Rice and Sandefur occurred on Sunday, not	19	what happened on what date?
20	Saturday?	20	A. In my defense, in two days we put together
21	A. Right.	21	two very substantive petitions to the Montana
22	Q. So if I understand this correctly, the	22	Supreme Court under very extreme circumstances in a
23	timeline, in your mind, was that Director Giles sent	23	very short time. There were a lot of things
24	you that email on Sunday morning, 11:23, and that's	24	happening. I didn't get that one right.
25	what propelled you to contact Justice Rice and	25	Q. You didn't get that one right, and you
	Dara 05		Dava 07
	Page 95		Page 97
	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?		forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?
	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was	2	forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur? A. Yes. Still don't remember it.
2 3	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply	2 3	<ul><li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li><li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li><li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li></ul>
2 3	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more	2 3 4	<ul><li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li><li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li><li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li><li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li><li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li><li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li><li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li><li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> <li>And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur? <b>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</b> Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur? <b>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</b> Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> <li>And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday</li> <li>that there was an emergency, which propelled you to</li> <li>contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> <li>And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday</li> <li>that there was an emergency, which propelled you to</li> <li>contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> <li>And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday</li> <li>that there was an emergency, which propelled you to</li> <li>contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that</li> <li>weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte;</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called</li> <li>Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency</li> <li>relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court.</li> <li>And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday</li> <li>that there was an emergency, which propelled you to</li> <li>contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that</li> <li>weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, did you have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> <li>Q. And your the Montana Legislature was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening? A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take. Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate. A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues. Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, did you have your deposition taken in this matter?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> <li>Q. And your the Montana Legislature was also not a party to that case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, did you have your deposition taken in this matter?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> <li>Q. And your the Montana Legislature was also not a party to that case?</li> <li>A. Not until I made them a party.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, did you have your deposition taken in this matter? </li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And was that on April 10, 2024?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> <li>Q. And your the Montana Legislature was also not a party to that case?</li> <li>A. Not until I made them a party.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Cox, do you know what a temporary</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Justices Rice and Sandefur on Sunday evening?</li> <li>A. I thought so my mindset when I was testifying from memory in my deposition was simply that the situation became more dire, and thus more important that I get a message of an emergency petition to the Court so the Court could take whatever action it chose to take.</li> <li>Q. But you testified that Misty Ann Giles's email on Sunday morning at 11:23 is what caused you to go through the mental checklist of whether an ex parte conversation was appropriate.</li> <li>A. That's what I testified to, but it was wrong. MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, may I request your indulgence for just a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As an appellate lawyer, I'm a bit of a fish out of water at times on evidentiary issues.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, did you have your deposition taken in this matter?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>forgot your conversation with Justice Sandefur?</li> <li>A. Yes. Still don't remember it.</li> <li>Q. So just to recap, you called Justice Sandefur on a Saturday to get emergency relief. Then later on Saturday you left Acting Chief Justice Rice a voicemail to convene the Court. And then you learned from Director Giles on Sunday that there was an emergency, which propelled you to contact the Supreme Court ex parte?</li> <li>A. Can't adopt it the way you said it.</li> <li>Q. Now, you filed your emergency motion that weekend in a case called Brown v. Gianforte; correct?</li> <li>A. I did, yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think we established earlier that your client was not a party to the case at that time; right?</li> <li>A. Well, yeah, nobody's a party till they file a petition to intervene.</li> <li>Q. And your the Montana Legislature was also not a party to that case?</li> <li>A. Not until I made them a party.</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 98		Page 100
1	Q. Have you ever sought one before?	1	correct?
	A. Yes.		A. On Monday, I think.
	Q. What is it?		Q. And does that mean your intervention wasn't
	A. A temporary restraining order is an order		granted in Brown?
	of the Court that essentially freezes things in		A. It as the Court said, it became moot and
	in a case of where there's irreparable harm and	6	
7	all those sorts of things. The Court can issue an	7	
8	order that I always refer to as a standstill order.	8	
9	Just everybody stop doing what you're doing, and	_	Q. Now, your lawsuit sought to quash the
	we're going to get this sorted out.	10	
	Q. And can state district court issue	11	
	temporary restraining orders?		A. Yes.
	A. Yes.		Q. And that included non-privileged documents;
	Q. So you could have gone to a state district		correct?
	court to obtain a temporary restraining order		A. Yes.
		-	
	against the Department of Administration? A. I suppose.		Q. And you testified earlier that your client's concerns were about various types of
	<ul><li>Q. But instead you chose to call your client's</li></ul>		
		18	
	supervisor ex parte to request that they come in on	19	
	a Sunday A Lot's just stop with that	20	
	<ul><li>A. Let's just stop with that.</li><li>Q. I'm allowed to ask my questions.</li></ul>	21	A. Yes.
	But instead you chose to call your client's		
23	supervisor ex parte to request that they come in on		Q. Are you aware of any emails that were publicly disclosed that contained the types of
24	a Sunday to stop a third party from releasing		confidential information that your client claims she
25	a Sunday to stop a tinte party nom releasing	25	confidential information that your chefit claims she
	Page 99		Page 101
	emails, which included emails belonging to your		wanted to protect?
2	emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client	2	wanted to protect? A. I didn't see I don't know because I
2 3	emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?	2 3	wanted to protect? A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell
2 3 4	<ul><li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li><li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li></ul>	2 3 4	wanted to protect? A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li><li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li><li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> <li>Q. And you knew her direct supervisors were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the Legislature's cert petition?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> <li>Q. And you knew her direct supervisors were the Montana Supreme Court; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the Legislature's cert petition?</li> <li>A. They returned what they said were the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> <li>Q. And you knew her direct supervisors were the Montana Supreme Court; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the Legislature's cert petition?</li> <li>A. They returned what they said were the documents.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> <li>Q. And you knew her direct supervisors were the Montana Supreme Court; correct?</li> <li>A. I think she reported to the chief.</li> <li>Q. Now, you then filed a new case later that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the Legislature's cert petition?</li> <li>A. They returned what they said were the documents.</li> <li>Q. Did you review the documents to see if they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>emails, which included emails belonging to your client's employer, in a case where your client wasn't a party; correct?</li> <li>A. Absolutely not correct.</li> <li>Q. Which part of that question is incorrect?</li> <li>A. Well, first off, I didn't make a request to the Court to do anything. I just said the petition was being filed, and the Court could do what the Court was going to do. As I said before, if the Court shrugged it off, they shrugged it off. If the Court took it up, they took it up. I didn't ask that the Court be convened. I don't have that kind of power.</li> <li>If I had a transcript and I could go through what you just said, I'd probably give you several more examples.</li> <li>Q. And you knew at that time that your client, Beth McLaughlin, was the Supreme Court administrator?</li> <li>A. Of course.</li> <li>Q. And you knew her direct supervisors were the Montana Supreme Court; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>wanted to protect?</li> <li>A. I didn't see I don't know because I didn't review every email. So I I couldn't tell you. I'm unaware of any.</li> <li>Q. But you could have reviewed all those emails?</li> <li>A. Sure could have.</li> <li>Q. So just to be very clear, you can't point to any evidence that the types of privileged information, such as confidential employee records, that were released to the Legislature were ever released publicly?</li> <li>A. To any evidence? That's judging it after the fact. I was judging it on the basis of the facts as they existed. You can't cure a problem by saying there was no there was there was no harm done.</li> <li>Q. Moving to the return of the documents, did the Attorney General's Office return the documents once the United States Supreme Court had denied the Legislature's cert petition?</li> <li>A. They returned what they said were the documents.</li> <li>Q. Did you review the documents to see if they</li> </ul>

Πι	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 102		Page 104
1	A. No. I would have no way to know if they	1	tells me that I should.
	had all been returned.		Q. Do you believe your actions representing
	Q. Did anyone, to your knowledge, review the	3	
	documents to see if they had all been returned?		
	-	4	-
	A. No.	5	
	Q. Do you know why?	6	MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor.
	A. Yes.	7	Mr. Cox's conduct is not at issue in these
	Q. Why is that?	8	proceedings; it's the conduct of the
	A. I cannot tell you because the that	9	Attorney General. I object and move to strike the
10	decision was rooted in an attorney-client	10	
	conversation between me and my client, Beth	11	CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.
	McLaughlin.		Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Cox, are you aware of
	Q. Someone could have reviewed all the		Montana Rule of Professional Conduct 8.3(a)?
	documents to ensure they'd all been returned;	14	A. Likely.
	correct?	15	Q. Does it concern what happens when a lawyer
16	A. I don't see how that would have been	16	knows that another lawyer has possibly committed a
17	possible.	17	violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct?
18	Q. Did you ever file any type of motion to	18	A. Can you show it to me so I can see it?
	enforce the Montana Supreme Court's order to return	19	Q. Sure.
20	the documents while the case was pending before the		A. Is it in your is it in your exhibits?
21	United States Supreme Court?		Q. I believe it is.
	A. No.	22	A. Tell me what number it is or what letter it
	Q. But you communicated with the		is, and I'll look at it.
	Attorney General's Office that you wanted the	24	
	documents returned several times; correct?	25	MR. CORRIGAN: W.
	Page 103		Page 105
-		1	
	A. Yes.		Thank you.
2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion</li></ul>	1 2	Thank you. <b>THE DEPONENT:</b> Okay. 8.3 is what you're
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the</li></ul>	2 3	Thank you. <b>THE DEPONENT:</b> Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct.
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li></ul>	2 3 4	Thank you. <b>THE DEPONENT:</b> Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Thank you.</li><li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li><li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Thank you.</li><li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li><li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay. 8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have brought it up to them;</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have brought it up to them; correct?</li> <li>A. Could have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have brought it up to them; correct?</li> <li>A. Could have.</li> <li>Q. Did you report the Attorney General or any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have brought it up to them; correct?</li> <li>A. Could have.</li> <li>Q. Did you report the Attorney General or any of his employees to the Office of Disciplinary</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional authority.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have.</li> <li>Q. Did you report the Attorney General or any of his employees to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for not returning the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional authority.</li> <li>8.3(b): A lawyer who knows that a judge</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have brought it up to them; correct?</li> <li>A. Could have.</li> <li>Q. Did you report the Attorney General or any of his employees to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for not returning the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional authority.</li> <li>8.3(b): A lawyer who knows that a judge has committed a violation of the applicable code of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Could you have filed any type of motion before the Montana Supreme Court to compel the Attorney General's Office to return the documents?</li> <li>A. I could have.</li> <li>Q. And you, as opposing counsel, would you have been in the best position to compel the return of the documents?</li> <li>A. Probably.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any order from the Montana Supreme Court holding the Attorney General or his office or the Legislature in contempt for not returning the documents?</li> <li>A. I don't see how they could have issued such an order because the issue wasn't brought up to them.</li> <li>Q. You could have.</li> <li>Q. Did you report the Attorney General or any of his employees to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for not returning the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Thank you.</li> <li>THE DEPONENT: Okay. 8.3 is what you're talking about? Reporting professional misconduct. Yes.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) You're familiar with this rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what does the rule say?</li> <li>A. I'm not going to characterize it. Anybody can read it.</li> <li>Q. Can you read it?</li> <li>A. You want me to read it out loud?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Good use of time. Okay.</li> <li>8.3(a): A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional authority.</li> <li>8.3(b): A lawyer who knows that a judge has committed a violation of the applicable code of judicial conduct that raises a substantial question</li> </ul>

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 202
	Page 106		Page 10
1	the appropriate authority.	1	July of 2021?
2	<b>8.3(c):</b> This rule does not require		A. I think I wrote two letters and an email.
3	disclosure of information otherwise protected by		Q. Right. And those letters only went
4	Rule 1.6 or information gained by a lawyer or a		strike that.
5	judge while participating in an approved lawyer's	5	Those letters were correspondence between
6	assistance program.	6	you and the AG's office; correct?
7	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) If you had witnessed		A. Yes.
8	Kristin Hansen, Derek Oestreicher, or the	8	Q. They weren't public?
9	Attorney General, or any other attorney in the AG's		A. True.
10	office commit an ethical violation in violation of	10	Q. So you had knowledge of the AG's office
11	the Rules of Professional Conduct, does this rule	11	position as it relates to the return of the
12	mean you would have had an obligation to report it?	12	documents that perhaps the public didn't have at
13	A. No.	13	that time?
14	Q. Why not?	14	MR. STRAUCH: Objection; mischaracterizes
15	A. Because I am flatly prohibited from	15	the exhibits, for the record, for Exhibit 25 and 28
L6	reporting something that is that I haven't	16	and 29.
17	discussed and obtained authority from my client to	17	
18	have, and I always have to keep the client's	18	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did the Montana
L9	interest paramount in mind so. It's not as simple	19	1 1
20	as, Whoa, a violation, I report.	20	Attorney General or his subordinates for their
21	It's not that simple at all.	21	e
22	Q. Well, Rule 8.3(a) contains the word	22	6 6 6
23	"shall;" correct?	23	A. Not that I know of.
	A. Yes, it does.	24	
25	Q. And "shall" means "mandatory"?	25	Exhibit 11?
	Page 107		Page 10
1	A. Well, yes, but this always has to be	1	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) And I think we
	reviewed in the light of the case law and the		established earlier that this is Lieutenant
3		3	General Kris Hansen's letter to Acting
4	assume you've read as well.		Chief Justice Rice of April 12, 2021; correct?
5	Q. Given that you were opposing counsel with		A. Yes.
	the Attorney General's Office in all these cases,	6	Q. Is it fair to say this was an open letter?
7	was there anyone in a better place than you to file		A. Yes.
8	a complaint? Excuse me, a grievance?	8	Q. It wasn't a private communication, was it?
9	A. Well, yeah, just about everybody. It	9	A. No.
LO	you know, it was widely known. There was news	10	MR. CORRIGAN: Can we bring up ODC
.1	reports about this. I was in the middle of	11	Exhibit 13?
2	representing my client. I wasn't going looking	12	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) And look at Pages 7 to 8.
L3	for for other fights to have.	13	A. Of the document itself?
4	Q. Well, Mr. Strauch asked you earlier about	14	Q. Uh-huh.
L5	communications with the AG's office that were		A. Okay. I've got it.
L6	supposedly not open that were just made to you		Q. And is this document a public court filing?
.7	,	17	A. Yes.
	A. What are you thinking of?	18	6
19	Q. So, I believe well, we'll go to we'll	19	
20	go to go to ODC Exhibit 16.	20	Attorney General's Office says the Montana
	A. Okay.	21	Legislature submitted a letter to Acting Chief
22	Q. Sorry. I have my exhibits mixed up here.	22	
23	You communicated with the AG's office	23	
24	requesting to get the documents back, correct,	24	6
25	following the Montana Supreme Court's decision in	25	and then it says:
		1	

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 110	Page 112
1 McLaughlin's current petition seeks yet	1 Q. I'm not suggesting anything. I'm just
2 another court order, which will not bind the	2 simply asking if that's true.
3 Legislature and will not be followed.	3 A. Say it again, please.
4 These statements were public; correct?	4 Q. The Montana Supreme Court ruled on the
5 A. Yes.	5 validity of a subpoena brought by its own employee.
6 MR. CORRIGAN: Can we go to ODC Exhibit 16?	6 MR. STRAUCH: Objection. Ms. McLaughlin
7 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Sorry to bring this in a	7 did not bring a subpoena, Mr. Chairman. It
8 roundabout way.	8 misstates facts.
9 A. Got nothing but time.	<b>9 THE WITNESS:</b> We did bring a petition to
10 Q. And this is the Attorney General's	10 quash a subpoena that went to the Department of
11 April 18, 2021, letter to the justices of the	11 Administration, but did concern emails of Beth
12 Montana Supreme Court?	12 McLaughlin, and she is an employee of the judicial
13 A. Yes.	<b>13</b> branch of the State of Montana.
<b>14</b> Q. Is it fair to characterize this as an	14 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Who reports to the
15 open letter?	15 chief justice?
16 A. In the sense that it was in a court filing	16 A. True.
17 and was public, and I got it and then yes.	<b>17</b> Q. And was the Legislature's first attempt to
18 MR. CORRIGAN: Can we bring up ODC	<b>18</b> get emails from your client an attempt to get emails
19 Exhibit 26?	<b>19</b> related to Senate Bill 140?
<b>20</b> Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the Montana	20 A. Probably, yes.
<b>21</b> Legislature's petition for a rehearing?	<b>21</b> Q. Did your client use state email to conduct
22 A. Yep. It was public too.	<ul><li>22 polling of Montana judges on Senate Bill 140?</li></ul>
<b>23</b> Q. Can we go to Pages 19 to 20.	23 A. Yes.
24 A. Okay.	<b>24</b> Q. Mr. Cox, in your 40 years of practice have
<b>25</b> Q. Go down to the bottom. Let's go to Page	<ul><li>25 you ever moved to disqualify a judge for cause?</li></ul>
Page 111	Page 113
1 go down to Page 19 of the document.	1 A. Yes.
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> <li>Q. So the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> <li>Q. So that would have further delayed</li> <li>resolution of this case?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> <li>Q. So the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the</li> <li>validity of a subpoena brought by its own employee?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> <li>Q. So that would have further delayed</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> <li>Q. So the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the</li> <li>validity of a subpoena brought by its own employee?</li> <li>A. Well, would you have state employees not</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> <li>Q. So that would have further delayed</li> <li>resolution of this case?</li> <li>A. I suppose, but the AG's office agreed to</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> <li>Q. So the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the</li> <li>validity of a subpoena brought by its own employee?</li> <li>A. Well, would you have state employees not</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> <li>Q. So that would have further delayed</li> <li>resolution of this case?</li> <li>A. I suppose, but the AG's office agreed to</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>go down to Page 19 of the document.</li> <li>We'll move on. We'll come back to this if</li> <li>we have time.</li> <li>To your knowledge, did the Supreme Court</li> <li>ever offer to appoint a special master to facilitate</li> <li>negotiations in this case given the unique</li> <li>considerations?</li> <li>A. They were never asked.</li> <li>Q. So you never proposed a special master?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did the legislative subpoena that your</li> <li>client sought to quash seek some emails from the</li> <li>justices of the Montana Supreme Court?</li> <li>A. Presumably, yes.</li> <li>Q. So when the Montana Supreme Court quashed</li> <li>the subpoena, they were presumably, at least in</li> <li>part, quashing a subpoena that concerned their own</li> <li>emails?</li> <li>A. I don't see it that way.</li> <li>Q. So the Montana Supreme Court ruled on the</li> <li>validity of a subpoena brought by its own employee?</li> <li>A. Well, would you have state employees not</li> <li>have or judicial branch employees have no</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is every motion to disqualify successful,</li> <li>or are there sometimes disagreements about whether</li> <li>recusal is required?</li> <li>A. I don't think they're all successful. I</li> <li>they depend on the facts and circumstances.</li> <li>Q. So is it automatically an ethical violation</li> <li>if a lawyer unsuccessfully moves to disqualify a</li> <li>judge, or do the facts matter?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, I'm not really planning</li> <li>to give opinions on ethics matters, certainly not on</li> <li>hypothetical ones.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move now to the Legislature's</li> <li>petition for writ of certiorari.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Did you seek and receive an extension of</li> <li>time to file your response to the cert petition?</li> <li>A. I think I did.</li> <li>Q. So that would have further delayed</li> <li>resolution of this case?</li> <li>A. I suppose, but the AG's office agreed to</li> <li>it.</li> <li>Is there some problem with that?</li> </ol>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 114		Page 116
1	A. No.	1	2021; correct?
	Q. Is it fair to say that the horse was		A. Yes.
	already out of the barn at this point?		Q. So there was a three-month period
	A. Yes.		between roughly between the April emergency order
	Q. Does the United States Supreme Court have		and the final disposition that ordered the documents
	its own disciplinary power?		to be returned; correct? Roughly?
	A. Presumably.		A. Yes. But during that timeframe Kristin
	Q. So if a lawyer commits an ethical violation		Hansen had submitted a declaration that said,
	before the United States Supreme Court, the justices		Everything's in the hands of the AG, so no worries.
10	there can issue discipline?	10	Q. So the AG's office had the documents at
11	A. I actually don't know the answer to that.	11	this time?
12	You probably do.	12	A. That's what she said.
13	Q. And did the United States Supreme Court, to	13	Q. And prior to the Montana Supreme Court
14	your knowledge, ever issue any discipline against	14	ordering the documents to be returned on July 14th,
	the Attorney General or the attorneys in his office?	15	it would be fair to say that the horse was also
	A. Not that I'm aware of.		already out of the barn?
	Q. And when the United States Supreme Court		A. What do you mean by that?
18	denies a cert petition, is it adjudicating that cert		Q. There were no more is it fair to say
19	petition on the merits?		that there were no more documents released between
	A. No.		April and July?
	Q. Is fair to say that the odds are quite low		A. I don't know the answer to that because,
	of getting a cert petition granted?		the I mean, Kristin Hansen had a link in her
	A. That's why I was a little surprised that		email. Have you looked at it? Do you know all the
	had they filed one. Yeah.		stuff that was shown there?
25	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, with your	25	Q. I
_			
	Page 115		Page 117
1	Page 115	1	Page 117
	indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can		A. I know. You can't answer my questions.
2	indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.	2	A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,
2 3	indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up. CHAIR OGLE: Very well.	2 3	<ul><li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions.</li><li>So so I don't I don't know,</li><li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look. Do you know the exhibit number of that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> <li>A. Numerous.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look. Do you know the exhibit number of that order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> <li>A. Numerous.</li> <li>Q. What about in a clash between the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look.</li> <li>Do you know the exhibit number of that order?</li> <li>THE CLERK: 24.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> <li>A. Numerous.</li> <li>Q. What about in a clash between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look. Do you know the exhibit number of that order?</li> <li>THE CLERK: 24.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: 24.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> <li>A. Numerous.</li> <li>Q. What about in a clash between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. That was a new one on me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>indulgence, just a few minutes, and I think we can wrap up.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Very well.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: If we could bring up ODC Exhibit 10?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Is this the temporary order?</li> <li>A. Yes. Issued on Sunday evening, April 11th. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does anything in this order require the Attorney General's Office to return documents?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you know when the first time was that the Montana Supreme Court ordered return of the documents?</li> <li>A. I think it was their ultimate ruling on the petition, but let me just look.</li> <li>Do you know the exhibit number of that order?</li> <li>THE CLERK: 24.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I know. You can't answer my questions. So so I don't I don't know,</li> <li>Mr. Corrigan. I don't know the answer.</li> <li>Q. But there's no evidence that after the Montana Supreme Court issued its order quashing its temporary order quashing the subpoena that additional emails were released; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I don't know of any.</li> <li>Q. And, Mr. Cox, you on direct you said a few times that in your 40 years of experience you'd never seen this type of statement and positions that were taken. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Can you tell me how many times in your 40 years you've litigated cases where there was not-yet-binding Montana precedent?</li> <li>A. Numerous.</li> <li>Q. What about in a clash between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> </ul>

**Min-U-Script**®

24 attorney -- you've been an attorney in a case about

**25** two branches of government disputing the extent of

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 118		Page 120
-	-	_	
	their power?	1	,
	A. Well, I don't think I've had a case where	2	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
3	any party, other than in an orderly way, has said,	3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
4	Whatever you all do, we're not going to follow it.	4	
5	I don't I've never seen that.	5	(Witness sworn.)
	Q. Would it be fair to characterize this case	6	
	as unusual, even outside of the statements made by	7	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF AUSTIN KNUDSEN
8	the Attorney General's Office?	8	
	A. Oh, sure.		Q. Good afternoon.
	Q. It's possible none of us will ever see a		A. Good afternoon.
	case like this again?		Q. Your name, please?
	A. Well, I'm not going to.		A. Austin Miles Knudsen.
	Q. No further questions.		Q. And, your Honor, how would you like me to
14	CHAIR OGLE: Redirect, Mr. Strauch?		address you today? A. No one has ever called me honorable before.
15	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, members of the		
16	commission, thank you.	16	fine with that.
17	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	17	Q. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that.
18 19	BY MR. STRAUCH:	19	I kind of grew up where it was appropriate
	Q. Mr. Cox, so just to go back to the		to address the Attorney General as "your Honor."
20 21	almost the last point that Mr. Corrigan made in his		A. We're not big on formality I'm not big
22	questions to you, Exhibit 24, he had you establish		on formality.
22	was the first time that the Supreme Court ordered		Q. Thank you. Nor am I, sir, so you may call
	the return of the emails; correct?		me Tim or whatever you'd like to call me.
	A. I think so. I don't		A. I'll be careful with that one.
23		23	The finite current with that one.
	Page 119		Page 121
	Page 119		Page 121
	Q. July 14, 2021?		Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you.
2	Q. July 14, 2021? A. Yes.	2	Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?
2 3	<ul><li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li><li>A. I am indeed.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break? MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may.</li> <li>So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable Attorney General, so probably should take a break</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana bar.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable Attorney General, so probably should take a break soon.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana bar.</li> <li>And please go ahead and take a look at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable Attorney General, so probably should take a break soon.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana bar.</li> <li>And please go ahead and take a look at that, sir. I'll have some questions on various</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable Attorney General, so probably should take a break soon.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take a lunch break now then, and we'll reconvene at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana bar. And please go ahead and take a look at that, sir. I'll have some questions on various pages.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. July 14, 2021?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. From that date on, did the Attorney General notify the Supreme Court of the State of Montana that it would not obey that order?</li> <li>A. No. They didn't didn't seek a stay, didn't do anything. Never told the Court that. MR. STRAUCH: No further questions. CHAIR OGLE: You can step down, Mr. Cox. THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may this witness be excused? Because he's also on the respondent's list. CHAIR OGLE: Yes, he may. So it's about 10 minutes to 12:00. Do you want to call your next witness, or should we take a lunch break?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, our next witness would be the Honorable Attorney General, so probably should take a break soon.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't we take</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. I'm sure you will. Thank you. You're the respondent in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. I am indeed. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I ask permission to ask leading questions, Rule 611(c), Charlie. CHAIR OGLE: Sure.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, I misspoke when I gave my opening statement. I said you were admitted in 1998 [sic], and and I understand you were admitted in 2008; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I didn't mean to age you by 10 years, sir.</li> <li>A. I would have set some kind of record if I was barred when I was seven.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit 40, and this these are copies of the of the oral and written oaths that you took on October 7th of 2008 as to join the Montana bar. And please go ahead and take a look at that, sir. I'll have some questions on various pages. MR. STRAUCH: Your Honor, I understand</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 122		Page 124
1	Exhibit 40.	1	Q. A few lines down there, you agree you swore
2	CHAIR OGLE: Any objection?		that you would be candid, fair, and courteous before
3	MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.		the Court and with other attorneys; correct?
4	CHAIR OGLE: That's admitted. Exhibit 40		A. That is part of that sentence. Yes.
	is admitted.		Q. And the next sentence, that you swore you
5	(Exhibit 40 admitted.)		
6	MR. STRAUCH: And, your Honor	6	
7	Mr. Chairman, I apologize for the oversight. That	7	
8		8	A. Yes.
9	is not in our book, but		
10	CHAIR OGLE: I'm sure it wasn't.		Q. And the last, that you would strive to
11	MR. STRAUCH: Thank you.	11	
12	CHAIR OGLE: Thank you.	12	
	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Mr. Knudsen, have you had	13	<b>J</b>
	a chance to look at Exhibit 40?		A. Yes.
	A. Yes.		Q. And the last page, an oral oath, you also
	Q. And does this exhibit include the written		agreed that you would faithfully follow the
	oath that you took on October 7th of 2008?		affirmations of your written oath and the Rules of
	A. It's been several years, but it certainly		Professional Conduct promulgated by the
	looks correct.		Supreme Court of Montana; correct?
	Q. Okay. And then the second page, that is		A. Yes.
	your name in the official roll book of attorneys		Q. Did you ever openly refuse your
	with the date of admission, October 7, 2008; is that		obligations, your sworn obligations, as an officer
	correct?		of the court?
	A. That is correct.		A. Ever openly refuse my obligations? No.
25	Q. And, Page 3, that's your signature in the	25	Q. Yeah. In other words, did you ever
	Page 123		Page 125
1	official roll book indicating that your oath was	1	since you signed these documents and swore on
2	filed and the certificate was issued October 7th of	2	October 7th of 2008, did you ever notify the Supreme
3	2008; is that right?	2	Court that you were revoking your oath, that you
-	A. I have no reason to think otherwise.		were not going to do these things?
	Q. Okay. And then last but not least, the		A. No.
	very last page of that is a copy of the oral oath of		Q. Do you revoke your oath today?
7	admission; correct?		A. Absolutely not.
	A. I believe so, yes. I don't see a signature		Q. You and I have never met; right, sir?
8	on it, but I have no reason to think it's not.		A. Not that I can recall.
	Q. Thank you, sir.		Q. Okay.
11	And you're aware that the clerk of the		A. Not before this. And as near as I can
	Supreme Court, Mr. Greenwood, maintains the official		remember, that's the first time.
12	-		
	roll book with every attorney's name in it; right? A. Yes.		Q. I believe you're I believe that's right. And it's an honor to meet you. And I can't recall a
			-
	Q. Okay. So I have some questions for you	15	
	regarding this is not your oath of office as the	16	
17	Attorney General. This is the oath that all of us		A. No, I cannot. I think that's correct.
18	lawyers take when we're sworn in to join the bar;	18	
19	correct?	19	8
	A. Yes.	20	
	O The second and the first first		computing they get mod I don't remember them. But I
21	Q. The second on the first page, one of the	21	
21 22	things you swore to do was maintain the respect due	22	think I can genuinely say you and I have never met.
21 22 23	things you swore to do was maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers;	22 23	<ul><li>think I can genuinely say you and I have never met.</li><li>Q. Thank you, sir. I agree with you. I wish</li></ul>
21 22 23 24	things you swore to do was maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers; correct?	22 23 24	think I can genuinely say you and I have never met. Q. Thank you, sir. I agree with you. I wish maybe we hadn't, frankly.
21 22 23 24	things you swore to do was maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers;	22 23	think I can genuinely say you and I have never met. Q. Thank you, sir. I agree with you. I wish maybe we hadn't, frankly.

Πι	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 126		Page 128
1	about your personal background, please.	1	handful of civil trials. As you know most civil
	A. Sure. Grew up on a family farm and ranch	2	
	in Roosevelt County, eastern Roosevelt County. A	3	
4	little town called Bainville and Culbertson.	_	upset me because I trained for trial. Much more so
5	Graduated Culbertson High School. Attended Montana	5	
6	State University. Received a double major at	6	
7	Montana State. I believe that was in 2003 or 2004.	7	trials. That's probably about the best I can do.
8	Got married about a year and a half thereafter.	8	And maybe a handful of civil trials.
9	Went to the University of Montana School of Law in	9	Q. Generally it's a good idea for defendants
10	Missoula. Graduated there in 2008. Was sworn into		in the criminal trials that you handle to follow the
11	the bar. Spent the first 10 years of my life in		court orders?
12	private practice exclusively in northeastern		A. Generally, yes.
13	Montana, first at a small firm in Plentywood, the		Q. As Roosevelt County Attorney you had
14	O'Toole Law Firm, working under a couple of very,		authority to prosecute defendants if they defied
15	very good mentors in Loren J. O'Toole, Sr., and	15	
16	Loren J. O'Toole, Jr.		A. If we deemed it necessary, yes.
17	At that time I was also elected to the		Q. Or if they failed to abide by their
18	Montana State Legislature. I served four sessions		conditions, you could bring that back in front of
19	in the Montana House of Representatives from 2010	19	
20	until 2017. After five years with the O'Toole Law		A. We could do file for a revocation if a
21	Firm, left, started my own solo practice law firm,	21	
22	civil litigation law firm, in my hometown of		Q. And and how how would a defendant
23	Culbertson.		typically modify an order of their bail conditions?
24	In 2018 I successfully ran for Roosevelt		How would they go about doing that?
25	County Attorney. Served in that position in the		A. Well, I never did much criminal defense,
	Page 127		Page 129
1		1	
	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for		candidly.
	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully		<b>candidly.</b> Q. As you you observed as prosecutor.
2 3	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.	2 3	<ul><li>candidly.</li><li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you</li></ul>
2 3 4	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully	2 3 4	<ul><li>candidly.</li><li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020. Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?	2 3 4	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020. Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 14 5	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court. Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>A. Less so the rules of appellate procedure.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>J. Less so the rules of appellate procedure. That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>A. Less so the rules of appellate procedure. That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure there's a lot smarter lawyers that work in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> <li>Q. By a defense lawyer?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>A. Less so the rules of appellate procedure. That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure there's a lot smarter lawyers that work in the Department of Justice that can handle that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> <li>Q. By a defense lawyer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>A. Less so the rules of appellate procedure.</li> <li>That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure there's a lot smarter lawyers that work in the Department of Justice that can handle that.</li> <li>Q. Have you tried a case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> <li>Q. By a defense lawyer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Not very often?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure?</li> <li>J. Less so the rules of appellate procedure.</li> <li>That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure there's a lot smarter lawyers that work in the Department of Justice that can handle that.</li> <li>Q. Have you tried a case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> <li>Q. By a defense lawyer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Not very often?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>county seat of Wolf Point. Criminal prosecutor for two years before running for and being successfully elected Montana Attorney General in 2020.</li> <li>Q. Is it safe to say you know your way around a courtroom?</li> <li>A. Not big on patting myself on the back, but I've been in a courtroom a few times.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And you understand the rules of civil procedure?</li> <li>A. It's been a while. I don't get to practice as much law nowadays. But, yes, yes, I'm familiar with the rules of civil procedure and rules of evidence.</li> <li>Q. And the rules of criminal procedure?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The rules of appellate procedure.</li> <li>That's not ever a club I put in my bag. I figure there's a lot smarter lawyers that work in the Department of Justice that can handle that.</li> <li>Q. Have you tried a case?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. How many have you tried?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>candidly.</li> <li>Q. As you you observed as prosecutor. How would the defendants opposite you typically do that?</li> <li>A. Sometimes it was openly in court.</li> <li>Sometimes, if they if they had a particularly skillful lawyer, they would file those with the Court ahead of time in the form of a motion.</li> <li>Q. Sure. So they'd either make a written motion or maybe an oral motion in court?</li> <li>A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do defense counsel typically write letters to judges to disagree with the court orders?</li> <li>A. I have seen it. I won't say "typically." I guess I'm not probably not an expert to say what's typical. But I can tell you, in my practice, I didn't see it very often, but we did sometimes see it.</li> <li>Q. By a defense lawyer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Not very often?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you when you were prosecutor, did</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 130		Page 132
1	A. Not that I can ever recall.	1	I have no authority over sheriffs or local PDs.
	Q. If you disagree, you're representing a	2	Also in charge of state crime lab. We call
3	party in the prosecutor role and in your current	3	that the forensic science division, FSD. That's
4	role, you typically represent the State of Montana.	4	located in Missoula with a satellite office in
5	When you're advocating for a client and	5	Billings.
6	there's a disagreement with an order, typically how	6	In charge of the Montana Law Enforcement
7	would you bring that disagreement to attention of	7	Academy out here in the north valley in Helena.
8	the Court?	8	Every sworn peace officer in Montana, whether
9	A. Well, as I said, I don't get much involved	9	they're, you know, Helena PD or sheriff's office,
10	in the day-to-day litigation in the office anymore	10	highway patrol, fish and game, they go through the
11	since I've taken the role of Attorney General. In	11	Montana Law Enforcement Academy. So in charge of
12	fact, I'm a glorified administrator.	12	that.
13	Q. When you were a prosecutor, sir.	13	And then in charge of the what we call
14	A. When I was a prosecutor, if there was a	14	the state's attorney's office. And within that
15	disagreement with an order, you typically would make	15	there are a number of divisions broken down within
16	some sort of a motion, either orally or in writing,	16	that bureau. We've got the prosecution services
17	to the Court.	17	bureau that goes out and assists county attorneys
18	Q. Or you can take an appeal, perhaps, or a	18	with particularly difficult criminal prosecutions.
19	petition, some kind of formal motion asking the	19	We've got the appellate bureau. Every single
20	Court for relief; is that right?	20	criminal appeal in the state of Montana that does
21	A. Typically, yes.	21	not have an attorney, those come through our office,
22	Q. Would you agree that law and order works	22	and that bureau handles every single criminal
23	because people people are supposed to follow the	23	appeal. We've got the civil bureau within the
24	law?	24	state's attorney's office, which spends a lot of
25	A. Absolutely.	25	time defending various laws, various state agencies
	Page 131		Page 133
1		1	
	Q. And that maintains order?	1	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is
2	<ul><li>Q. And that maintains order?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we
2 3	<ul><li>Q. And that maintains order?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Please describe your roles and</li></ul>	1 2 3 4	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation.
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. And that maintains order?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me,
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And that maintains order?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li></ul>	2 3 4	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And that maintains order?</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me,
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the</li> </ul>	2 3 5 6 7 8 9	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents and major crimes agents and human trafficking agents</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> <li>Q. Sounds like piece of cake to me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents and major crimes agents and human trafficking agents that go out throughout the state when they're</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> <li>Q. Sounds like piece of cake to me.</li> <li>A. Yeah. There's roughly, I think, last count</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents and major crimes agents and human trafficking agents that go out throughout the state when they're requested by local law enforcement.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> <li>Q. Sounds like piece of cake to me.</li> <li>A. Yeah. There's roughly, I think, last count we're roughly 800 employees, give or take, all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents and major crimes agents and human trafficking agents that go out throughout the state when they're requested by local law enforcement. Also in charge of the Montana Highway</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> <li>Q. Sounds like piece of cake to me.</li> <li>A. Yeah. There's roughly, I think, last count we're roughly 800 employees, give or take, all throughout the state of Montana.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And that maintains order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Please describe your roles and responsibilities as the Attorney General of the state.</li> <li>A. Sure. There's several. Generally speaking, I'm the administrator of the Montana Department of Justice. So within the Montana Department of Justice there are a number of bureaus and agencies that I oversee. People typically think it's lawyers, but honestly, it's much more so other duties. For instance, I'm in charge the motor vehicle division. That's the single biggest division inside the Department of Justice. The Office of Consumer Protection is under my purview. The Montana excuse me the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, which is the state I guess probably the best analogy is the state version of the FBI. We have a number of narcotics agents and major crimes agents and human trafficking agents that go out throughout the state when they're requested by local law enforcement.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>in case they're sued, or if a particular law is challenged. And then the solicitor's bureau, we where we focus primarily on federal litigation. And I think that's a pretty excuse me, Agency Legal Services is administratively attached to the Department of Justice. Agency Legal Services a basically the state's subsidized law firm. If agencies want to hire outside counsel, under previous administrations and legislatures, Agency Legal Services was created to basically be a state-subsidized law firm where agencies could hire lawyers from within that division to represent them in their various cases. I have very little oversight over Agency Legal Services. They're administratively attached. As is the Montana Board of Crime Control. They're also administratively attached.</li> <li>Q. Quite a list. That's it?</li> <li>A. I'm sure I'm forgetting something.</li> <li>Q. Sounds like piece of cake to me.</li> <li>A. Yeah. There's roughly, I think, last count we're roughly 800 employees, give or take, all</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 134		Page 136
1	law enforcement officer, and director of the Montana		your office was involved; correct?
2	Department of Justice; is that right?	2	A. The Legislature retained the Department of
3	A. I think there is a statute that says I'm	3	
4	the chief law enforcement officer of the state. I		Q. And in the McLaughlin litigation your
5	am very loathe to use that term because a lot of		office represented the Legislature from the get-go;
6	people think that means I have some say over local		right?
7	law enforcement sheriffs, police departments.		A. As soon as they intervened, yes.
8 9	They think they can call me up, and I tell them tell them I got to make the county sheriff do X, and	8 9	Q. Sorry. In the McLaughlin case, not the Brown case.
10	I do not have that authority. So I'm as I said,	10	A. I'm probably getting my cases mixed up. I
11	I'm loathe to use that term, but I do think it's in	11	apologize.
12	statute.	12	Q. No, that's okay. McLaughlin was the
13	Q. You are the state's chief legal officer?		original proceeding that followed Brown.
	A. Yes.		A. I think it's accurate to say that my office
	Q. And on the AG website, it says that you are		represented the Legislature as soon as they got
16	responsible for representing and defending Montana's		involved.
17	legal positions and Montana's laws; correct?	17	Q. Thank you, sir.
	A. I and my staff. But ultimately me, yes.	18	And on April 1 of '21, on behalf of the
	Q. And that you control and manage all	19	governor, did you file a motion to disqualify
	litigation on behalf of the state; correct?	20	6 6
	A. Correct. Well, I I should qualify that.		A. I would have to see that to make sure, but
22	Very often very often there are other agencies		I have no reason to dispute you on that.
23	that are sued or get involved in litigation that do not foll under my numiery, the Department of		Q. It's Exhibit 4, sir, in the book. That's
	not fall under my purview, the Department of Justice. Various of the governor's agencies. Very		April 1, '21, in the Brown case; correct? A. Correct.
25	Justice. Various of the governor s agencies. Very	25	A. Contett.
	Page 135		Page 137
1	Page 135 common for them to use their own internal lawyers to	1	Page 137 Q. And with that, did you did your office
1			-
	common for them to use their own internal lawyers to	2	Q. And with that, did you did your office
2	common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or	2 3	Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek
2 3 4 5	common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved in what we're calling by shorthand the Brown and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall when Mr. Oestreicher left?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved in what we're calling by shorthand the Brown and McLaughlin lawsuits; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall when Mr. Oestreicher left?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I mean, I want to say</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved in what we're calling by shorthand the Brown and McLaughlin lawsuits; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall when Mr. Oestreicher left?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I mean, I want to say maybe oh, boy.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved in what we're calling by shorthand the Brown and McLaughlin lawsuits; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall when Mr. Oestreicher left?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I mean, I want to say maybe oh, boy.</li> <li>Q. Well.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>common for them to use their own internal lawyers to pursue whatever litigation, whether they're suing or being sued. That's that's a we we typically allow them to do that. We don't step in and try to step on the governor's agencies and what they want to pursue for a legal theory.</li> <li>Q. On your website it says you control and manage all litigation on behalf of the state. I guess, is that with these exceptions, is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Generally accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And the website indicates that your legal views and opinions prevail when a conflict arises between state agencies and officers whom the Attorney General represents; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, thankfully we've never had to test that. But if that's on the website, I'll take your word for it.</li> <li>Q. And we know that your office was involved in what we're calling by shorthand the Brown and McLaughlin lawsuits; correct?</li> <li>A. We became involved later. When that when that litigation was initiated, my office was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And with that, did you did your office also submit, its Exhibit 5, a declaration of Derek Oestreicher?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And was Mr am I pronouncing his name correct?</li> <li>A. I believe it's Oestreicher.</li> <li>Q. So do I, so thank you. I have met Derek previously, and I thought that's how he pronounced it. Thank you, sir.</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. Was Mr. Oestreicher one of your subordinates under your supervision at the AG's office?</li> <li>A. He was. At time he was chief general counsel or I forget what title we technically I think general counsel the title we gave him.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall when Mr. Oestreicher left?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. I mean, I want to say maybe oh, boy.</li> </ul>

Page 138 Page 140 1 A. Ish. 1 happened or what's going on there, yeah, generally 2 Q. Yeah. Okay. That's fair? mistakes happen sometimes. 2 3 A. But I hope I -- I hope I have that right. 3 Q. Sometimes. The motion -- back to 4 I couldn't say specifically. Sorry. Exhibit 4, please. 4 I apologize for the back-and-forth a little 5 Q. Well, the reason I ask is we know -- I 5 think -- well, we'll see today as I'm asking you bit. I'll try to minimize it. 6 6 A. No problem. 7 questions that are in March of '22, 7 Mr. Oestreicher -- Mr. Oestreicher was one of the 8 Q. At Exhibit 4, Page 3, at the top, the 8 9 ones from your office that returned the emails. 9 motion sought, among other things, the immediate So does that comport with your recusal or disqualification of Judge Kurt Krueger 10 10 recollection? He was still with you at that time? and any Montana judicial officer who, quote, voted, 11 11 12 A. Yes. 12 end quote, on and express -- or expressed public **13** Q. Okay. Now, in your response to the approval or disapproval of SB 140; correct? 13 grievance in this matter, you denied that the 14 14 A. Yes. Attorney General filed the motion to disgualify that 15 Q. And it also sought disclosure of the voting 15 I just showed you, didn't you? results of the Montana Supreme Court Administrator 16 16 17 A. I -- I -- honestly, without it in front of Beth McLaughlin's poll regarding SB 140; correct? 17 me, I couldn't say for sure. 18 A. Yes. 18 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 39, please. And **19** Q. And Exhibit 5, the declaration of 19 it's -- 39, first of all, that's the response that Mr. Oestreicher, attached to that declaration is 20 20 21 you sent to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel back 21 Exhibit A, which I believe begins at Page 5 -in '21 in response to the grievance that was sorry, Page 6. There are emails there between the 22 22 originally filed; correct? 23 court administrator and numerous judges. The 23 24 A. That looks correct. Yes. subject line is "SB 140." 24 25 Q. Yeah. And your -- I believe your signature Do you see those? 25 Page 139 Page 141 is on this. Let me check before I say that. 1 A. Starting on Page 6, I see Subject, SB 140, 1 Yes, sir, on Exhibit 39, it's 39-15. 2 and it's a series of emails that follow. Yes. 2 That's your signature; correct? **3** Q. Okay. So these -- when you filed the 3 motion to DQ Judge Krueger, your office already had, 4 A. Yes. 4 5 Q. And then if you would please turn to 39, it looks like, many -- I'm not going to characterize 5 Page 4 -- I'm referring to the Bates number pages, 6 it other than that -- of the polling emails 6 sir, because they're off. But 39, Page 4. regarding SB 140; correct? 7 7 8 A. Would that be ODC0070? 8 A. I believe we had some of them. Yes. **9** Q. What was the source of those emails? 9 Q. Yes, sir. 10 A. Okav. 10 A. Those came from the Montana Legislature, if **11** Q. First paragraph at the top, there's some 11 I'm remembering correctly. highlighted language: **12** Q. Now, on the same day that you filed the 12 However, the Montana Attorney General did motion to DQ Judge Krueger, did you receive a letter 13 13 not file a motion to disqualify. That motion was from the Legislature on April 1, '21, to represent 14 14 filed by Oestreicher. the Legislature in Brown? 15 15 Correct? A. I honestly don't remember if we received a 16 16 17 A. That is what that says. Yes. letter or if it was in person or what we got. 17 Is there an exhibit you can point me to? **18** Q. All right. Mistakes happen. We know that 18 your name is on that motion to disqualify; correct? **19** Q. Yes, sir. Absolutely. It's Exhibit O. 19 20 A. You just showed it to me. Yes. 20 It's actually one of yours. 21 Q. Okay. And my point is sometimes mistakes MR. STRAUCH: Can we have the book that I 21 **22** happen; right? I'm not ascribing anything ill here. could hand the attorney here? 22 **23** I'm just saying it was a mistake. 23 This also has your exhibits in it. 24 A. You know, without sitting down with my 24 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Let's see. Exhibit O is 25 lawyers and really drilling down into how that 25 the declaration of -- of Mr. Oestreicher; correct?
mı	he Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
	Page 142	Page 144
1	It's a different declaration than the one we looked	1 Legislature to Director Misty Ann Giles of the
2	at.	2 Department of Administration.
3	A. Respondent's Exhibit O is the declaration	3 Q. Dated April 8th; correct, sir?
	of Derek Oestreicher filed April the 2nd of '21.	4 A. Correct.
5	Q. And attached to that declaration,	<b>5</b> Q. Did your office advise the Legislature
6	Exhibit O, is an Exhibit A, which I believe is the	6 I'm not asking what the advice was did your
7	letter I was asking you about. April 1, '21.	7 office advise the Legislature on this subpoena?
8	A. Yes. I see it.	8 A. To my knowledge, no.
9	Q. Okay. So and that's where the	<b>9</b> Q. Do you have any idea why the subpoena was
	Legislature asked you, sir, to represent it in the	<b>10</b> served a subpoena for judicial branch emails was
	Brown case; correct?	<b>11</b> served on the Department of Administration rather
	A. That looks accurate. Yes.	<b>12</b> than the court administrator herself?
	Q. And then you agreed, obviously, to	13 A. I can say that, just in my own knowledge,
	undertake that?	14 the Department of Administration generally is the
	A. We had some internal discussions, as I	15 server host for all of state government. I would
16	recall, me and some of my senior staff, there or	16 presume that was why. So as I understand the facts,
17	shortly thereafter. Yes, we agreed.	17 a subpoena was initially served on Court
18	MR. STRAUCH: And, Sheena, would you please	18 Administrator McLaughlin. She indicated that those
19	scroll down just to who is that letter signed by,	19 emails no longer existed, that she had deleted them
20	please. O (By Mr. Straugh) So it's signed by	20 or done some sort of, I think in her words,
	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) So it's signed by Speaker Speaker of the House Wylie Galt and	21 sloppiness. So I would presume again, this is
22	Senate President Mark Blasdel do you say Blasdel?	<ul><li>22 only my presumption that the Legislature decided</li><li>23 to go to the housing unit for that server that would</li></ul>
23 24	A. Blasdel.	<ul><li>23 to go to the housing unit for that server that would</li><li>24 have held those emails, which would be the</li></ul>
	Q. Blasdel. Thank you.	<ul><li>24 nave new mose emans, which would be the</li><li>25 Department of Administration.</li></ul>
	Q. Diaster. Hank you.	25 Deput thent of Fullimber at on.
	Page 143	Page 145
1	-	
1	Is that correct?	<b>1</b> Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the
2	Is that correct? A. That is correct.	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> </ol>
2 3	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> </ol>
2 3 4	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct?	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? <b>A. I I have no reason to dispute you there,</b>	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that.	<ol> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the	<ul> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the	<ul> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that	<ul> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>Administration.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the	<ul> <li>Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>Administration.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Is that correct? <b>A. That is correct.</b> Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? <b>A. I I have no reason to dispute you there,</b> <b>but if you're asking me do I recall that</b> <b>specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no</b> <b>reason to dispute that.</b> Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct?	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes. Q. That's in the other book, sir, the white	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> <li>20 matter. So I couldn't say one way or the other.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes. Q. That's in the other book, sir, the white book, I believe. Exhibit 6, if you'd just take a	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> <li>20 matter. So I couldn't say one way or the other.</li> <li>21 Q. Okay. And you don't know if the email</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes. Q. That's in the other book, sir, the white book, I believe. Exhibit 6, if you'd just take a look.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> <li>20 matter. So I couldn't say one way or the other.</li> <li>21 Q. Okay. And you don't know if the email</li> <li>22 request that Ms. McLaughlin got was for all emails</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes. Q. That's in the other book, sir, the white book, I believe. Exhibit 6, if you'd just take a look. A. The one on here.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> <li>20 May. And you don't know if the email</li> <li>22 request that Ms. McLaughlin got was for all emails</li> <li>23 and attachments sent and received by her between</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Is that correct? A. That is correct. Q. And then you and you entered an appearance for the Legislature in Brown on April 2nd to request an extension and time to answer the petition; is that correct? A. I I have no reason to dispute you there, but if you're asking me do I recall that specifically, I do not. But, again, I have no reason to dispute that. Q. Okay. Between the time that you filed the motion for extension to respond on behalf of the Legislature in Brown and the time you filed that response, your clients served a subpoena on the Department of Administration; correct? A. After they had filed a lodged a subpoena against the court administrator, Beth McLaughlin. Q. Yeah. A. Yes. Q. That's in the other book, sir, the white book, I believe. Exhibit 6, if you'd just take a look.	<ul> <li>1 Q. It's your understanding that, prior to the</li> <li>2 April 8th subpoena, there was an earlier subpoena to</li> <li>3 Ms. McLaughlin?</li> <li>4 A. That's my that's my understanding. I</li> <li>5 could be hazy on my dates, but I think my my</li> <li>6 recollection of the timeline is that the McLaughlin</li> <li>7 subpoena was first, that it was, I think I</li> <li>8 believe Director McLaughlin appeared before the</li> <li>9 legislative committee, said, Oops, don't have them</li> <li>10 anymore, probably was sloppy, I deleted them. And</li> <li>11 then at that point sorry, I think at that point a</li> <li>12 second subpoena was issued to the Department of</li> <li>13 Administration.</li> <li>14 Q. And if I told you that there was no earlier</li> <li>15 subpoena but there was an email request, would that</li> <li>16 be consistent with what you recall or not?</li> <li>17 A. I guess my answer would be no. I thought</li> <li>18 there was a subpoena from the Legislature, but, I</li> <li>19 mean, at that time we were not advising them on this</li> <li>20 matter. So I couldn't say one way or the other.</li> <li>21 Q. Okay. And you don't know if the email</li> <li>22 request that Ms. McLaughlin got was for all emails</li> </ul>

In t	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 146		Page 148
1	A. I couldn't say with any certainty.	1	to a Court to challenge its order?
	Q. Do you know if email requests that		A. I would point to Montana Rule of
	Ms. McLaughlin got were specifically for polling		Professional Conduct 3.4(c).
	emails, but not generally all judicial branch emails		Q. Relying on the exception that says "an open
	for a given point in time? Do you know that?		refusal"?
	A. I do not know that.		A. Correct.
	Q. Do you recall that the court administrator,		Q. It's your interpretation that an open
	Beth McLaughlin, filed an ex parte motion to quash		refusal is a letter?
9	the subpoena, Exhibit 6?		A. A letter that was sent out to the justices.
	A. I think I remember hearing something about		I'm not sure how it could be more open. But yes.
	that.		Q. As opposed to a motion?
	Q. Okay. And do you recall that on April 11,		A. Yes.
13	'21, the Supreme Court entered a temporary order		Q. And back to my question, are you familiar
	granting that motion?		
	A. I believe I found out about it the	15	appellate that allows counsel of record to send a
16	following Monday, whatever day that would have been.	16	letter to the Court to challenge an order? Not a
17	Q. Did your office send a letter to the Court		
18	challenging that order, Exhibit 11?		A. We certainly were in uncharted territory.
	A. Yes.		
	Q. And then and this is the one we saw	20	Q. And you recognize that the Rules of
	earlier, it says:		Professional Conduct govern the standards of conduct
21 22	The Legislature does not recognize this		of lawyers practicing law; correct?
	Court's order as binding and will not abide by it.		A. Yes.
23 24	Right?		Q. And but there's a difference. Rules of
	A. That is what that letter says. And just so		procedure are the rules that we follow when we're
25	A. That is what that letter says. And just so	25	procedure are the fules that we follow when we re
	Page 147		Page 149
1	Page 147 I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?	1	Page 149 applying to a Court for relief; correct?
2	I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?	2	applying to a Court for relief; correct?
2	I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?	2 3	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<b>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</b> <b>Exhibit 11?</b> Q. Yes, sir.	2 3 4	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li><li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11? Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li><li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4,</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11? Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant General Hansen; correct?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li><li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li><li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li><li>A. Among other things, yes.</li><li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year</li> <li>and a half ago. I should remember that</li> <li>specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists. Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists. Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but</li> <li>Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record to send a letter to a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant</li> <li>General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record what</li> <li>A. Are you asking me what specific rule under</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due to the court of justice and judicial officers?</li> <li>A. That is yes, that's one of the rules</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter?</li> <li>Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record to send a letter to a Court to challenge an order?</li> <li>A. Are you asking me what specific rule under civil procedure, or rules of conduct? What are you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due to the court of justice and judicial officers?</li> <li>A. That is yes, that's one of the rules</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record to send a letter to a Court to challenge an order?</li> <li>A. Are you asking me what specific rule under civil procedure, or rules of conduct? What are you asking me?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due to the court of justice and judicial officers?</li> <li>A. That is yes, that's one of the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm talking about your oath as a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record to send a letter to a Court to challenge an order?</li> <li>A. Are you asking me what specific rule under civil procedure, or rules of conduct? What are you asking me?</li> <li>Q. What rule of procedure, whether it's civil</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due to the court of justice and judicial officers?</li> <li>A. That is yes, that's one of the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm talking about your oath as a lawyer. That was in there. We looked at it; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>I'm clear, we're on the April 12, '21, letter? Exhibit 11?</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. And it's signed by Lieutenant General Hansen; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And she's deceased. The saints preserve. Do you remember when she passed away?</li> <li>A. Not specifically. Oh, boy. Year year and a half ago. I should remember that specifically, and it's terrible that I don't, but Q. That's all right. I understand. You have 800</li> <li>A. Well, that's one that none of us are going to forget any time soon.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. I agree. What rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record what rule permits counsel of record to send a letter to a Court to challenge an order?</li> <li>A. Are you asking me what specific rule under civil procedure, or rules of conduct? What are you asking me?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>applying to a Court for relief; correct?</li> <li>A. Among other things, yes.</li> <li>Q. Now, you acknowledge that same rule that you cited, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4, Charlie, states that a lawyer shall not knowingly disobey an obligation under the rules of the tribunal; correct?</li> <li>A. That is the first portion of that rule.</li> <li>Unless that lawyer believes has made an open I forget what the exact verbiage is but basically an open assertion that no valid obligation exists.</li> <li>Yes, that's what Rule 3.4, Charlie, says.</li> <li>Q. And that includes the the rules of the tribunal referenced in 3.4, Charlie, include your oath as an officer of the Court, doesn't don't they?</li> <li>A. I believe yeah, I believe sure.</li> <li>Q. Which includes maintaining the respect due to the court of justice and judicial officers?</li> <li>A. That is yes, that's one of the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm talking about your oath as a</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 150	Page 152
1 officers; correct?	1 will not agree with that.
2 A. Yes.	2 Q. It's your job as the chief legal officer of
<b>3</b> Q. And it includes, quote, striving to uphold	3 this state to enforce the law; right?
4 the honor and to maintain the dignity of the	4 A. Correct.
<ul><li>5 profession, end quote; correct?</li></ul>	5 Q. But telling the Court that its order is
6 A. Correct.	
7 Q. This letter was disrespectful to the	<ul><li>6 invalid and will not be followed does just the</li><li>7 opposite, doesn't it?</li></ul>
	11
8 Montana Supreme Court, wasn't it?	8 A. No. I think pointing out a situation where
9 A. No.	9 our client's genuine belief was that a coequal
<b>10</b> Q. This letter was intemperate, wasn't it?	10 branch of government had overstepped its authority
11 A. No.	11 is not unprofessional or any of the adjectives that
<b>12</b> Q. It was contemptuous, wasn't it?	12 you used. No. I disagree with that
13 A. Not in my opinion, no.	13 characterization.
<b>14</b> Q. It was insulting, wasn't it?	<b>14</b> Q. And I apologize, but I wasn't asking about
15 A. Nope.	<b>15</b> that part of it.
<b>16</b> Q. This letter was undignified of our	<b>16</b> The order is the law; right?
<b>17</b> profession, and particularly undignified of the	17 A. Which order are we
<b>18</b> chief legal officer of this state, wasn't it?	<b>18</b> Q. The only order we've looked at so far. The
<b>19</b> A. No. This letter was meant to openly assert	<b>19</b> order the temporary order that said your subpoena
20 our client's position that there was no valid	20 is quashed, the one that this letter says will not
21 obligation to comply with that court order. That	<b>21</b> be followed.
22 was the position of our client, my client, a coequal	22 That order is the law; right?
23 branch of government with the judiciary.	23 A. Well, there's statutory law dealing with
<b>24</b> Q. The letter doesn't say, does it, that your	24 the legislative subpoena power, and that is a
<b>25</b> office asserts the order is erroneous, does it?	25 completely untested area of law, up until this. I
Page 151	Page 153
Page 151 1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read 2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.	Page 153 1 will admit that has now been litigated. But at the 2 time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> <li>19 Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> <li>19 Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>20 the court, you're obligated to uphold the dignity of</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> <li>19 Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>20 the court; right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> <li>letter at the time it was written; correct?</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>the court, right?</li> <li>A. That is one of my obligations as an officer</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> <li>letter at the time it was written; correct?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure I would characterize it quite</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> <li>19 Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>20 the court, you're obligated to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>21 the Court; right?</li> <li>22 A. That is one of my obligations as an officer</li> <li>23 of the court, yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> <li>letter at the time it was written; correct?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure I would characterize it quite</li> <li>that way. The conversations I recall with</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>1 A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>2 through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>3 Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>4 you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>5 disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>6 that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>7 insulting?</li> <li>8 A. I do.</li> <li>9 Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>10 Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>11 that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>12 engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>13 administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>14 A. Correct.</li> <li>15 Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>16 that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>17 respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>18 A. Yes.</li> <li>19 Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>20 the court, you're obligated to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>21 the Court; right?</li> <li>22 A. That is one of my obligations as an officer</li> <li>23 of the court, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. This letter does not do that, does it?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> <li>letter at the time it was written; correct?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure I would characterize it quite</li> <li>that way. The conversations I recall with</li> <li>Lieutenant General Hansen, she she briefed me on</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>A. I mean, honestly, Counsel, I haven't read</li> <li>through this thing word for word in quite some time.</li> <li>Q. Fair enough. It says what it says. But</li> <li>you disagree with me that it is disrespectful, you</li> <li>disagree with me that it's intemperate, you disagree</li> <li>that it's contemptuous, and you disagree that it's</li> <li>insulting?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And you also know, don't you, that the</li> <li>Rules of Professional Conduct 8.4(d), delta, states</li> <li>that it is professional misconduct for a lawyer to</li> <li>engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the</li> <li>administration of justice; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And that includes being disrespectful</li> <li>that includes barring disrespectful language with</li> <li>respect to the Court, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. But you acknowledge that, as an officer of</li> <li>the court, you're obligated to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the Court; right?</li> <li>A. That is one of my obligations as an officer</li> <li>of the court, yes.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>will admit that has now been litigated. But at the</li> <li>time my client had a bona fide and genuine belief</li> <li>that that order was not valid. And that was what we</li> <li>were instructed, and it's what my office was</li> <li>instructed to press that position.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, the order of a court</li> <li>of this state is the law, isn't it?</li> <li>A. Unless there is a bona fide open assertion</li> <li>that that order is not valid. I will admit,</li> <li>Counsel, that does not happen very often. I</li> <li>certainly have never seen it in my career. I hope</li> <li>to never see it again. But that is the position we</li> <li>were put in in this litigation.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, my question to you as the</li> <li>Attorney General of the State of Montana is, is an</li> <li>order of the Montana Supreme Court the law?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> <li>answered.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) You fully supported this</li> <li>letter at the time it was written; correct?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure I would characterize it quite</li> <li>that way. The conversations I recall with</li> </ul>

	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 154		Page 156
1	She had been dealing with the Legislature.	1	Administrator McLaughlin filed a new petition in the
2	Personally, I had not. She had told me what	2	original proceeding in McLaughlin in April of '21?
3	happened. She wanted to if I'm remembering	3	Do you remember that?
	correctly and, Counsel, I apologize, this has		A. Yes.
5	been several years ago now. But I do recall she was		Q. And for the record, it's Exhibit 12. But
6	quite agitated and she told me she wanted to use		I it's okay, I don't I don't have any specific
7	some quite strong language to push back and assert	7	
	the Legislature's position.	8	By April 12th, when that when
8	Q. And my question is, you fully supported		Ms. McLaughlin fired that filed that petition,
	that language at the time; correct?	9	the Department of Administration had actually
		10	-
	A. Yes. I'll say that. Yes.	11	already produced judicial branch emails to the
	Q. And you still do?	12	Department of Justice in response to the
	A. Counsel, if I'm being really honest, in	13	Legislature's subpoena; correct? A. I believe that's correct.
	hindsight I think a lot of things could be done		
15	could have been done different here and probably		Q. And some emails apparently had made it to
16	should have been done different here. If I had this	16	the media that same weekend?
17	to do over, I probably would not have allowed	17	A. I believe that is also correct.
18	language like this, so sharp, to be used. But we	18	Q. After the April 11, '21, order quashing the
19	we and our client truly felt that we were in an	19	subpoena because of confidentiality concerns, did
20	absolutely novel situation of constitutional	20	you or your clients make any efforts to allow the
21	emergency, and this is the language that went out.	21	court administrator's office to regain control over
	Q. I appreciate that, sir. And hindsight may	22	those emails and redact confidential information?
	be 20/20, but we asked you about this in hindsight		A. My recollection of the conversations I had
	when we inquired originally back in '21. This is		with Lieutenant General Hansen was that she she
25	Exhibit 39, Page 3. This is, again, your response	25	was attempting to reach some sort of an agreement
	Page 155		Page 157
1		1	
	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry,		with the court administrator's office. I don't
2	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of	2	with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.
2 3	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role,	2 3	<ul><li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li><li>Q. Did your clients issue additional</li></ul>
2 3 4	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his	2	<ul><li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li><li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li><li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li><li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry,</li> <li>Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of</li> <li>Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role,</li> <li>you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his</li> <li>subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and</li> <li>contentious separation of powers dispute.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry,</li> <li>Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of</li> <li>Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role,</li> <li>you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his</li> <li>subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and</li> <li>contentious separation of powers dispute.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did</li> <li>fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry,</li> <li>Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of</li> <li>Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role,</li> <li>you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his</li> <li>subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and</li> <li>contentious separation of powers dispute.</li> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did</li> <li>fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys</li> <li>and their advocacy of our client.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients. I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Conclusion: The Montana Legislature, your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you implement an office policy that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Conclusion: The Montana Legislature, your client, submitted a letter to the acting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you implement an office policy that said we will not use this kind of sharp language</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Conclusion: The Montana Legislature, your client, submitted a letter to the acting chief justice on April 12th.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you implement an office policy that said we will not use this kind of sharp language anymore?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Conclusion: The Montana Legislature, your client, submitted a letter to the acting chief justice on April 12th. That's the letter we just looked at; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel inquiry, Page 3, Number 3. Your letter to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel says, in your supervisory role, you fully supported the vigorous advocacy of his subordinate attorneys in this unprecedented and contentious separation of powers dispute. Correct?</li> <li>A. That's an accurate statement. I I did fully support the vigorous advocacy of my attorneys and their advocacy of our client.</li> <li>Q. And needless to say, since you fully supported it, you never took any kind of action to remediate it or correct it; true?</li> <li>A. No, that's not true.</li> <li>Q. Did you write to the Supreme Court and apologize for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you fire your subordinates for saying these things?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you implement an office policy that said we will not use this kind of sharp language</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>with the court administrator's office. I don't think those were successful.</li> <li>Q. Did your clients issue additional legislative subpoenas for judicial branch emails and various electronic devices that might house emails after the Supreme Court's April 11th order?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you advise them on those subpoenas?</li> <li>A. Well, at that point we were their clients.</li> <li>I would imagine so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on April 14th of '21 your office filed a motion to dismiss the McLaughlin petition on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. I couldn't tell you the exact dates, but I know that we filed a motion to dismiss.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, sir. It's Exhibit 13, and it's in the book if that's easier for you to read. Pages 8 to 9, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Conclusion: The Montana Legislature, your client, submitted a letter to the acting chief justice on April 12th.</li> </ul>

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 158		Page 160
1	this says:	1	the attorneys that work for me.
2	McLaughlin's current petition seeks yet		Q. Well, you heard Mr. Cox's you heard
3	another court order which will not bind the		Mr. Cox's testimony about the various emails and
4	Legislature and will not be followed.	4	letters and efforts that he made for cooler heads to
5	Correct?	5	prevail, and it ended flatly, no effort whatsoever
	A. That is what it says.	6	by you or your clients to do that.
	Q. Those statements filed in a brief in the	7	Did you hear that testimony?
8	Montana Supreme Court were disrespectful to the		A. I heard him say that. I also had numerous
9	Court, weren't they?	9	conversations with Lieutenant General Hansen
	A. No.	10	where almost daily where she told me she was
	Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?	11	legitimately trying to open a line of communication
	A. No.	12	with the judiciary in hopes of resolving this.
	Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?	13	Q. Do you have any information that Mr. Cox
	A. No.		provided false information here this morning?
15	Q. This was insulting, wasn't it?		A. No.
	A. No.		Q. And you fully supported the motion that we
	Q. This was undignified of our profession, and		just read, that language we just read; correct?
	particularly undignified of the chief legal office		A. Yes.
	of this state, wasn't it?	19	Q. Do you recall on April 16th, a few days
20	A. No.	20	later, the Court issued another order enjoining and
21	Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the	21	quashing the legislative subpoenas? It's
22	Montana Supreme Court, does it?	22	Exhibit 15.
23	A. I believe that it does.	23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Telling the Court that its orders that	24	Q. And following that order, on April 18th
25	its order is invalid and will not be followed	25	your office once again wrote another letter to the
	D 450		D 494
	Page 159		Page 161
	upholds the dignity of the Court?	1	Page 161 Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.
2	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely	2	Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16. A. Yes.
2 3	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office	2 3	Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16. <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the
2 3 4	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position	2 3 4	<ul><li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position</li></ul>
2 3 4	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of	2 3 4 5	Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16. <b>A. Yes.</b> Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?
2 3 4	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that. Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that. Q. Understood. As an officer of the court, it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	upholds the dignity of the Court? A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that. Q. Understood. As an officer of the court, it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the court; right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court, it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the profession and to be respectful; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this</li> <li>thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court, it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the profession and to be respectful; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature and the judiciary would not come to the position</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely unprecedented position, and we I felt my office was ethically bound to press our client's position firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of our remedies. I have one coequal branch of government telling another coequal branch of government the scope of their own power, and we had one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court, it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of the profession and to be respectful; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature and the judiciary would not come to the position we've come to and that there would be some sort of a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir. No.</li> <li>Q. If you tell somebody that their statement</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this</li> <li>thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature</li> <li>and the judiciary would not come to the position</li> <li>we've come to and that there would be some sort of a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir. No.</li> <li>Q. If you tell somebody that their statement is wholly outside the bounds of rational thought,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this</li> <li>thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature</li> <li>and the judiciary would not come to the position</li> <li>we've come to and that there would be some sort of a</li> <li>cooler heads prevailing and some sort of an</li> <li>agreement over over the disclosure of these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir. No.</li> <li>Q. If you tell somebody that their statement is wholly outside the bounds of rational thought, that's not insulting?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>upholds the dignity of the Court?</li> <li>A. Again, Counsel, we were in an absolutely</li> <li>unprecedented position, and we I felt my office</li> <li>was ethically bound to press our client's position</li> <li>firmly and zealously until we had exhausted all of</li> <li>our remedies. I have one coequal branch of</li> <li>government telling another coequal branch of</li> <li>government the scope of their own power, and we had</li> <li>one client that disagreed with that. And we felt it</li> <li>was our position to, again, zealously uphold that.</li> <li>Q. Understood. As an officer of the court,</li> <li>it's your sworn obligation to uphold the dignity of</li> <li>the court; right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And it's your sworn obligation to uphold</li> <li>the dignity of the profession and to be respectful;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Correct. Counsel, at all times in this</li> <li>thing, it was our genuine hope that the Legislature</li> <li>and the judiciary would not come to the position</li> <li>we've come to and that there would be some sort of a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Court; correct? It's Exhibit 16.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And on Page 1 of that letter, the Attorney General advises the Court that its position is, quote/unquote, ludicrous; is that right?</li> <li>A. That's what it says. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that the statement of the Court is, quote, wholly outside the bounds of rational thought; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. You fully supported that statement when it was made; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir. No.</li> <li>Q. If you tell somebody that their statement is wholly outside the bounds of rational thought,</li> </ul>

	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 162		Page 164
1	there's certainly legal precedent for that when	1	of judicial misconduct; correct?
2	we're talking about judicial allegations of		A. That is sentence says there's evidence
3	judicial misconduct.		judicial misconduct has come to light. I don't
	Q. How many times can you think other times		think that's an accusation from my office. That's a
5	can you think of in the history of this state where		statement that there is evidence in possession of
6	counsel of record told the Montana Supreme Court in	6	the Department of Justice and our client, the state
7	a pleading or, excuse me, a letter that was filed	7	legislature, that suggests there's judicial
	in court, that it was ludicrous, that its thoughts	8	misconduct.
9	were wholly outside the bounds of rational thought.	-	Q. How about the next one that I highlighted:
10	Where? Show me. Think of another time	10	The self-interest is so apparent that any
	where something like that was said. Can you help	11	attempt by the Court to do its job not only runs
	me?	12	afoul of state law, but it also runs afoul of the
	A. As I said, Counsel, I'm not an appellate	13	code of judicial conduct.
	lawyer and never pretended to be, so I cannot point	14	That's accusing the Court of judicial
	you to one.	15	misconduct, isn't it, sir?
	Q. On April 30th of '21, your office moved on		A. That is a statement putting that's an
17	behalf of the Legislature to disqualify all the	17	open assertion by our client us doing it on their
18	justices in McLaughlin; correct?	18	behalf that a valid obligation does not exist,
	A. Yes.	19	hence exempted under Rule 3.4, Charlie.
	Q. And it's Exhibit 17. Stop right there,	20	Q. No, this is not this is not saying
	please.	20	you're refusing to obey a court order. This saying
22	At the top, that's your name; right?	22	you, the judges of the Supreme Court of the State of
	A. Yes.	22	Montana, have violated the code of judicial conduct,
	Q. And then Page 5, the top of the page:		doesn't it?
25	This matter has arisen speaking of the		A. It is our office advising the Court, in our
25	This matter has arisen speaking of the	25	A. It is our office advising the court, in our
	Page 163		Page 165
1	-	1	
	McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen		opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they
2	McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to	2	opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state
2 3	McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light.	2 3	opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.
2 3 4	McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?	2 3 4	<ul><li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li><li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly? A. You did.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li><li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li><li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light.</li> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission;</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful to judges. I mean, I'm not going to I don't know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful to judges. I mean, I'm not going to I don't know how a judge would not be considered disrespected if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. That is an avenue you can take.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful to judges. I mean, I'm not going to I don't know how a judge would not be considered disrespected if they were being asked to recuse from a case.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. That is an avenue you can take.</li> <li>Q. No, sir, that's the only avenue you can</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful to judges. I mean, I'm not going to I don't know how a judge would not be considered disrespected if they were being asked to recuse from a case.</li> <li>Q. No, sir. My question is, in a public brief</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. That is an avenue you can take.</li> <li>Q. No, sir, that's the only avenue you can take; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>McLaughlin case because this matter as arisen because evidence of judicial misconduct has come to public light. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. The self-interest is so apparent any attempt by this Court to decide the question runs afoul of state law and the MCJC, which is the code of judicial conduct; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So you're accusing the judges of the Montana Supreme Court of judicial misconduct in a public court filing.</li> <li>A. It became, at the time, apparent to us that, given some of the emails that were disclosed, that there were pretty flagrant conflicts of interest that we were, of duty, obligated to point out to the Court. As I said, there is precedent for strong language that could be seen as disrespectful to judges. I mean, I'm not going to I don't know how a judge would not be considered disrespected if they were being asked to recuse from a case.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>opinion, in our client's opinion, that should they decide to rule on this, it would run afoul of state law and the MCJC.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Knudsen, how are you supposed to file a complaint of judicial misconduct? There's a mechanism for that, isn't there?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. It's with the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. A constitutional body; correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. I have a copy of the constitution, if you'd like to check it.</li> <li>A. I believe you.</li> <li>Q. If you want to claim that a judge has violated the code of judicial misconduct judicial conduct, you report it to the constitutional authority, the Judicial Standards Commission; correct?</li> <li>A. That is an avenue you can take.</li> <li>Q. No, sir, that's the only avenue you can</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 166		Page 168
1	so fast so quickly and this was an emergent	1	Are you aware of that rule?
2	situation. We didn't think that was prudent.		A. I am aware of that rule.
	Q. No, sir. As an officer of the court, you		Q. Now, you understand the purpose of that
3	swore to follow the rules of the court. And one of		rule is to preserve public confidence in our far
5	those rules is, if you want to bring a claim of	5	1 5 5
6	judicial misconduct, you do so through the Judicial	6	
7	Standards Commission; correct?		A. That's probably one of the reasons for it.
8	MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; leading.	8	
9	MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir, it is.	9	
10	CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.	10	please. It is Exhibit 17, Page 5.
11	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, this is the	11	Your statements here willfully and
12	respondent in this case. I asked originally if we	12	knowingly undermine the presumed integrity and
13	could lead the witness. He's the he is the	13	qualifications of the justices, didn't it?
14	adverse party. Rule 611(c) permits me to lead the	14	A. No. These were not knowingly false or
15	witness.	15	reckless disregarding truth statements.
16	CHAIR OGLE: All right. Why don't you	16	Q. When you accuse a judge of violating the
17	restate the question.	17	rules of judicial the code of judicial conduct,
18	Q. (By Mr. Strauch) As a sworn officer of the	18	you don't think that undermines their integrity and
19	court, you're supposed to follow the rules of the	19	
20	court; correct?		A. This was not a knowingly false statement,
	A. Yes.		nor one made with reckless disregard for the truth.
	Q. And one of those rules is, if you want to	22	
23	make a complaint against a judge, you file the	23	
24	complaint with the Judicial Standards Committee;		integrity and qualifications, does it not?
	correct?		A. I'm sorry, Counsel. You had asked
2.5		2.5	n. Thi sorry, counsel. Tou had asked
	Page 167		Page 169
1	-	1	Ŭ
	A. Yes.	1	about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking
2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the</li></ul>	2	about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li><li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li><li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li><li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li><li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li><li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge.</li> <li>My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Following the May 12th order, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware that Rule of Professional</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Following the May 12th order, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware that Rule of Professional Conduct 8.2, alpha, provides that a lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Following the May 12th order, you wrote your own letter to the Court; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware that Rule of Professional Conduct 8.2, alpha, provides that a lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Following the May 12th order, you wrote your own letter to the Court; correct? It's Exhibit 19?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. These statements in a brief, not the Judicial Standards Committee, are disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're intemperate, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're contemptuous, aren't they excuse me? They're contemptuous, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They're insulting, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, and particularly undignified of the legal officer of this state, aren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, does it?</li> <li>A. Yes, it does.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware that Rule of Professional Conduct 8.2, alpha, provides that a lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>about 8.4. I thought that's what we were talking about.</li> <li>Q. No, I'm asking about 8.2(a), which says that you shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge. My question to you isn't I'm not asking you to admit that this was false. I'm not asking you admit if this was reckless. I'm simply asking you that when you say they have violated the code of judicial conduct, that does go to the qualifications or integrity of a judge, doesn't it?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall that on May 12 of '21 the Supreme Court issued a decision denying your motion to disqualify the judges? It's Exhibit 18.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Following the May 12th order, you wrote your own letter to the Court; correct? It's Exhibit 19?</li> </ul>

Before the Commission on Practice In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024
Page 170	
1 A. Yes.	1 A. No, not necessarily. No, I would never
2 Q. You made it clear in this letter that you	2 call the justices liars.
3 were aware of the, quote/unquote, strong statements	3 Q. Why not?
4 of the subordinates in your office,	4 A. That would be horribly inappropriate.
5 Lieutenant Hansen and Derek Oestreicher; correct?	5 Q. And disrespectful?
6 You were definitely aware of those statements?	6 A. To call them outright liars? Yes.
7 A. Yes.	7 Q. The statements that I've highlighted that
8 Q. And did you offer to do anything to	8 we went through here in this letter that you made
9 remediate or in any way soften or correct the	9 were disrespectful to the Montana Supreme Court,
10 statements that they made?	10 weren't they?
11 A. Officially, no.	11 A. No.
<b>12</b> Q. You certainly don't do it in this letter,	<b>12</b> Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?
13 do you?	13 A. No, sir.
14 A. Correct.	<b>14</b> Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?
<b>15</b> Q. And on Page 2, the fourth paragraph, you're	15 A. No.
16 admonishing the Court directing them, if you	<b>16</b> Q. They were insulting, weren't they?
17 will how to administer these issues; is that	17 A. No.
18 right?	<b>18</b> Q. They were undignified of our profession,
<b>19</b> A. No. I am inviting the Court to please	19 weren't they?
20 don't take their frustrations out on my lawyers;	20 A. No.
21 take it out on me, the elected official.	<b>21</b> Q. This does not uphold the dignity of the
<b>22</b> Q. You're aware of the fact that every court	22 Court, does it?
<b>23</b> in the state has the inherent authority to maintain	23 A. It does.
<b>24</b> respect and the administration of justice in its own	24 Q. For the same reason you said earlier;
<b>25</b> court, aren't you?	25 right?
Page 171	Page 173
1 A. Of course.	1 A. Yes.
<b>2</b> Q. But you're telling the judges the	2 Q. Do you know who Abraham Maslow is?
3 justices of the Montana Supreme Court, Don't take it	3 A. I believe I have heard that name. Yes.
4 up with the people that said it; take it up with	4 Q. Who is he?
5 you?	5 A. I couldn't tell you who he is exactly. I
6 A. I am asking them politely, please refrain	6 know he's referenced in one of our filings or
7 and contact me.	7 letters.
<b>8</b> Q. If you wish to vent any further	
	<b>8</b> Q. Do you know anything about what he wrote?
<b>9</b> frustrations about the conduct of attorneys in my	<ul><li>8 Q. Do you know anything about what he wrote?</li><li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li></ul>
<ul><li>9 frustrations about the conduct of attorneys in my</li><li>10 office you think that's polite?</li></ul>	9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a
	<ul><li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li><li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li></ul>
<ul><li>10 office you think that's polite?</li><li>11 A. Yes.</li></ul>	9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> <li>19 Q. You're attacking the honesty and integrity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> <li>19 Q. You're attacking the honesty and integrity</li> <li>20 of the Court, aren't you?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> <li>20 personally interested in the outcome so their</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> <li>19 Q. You're attacking the honesty and integrity</li> <li>20 of the Court, aren't you?</li> <li>21 A. I'm no, I'm disagreeing with a portion</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> <li>20 personally interested in the outcome so their</li> <li>21 ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> <li>19 Q. You're attacking the honesty and integrity</li> <li>20 of the Court, aren't you?</li> <li>21 A. I'm no, I'm disagreeing with a portion</li> <li>22 of their statement here.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> <li>20 personally interested in the outcome so their</li> <li>21 ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>22 Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10 office you think that's polite?</li> <li>11 A. Yes.</li> <li>12 Q. To the justices of the Montana</li> <li>13 Supreme Court? Vent their frustrations? Yes?</li> <li>14 A. Yes.</li> <li>15 Q. In the Footnote 1, you are saying the</li> <li>16 statement of the Court is inaccurate, almost to a</li> <li>17 word; right?</li> <li>18 A. That's correct.</li> <li>19 Q. You're attacking the honesty and integrity</li> <li>20 of the Court, aren't you?</li> <li>21 A. I'm no, I'm disagreeing with a portion</li> <li>22 of their statement here.</li> <li>23 Q. I'm sorry. I mean, saying somebody's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 A. Something along the lines of, If you're a</li> <li>10 hammer, everything looks like a nail.</li> <li>11 Q. Do you recall on May 26th of '21 that your</li> <li>12 office filed on behalf of the Legislature a petition</li> <li>13 for rehearing of the May 12th order?</li> <li>14 A. Is that Exhibit 20?</li> <li>15 Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>16 A. Yes.</li> <li>17 Q. And on Page 4 excuse me Page 6,</li> <li>18 there's some highlighted language there:</li> <li>19 Here the justices are institutionally and</li> <li>20 personally interested in the outcome so their</li> <li>21 ability to be impartial is justifiably suspect.</li> <li>22 Specifically, the Court asserts that no justice</li> <li>23 the Court said no justice participated in the polls</li> </ul>

	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 174		Page 176
1	Did I read that correctly?	1	been litigated. We're done with that, so
	A. You did.		Q. Well, now, there isn't a rule of
	Q. The judges say X, but you're saying public	3	
	records say Y; correct?		because it's your client's position, is there?
	A. That was our client's position. Yes.		A. I cannot come up with one, off the top of
	Q. That's what you said?		my head, right now, as I sit here.
	A. On behalf of our clients, yes.		Q. But there's not? And
	Q. And it's still is this still your		A. There is an ethical obligation to zealously
	testimony that this doesn't go to the honesty of the		e .
9			represent the position of our client.
10	Supreme Court and the integrity of the	10	
11	Supreme Court?		didn't know, probably, that the rule zealous came
	A. Yes.	12	
	Q. It goes directly to their honesty and	13	5
	integrity, doesn't it? When you say to somebody,	14	But my question is let's do it this way.
15	Hey, the public records tell a different tale,	15	You did tell me that you would not tell the
	you're saying, You're not being honest; aren't you?	16	Montana Supreme Court they're a bunch of liars. You
	A. We were we were pointing out that a	17	did tell me that.
18	at the time what we felt was a fairly obvious		A. I forget exactly how I put it, but yes.
19	conflict of interest existed.	19	
20			was the gist of it; right?
	perverse? Page 8, Note 4? Perverse?		A. Yes.
	A. "Perverse" is used in that sentence.		Q. The Legislature says to you:
	There's not a direct a statement that the Court		Attorney General, we want you to tell the Montana
	is perverse.	24	Supreme Court they're liars.
25	Q. You're saying it's perverse for the Court	25	Is it your testimony that because your
	Page 175		Page 177
1	to suggest that it will decide this case; right?		
	to suggest that it will decide this case, light.	1	client's position is that that you can say if ?
2	A. That is what that sentence says.		client's position is that, that you can say it? A. No.
	A. That is what that sentence says. O And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer:	2	A. No.
3	Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer:	2 3	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Thank you.</li></ul>
3 4	Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Thank you.</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>
3 4 5	Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6	Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. <ul> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this</li> <li>brief, the highlighted things, these were all</li> <li>disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony. Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client, the Legislature. Our client, the Legislature,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client, the Legislature. Our client, the Legislature, genuinely could not fathom that a judiciary, who had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir. <ul> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this</li> <li>brief, the highlighted things, these were all</li> <li>disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client, the Legislature. Our client, the Legislature, genuinely could not fathom that a judiciary, who had been involved in polling and some of these emails,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client, the Legislature. Our client, the Legislature, genuinely could not fathom that a judiciary, who had been involved in polling and some of these emails, would also sit in judgment of that case. That was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of the dignity of the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And on Page 10 there's Maslow's hammer: But the Court appears to suffer from the bias of Maslow's hammer, which is to cite, quote, if all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Is that respectful?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's disrespectful.</li> <li>Q. Page 13: Which begs the question, Who will judge the judges? According to this Court, the judges. The judges will judge the judges. That, of course, defies common and constitutional sense. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. This is disrespectful, isn't it?</li> <li>A. No. This was the position of our client, the Legislature. Our client, the Legislature, genuinely could not fathom that a judiciary, who had been involved in polling and some of these emails,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>A. No, that's not my testimony.</li> <li>Counsel, can I get a drink of water? I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q. Yes, sir.</li> <li>The stuff that we just went through in this brief, the highlighted things, these were all disrespectful to the Montane Supreme Court, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>

Page 178 Page 180 1 A. It does. 1 A. Everything we had in our possession, yes. 2 Q. Did the Court ultimately rule in the court 2 Q. So no employee, agent, or representative of administrator's favor and quash the subpoenas for 3 the Department of Justice has any copies, paper or 3 4 the judicial branch emails and order the return of electronic, of any of the judicial branch emails 4 the emails? received pursuant the legislative subpoena? 5 5 6 A. The Court quashed the subpoenas. We did A. Not as far as I know. 6 not get an order to return the subpoenas, I believe, Q. And no copies are anywhere in the 7 7 until July. legislative branch's computer network? 8 8 9 Q. Yes, sir. It's Exhibit 24. That's the one 9 A. I couldn't testify to that. I have no **10** I'm asking you about. knowledge about that, Counselor. 10 11 A. 24? 11 Q. I'm just asking you because you were the **12** Q. Yes, sir. July 14th of '21. one that ordered -- ordered to do it. So my 12 And if we go to the back of that -- let's question is, sitting here today, will you please 13 13 verify and affirm under oath that no employee, 14 see... 14 15 A. It looks like Page 36. agent, or representative of the Department of 15 **16** Q. Thank you, sir. That's the one that orders Justice has any copies, paper or electronic, of any 16 to return of the emails; correct? of the judicial branch emails received pursuant to a 17 17 18 A. Correct. legislative subpoena? 18 **19** Q. July 14, '21? Can you swear to that? 19 20 A. Correct. 20 A. I will affirm and swear as far as I am **21** Q. And as you point out, that's the first time 21 able, yes. the Supreme Court ordered the return of the emails; 22 Q. And can you -- can you swear that no such 22 right? copies are anywhere in the legislative branch's 23 23 24 A. That's correct. computer network? 24 25 Q. Okay. And the words that the -- the word 25 A. I cannot swear --Page 179 Page 181 that the Supreme Court used in that version was MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; lack of personal 1 1 "immediately;" correct? knowledge. He's asking him to testify as to what's 2 2 3 A. Immediately return. Yes. going on at the Legislature. 3 4 Q. Okay. Did the -- excuse me. Did your 4 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Well, I certainly am -- so office immediately return all copies of the emails let me see if I can do it this way. 5 5 6 to the court administrator as ordered? 6 The Legislature was your client; right? 7 A. We did not. A. Correct. 7 8 Q. When did your office finally return the 8 Q. And as an attorney, you understand that you **9** emails? 9 are an agent of your client; correct? 10 A. Immediately upon the denial of our petition 10 A. Yes. for writ of certiorari to the United States 11 **11** O. So when your client is directed to do Supreme Court. something, it's your job, as your client's attorney, 12 12 **13** Q. So in March of '22; does that sound right? to make sure they do it; right? 13 14 A. Yes. I think that's right. 14 A. As much as we are able, yes. **15** O. So about eight months after the Montana **15** O. Back to my question, will you affirm today Supreme Court orders you to immediately return that no such copies are anywhere in the legislative 16 16 emails, you return emails? branch's computer network? 17 17 18 A. I don't know what the timeline is there. MR. CORRIGAN: Object to the extent it asks 18 19 but ves. for protected attorney-client privilege information. 19 20 Q. Well, I just went July to March -- I just 20 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained. did, you know, July to December is five, plus three 21 Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Do you know what a -- I 21 22 is eight. can't even say this word. Sorry. I'll try it 22 23 A. That sounds right. 23 again. 24 Q. Did the Attorney General return all copies Do you know what a confiscatory decree is? 24 **25** of emails as ordered? 25 A. No. I might if you explained it, but no.

	Page 182		Page 184
1	Q. I don't know either. I looked it up, and	1	a petition for a writ of certiorari with the
	it's basically a judicial fiat to take away		Supreme Court?
3	property.		A. U.S. Supreme Court. Yes.
4	Does that make sense to you? I mean, the		Q. I misspoke. Thank you, sir.
5			A. Just for the record.
6	"Confiscate" means to take.	6	Q. Thank you. Exhibit 30, on Page 1, your
7	A. Yes.	7	name appears among others as counsel of record for
8	Q. Yes. Do you believe the July 14th order we	8	the Montana Legislature; correct?
9	just looked at, the one that ordered you to return	9	A. Yes, sir.
10	judicial branch emails, was a confiscatory decree?	10	Q. Page 47. You signed it? That's your
11	A. Counselor, are you referring to something	11	electronic signature?
12	specific that we filed in response?	12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Well, I'm asking you if you belief it was.	13	Q. I want to go through a few statements made
14	A. No.	14	in this petition filed with the United States
15	Q. So Exhibit 26, Page 11, this is the brief	15	Supreme Court. Page 18, quote:
	that that you guys filed in your petition for	16	Judicial self-dealing speaking of the
	rehearing; right? Exhibit 26?	17	Montana Supreme Court judicial self-dealing on
	A. That is our petition for rehearing, yes.	18	this scale might be unprecedented in the nation's
19	Q. Yeah. And on Page 11 it says:	19	5
20	The opinion referring to the July 14th	20	Did I read that correctly?
21	order is an unwarranted confiscatory decree.	21	A. You did.
22	Correct?	22	Q. Page 34, speaking of the Montana
	A. That is what it says.	23	Supreme Court, quote:
	Q. Those statements are disrespectful to the	24	It reached out to facilitate a case brought
25	Montana Supreme Court, weren't they?	25	by its appointee to conceal its misbehavior.
	Page 183		Page 185
1	Page 183	1	Manifold conflicts arose at every step of
2	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li></ul>	1 2	Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all.
2 3	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li><li>A. No, sir.</li></ul>	2 3	Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li><li>A. I do.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom:</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order. Did the Legislature order your office</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order. Did the Legislature order your office immediately return the emails after the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 45.</li> <li>A. Exhibit 45 or Page 45?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order. Did the Legislature order your office</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Ido.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 45.</li> <li>A. Exhibit 45 or Page 45?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order. Did the Legislature order your office immediately return the emails after the September 7th order?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Ido.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 45.</li> <li>A. Exhibit 45 or Page 45?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. Page 45. Thank you, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were intemperate, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were contemptuous?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>Q. They were insulting, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. They were undignified of our profession, weren't they?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. This doesn't uphold the dignity of the Montana Supreme Court, calling one of its orders a confiscatory decree, does it?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Did the Montana Supreme Court deny your petition for rehearing?</li> <li>A. It did.</li> <li>Q. And then, for your reference, sir, Exhibit 27, is the September 7, '21, order. Did the Legislature order your office immediately return the emails after the September 7th order?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Manifold conflicts arose at every step of litigation, and the Court ignored them all. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Ido.</li> <li>Q. Page 38, the footnote at the bottom: In addition to being untrue, these statements again, statements of the Montana Supreme Court these statements, a panageric to insincerity, came after the nonparty justices stayed their own subpoenas. Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. You did read that footnote correctly.</li> <li>Q. Page 43: The six McLaughlin justices refused to withdraw. They charged ahead, ensuring a result that bailed themselves out of an investigation prompted by their own inappropriate behavior. Did I read that right?</li> <li>A. You did.</li> <li>Q. Exhibit 45.</li> <li>A. Exhibit 45 or Page 45?</li> <li>Q. Sorry. Page 45. Thank you, sir. It permitted them italics to resolve the legal question of legislative subpoena power</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 186		Page 188
-		_	
	branch misbehavior from the light of day.		PR 23-0496, ODC File Number 21-094. And we're
2	Did I read that right? A. You did.	2	
			the respondent.
	Q. Now, you, the highest legal officer in the	4	MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
	state of Montana, state these things about the	5	
	highest court of our state in an open filing before	6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	8	7	
	A. Yes.	8	
	Q. That is disrespectful to the Montana	9	questioning, it came up that your office filed a
	Supreme Court, isn't it?	10	
	A. No.		correct?
	Q. It's intemperate, isn't it?		A. I think we did talk about that. Yes.
	A. No.		Q. And you reviewed ODC Exhibit 39, which was
	Q. It's contemptuous, isn't it?		used to infer that your April 2021 response was
	A. No.	-	mistaken or incorrect.
	Q. It's insulting?	16	A. Yes, I did.
	A. No.	17	MR. CORRIGAN: Could we bring up ODC
	Q. These statements that you made to the	18	71
19	United States Supreme Court were undignified of our	19	
20	profession, weren't they?		know when you're there, Mr. Attorney General.
	A. No.		A. What page was that?
22	Q. This statement in particular about judicial	22	Q. So under the rule of completeness, I'd
23	branch misbehavior willfully and knowingly		direct you to the previous page, Exhibit 39, Page 3
24	undermines the presumed integrity and qualifications	24	of the exhibit.
25	of the justices of the Montana Supreme Court,	25	A. Okay.
	5 1	-	
	5 1 /		<b>y</b>
	Page 187		Page 189
1	Page 187		Page 189
	Page 187 doesn't it?	1	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in
2	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No.	1 2	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?
2 3	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the	1 2 3	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think
2 3 4	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment?	1 2 3 4	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page.
2 3 4 5	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could,
2 3 4 5 6	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it? Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it? Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 189 Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph? A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page. Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it? Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph? A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some complaints about noise in the audience there. I'd	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit.</li> <li>We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy.</li> <li>Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> <li>Q. And could you read the next sentence?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some complaints about noise in the audience there. I'd like everybody to be quite so everyone can hear.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> <li>Q. And could you read the next sentence?</li> <li>A. Notwithstanding, the Attorney General is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some complaints about noise in the audience there. I'd like everybody to be quite so everyone can hear. We appreciate that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> <li>Q. And could you read the next sentence?</li> <li>A. Notwithstanding, the Attorney General is rarely counsel of record in the normal sense and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some complaints about noise in the audience there. I'd like everybody to be quite so everyone can hear. We appreciate that. We're back on the record in the matter of Austin	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> <li>Q. And could you read the next sentence?</li> <li>A. Notwithstanding, the Attorney General is rarely counsel of record in the normal sense and rarely participates directly in discrete litigation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Page 187 doesn't it? A. No. MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, may I have the commission's indulgence for a moment? CHAIR OGLE: Yes, you may. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. No further questions, Mr. Chair. Mr. Knudsen, thank you for your time. CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Strauch. Would you care to cross-examine, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I request just a brief recess for a restroom break? CHAIR OGLE: Sure. We'll reconvene in 10 minutes. MR. CORRIGAN: Thank you. (Break taken from 2:25 p.m. until 2:35 p.m.) CHAIR OGLE: We're ready to get going again, everyone. We would like to ask the audience to be quiet back there. We've received some complaints about noise in the audience there. I'd like everybody to be quite so everyone can hear. We appreciate that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Page 189</li> <li>Q. Could you please read the first sentence in the last paragraph?</li> <li>A. This is ODC Exhibit 39, Page 3? I think</li> <li>I'm on the wrong page.</li> <li>Q. So let's first go to Page 15, if we could, of the exhibit. We have a discrepancy. I'm sorry. It's MR. CORRIGAN: Which page is it?</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) It's Page 4 of Exhibit 39. Sorry. There was a numbering discrepancy. Could you read the first sentence in the last paragraph? In the last full paragraph?</li> <li>A. All attorneys in the Department of Justice operate under of the authority of the Office of the Attorney General and make court filings under those auspices.</li> <li>Q. Could you read the next sentence, please?</li> <li>A. The Attorney General's name appears typically on all pleadings and motions.</li> <li>Q. And could you read the next sentence?</li> <li>A. Notwithstanding, the Attorney General is rarely counsel of record in the normal sense and</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 190		Page 192
-	you personally filed the motion to disqualify on		And could you need the first clouse of the
	you personally filed the motion to disqualify or whether your office did it?		Q. And could you read the first clause of the first line after "I do affirm" and your name?
2			
	A. Yeah, my answer was definitely that it was		A. I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of
4	done under the auspices of my office.	4	
5	<b>MR. COLEMAN:</b> Apologies, Mr. Chairman. The exhibit has sometimes Number 2 and sometimes	5	Montana. Q. And does the Constitution of the
6	Number 3 because it's been Bates labeled, so there's		United States contain a clause known as the
7	some confusion as to which 3 we're on.		
8		8	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So we're turning to your		A. It most certainly does.
10	testimony that was highlighted. In saying you personally didn't file the		Q. Did the Montana Legislature advance legal theories under that due process clause in the course
11	motion, you didn't make a mistake there, did you?		of this litigation?
	A. No, that's correct. I did not personally		A. Yes. That was one of their main arguments
	file this motion.		was that this these this unprecedented
	Q. And there are numerous court filings in the	15	•
16	Department of Justice that contain your name;	16	
17	correct?	17	
	A. Most certainly.		Q. And then if you could go down we'll call
19	Q. And you physically did not hit the "file"	19	
20	button to file the response at issue?	20	five, six, seven to the line that says "I shall
	A. That's correct.	20	faithfully discharge"?
22	MR. STRAUCH: Leading; Mr. Chairman.		A. Yes.
23	CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.		Q. Does that say:
24	MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, as it relates	24	
25	to leading questions, I'd like to address that it's	25	
	to reading questions, i a nice to address that it's		
	Page 191		
			Page 193
1		1	ů –
1	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to		Page 193 knowledge and ability? A. It does.
	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness	2	knowledge and ability? A. It does.
2	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by	2 3	<ul><li>knowledge and ability?</li><li>A. It does.</li><li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the</li></ul>
2 3 4	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and	2 3 4	<ul><li>knowledge and ability?</li><li>A. It does.</li><li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of</li></ul>
2 3 4	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>knowledge and ability?</li><li>A. It does.</li><li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>knowledge and ability?</li><li>A. It does.</li><li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think you can elicit	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> I think you can elicit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the CHAIR OGLE: Sustained. THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the CHAIR OGLE: Sustained. THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the CHAIR OGLE: Sustained. THE WITNESS: I do not. CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and answered. I think you've got this one on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all? MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and answered. I think you've got this one on the record.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading. MR. CORRIGAN: Withdrawn. CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Now, if we could go back</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not <ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file</li> <li>every document that comes from the</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and answered. I think you've got this one on the record.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, I'd like to take you to ODC's Exhibit 40, which you looked at. And on the first page, is this the oath</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading. MR. CORRIGAN: Withdrawn. CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Now, if we could go back to ODC Exhibit 39, Page 15. Now, Mr. Strauch asked</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file every document that comes from the</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and answered. I think you've got this one on the record.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, I'd like to take you to ODC's Exhibit 40, which you looked at. And on the first page, is this the oath you took as a Montana attorney?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all? MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading. MR. CORRIGAN: Withdrawn. CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Now, if we could go back to ODC Exhibit 39, Page 15. Now, Mr. Strauch asked you questions about doing things differently if you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>well-recognized that a Court may allow counsel to propound leading questions to his or her own witness when it's been called as an adverse witness by opposing counsel, and both the Tenth, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits have agreed, as well as the advisory committee notes for the federal rules.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: I think you can elicit responses from your own client without leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, just to be clear, you do not personally file every document that comes from the Department of Justice?</li> <li>A. I do not <ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Do you file</li> <li>every document that comes from the</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I do not.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Also, it's been asked and answered. I think you've got this one on the record.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General, I'd like to take you to ODC's Exhibit 40, which you looked at. And on the first page, is this the oath</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. It does.</li> <li>Q. Do you believe, in representing the Legislature, you faithfully discharged the duties of an attorney and counselor at law to the best of your knowledge and ability?</li> <li>A. I did. I do believe that. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Attorney General Knudsen, you were asked by Mr. Strauch about cases involving criminal defendants and following court orders. Do you remember that exchange?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Do cases involving criminal defendants typically concern separation of powers questions between the legislative and judicial branches?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Would you say that they're not alike at all?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection; leading. MR. CORRIGAN: Withdrawn. CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Now, if we could go back to ODC Exhibit 39, Page 15. Now, Mr. Strauch asked</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 194		Page 196
1	Do you recall that exchange?	1	refresh the witness's memory.
	A. I do.	2	MR. STRAUCH: May I see it?
	Q. And Mr. Strauch pointed to this exhibit,	3	(Document provided.)
	which was filed on December 6, 2021.	4	<b>MR. CORRIGAN:</b> It's just for it's just
5	Do you recall that exhibit?	5	to refresh his memory as to date.
	A. Yes.	6	CHAIR OGLE: Any objection, Mr. Strauch?
	Q. How long ago was December 2021?	7	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I understood
	A. Oh, I mean, we're getting on four years		he's just refreshing the recollection, and under the
	here.	8	rule, when refreshing the recollection, the exhibit
	Q. Was the Montana Legislature's petition for	10	
	writ of certiorari pending at that time?	11	MR. CORRIGAN: That's fine.
	A. I believe so. Yes.	12	CHAIR OGLE: All right. Thank you.
	Q. So this was filed during the pendency of		Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) So, Mr. Attorney General,
	this litigation at issue?		Mr. Strauch asked you earlier pointed out to an
	A. Yes.		exhibit where the Attorney General's Office filed a
	Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, you were asked		motion asking for additional time because the
	by Mr. Strauch about what set off the events of the		Legislature wanted to intervene in that case that, I
	Brown and McLaughlin saga, and there was an exchange		believe, was filed on April 1st.
	relating to when the Legislature issued its first	19	Do you recall your discussion with
		20	
20	subpoena. Do you recall that?		A. I do.
21	A. I do.		Q. And one of the attachments was a letter
	Q. And I think you testified that you thought		from the Speaker and Senate President indicating
	that the Legislature had issued a subpoena first		that they wanted to get involved in that case; is
	or to the best of your recollection.		that correct?
25	of to the best of your reconcetion.	25	that confect?
	Page 195		Page 197
1		1	-
	A. To the best of my recollection, yes.		A. Yes.
2	<ul><li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li><li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that</li></ul>	2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana</li></ul>
2 3	<ul><li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li><li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th</li></ul>	2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li><li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li><li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filing a motion to intervene as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana Legislature actually filed its motion to intervene.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filing a motion to intervene as respondent in Brown versus Gianforte at some point?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filling a motion to intervene as respondent in Brown versus Gianforte at some point?</li> <li>A. At some point, yes, but not specifically.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana Legislature actually filed its motion to intervene. Does that sound right?</li> <li>A. That sounds correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filing a motion to intervene as respondent in Brown versus Gianforte at some point?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana Legislature actually filed its motion to intervene. Does that sound right?</li> <li>A. That sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. And to your knowledge, the emergency order</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filing a motion to intervene as respondent in Brown versus Gianforte at some point?</li> <li>A. At some point, yes, but not specifically.</li> <li>Q. You don't recall the date?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana Legislature actually filed its motion to intervene. Does that sound right?</li> <li>A. That sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. And to your knowledge, the emergency order in McLaughlin occurred over the weekend of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. To the best of my recollection, yes.</li> <li>Q. If I told you that the record shows that the first subpoena was issued on or around April 8th or April 9th, does that sound correct to you?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge, was the Montana Legislature ever granted intervention in the Brown litigation?</li> <li>A. I don't believe so, to my knowledge.</li> <li>Q. And what was the issue in Brown versus Gianforte? What was the subject of case?</li> <li>A. I'll go back. The underlying issue was Senate Bill 140. The underlying issue had to deal with the Legislature's passing and Governor Gianforte subsequently signing Senate Bill 140, which changed the process for judicial vacancy filling.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, do you recall the Legislature filing a motion to intervene as respondent in Brown versus Gianforte at some point?</li> <li>A. At some point, yes, but not specifically.</li> <li>Q. You don't recall the date?</li> <li>A. I do not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall the date at which the Montana Legislature actually filed for intervention in Brown versus Gianforte?</li> <li>A. Well, I'm going to guess it was the 13th of April, 2021.</li> <li>Q. And I did the Attorney General's Office represent the Legislature for that motion to intervene?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Who represented the Legislature?</li> <li>A. That would have been the Jones Law Firm in Billings, Montana. Specifically attorneys Emily Jones and Talia G. Damrow.</li> <li>Q. So there was according to the math, there was approximately a 12-day period between the Department of Justice's motion accompanied by the Oestreicher declaration and when the Montana Legislature actually filed its motion to intervene. Does that sound right?</li> <li>A. That sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. And to your knowledge, the emergency order in McLaughlin occurred over the weekend of the function of the source of the sour</li></ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 198	Page 200
1 correctly, when I came in the following Monday.	1 asked you about a number of comments that I think
2 Yes.	2 you conceded were strong language in the AG's
<b>3</b> Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, you were asked	3 filings.
4 by Mr. Strauch about the validity of orders and	4 Is that correct?
<ul><li>5 following court orders.</li></ul>	5 A. Yes.
6 Do you remember that exchange?	6 Q. Do you recall that discussion?
7 A. Yes.	7 A. I do.
8 Q. Is an invalid court order valid?	8 Q. Was there strong language used about you by
9 A. No.	9 the Montana Supreme Court?
<b>10</b> Q. Is an invalid order law?	10 A. There certainly was.
11 A. No.	<b>11</b> Q. Did Justice Rice compare you to Andrew
<b>12</b> Q. If a Court issues order that is plainly	<b>12</b> Jackson and the removal of the Cherokee in his Brown
<b>13</b> discriminatory, is that valid?	13 concurrence?
14 A. No.	14 A. He certainly did.
<b>15</b> Q. If a Court issues an order that's that	<b>15</b> Q. Does upholding the dignity of a court
16 discriminates on the basis of race, is that valid?	<b>16</b> sometimes include pointing out potential ethical
17 A. No.	17 conflicts?
<b>18</b> Q. Mr. Attorney General, are judges supposed	18 A. It does, fortunately.
<b>19</b> to prejudge the laws that might become before them?	<b>19</b> Q. Mr. Attorney General, if you believe a
20 A. They are not.	20 judge has a conflict of interest, how do you ask for
<b>21</b> Q. Did Judge Krueger indicate his opposition	21 the judge's recusal without pointing out that
<b>22</b> to SB 140 before agreeing to sit in judgment of	22 conflict of interest.
23 SB 140?	23 A. I certainly don't know the way to do it,
24 A. He did.	24 and I think the case law backs that up.
<b>25</b> Q. Did Supreme Court Administrator McLaughlin	<b>25</b> Q. I'd like to ask you to go back over your
25 Q. Did Supreme Court Administrator McLaughin	25 Q. TU like to ask you to go back over your
Page 199	Page 201
1 delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on	1 testimony and ask you some general questions, but is
<ul><li>1 delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li><li>2 SB 140?</li></ul>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>8 Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> <li>A. I couldn't say for sure. I would say</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> <li>A. I couldn't say for sure. I would say</li> <li>probably not.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> <li>A. I couldn't say for sure. I would say</li> <li>probably not.</li> <li>Q. Is a violation of the code of judicial</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> <li>Are you familiar with that rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that rule states that a lawyer should</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> <li>A. I couldn't say for sure. I would say</li> <li>probably not.</li> <li>Q. Is a violation of the code of judicial</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> <li>Are you familiar with that rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that rule states that a lawyer should</li> <li>not knowingly disobey an obligation or the rules of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>delete emails pertaining to judicial polling on</li> <li>SB 140?</li> <li>A. Those emails disappeared. Whether they</li> <li>were deleted or through sloppiness, I can't say for</li> <li>certain. But we know they certainly were no longer</li> <li>in her possession.</li> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Strauch</li> <li>asked you about the a the judicial standards</li> <li>complaint process.</li> <li>Do you recall that discussion?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Is there a difference between a judicial</li> <li>standards complaint and a recusal motion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are they two separate mechanisms?</li> <li>A. They are.</li> <li>Q. And are judicial standards complaints a</li> <li>fast mechanism for reaching a resolution on a</li> <li>judicial ethics issue?</li> <li>A. I couldn't say for sure. I would say</li> <li>probably not.</li> <li>Q. Is a violation of the code of judicial</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>testimony and ask you some general questions, but is</li> <li>one of your duties to prosecute and defend all cases</li> <li>in the Supreme Court in which the State, or any</li> <li>officer of the State in the officer's official</li> <li>capacity is a party or which the State has an</li> <li>interest?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And does that make you and the attorneys</li> <li>under your supervision somewhat unique among Montana</li> <li>lawyers?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have responsibilities that other</li> <li>Montana lawyers don't have?</li> <li>A. Certainly.</li> <li>Q. And you are a constitutional officer;</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. One of five. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And I think Mr. Strauch pointed out</li> <li>Rule 3.4(c) of the Rules of Professional Conduct.</li> <li>Are you familiar with that rule?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that rule states that a lawyer should</li> </ol>

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 202		Page 204
1	A. That's correct.	1	maintaining consistency in your client's view that
	Q. And you're aware that eight of the counts		the Supreme Court couldn't exercise jurisdiction
3			over someone who's a party to a case?
4	approved in court filings supposedly violated		A. Yes.
	Rule 3.4(c); correct?		Q. Now, Mr. Strauch pointed out the April 12th
	A. That is what it says.	6	letter from Lieutenant General Kris Hansen to the
	Q. When you made each of these statements,	7	Montana Supreme Court.
8	were you attempting to disobey any obligation under	8	Do you recall that letter?
9	the rules of the Montana Supreme Court?		A. I do.
	A. No.		Q. And do you recall Mr. Strauch asking you
	Q. When you made or approved each of the		why it was appropriate to send a letter and not file
	identified statements, were you representing the		a motion?
13	legal views of your client, the Montana Legislature?		A. I do.
	A. Yes.		Q. Is it possible that it would prejudice your
	Q. Was it your client's view that the Montana		client's interests by filing a motion in a case to
	Supreme Court had no jurisdiction over the		which they had a jurisdictional objection?
	legislative subpoena at issue?		A. That certainly is possible and was a
	A. That was their view as a coequal branch of	18	
19	government, which, again, is what makes this such a		Q. Under the circumstances, did you believe
20	novel situation. You have a coequal branch of		
21	government in what we viewed at the time as a		A. Under the circumstances at the time, and
22			with the information that we had, yes, we thought
23	coequal branch of government. And that was the	23	that was the most reasonable course of action.
24	position of the Montana Legislature, yes.	24	Q. And when you made each of those statements,
25	Q. At the time did you believe your client's	25	were you attempting to disobey any obligation under
	Page 203		Page 205
1	legal position about the Supreme Court having no		the rules of the Montana Supreme Court?
2	authority over the legislative subpoenas was a	2	A. No.
2 3	authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?	2 3	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li><li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li><li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position? A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your client's views until all opportunities for appeal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And so did you make an open refusal based</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your client's views until all opportunities for appeal were exhausted.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And so did you make an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation existed?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your client's views until all opportunities for appeal were exhausted.</li> <li>A. We did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And so did you make an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation existed?</li> <li>A. Absolutely, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your client's views until all opportunities for appeal were exhausted.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>authority over the legislative subpoenas was a reasonable legal position?</li> <li>A. I absolutely thought it was a reasonable legal position. There was absolutely no</li> <li>Supreme Court precedent on the scope of the legislative subpoena power, the limits of the legislative subpoena power. This was completely uncharted territory.</li> <li>Q. And was it also the view of the Montana Legislature, your client, that the Legislature could not be subject to the jurisdiction of any court when it was not a party in any proceeding before that court?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. So at the time you made or approved these statements, it was the view of your client that the Supreme Court did not have the authority to review the legislative subpoenas; correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. And so did you make an open refusal based on an assertion that no valid obligation existed?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you had an ethical obligation to vigorously represent the interests of the Legislature in asserting the full scope of its constitutional powers?</li> <li>A. Very much so, yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you believe you need to put forward all reasonable grounds for your client, the Legislature's, constitutional authority?</li> <li>A. Yes. And exhaust every possible remedy that was available to them.</li> <li>Q. Were all the statements you made or approved good faith representations of your client's legal interests?</li> <li>A. They were.</li> <li>Q. So even after the Montana Supreme Court entered its initial few orders, you still believed you had an ethical responsibility to argue for your client's views until all opportunities for appeal were exhausted.</li> <li>A. We did MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, leading.</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 206		Page 208
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>you discuss the view of the of your client as it relates to exhausting all appeals?</li> <li>A. I can. Yeah, I mean, obviously MR. STRAUCH: Leading. CHAIR OGLE: Sustained. You can elicit questions from your own client without leading him, Mr. Corrigan.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Attorney General, did the Attorney General's Office exhaust all appeals on behalf of the Legislature?</li> <li>A. We did.</li> <li>Q. And was that the Legislature's wishes?</li> <li>A. It was. After, I mean, several discussions with the Legislature, I mean, this was a case they wanted to press hard. The Legislature and leadership in the Legislature were quite forceful that this was an area of law that the Supreme Court did not have the Montana Supreme Court, excuse me, did not have authority to to involve themselves in. And we, as an agency and the lawyer for that client, believed it was our duty, and certainly it was our</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>information and sensitive information. We protect it every day for the citizens of Montana. And I will also state our staff is all trained on that. Literally every member every employee of the Department of Justice is trained annually on protection of PII and security measures because we were required to by the FBI.</li> <li>Q. I'd like to move next to Rule 8.2(a). Do you recall discussion with Mr. Strauch about Rule 8.2(a)?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you generally understand that Rule 8.2(a) states that a lawyer shall not make a statement that the lawyer knows to be false or with reckless disregard as to its truth or falsity concerning the qualifications or integrity of a judge, an adjudicatory officer, or public legal officer?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Does the rule say that you cannot challenge the integrity of a judge?</li> <li>A. No. In fact, sometimes it's necessary,</li> </ul>
23	client's wish, to exhaust any and all possible	23	unfortunately. I mean, I think any proceeding where
24	avenues legally within the judicial system to to	24	you have to ask to recuse a judge could be taken
25	press that point.	25	personally and as disrespect by that judge. That's
	Page 207		Page 209
2 3 4 5	Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves</li><li>because you believe they have a conflict.</li><li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves</li><li>because you believe they have a conflict.</li><li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022.</li> <li>Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves</li> <li>because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves</li><li>because you believe they have a conflict.</li><li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the Supreme Court Administrator's office. That</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the Supreme Court Administrator's office. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about prejudice. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the Supreme Court Administrator's office. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that while we were exploring and exhausting judicial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about prejudice. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the Supreme Court Administrator's office. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that while we were exploring and exhausting judicial review, that our office, the state's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any way you could have filed a motion seeking recusal of the justices that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about about spoliation. We had already seen one batch of emails go missing from the Supreme Court Administrator's office. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that while we were exploring and exhausting judicial review, that our office, the state's Attorney General's Office, would retain those documents pending those appeals. That retention was done behind secure doors. The Department of Justice</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any way you could have filed a motion seeking recusal of the justices that didn't allege that the impartiality of the justices might be questioned in the case?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Now, Mr. Strauch discussed with you the period of time between the Montana Supreme Court's decision in July of 2021 ordering the return of the documents and when the documents were actually returned in March of 2022. Do you remember that discussion?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Were you actively appealing those orders while you kept the documents?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Did you or your client have any concern about prejudice if you returned the emails too soon?</li> <li>A. We did. I mean, there was definitely there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about prejudice, there was questions about prejudice. That absolutely was a concern of our client and, frankly, a concern of ours. So the decision was made that while we were exploring and exhausting judicial review, that our office, the state's Attorney General's Office, would retain those documents pending those appeals. That retention was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>the nature of asking a judge to recuse themselves because you believe they have a conflict.</li> <li>Q. When you made or approved any of the statements at issue under Rule 8.2(a), did you know that any of the statements were false?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Were they made with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In your experience as an attorney, is it common for a party to ask judge or judges to recuse from a case if a judge would personally be affected by the case?</li> <li>A. Absolutely common.</li> <li>Q. At the time you made or approved each of these statements, was the position of the Legislature that Montana Supreme Court justices should not be ruling on a matter that potentially involved their own emails and employee?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any way you could have filed a motion seeking recusal of the justices that didn't allege that the impartiality of the justices</li> </ul>

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen	October 09, 2024
Page 210	Page 212
1 mechanism.	1 documents?
2 Q. Was that necessarily was that strike	2 A. Immediately upon that denial of cert. Yes.
3 that.	3 Q. At that point do you believe you were in
4 Was that necessary to adequately	4 compliance with the Court's order?
5 representing your client?	5 A. Yes.
6 A. Yes.	6 Q. When you were representing the Montana
7 Q. Now, Mr. Attorney General, I'd like to take	<ul><li>7 Legislature in this separation of powers conflict,</li></ul>
8 you to Montana Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4(d)	<ul><li>8 were all of your statements made in articulation of</li></ul>
<ul><li>9 that you discussed with Mr. Strauch.</li></ul>	<ul><li>9 client's position and defense of your client's legal</li></ul>
10 Do you recall that discussion?	10 interests?
11 A. Yes.	11 A. All of them, yes. And at vociferous
<b>12</b> Q. And you're familiar with that rule?	12 insistence of my client, I will add.
13 A. Generally so, yes.	13 Q. Do you believe that your statements fit
14 Q. And does it state that it is professional	<ul><li>14 within common litigation strategies for defending a</li></ul>
15 misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is	<ul><li>party's legal interests, such as challenging</li></ul>
16 prejudicial to the administration of justice?	16 jurisdiction?
17 A. I believe that's correct, yes.	17 A. Yes.
<b>18</b> Q. You're aware that 20 counts from the	<b>18</b> Q. In your experience as an attorney, when
<ul><li>19 complaint allege that statements you made or</li></ul>	<ul><li>attempting to gain review or reconsideration of an</li></ul>
20 approved in court filings or letters supposedly	20 order that negatively affects your client, is it
21 violated Rule 8.4(d)?	<ul><li>21 common to use strong language to criticize the</li></ul>
22 A. That's correct.	22 order?
<b>23</b> Q. Within the proceedings of the cases at	23 A. It is.
<ul><li>24 issue, did you ever take an action that interfered</li></ul>	<b>24</b> Q. Is a motion for consideration necessarily a
<ul><li>with the ability of any court to carry out its job?</li></ul>	<ul><li>25 motion that argues with a previous decision before</li></ul>
Page 211	Page 213
	Page 213 1 the Court?
Page 211 1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came 2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings	
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> </ol>	1 the Court?
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>order to return the documents as soon as the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that we had. This was a very difficult situation</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that we had. This was a very difficult situation</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> <li>19 said about filing a petition. It mischaracterizes</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> <li>complete novel issue, and discussion was had with,</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> <li>19 said about filing a petition. It mischaracterizes</li> <li>20 the evidence.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that we had. This was a very difficult situation</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> <li>complete novel issue, and discussion was had with,</li> <li>Do we even want to get involved in this?</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> <li>19 said about filing a petition. It mischaracterizes</li> <li>20 the evidence.</li> <li>21 CHAIR OGLE: That's sustained. That's</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that we had. This was a very difficult situation</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> <li>complete novel issue, and discussion was had with,</li> <li>Do we even want to get involved in this?</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>2 multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> <li>19 said about filing a petition. It mischaracterizes</li> <li>20 the evidence.</li> <li>21 CHAIR OGLE: That's sustained. That's</li> <li>22 correct.</li> <li>23 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Attorney General,</li> <li>24 following the U.S. Supreme Court's denial of writ of</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> <li>complete novel issue, and discussion was had with,</li> <li>Do we even want to get involved in this?</li> <li>But when you look at the duties of the</li> <li>Attorney General, I did not believe that was an</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>1 A. No. In fact, several rulings came</li> <li>multiple came and, I mean, the court proceedings</li> <li>3 continued on. They were not stymied. They were not</li> <li>4 stopped. They were not adversely affected.</li> <li>5 Q. Did you ever take an action that defied a</li> <li>6 court order or court order outside the realm of</li> <li>7 judicial proceedings or litigation positions?</li> <li>8 A. No.</li> <li>9 Q. Did you obey the Montana Supreme Court's</li> <li>10 order to return the documents as soon as the</li> <li>11 Legislature's final appeals were exhausted?</li> <li>12 A. Immediately upon complete exhaustion of our</li> <li>13 judicial appeals and remedies, yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a</li> <li>15 chance to object in there, but Counsel's statement</li> <li>16 mischaracterizes what the Supreme Court ordered.</li> <li>17 The Supreme Court ordered immediate return. The</li> <li>18 Supreme Court did not order return after whatever he</li> <li>19 said about filing a petition. It mischaracterizes</li> <li>20 the evidence.</li> <li>21 CHAIR OGLE: That's sustained. That's</li> <li>22 correct.</li> <li>23 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Attorney General,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>the Court?</li> <li>A. That's exactly what a motion for</li> <li>reconsideration is. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you didn't vigorously try to</li> <li>protect your client's legal rights against an</li> <li>adverse ruling as long as there was a chance that</li> <li>ruling might be reversed?</li> <li>A. No. That certainly was my and my</li> <li>attorneys' belief.</li> <li>Q. Would you have been upholding your ethical</li> <li>duty to your client if you simply refused to</li> <li>participate in this novel separation of powers</li> <li>conflict between the Legislature and the judiciary?</li> <li>A. No. And that really was a consideration</li> <li>that we had. This was a very difficult situation</li> <li>that the Department of Justice was put in. We did</li> <li>not jump into this thoughtlessly. That was a</li> <li>complete novel issue, and discussion was had with,</li> <li>Do we even want to get involved in this?</li> <li>But when you look at the duties of the</li> <li>Attorney General, I did not believe that was an</li> </ol>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 214		Page 216
1	Legislature's legal interest as far as those	1	against your or your subordinates as a result of
	interests could reasonably extend?	2	this litigation?
	A. Absolutely, yes.	3	MR. STRAUCH: Objection; relevance,
	Q. At the time you represented the	4	Mr. Chairman.
	Legislature, did you believe that the Legislature's	5	CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.
6	belief that the legislative subpoenas were	6	MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could
7	unreviewable was a reasonable legal position?	_	have the commission's indulgence for just a couple
/	A. I did. Again, we were in completely	7	of minutes?
	uncharted water, and there was absolutely no	8	CHAIR OGLE: Yes.
9		9	
10	guidance anywhere on what the limits or extent of	10	MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.
11	the legislative subpoena power was. And the	11	
12		12	Thank you, Mr. Attorney General.
13	power. It's not a judicial subpoena. It's not a	13	CHAIR OGLE: Thank you, Mr. Corrigan.
	court subpoena. We see it on the federal level as		Any redirect, Mr. Strauch?
	well. I mean, this is something that the that	15	MR. STRAUCH: Yes. Thank you,
16	the Legislature has, power that they have. At the	16	Mr. Chairman, members of the commission.
17	time, we believed it was reasonable to think that	17	
18	that was not something that the Montana judiciary	18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
19	could involve themselves in.	19	BY MR. STRAUCH:
20	Q. So now I'd like to take a step back and	20	Q. Mr. Attorney General, you are aware of the
21	think about the entire complaint and the allegations	21	fact that not a single count in the complaint
22		22	against you in this case relates to the act of
23	Are all the statements at issue in the	23	filing a motion on behalf of your client? You're
	complaint and the allegations statements you made in	24	aware of that; right? You're not charged with
25	your capacity while representing your client, the	25	any let me back up.
	Page 215		Page 217
1	-	1	
	Montana Legislature?	1	You're not charged with any ethical
2	Montana Legislature? A. All of them. Yes.	2	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices,
2 3	<ul><li>Montana Legislature?</li><li>A. All of them. Yes.</li><li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the</li></ul>	2 3	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been?
2 3 4	<ul><li>Montana Legislature?</li><li>A. All of them. Yes.</li><li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li></ul>	2 3 4	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A.</b> No.
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Montana Legislature?</li><li>A. All of them. Yes.</li><li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li><li>A. No.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that
2 3 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem</b> <b>like some of the language used, I could take it that</b> <b>way.</b> Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem</b> <b>like some of the language used, I could take it that</b> way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you?</li> <li>A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way.</li> <li>Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's accurate. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any discipline, sanctions, or punishment imposed on you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your mouth but you said something to the effect of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any discipline, sanctions, or punishment imposed on you or your subordinates by the Montana Supreme Court</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that</b> way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? <b>A. I think that's accurate. Yes.</b> Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your mouth but you said something to the effect of that there's only one way to point out a conflict of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any discipline, sanctions, or punishment imposed on you or your subordinates by the Montana Supreme Court during this litigation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem</b> <b>like some of the language used, I could take it that</b> way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? <b>A. I think that's accurate. Yes.</b> Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your mouth but you said something to the effect of that there's only one way to point out a conflict of interest, and that you obviously have to do that if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any discipline, sanctions, or punishment imposed on you or your subordinates by the Montana Supreme Court during this litigation?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? A. No. Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? A. I think some of the some of counts seem like some of the language used, I could take it that way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? A. I think that's accurate. Yes. Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your mouth but you said something to the effect of that there's only one way to point out a conflict of interest, and that you obviously have to do that if you're filing a motion to disqualify or a motion for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Montana Legislature?</li> <li>A. All of them. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Are any of statements at issue in the complaint your own personal statements?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And at the time did you believe these statements were reasonable litigation positions?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And are you aware of any action that delayed or altered the course of proceedings or resulted in a direct disruption of pending proceedings?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. And were all of these statements a reflection of your client's views during an ongoing litigation process up until the point the case was final?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Mr. Attorney General, are you aware of any discipline, sanctions, or punishment imposed on you or your subordinates by the Montana Supreme Court during this litigation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You're not charged with any ethical misconduct for moving to disqualify the justices, have you been? <b>A. No.</b> Q. You're not charged with any misconduct for having filed motions or petitions for rehearing, are you? <b>A. I think some of the some of counts seem</b> <b>like some of the language used, I could take it that</b> way. Q. It's the what was said in the motions and the petitions that you've been charged with; correct? <b>A. I think that's accurate. Yes.</b> Q. Thank you. And since it is what was said, I want to go back to some questions that I asked you earlier. Because I believe, during the examination by your lawyer, Mr. Corrigan, you said something to the effect and I'm not putting words in your mouth but you said something to the effect of that there's only one way to point out a conflict of interest, and that you obviously have to do that if

	Page 218		Page 220
1	A. I think that's a fair summary.	1	Q. Okay. That's why I asked the question,
	Q. Okay. Now, again, you haven't been charged		because I wanted to see if you were walking back on
3	with any ethical misconduct for filing a motion to		what you told me. You're not. You're not walking
4	disqualify based on a conflict of interest; true?		back on what you told me, that maybe in hindsight
	A. I think that's true. Yes.		some softer language could have been used?
6	Q. It's what was said. And and it's		A. No, I'm not walking back on that.
7	specifically things like this is "ludicrous," this		Q. And during questioning by your lawyer, I
8	statement is "wholly outside the bounds of rational		think I didn't write them all down, but you
9	thought." Telling the Court that, when it says it		mentioned sometimes when orders can be invalid
10	wasn't involved in polling, "that the public records		because they're discriminatory or maybe based on
11	tell the different tale." A statement that the		race, and you might have listed some others; right?
12	Court is "perverse" to suggest that it will make		A. My I think my lawyer did. Yeah.
13	that determination. A statement about the Court		Q. And you agreed with him?
14	suffering from bias of Maslow's hammer. A statement		A. Yeah.
15	that the Court "defies common and constitutional		Q. And any of the orders of the Montana
16	sense." A statement that we're here because of	16	
17	"questionable judicial conduct." A statement that	17	about today discriminate or are they discriminatory
18	Court's order is a confiscatory decree. A statement	18	
19	that its decision "blinks reality." Accusing the		A. No.
20	Court of "stunning counterfactual denial." Telling		Q. We, I believe, started with something from
20	the Court that it's advisory statements must be		your lawyer on Exhibit 39, Page 4, and I just want
22	withdrawn.	22	
23	None of those, first of all, have anything	23	Could you turn there, please?
	to do with telling the Court that it had a conflict		A. (Complies.)
	of interest, do they?		Q. I think your counsel read you this stuff
			Q. Tunink your counsel four you this start
	Page 219		Page 221
	Page 219		Page 221
	A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with	1	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General
2	A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.	2	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was
2 3	<ul><li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li><li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for</li></ul>	2 3	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li><li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and</li></ul>	2 3 4	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest? CHAIR OGLE: Overruled. THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and where we had a bona fide belief that this was an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the Department of Justice.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> <li>Q. You still do believe it was necessary?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>Q. That's fair. But the letter I mean, the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest? CHAIR OGLE: Overruled. THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> <li>Q. You still do believe it was necessary?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the Department of Justice.</li> <li>Q. That's fair. But the letter I mean, the brief says excuse me. It's not a brief. It's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> <li>Q. You still do believe it was necessary?</li> <li>A. As I testified earlier, if I could employ some hindsight here, I certainly would on some of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the Department of Justice.</li> <li>Q. That's fair. But the letter I mean, the brief says excuse me. It's not a brief. It's your response to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> <li>Q. You still do believe it was necessary?</li> <li>A. As I testified earlier, if I could employ some hindsight here, I certainly would on some of these things. I think everyone wishes cooler heads</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the Department of Justice.</li> <li>Q. That's fair. But the letter I mean, the brief says excuse me. It's not a brief. It's your response to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. It says:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. They certainly do. No, I won't agree with that.</li> <li>Q. Are you charged with one single count for telling the Montana Supreme Court in a polite and respectful way that you believe MR. CORRIGAN: Objection; asked and answered.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) that it had a conflict of interest?</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, no, not directly.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Strauch) Is it your testimony that it was necessary to use the language that you used? That it was necessary?</li> <li>A. In this unprecedented situation where we had absolutely no guidance and no case law, and where we had a bona fide belief that this was an unprecedented constitutional clash, yes.</li> <li>Q. You still do believe it was necessary?</li> <li>A. As I testified earlier, if I could employ some hindsight here, I certainly would on some of these things. I think everyone wishes cooler heads</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that's highlighted the Montana Attorney General did not file a motion to disqualify, that motion was filed by Oestreicher. And then I think you basically said, Yeah, I didn't personally you know, I'm not often personally involved in things. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And I couldn't tell from the questioning whether he was attempting to suggest that you didn't file this motion to disqualify. Is that what you understood, that you did not personally file the motion to disqualify? Is that what you were trying to say?</li> <li>A. Without looking at that motion right in front of me, Counsel, I honestly can't tell you who who filed it.</li> <li>Q. Well, okay. That's fair.</li> <li>A. Certainly done under the auspices of the Department of Justice.</li> <li>Q. That's fair. But the letter I mean, the brief says excuse me. It's not a brief. It's your response to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. It says: However, the Montana Attorney General did</li> </ul>

m	the Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 222		Page 224
1	filed by Oestreicher and is referenced in Exhibit 2	-	A I think that was a logislative submoone
	filed by Oestreicher and is referenced in Exhibit 2.		A. I think that was a legislative subpoena,
2	Do you see that?		not from my office.
	A. I do see that.		Q. Understood. But the emails were still
4			there, weren't they, because you got them?
5	response to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.		A. They were on the Department of
6	It's on Page 18 of Exhibit 39.		Administration servers, yes.
7	Do you see that?		Q. Do you see these two boxes here, sir?
	A. Yes.		8
9	Q. This is the motion to disqualify the	9	A. Yep.
10	justices; right?	10	Q. Two boxes. Two boxes full of emails that
11	A. Yes.	11	the Legislature got from the subpoena, obviously not
12	Q. And your name is at the top of it?	12	destroyed; right?
13	A. It is.	13	A. Obviously not.
14	Q. So you're not suggesting that you weren't	14	Q. And what reasonable belief did you have
15	involved in this, were you? Is that what you're		that, had a subpoena been sent to Ms. McLaughlin,
16	trying to suggest?	16	the court administrator, that she would not have had
	A. No.	17	a search undertaken in the court network? What
	Q. I have to ask you about this statement that	18	reasonable belief did you have?
	you made, that you were afraid if you followed the		A. Her appearance before the Legislature, I
	Montana Supreme Court order, July 14th of '21, to		believe, where she stated that they no longer had
	immediately return emails, that you were concerned		those emails in their possession.
22			Q. No, sir. That's not what she stated, is
23			it?
23	Is that what you said?		A. To the best of my recollection, that's what
	A. I mean, without having it read back to me,		was stated.
25	A. I mean, without having it read back to me,	25	was stateu.
	Dogo 202		Dogo 225
	Page 223		Page 225
1	Page 223 but something along those lines. Yes.	1	Page 225 Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she
	-		
2	but something along those lines. Yes.		Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she
2 3	<b>but something along those lines. Yes.</b> Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?	2	Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy
2 3 4	<ul><li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li><li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li><li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li></ul>	2 3 4	Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 18 19 20	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> <li>Q. 19, sir, please. This is the letter</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Well, you do know the answer to that,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> <li>Q. 19, sir, please. This is the letter this is the letter that you wrote the Court; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Well, you do know the answer to that, because when you guys sent the subpoena to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> <li>Q. 19, sir, please. This is the letter this is the letter that you wrote the Court; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that, because when you guys sent the subpoena to the Department of Administration, the emails were still</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> <li>Q. 19, sir, please. This is the letter this is the letter that you personal signature as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>but something along those lines. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I think it's what you said. But, spoliation, what does that mean?</li> <li>A. The spoiling of evidence.</li> <li>Q. You mean to imply that if you returned the emails to the court administrator, she would spoil them? She would destroy them?</li> <li>A. Counsel, I think my words speak for themselves, but</li> <li>Q. They do. They do. But I want to hear it. That's that was you actually were concerned that if you followed the order, the court administrator would spoil evidence?</li> <li>A. We had had previous instance that emails were accidentally deleted.</li> <li>Q. Well, now</li> <li>A. And so there was concern on behalf of my clients, yes.</li> <li>Q. Deleted from where? Deleted from Ms. McLaughlin's inbox only; right?</li> <li>A. I don't know the answer to that.</li> <li>Q. Well, you do know the answer to that, because when you guys sent the subpoena to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Earlier today you actually did say what she said. She said she was sorry, that it was sloppy that she had deleted them from her inbox. Isn't that correct?</li> <li>A. Well, I think we're probably splitting hairs, but, yes, that was what she said.</li> <li>Q. And during questioning by your lawyer I think he said something and you agreed with him but to the effect of none of the statements made are your personal statements. And you agreed with him; right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. But the letter that you wrote to the Supreme Court was your personal statement, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. That was that was a letter that I sent to the Court in the course of a very heated dispute with the judiciary that I felt was in the course of my job as an attorney representing my client, and looking out for my attorneys, frankly.</li> <li>Q. 19, sir, please. This is the letter this is the letter that you wrote the Court; right?</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 226		Page 228
1	A. It is.	1	MR. STRAUCH: Yes. But also again tomorrow
	Q. Thank you.	2	morning. So think if you guys started and weren't
3	No further questions.	3	finished, she could probably the information I
4	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Very well. I think we're	4	have. I have to get in touch with her. She could
5	finished with this witness and you can be excused,	5	probably finish in the morning, if you wish.
6	Mr. Knudsen.	6	MR. CORRIGAN: We do would it be
7	<b>THE WITNESS:</b> Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	7	possible to do her direct now and do her cross
8	CHAIR OGLE: You can call your next	8	tomorrow morning?
9	witness.	9	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> That's up to Mr. Chairman.
10	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, our next	10	I wouldn't have an objection to that,
11	witness is Ms. McLaughlin, but she, as you know, is	11	Mr. Chairman.
12	not available at the moment. And so I was wondering	12	MR. CORRIGAN: I'm just not sure we're
13	if if we could have a discussion about scheduling	13	going to meet the 90-minute window.
14	briefly here, because I'm not sure the order of the	14	CHAIR OGLE: Well, why don't we go ahead,
15	witnesses that the respondent is going to call or	15	call her now, do the direct, see where we're at.
16	how long the respondent anticipates his case to be.	16	And if you guys can do the cross today, fine.
17	Ms. McLaughlin does have some availability. She	17	Otherwise we can do the cross in the morning.
18	has availability today to testify remotely before	18	MR. STRAUCH: Makes sense to me.
19	5:00 o'clock. She has availability tomorrow morning	19	May I make a take a five-minute break and
20	from 8:00 to 1:00. And then her next availability	20	make a phone call?
21	would be Friday afternoon.	21	CHAIR OGLE: Yeah. Let's take a
22	And and as you know, our intent is to call	22	five-minute break. See if you can line that up to
23	her in-person, if possible. But in order to make	23	call her today, and then we'll see where we're at in
24	that determination, I think we need some calculus	24	terms of cross.
25	from the respondent's table in terms of how long	25	(Break taken from 3:25 p.m. until 3:38 p.m.)
	Page 227		Page 229
	Page 227		Page 229
1	they think their case is going to be.	1	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief
2	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or	2	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC
2 3	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding	2 3	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going
2 3 4	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be	2 3 4	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call
2 3 4	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin	2 3 4 5	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely.
2 3 4 5 6	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Is she your last witness?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness? MR. STRAUCH: She is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Is she your last witness? <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> She is. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness? MR. STRAUCH: She is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness? MR. STRAUCH: She is. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. Do you have an idea of how long her testimony would take?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they think their case is going to be. I personally believe, your Honor or Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all. And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Is she your last witness? <b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> She is. <b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay. Do you have an idea of how long her testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's our understanding as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's our understanding as well. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You say her so she's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's our understanding as well. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable to you, Mr. Strauch.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we can certainly call her right now, but it will be remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how long I think I can be done in less than an hour, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You say her so she's available now, she's available at 8:00 o'clock in the morning?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's our understanding as well. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable to you, Mr. Strauch. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Did I state that correctly? MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You say her so she's</li> <li>available now, she's available at 8:00 o'clock in</li> <li>the morning?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief</li> <li>recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC</li> <li>is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going</li> <li>to rest your case subject to the ability to call</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has</li> <li>agreed to withdraw their objection to</li> <li>cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so</li> <li>they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first</li> <li>witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's</li> <li>testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first</li> <li>thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And</li> <li>then we'll proceed with the respondent's case.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's</li> <li>our understanding as well.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable</li> <li>to you, Mr. Strauch.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Did I state that correctly?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>And so, for the record. ODC rests its case</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You say her so she's</li> <li>available now, she's available at 8:00 o'clock in</li> <li>the morning?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. COLEMAN: I think did she did you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going to rest your case subject to the ability to call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir. CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has agreed to withdraw their objection to cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And then we'll proceed with the respondent's case. MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's our understanding as well. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable to you, Mr. Strauch. MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIR OGLE: Did I state that correctly? MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And so, for the record. ODC rests its case subject to calling Ms. McLaughlin out of turn in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>they think their case is going to be.</li> <li>I personally believe, your Honor or</li> <li>Mr. Chairman, that the case is proceeding</li> <li>expeditiously. If I had to take a guess, we'd be</li> <li>done by tomorrow, which means calling Ms. McLaughlin</li> <li>on Friday afternoon makes no sense at all.</li> <li>And so I would invite a discussion here. And we</li> <li>can certainly call her right now, but it will be</li> <li>remotely.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Is she your last witness?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: She is.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>Do you have an idea of how long her testimony</li> <li>would take?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Well, I'm judging from how</li> <li>long I think I can be done in less than an hour,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: You say her so she's</li> <li>available now, she's available at 8:00 o'clock in</li> <li>the morning?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. After a brief</li> <li>recess here, counsel have conferred, and the ODC</li> <li>is as I understand it, Mr. Strauch, you're going</li> <li>to rest your case subject to the ability to call</li> <li>Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning remotely.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, sir.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: And then the respondent has</li> <li>agreed to withdraw their objection to</li> <li>cross-examining Ms. McLaughlin remotely, and so</li> <li>they're going to call Mr. Greenwood as their first</li> <li>witness today. We will have Mr. Greenwood's</li> <li>testimony, and then we'll call Ms. McLaughlin first</li> <li>thing in the morning for both direct and cross. And</li> <li>then we'll proceed with the respondent's case.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That's</li> <li>our understanding as well.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Is that acceptable</li> <li>to you, Mr. Strauch.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Did I state that correctly?</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>And so, for the record. ODC rests its case</li> </ul>

In t	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 230		Page 232
1	record?	1	those have been deemed compliant, then we mark them
2	THE COURT REPORTER: I did.	2	as filed, which makes it an official public record,
3	CHAIR OGLE: All right. So go ahead and	3	
4	call Mr. Greenwood then, Mr. Corrigan.		Q. When a document is filed, does it go
5	MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, respondent		directly to the justices of the Supreme Court?
6	Austin Knudsen calls Bowen Greenwood.		A. Most of the time, no. An appeal, for
7	CHAIR OGLE: Very well.		example, follows a set briefing schedule. A notice
8	(Witness sworn.)	8	of appeal comes in, and then there's an certain
9		9	amount of time for a district court record, for a
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF BOWEN GREENWOOD	10	transcript, for the first brief.
11	BY MR. CORRIGAN:	11	Documents that are filed don't necessarily
	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Greenwood.	12	
	A. Good afternoon.		Q. Is there a term for when your office sends
	Q. Could you state your name for the record?		them to the Montana Supreme Court?
	A. Bowen Greenwood.		A. We just call it "send to Court" or "route
	Q. And where do you reside?		to justice" sometimes.
	A. Helena, Montana.		Q. Is there any type of special process for
	Q. And what is your current job title?	18	filing an emergency motion with the Montana
	A. I'm the clerk of the Montana Supreme Court.	19	Supreme Court?
	Q. And how long have you had that job?		A. The Montana rules of appellate procedure
	A. Since January 7th of 2019.		make no provision for emergency functions.
	Q. And how did you get that job?		Q. Now, when parties file documents with your
	A. I was elected by the people of Montana in		office, can they file paper copies?
	November of 2018.		A. It is possible to file on paper, yes.
	Q. Were you the clerk of the Court in April of		Q. Can they file documents any other way?
25	Q. Were you the elerk of the court in April of	25	Q. Can they file documents any other way.
	Page 231		Page 233
1	2021?		A. The most common other way of filing is what
	A. I was.	2	we call e-filing or electronic filing.
	Q. What are the duties of the clerk of the	3	I want to just point out for anybody who
	Supreme Court?		might not know, that that is not the same thing as
	A. Generally speaking, we file documents		filing by email. The appellate rules don't allow
6	according to the appellate rules. I like to tell	6	for filing by email. There are a limited number of
7	people that the clerk's office is the front door of	7	1 5
8	the Montana Supreme Court. Every case begins with	8	
9	us. Every appeal, every original proceeding,		Q. So can a filing get to the Montana
10	everybody's documents are filed on time and		Supreme Court without going through your office?
11	according to the rules for every document, every	11	A. No, not any kind of regular filing that I
12	person, every time.	12	would be involved with anyway.
	Q. And in your position do you regularly work		Q. And when the Montana Supreme Court issues
	with the Montana Supreme Court?		an order, does it also go through your office?
	A. Yes.		A. Correct. Yes.
16	Q. And in your position do you regularly work	16	Q. Do you maintain the Montana Supreme Court's
17	with the office of the Supreme Court administrator?	17	docket sheet?
18	A. Yes.		A. We keep the docket in our office. Yes.
19	Q. I think you testified a second ago that		Q. And what are your hours of business?
20	your office deals with filings.	20	A. Monday through Friday, 8:00 to 5:00.
21	What is a filing?	21	Q. And who sets your hours of business?
22	A. People want to start a case at the Montana	22	A. The appellate rules require that filings
23	Supreme Court, and they do that with a document of	23	being be accepted during those hours, and so we're
24	some kind a notice of appeal, an original	24	open those hours.
25	proceeding, any of those types of things. And when	25	Q. I'd like to bring up ODC Exhibit 10. I

Page 234	Page 236
1 think you have the binder.	1 A. No.
-	
2 A. All right. Number 10.	2 Q. Did you go home after you sent the
<b>3</b> Q. Do you recognize this document?	3 emergency motion to Justice Rice?
4 A. Yes.	4 A. No.
5 Q. Is that your stamp on the top right corner?	5 Q. Why not?
6 A. Yes.	6 A. Because I had been told to expect an order.
7 Q. What does your stamp mean?	7 Q. Prior to the weekend of April 11, 2021, had
8 A. That means this document was filed in.	8 you ever been called to file something on weekend?
9 Q. And is this the Montana Supreme Court's	9 A. No.
10 temporary order quashing the legislative subpoenas	<b>10</b> Q. Does the Montana Supreme Court promptly
<b>11</b> on April 11, 2021?	<b>11</b> review emergency motions over the weekend when
12 A. Correct.	<b>12</b> they're filed over a weekend?
<b>13</b> Q. What day of the week was April 11, 2021?	13 A. No.
14 A. That was a Sunday.	<b>14</b> Q. To your knowledge, has the Montana
<b>15</b> Q. Do you normally work on Sundays?	15 Supreme Court ever met on a weekend other than
	-
16 A. No.	<b>16</b> Sunday, April 11, 2021?
<b>17</b> Q. Is it normal for the Montana Supreme Court	17 A. Not during my term of office.
<b>18</b> to decide motions over the weekend?	<b>18</b> Q. Would any other individual besides
19 A. No.	<b>19</b> Supreme Court Administrator Beth McLaughlin have
20 Q. So if someone called you on a Sunday and	20 been able to have the Montana Supreme Court consider
21 said they'd like the Supreme Court to consider their	21 her emergency motion on a Sunday?
22 emergency motion, do you have the power to put that	22 A. No one in the state of Montana can get
	_
23 in front of the justices?	23 something filed on a weekend without some kind of
24 A. No.	24 extra-rule procedure.
<b>25</b> Q. Did you send Beth McLaughlin's emergency	<b>25</b> Q. Did this filing follow the normal process?
Page 235	Page 237
1 motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,	1 A. No.
<ul><li>1 motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li><li>2 2021?</li></ul>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>employee.</li> <li>Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>employee.</li> <li>Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>employee.</li> <li>Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>Why not?</li> <li>A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>employee.</li> <li>Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>r filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> <li>Justice Rice that day?</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> <li>21 position as Supreme Court administrator allow her to</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>r filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> <li>Justice Rice that day?</li> <li>A. No. There was at least one other series of</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> <li>21 position as Supreme Court administrator allow her to</li> <li>22 file her motion over a weekend?</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> <li>Justice Rice that day?</li> <li>A. No. There was at least one other series of</li> <li>text messages or phone calls.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> <li>21 position as Supreme Court administrator allow her to</li> <li>22 file her motion over a weekend?</li> <li>23 MR. STRAUCH: Objection; calls for</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> <li>Justice Rice that day?</li> <li>A. No. There was at least one other series of</li> <li>text messages or phone calls.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only document you filed that</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> <li>21 position as Supreme Court administrator allow her to</li> <li>22 file her motion over a weekend?</li> <li>23 MR. STRAUCH: Objection; calls for</li> <li>24 speculation, expert testimony.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>motion to the Supreme Court on Sunday, April 11,</li> <li>2021?</li> <li>A. That's correct, as far as it goes.</li> <li>Q. On whose authority did you send Beth</li> <li>McLaughlin's emergency motion to the Supreme Court</li> <li>on Sunday, April 11, 2021?</li> <li>A. Justice Rice.</li> <li>Q. Did Justice Rice contact you directly?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What was the outcome of that conversation?</li> <li>A. I was the outcome of that conversation</li> <li>was that I came into the office to work on a case.</li> <li>Q. And did you send Administrator McLaughlin's</li> <li>emergency motion directly to Acting</li> <li>Chief Justice Rice?</li> <li>A. First Justice Rice asked for a part of that</li> <li>filing to be emailed to him. And after he had</li> <li>considered that and taken some other steps, then we</li> <li>filed the emergency motion.</li> <li>Q. Was that the only contact you had with</li> <li>Justice Rice that day?</li> <li>A. No. There was at least one other series of</li> <li>text messages or phone calls.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. No.</li> <li>2 Q. Tell me a excuse me.</li> <li>3 Why not?</li> <li>4 A. Normally, if a document is e-filed over the</li> <li>5 weekend, that document will be processed in on</li> <li>6 Monday at 8:00 o'clock. A prisoner, a politician, a</li> <li>7 parent losing custody of their children any of</li> <li>8 those people would wait till Monday morning at</li> <li>9 8:00 o'clock. The only case of which I'm aware</li> <li>10 where that was not the case was the Court's own</li> <li>11 employee.</li> <li>12 Q. Did Beth McLaughlin get special treatment?</li> <li>13 A. Yes.</li> <li>14 MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. That</li> <li>15 is calls for a legal conclusion. This gentleman</li> <li>16 is not a licensed</li> <li>17 MR. CORRIGAN: Sorry, special treatment is</li> <li>18 not a</li> <li>19 CHAIR OGLE: Sustained.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Did Beth McLaughlin's</li> <li>21 position as Supreme Court administrator allow her to</li> <li>22 file her motion over a weekend?</li> <li>23 MR. STRAUCH: Objection; calls for</li> </ul>

	he Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 238		Page 240
1	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Greenwood, are you	1	renewal policy or maybe what benefits you have or
	aware of anyone else who's been able to file a		some type of employment question, for that matter.
	motion over a weekend other than Supreme Court		A. Well, the human
	Administrator McLaughlin?		Q. Do you take those up with the court
	A. No.	5	administrator's office?
6	MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions.	-	A. The human resources department is part of
7	Wire Concronate to future questions.		the court administrator's office, so I'm sure we
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION		have that kind of conversation. Yeah.
9	BY MR. STRAUCH:		Q. All right. Would you want those emails
_	Q. Mr. Greenwood, how are you?	10	being leaked out to someone other than the court
	A. Doing great. Thank you.		administrator's office?
	Q. Good. You and I have met, I think, the		A. Your question is would I want that?
	other day, right, for the first time?		Q. Yes?
	A. As far as I know, yes.		A. I strongly believe that a state employee
	Q. Tim Strauch. Nice to see you again. Thank	15	creating a document on state time owes that document
	you.	16	to the people of Montana.
17	Are you an attorney licensed in the state	17	Q. My question is, would you want your
18	of Montana?	18	personal employment information and healthcare
	A. I am not.	19	information being released to anyone other than the
	Q. Have you ever practiced law?	20	judicial branch?
	A. No.		A. As a state employee and an elected
	Q. Have you ever appeared in court as counsel	22	
	of record?	23	any of my emails they ask for.
	A. No.		Q. Who asked for it?
	Q. So obviously, based on your experience,		A. For mine?
	Page 239		Page 241
	Page 239		
	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an	1	Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You
2	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?	1 2	Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want
2 3	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very.	1 2 3	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of</li> </ul>
2 3 4	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very. Q. You were asked questions about can you	1 2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very. Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called	1 2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very. Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?	1 2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very. Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right? A. I am not aware of any other time, no.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 239 being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event? A. Very. Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right? A. I am not aware of any other time, no. Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health insurance stuff, with the court administrator's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health insurance stuff, with the court administrator's office?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. MR. CORRIGAN: Redirect, Mr. Chairman?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health insurance stuff, with the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. Do I take up health insurance matters with</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. MR. CORRIGAN: Redirect, Mr. Chairman? CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health insurance stuff, with the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. Do I take up health insurance matters with the court administrator's office?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. MR. CORRIGAN: Redirect, Mr. Chairman? CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Page 239</li> <li>being called in to file something on Sunday is an extraordinary event?</li> <li>A. Very.</li> <li>Q. You were asked questions about can you think of any other time when you were to be called in on Sunday, and you couldn't; right?</li> <li>A. I am not aware of any other time, no.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of any other time that a subpoena was sent for every judicial branch email for a specified period of time to someone other than the judicial branch?</li> <li>A. That would be information I don't have.</li> <li>Q. Can you think of such a thing?</li> <li>A. I have no information about that.</li> <li>Q. When you do you have emails with Beth McLaughlin from time to time?</li> <li>A. I certainly do, yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you have to take up personal matters, employment matters or maybe health insurance stuff, with the court administrator's office?</li> <li>A. Do I take up health insurance matters with</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Yeah. Who asked for your emails? You want</li> <li>A. If anybody if a taxpayer, a citizen of Montana wants to know what I do on public time, I want them to get that information.</li> <li>Q. Well, I'm not asking I guess you maybe missed my question. But I'm not asking about your official duties. I'm asking about your personal healthcare records and stuff like that. You want the taxpayers to see that?</li> <li>A. I don't see why I wouldn't. I I I don't see what's the problem with that.</li> <li>Q. You do understand, don't you, that that personnel records, human resources records, are strictly confidential under Montana law? Don't you understand that?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I would not want any of my employees' confidential information shared with the public. MR. STRAUCH: Thank you. MR. CORRIGAN: Redirect, Mr. Chairman? CHAIR OGLE: Yes.</li> </ul>

	ne Matter of Austin Knudsen		October 09, 2024
	Page 242		Page 244
1	<b>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</b>	1	Mr. Corrigan?
2	BY MR. CORRIGAN:	2	MR. CORRIGAN: Senator Greg Hertz and
	Q. Mr. Greenwood, Mr. Strauch just asked you	3	Speaker Wylie Galt.
4	about what you would or would not want occurring	4	CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And you how long do you
5	over state email; do you recall that?	5	
	A. I do.	6	MR. CORRIGAN: I would imagine for Wylie
	Q. If you had been conducting a poll of all	7	Galt, no more than a half an hour; for
8	Montana judges on pending legislation, would you	8	Senator Hertz, no more than an hour.
9	expect that that email would be released publicly?	9	<b>CHAIR OGLE:</b> Okay. And I'm not trying to
10	MR. STRAUCH: Objection, your Honor. Calls	10	
11		11	
	witness is not a lawyer.	12	And how long do you think it might take for Beth
13	MR. CORRIGAN: It's the same hypothetical	13	McLaughlin, Tim?
	Mr. Strauch that just proposed	14	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, I anticipate
15	CHAIR OGLE: Objection sustained.	15	direct, less than an hour. That's about as good as
	Q. (By Mr. Corrigan) Mr. Greenwood, does your		I can do at the moment.
17	office follow state email policy?	17	CHAIR OGLE: All right.
	A. Absolutely.	18	MR. CORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I can ask a
	Q. Are you required to?	19	clarification question, if the commission intends to
	A. Yes.	20	request posttrial briefing on proposed findings of
	Q. And when you create an email, do you	21	fact and conclusions of law following the end of
	understand that that email might be subject to	22	this hearing?
	disclosure?	23	CHAIR OGLE: Let me think on that over the
	A. Yes.	24	evening. We typically have not asked for that in
	Q. And is that email state property?		the past, but this a little different situation.
	Page 243		Page 245
1		1	C C
	A. Yes.	1	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise
2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And do you understand that there are some</li></ul>		<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li></ul>	2 3	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was
2 3	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li><li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li></ul>	2 3	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes. MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<b>MR. STRAUCH:</b> Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes. CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan? MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening. CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> <li>Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And that's it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't you file that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> <li>Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And that's it?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Uh-huh.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't you file that.</li> <li>You've got a copy for Mr. Strauch, I assume.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> <li>Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And that's it?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Uh-huh.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: And do you anticipate how long</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't you file that.</li> <li>You've got a copy for Mr. Strauch, I assume.</li> <li>Okay. So we will recess for the day. We will</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> <li>Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And that's it?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Uh-huh.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: And do you anticipate how long that's going to take.</li> <li>MR. PARKER: Very short. No more than a half-hour each. Maybe quite a bit less.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing.</li> <li>I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't you file that.</li> <li>You've got a copy for Mr. Strauch, I assume.</li> <li>Okay. So we will recess for the day. We will reconvene tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. We will call Ms ODC will call Ms. McLaughlin first thing in the morning at 9:00, and then after that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And do you understand that there are some things that are not appropriate for state email?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. Yes.</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: No further questions,</li> <li>Mr. Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: So is that the last witness you want to call today then, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We told our other two witnesses to to go home for the evening, so if we could start tomorrow with Administrator McLaughlin, we can get to our two other witnesses after that.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And, Mr. Chairman, may I understand the respondent's witness lineup, please?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: We intend to call</li> <li>Senator Greg Hertz and Speaker Wylie Galt.</li> <li>MR. STRAUCH: And that's it?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Uh-huh.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: And do you anticipate how long that's going to take.</li> <li>MR. PARKER: Very short. No more than a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. STRAUCH: Mr. Chairman, that does raise another just housekeeping type of thing. I typically do not give a closing argument when I was ODC. In this case I would like to, if the Court if the commission would entertain it. I certainly expect the respondent would as well. And if I had to if I had to estimate, my time of closing would be in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 minutes.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: Okay. And I assume you'll want to make a closing argument, Mr. Corrigan?</li> <li>MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And we actually have a point brief on supporting respondents' ability to file proposed findings of fact and conclusion of law for posttrial briefing. I have one for all the commission members, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, of course, and ODC, if you're going to consider it over the evening.</li> <li>CHAIR OGLE: All right. Well, why don't you file that.</li> <li>You've got a copy for Mr. Strauch, I assume.</li> <li>Okay. So we will recess for the day. We will reconvene tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. We will call Ms ODC will call Ms. McLaughlin first thing</li> </ul>

	Page 246	
1	and then you'll both have an opportunity to make	
2	closing arguments.	
3	All right. Have a good evening, everybody. See	
4	you in the morning.	
5	MR. STRAUCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,	
6	members.	
7	(Proceedings adjourned at 3:57 p.m.)	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Page 247	
1	Page 247 CERTIFICATE	
1 2		
2	C E R T I F I C A T E I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a	
2 3 4 5	C E R T I F I C A T E I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby	
2 3 4 5 6	C E R T I F I C A T E I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify:	
2 3 4 5 6 7	C E R T I F I C A T E I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024. HOLLY EFOX	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024. MOLLY EFOX NO TARY PUBLIC for the Sate of MONTANA	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024. HOLLY EFOX NOTARY PUBLIC for the Step of Montana Residness Montana Montana Residness Montana Residness Montana Residness Montana Residness Montana Residness Mo	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024. HOLLY EFOX NOTARY PUBLIC for the State of Montana Residon at Hebra, Montana Residon at Hebra, Montana	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE I, HOLLY FOX, Freelance Court Reporter and a Notary Public for the State of Montana, do hereby certify: That the foregoing hearing was taken before me at the time and place herein named, that the hearing was reported by me, and that the foregoing pages contain a true record of the testimony of the witnesses to the best of my ability. DATED this 18th day of October, 2024. HOLLY EFOX NoTARY PUBLIC forthe Step of Montana Residing at Helena, Montana My Commission Expires 	

In the Mutter of Muslin I	inuasen	1		000000000000000000000000000000000000000
	135:10,11;136:14;	246:7	adopted (1)	4:17;5:6;7:5;9:13;
			19:13	
/	142:12;155:8;217:14	adjudicating (1)		12:4;36:16;78:11;86:5;
	accusation (1)	114:18	advance (1)	98:16;114:14;143:17;
/// (3)	164:4	adjudicatory (2)	192:10	166:23;213:6;216:1,22
241:23,24,25	accuse (1)	5:17;208:17	adversarial (3)	age (1)
	168:16	administer (1)	78:10,13,16	121:13
[	accused (1)	170:17	adversaries (1)	agencies (8)
L	163:25	administration (37)	125:15	131:10;132:25;
[- <b>!</b> -] (4)	accusing (4)	8:20;11:10;18:16;	adverse (4)	133:8,11;134:22,25;
[sic] (4)	56:8;163:11;164:14;	21:22;22:12;26:11,19;	11:17;166:14;191:3;	135:5,14
8:2;27:24;89:16;	218:19	27:5;28:11;30:17;32:8;	213:7	Agency (5)
121:10				133:5,6,9,14;206:21
	achievements (1)	38:18;42:25;43:21;	adversely (1)	
Α	19:7	47:10;51:3;52:8;80:17;	211:4	agent (3)
	acknowledge (2)	81:21;82:1;85:2;91:21;	advice (1)	180:2,15;181:9
AA (1)	149:3;151:19	98:16;112:11;124:13;	144:6	agents (3)
16:9	act (1)	143:15;144:2,11,14,25;	advise (4)	131:19,20,20
aback (1)	216:22	145:13;151:13;156:10;	34:11;144:5,7;157:8	agitated (2)
46:7	acting (19)	170:24;210:16;223:24;	advised (1)	153:25;154:6
	22:11;44:23;49:23;	224:6	35:24	ago (8)
abide (5)	83:19;84:3,19;86:12,	administrations (1)	advises (1)	6:10;20:1,21;137:24;
6:7;13:7;45:13;	15;88:22;90:14,16,22;	133:9	161:4	147:10;154:5;194:7;
128:17;146:23	93:2;97:5;109:3,21,22;	administratively (3)	advising (2)	231:19
ability (10)	157:21;235:14	133:5,15,16	145:19;164:25	agree (8)
13:1;47:15;61:5;				
124:8;173:21;193:1,6;	action (10)	administrator (37)	advisory (3)	51:17,18;124:1;
210:25;229:4;245:13	9:21;11:11;44:10;	18:9;21:6;23:17;	69:10;191:6;218:21	125:23;130:22;147:16;
able (7)	92:24;95:7;155:12;	27:3;28:21;34:16,17;	advocacy (3)	152:1;219:1
31:5;33:7;92:9;	204:23;210:24;211:5;	42:5,8;44:9;47:19;	155:4,9,10	agreed (11)
180:21;181:14;236:20;	215:9	64:17;66:14;82:14,20;	Advocates (1)	24:21;62:15;113:21;
238:2	actions (3)	99:19;104:3;130:12;	20:8	124:16;142:13,17;
ABOTA (1)	44:5;62:20;104:2	131:7;140:16,23;	advocating (3)	191:5;220:13;225:8,
20:4	active (2)	143:17;144:12,18;	13:17;36:25;130:5	11;229:8
	17:23;72:8	146:7;156:1;179:6;	affected (2)	agreeing (1)
Abra (2)	actively (1)	198:25;223:6,13;	209:12;211:4	198:22
31:22,23	207:8	224:16;231:17;235:13;	affects (1)	agreement (6)
Abraham (1)	actual (3)	236:19;237:21;238:4;	212:20	33:11;79:21;80:1;
173:2		243:12		
Absolutely (17)	63:3,20;131:25		affirm (4)	92:6;156:25;159:23
99:4;125:7;130:25;	actually (18)	administrator's (13)	180:14,20;181:15;	AG's (14)
141:19;154:20;159:2;	32:1,22;35:8;40:16;	31:3,13;52:24;65:13;	192:2	7:10;11:17;52:8;
203:4,5,23;207:10,18;	53:9;56:9;62:12;	156:21;157:1;178:3;	affirmations (1)	66:17;70:15;106:9;
209:14;214:3,9;	114:11;128:2;141:20;	207:17;239:20,23;	124:17	107:15,23;108:6,10;
219:17;242:18;243:4	156:10;176:10;197:3,	240:5,7,11	affirmed (1)	113:21;116:10;137:14;
Academy (3)	19;207:4;223:11;	admissible (1)	62:12	200:2
20:10;132:7,11	225:1;245:12	94:8	afoul (5)	ahead (7)
	add (2)	admission (13)	56:3;163:8;164:12,	15:3;75:15;121:21;
accept (1)	29:19;212:12	14:24;15:5,8,21;	12;165:2	129:8;185:15;228:14;
82:24	added (1)	16:4;19:19,19;29:22;	afraid (1)	230:3
acceptable (1)	78:22	78:23;93:7;121:25;	222:19	aisle (1)
229:17				
accepted (2)	addition (7)	122:22;123:7	afternoon (6)	13:4
83:7;233:23	25:5;41:7;46:15;	admit (5)	120:9,10;226:21;	alike (1)
accidentally (1)	48:12;75:4,7;185:6	84:9;153:1,9;169:9,	227:6;230:12,13	193:17
223:15	additional (6)	10	AG (3)	allegation (1)
accompanied (1)	39:18;48:2;92:24;	admitted (21)	10:11;116:9;134:15	9:21
197:17	117:7;157:3;196:16	7:13;15:14,16,23,24;	again (27)	allegations (4)
accomplish (3)	address (5)	16:23;22:1;27:21;30:1,	11:8;24:11;28:13;	6:5;162:2;214:21,24
28:14;32:12,13	16:18;39:16;120:14,	2;40:1;56:22;78:24;	44:8;62:1;70:19,23;	allege (3)
	20;190:25	80:5,6;121:10,11;	75:5;94:5;112:3;	202:3;209:23;210:19
According (11)	addressing (1)	122:4,5,6;196:10	118:11;143:9;144:21;	alleged (2)
42:17;51:11;61:21;	189:25	admonishing (2)	153:12;154:25;159:2,	5:23;11:25
89:11;90:4,6,9;175:14;	adequately (1)	58:24;170:16	10;160:25;181:23;	alleges (4)
197:15;231:6,11				
account (2)	210:4	admonishment (1)	185:7;187:19;193:25;	11:4,6,19,24
87:11;89:11	adjectives (1)	14:9	202:19;214:8;218:2;	alleging (1)
accurate (9)	152:11	adopt (2)	228:1;238:15	7:6
72:17;80:24;129:22;	adjourned (1)	19:15;97:10	against (15)	allow (5)
				1

135:4:156:20:191:1; 233:5:237:21 allowed (3) 94:6;98:22;154:17 allowing (1) 88:4 allows (4) 36:20,20:147:25; 148:15 Almost (5) 18:19;59:9;118:21; 160:10:171:16 alone (1) 100:7 along (4) 19:22;20:11;173:9; 223:1 Alpha (2) 8:12;167:21 altered (2) 11:12;215:10 always (4) 18:7;98:8;106:18; 107:1 American (2) 20:8,10 among (4) 140:9;149:2;184:7; 201:9 amount (1) 232:9 analogy (1) 131:18 anchor (1) 13:5 Andrew (1) 200:11 Ann (6) 22:12;30:16;91:20; 93:16:95:8:144:1 annually (1) 208:6 answered (3) 153:18;191:19;219:7 Anthony (1) 19:23 anticipate (3) 243:21;244:5,14 anticipates (1) 226:16 anymore (5) 43:18:128:2:130:10: 145:10;155:23 Apart (1) 69:14 Apologies (1) 190:5 apologize (6) 122:8;136:11;140:5; 152:14:154:4:155:16 apparent (4) 56:1;163:6,14; 164:10

apparently (1) 156:15 appeal (13) 13:18;73:8,9,12,16; 130:18;132:20,23; 205:20;231:9,24; 232:6,8 appealing (1) 207:8 appeals (9) 10:18;20:13,14; 73:17;206:2,9;207:23; 211:11.13 appearance (3) 49:8;143:4;224:19 appeared (2) 145:8;238:22 appears (4) 16:8;175:4;184:7; 189:19 Appellate (12) 20:10;95:18;127:16, 17;132:19;147:24; 148:15;162:13;231:6; 232:20;233:5,22 applicable (1) 105:23 apply (1) 14:10 applying (1) 149:1 appoint (1) 111:5 appointed (2) 4:24;17:19 appointee (2) 74:25;184:25 Appreciate (4) 40:14;120:18; 154:22:187:23 approach (3) 29:13:80:9:96:7 appropriate (8) 91:2;95:11;105:20; 106:1;120:19;204:11, 20;243:3 approval (1) 140:13 approved (8) 106:5;202:4,11; 203:16:205:14:209:3, 15:210:20 approximately (3) 23:4;90:8;197:16 April (77) 22:21;23:14,14,15; 28:4,4;30:15;31:20; 37:13;40:3;41:4,23; 42:2;44:1,22;49:5,24; 50:3,20;51:2;53:8,19, 24;55:11;77:24;81:25; 82:4,12;83:8,11;84:5; 86:11;87:12;91:19;

95:23:109:4,22,23: 110:11:115:8:116:4. 20;136:18,24;141:14; 142:4,7;143:4;144:3; 145:2,24;146:12; 147:1;156:2,8,18; 157:6,11,22;160:19,24; 162:16:188:10.14; 195:3,4;196:18;197:6, 24;204:5;230:25; 234:11,13;235:1,6; 236:7.16 area (2) 152:25:206:18 areas (2) 7:6;8:4 argue (1) 205:19 argued (2) 12:23;59:21 argues (1) 212:25 arguing (1) 36:25 argument (3) 47:18;245:3,10 arguments (2) 192:13:246:2 arisen (3) 55:23;162:25;163:1 arises (1) 135:13 arose (2) 43:11:185:1 around (8) 4:24;19:5;20:2;23:6, 6;64:12;127:4;195:3 articulation (1) 212:8 ascertain (1) 38:25 ascribing (1) 139:22 assert (3) 13:1;150:19;154:7 asserted (2) 10:12,17 asserting (1) 205:5 assertion (8) 10:7,10:54:16; 149:11;153:8;164:17; 201:25:203:22 asserts (4) 10:20;61:6;150:25; 173:22 assiduously (1) 58:17 assistance (1) 106:6 assists (1) 132:17 associated (1)

32:2 associates (2) 24:23;25:6 Association (1) 61:8 assume (5) 65:2;78:10;107:4; 245:9,20 attached (7) 78:22;133:5,15,17; 140:20;142:5;222:4 attachments (3) 30:21;145:23;196:22 attacking (1) 171:19 attempt (10) 11:21;25:6;27:11; 56:2;80:19,25;112:17, 18;163:7;164:11 attempting (5) 156:25;202:8; 204:25;212:19;221:9 attempts (1) 50:12 attended (2) 17:6;126:5 attention (9) 30:25;39:19;54:7; 55:20;60:17;68:9;74:3; 83:23:130:7 attorney (162) 5:6.7:7:6.9.25:8:9: 9:7,9,13,19,22;10:4,17, 23,24;11:3,9,12;12:5, 11,14,17,23,23;13:6, 12;16:20;20:24;31:12; 37:12,17:44:13,20,23; 46:16,23,25;47:2,21; 49:8;51:8,11,24;52:4; 53:20,24:54:21:55:4, 15;56:24;57:4,14,25; 58:9,24:59:6,7:60:5,7: 62:22;64:22;66:21,24; 67:3,9,19,22,25;68:24; 70:19,22,25;72:9,12, 17,22;73:1;74:16; 76:23;77:8;85:5; 101:19;102:24;103:4, 11,20;104:9;106:9,9; 107:6;108:20;109:20; 110:10;114:15;115:11; 117:24.24:118:8: 119:3.20:120:3.20; 123:17;124:6;126:25; 127:3;128:5,13; 130:11;131:4;132:21; 135:15;138:15;139:13; 141:22;153:6,15; 161:4;163:25;176:23; 179:24;181:8,12; 188:8,20;189:16,19,22; 191:9,21,24;192:25; 193:5,8;194:16;

Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

195:18:196:13,15; 197:7:198:3.18:199:7. 25;200:19;205:25; 206:8.9:207:22: 209:10:210:7:211:23; 212:18;213:22;215:19, 25;216:12,20;221:1, 24;225:19,25;238:17 attorney-client (3) 21:12;102:10;181:19 attorneys (20) 4:25;5:4;6:6;9:16; 31:12;58:17,20;85:5; 114:15;122:21;124:3; 132:17;155:5,9;160:1; 171:9;189:14;197:13; 201:8;225:20 attorneys' (1) 213:10 attorney's (3) 123:13:132:14,24 attuned (1) 27:4 audience (2) 187:19,21 August (1) 68:4 auspices (3) 189:17;190:4;221:18 Austin (14) 4:15,17;9:7;13:11; 55:16:57:4:59:7:79:15: 120:3,7,12,16;187:24; 230:6 authority (17) 54:11;88:3;105:21; 106:1,17:128:14; 132:1;134:10;152:10; 165:19;170:23;189:15; 203:2,18:205:10; 206:20;235:4 automatically (1) 113:7 availability (4) 226:17,18,19,20 available (5) 205:12;226:12; 227:19,19,24 avenue (2) 165:21,22 avenues (1) 206:24 avoid (6) 32:20,21;33:3;46:13; 63:23;77:23 avoided (1) 77:20 aware (48) 37:9,14;53:2;56:12, 15;58:1,12;59:17,19, 25;60:3;62:5;67:18; 69:21,24;70:2,4;72:21; 76:4,9,12,15,18;88:3;

In the Matter of Austin R	liuusen	1	1	Octobel 03, 2024
91:6;100:23;103:10;	149:10;182:2;221:4	23:19;27:20;31:5;	17:2	153:24
	basis (13)			
104:12;114:16;123:11;		32:25;34:23;103:7;	Boston (1)	briefing (5)
167:20;168:1,2;170:3,	11:3;41:18;56:15;	124:7;128:7;131:18;	17:7	12:24;53:16;232:7;
6,22;202:2;209:21,25;	60:3;62:5;70:4;71:23;	192:25;193:5;194:25;	both (9)	244:20;245:14
210:18;215:9,19,24;	76:18;78:2;88:5;	195:1;224:24	6:13;8:2;33:9;40:12;	briefly (3)
216:20,24;237:9;	101:14;198:16;199:23	Beth (29)	53:9;191:4;206:14;	20:15;21:3;226:14
238:2;239:7	batch (1)	18:9,14;21:4,6,16,	229:13;246:1	bring (14)
away (2)	207:16	18;22:5,13;24:11,21;	bottom (11)	39:18;91:16;108:24;
147:8;182:2	Bates (2)	28:20;32:5;38:15;44:9;	23:11;34:5;40:3;	109:10;110:7,18;
····, ···	139:6;190:7	66:14;81:16;99:18;	49:20;58:13;59:3;	112:7,9;115:4;128:18;
В	BB (1)	102:11;112:11;140:17;	61:13;74:12;75:3;	130:7;166:5;188:17;
<b>D</b>	16:9	143:17;146:8;234:25;	110:25;185:5	233:25
back (44)	bears (1)	235:4;236:19;237:12,	bounced (1)	brings (1)
	10:8			5:18
8:1;12:7;27:13;		20;239:15;244:12	34:24	
32:25;33:17;34:24;	became (5)	Beth's (2)	bound (2)	broad (4)
38:2,4;39:3;50:16;	95:4;100:5;128:5;	21:10;23:21	6:6;159:4	21:22;23:23;48:15,
64:4,12;65:22;71:4,11;	135:22;163:14	better (3)	bounds (5)	17
79:14;91:16;92:7;	become (1)	21:8;24:12;107:7	54:17;161:8,22;	Broadwater (1)
107:24;111:2;115:23;	198:19	bias (2)	162:9;218:8	7:3
118:20;127:6;128:18;	becoming (1)	175:5;218:14	Bowan (1)	broken (1)
138:21;140:3;148:13;	21:10	big (3)	35:3	132:15
154:7,24;168:9;	Beg (2)	120:21,21;127:6	Bowen (3)	brought (6)
178:13;181:15;187:20,	29:4;45:1	biggest (1)	230:6,10,15	74:24;103:15,17;
24;193:22;195:12;		131:13	boxes (5)	111:21;112:5;184:24
	began (1)			
200:25;214:20;216:25;	213:24	Bill (4)	36:10,15;224:7,10,	Brown (32)
217:16;220:2,4,6;	beginning (1)	112:19,22;195:13,16	10	18:11,13;39:25;
222:25	77:21	Billings (2)	boy (2)	41:21;43:10,12,17;
back-and-forth (1)	begins (2)	132:5;197:13	137:22;147:9	44:17;62:9,20;86:21;
140:5	140:21;231:8	bills (1)	Bozeman (1)	88:23;90:17;97:12;
background (5)	begs (2)	6:1	20:19	100:4;135:20,25;
4:21;6:8;17:1,2;	61:20;175:13	bind (3)	branch (36)	136:9,13,20,24;141:15;
126:1	behalf (13)	50:5;110:2;158:3	12:20;21:23;24:4;	142:11;143:4,13;
backs (1)	134:20;135:8;	binder (1)	26:20;28:19;42:19;	188:10;194:18;195:7,
200:24	136:18;143:12;157:13;	234:1	47:16;52:14,16,19;	10,20;197:3;200:12
bag (1)	162:17;163:24;164:18;	binding (3)	57:21;75:25;76:15;	bunch (3)
127:18	173:12;174:7;206:10;	45:13;109:23;146:23	109:24;111:23;112:13;	43:4;91:14;176:16
	216:23;223:17			burden (1)
bail (1)	,	bit (11)	144:10;146:4;150:23;	
128:23	behavior (4)	4:21;17:1;18:17;	152:10;156:11;157:4;	9:11
bailed (2)	75:17;76:12;176:3;	53:10;94:11;95:18;	159:6,7;178:4;180:4,	bureau (6)
75:15;185:16	185:17	125:25;140:6;157:25;	17;182:10;186:1,23;	132:16,17,19,22,23;
Bainville (1)	behind (1)	243:24;244:10	202:18,20,23;239:9,11;	133:2
126:4	207:24	Blasdel (7)	240:20	bureaus (1)
bar (9)	belief (8)	31:21,25;32:10;	branches (5)	131:9
13:7;19:11,14,15,20;	152:9;153:2;182:13;	142:23,23,24,25	12:16;33:4;54:12;	Bush (1)
20:1;121:20;123:18;	213:10;214:6;219:18;	blinks (2)	117:25;193:15	17:20
126:11	224:14,18	68:19;218:19	branch's (4)	business (4)
barn (3)	believes (1)	blown (1)	51:23;180:8,23;	21:7;46:19;233:19,
77:17;114:3;116:16	149:9	43:12	181:17	21.7,10.19,255.19,
barred (1)	Belke (3)	Board (5)	break (13)	Butte (2)
121:15	31:22,23;32:11	19:10,14,25;20:8;	79:6,9,11,13;119:17,	17:10,17
barring (1)	belonging (1)	133:15	20,23,25;187:13,17;	button (1)
151:16	99:1	body (1)	228:19,22,25	190:20
Barristers (1)	below (1)	165:11	breath (1)	~
20:9	157:25	bona (3)	174:20	С
based (12)	bench (1)	153:2,8;219:18	brief (20)	
10:6,9;12:24;20:18;	17:20	book (12)	41:9;50:9;55:14;	cake (1)
77:19;201:24;203:21;	benefit (2)	22:2;27:22;29:18;	62:3;64:10;67:21;	133:20
217:24;218:4;220:10,	53:3;73:7	122:9,21;123:1,13;	69:19;79:6,8;158:7;	calculus (1)
18;238:25	benefits (1)	136:23;141:21;143:20,	163:23;167:2;177:11;	226:24
basic (1)	240:1	21;157:17	182:15;187:12;221:21,	call (42)
10:16	besides (1)	Boone (2)	21;229:1;232:10;	13:21;14:23;21:15,
basically (7)	236:18	17:18,21 <b>P</b>	245:12	16;23:5;24:18;37:1,24;
36:9;92:2;133:7,10;	best (14)	Born (1)	briefed (1)	84:4,20;86:12;87:2,15;
	1	i de la constante de	1	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

Min-U-Script®

In the Matter of Austin Is	muusen			0000001 07, 2021
88:10;98:18,23;	19.10.10.4.152.11	100.5 24.200.10 14 22.	27:14;28:15;122:14;	175:5
	18:19;19:4;153:11	199:5,24;200:10,14,23;		
119:16;120:23,24;	careful (2)	201:14;204:17;206:22;	211:15;213:7	cited (1)
132:2,13;134:8;172:2,	76:7;120:25	213:9;219:1,22;	change (1)	149:4
6;192:18;226:8,15,22;	Carey (1)	221:18;227:8;239:17;	68:12	Citing (1)
227:8;228:15,20,23;	4:12	245:5	changed (2)	68:23
229:4,10,12;230:4;	carry (1)	certainty (1)	17:20;195:16	citizen (1)
232:15;233:2;243:8,	210:25	146:1	characterization (1)	241:3
17;245:23,23	Cascade (1)	certificate (1)	152:13	citizens (2)
called (21)	17:4	123:2	characterize (8)	9:17;208:2
14:5,6;20:19;21:18,	case (87)	certiorari (11)	59:1;89:10,15;105:9;	civil (12)
19;22:6;23:6;35:22;	4:10,15;5:22;6:4,9,	67:13;71:22;72:6;	110:14;118:6;141:5;	18:25;27:9;126:22;
73:9,22;88:21;97:3,12;	12;9:14;13:5,16;14:5;	73:7,22;77:1;113:14;	153:22	127:9,12;128:1,1,8;
120:15;126:4;174:20;	18:11,11,12;21:3;	179:11;184:1;194:11;	charge (6)	132:23;147:21,23;
191:3;234:20;236:8;	36:23;40:1;41:21;	211:25	131:12,23;132:2,6,	148:14
239:1,5	48:24;49:9;60:12;	CHAIR (95)	11,13	claim (6)
calling (6)	63:13;64:5,6;68:23;	4:6,8;6:23;8:24;9:3;	charged (9)	51:17;54:8,10;
25:5;36:15;135:20;	74:24;77:21;85:13,19;	13:20,22;14:1,4,12,17;	75:15;185:15;	127:25;165:16;166:5
183:12;227:5;229:23	86:3;88:23;89:18;	15:2,9,11,23;16:10;	216:24;217:1,5,12;	claims (2)
calls (7)	90:17;97:12,16,21;	19:11;29:14,24;78:19,	218:2;219:3,25	10:21;100:25
14:14;120:2;230:6;	98:6;99:2,24;100:19;	24;79:3,10;80:3,5,10;	charges (1)	clarification (2)
235:23;237:15,23;	102:20;107:2;111:6;	93:8,19;95:16;96:8,10;	12:5	40:14;244:19
242:10	113:20;117:24;118:2,	104:11;108:17;115:3;	Charlie (7)	clash (3)
came (13)	6,11;127:21;133:1;	118:14;119:9,14,22;	7:19;8:6;121:6;	12:16;117:19;219:19
57:11;62:9;65:21;	136:8,9,24;142:11;	121:7;122:2,4,10,12;	149:5,12,14;164:19	clause (5)
70:14;75:8;141:10;	163:1,22;166:12;	153:19;166:10,16;	check (4)	192:1,7,8,11,19
176:11;185:9;188:9;	175:1,24;184:24;	181:20;187:5,7,9,14,	36:9,14;139:1;	claw (1)
198:1;211:1,2;235:12	195:11;196:17,24;	18;190:23;191:7,16,	165:14	27:13
campaigns (1)	200:24;202:22;204:3,	18;193:21;196:6,12;	checklist (1)	clawback (1)
88:17	15;206:15;209:12,13,	205:24;206:5;211:21;	95:10	31:7
can (77)	24;215:16;216:22;	216:5,9,13;219:10;	Cherokee (1)	clear (15)
11:14;15:4;21:14;	219:17;220:16;226:16;	226:4,8;227:10,12,18,	200:12	8:21;10:3,22;11:8,
24:11;25:16,21;28:14,	227:1,3;229:4,14,22,	22;228:14,21;229:1,7,	chief (39)	15;12:4;13:10;57:25;
15;35:19;59:2;64:3;	24;231:8,22;235:12;	17,20,25;230:3,7;	7:3,4;13:15;18:1;	74:4;80:23;86:2;101:8;
80:9;87:23;98:7,11;	237:9,10;245:4	237:19,25;241:22;	20:17;31:24;44:24;	147:1;170:2;191:10
104:18,18;105:10,11;	case-in-chief (1)	242:15;243:7,14,21,25;	45:5;49:24;74:9;83:19;	Clearly (4)
109:10;110:6,18,23;	16:5	244:4,9,17,23;245:9,18	84:4,20;86:12,15;	56:8;64:11,13;94:15
114:10;115:1;117:15,	cases (17)	Chairman (67)	88:23;90:14,16,22;	CLERK (12)
22;119:9;120:16;	13:2;18:5;19:3;	6:22,25;7:5,22;9:2,4;	93:3,24,24;94:14;97:6;	17:12,14;26:4;30:10;
125:9,11,16,22;127:20;	20:11;24:8;27:9;53:9;	13:24;14:7,14,16,21,	99:23;109:4,21,22;	35:2;83:6;86:7;115:20;
128:7;129:16;130:1,	78:10;88:13;107:6;	22;15:18;29:17;77:3;	112:15;133:25,25;	123:11;230:19,25;
18;134:8;141:18,21;	117:16;133:13;136:10;	78:17,20;79:1,7,20;	134:4,13;137:16;	231:3
144:13;162:4,5,11;	193:9,13;201:2;210:23	93:17;94:3,5;95:14,17;	150:18;152:2;157:22;	clerk's (1)
165:21,22;177:1,7;	Cause (7)	112:7;114:25;118:15;	158:18;235:15	231:7
180:19,22,22;181:5;	4:18;79:15,24;92:21,	119:11,18;120:1;	children (1)	client (60)
187:22;191:7;205:25;	23;112:25;187:25	121:4;122:8;166:11;	237:7	10:12;46:3;47:15,24,
206:3,5;220:9;226:5,8;	caused (1)	187:3,11;188:4;190:5,	Children's (2)	25;48:8;53:14;62:23;
227:8,16;228:16,17,22;	95:9	22,24;196:7;205:23;	24:16,17	66:13;80:17,20;81:1,5,
232:23,25;233:7,9;	CC (1)	211:14;216:4,6,11,16;	choosing (1)	11;97:16;99:2,17;
236:22;239:4,8,13;	93:7	226:7,10;227:3,17;	50:11	100:25;102:11;106:17;
243:12;244:16,18	cell (1)	228:9,11;229:15,19,21;	chose (3)	107:12;111:12;112:18,
Canadian (1)	35:22	230:5;241:21;243:6,9,	95:7;98:18,23	21;130:5;150:22,22;
20:20	cert (8)	15;244:14,18;245:1,11,	Christian (1)	153:2;154:19;155:10;
candid (1)	73:2;77:10;101:21;	16;246:5	9:5	157:21;159:9,25;
124:2	113:17;114:18,18,22;	challenge (5)	Circuit (1)	163:24;164:6,17;
candidly (1)	212:2	45:24;147:19;148:1,	20:14	175:20,21;176:9;
129:1	certain (5)	16;208:20	Circuits (1)	181:6,9,11;191:8;
capable (1)	8:10;20:5;21:3;	challenged (1)	191:5	202:13;203:11,17;
64:8	199:5;232:8	133:2	circumstances (11)	205:9;206:1,6,21;
capacity (2)	certainly (26)	challenging (2)	8:11;12:25;21:13;	207:11,18;210:5;
201:5;214:25	46:18;113:11;	146:18;212:15	58:18;64:7;85:22;	212:12,20;213:5,12;
care (2)	122:18;148:18;153:11;	chambers (1)	96:22;113:6;204:19,	214:25;216:23;225:19
30:17;187:10	162:1;168:23;170:12;	85:13	21;233:7	clients (7)
career (3)	181:4;190:18;192:9;	chance (5)	cite (1)	143:14;156:20;

157:3,9:160:6:174:7; 223:18 client's (31) 10:12,18;23:17;25:9; 37:1:65:16:98:18.23; 99:2;100:17;106:18; 150:20;152:9;159:4; 165:1;174:5;175:25; 176:4;177:1;181:12; 202:15,25;204:1,15; 205:14,20;206:23; 212:9,9;213:6;215:15 closer (1) 17:11 closest (1) 131:24 closing (4) 245:3,7,10;246:2 club (1) 127:18 clumsiness (1) 96:6 Code (10) 56:7,9;105:23;163:8; 164:13,23;165:17; 168:17;169:11;199:22 coequal (9) 12:16,19;150:22; 152:9;159:6,7;202:18, 20,23 Coleman (3) 9:8:190:5:227:23 colleagues (1) 9:7 college (1) 17:4comfortable (1) 12:10 comments (3) 4:13:58:4:200:1 **Commission** (41) 4:9,20,22,23,23;5:1, 1,3,5,8,19;6:24,25; 7:14,22;8:16;9:5; 13:23;15:19;16:25; 18:17;21:3;24:1;73:8; 77:4;78:21;79:2;80:8; 103:25;118:16;119:19; 120:2;121:5;125:25; 165:9,19;166:7; 216:16;244:19;245:5, 15 commission's (5) 78:18;79:8,21;187:4; 216:7 commit (1) 106:10 commits (1) 114:8 committed (3) 104:16:105:16.23 committee (4) 145:9;166:24;167:3;

191:6 common (10) 61:23;128:6:135:1: 175:16:209:11.14: 212:14,21;218:15; 233:1 communicated (2) 102:23:107:23 communication (15) 27:2:83:18:84:23; 85:14,15,18,20,24; 86:15,20,24;87:3;91:2; 109:8:160:11 communications (3) 37:6;107:15;161:25 company (3) 17:24;20:18,21 compare (1) 200:11 compel (2) 103:3.7 complaint (32) 5:6,8,8,11,13,14,14, 16,23;6:5,9,11;7:5,11; 9:12;10:1,20;11:6,24; 12:8;107:8;165:5; 166:23,24;199:9,13; 202:3;210:19;214:21, 24;215:4;216:21 complaints (4) 5:22;103:24;187:21; 199:17 complete (3) 29:23;211:12;213:19 completely (4) 152:25;203:8;214:8, 12 completeness (2) 29:19;188:22 compliance (1) 212:4 compliant (1) 232:1 complied (1) 104:4 Complies (1) 220:24 comply (5) 10:15;67:11;72:18, 20;150:21 complying (2) 33:20;92:8 comport (1) 138:10 comprising (1) 7:9 computer (3) 180:8,24;181:17 conceal (4) 74:25;75:25;184:25; 185:25 conceded (1) 200:2

concern (13) 10:2:23:21:26:18: 43:16:91:10:104:15: 112:11:193:14:204:18: 207:11,18,19;223:17 concerned (4) 7:24;111:17;222:21; 223:11 concerning (6) 8:12;11:1;92:18; 167:24;169:6;208:16 concerns (13) 12:12;23:17;25:9; 31:3,13;33:16,19; 38:22:39:9:43:14; 52:24;100:17;156:19 conclude (1) 9:20 conclusion (7) 49:21;61:19;109:19; 157:20;237:15;242:11; 245:14 conclusions (1) 244:21 concurrence (1) 200:13 conditions (3) 128:18,21,23 conduct (52) 8:17,19:9:24,24; 11:9,17,22,23;12:1,3; 13:8:45:18:46:16:56:7. 9:58:20:68:13:69:22: 104:5.7.8.13.17: 105:17,24;106:11; 108:21;112:21;124:18; 147:21;148:3,17,21,21; 149:4:151:10.12: 163:9;164:13,23; 165:18;167:21;168:17; 169:12:171:9:176:3. 12;199:23;201:19; 210:8,15;218:17 conducted (2) 61:7;173:24 conducting (1) 242:7 conferred (1) 229:2 confidence (2) 54:21:168:4 confidential (14) 23:24;25:18;27:16; 32:16;92:12;100:18, 20,25;101:10;103:23, 24;156:22;241:15,18 confidentiality (4) 31:14;39:4;47:6; 156:19 confirms (2) 51:1.8 confiscate (2) 182:5,6

#### confiscatory (6) 181:24:182:5.10.21: 183:13:218:18 conflict (13) 135:13:174:19; 200:20,22;209:2; 212:7;213:14,24; 217:21,24;218:4,24; 219:8 conflicts (3) 163:16;185:1;200:17 confront (1) 94:7 confusion (1) 190.8connection (1) 44:14 consider (6) 41:13;88:4,6;234:21; 236:20;245:17 consideration (2) 212:24:213:15 considerations (1) 111:7 considered (3) 6:16;163:21;235:18 consistency (1) 204:1 consistent (2) 46:17:145:16 constitutes (1) 9:23 constitution (4) 165:13:192:3.4.6 constitutional (16) 12:15,18;24:2;61:23; 62:16:154:20:165:11, 18:175:16:192:16: 201:15;202:22;205:6, 10:218:15:219:19 constrain (1) 244:10 Consumer (1) 131:15 contact (22) 27:12;35:2,18,21; 36:18,19;58:21;84:21, 25;85:4,8,13;90:13,17; 93:2,23;94:13,25;97:9; 171:7;235:8,20 contacted (8) 24:22:35:20:36:4: 84:3,19;86:7;87:17; 92:3 contacting (2) 90:21,22 contacts (1) 36:17 contain (3) 86:11;190:16;192:7 contained (1) 100:24 contains (3)

### Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

28:1:69:14:106:22 contempt (1) 103:12 contemptuous (9) 150:12;151:6; 158:13;167:8,9; 172:14;177:17;183:4; 186:14 contentious (1) 155:6 contest (2) 5:16;47:14 context (1) 92:2 continue (1) 17:23 continued (1) 211:3 contrary (2) 46:9;62:7 control (5) 47:15:133:16: 134:19;135:7;156:21 controversial (1) 12:8 controversy (1) 43:12 convene (2) 90:10;97:6 convened (1) 99:12 conversation (18) 35:7:47:8:84:17; 87:7,11;89:1,2,12,13, 25;90:7;91:2;95:11; 97:1;102:11;235:10, 11:240:8 conversations (6) 83:24:89:4:94:18: 153:23:156:23:160:9 conveyed (1) 91:23 convincing (7) 8:22;10:3,22;11:8, 16;12:4;13:10 cooler (3) 159:22;160:4;219:23 coordinate (1) 57:21 copied (1) 45:6 copies (13) 38:8:65:7:66:13: 92:15;121:17;179:5, 24;180:3,7,16,23; 181:16;232:23 copy (16) 21:20;22:13,16,17; 29:11;34:12;38:16; 39:5;41:2;43:24;80:7; 96:4,9;123:6;165:13; 245:20 corner (1)

				,
234:5	7:11;133:21;216:21;	109:16,23;110:2,12,16;	Court's (23)	237:7
correctly (18)	219:3	111:4,13,15,20;112:4;	8:3;41:3;45:12,16;	cutoff (1)
45:20;54:18;56:4;	counterfactual (3)	114:5,9,13,17;115:14,	57:18;68:17;69:6;	227:25
57:22;61:11,24;68:14;	69:1,24;218:20	23;116:13;117:5;	71:24;72:14;76:6;	
69:16;94:22;141:11;	country (3)	118:23;119:4,7;	83:23;102:19;107:25;	D
154:4;163:4;174:1;	74:10,16;186:7	123:12;124:3,19,23;	146:23;157:6;207:2;	<b>D</b>
184:20;185:11,12;	counts (9)	125:12,124:5,19,25, 125:3,128:11,19;	211:9,24;212:4;	<b>D-2</b> (3)
198:1;229:20				
	7:10;10:1,20;11:19, 24;12:4;202:2;210:18;	129:5,8,10,13;130:8,	218:18;233:16;234:9; 237:10	31:1,1,6
corresponded (1)	24;12:4;202:2;210:18; 217:8	17,20;140:16,23;		daily (1)
32:5		143:17;144:12,17;	<b>covered</b> (1) 81:1	160:10
correspondence (1)	County (8)	146:7,13,17;147:19;		Dale (2)
108:5	126:3,3,25;127:1;	148:1,16;149:1,15,19,	Cox (25)	42:6;47:8
corresponding (1)	128:5,13;132:17;134:9	21;150:8,21;151:17,20,	14:14;16:14,17;18:2;	<b>Damrow</b> (1)
7:12	couple (6)	21,23;152:5;153:6,16;	24:19;27:8;30:3;31:10;	197:14
<b>CORRIGAN (105)</b>	14:22;34:7;55:21;	155:15,25;156:21;	34:6;44:4;64:14;73:7;	date (8)
9:2,4,6;13:20;14:2;	77:10;126:14;216:7	157:1;158:3,8,9,22,24;	79:18;80:14;93:21;	23:11,12;96:19;
15:9,10;29:25;79:7,20;	course (28)	159:1,11,13;160:20;	95:20;97:23;104:12;	119:3;122:22;195:22;
80:7,13;84:15;91:16,	5:6;7:7,13;11:12;	161:1,4,7,15;162:6,8;	112:24;117:9;118:20;	196:5;197:2
18;93:6,13,21;94:3,10;	19:12;26:15,23;27:17,	163:7,12,13,18,25;	119:9;127:25;160:13;	dated (10)
95:14,17,20;96:7,11;	18,18;39:14,14;58:6,7;	164:11,14,21,22,25;	169:25	44:22;49:4;55:11;
104:12,25;105:5;	61:22;76:25;88:25;	166:3,4,19,20;167:4,	Cox's (3)	57:4;60:11;65:19;
106:7;108:18,24;	99:20;108:21;165:25;	18;169:16,21;170:16,	104:7;160:2,3	70:11;71:4,17;144:3
109:1,10,12;110:6,7,	171:1;175:15;192:11;	19,22,25;171:3,13,16,	create (2)	dates (3)
18,20;112:14;115:4,6,	204:23;215:10;225:17,	20;172:9,22;173:22,	19:17;242:21	94:16;145:5;157:14
21,25;117:3;118:21;	18;245:16	23;174:10,11,20,23,25;	created (2)	day (20)
122:3;153:17;166:8;	Court (432)	175:4,14;176:16,24;	86:24;133:10	23:1,21;31:20;32:5,
181:1,18;187:10,11,16;	4:18,24;7:9,12;8:1,	177:12,25;178:2,2,6,	creating (1)	6;37:22;51:4;76:1;
188:2,4,7,17,19;189:8,	14,15;9:16;10:15,19;	22;179:1,6,12,16;	240:15	82:4;93:5,25;141:12;
9;190:9,24;191:9,14,	18:9,10;19:14,16;	182:25;183:12,15;	crime (2)	146:16;186:1;208:2;
21;193:20,22;195:24;	20:13,14;21:7,8;23:17,	184:2,3,15,17,23;	132:2;133:16	234:13;235:21,25;
196:4,11,13;205:25;	25;24:14;27:3;28:21;	185:2,8;186:6,7,10,19,	crimes (1)	238:13;245:21
206:7,8;211:23;216:6,	29:1,20;30:1,10,12;	25;187:25;189:16;	131:20	days (3)
10,13;217:18;219:6;	31:3,13;33:14;35:3,10,	190:15;191:1,25;	Criminal (13)	41:19;96:20;160:19
228:6,12;229:15;	18;36:5,22;37:6;39:19,	193:10;198:5,8,12,15,	127:1,14;128:6,10,	day-to-day (1)
230:4,5,11;237:17,20;	23,25;40:23;41:8,11;	25;200:9,15;201:3;	25;131:17;132:18,20,	130:10
238:1,6;241:21;242:2,	42:2,8,9,18;43:13;44:1,	202:4,9,16;203:1,6,12,	22;147:24;148:14;	<b>DD</b> (1)
13,16;243:5,8,9,17,20;	9,24;45:24,24;46:3,19;	14,18,25;204:2,7;	193:9,13	16:9
244:1,2,6,18;245:10,11	47:19;48:3,10;52:2;	205:1,17;206:18,19;	crisis (1)	deal (4)
Counsel (64)	53:5,8,21;54:1,8,10,15;	207:17;209:17;210:20,	202:22	6:4;33:19;38:24;
4:17;5:9,10,24;6:20,	55:1,1,6,10;56:2,8,16,	25;211:2,6,6,16,17,18;	critical (2)	195:13
25;7:1,2;9:10;16:3;	18,23,25;57:5,20;	213:1;214:14;215:21;	10:8;35:15	dealing (3)
28:7,8,10;30:17;45:23;	58:11,25;59:8,13,20,	218:9,12,13,15,20,21,	criticize (1)	88:25;152:23;154:1
49:13;54:25;59:12;	22,23;60:1,20;61:6,15,	24;219:4;220:16;	212:21	deals (1)
62:2;69:18;79:22;	21;62:3,12,15,18;	222:20;223:6,12;	cross (5)	231:20
84:21;85:14,20,23;	63:12,19;64:16;65:5,6,	224:16,17;225:14,17,	228:7,16,17,24;	dealt (2)
103:6,22;107:5;	9,11,13,15,23;66:14;	22;230:2,19,25;231:4,	229:13	6:13;67:15
111:25;120:2;129:12;	67:10,14,20,22;68:24;	8,14,17,23;232:5,9,12,	cross-examination (6)	deceased (2)
133:8;136:3;137:17,	69:19;70:5,7;71:22,25;	14,15,19;233:10,13;	79:5,18;80:12;188:2,	49:15;147:7
18;138:21;147:17,18,	72:1,3,7,8,10,13,21,24;	234:17,21;235:1,5;	6;238:8	December (3)
25;148:15;151:1,25;	73:3,13,15,19;74:10,	236:10,15,19,20;	cross-examine (1)	179:21;194:4,7
153:10;154:4,13;	13,13,15,15,17,23;	237:21;238:3,22;	187:10	decide (6)
155:1,3;159:2,18;	75:6,14,22;76:5,10,19,	239:20,23;240:4,7,10;	cross-examining (1)	56:2;91:1;163:7;
162:6,13;168:25;	20,22,25;77:5,22;	245:4	229:9	165:2;175:1;234:18
177:7;184:7;189:23;	79:14,15;81:4;82:6,8,9,	courteous (1)	Crowley (1)	decided (4)
191:1,4;220:25;	15,16,19,21,24;83:3,4,	124:2	42:7	59:22;72:18;144:22;
221:15,22;222:5;	13,14,20;86:1,8,19;	courtesy (4)	Culbertson (3)	165:25
223:8;229:2;238:22	87:3;88:1,13,14,16;	21:20;22:16,17;	126:4,5,23	decision (11)
counselor (5)	89:5;90:11,23;91:6,8;	38:16	cure (1)	7:16;8:3;64:10;
124:7;180:10;	95:6,6;96:22;97:6,9;	courtroom (2)	101:15	72:14;102:10;107:25;
182:11;192:25;193:5	98:5,7,11,15;99:7,8,9,	127:5,7	current (4)	169:16;207:3,19;
Counsel's (1)	10,11,12,18,22;100:5;	courts (4)	110:1;130:3;158:2;	212:25;218:19
211:15	101:20;102:21;103:3,	46:10;123:23;	230:18	declaration (15)
count (4)	11;104:3;108:19;	129:24;149:25	custody (1)	23:20,21;42:13;43:3;
			• • •	

Lesofski Court Reporting, Inc./406-443-2010

50:19:63:6:116:8; 137:2:140:19.20: 141:25:142:1,3,5: 197:18 decree (5) 181:24;182:10,21; 183:13;218:18 deemed (3) 128:16;165:24;232:1 defend (2) 13:16;201:2 defendant (2) 128:21.22 defendants (5) 128:9,14:129:3; 193:10,13 defending (3) 132:25;134:16; 212:14 defense (7) 18:24;20:19;96:20; 128:25;129:12,19; 212:9 defied (3) 128:14,21;211:5 defies (3) 61:23;175:16;218:15 definitely (3) 170:6;190:3;207:13 definition (1) 64:13 degree (1) 17:5delayed (3) 11:12;113:19;215:10 delete (1) 199:1 deleted (10) 21:24;81:5,15; 144:19:145:10:199:4; 223:15.19.19:225:3 deliberation (1) 7:15 deliberations (1) 100:19 delivered (1) 57:17 delta (1) 151:10 denial (7) 69:1;77:4,9;179:10; 211:24:212:2:218:20 denials (1) 69:25 denied (8) 56:20,23;63:19;65:9, 11;76:25;101:20; 138:14 denies (1) 114:18 denv (4) 56:18;70:7;76:23; 183:15

denving (2) 70:12:169:16 Department (56) 18:15;21:22;22:11; 26:11,19;27:5;28:2,10; 30:16;32:7;38:18; 43:20;45:6;47:10;51:3; 52:7;80:16;81:17,18, 20;82:1;85:1,1;91:20; 98:16;112:10;127:20; 131:8,9,14;133:6; 134:2,24;136:2; 143:15;144:2,11,14,25; 145:12;156:10,12; 164:6;180:3,15; 189:14;190:16;191:11; 197:17;207:24;208:5; 213:17;221:19;223:24; 224:5;240:6 departments (1) 134:7 depend (1) 113:6 **DEPONENT (2)** 41:24;105:2 deposition (7) 36:7;37:16;93:11; 95:3,21;96:2,5 Derek (9) 49:12:55:16:57:16: 71:5;106:8;137:2,8; 142:4:170:5 describe (3) 21:8:24:12:131:3 described (3) 22:15;23:19;47:3 describes (1) 133:24 designation (1) 57:8 Desks (1) 48:16 **Despite** (1) 38:22 destroy (1) 223:7 destroyed (1) 224:12 detailed (1) 7:5 determination (2) 218:13:226:24 determine (1) 61:15 develop (1) 19:20 developed (2) 18:23:19:12 development (1) 39:17 developments (1) 43:7 devices (2)

48:19:157:5 devoted (1) 18:20 difference (2) 148:24:199:12 different (11) 27:2:52:14:61:10: 90:20;142:1;154:15, 16;173:25;174:15; 218:11:244:25 differently (1) 193:24 difficult (2) 132:18:213:16 dignity (12) 124:11;150:4; 151:20;158:21;159:1, 12,16;167:17;172:21; 177:24;183:11;200:15 dire (1) 95:4 direct (16) 11:13;16:14;54:6; 58:3;94:3;99:21;117:9; 120:7;174:23;188:23; 215:11;228:7,15; 229:13;230:10;244:15 directed (4) 21:21;48:7;57:5; 181:11 Directing (3) 30:25:41:24:170:16 directly (10) 58:21.22:87:20: 93:15:174:13:189:24; 219:12;232:5;235:8,14 director (17) 22:11,25;25:7;26:9, 11;33:17;34:6;42:3,10, 25;51:2;91:20;94:23; 97:7:134:1:144:1: 145:8 disagree (9) 51:18;129:13,24; 130:2;151:4,5,5,6; 152:12 disagreed (1) 159:9 disagreeing (1) 171:21 disagreement (3) 130:6,7,15 disagreements (1) 113:3 disappeared (1) 199:3 disapproval (1) 140:13 discharge (4) 13:14;124:6;192:21, 24 discharged (1) 193:4

**Disciplinary** (18) 4:16:5:4.9.10.24: 6:20;7:2;9:10;37:10; 79:22:103:21:114:6: 120:2;138:21;155:1,3; 221:22;222:5 discipline (4) 108:19:114:10,14; 215:20 **Disciplining** (1) 12:22 disclose (2) 86:14.19 disclosed (6) 24:15:25:14:43:4; 51:14;100:24;163:15 disclosing (2) 32:23;66:7 disclosure (6) 24:3;32:21;106:3; 140:15;159:23;242:23 discovery (6) 6:11;37:11;80:1; 84:10;87:6;88:2 discrepancy (2) 189:7,11 discrete (1) 189:24 discretionary (1) 73:18 discriminate (1) 220:17 discriminates (1) 198:16 discriminatory (3) 198:13;220:10,17 discuss (1) 206:1 discussed (3) 106:17:207:1:210:9 discussing (1) 93:15 discussion (10) 36:21:196:19: 199:10;200:6;207:6; 208:9;210:10;213:19; 226:13;227:7 discussions (3) 142:15;206:13,14 dismiss (11) 48:22:49:4:63:1.17. 18,20;64:2;65:10,12; 157:12,15 dismissive (1) 68:17 disobedience (1) 7:20 disobey (4) 149:6;201:23;202:8; 204:25 disobeyed (1) 10:5disposition (1)

### Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

116:5 dispute (9) 57:21:58:14:77:20; 87:10:136:22:143:7. 10:155:6:225:17 disputing (1) 117:25 disgualification (1) 140:10 disgualify (23) 55:6,10;56:19,24; 112:25;113:2,8; 136:19;138:15;139:14, 19;162:17;169:17; 188:10;190:1;217:2, 23;218:4;221:2,10,12, 25;222:9 disregard (6) 10:25;167:23; 168:21;169:5;208:15; 209:7 disregarding (1) 168:15 disrespect (1) 208:25 disrespected (1) 163:21 disrespectful (15) 150:7;151:4,15,16; 158:8;161:14:163:19; 167:3:172:5,9:175:11, 19:177:12:182:24: 186:9 disruption (3) 11:13,15:215:11 disseminating (1) 66:6 **District** (6) 17:9;81:4;88:14; 98:11,14:232:9 division (6) 30:19;131:13,14,16; 132:3;133:12 divisions (1) 132:15 divulge (1) 21:11 **DOA** (1) 52:3 docket (4) 35:13;100:7;233:17, 18 docketed (3) 40:13,17,20 dockets (2) 53:10;100:6 document (17) 60:14;109:13,16; 111:1;191:11,15; 196:3:231:11.23; 232:4;234:3,8;235:24; 237:4.5;240:15,15 documents (50)

15:13;27:6,11;32:21;	233:23;236:17	71:4,8;84:14;91:19,24;	100:19;101:10;	entries (2)
38:10,17;47:4;52:2;	duties (10)	92:21,23;93:1,15,22;	111:21;112:5,12;	40:3;41:23
66:8,25;81:1,3,6,11;	13:14;124:6;131:12,	94:24;95:9;101:3;	180:2,14;208:5;	equipped (3)
92:17;100:13;101:18,	25;192:24;193:4;	108:2;112:21;116:23;	209:19;237:11;240:14,	26:19;33:19;38:23
19,23,24;102:4,14,20,	201:2;213:21;231:3;	145:15,21;146:2;	209.19,237.11,240.14, 21	erroneous (1)
25;103:4,8,13,22;	241:8	233:5,6;239:9;242:5,9,	employees (5)	150:25
107:17,24;108:12;	duty (5)	17,21,22,25;243:3	52:15;103:21;	essence (3)
113:25;115:11,15;	163:17;206:22;	emailed (1)	111:22,23;133:22	46:21;52:12;113:24
116:5,10,14,19;125:1;	213:5,12,25	235:17	employees' (4)	essential (1)
207:4,4,9,23;211:10;		emails (117)	24:5;52:18,19;	90:23
212:1;231:5,10;	Ε	21:23,24;23:1,23;	241:18	essentially (6)
232:11,22,25		24:5,7,13;25:13,25;	employer (1)	63:6,14;73:13;87:17;
domain (1)	earlier (16)	26:7,20;27:25;28:2,3;	99:2	92:8;98:5
52:12	13:8;83:17;87:1;	31:4;32:9;33:9;39:4;	employment (3)	establish (1)
dominion (1)	97:15;100:16;107:14;	42:4,10,19,24;43:5;	239:19;240:2,18	118:22
47:5	109:2;145:2,14;	46:25;47:16;48:5,8,12,	end (10)	established (3)
done (14)	146:21;172:24;196:14;	18,20;50:16,24;51:4,9;	12:10;17:22;54:1;	81:24;97:15;109:2
42:24;78:8;101:17;	217:17;219:11,21;	52:7,16;64:16,21;65:5,	61:10;65:22;69:2;	estimate (1)
144:20;154:14,15,16;	225:1	12;66:17;67:4;70:16,	75:17;140:12;150:5;	245:7
176:1;190:4;193:25;	easier (1)	23;71:1,14,16,25;77:8,	244:21	estimates (1)
207:24;221:18;227:5,	157:17	11,13;78:3;85:3;91:14;	ended (2)	42:12
16	easily (1)	92:4;94:12;99:1,1;	25:11;160:5	ethical (15)
door (1)	59:2	100:23;101:6;111:12,	endorsement (1)	12:14;58:18;106:10;
231:7	eastern (1)	18;112:11,18,18;	58:3	107:3;113:7;114:8;
doors (1)	126:3	115:24;117:7;118:24;	enforce (4)	176:8;200:16;205:3,
207:24	EE (1)	138:9;140:22;141:2,6,	5:3;102:19;128:19;	19;213:4,11;215:24;
double (1)	16:9	9;144:10,19,24;	152:3	217:1;218:3
126:6	effect (5)	145:22;146:4,4;	enforced (1)	ethically (1)
doubted (1)	11:17;217:19,20;	156:11,15,22;157:4,5;	45:19	159:4
90:19	225:9;239:25		enforcement (7)	ethics (2)
<b>down (19</b> )	effort (2)	159:24;160:3;163:15; 175:23;178:4,5,17,22;	131:22,25;132:6,11;	113:11;199:19
19:25;22:23;28:15;	33:15;160:5	179:5,9,17,17,25;	131.22,25,152.0,11, 134:1,4,7	
		180:4,17;182:10;	engage (3)	evading (1) 64:8
54:22;63:24;64:15; 66:5;109:18;110:25;	<b>efforts (2)</b> 156:20;160:4	180.4,17,182.10, 183:21;199:1,3;	50:15;151:12;210:15	even (14)
		207:12,16;209:19;		11:14;12:12;24:2;
111:1;119:9;124:1;	<b>e-filed (1)</b> 237:4		<b>engaged (1)</b> 11:9	
132:15;139:24,25;		222:21;223:6,14,24;		26:25;32:6;35:12;
142:19;157:25;192:18; 220:8	<b>e-filing (1)</b> 233:2	224:3,10,21;239:15;	enjoining (2)	38:16;78:2,11;88:5;
dozens (3)		240:9,23;241:1	53:6;160:20	118:7;181:22;205:17; 213:20
	Eh (1)	emasculating (2)	enjoins (2)	evening (12)
78:8,8;128:6	91:8	75:24;185:25	53:13;66:5	
DQ (2)	eight (3)	emergency (41)	enough (6)	21:18;29:5;82:10,11;
141:4,13	179:15,22;202:2	28:25;33:13;35:10,	17:8;63:25;91:5;	84:5;91:4;95:1;115:8;
draw (4)	either (6)	24,25;36:23;38:13;	125:19,20;151:3	243:11;244:24;245:17;
55:20;60:17;68:9;	24:2;85:14;129:9;	40:7,10,11;43:9;80:16;	ensure (1)	246:3
74:3	130:16;176:10;182:1	81:24;82:6,9;84:16;	102:14	event (1)
drilling (1)	elected (5)	86:10,23;87:20;88:5;	ensuring (2)	239:2
139:25	126:17;127:3;	90:23;91:11,13;95:5;	75:15;185:15	events (2)
drink (1)	170:21;230:23;240:21	97:4,8,11;116:4;	enter (4)	12:7;194:17
177:7	electronic (7)	154:21;197:22;202:22;	40:23;41:11;53:5;	Everts (6)
dropped (1)	30:10;48:19;157:5;	232:18,21;234:22,25;	92:5	27:24;28:6,7;30:18;
22:14	180:4,16;184:11;233:2	235:5,14,19;236:3,11,	entered (4)	31:22;85:10
drug (1)	electronically (2)	21	41:4;143:3;146:13;	everybody (4)
19:1	30:12;40:16	emergent (1)	205:18	98:9;107:9;187:22;
due (7)	elicit (2)	166:1	entertain (2)	246:3
54:11;123:22;	191:7;206:5	Emily (1)	45:16;245:5	everybody's (1)
149:18,25;192:8,11,17	Elinor (1)	197:13	entire (2)	231:10
duplicate (1)	4:11	emotional (1)	8:15;214:21	everyone (4)
16:8	else (3)	219:25	entirely (2)	4:6;187:19,22;
during (14)	35:18;48:13;238:2	emphasize (1)	5:2,20	219:23
7:13;16:5;19:12;	email (42)	5:19	entirety (2)	Everything's (1)
83:11;116:7;188:8;	25:12;26:13;27:22;	employ (2)	18:19;100:10	116:9
194:13;215:15,22;	31:10;34:6,15,15,16;	20:21;219:21	entitled (2)	evidence (24)
217:17;220:7;225:7;	38:3,5,12;43:11;66:23;	employee (12)	36:19;99:25	8:7,22;9:17;10:4,11,

Lesofski Court Reporting, Inc./406-443-2010

22;11:2.8,16;12:2,4; exempted (1) 164:19 13:10;55:23;94:7; 101:9,13:117:4; exemption (1) 10:8 127:13;163:2;164:2,5; 211:20;223:4,13 exercise (1) evidentiary (1) 204:2 95:19 exhaust (3) ex (27) 205:11:206:9.23 36:16,19;37:3;40:24; exhausted (5) 41:9.17:83:18.24; 10:19:13:18:159:5: 84:17,20,22;85:18; 205:21;211:11 86:11,14,20;87:2;89:4; exhausting (2) 91:1;93:3,3,24;94:14; 206:2;207:20 95:10;97:9;98:19,24; exhaustion (1) 146:8 211:12 exact (3) Exhibit (147) 15:22;16:2;22:2,5, 16:8;149:10;157:14 24;23:18;27:21,22; exactly (4) 92:9;173:5;176:18; 28:1;29:7,21,21,23; 213:2 30:3,14,22;31:1,17; exam (1) 33:21,25;34:5;38:2; 19:15 39:22;40:1,2;41:1,2, **EXAMINATION (7)** 22;43:23,24;44:3,4,20, 16:14;118:18;120:7; 22;49:1;50:18;53:7,11, 216:18;217:17;230:10; 21,23;55:7,9,18;56:21; 242:1 57:1,3;60:10,18;62:8; **Examiners** (2) 63:1;65:10,18;66:2,23; 19:11;20:1 68:3,3;69:7,9;70:10, Examiners' (1) 21;71:8;73:5,25;75:20; 19:15 77:6;78:22;79:25,25; 84:9:91:17:93:7.15.23; example (3) 24:11:72:1:232:7 94:8:96:12:107:20: examples (1) 108:15,25;109:11; 99:16 110:6,19;115:5,18; except (2) 118:22;121:17;122:1, 10:6;201:24 4,6,14,16;136:23; 137:2;138:19;139:2; exception (4) 71:24;79:24;84:1; 140:4,8,19,21;141:18, 148:419,24;142:3,6,6; exceptions (1) 143:21,25;146:9,18; 135:9 147:2;154:25;156:5; exchange (4) 157:16:160:22:161:1; 193:11;194:1,18; 162:20;168:9,10; 198:6 169:18,22;173:14; excluded (1) 178:9;182:15,17; 14:3 183:19;184:6;185:20, exclusion (1) 21;188:13,18,23,24; 13:24 189:3,6,10;190:6; exclusively (1) 191:22;193:23;194:3, 126:12 5;195:25;196:9,15; excuse (16) 220:21;222:1,4,6; 31:1;49:7;57:17; 233:25 exhibits (20) 62:21;68:10;90:22; 7:15;14:24,25;15:15, 107:8;131:16;133:4; 162:7;167:8;173:17; 24;16:3,6;29:10,15,19; 30:2,4,21;78:22;79:23; 179:4;206:19;221:21; 237:2 80:6;104:20;107:22; excused (2) 108:15;141:23 119:12;226:5 exist (1) excuses (1) 164:18 176:3 existed (7) executive (2) 10:7,10;32:4;101:15; 17:25;20:18

exists (2) 149:11:201:25 expect (4) 78:7;236:6;242:9; 245:6 expediency (1) 7:16 expedited (1) 78:2 expeditiously (1) 227:4 experience (7) 18:18;82:23;85:11; 117:10;209:10;212:18; 238:25 expert (3) 129:15;237:24; 242:11 explained (2) 21:19;181:25 exploring (1) 207:20 express (2) 31:2;140:12 expressed (1) 140:12 extend (1) 214:2 extension (4) 12:21;113:16;143:5, 12 extensive (1) 6:8 extent (3) 117:25;181:18; 214:10 extraordinary (2) 58:15;239:2 extra-rule (1) 236:24 extreme (1) 96:22 F facilitate (4) 74:24;83:20;111:5; 184:24 fact (15) 9:12;13:5;27:6; 41:25;50:24;51:8;65:4; 101:14;130:12;170:22; 208:22;211:1;216:21; 244:21;245:14 facts (7) 12:24;60:21;101:15; 112:8;113:6,9;144:16 factual (6) 56:15:60:3:62:5; 70:2,4;76:18 fail (1) 12:6 144:19;174:19;203:22 failed (1)

**Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1** October 09, 2024

	October 09, 2024
128:17	fiat (1)
fair (18)	182:2
28:17;89:10;109:6;	fide (3)
110:14;114:2,21;	153:2,8;219:18
116:15,18;117:13; 118:6;124:2;138:2;	<b>fidelity (1)</b> 13:14
151:3;201:11;217:25;	Fifth (1)
218:1;221:17,20	191:4
fairly (1)	fights (1)
174:18	107:13
<b>fairness (2)</b> 10:17;168:5	<b>figure (1)</b> 127:18
faith (2)	File (52)
11:3;205:14	4:18;28:25;33:13;
faithfully (5)	38:9;43:8;47:14;49:8;
124:6,16;192:21,24;	55:5;60:7;67:13,25; 72:6;73:1,8,12;79:16;
193:4 fall (2)	83:2;92:15;97:18;
17:17;134:24	102:18;107:7;113:17;
false (9)	128:20;129:7;136:19;
10:25;160:14;	139:14;165:4;166:23;
167:22;168:14,20;	188:1;190:11,14,19,20;
169:5,9;208:14;209:5 <b>falsity (6</b> )	191:10,14;204:11; 221:2,10,12,25;231:5;
11:1;167:24;168:22;	232:22,23,24,25;233:7;
169:6;208:15;209:8	236:8;237:22;238:2;
familiar (8)	239:1;245:13,19
4:22;5:22;27:4; 105:5;127:11;148:13;	<b>filed (98)</b> 5:6,13,14,15;6:9,12,
201:20;210:12	15;29:2,2;30:6,8,12;
family (1)	34:12,14;35:11,24,25;
126:2	36:2;37:3,7;38:13;
far (7) 152:18;168:4;180:6,	40:6,20;41:17;43:9,18, 25;44:1,16;47:18;
20;214:1;235:3;238:14	48:23;49:18;53:5;
farm (1)	55:18;60:15;64:15;
126:2	67:21;68:7;74:1;81:23;
fast (3) 25:22;166:1;199:18	82:14;83:12;86:4,5,10; 91:4;92:25;97:11;99:8,
fathom (1)	24;103:2;114:24;
175:22	123:2;138:15,23;
favor (1)	139:15;141:3,12;
178:3 fax (1)	142:4;143:11,13,16; 146:8;156:1,9;157:12,
233:7	15;158:7;162:7;
<b>FBI</b> (2)	163:24;173:12;182:12,
131:19;208:7 federal (5)	16;183:25;184:14; 188:9;190:1;194:4,13;
17:9,20;133:3;191:6;	196:15,18;197:3,19;
214:14	209:22;215:25;217:6;
feel (1)	221:3,16;222:1;
113:24	231:10;232:2,4,11;
feels (1) 5:10	234:8;235:19,24; 236:12,23
felt (5)	filing (27)
154:19;159:3,9;	9:13;35:4;72:5;83:7,
174:18;225:18	9;91:5;109:16;110:16;
<b>few (8)</b> 4:13;115:1;117:10;	163:13;186:6;195:19; 204:15;211:19;216:23;
124:1;127:7;160:19;	217:23;218:3;231:21;
184:13;205:18	232:3,18;233:1,2,5,6,9,
FF (1)	11;235:17;236:25
16:9	filings (13)
# Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

In the Matter of Austin K	Inudsen	T	T	October 09, 2024
7 0 40 10 00 15 04	g (2)		12 50 20 52 4 56 24	21 11 22 17 24 24
7:9;42:18;82:15,24;	flagrant (2)	foundation (3)	13;50:20;52:4;56:24;	31:11;33:17;34:24;
86:19;173:6;189:16;	163:16;192:16	93:10,18,20	57:4,14,15,25;58:9,24;	38:4;48:2;91:20;93:16;
190:15;200:3;202:4;	flatly (2)	four (3)	59:6,7;60:5;63:4;67:9,	94:23;97:7;144:1
210:20;231:20;233:22	106:15;160:5	126:18;192:19;194:8	22;68:24;72:17,22;	Giles's (1)
filling (1)	focus (1)	fourth (1)	74:9,16;103:11,20;	95:8
195:17	133:3	170:15	104:9;106:9;108:20;	gist (1)
final (3)	folks (3)	frankly (3)		176:20
			109:3;114:15;119:3,	
116:5;211:11;215:17	32:18;33:15;73:8	125:24;207:18;	20;120:3,20;123:17;	Given (5)
Finally (4)	follow (12)	225:20	127:3;130:11;131:4;	107:5;111:6;145:25;
11:19;13:3;77:8;	42:9;50:3;118:4;	freezes (1)	135:15;137:17,18;	146:5;163:15
179:8	124:16;128:10;130:23;	98:5	138:15;139:13;147:5;	giving (2)
find (4)	141:2;148:25;166:4,	freezing (1)	153:6,15,24;156:24;	12:7;41:16
10:2;25:8;31:17;	19;236:25;242:17	41:12	160:9;161:4;163:25;	glorified (1)
44:12	followed (13)	Friday (11)	176:23;179:24;188:8,	130:12
finding (1)	28:22,23;47:20;50:6;	21:18;22:19;23:1;	20;189:16,22;191:9,	God (1)
31:18	109:24;110:3;136:13;	33:23;38:9;43:1;51:2;	21;193:8;194:16;	49:15
findings (2)	152:6,21;158:4,25;	92:16;226:21;227:6;	195:18;196:13;198:3,	goes (5)
244:20;245:13	222:19;223:12	233:20	18;199:7,25;200:19;	54:13;132:17;
fine (3)	following (12)	friend (2)	201:1;204:6;205:25;	168:23;174:13;235:3
120:17;196:11;	4:1;16:2;99:25;	13:3:17:24	206:8;210:7;211:23;	Good (20)
228:16	107:25;146:16;160:24;	front (9)	213:22;215:19;216:12,	4:6;9:4;11:3;18:22;
finish (2)	169:20;193:10;198:1,	22:2;88:13,15;91:17;	20;221:1,24;225:25	63:25;64:1;79:23;
228:5;245:25	5;211:24;244:21	128:18;138:17;221:15;	Generally (13)	81:16;91:5;105:14;
finished (2)	follows (1)	231:7;234:23	73:14;82:24;83:25;	120:9,10;126:15;
226:5;228:3	232:7	frustrations (4)	128:9,12;131:6;	128:9;205:14;230:12,
fire (1)	footnote (6)	58:19;170:20;171:9,	135:11;140:1;144:14;	13;238:12;244:15;
155:18	59:3;61:13;75:3;	13	146:4;208:12;210:13;	246:3
fired (1)	171:15;185:5,12	FSD (1)	231:5	govern (1)
156:9	forbidden (1)	132:3	General's (50)	148:21
firm (11)	37:2	full (4)	7:25;8:9;37:12,17;	government (17)
17:18,21;42:7;	forceful (1)	87:25;189:13;205:5;	44:20,23;46:16,23,25;	12:17,20;28:19;
	206:17			
126:13,14,21,21,22;		224:10	47:2,21;49:8;51:8,11,	31:11;33:4;52:14;
133:7,11;197:12	forensic (1)	fully (7)	24;53:20,24;54:21;	54:12;57:21;117:25;
firmly (1)	132:3	153:20;154:9;155:4,	55:4,15;60:7;62:22;	144:15;150:23;152:10;
159:5	forge (1)	9,11;160:16;161:11	64:22;66:21,24;67:3,	159:7,8;202:19,21,23
First (47)	79:5	functions (1)	19,25;70:19,22,25;	governor (4)
4:20;7:24;10:1;	forget (4)	232:21	72:9,12;73:1;76:23;	19:22;84:21;136:19;
13:21;14:23;22:23;	137:17;147:15;	further (15)	77:8;85:5;101:19;	195:15
29:2;38:7;48:3;58:13;	149:10;176:18	37:6;42:4;53:8;	102:24;103:4;107:6;	governor's (2)
80:19;87:16;88:10,18;	forgetting (1)	58:19;78:25;93:20;	109:20;110:10;115:11;	134:25;135:5
99:6;112:17;113:10;	133:19	113:19;118:13;119:8;	118:8;189:19;196:15;	Graduated (2)
115:13,23;118:23;	Forgive (1)	171:8;187:7;216:10;	197:7;206:9;207:22	126:5,10
123:21;125:12;126:11,	96:6	226:3;238:6;243:5	generated (1)	graduating (1)
13;138:20;139:11;	forgot (1)	~	5:25	17:7
145:7;149:8;178:21;	97:1	G	gentleman (1)	grant (6)
189:1,5,12;191:23;	form (1)		237:15	56:18;65:15;82:6,9;
192:1,2,19;194:19,24;	129:8	gain (1)	genuine (4)	87:25;88:4
195:3;218:23;229:5,	formal (1)	212:19	152:9;153:2;159:19,	granted (7)
10,12;232:10;235:16;	130:19	gained (1)	25	15:13,14;19:14;
238:13;245:23	formality (2)	106:4	genuinely (2)	63:17;100:4;114:22;
				195:7
fish (2)	120:21,22	Galt (6)	125:22;175:22	
95:18;132:10	formally (2)	31:21;32:10;142:22;	get-go (1)	granting (2)
fit (1)	15:5,21	243:18;244:3,7	136:5	40:24;146:14
212:13	fortunate (1)	game (1)	gets (4)	great (2)
fitness (2)	17:8	132:10	28:22;41:13,14;92:6	127:25;238:11
105:19,25	fortunately (1)	gave (2)	GG (1)	Green (1)
fits (1)	200:18	121:9;137:19	16:9	9:8
86:24	fortune (1)	General (107)	Gianforte (10)	Greenwood (14)
five (7)	18:22	7:6,9;9:6,7,9,13,19,	18:13;43:10,13,17;	35:3,15;83:6;123:12;
4:25;90:7,8;126:20;	forward (3)	22;10:4,17,23,24;11:3,	86:21;97:12;195:11,	229:10;230:4,6,10,12,
179:21;192:20;201:17	79:5;94:17;205:8	9,12;12:5,11,14,17,23,	15,20;197:4	15;238:1,10;242:3,16
five-minute (2)	found (3)	23;13:6,12;42:14;	Giles (13)	Greenwood's (1)
228:19,22	85:7;146:15;192:15	44:13,25;45:2;49:12,	22:12;27:23;30:16;	229:11

Greg (2) 243:18:244:2 grew (2) 120:19:126:2 grievance (4) 107:8;138:14,22; 215:24 ground (1) 6:14 grounds (1) 205:9 guess (8) 35:11;129:15; 131:18;135:9;145:17; 197:5;227:4;241:6 guessing (1) 41:25 guidance (2) 214:10;219:17 guy (1) 78:14 guys (5) 28:14;182:16; 223:23;228:2,16 Η Haddon (4) 17:19,19;18:21,22 hairs (1) 225:6 half (5) 55:8;126:8;137:24; 147:10:244:7 half-hour (1) 243:24 hammer (5) 173:10;175:3,5,6; 218:14 hand (2)96:4:141:22 handful (2) 128:1,8 handle (2) 127:20:128:10 handled (2) 20:12;86:1 handles (1) 132:22 handling (1) 20:12 hands (3) 52:4;64:21;116:9 hands-on (1) 131:25 hang (1) 45:3 Hansen (20) 42:14:43:3:44:25; 45:2;49:11,15;50:20; 55:16:57:15:71:7; 106:8;116:8,22;147:5; 153:24;156:24;160:9;

170:5;204:6;206:14 Hansen's (1) 109:3 happen (8) 47:12:50:12:65:23; 139:18,22;140:2; 153:10;159:24 happened (4) 85:25;96:19;140:1; 154:3 happening (2) 26:2;96:24 happens (1) 104:15 happy (1) 38:8 Hard (2) 25:10;206:16 harm (2) 98:6;101:17 Harris (1) 57:7 hashed (1) 59:21 hate (1) 14:22 Hayhurst (1) 34:8 hazy (1) 145:5 head (1) 176:6 heads (3) 159:22;160:4;219:23 health (3) 52:19;239:19,22 healthcare (2) 240:18;241:9 hear (3) 160:7;187:22;223:10 heard (6) 73:21;90:11;160:2,2, 8:173:3 hearing (11) 4:10,14,15;5:17; 6:16;7:7,13;14:8; 90:23;146:10;244:22 heated (1) 225:17 heavy (1) 9:10 held (2) 52:2;144:24 Helena (3) 132:7,9;230:17 help (1) 162:11 helped (1) 19:20 helper (1) 19:20 hence (1) 164:19

herself (2) 34:24:144:12 Hertz (3) 243:18;244:2,8 Hev (3) 27:12;28:14;174:15 HH (1) 16:9 high (3) 12:15:17:3:126:5 highest (10) 73:19:74:8,10,13,15; 76:19,20;186:4,6,7 highlighted (11) 7:12;45:10;54:7; 61:2;139:12;164:9; 172:7;173:18;177:11; 190:10;221:1 highly (4) 12:8,13;23:24; 219:24 Highway (2) 131:23;132:10 himself (1) 12:17 hindsight (5) 154:14,22,23; 219:22;220:4 hire (2) 133:8.11 hired (1) 42:6 history (3) 74:19;162:5;184:19 hit (1) 190:19 hold (2) 26:3:67:14 holding (3) 51:9:62:17:103:11 home (2) 236:2;243:10 hometown (1) 126:22 honest (2) 154:13;174:16 honestly (5) 131:11;138:17; 141:16;151:1;221:15 honesty (4) 105:18:171:19; 174:9.13 Honor (14) 15:17;16:1;93:9; 104:6;120:13,20; 121:24;122:7;124:11; 125:14;150:4;227:2; 237:14:242:10 Honorable (9) 7:24;57:4,14,24; 59:6:60:4:119:19: 120:3,15 honorary (1)

**Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1** October 09, 2024

implement (1) 20:5hope (6) 27:19:138:3,3; 153:11:159:19.25 hopes (2) 46:12;160:12 horribly (1) 172:4 horse (3) 77:17:114:2:116:15 host (1) 144:15 hour (5) 79:4;227:16;244:7,8, 15 hours (4) 233:19,21,23,24 House (3) 126:19;142:22;157:5 housed (2) 81:18,20 housekeeping (2) 14:23;245:2 housing (1) 144:23 Huh (1) 64:2 human (4) 131:20;240:3,6; 241:14 hypothetical (2) 113:12:242:13 I idea (4) 128:9;144:9;227:13; 244:11 identifiable (1) 207:25 identified (2) 202:12:203:24 ignored (1) 185:2 ignoring (1) 68:11 ill (1) 139:22 imagine (3) 25:11:157:10:244:6 immediate (2) 140:9;211:17 immediately (15) 66:11,11,17;70:16; 71:14,25;179:2,3,5,10, 16;183:21;211:12; 212:2;222:21 impartial (2) 61:5;173:21 impartiality (2) 168:5;209:23 **impeachment** (3)

93:14;94:4,6

155:21 imply (1) 223:5 important (2) 5:21:95:5 imposed (1) 215:20 impossible (1) 94:1 improprieties (1) 59:19 **impropriety** (1) 57:19 improve (1) 124:12 inaccuracies (1) 59:25 inaccurate (3) 59:9;171:16,24 inappropriate (4) 75:17;76:12;172:4; 185:17 inbox (2) 223:20;225:3 incendiary (1) 69:20 inclined (1) 90:18 include (4) 85:14;122:16; 149:14:200:16 included (2) 99:1:100:13 includes (6) 149:13,18,24;150:3; 151:15,16 including (4) 28:20;57:7,18,19 incomplete (1) 29:18 inconsistent (1) 93:14 incorrect (2) 99:5;188:15 indeed (4) 8:14;18:4;24:6; 121:3 indicate (2) 40:6;198:21 indicated (1) 144:18 indicates (2) 66:2;135:12 indicating (3) 37:12;123:1;196:23 individual (2) 88:4:236:18 induce (1) 11:22 indulgence (5) 78:18;95:15;115:1; 187:4;216:7

**Min-U-Script**®

In the Matter of Austin R	liuusen		I	Octobel 03, 2024
infer (1)	159.11.161.17.167.6.	7.14.58.20.227.7	230:18,20,22	$\operatorname{Inly}(25)$
	158:11;161:17;167:6;	7:14;58:20;227:7		July (25)
188:14	172:12;177:15;183:2;	inviting (1)	Johnstone (1)	8:3;65:20,21;67:8,
inform (5)	186:12	170:19	19:23	23;68:1;71:13,24;
84:22;85:15,19;	intend (2)	involve (2)	join (3)	72:10,19,23;108:1;
105:20,25	8:11;243:17	206:20;214:19	17:18;121:19;123:18	115:25;116:14,20;
information (41)	intended (1)	involved (20)	Jones (2)	119:1;178:8,12,19;
21:12;23:25;24:10;	33:6	9:16;21:10;43:17;	197:12,14	179:20,21;182:8,20;
25:16,19;26:21;32:14,	intends (1)	85:12;130:9;134:23;	Jr (1)	207:3;222:20
24;33:13;39:8,19,21;	244:19	135:19,22,24;136:1,16;	126:16	jump (1)
51:13,23;52:11,13,19;	intent (1)	175:23;196:24;209:19;	judge (38)	213:18
85:4,8;91:23;92:5;	226:22	213:20;215:25;218:10;	8:13;11:2;17:9,10,	June (3)
100:18,20,25;101:10;	intentions (1)	221:5;222:15;233:12	16;18:22;36:15,18;	62:9;65:10,12
	25:8			
106:3,4;156:22;		involvement (1)	57:7;61:20,22;88:14;	Juras (1)
160:13,14;181:19;	interest (13)	77:19	105:22;106:5;112:25;	19:21
204:22;208:1,1;228:3;	7:16;106:19;163:17;	involving (2)	113:9;136:20;140:10;	jurisdiction (5)
239:12,14;240:18,19;	174:19;200:20,22;	193:9,13	141:4,13;163:21;	57:19;202:16;
241:5,18	201:6;214:1;217:22,	irrelevant (1)	165:16;166:23;167:25;	203:12;204:2;212:16
informed (1)	24;218:4,25;219:9	63:14	168:16;169:7,13;	jurisdictional (1)
90:15	interested (2)	irreparable (1)	175:13,15;198:21;	204:16
inherent (1)	61:4;173:20	98:6	200:20;208:17,21,24,	justice (105)
170:23	interests (8)	Ish (1)	25;209:1,11,12	8:20;11:10;35:20,21;
initial (3)	13:2,16;204:15;	138:1	Judges (22)	36:25;37:5,9,13,23;
64:1;86:4;205:18	205:4,15;212:10,15;	ISP (1)	61:8,21,21,22,22;	44:24;45:7;49:24;61:6;
initially (1)	214:2	26:13	81:4;112:22;129:13;	80:2,2;83:18,19;84:4,
144:17	interfered (1)	issue (28)	140:23;163:11,20;	10,20;86:12,15;87:2,6,
initiated (1)	210:24	7:19;8:8;32:19;	164:22;169:17;171:2;	11,15,18,21,24;88:4,8,
135:23	interference (1)	41:15;63:3;66:21;	174:3;175:14,14,15,15;	10,12,20,21,22,23;
in-person (1)	45:16	80:15;88:19;89:8;98:7,	198:18;209:11;242:8	89:11,12,14,16,20,21,
226:23	internal (2)	11;103:15;104:7;	judge's (2)	22;90:1,4,6,9,14,15,16,
inquired (1)	135:1;142:15	114:10,14;157:3;	105:25;200:21	16,19,19,21,22;93:3,3,
154:24	International (1)	190:20;194:14;195:10,	Judging (4)	24,25;94:14,25;97:1,4,
inquiry (1)	20:9	12,13;199:19;202:17;	41:24;101:13,14;	6;109:4,22;112:15;
155:1	internet (1)	209:4;210:24;213:19;	227:15	123:23;124:13;127:20;
inside (1)	26:13	214:23;215:3	judgment (2)	131:8,9,14;133:6;
131:14	interpretation (1)	issued (20)	175:24;198:22	134:2,25;149:19,25;
insincerity (2)	148:7	21:21;42:2;47:23;	judicial (84)	151:13;156:12;157:22;
75:8;185:9	intervene (6)	53:8,14;62:19;67:8;	15:12,19;21:23;24:1,	164:6;168:6;170:24;
insistence (1)	41:20;97:19;195:19;	71:14;80:16;100:10;	4;26:20;42:19;47:16;	173:22,23;180:3,16;
212:12	196:17;197:9,19	103:14;115:8;117:5;	51:22;52:16,19;55:24,	189:14;190:16;191:11;
instance (2)	intervened (2)	123:2;145:12;160:20;	25;56:7,12;68:12,19;	200:11;207:24;208:5;
131:12;223:14				
,	135:25;136:7	169:16;194:19,24;	69:21;74:18;75:25;	210:16;213:17;221:19;
instead (3)	intervention (3)	195:3	76:9,15;81:3;88:16;	232:16;235:7,8,15,16,
81:12;98:18,23	100:3;195:7;197:3	issues (11)	105:24;111:23;112:12;	21;236:3
institutionally (2)	into (13)	6:3,18;25:20;27:10;	123:23;140:11;144:10;	justices (36)
61:3;173:19	6:3,17;23:20;28:24;	38:25;43:15;95:19;	146:4;149:19,25;	8:14;9:15;36:5;
instructed (3)	30:9;42:8;51:20;68:18;	170:17;198:12,15;	156:11;157:4;162:2,3;	53:25;55:6,10;57:6;
90:10;153:4,5	92:5;126:10;139:25;	233:13	163:2,9,12;164:1,3,7,	61:3;75:9,13;76:13;
insult (1)	213:18;235:12	issuing (1)	13,14,23;165:5,8,17,	88:11;89:5;94:17,19;
176:13	introduce (2)	72:7	17,19;166:6,6,24;	95:1;110:11;111:13;
insulting (10)	79:23;195:24	italics (2)	167:3;168:17,17;	114:9;148:9;162:18;
150:14;151:7;	invalid (6)	75:21;185:23	169:12;178:4;180:4,	168:13;171:3,12;
158:15;161:19,23;	59:17;152:6;158:25;	,	17;182:2,10;184:16,	172:2;173:19;185:9,
167:11;172:16;177:19;	198:8,10;220:9	J	17;185:25;186:22;	14;186:25;209:17,22,
183:6;186:16	investigated (1)	9	193:15;195:16;199:1,	23;217:2;222:10;
<b>insurance</b> (2)	5:9	Jackson (1)	8,12,17,19,22;206:24;	232:5;234:23
239:20,22	investigation (5)	200:12	207:20;211:7,13;	Justice's (1)
integrity (14)	45:17;68:18;75:16;		214:13;218:17;239:9,	197:17
		January (3)		
11:1;58:16;167:24;	131:17;185:16	13:11;145:24;230:21	11;240:20	Justices's (1)
168:12,18,24;169:7,13;	investigator (1)	JJ (3)	judiciary (9)	136:3
171:19;174:10,14;	7:3	79:25;80:6;84:11	45:18;117:20;	justifiably (2)
186:24;208:16,21	invitation-only (1)	job (8)	150:23;159:20;160:12;	61:5;173:21
intemperate (9)	20:6	152:2;164:11;	175:22;213:14;214:18;	justified (1)
150:10;151:5;	invite (3)	181:12;210:25;225:19;	225:18	84:17

			1	,
justify (1)	Krueger (5)	86:4;100:9	186:4;192:10;202:13;	214:1,5
85:23	136:20;140:10;	lawsuits (1)	203:1,3,5;205:15;	legitimately (1)
83.23	141:4,13;198:21	135:21	208:17;212:9,15;	160:11
K				
<b>N</b>	Kurt (1)	lawyer (40)	213:6;214:1,7;237:15;	Leonard (1)
	140:10	11:21;18:18,23;19:6;	242:11	34:8
Karlberg (2)	T	21:11;36:15;59:14,15;	legally (1)	Less (4)
17:18,21	L	66:16;95:18;104:15,	206:24	127:17;227:16;
keep (5)		16;105:15,16,19,22;	legislation (1)	243:24;244:15
6:16;26:10;66:5;	lab (1)	106:4;113:8;114:8;	242:8	letter (77)
106:18;233:18	132:2	129:7,19;149:5,9,23;	legislative (33)	9:14;30:15,20;44:19,
keeps (1)	labeled (1)	151:11;162:14;167:21,	6:1;28:8,8;34:7;	22;45:3,5,24;49:23,25;
26:2	190:7	22;169:4;201:22;	46:20;53:6;62:20;63:4;	53:21,23,23;54:3,20;
kept (2)	lack (1)	206:21;208:13,14;	75:23;80:15;85:9;	55:1,5;56:25;57:3,11,
78:4;207:9	181:1	210:15;217:18;220:7,	109:24;111:11;145:9;	25;58:6;66:20,24;67:4,
kids' (1)	laid (3)	12,21;225:7;242:12	152:24;157:4;160:21;	21;70:18,21;71:1,17;
52:23	7:11;39:20;93:18	Lawyers (17)	180:5,8,18,23;181:16;	104:22;109:3,6,21;
kind (12)	Lamb (1)	20:10;25:7;27:12;	185:24;193:15;202:17;	110:11,15;141:13,17;
99:12;120:19;	4:10	34:7;37:17;49:7;66:6;	203:2,7,8,19;214:6,11;	142:7,19;146:17,25;
121:14;127:25;128:3;	land (2)	123:18;127:19;131:11;	224:1;234:10	147:1,18,25;148:8,9,
130:19;155:12,22;	73:20;76:19	133:12;135:1;139:25;	Legislature (120)	16;150:7,10,16,19,24;
231:24;233:11;236:23;	language (20)	148:22;170:20;201:10,	6:2;10:13;12:11,19,	151:24;152:20;153:21;
240:8	45:10;54:7;61:2;	13	20;18:15;21:21;26:9;	155:2;157:21,23;
kinds (2)	139:12;151:16;154:7,	lawyers' (1)	28:8;32:3,7;38:18;	160:25;161:3;162:7;
27:2;60:4	10,18,21;155:22;	8:7	41:8,13,16,20;42:17,	169:21;170:2,12;
KK (3)	160:17;161:24;163:19;	lawyer's (3)	20;43:20;44:14;45:7,	172:8;196:22;204:6,8,
79:25;80:6;84:10	173:18;200:2,8;	46:2;105:18;106:5	11,12,15;46:22;47:11,	11,20;221:20;225:13,
knew (9)	212:21;217:9;219:14;	lay (3)	22,23;48:22;49:9,23;	16,21,22,25
32:4;46:9;52:6;	220:5	73:7;93:10,19	50:5;52:3,8;55:15;	letters (11)
83:12,23;88:12;91:4;	large (1)	lays (2)	62:16,21;63:8,24;	33:10;108:2,3,5;
99:17,21	73:18	54:8,10	64:14;66:6,10,16;	129:12,24,25;160:4;
Knowing (1)	last (14)	lead (2)	70:15;80:19,25;81:8;	173:7;203:25;210:20
7:20	38:6;45:9;118:21;	166:13,14	84:22;86:3,22;92:13;	level (1)
knowingly (7)	123:5,6;124:10,15;	leadership (1)	97:20;99:25;100:8,10;	214:14
10:4;149:5;168:12,	133:21;189:2,13,13;	206:16	101:11;103:12;109:21;	liability (1)
14,20;186:23;201:23	227:10;243:7;245:25	leading (11)	110:3;117:20;126:18;	32:22
knowledge (17)	lastly (1)	121:5;166:8;190:22,	135:25;136:2,5,15;	liars (4)
58:5;86:18;102:3;	8:19	25;191:2,8,13;193:19;	141:10,14,15;142:10;	172:2,6;176:16,24
108:10;111:4;114:14;	Late (5)	205:23;206:4,6	143:4,13;144:1,5,7,22;	licensed (5)
124:7;144:8,13;	29:5;31:20;34:14;	leaked (1)	145:18;146:22;154:1;	16:20;20:23;46:2;
180:10;181:2;193:1,6;	37:4;65:12	240:10	157:13,20;158:4;	237:16;238:17
195:6,9;197:22;236:14	later (5)	learn (3)	159:19;162:17;164:7;	lieutenant (15)
known (4)	55:8;97:5;99:24;	35:6;38:11,14	173:12;175:21,21;	19:21;42:14;44:25;
17:18;19:12;107:10;	135:22;160:20	learned (9)	176:22;181:3,6;	45:2;49:12;50:20;
192:7	law (54)	35:8,9,14;38:15;	183:20;184:8;192:10;	57:15,15;109:2;147:4;
knows (8)	9:21;17:6;19:13,17;	39:14;87:6;91:14;	193:4;194:19,24;	153:24;156:24;160:9;
8:16;10:24;104:16;	25:5;36:20,20;42:7;	94:11;97:7	195:7,19;196:17;	170:5;204:6
105:15,22;167:22;	46:10;56:3;64:5,5;	least (5)	197:3,8,11,19;202:13,	life (1)
169:5;208:14	107:2;124:12;126:9,	25:11;85:15;111:16;	24;203:11,11;205:5;	126:11
Knudsen (23)	14,20,21,22;127:11;	123:5;235:22	206:10,15,16,17;	light (6)
4:15,17;6:10;9:7;	130:22,24;131:22,25;	led (2)	209:17;212:7;213:14;	55:24;75:25;107:2;
13:6,11;55:16;57:4;	132:6,11;133:1,7,11;	21:10;32:22	214:5,16;215:1;	163:3;164:3;186:1
59:7;79:15;120:3,7,12,	134:1,4,7;148:22;	left (10)	224:11,19	likelihood (1)
16;121:8;122:13;	152:3,16,22,23,25;	4:11,11;35:23;36:4;	legislatures (1)	25:20
153:14;165:4;187:8,	153:7,16;163:8;	37:4;64:19;90:2;97:5;	133:9	likely (5)
25;193:8;226:6;230:6	164:12;165:3;192:25;	126:21;137:20	Legislature's (28)	19:21;23:23;83:14;
Knudsen's (1)	193:5;197:12;198:10;	legal (41)	10:13;12:12;13:1;	91:5;104:14
74:5	200:24;206:18;219:17;	12:22;13:5,15;18:1;	30:18;45:17;49:4;53:4;	likewise (1)
Kris (3)	238:20;241:15;244:21;	20:17;24:2;30:18;74:9;	55:9;60:10;62:13;	12:5
71:6;109:3;204:6	245:14	75:23;88:3;111:24;	63:16;68:4,18;70:12;	limited (1)
Kristin (10)	laws (3)	133:5,6,10,14,25;	81:25;101:21;110:21;	233:6
19:21;42:14;43:3;	132:25;134:17;	134:13,17;135:6,12;	112:17;113:13;154:8;	limits (2)
49:11,15;55:16;106:8;	198:19	150:18;152:2;158:18;	156:13;194:10;195:14;	203:7;214:10
116:7,22;206:14	lawsuit (2)	162:1;167:14;185:24;	205:10;206:12;211:11;	line (5)
		,	,,,,,,,,,,_,,,,,,,,,	(- )

140:24;160:11; 192:2.20:228:22 lines (3) 124:1;173:9;223:1 lineup (1) 243:16 link(2)43:3:116:22 list (5) 15:1,3;16:2;119:13; 133:18 listed (2) 71:23;220:11 Literally (1) 208:4 litigated (4) 13:16;117:16;153:1; 176:1litigating (2) 32:19;89:3 litigation (51) 8:4;12:16,18;17:22; 18:20,23,25;19:2; 32:20;33:3,5;37:10; 43:10,13,18;44:5,17; 45:22;46:13;50:15; 62:9;63:23;78:7,9; 108:21,22;125:16; 126:22;128:2;130:10; 133:3:134:20.23; 135:2,8,23;136:4; 153:13:165:25:185:2: 189:24;192:12;194:14; 195:8:211:7:212:14: 215:7,16,22,25;216:2 litigator (1) 85:11 little (15) 4:21;6:9;17:1;18:17; 20:22;35:11;94:11; 114:23;125:25;126:4; 133:13:140:5:157:25: 244:10,25 live (3) 14:8,10;16:19 living (2) 20:16;58:17 loathe (2) 134:5,11 local (3) 131:22;132:1;134:6 located (1) 132:4 lodged (1) 143:16 log (1) 78:4 long(11)194:7;213:7;226:16, 25;227:13,16;230:20; 243:21;244:4,11,12 longer (4) 24:25;144:19;199:5;

224:20 Look (15) 33:18:40:2:49:21; 56:22;65:19;70:11; 92:7;104:23;109:12; 115:17;121:21;122:14; 138:19;143:22;213:21 looked (14) 49:25;51:21;64:5,11, 13:116:23:133:24; 142:1;149:23;152:18; 157:23;182:1,9;191:23 looking (3) 107:12;221:14; 225:20 looks (12) 22:25;27:23;34:3,7; 63:24;122:19;138:24; 141:5;142:12;173:10; 175:6;178:15 Loren (2) 126:15.16 losing (1) 237:7 lot (10) 21:8;24:12;25:16; 89:17;96:23;125:20; 127:19;132:24;134:5; 154:14 loud (1) 105:12 low (1) 114:21 Lower (1) 17:3 luck (1) 91:8 ludicrous (4) 54:12;161:5;162:8; 218:7 lunch (2) 119:17,23 lying (1) 171:24 Μ machine (2) 81:15;233:8 mad (1) 125:21 Madison (1) 46:10 mail (1) 84:5 main (1) 192:13 maintain (6) 123:22;124:11; 149:24;150:4;170:23; 233:16 maintaining (2) 149:18;204:1

maintains (2) 123:12:131:1 maior (3) 19:20:126:6:131:20 majority (1) 62:17 makes (5) 11:20;202:19;227:6; 228:18;232:2 making (1) 11:4 maligning (1) 58:16 man (2) 88:8;89:17 manage (2) 134:19;135:8 manager (1) 26:12 manages (1) 21:7 mandatory (1) 106:25 Manifold (1) 185:1 Manion (5) 28:10,12;30:17; 34:18,25 manner (4) 19:1,2:46:17:66:7 Manning (2) 27:24:28:9 manufacturers (1) 19:1 many (17) 8:13;19:3;20:11,12; 27:8;42:10;82:22;88:8; 89:4,6,6,17;117:15,22; 127:23;141:5;162:4 Marbury (1) 46:10 March (5) 77:5;138:7;179:13, 20;207:5 Mark (3) 9:8;142:23;232:1 marked (1) 121:16 married (1) 126:8 Maslow (1) 173:2 Maslow's (3) 175:3,5;218:14 master (2) 111:5,9 material (3) 32:16;60:20;78:3 materials (1) 66:12 math (1) 197:15 Matovich (1)

4:12 Matt (1) 34:8 matter (17) 9:9,20;46:21;55:23; 61:1;79:15;82:15; 95:21;113:9;138:14; 145:20,25;162:25; 163:1;187:24;209:18; 240:2 matters (5) 44:14;113:11; 239:19,19,22 May (28) 6:24;12:9,12;14:10; 26:22;29:13;57:5; 60:11;78:17,21;79:19; 95:14;96:7;119:11,14; 120:23;154:22;169:15, 20;173:11,13;187:3,5; 191:1;196:2;227:24; 228:19;243:15 maybe (14) 20:1;31:24,25;32:6; 125:24;128:8;129:10; 137:22;220:4,10; 239:19;240:1;241:6; 243:24 McGee (1) 4:12MCJC(4) 56:3.6:163:8:165:3 McLaughlin (76) 8:3;18:10,12,14; 21:4,6,15;22:8;23:5; 28:20;31:3;32:5;38:16; 41:14:43:19:44:5.9: 48:8,13,24;58:7;60:12; 65:16,20;66:14;68:23; 75:13:76:13:77:20: 82:20;86:22;99:18,25; 100:7;102:12;104:3; 112:6,12;135:21; 136:4,8,12;143:17; 144:18;145:3,6,8,22; 146:3,8;156:1,2,9; 157:12;162:18;163:1; 185:14;194:18;197:23; 198:25;220:16;224:15; 226:11,17;227:5; 229:5,9,12,23;236:19; 237:12:238:4:239:16: 243:12:244:13:245:23 McLaughlin's (10) 26:21;82:15;110:1; 140:17;158:2;223:20; 234:25;235:5,13; 237:20 mean (43) 12:14:13:17:27:17, 25;33:17;36:17,24; 40:9;41:10;46:11; 51:25;52:1,6;72:4;

Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

81:16:91:7:100:3; 106:12:116:17.22: 121:13;127:24;137:21; 145:19;151:1;163:20; 171:23;182:4;194:8; 206:3,13,15;207:13; 208:23;211:2;214:15; 220:18;221:20;222:25; 223:3,5;234:7;239:24 Meaning (4) 73:12;75:22;90:17, 18 means (5) 106:25;134:6;182:6; 227:5;234:8 meant (4) 36:14;46:12;89:21; 150:19 measures (2) 14:23;208:6 mechanism (4) 35:9:165:6:199:18: 210:1 mechanisms (1) 199:15 media (6) 39:15;43:4;50:24; 51:20;77:14;156:16 medical (4) 23:25:24:5:26:25; 52:18 meet (4) 9:11:125:14.20; 228:13 member (6) 13:7;19:10;20:4,7; 80:8;208:4 members (17) 4:10;6:25;7:22;9:5; 13:22;21:4;45:18;77:4; 78:20;79:1;118:15; 119:18;120:1;121:4; 216:16;245:15;246:6 memory (6) 20:3;65:3;95:3; 195:25;196:1,5 mental (1) 95:10 mention (3) 37:16;38:3;86:11 mentioned (8) 13:4;20:15;38:2,6; 40:8;183:24,25;220:9 mentioning (2) 44:6;50:23 mentor (1) 18:21 mentors (1) 126:15 merit (1) 5:11 merits (2) 36:22;114:19

# Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

In the Matter of Austin R	liuusen	1	1	October 09, 2024
	Missouls (4)	17.110.4.120.4.	56.19 22.62.16 19 10.	4.9.0.5.16.16 17.
message (3)	Missoula (4)	17;119:4;120:4;	56:18,23;63:16,18,19;	4:8;9:5;16:16,17;
35:23;37:5;95:5	16:19;17:17;126:10;	121:19;124:19;126:5,	64:15,25;65:9,11;	17:21;74:5;120:11;
messages (1)	132:4	7,9,13,18,19;127:3;	80:16;81:24;82:7,9;	122:21;123:13;137:5;
235:23	misspoke (4)	130:4;131:7,8,16,16,	83:20;86:10;90:11,23;	139:19;162:22;173:3;
met (5)	28:12;48:1;121:8;	23,25;132:6,8,11,20;	97:11;102:18;103:2;	184:7;189:19;190:16;
125:8,22;137:8;	184:4	133:15,23;134:1;	113:2;129:8,10,10;	192:2;222:12;230:14
236:15;238:12	misstated (2)	139:13;140:11,16;	130:16,19;136:19;	namely (1)
mic (1)	60:20,24	141:10;143:25;148:2;	138:15;139:14,14,19;	18:11
17:12	misstatements (2)	150:8;153:15,16;	140:3,9;141:4,13;	names (7)
middle (1)	69:15;70:2	157:20;158:8,22;	143:12;146:8,14;	24:14,16,17,17;
107:11	misstates (1)	161:15;162:6;163:12;	148:11;157:12,15;	52:23,25;55:14
might (16)	112:8		160:16;169:16;188:10;	narcotics (1)
		164:23;167:4,18;		
14:5;25:11;26:24;	mistake (2)	171:3,12;172:9;	190:1,12,14;195:19;	131:19
27:1;48:19;74:18;	139:23;190:12	176:16,23;177:25;	196:16;197:8,17,19;	nation's (2)
157:5;181:25;184:18;	mistaken (2)	179:15;182:25;183:12,	199:13,23;204:12,15;	74:19;184:18
198:19;209:24;213:8;	94:16;188:15	15;184:8,17,22;185:7;	209:22;212:24,25;	nature (1)
220:11;233:4;242:22;	Mistakes (3)	186:5,9,25;191:24;	213:2;216:23;217:23,	209:1
244:12	139:18,21;140:2	192:5,10;194:10;	23;218:3;221:2,2,10,	Nault (1)
Mike (7)	Misty (6)	195:6;197:2,13,18;	12,14,25,25;222:9;	4:11
4:10;27:24;28:9,10,	22:12;30:16;91:20;	200:9;201:9,13;202:9,	232:18;234:22;235:1,	near (1)
12;30:17;34:18	93:16;95:8;144:1	13,15,24;203:10;	5,14,19;236:3,21;	125:11
Miles (6)	mitigate (1)	204:7;205:1,17;	237:22;238:3	necessarily (6)
4:15,17;79:15;120:3,	58:9	206:19;207:2;208:2;	motions (8)	27:4;65:19;172:1;
12;187:25	mixed (2)	209:17;210:8;211:9;	6:12,15;15:11;	210:2;212:24;232:11
mind (5)	107:22;136:10	212:6;214:18;215:1,	189:20;217:6,11;	necessary (7)
26:10;63:7;64:7;	MJA (2)	21;219:4;220:15;	234:18;236:11	128:16;161:25;
94:23;106:19	61:7;173:24	221:1,24;222:20;	motor (1)	208:22;210:4;219:14,
mindset (1)	MM (1)	230:17,19,23;231:8,14,	131:13	15,20
95:2	195:25	22;232:14,18,20;233:9,	mouth (1)	need (12)
mine (2)	modify (1)	13,16;234:9,17;236:10,	217:20	17:11;24:25;25:21;
17:24;240:25	128:23	14,20,22;238:18;	move (18)	27:13;41:12;56:22;
mini (1)	moment (6)	240:16,22;241:4,15;	14:24;15:5,8,20;	65:19;70:10;73:20;
96:13	78:18;95:15;96:6;	242:8	16:4;29:22;48:22;63:1;	85:13;205:8;226:24
minimize (1)	187:4;226:12;244:16	Montana's (3)	78:21,23;84:8;93:6;	needed (4)
140:6	Monday (18)	13:12;134:16,17	104:9;109:18;111:2;	19:16;64:13;90:13;
ministerial (1)	33:24;35:13;38:10,	Montane (1)	113:13;121:25;208:8	91:6
85:25	20;39:7;43:5;44:2,15;	177:12	moved (4)	needless (1)
minute (1)	83:4,15;91:8;92:17;	months (1)	17:17;84:8;112:25;	155:11
90:7		179:15	162:16	needs (3)
	100:2;146:16;198:1;			
minutes (7)	233:20;237:6,8	moot (4)	moves (2)	14:9;65:23;93:10
79:11;90:8;115:1;	Montana (212)	63:2,7,18;100:5	13:24;113:8	negatively (1)
119:15;187:15;216:8;	4:25;5:5;8:14;9:16,	more (14)	Moving (3)	212:20
245:8	17;10:13;12:19,21;	47:14,23;89:12;95:4,	101:18;165:25;217:2	neglected (1)
misbehavior (6)	13:13;16:19,21,23;	4;99:16;116:18,19;	much (13)	78:21
74:25;75:25;76:16;	17:4;18:15;19:13,17,	128:4;131:11;148:10;	13:5,9;18:7;64:3;	negotiating (1)
184:25;186:1,23	19;21:21;32:23;33:14;	243:23;244:7,8	87:8;119:10;127:11;	81:9
mischaracterizes (3)	43:19;44:24;45:23;	morning (25)	128:4,25;130:9;	negotiations (1)
108:14;211:16,19	53:25;54:14,25;55:1,9;	4:6;9:4;25:1;35:13;	131:11;181:14;205:7	111:6
misconduct (25)	56:7,16;58:11;59:12;	38:5,12;83:4,15;91:13;	multiple (2)	neighborhood (1)
7:6;8:7;9:19;11:20;	60:1;61:8;62:2,13,20,	94:24;95:9;160:14;	6:12;211:2	245:8
55:24,25;56:8,12;	21;63:16;67:10,20,21;	226:19;227:20;228:2,	Murray (2)	network (5)
61:16;105:3;151:11;	70:5;72:3,10,13,24;	5,8,17;229:5,13,24;	17:9,16	180:8,24;181:17;
162:3;163:2,12;164:1,	73:9,12;74:9,13,14,17,	237:8;245:22,24;246:4	must (7)	223:25;224:17
				·
3,8,15;165:5,17;166:6;	22;75:6,14,22;76:5,10;	most (7) 72:15:129:1:100:19:	10:3,9,21;11:15;	new (10)
210:15;217:2,5;218:3	81:25;82:21,23;83:3,	73:15;128:1;190:18;	12:5;69:10;218:21	9:12;39:8,9,16,21;
misremembered (1)	13;84:22;86:2,8,18;	192:9;204:23;232:6;	myself (1)	53:5;79:23;99:24;
96:18	87:3;88:15;89:5;96:21;	233:1	127:6	117:21;156:1
missed (2)	97:20;99:22;102:19;	mostly (1)		news (2)
25:24;241:7	103:3,10;104:4,13;	18:5	Ν	92:16;107:10
			1	$N_{+}$ (20)
missing (1)	107:25;108:18;109:20;	motion (97)		Next (20)
		<b>motion (97)</b> 15:14;35:10;37:4,7;	nail (2)	Next (20) 10:20;11:6;23:21;
missing (1)	107:25;108:18;109:20;		nail (2) 173:10;175:7	
<b>missing (1)</b> 207:16	107:25;108:18;109:20; 110:12,20;111:13,15,	15:14;35:10;37:4,7;		10:20;11:6;23:21;

		1	1	
124:5;164:9;189:18,	16:3;67:10;119:4;	obligation (20)	87:18;88:19;99:6,10,	Officially (1)
21;208:8;224:8;226:8,	125:2	7:20;10:5,7,10,14;	10;139:7;176:5;194:17	170:11
10,20	notifying (2)	106:12;149:6,11,24;	offer (5)	officials (1)
nexus (1)	85:23;109:22	150:21;159:12,15;	9:11;39:1,3;111:5;	31:11
11:16	Notwithstanding (1)	164:18;176:8;201:23,	170:8	often (7)
nice (2)	189:22	25;202:8;203:22;	offered (1)	24:13;129:17,21;
78:14;238:15	not-yet-binding (1)	204:25;205:4	93:14	134:22,22;153:10;
nine (2)	117:17	obligations (9)	Office (142)	221:5
4:25;11:19	novel (4)	12:15;26:16;58:18;	4:16;5:9,10,23;6:20;	OGLE (91)
Ninth (1)	154:20;202:20;	72:23,23;124:22,22,24;	7:1;9:10;13:14;22:14;	4:6,8;6:23;8:24;9:3;
20:14	213:13,19	151:22	24:25;26:22;44:20,23;	13:20;14:1,4,12,17;
nobody's (1)	November (1)	observed (1)	46:16,18,24,25;47:2,	15:2,9,11,23;16:10;
97:18	230:24	129:2	22;49:8;51:8,12,24;	29:14,24;78:19,24;
noise (1)	nowadays (1)	obtain (1)	52:9;53:20,24;54:22;	79:3,10;80:3,5,10;93:8,
187:21	127:11	98:15	55:4,15;58:2,20;60:7;	19;95:16;96:8;104:11;
nonattorneys (1)	Number (20)	obtained (2)	62:22;64:22;65:13;	108:17;115:3;118:14;
5:1	4:18,19;8:8;19:24;	17:5;106:17	66:17,21,25;67:3,19,	119:9,14,22;121:7;
none (4)	79:16,16;104:22;	obvious (1)	25;70:15,19,22,25;	122:2,4,10,12;153:19;
		174:18		
118:10;147:14;	115:18;131:9,19;		72:9,12;73:1;77:8;	166:10,16;181:20;
218:23;225:9	132:15;139:6;155:2;	<b>obviously (8)</b>	79:22;85:5;101:19;	187:5,9,14,18;190:23;
nonpartisan (2)	187:25;188:1;190:6,7;	142:13;153:25;	102:24;103:4,12,21;	191:7,16,18;193:21;
5:2,20	200:1;233:6;234:2	159:24;206:3;217:22;	105:25;106:10;107:6,	196:6,12;205:24;
nonparty (3)	numbering (1)	224:11,13;238:25	15,23;108:6,10;	206:5;211:21;216:5,9,
27:10;75:9;185:9	189:10	occur (2)	109:20;113:21;114:15;	13;219:10;226:4,8;
nonpolitical (2)	Numbers (1)	27:1;78:7	115:11;116:10;118:8;	227:10,12,18,22;
5:2,20	42:12	occurred (5)	120:2;123:16;130:10;	228:14,21;229:1,7,17,
non-privileged (1)	numeral (1)	9:15;84:23;85:16;	131:15;132:4,9,14,21,	20,25;230:3,7;237:19,
100:13	60:19	94:19;197:23	24;135:19,23;136:1,5,	25;241:22;242:15;
non-substantive (3)	numerous (6)	occurring (1)	14;137:1,15;138:9,21;	243:7,14,21,25;244:4,
36:21,24;86:23	63:22;69:15;117:18;	242:4	141:4;144:5,7;146:17;	9,17,23;245:9,18
noon (1)	140:23;160:8;190:15	o'clock (7)	150:25;153:4;155:1,2,	old (1)
94:11	0	79:12;119:24;	21;156:21;157:1,12;	6:14
Nope (1)	0	226:19;227:19;237:6,	158:18;159:3;160:25;	once (4)
Nope (1) 150:15		226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25;	<b>once (4)</b> 25:19;64:4;101:20;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2)	oath (22)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12;	<b>once (4)</b> 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11,	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72)
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20;	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15,	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25;	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22,	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17,
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1,
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13,	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15;	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21,	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 officer (28)	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19,	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0970 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;22:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0970 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;22:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4;	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b>	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7,	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1)
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8;	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b>	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22 notified (2)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8; 237:14,23;242:10,15	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15; 140:20;141:25;142:4;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b> 201:4	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18 ones (5)
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22 notified (2) 67:20;197:25	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8; 237:14,23;242:10,15 objections (2)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15; 140:20;141:25;142:4; 170:5;197:18;221:3;	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b> 201:4 <b>official (8)</b>	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18 ones (5) 26:14;63:5;64:9;
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22 notified (2) 67:20;197:25 notifies (1)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8; 237:14,23;242:10,15 objections (2) 15:19;16:1	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15; 140:20;141:25;142:4; 170:5;197:18;221:3; 222:1	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b> 201:4 <b>official (8)</b> 122:21;123:1,12;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18 ones (5) 26:14;63:5;64:9; 113:12;138:9
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22 notified (2) 67:20;197:25 notifies (1) 45:5	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8; 237:14,23;242:10,15 objections (2) 15:19;16:1 obligated (2)	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15; 140:20;141:25;142:4; 170:5;197:18;221:3; 222:1 off (11)	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b> 201:4 <b>official (8)</b> 122:21;123:1,12; 170:21;201:4;232:2;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18 ones (5) 26:14;63:5;64:9; 113:12;138:9 ongoing (2)
Nope (1) 150:15 Nor (2) 120:23;168:21 normal (9) 27:18,18;28:20; 41:11;47:3;76:25; 189:23;234:17;236:25 normally (4) 27:11;78:6;234:15; 237:4 north (1) 132:7 Northeastern (2) 17:6;126:12 note (3) 16:7;61:13;174:21 noted (2) 16:11;27:5 notes (1) 191:6 notice (6) 5:21;15:12,20;77:4; 231:24;232:7 notification (1) 36:22 notified (2) 67:20;197:25 notifies (1)	oath (22) 7:25,25;13:6,9,11, 13;14:15;122:17; 123:1,6,16,17;124:15, 17;125:3,6;149:15,22, 24;180:14;191:23,25 oaths (1) 121:18 obey (7) 42:3;46:3;54:22; 67:23;119:5;164:21; 211:9 object (4) 93:12;104:9;181:18; 211:15 objection (32) 14:2,25;15:9,10; 16:5;29:24,25;80:4; 93:8,17;94:9;104:6; 108:14;112:6;121:25; 122:2,3;153:17;166:8; 181:1;191:13;193:19; 196:6;204:16;216:3; 219:6;228:10;229:8; 237:14,23;242:10,15 objections (2) 15:19;16:1	226:19;227:19;237:6, 9;245:22 October (5) 121:19;122:17,22; 123:2;125:2 ODC (39) 4:18;7:23;8:21;9:11, 20;10:3,9,21;11:4,7,11, 14,19;13:4,9,24;14:14, 24;16:1;79:16;93:15, 23;107:20;108:24; 109:10;110:6,18; 115:4;188:1,13,17; 189:3;193:23;229:2, 22;233:25;245:4,16,23 ODC0070 (1) 139:8 ODC's (4) 11:24;12:2;91:16; 191:22 odds (1) 114:21 Oestreicher (20) 49:12;55:17;57:16; 71:6,20;106:8;137:3,7, 13,20;138:8,8;139:15; 140:20;141:25;142:4; 170:5;197:18;221:3; 222:1	158:18;159:3;160:25; 162:16;164:4,25; 170:4;171:10;173:12; 179:5,8;183:20;188:9; 189:15;190:2,4; 196:15;197:7;206:9; 207:17,21,22;211:25; 221:22;222:5;224:2; 231:7,17,20;232:12,13, 23;233:10,14,18; 235:12;236:17;239:21, 23;240:5,7,11;242:17 <b>officer (28)</b> 7:25;8:1;12:18; 13:15;18:1;20:17;74:9; 124:22;132:8;133:25; 134:1,4,13;140:11; 149:15;150:18;151:19, 22;152:2;159:11; 166:3,18;167:14; 186:4;201:4,15; 208:17,18 <b>officers (5)</b> 68:19;123:23; 135:14;149:19;150:1 <b>officer's (1)</b> 201:4 <b>official (8)</b> 122:21;123:1,12;	once (4) 25:19;64:4;101:20; 160:25 one (72) 5:20;9:18;20:7; 24:22,23;25:11;26:16; 29:2;30:20,21;34:17, 24,25;36:5;38:5;48:1, 2,3;63:10;64:7;72:6; 81:10,15,23;83:1; 96:24,25;98:1;114:24; 117:21;120:15,25; 123:21;137:13;138:8; 141:20;142:1;143:23; 145:20;146:20;147:14; 149:20;151:22;152:20; 159:6,9;162:15;164:9; 166:4,22;168:7,21; 173:6;176:5;178:9,16; 180:12;182:9;183:12; 191:19;192:13,19,19; 196:22;201:2,17; 207:16;217:21;219:3; 235:22;236:22;245:15 one-day (1) 19:18 ones (5) 26:14;63:5;64:9; 113:12;138:9

only (17)	70:11,14;71:13,13,24;	192:15	206:6;209:19;215:4;	pardon (2)
6:4;40:12;50:2;87:2;	72:5,8,10,14,19,24;	out (56)	237:10	29:4;45:1
89:7;108:3;124:12;	83:19;97:24;98:4,4,8,8,	7:11;18:20;25:7,8;	owner (1)	parent (1)
144:22;152:18;164:11;	15;102:19;103:10,15;	27:15;39:13,15,20;	47:4	237:7
			47.4	
165:22;217:21;223:20;	109:23;110:2;115:7,	43:11;44:12;46:13;	Р	parentheses (1)
227:24;235:20,24;	10,19;116:4;117:5,6;	50:13;51:20;52:25;	P	72:2
237:9	119:5;128:23;130:6,	57:11;59:21;62:9;		parents' (1)
onto (1)	15,22;131:1;146:13,18,	64:19;65:21;70:15;	PA (1)	24:17
32:25	23;147:19;148:1,16;	74:24;75:16;77:17;	29:21	Parker (4)
Oops (1)	150:21,25;152:5,16,17,	81:9;88:11;95:18;	page (89)	9:8;36:8;86:17;
145:9	18,19,19,22;153:3,6,9,	98:10;105:12;114:3;	23:11;30:25;34:5;	243:23
open (17)	16;156:18;157:6;	116:16;131:21;132:7,	39:24;40:3,4;41:6;	part (11)
10:6,9;107:16;109:6;	158:3,25;160:20,24;	17;146:15;148:9;	45:9;49:20,20;50:2;	29:20;32:22;33:22;
110:15;148:4,7,10;	164:21;169:20;173:13;	152:8;154:21;163:18;	55:13,20,21,21;57:13;	73:16;99:5;111:17;
149:9,11;153:8;	178:4,7;182:8,21;	170:20,21;174:17;	58:13;59:4;60:18;61:2,	124:4;152:15;168:23;
160:11;164:17;186:6;	183:19,20,22;197:22;	176:12;178:21;184:24;	13,19;65:25;68:10,16,	235:16;240:6
201:24;203:21;233:24	198:8,10,12,15;211:6,	185:16;196:14;200:16,	23;69:5,6,6,7,13;74:12,	parte (27)
opening (4)	6,10,18;212:4,20,22;	21;201:18;204:5;	12,22;75:3,13,20;	36:17,19;37:4;40:24;
6:21;8:25;13:4;	218:18;222:20;223:12;	210:25;217:21;225:20;	91:18;96:12,13;	41:9,17;83:18,24;
121:9	226:14,23;233:14;	229:23;233:3;240:10	109:18;110:25;111:1;	84:17,20,23;85:18;
openly (7)	234:10;236:6	outcome (4)	122:20,25;123:6,21;	86:12,15,20;87:3;89:4;
10:11;67:10,20;	ordered (15)	61:4;173:20;235:10,	124:15;139:6,7;140:8,	91:1;93:3,4,24;94:14;
124:21,24;129:5;	65:6;66:10,18;70:23;	11	21,22;141:1;154:25;	95:11;97:9;98:19,24;
150:19	115:14;116:5;118:23;	outright (1)	155:2;161:3;162:24,	146:8
operate (1)	178:22;179:6,25;	172:6	24;168:10;170:15;	participate (1)
189:15	180:12,12;182:9;	outside (11)	173:17,17;174:21;	213:13
opinion (5)	211:16,17	14:6,6;19:6;54:16;	175:3,12;178:15;	participated (2)
69:14;150:13;165:1,	ordering (3)			61:7;173:23
	65:5;116:14;207:3	118:7;133:8;161:8,22;	182:15,19;184:6,10,15,	
1;182:20		162:9;211:6;218:8	22;185:5,13,21,22;	participates (1)
opinions (5)	orderly (4)	<b>over (43)</b> 6:10,14;20:22;27:19;	188:21,23,23;189:3,4,	189:24
76:6;86:21;107:3;	6:17;25:17;31:7; 118:3		5,8,9;191:23;193:23;	participating (1) 106:5
113:11;135:13		32:15;33:23,24;38:9,	220:21;222:6	
opportunities (1)	orders (23)	17;39:6,7;47:15;51:3;	Pages (6)	particular (4)
205:20	15:18;24:14;54:22;	54:11;78:5;83:13,20;	49:20;109:12;	6:5;63:5;133:1;
opportunity (5)	59:17;65:23;72:21;	91:12,12;92:12,15;	110:23;121:23;139:6;	186:22
5:7,15;6:10;41:8;	86:21;98:12;128:11,	132:1;133:14;134:6;	157:18	particularly (7)
246:1	15;129:13,24;158:24;	154:17;156:21;159:23,	panageric (1)	21:23;92:18;129:6;
246:1 oppose (1)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23;	<b>panageric (1)</b> 185:8	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2;	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14
246:1 <b>oppose (1)</b> 64:10 <b>opposed (2)</b>	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11,	<b>panageric (1)</b> 185:8 <b>panegyric (2)</b> 75:8,8	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2)
246:1 <b>oppose (1)</b> 64:10 <b>opposed (2)</b> 63:19;148:11	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3;	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 <b>parties (2)</b> 6:13;232:22
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23;	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 <b>overlooked (1)</b> 60:20	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16;	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18,	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18,	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2)	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5;
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;     50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7;</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1)	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;     50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7;     57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2,</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6;	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;     50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7;     57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2,     10;68:10;139:11;</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1)	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;     50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7;     57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2,     10;68:10;139:11;     170:15;189:2,13,13</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25	<pre>panageric (1)     185:8 panegyric (2)     75:8,8 panel (4)     4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5)     30:11;180:3,16;     232:23,24 papers (1)     31:18 paragraph (22)     31:2,6;38:7;45:9;     50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7;     57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2,     10;68:10;139:11;     170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1)</pre>	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124)	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124) 10:15;15:13;20:13;	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4) 26:22;106:3;123:4;	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15 own (24)	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1) 7:4	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14 past (1)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124) 10:15;15:13;20:13; 40:23;41:3,11;42:2,3,	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4) 26:22;106:3;123:4; 228:17	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15 own (24) 18:23;31:18;61:16;	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1) 7:4 paralegals (1) 24:23	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14 past (1) 244:25
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124) 10:15;15:13;20:13; 40:23;41:3,11;42:2,3, 9;43:14;45:12,24;46:4;	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4) 26:22;106:3;123:4; 228:17 O'Toole (4)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15 own (24) 18:23;31:18;61:16; 75:9,17;87:25;111:17,	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1) 7:4 paralegals (1)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14 past (1) 244:25 path (1)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124) 10:15;15:13;20:13; 40:23;41:3,11;42:2,3, 9;43:14;45:12,24;46:4; 47:19;50:3,4;53:5,9,11, 19,19;59:8;61:1;62:8,	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4) 26:22;106:3;123:4; 228:17 O'Toole (4) 126:14,15,16,20	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15 own (24) 18:23;31:18;61:16; 75:9,17;87:25;111:17, 21;112:5;114:6; 126:21;135:1;144:13;	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1) 7:4 paralegals (1) 24:23 parallel (2) 53:10;100:6	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14 past (1) 244:25 path (1) 50:11 Patrol (2)
246:1 oppose (1) 64:10 opposed (2) 63:19;148:11 opposing (7) 45:23;85:14,20,23; 103:6;107:5;191:4 opposite (3) 18:5;129:3;152:7 opposition (1) 198:21 option (1) 213:23 oral (4) 121:18;123:6; 124:15;129:10 orally (2) 8:2;130:16 order (124) 10:15;15:13;20:13; 40:23;41:3,11;42:2,3, 9;43:14;45:12,24;46:4; 47:19;50:3,4;53:5,9,11,	15;129:13,24;158:24; 178:16;179:16;183:12; 193:10;198:4,5; 205:18;207:8;220:9,15 ordinary (1) 33:1 organizations (1) 20:6 orient (1) 62:25 original (11) 18:14;40:10;43:8,18, 25;44:6;48:23;136:13; 156:2;231:9,24 originally (3) 138:23;154:24; 166:12 others (3) 19:23;184:7;220:11 otherwise (4) 26:22;106:3;123:4; 228:17 O'Toole (4) 126:14,15,16,20 ours (2)	154:17;156:21;159:23, 23;193:25;197:23; 200:25;202:16;203:2; 204:3;234:18;236:11, 12;237:4,22;238:3; 242:5;244:23;245:17 overlooked (1) 60:20 Overruled (1) 219:10 oversee (1) 131:10 oversight (2) 122:8;133:14 overstepped (1) 152:10 overtures (1) 5:25 owes (1) 240:15 own (24) 18:23;31:18;61:16; 75:9,17;87:25;111:17, 21;112:5;114:6;	panageric (1) 185:8 panegyric (2) 75:8,8 panel (4) 4:9,9;5:12,17 paper (5) 30:11;180:3,16; 232:23,24 papers (1) 31:18 paragraph (22) 31:2,6;38:7;45:9; 50:22,22,23;51:1,7,7; 57:13;58:13,13;66:1,2, 10;68:10;139:11; 170:15;189:2,13,13 Paragraphs (1) 41:6 paralegal (1) 7:4 paralegals (1) 24:23 parallel (2)	21:23;92:18;129:6; 132:18;150:17;158:18; 167:14 parties (2) 6:13;232:22 partisan (1) 12:13 partners (4) 24:22;25:5,6;34:8 party (14) 86:3;97:16,18,21,22; 98:25;99:3;118:3; 130:3;166:14;201:5; 203:13;204:3;209:11 party's (1) 212:15 passed (2) 6:1;147:8 passing (1) 195:14 past (1) 244:25 path (1) 50:11

127:6 PD (5) 30:14,14,15;31:1; 132:9 **PDs**(1) 132:1 peace (1) 132:8 pendency (1) 194:13 pending (8) 11:14:63:5:72:14; 102:20;194:11;207:23; 215:11:242:8 people (18) 4:23;12:21;13:13; 20:22;25:20;86:16; 125:20;130:23,23; 131:10;134:6;171:4; 230:23;231:7,22; 237:8;240:16,22 people's (1) 13:17 perceived (1) 91:11 perhaps (3) 100:19;108:12; 130:18 period (5) 116:3;197:16;207:2; 219:25:239:10 permissible (1) 21:16 permission (3) 79:8.21:121:5 permits (3) 147:17,18;166:14 permitted (4) 75:21,22;103:25; 185:23 person (6) 87:17,18;88:18; 141:17;231:12;233:7 personal (13) 17:1,2;32:23;92:5; 126:1;181:1;215:4; 225:10,14,24;239:18; 240:18;241:8 personally (14) 61:4;154:2;173:20; 190:1,11,13;191:10; 207:25:208:25:209:12: 221:4,5,12;227:2 personnel (1) 241:14 persons (1) 31:16 perspective (1) 91:3 pertaining (3) 24:7;52:14;199:1 perverse (8) 61:14,14;174:21,21,

22,24,25;218:12 petition (74) 19:15:23:20:28:25: 30:5;33:14;34:12;35:4; 36:1,2,23;38:13;40:24; 41:9,21;43:25,25; 44:18;48:23;49:4;50:4; 53:4:60:8,11,25:63:2, 21;65:16,20;67:13; 68:1,4;70:7,12;71:21; 72:2,5,15;73:2,6,22; 74:6;76:23;77:1;86:5; 91:4;92:25;95:6;97:19; 99:7:101:21;110:1,21; 112:9:113:14,17: 114:18,19,22;115:17; 130:19;143:6;156:1,9; 157:13;158:2;173:12; 179:10;182:16,18; 183:16;184:1,14; 194:10:211:19 petitions (4) 60:23;96:21;217:6, 12 phone (9) 21:15;35:22;37:1; 84:4,20;86:12;87:2; 228:20;235:23 physically (1) 190:19 piece (1) 133:20 **PII** (1) 208:6 place (2) 35:10;107:7 places (1) 88:17 placing (1) 203:24 plain (1) 9:15 plainly (1) 198:12 planning (1) 113:10 plans (1) 24:24 pleading (3) 39:20;47:17;162:7 pleadings (2) 47:14;189:20 Please (44) 6:23,24;9:3;14:5,17; 16:18,25;18:18;23:11; 29:8;38:3;39:22;40:2; 41:1,22;43:23;50:18; 58:15;62:25;65:24; 72:7;112:3;120:11; 121:21;126:1;131:3; 138:19;139:5;140:4; 142:18,20;157:18,25; 162:21;168:10;170:19;

171:6;180:13;188:18; 189:1.18:220:23: 225:21:243:16 Plentywood (1) 126:13 plowing (1) 6:14 plus (3)29:21;34:7;179:21 pm (8) 23:1,8;119:25; 187:17,17;228:25,25; 246:7 point (27) 6:9;11:14;17:8; 25:12;87:23;101:8; 114:3;118:21;127:1; 139:21;141:18;145:11, 11;146:5;148:2;157:9; 162:14;163:17;178:21; 195:20,21;206:25; 212:3;215:16;217:21; 233:3;245:12 pointed (4) 194:3;196:14; 201:18;204:5 pointing (4) 152:8;174:17; 200:16,21 police (1) 134:7 policy (4) 155:21:239:25; 240:1:242:17 polite (2) 171:10;219:4 politely (1) 171:6 political (3) 5:24:6:3,17 politician (1) 237:6 poll (2) 140:17;242:7 polling (9) 61:16;81:3,4;112:22; 141:6;146:3;175:23; 199:1;218:10 polls (2) 61:7;173:23 portion (2) 149:8:171:21 position (37) 10:12,14,18;37:1; 46:19;51:18;62:13; 63:15;103:7;108:11; 126:25;150:20,22; 153:5,12;154:8;159:3, 4,10,20;161:4;174:5; 175:20,25;176:4,9; 177:1;202:24;203:1,3, 5;209:16;212:9;214:7; 231:13,16;237:21

positions (4) 117:11:134:17: 211:7:215:7 possession (5) 51:24;164:5;180:1; 199:6;224:21 possible (10) 90:24;102:17; 118:10;204:14,17; 205:11;206:23;226:23; 228:7;232:24 possibly (1) 104:16 posttrial (2) 244:20:245:14 potential (2) 199:23;200:16 potentially (5) 24:5;25:7;27:10; 52:10;209:18 power (15) 75:24,24;99:13; 114:6;118:1;152:24; 159:8;185:24,25; 203:7,8;214:11,13,16; 234:22 powers (6) 10:16;155:6;193:14; 205:6;212:7;213:13 PR (3) 4:18:79:16:188:1 Practice (19) 4:9,20,23;5:3;17:22, 23;18:20,24;45:22; 54:24;59:11;62:1; 85:12;89:3;112:24; 126:12,21;127:10; 129:16 practiced (2) 82:20;238:20 practices (2) 61:16:68:19 practicing (1) 148:22 precedent (4) 117:17;162:1; 163:18;203:6 predominantly (1) 18:24 prejudge (1) 198:19 prejudice (6) 13:1;86:24;204:14; 207:12,14;222:22 prejudicial (4) 8:19;11:10;151:12; 210:16 prepare (1) 78:3 prepared (3) 15:1;39:20;188:2 preserve (2) 147:7;168:4

### Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

President (8) 17:20.25:20:18: 31:21,25:32:10; 142:23:196:23 press (4) 153:5;159:4;206:16, 25 Presumably (4) 96:1;111:14,16; 114:7 presume (2) 144:16,21 presumed (2) 168:12;186:24 presuming (1) 57:20 presumption (1) 144:22 pretended (1) 162:14 Pretty (8) 18:7;34:14;41:10; 48:15;71:20;133:4; 163:16;192:16 prevail (2) 135:13;160:5 prevailed (1) 219:24 prevailing (1) 159:22 previous (4) 133:9:188:23: 212:25:223:14 previously (2) 6:15:137:9 primarily (1) 133:3 principles (1) 10:16 prior (6) 15:11:82:19:93:13: 116:13:145:1;236:7 prisoner (1) 237:6 private (7) 32:16,23;33:13; 52:11,13;109:8;126:12 privilege (4) 27:7;47:6;78:4; 181:19 privileged (9) 21:12;25:18;27:11, 15;32:16;78:3;92:11; 100:18;101:9 probably (22) 23:7;46:14;85:21; 99:15;103:9;112:20; 114:12;119:20;128:7; 129:15;131:18,24; 136:10:145:10:154:15, 17;168:7;176:11; 199:21;225:5;228:3,5

problem (6)

Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen October 09, 2024				
26:25;92:3;101:15;	36:16	167:21	111:15;152:20;178:6	reaching (1)
113:23;140:7;241:12	project (3)	provinces (1)	quashes (1)	199:18
procedural (2)	25:1,15,23	20:20	53:13	reaction (1)
43:15;90:20	prompted (2)	provision (2)	quashing (7)	46:6
procedure (17)	75:16;185:17	54:11;232:21	53:6;111:17;117:5,6;	read (50)
33:11;47:3;72:4;	promptly (1)	prudent (1)	156:18;160:21;234:10	37:15,23;45:20;46:2;
127:9,12,14,16,17;	236:10	166:2	questionable (3)	49:18;54:3,5,18;55:18;
147:21,23,24,24,25;	promulgated (2)	<b>PST</b> (2)	68:12;69:21;218:17	56:4;57:11,22;58:22;
148:14,25;232:20;	124:18;149:21	38:8;92:15	quickly (2)	59:2;60:14;61:11,24;
236:24	pronounced (1)	public (24)	90:24;166:1	68:7,14,21;69:16;
proceed (4)	137:9	9:14;52:12,25;55:24;	quiet (1)	73:25;74:20;75:1,11,
6:23;9:3;79:19;	pronouncing (1)	61:9;108:8,12;109:16;	187:20	18;76:2;105:10,11,12;
229:14	137:5	110:4,17,22;140:12;	<b>quit</b> (1)	107:4;151:1;157:17;
proceeded (1)	propelled (5)	163:3,13,23;168:4;	63:7	160:17,17;163:4;
100:6	93:2,23;94:13,25;	173:24;174:3,15;	quite (11)	174:1;175:17;184:20;
proceeding (18)	97:8	208:17;218:10;232:2;	69:20;114:21;	185:11,12,18;186:2;
18:14;37:10;43:8,18;	proper (1)	241:4,19	133:18;151:2;153:22,	189:1,12,18,21;192:1;
44:6;48:23;56:13;58:6,	90:10	publicly (4)	25;154:6,7;187:22;	220:25;222:25
8;59:20;121:2;136:13;	property (2)	86:14;100:24;	206:17:243:24	reading (2)
156:2;203:13;208:23;	182:3:242:25	101:12;242:9	quote (23)	45:11;55:22
227:3;231:9,25	propose (1)	publishing (1)	51:12;53:25;54:1;	reads (1)
proceedings (11)	31:7	66:7	55:22;57:17,19;61:9,	49:22
4:1;11:13,14;18:10;	proposed (6)	pull (3)	10;68:10,25;69:2;	ready (2)
104:8;210:23;211:2,7;	77:24;81:10;111:9;	27:15;78:3;84:9	74:23;75:17,20;	6:19:187:18
215:10,12;246:7	242:14;244:20;245:13	punishment (1)	140:11,12;150:3,5;	real (1)
process (16)	proposing (1)	215:20	161:8;173:24;175:5;	92:4
25:17;28:14,22,24;	31:8	purpose (2)	184:15,23	reality (2)
31:7;46:8;47:9;54:11;	propound (1)	87:14;168:3	quote/unquote (7)	68:20;218:19
192:8,11,17;195:16;	191:2	pursuant (6)	41:3;57:20;58:1;	really (7)
199:9;215:16;232:17;	prosecute (2)	66:8,12;79:23;80:1;	59:9;69:11;161:5;	26:12;38:23;48:17;
236:25	128:14;201:2	180:5,17	170:3	113:10;139:25;154:13;
processed (1)	prosecution (1)	pursue (2)		213:15
<b>processed (1)</b> 237:5	<b>prosecution (1)</b> 132:16	<b>pursue (2)</b> 135:2.6	R	213:15 realm (1)
237:5	132:16	135:2,6	R	realm (1)
237:5 produce (4)	132:16 prosecutions (1)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3</b> )		<b>realm (1)</b> 211:6
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24	race (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8)
237:5 <b>produce (4)</b> 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b>	<b>race (3)</b> 198:16;220:11,18	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23;	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7,
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11,	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b>	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23;	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b>	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10,	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 <b>putting (3)</b>	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2)	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 <b>putting (3)</b> 30:9;164:16;217:19	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5	135:2,6 <b>purview (3)</b> 46:22;131:15;134:24 <b>push (1)</b> 154:7 <b>pushed (1)</b> 88:19 <b>put (15)</b> 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 <b>putting (3)</b>	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1)	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22,	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10)	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7)	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17,	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22;	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12; 186:24;208:16	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1)	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12; 186:24;208:16 qualify (1)	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12; 186:24;208:16 qualify (1) 134:21	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22;	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19;	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3)	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12; 186:24;208:16 qualify (1) 134:21 quarters (1)	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9;
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19; 210:8,14	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3) 38:8;39:5;92:14	135:2,6 purview (3) 46:22;131:15;134:24 push (1) 154:7 pushed (1) 88:19 put (15) 19:23;23:20;42:7; 43:3;78:1;91:3,17; 92:2;96:20;127:18; 153:13;176:18;205:8; 213:17;234:22 putting (3) 30:9;164:16;217:19 Q qualifications (10) 8:13;11:1;167:24; 168:13,19,24;169:6,12; 186:24;208:16 qualify (1) 134:21 quarters (1) 79:4	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8 rationale (1)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9; 210:10;242:5
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19; 210:8,14 program (4)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3) 38:8;39:5;92:14 provided (3)	135:2,6         purview (3)         46:22;131:15;134:24         push (1)         154:7         pushed (1)         88:19         put (15)         19:23;23:20;42:7;         43:3;78:1;91:3,17;         92:2;96:20;127:18;         153:13;176:18;205:8;         213:17;234:22         putting (3)         30:9;164:16;217:19         Q         qualifications (10)         8:13;11:1;167:24;         168:13,19,24;169:6,12;         186:24;208:16         qualify (1)         134:21         quarters (1)         79:4         quash (6)	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8 rationale (1) 71:23	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9; 210:10;242:5 recalls (1)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19; 210:8,14 program (4) 19:18,24;78:2;106:6	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3) 38:8;39:5;92:14 provide (3) 37:11;160:14;196:3	135:2,6         purview (3)         46:22;131:15;134:24         push (1)         154:7         pushed (1)         88:19         put (15)         19:23;23:20;42:7;         43:3;78:1;91:3,17;         92:2;96:20;127:18;         153:13;176:18;205:8;         213:17;234:22         putting (3)         30:9;164:16;217:19         Q         qualifications (10)         8:13;11:1;167:24;         168:13,19,24;169:6,12;         186:24;208:16         qualify (1)         134:21         quarters (1)         79:4         quash (6)         81:25;100:9;111:12;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8 rationale (1) 71:23 reach (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9; 210:10;242:5 recalls (1) 87:7
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19; 210:8,14 program (4) 19:18,24;78:2;106:6 prohibited (2)	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3) 38:8;39:5;92:14 provide (3) 37:11;160:14;196:3 provider (1)	135:2,6         purview (3)         46:22;131:15;134:24         push (1)         154:7         pushed (1)         88:19         put (15)         19:23;23:20;42:7;         43:3;78:1;91:3,17;         92:2;96:20;127:18;         153:13;176:18;205:8;         213:17;234:22         putting (3)         30:9;164:16;217:19         Q         qualifications (10)         8:13;11:1;167:24;         168:13,19,24;169:6,12;         186:24;208:16         qualify (1)         134:21         quarters (1)         79:4         quash (6)         81:25;100:9;111:12;         112:10;146:8;178:3	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8 rationale (1) 71:23 reach (3) 25:7;33:7;156:25	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9; 210:10;242:5 recalls (1) 87:7 recap (1)
237:5 produce (4) 22:25;26:17;27:16; 32:14 produced (15) 27:14;38:20;42:11, 19,25;51:3,9;52:3; 66:8,12;91:15;92:4,6; 94:12;156:11 production (6) 25:25;26:7;33:1,12; 39:1;42:3 profession (10) 124:12;150:5,17; 158:17;159:16;167:13; 172:18;177:21;183:8; 186:20 professional (29) 8:17;9:23,24;11:22, 23;12:1,3;13:8;19:7; 104:4,13,17;105:3,17, 20;106:11;124:18; 148:3,17,21;149:4; 151:10,11;167:20; 176:3,12;201:19; 210:8,14 program (4) 19:18,24;78:2;106:6	132:16 prosecutions (1) 132:18 prosecutor (6) 127:1;129:2,23; 130:3,13,14 protect (3) 101:1;208:1;213:6 protected (7) 27:2;51:13,23;52:10, 13;106:3;181:19 Protection (2) 131:15;208:6 protections (1) 24:3 protracted (2) 33:3,5 proud (1) 19:7 prove (7) 8:11,21;10:3,9,22; 11:7;60:25 proverbial (1) 77:17 provide (3) 38:8;39:5;92:14 provide (3) 37:11;160:14;196:3	135:2,6         purview (3)         46:22;131:15;134:24         push (1)         154:7         pushed (1)         88:19         put (15)         19:23;23:20;42:7;         43:3;78:1;91:3,17;         92:2;96:20;127:18;         153:13;176:18;205:8;         213:17;234:22         putting (3)         30:9;164:16;217:19         Q         qualifications (10)         8:13;11:1;167:24;         168:13,19,24;169:6,12;         186:24;208:16         qualify (1)         134:21         quarters (1)         79:4         quash (6)         81:25;100:9;111:12;	race (3) 198:16;220:11,18 railroads (1) 19:1 raise (2) 88:18;245:1 raised (3) 17:2;25:19;38:22 raises (2) 105:17,24 ran (1) 126:24 ranch (2) 17:3;126:2 Randy (4) 4:8;14:14;16:14,17 rarely (3) 128:3;189:23,24 rather (3) 4:16;32:18;144:11 rational (5) 54:17;161:8,22; 162:9;218:8 rationale (1) 71:23 reach (3)	realm (1) 211:6 reason (8) 87:10;123:4,9; 136:22;138:5;143:7, 10;172:24 reasonable (10) 11:3;203:3,4;204:23; 205:9;214:7,17;215:7; 224:14,18 reasonably (1) 214:2 reasons (2) 91:11;168:7 recall (33) 31:16;35:19;36:11; 125:9,14;130:1; 137:20;142:16;143:8; 145:16;146:7,12; 153:23;154:5;155:25; 157:11;160:19;169:15; 173:11;194:1,5,21; 195:18,22;196:19; 197:2;199:10;200:6; 204:8,10;208:9; 210:10;242:5 recalls (1) 87:7

Min-U-Script®

Lesofski Court Reporting, Inc./406-443-2010

(19) procedural - receive

In the Mutter of Muslin I	nuasen	r		-
26:23;113:16;141:13	reference (1)	194:19	reports (2)	
received (9)	183:18	relatively (1)	107:11;112:14	
21:20,24;23:7;126:6;	referenced (3)	77:9	represent (10)	
141:16;145:23;180:5,	149:14;173:6;222:1	released (6)	9:9;24:21;130:4;	
17:187:20	referencing (3)	101:11,12;116:19;	133:12;141:14;142:10;	
recess (3)	71:9;74:17;75:5	117:7;240:19;242:9	176:9;197:8;205:4;	
187:12;229:2;245:21	referred (2)	releasing (1)	213:25	
recipient (2)	5:11,17	98:25	representation (1)	
43:21;63:11	referring (4)	relevance (1)	12:22	
reciting (1)	62:24;139:6;182:11,	216:3	representations (1)	
89:24	20	relief (5)	205:14	
Reckless (10)	reflect (2)	87:20;88:5;97:5;	representative (2)	
8:12;10:25;167:23;	65:9;195:25	130:20;149:1	180:2,15	
			representatives (2)	
168:15,21,22;169:5,10; 208:15;209:7	<b>reflection (1)</b> 215:15	<b>relieving (1)</b> 72:22	13:18;126:19	
recognize (4)	refrain (2)	Relying (1)	represented (10)	
45:12;146:22;	58:15;171:6	148:4	12:11,19;18:9,25;	
43.12,140.22, 148:20;234:3		remainder (1)		
,	refresh (2)	33:23	35:25;44:9;136:5,15;	
recollection (10)	196:1,5		197:11;214:4	1
34:23;37:24;138:11;	refreshing (2)	remaining (2)	representing (13)	
145:6;156:23;194:25;	196:8,9	38:10;92:17	44:13;45:7;82:19;	
195:1;196:8,9;224:24	refusal (6)	remediate (3)	104:2;107:12;130:2;	
reconsideration (2)	10:6,9;148:5,8;	58:10;155:13;170:9	134:16;193:3;202:12;	
212:19;213:3	201:24;203:21	remedies (2)	210:5;212:6;214:25;	
reconvene (4)	refuse (2)	159:6;211:13	225:19	
79:11;119:23;	124:21,24	remedy (1)	represents (1)	
187:14;245:22	refused (3)	205:11	135:15	
record (40)	75:14;185:14;213:12	remember (25)	reproducing (1)	
15:2,21,25;16:11;	refusing (2)	37:8,21,22;54:4;	66:7	
26:24;29:20;42:8;	67:11;164:21	64:9;65:1;71:12;83:10;	reproductions (1)	
54:25;56:21;59:12;	regain (2)	87:8,9;89:1,2;97:2;	66:13	
62:2;65:8,18;69:18;	47:15;156:21	125:12,21;141:16;	request (13)	
70:10;77:3;79:14;	regard (2)	146:10;147:8,10;	72:7;79:8;88:6,7;	
89:20;93:1;108:15;	15:12;19:21	156:3;193:11;197:25;	95:14;98:19,24;99:6;	
121:14;127:25;147:17,	regarding (8)	198:6;207:6;221:6	143:5;145:15,22;	
18,25;148:15;156:5;	23:18;31:4,14;62:22;	remembering (3)	187:12;244:20	
162:6;184:5,7;187:24;	76:20;123:16;140:17;	89:23;141:11;154:3	requested (1)	
189:23;191:20;195:2;	141:7	remotely (5)	131:22	
229:22;230:1,14;	regards (1)	226:18;227:9;229:5,	requesting (1)	
232:2,9;238:23	61:9	9,24	107:24	
records (20)	Regier (3)	removal (1)	requests (2)	
7:12;26:17;28:19;	23:13;31:22;32:11	200:12	28:19;146:2	
33:1,12,22;52:20,22;	register (4)	rendering (1)	require (4)	
61:9;67:15;68:18;	39:23,23,25;44:5	7:15	65:4;106:2;115:10;	
100:19;101:10;173:25;	regular (1)	renewal (1)	233:22	
174:4,15;218:10;	233:11	240:1	required (5)	
241:9,14,14	regularly (2)	repeat (1)	19:18;87:25;113:4;	
recourse (1)	231:13,16	31:5	208:7;242:19	
111:24	reheard (1)	repeating (1)	requires (2)	
recusal (7)	61:1	10:8	11:7;22:25	
113:4;140:10;	rehearing (14)	repetition (1)	reside (1)	
199:13,23;200:21;	60:8,11,23;61:1;	64:8	230:16	
209:22;217:24	68:1,4;70:8,13;110:21;	rephrase (1)	resolution (4)	
recuse (4)	173:13;182:17,18;	117:22	33:7;81:10;113:20;	
163:22;208:24;	183:16;217:6	report (4)	199:18	
209:1,11	rejected (2)	103:20;106:12,20;	resolve (6)	
redact (1)	34:16,18	165:18	31:12,13;32:17;	
156:22	related (3)	reported (2)	33:16;75:23;185:23	
Redirect (6)	81:3;107:17;112:19	9:18;99:23	resolving (1)	
118:14,18;216:14,	relates (4)	<b>REPORTER</b> (1)	160:12	
18;241:21;242:1	108:11;190:24;	230:2	resources (2)	
refer (2)	206:2;216:22	Reporting (2)	240:6;241:14	
98:8;120:16	relating (1)	105:3;106:16	respect (6)	
	1		1	İ.

### Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

25:8;123:22;149:18, 25;151:17;170:24 respectful (3) 159:16;175:10;219:5 respectfully (2) 61:9;173:24 respects (1) 105:20 respond (9) 5:7,15;6:11;41:9,17, 21;67:6;71:3;143:12 responded (1) 60:16 respondent (13) 5:15;8:25;79:17; 121:2;166:12;188:3; 195:20;226:15,16; 229:7;230:5;245:6,25 respondents' (1) 245:13 respondent's (15) 16:2,3,6,9;29:9,15, 18;79:24,25;119:13; 142:3;226:25;229:14, 24;243:16 response (24) 14:1;37:11,15;51:4; 53:4;64:1;67:4;71:1; 76:24;84:10;87:7;88:2; 113:17:138:13,20,22; 143:14:154:25:156:12; 182:12;188:14;190:20; 221:22;222:5 responses (2) 80:1;191:8 responsibilities (2) 131:4;201:12 responsibility (3) 8:6,10;205:19 responsible (1) 134:16 responsive (1) 27:16 rest (5) 7:10;38:19;49:15; 78:4;229:4 restate (1) 166:17 restraining (4) 97:24;98:4,12,15 restroom (1) 187:13 rests (1) 229:22 result (5) 35:6;39:8;75:15; 185:15;216:1 resulted (2) 11:13;215:11 results (1) 140:16 retain (1) 207:22

# Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

In the Matter of Austin Is	Indusch			0000001 09, 2024
retained (1)	30:1,24;31:23;32:2;	121:6;147:17,18,20,23;	12,21;89:12,21,22;	seeking (6)
136:2	34:9,20;38:23;49:16,	148:2,14,17;149:3,4,8,	90:4,6,9,15,19,21;93:3,	19:19;26:24;32:15;
retention (2)	25;52:1,16;53:17;54:6;	12;164:19;165:2;	25;94:17,19;95:1;97:1,	47:19;55:5;209:22
68:19;207:23	56:10;59:9;60:12;67:1;	166:14;167:20;168:1,		seeks (3)
retired (1)	68:21;73:9,16,16,17,	2,4;176:2,11;178:2;	Sandefur's (3)	50:4;110:1;158:2
17:23	21,23;74:7,10,20;75:1,	188:19,22;196:9;	87:6,11;89:11	seem (1)
return (44)	11,18;76:2;79:10;	201:19,20,22;202:5;	satellite (1)	217:8
46:25;64:24;65:5,6;	83:16,24;94:2,21;	208:8,10,13,20;209:4;	132:4	seemed (3)
66:11,11,17,25;67:4;	96:24,25;97:17;108:3;	210:8,12,21	Saturday (22)	32:24,24;58:3
70:16,23,25;71:14,16,	119:22;123:3,13;	ruled (3)	25:1,2,3,4,10;28:4;	sees (1)
25;77:8;101:18,19;	125:8,13;128:19;	63:20;111:20;112:4	29:4;30:8;34:13,21;	83:4
102:19;103:4,7;	130:20;134:2;136:6;	rules (49)	37:4,7,13;40:16;43:5;	self-dealing (4)
107:17;108:11;115:11,	138:3;139:18,22;	5:4;6:6;7:19,21,23;	82:5;84:5;86:11;91:4;	74:18;76:9;184:16,
14;118:24;178:4,7,17,	146:24;147:12;149:23;	9:23,24;10:5;11:21,23;	94:20;97:4,5	17
22;179:3,5,8,16,17,24;	151:21;152:3,16,22;	12:3;13:8;86:25;94:6;	saw (2)	self-interest (4)
182:9;183:21;207:3;	157:23;159:13;161:5;	104:4,17;105:16;	30:21;146:20	56:1,13;163:6;
211:10,17,18,25;	162:20,22;165:23;	106:11;124:17;127:8,	saying (22)	164:10
222:21	166:16;168:6;169:25;	12,12,14,16,17;147:21;	24:23;28:14;41:12;	Seminar (2)
returned (18)	170:18;171:17,25;	148:20,24,25;149:6,13,	46:15;63:8;64:15;	19:13,17
42:22;64:16;65:12;	172:25;175:1,8,17;	20;151:10;166:4,5,19,	71:14;72:7;78:14;	Senate (6)
77:11,14;101:22,25;	176:6,20;178:23;	22;168:17;176:12;	101:16;139:23;155:16,	112:19,22;142:23;
102:2,4,14,25;113:25;	179:13,14,23;181:6,13;	191:6;201:19,23;	18;164:20,21;171:15,	195:13,15;196:23
116:6,14;138:9;207:5,	182:17;185:18;186:2,	202:9;205:1;231:6,11;	23,24;174:3,16,25;	Senator (6)
12;223:5	7;196:12;197:20;	232:20;233:5,22	190:11	23:13;31:22;32:11;
returning (2)	216:24;220:11;221:14;	ruling (5)	SB (9)	243:18;244:2,8
103:13,22	222:10;223:20;224:8,	46:19;115:16;	62:16;140:13,17,24;	send (17)
reversed (1)	12;225:11,22;227:8;	209:18;213:7,8	141:1,7;198:22,23;	45:23;48:1,7;53:20;
213:8	229:1,17;230:3;234:2,	rulings (1)	199:2	54:25;56:24;66:20;
review (21)	5;238:13;239:6;240:9;	211:1	scale (2)	70:18;146:17;147:18,
5:12;7:15;26:20;	244:17;245:18;246:3	run (1)	74:18;184:18	25;148:15;204:11;
27:14;28:15;31:8;39:4;	rights (1)	165:2	schedule (3)	232:15;234:25;235:4,
47:5;64:8;73:18,19;	213:6	running (2)	53:16;86:1;232:7	13
78:3;92:10,10;101:3,	rise (1)	53:10;127:2	scheduling (1)	sending (3)
24;102:3;203:18;	12:7	runs (4)	226:13	25:11;55:5;204:20
207:21;212:19;236:11	risk (1)	56:2;163:7;164:11,	school (4)	sends (2)
reviewed (5)	92:4	12	17:3,7;126:5,9	232:12,13
52:7;101:5;102:13;	92.4 River (1)	12	Schowengerdt (3)	Senior (2)
107:2;188:13	17:3	S	42:6,7;47:9	17:8;142:16
	role (6)			,
reviewing (2) 27:6;83:20		22f2 (1)	science (1)	sense (10)
	21:7;28:21;130:3,4,	safe (1)	132:3	33:5;43:11;61:23;
reviews (1)	11;155:3	127:4	scope (3)	110:16;175:16;182:4;
5:12	roles (1)	safeguards (1)	159:8;203:6;205:5	189:23;218:16;227:6;
revocation (1)	131:3	33:12	screened (1)	228:18
128:20	roll (3)	saga (1)	25:18	sensitive (8)
revoke (1)	122:21;123:1,13	194:18	scroll (2)	23:24;24:10;26:21;
125:6	$\mathbf{Roman}\left(1\right)$	saints (1)	22:22;142:19	51:13,23;52:11,13;
revoking (1)	60:18	147:7	search (2)	208:1
125:3 <b>Bio</b> c (41)	<b>Roosevelt</b> (4)	Sam (2)	81:17;224:17	sent (21)
Rice (41)	126:3,3,24;128:13	17:19;18:21	seat (1)	21:24;23:13;27:23;
35:20,21;36:25;37:5;	rooted (1)	Same (16)	127:1	30:9,15;40:15;48:14;
44:24;80:2;83:18,19;	102:10	32:13;38:10;48:5;	second (7)	50:24;66:24;71:16;
84:4,20;86:12,15;87:2,	roughly (4)	50:10;87:8;92:16;	45:4;62:22;87:18;	85:3,10;94:23;138:21;
18;88:20,22;89:14,16,	116:4,6;133:21,22	93:17;94:9;96:14;	122:20;123:21;145:12;	145:23;148:9;223:23;
20;90:1,14,16,18,19,	roundabout (1)	141:12;149:3;156:16;	231:19	224:15;225:16;236:2;
22;93:3,24;94:14,17,	110:8	172:24;174:20;233:4;	secure (1)	239:9
19,25;95:1;97:6;109:4;	route (1)	242:13	207:24	sentence (11)
200:11;235:7,8,15,16,	232:15	sanction (1)	security (1)	38:6,6;124:4,5;
21;236:3	Rule (64)	108:19	208:6	164:2;174:22;175:2;
<b>Rice's</b> (1)	7:19;8:5,10,12,16,17,	sanctions (1)	seeing (1)	189:1,12,18,21
84:10	21;10:2,3,8,21;11:5,7,	215:20	88:17	separate (2)
right (118)			$a_{a}a = (5)$	100.15.014.10
	7,20,25;13:25;29:18;	Sandefur (27)	seek (5)	199:15;214:12
4:11;12:21;14:4,11;	7,20,25;13:25;29:18; 46:9;60:22;104:13;	37:9,13,23;80:2;	72:2;87:20;111:12;	separation (5)
	7,20,25;13:25;29:18;			

212:7;213:13 September (7) 70:11,14,22;71:5,17; 183:19.22 series (6) 27:25;28:1,2,3; 141:2:235:22 serious (1) 45:17 serve (1) 9:6 served (10) 22:8,10;26:15,16; 126:18,25;143:14; 144:10,11,17 server (2) 144:15,23 servers (1) 224:6 serves (1) 20:3 service (1) 26:13 services (6) 30:19;132:16;133:5, 6,10,14 session (2) 6:1,2 sessions (1) 126:18 set (6) 4:14:47:3:94:17: 121:14:194:17:232:7 sets (2) 53:16:233:21 setting (1) 12 27:9 settle (1) 57:20 seven (3) 20:1;121:15;192:20 Seventh (1) 191:5 several (7) 99:16;102:25; 122:18;131:6;154:5; 206:13;211:1 severely (1) 12:25 shall (10) 105:20,25;106:23, 25;149:5;167:21; 169:4;192:20,24; 208:13 Shane (1) 9:8 shared (1) 241:18 sharp (2) 154:18:155:22 sit (3) Sheena (5) 7:2;22:22;23:10; 29:9;142:18

sheet (1) 233:17 Shelby (1) 7:3 sheriff (1) 134:9 sheriffs (2) 132:1:134:7 sheriff's (1) 132:9 short (3) 77:9;96:23;243:23 shorthand (1) 135:20 shortly (3) 21:19;62:19;142:17 show (13) 8:7;9:17;10:11;11:2, 11,15;12:2;13:9;22:1; 40:12;104:18;121:16; 162:10 showed (2) 138:16;139:20 showing (1) 39:24 shown (2) 16:1;116:24 shows (2) 40:9;195:2 shrugged (2) 99:10,10 shunted (1) 87:17 side (5) 13:3;18:5,24;27:10, signature (7) 122:25:123:8: 138:25;139:3;184:11; 225:24,24 Signed (7) 44:25;45:2;125:1; 142:19,21;147:4; 184:10 signing (1) 195:15 Similarly (1) 11:24 simple (3) 9:25;106:19,21 simply (12) 9:20:37:21:50:13: 51:19;68:11;83:12; 90:1;95:3;96:18;112:2; 169:10;213:12 single (8) 7:17;9:11,18;131:13; 132:19,22;216:21; 219:3 175:24;176:6;198:22 sitting (4) 9:13;57:7;139:24;

180:13 situation (13) 83:1:91:13:95:4: 125:15:152:8:153:25: 154:20;166:2;192:15; 202:20;213:16;219:16; 244:25 six (6) 10:20;20:1;75:13; 76:13:185:14:192:20 skillful (1) 129:7 sloppiness (2) 144:21;199:4 sloppy (2) 145:10;225:2 slow (1) 28:15 small (1) 126:13 smarter (1) 127:19 Smith (1) 17:3 so-called (1) 76:13 Society (1) 20:9 soften (1) 170:9 softer (1) 220:5 sole (1) 54:11 solely (1) 46:21 Solicitor (1) 9:6 solicitor's (1) 133:2 solo (1) 126:21 solve (1) 43:16 somebody (4) 26:24;32:2;161:21; 174:14 somebody's (1) 171:23 somehow (2) 22:14;92:11 Someone (5) 102:13:204:3; 234:20;239:10;240:10 sometimes (17) 24:2;85:17;113:3; 125:21;129:5,6,17; 139:21;140:2,3; 161:24;190:6,6; 200:16;208:22;220:9; 232:16 somewhat (2) 90:5;201:9

Somewhere (5) 19:5;20:2,12;42:16, 18 soon (6) 119:21;136:7,15; 147:15:207:12:211:10 Sorry (23) 17:14:23:14:31:17: 45:4;67:17;69:7,10; 84:11:107:22:110:7: 136:8;138:4;140:22; 145:11;168:25;171:23; 177:8;181:22;185:22; 189:7,10;225:2;237:17 sort (7) 87:8;92:6;130:16; 144:20;156:25;159:21, 22 sorted (1) 98:10 sorts (2) 98:7;103:23 sought (5) 98:1;100:9;111:12; 140:9,15 soul (1) 49:16 sound (3) 179:13;195:4;197:20 Sounds (3) 133:20:179:23; 197:21 source (1) 141:9 speak (2) 88:17;223:8 Speaker (7) 31:21;32:10;142:22, 22;196:23;243:18; 244:3 speakers (1) 19:22 speaking (8) 73:14;74:12,22; 131:7;162:25;184:16, 22;231:5 special (6) 7:1;111:5,9;232:17; 237:12,17 specific (3) 147:20;156:6;182:12 specifically (14) 41:16;49:11;61:6; 137:21;138:4;143:9; 146:3;147:9,11; 148:19;173:22;195:21; 197:13;218:7 specified (1) 239:10 speculation (1) 237:24 spends (1) 132:24

Spent (1) 126:11 spilled (1) 51:20 splitting (1) 225:5 spoil (2) 223:6,13 spoiling (1) 223:4 spoke (1) 37:13 spoliation (3) 207:15;222:23;223:3 Sr (1) 126:15 staff (7) 9:19;31:24,25;85:9; 134:18;142:16;208:3 staffers (1) 84:25 stakes (1) 12:15 stamp (3) 84:13;234:5,7 stand (3) 54:22;64:15;120:4 standalone (1) 8:18 standard (1) 85:12 standards (10) 24:1;148:21;165:8, 19:166:7.24:167:3: 199:8.13.17 standing (1) 63:24 standstill (1) 98:8 start (4) 21:14;79:17;231:22; 243:11 started (10) 4:7,14;6:19;17:24; 18:20;20:21;86:16; 126:21;220:20;228:2 Starting (1) 141:1 state (70) 4:24;5:4;13:15;17:4; 21:21;32:23;56:3;74:9. 14,15;76:20;81:4; 98:11,14:111:22; 112:13,21;119:4; 120:4;126:6,7,18; 130:4;131:5,17,18,21; 132:2,20,25;133:23; 134:4,20;135:8,14; 144:15;150:18;152:3; 153:7,15:158:19; 162:5;163:8,25;164:6, 12,22;165:2;167:15; 170:23;186:5,5,6;

192:4;201:3,4,5;208:3; 210:14:229:20:230:14: 236:22;238:17;240:14, 15,21;242:5,17,25; 243:3 stated (7) 23:22;76:8;91:12; 219:11:224:20,22,25 statement (45) 6:21;7:18;9:1,14,22; 10:24;11:4;28:17;46:3; 54:14,16:59:8:68:24; 80:24;93:14;94:4; 117:11;121:9;155:8; 161:7,11,21;164:5,16; 167:22;168:9,20; 169:4;171:16,22,24; 174:23;186:22;201:11; 208:14;211:15;218:8, 11,13,14,16,17,18; 222:18:225:14 statements (56) 7:8,10;8:8,12;54:20; 57:18;58:2;60:18;68:9; 69:10;74:4,5,8;75:5,6, 7;76:4;110:4;118:7; 158:7;161:14;167:2; 168:11,15;170:3,6,10; 172:7;182:24;184:13; 185:7.7.8:186:18: 202:3,7,12:203:17,25; 204:24:205:13:209:4. 5,16;210:19;212:8,13; 214:23,24;215:3,4,7, 14;218:21;225:9,10 States (23) 10:19;17:9;20:20; 73:20:74:14:76:22: 77:22;82:16;101:20; 102:21:114:5,9,13,17; 149:5:151:10:179:11: 184:14;186:19;192:4, 7;201:22;208:13 state's (7) 13:16;132:14,24; 133:7,25;134:13; 207:21 state-subsidized (1) 133:11 statute (2) 134:3,12 statutory (1) 152:23 stay (4) 72:7,10,13;119:6 stayed (3) 17:21;75:9;185:9 staying (2) 41:7;72:4 step (7) 12:7;14:5;119:9; 135:4,5;185:1;214:20 stepped (1)

19:25 steps (1) 235:18 still (16) 20:23;37:22,24;63:5; 64:19,21;87:9;97:2; 138:11;154:12;174:8, 8:205:18:219:20; 223:24;224:3 stop (10) 22:23;25:23;26:6; 39:1:42:3:78:1:98:9. 21,25;162:20 stopped (3) 19:25;25:15;211:4 story (1) 21:14 stranger (1) 207:25 strategies (1) 212:14 STRAUCH (140) 6:22,24;7:1;8:24; 13:21,22;14:7,13,21; 15:4,17,25;16:12,15; 18:2;22:22,24;23:10, 12;26:6;29:7,11,15; 30:3;39:22,24;41:1,2, 22;42:1;43:23,24;44:3, 4:50:18,19:77:3,7; 78:17.20.25;80:3.4; 86:17;93:8,9,17;94:5; 96:9,10:104:6,24; 107:14;108:14;112:6; 114:25;118:14,15,19; 119:8,11,18;120:1,8; 121:4,8,24;122:7,11, 13;141:21,24;142:18, 21;153:20;166:9,11, 18;181:4,21;187:3,6,9; 190:22;191:13;193:9, 19,23;194:3,17;196:2, 6,7,14,20;198:4;199:7, 25;201:18;204:5,10; 205:23;206:4;207:1; 208:9;210:9;211:14; 216:3,14,15,19;219:8, 13;226:10;227:11,15, 21,24;228:1,9,18; 229:3,6,18,19,21; 237:14,23:238:9,15; 241:20;242:3,10,14; 243:15,19;244:14; 245:1,20;246:5 Strauch's (1) 188:8 stream (1) 14:10 streamed (1) 14:9 Streib (1) 7:4 strictly (1)

241:15 strike (8) 44:17;71:15;82:8; 90:5;92:21;104:9; 108:4:210:2 strive (1) 124:10 striving (1) 150:3 strong (9) 57:17;58:1;154:7; 161:24;163:19;170:3; 200:2,8;212:21 strongly (1) 240:14 stuck (1) 30:4 stuff (7) 27:15;92:11;116:24; 177:10;220:25;239:20; 241:9 stunning (2) 69:1;218:20 stymied (1) 211:3 subject (12) 80:20;82:7;84:1; 93:22;140:24;141:1; 145:24;195:11;203:12; 229:4,23:242:22 submit (1) 137:2 submitted (4) 49:23:109:21:116:8: 157:21 subordinate (3) 8:6;57:16;155:5 subordinates (13) 8:9;10:23;12:1;58:2, 10:67:9,19:108:20; 137:14;155:18;170:4; 215:21:216:1 subpoena (81) 21:20;22:5,8,24; 23:13,18;25:9;26:10, 15,17;27:10;32:6; 33:20;38:17;41:7; 43:22;45:19;46:20,24; 48:2,7,13,14;51:4; 53:14;62:23;63:11,13; 66:3,8,12;75:24;80:15, 20;81:2;82:1;92:8; 100:10;111:11,16,17, 21;112:5,7,10;117:6; 143:14,16,25;144:7,9, 10,17;145:2,2,7,12,15, 18;146:9;152:19,24; 156:13,19;180:5,18; 185:24;194:20,24; 195:3;202:17;203:7,8; 214:11,13,14;223:23; 224:1,11,15;239:9 subpoenaed (4)

21:1:26:1.8:47:5 subpoenaing (1) 48:12 subpoenas (17) 47:23;53:6;63:4,9, 10;75:10;157:4,8; 160:21;178:3,6,7; 185:10:203:2,19; 214:6;234:10 subsequent (2) 42:13;82:15 subsequently (3) 39:14;87:5;195:15 subsidized (1) 133:7 substantial (2) 105:17,24 substantive (2) 89:13;96:21 successful (3) 113:2,5;157:2 successfully (2) 126:24;127:2 sued (3) 133:1;134:23;135:3 suffer (1) 175:4 suffering (1) 218:14 suggest (6) 61:15:81:9:175:1; 218:12:221:9:222:16 suggested (1) 81:14 suggesting (2) 112:1;222:14 suggestion (1) 111:25 suggestions (1) 81:11 suggests (1) 164:7 suing (1) 135:2 summary (2) 217:25;218:1 Sunday (28) 28:4;29:1;31:20; 33:18;34:2;38:4,12; 43:5;82:10,11;91:19; 94:11,19,24;95:1,9; 97:7;98:20,25;115:8; 234:14,20;235:1,6; 236:16,21;239:1,6 Sundays (1) 234:15 superb (1) 18:22 supervision (2) 137:14:201:9 supervisor (2) 98:19,24 supervisors (1)

### Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

99:21 supervisory (1) 155:3 supplemental (5) 36:2;39:20;40:7,19; 92:25 supplementation (1) 40:11 support (3) 9:12:155:9:192:3 supported (6) 153:20;154:9;155:4, 12;160:16;161:11 supporting (1) 245:12 suppose (2) 98:17;113:21 supposed (4) 130:23;165:4; 166:19;198:18 supposedly (3) 107:16;202:4;210:20 Supreme (197) 4:18,24;8:2,14,15; 9:16;10:19;18:10;29:1; 30:10;33:14;35:3;36:5; 39:23,25;41:3;44:1,24; 48:3;54:1,15;55:1,6, 10;56:16;57:5;58:11; 59:22,23;60:1;62:12, 15;65:5;67:10,14,20, 22;70:5;71:22;72:3,8, 10,13,14,24;73:3,13, 15;74:13,15,17,23; 75:6,14,22;76:5,10,22, 25;77:5,22;79:15; 82:16,19,21,24:83:3, 13;86:8,19;87:3;88:16; 89:5;90:11;96:22;97:9; 99:18,22:101:20; 102:19,21;103:3,11; 104:3;107:25;108:19; 110:12;111:4,13,15,20; 112:4;114:5,9,13,17; 115:14;116:13;117:5; 118:23;119:4;123:12; 124:19;125:2;140:16; 146:13;149:21;150:8; 153:16;155:15;157:6; 158:8,22;161:15; 162:6;163:12;164:22; 167:4,18;169:16; 171:3,13;172:9; 174:10,11;176:16,24; 177:12,25;178:22; 179:1,12,16;182:25; 183:12,15;184:2,3,15, 17,23;185:8;186:10,19, 25;187:25;191:25; 198:25;200:9;201:3; 202:9,16;203:1,6,18; 204:2,7;205:1,17; 206:18,19;207:2,17;

In the Matter of Austin Knudsen October 09, 2024				
209:17;211:9,16,17,18,	talking (9)	thereafter (4)	27:23;28:6,7;30:18;	troubling (2)
24;215:21;219:4;	24:4,7,20;50:7;	46:16;58:7;126:8;	31:22;85:10	45:18;58:15
220:16;222:20;225:14;	96:15;105:3;149:22;	142:17	together (2)	Troy (1)
230:19;231:4,8,14,17,	162:2;169:1	thereof (1)	78:1;96:20	4:12
23;232:5,14,19;233:10,	taught (1)	66:13	told (18)	true (12)
13,16;234:9,17,21;	19:24	thinking (1)	42:17;67:12,16;	84:13;86:6;90:3;
235:1,5;236:10,15,19,	taxpayer (1)	107:18	71:20;81:7,22;90:13;	108:9;112:2,16;
20;237:21;238:3	241:3	third (4)	119:7;145:14;154:2,6;	125:19,20;155:13,14;
Sure (29)	taxpayers (1)	20:10;31:6;57:13;	160:10;162:6;195:2;	218:4,5
24:17;26:4;34:18;	241:10	98:25	220:3,4;236:6;243:9	truly (2)
62:24;71:20;77:24;	technically (1)	though (1)	Tom (1)	46:11;154:19
101:7;104:19;118:9;	137:18	36:17	34:8	trustworthiness (1)
121:1,7;122:10;126:2;	<b>Telephones</b> (2)	thought (16)	tomorrow (7)	105:19
127:24;129:9;131:6;	48:15,18	25:19;54:17;88:18;	226:19;227:5;228:1,	truth (7)
133:19;136:21;138:18;	telling (10)	90:25;94:18;95:2;	8;229:24;243:11;	10:25;167:23;
148:10;149:17;153:22;	38:19;59:7;152:5;	137:9;145:17;161:9,	245:22	168:15,21;169:6;
181:13;187:14;199:20; 220:22;226:14;228:12;	158:24;159:7;171:2;	22;162:9;169:1;	took (14)	208:15;209:8
240:7	218:9,20,24;219:4 tells (1)	194:23;203:4;204:22; 218:9	8:1;13:6,11,13;46:7, 8,18;63:15;99:11,11;	<b>try (9)</b> 31:12,13;32:25;
surprised (2)	104:1	thoughtlessly (1)	121:18;122:17;155:12;	34:20;47:2;135:5;
35:11;114:23	temporarily (2)	213:18	191:24	140:6;181:22;213:5
surprising (1)	41:7;53:13	thoughts (1)	top (14)	trying (21)
35:8	temporary (15)	162:8	30:5;31:2;33:25;	20:11;25:12,23;26:6;
suspect (2)	40:23;41:3;42:2;	thread (1)	38:3,3;55:13,21;	28:13,23;32:11,13,17,
61:5;173:21	43:14;53:5;88:5;97:23;	27:22	139:11;140:8;162:22,	20,21;33:2,3;46:13;
Sustained (15)	98:4,12,15;115:6;	threatening (1)	24;176:5;222:12;234:5	63:23;160:11;176:19;
104:11;108:17;	117:6;146:13;152:19;	58:16	touch (1)	221:13;222:16;244:9,
153:19;166:10;181:20;	234:10	three (4)	228:4	10
190:23;191:16;193:21;	Tenth (1)	20:7;79:4;179:21;	tough (2)	turn (9)
205:24;206:5;211:21;	191:4	192:19	91:8;127:24	17:12;27:19;45:9;
216:5;237:19,25;	term (4)	three-month (1)	toward (2)	78:4;92:12;96:11;
242:15	134:5,11;232:13;	116:3	23:10;40:3	139:5;220:23;229:23
swath (2)	236:17	throughout (2)	town (1)	turned (7)
21:23;23:23	terms (2)	131:21;133:23	126:4	33:23,24;38:9,17;
swear (4)	226:25;228:24	<b>thus (2)</b> 52:4;95:4	<b>track (1)</b> 33:1	39:6,7;92:15
180:19,20,22,25 swore (5)	<b>terrible (1)</b> 147:11	tight (1)	trafficking (1)	<b>turning (3)</b> 32:15;41:6;190:9
123:22;124:1,5;	territory (2)	26:5	131:20	two (22)
125:1;166:4	148:18;203:9	till (2)	trained (3)	7:23;8:4;17:16;
sworn (13)	test (1)	97:18;237:8	128:4;208:4,5	18:10;20:20;24:22;
7:25;13:7,12;14:19;	135:16	Tim (4)	transcribed (1)	79:23;89:7;96:20,21;
120:5;123:18;124:22;	testified (15)	7:1;120:24;238:15;	96:2	108:2;117:25;127:2;
126:10;132:8;159:12,	80:14;83:17,25;	244:13	transcript (4)	137:24;192:19;199:15;
15;166:18;230:8	84:15;87:1,5,24;93:12,	timeframe (2)	93:11;96:13;99:14;	224:7,10,10;243:10,12,
system (5)	22;95:8,12;100:16;	31:10;116:7	232:10	25
8:20;30:10;111:24;	194:23;219:21;231:19	timeline (3)	transmitted (1)	Tyler (1)
168:5;206:24	testify (6)	94:23;145:6;179:18	48:19	9:8
Systems (2)	14:5;21:1;94:10;	times (12)	treatment (3)	type (9)
20:19;26:13	180:9;181:2;226:18	63:23;78:8;82:22;	68:17;237:12,17	11:15;26:21;92:23;
T	testifying (1)	95:19;102:25;117:10,	trial (6)	102:18;103:2;117:11;
Т	95:3	15,23;127:7;159:18;	18:18,22;19:6;20:8;	232:17;240:2;245:2
4abla (2)	testimony (15)	162:4,4	128:2,4	types (6)
table (3) 30:5;224:8;226:25	4:1;96:16;160:3,7; 174:9;176:25;177:6;	<b>title (3)</b> 137:17,18;230:18	<b>trials (4)</b> 128:1,7,8,10	13:2;100:17,20,24; 101:9;231:25
tale (4)	190:10;201:1;219:13;	titled (1)	tribunal (6)	typewriters (1)
61:10;173:25;	220:22;227:13;229:12;	43:19	7:21,23;10:6;149:7,	48:16
174:15;218:11	237:24;242:11	today (16)	14;201:24	typical (1)
Talia (1)	thankfully (1)	4:10;5:18;7:2;20:23;	tried (9)	129:16
197:14	135:16	120:14;125:6;138:6;	19:3;27:8;34:11;	typically (14)
talk (3)	theories (1)	180:13;181:15;220:17;	82:25;83:9;88:13;	128:23;129:4,12,14;
71:6;91:8;188:12	192:11	225:1;226:18;228:16,	89:18;127:21,23	130:4,6,15,21;131:10;
talked (3)	theory (1)	23;229:11;243:8	<b>TRO</b> (1)	135:4;189:20;193:14;
36:1;87:19;220:16	135:6	Todd (6)	87:25	244:24;245:3
	1			l

Transcript of Proceedings - Day 1 October 09, 2024

In the Matter of Austin F		20.22		105 00 004 10 004 5
	82:16;101:20;102:21;	28:22	11:25;56:9;168:16	197:23;234:18;236:7,
U	114:5,9,13,17;179:11; 184:14;186:19;192:4,7	V	<b>violation (16)</b> 8:17,18;9:23;10:2,	8,11,12,15,23;237:5, 22;238:3
	University (4)	•	21;12:3;104:17;	weekends (1)
ultimate (1)	17:5,6;126:6,9	vacancy (1)	105:16,23;106:10,10,	82:24
115:16	Unless (5)	195:17	20;113:7;114:8;	weeks (1)
<b>ultimately (9)</b> 52:1;56:20;59:22,23;	72:2,6;103:25;149:9;	valid (14)	192:16;199:22	77:10
63:20;65:6,15;134:18;	153:8	10:7,10,14;45:19;	violations (4)	well-recognized (1)
178:2	unprecedented (9)	149:11;150:20;153:3,	8:21;11:6,19,25	191:1
unaware (1)	9:12;12:9;74:19;	9;164:18;198:8,13,16;	vociferous (1)	well-suited (2)
101:4	155:5;159:3;184:18;	201:25;203:22	212:11	38:24;92:10
uncharted (3)	192:14;219:16,19	validity (5)	voice (2)	weren't (23)
148:18;203:9;214:9	unprofessional (1)	46:20;63:4;111:21;	35:23;84:5	108:8;158:9,11,13;
uncommon (1)	152:11	112:5;198:4	voicemail (3)	172:10,12,14,16,19;
28:18	unreviewable (1)	valley (1)	36:5;90:1;97:6	177:12,15,17,19,22;
under (38)	214:7	132:7	voted (1)	182:25;183:2,6,9;
7:20;8:4,9,10;10:5;	unsuccessfully (1)	various (9)	140:11	186:20;222:14;223:25;
13:25;29:18;58:18;	113:8	88:17;100:17;	voting (1)	224:4;228:2
64:7;72:23;81:1;94:6;	<b>untested (1)</b> 152:25	121:22;132:25,25;	140:15	what's (11) 19:12;22:1;27:16;
96:22;100:6;126:14;	152:25 untrue (5)	133:13;134:25;157:5; 160:3	W	19:12;22:1;27:16; 39:25;73:9,21;94:7;
131:15;133:8;134:24;	75:4,7;76:4,8;185:6	vary (1)	**	129:15;140:1;181:2;
137:14;147:20;149:6;	<b>unusual (2)</b>	42:12	wait (3)	241:12
164:19;180:14;188:19,	58:18;118:7	vehicle (1)	14:6;39:13;237:8	whatsoever (1)
22;189:15,16;190:4; 192:11;196:8;201:9;	unwarranted (1)	131:13	walk (1)	160:5
202:8;204:19,21,25;	182:21	vent (3)	30:11	white (1)
202.8,204.19,21,23, 209:4;221:18;241:15	up ( <b>39</b> )	58:19;171:8,13	walking (3)	143:20
underlie (1)	25:11;41:15;43:12;	verbiage (1)	220:2,3,6	Whoa (1)
18:11	47:3;58:17;65:22;84:9;	149:10	wants (2)	106:20
underlying (3)	91:16;99:11,11;	verifies (1)	9:20;241:4	whole (3)
12:2;195:12,13	103:15,17;107:22;	50:23	warrant (1)	43:11;63:13;214:22
undermine (1)	108:24;109:10;110:18;	verify (1)	5:13	wholesale (1)
168:12	115:2,4;120:19;126:2;	180:14	warrants (1)	27:19
undermines (2)	134:8;136:10;152:25;	version (2)	5:12	wholly (6)
168:18;186:24	171:4,4;176:5;182:1;	131:18;179:1	<b>watching (1)</b> 14:10	54:16;104:3;161:8, 22;162:9;218:8
underscored (1)	188:9,17;200:24; 215:16;216:25;228:9,	<b>versus (12)</b> 4:16;18:13,14;43:10,	water (3)	who's (5)
91:13	22;233:25;239:18,22;	12,17,19;46:10;100:7;	95:19;177:7;214:9	28:6,9;31:23;204:3;
understood (6)	240:4;245:25	195:10,20;197:4	way (34)	238:2
36:14;59:2;159:11; 196:7;221:11;224:3	uphold (11)	vice (2)	5:5;10:18;12:10;	whose (2)
undertake (1)	124:11;150:3;	17:25;20:18	35:16;51:19;77:12,15,	55:14;235:4
142:14	151:20;158:21;159:10,	view (8)	19,21,22;81:13,15;	widely (1)
undertaken (1)	12,15;167:17;172:21;	9:15;90:20;202:15,	82:16;83:22;89:16;	107:10
224:17	177:24;183:11	18;203:10,17;204:1;	90:10;97:10;102:1;	Wildfire (1)
undignified (10)	upholding (3)	206:1	110:8;111:19;118:3;	20:19
150:16,17;158:17,	200:15;213:4,11	viewed (1)	127:4;145:20;153:23;	willfully (2)
18;167:13,14;172:18;	upholds (1)	202:21	170:9;176:14;181:5;	168:11;186:23
177:21;183:8;186:19	159:1	views (4)	200:23;209:21;217:10,	window (1)
unfortunately (2)	<b>upon</b> (5)	135:13;202:13;	21;219:5;232:25;233:1	228:13
192:15;208:23	7:14;78:8;179:10;	205:20;215:15	ways (1)	wise (1)
unfounded (1)	211:12;212:2	<b>vigorous (2)</b> 155:4,9	64:6 WD (1)	165:24 wish (9)
12:13	<b>upset (1)</b> 128:4	vigorously (2)	17:9	6:20;8:25;16:4;
uniform (1)	use (9)	205:4;213:5	website (5)	21:11;58:19;125:23;
19:15	105:14;112:21;	violate (2)	133:24;134:15;	171:8;206:23;228:5
unilaterally (1)	134:5,11;135:1;154:6;	11:21,22	135:7,12,17	wishes (2)
72:18	155:22;212:21;219:14	violated (9)	week (5)	206:12;219:23
<b>unique (2)</b> 111:6;201:9	used (10)	6:7;10:15;12:14;	55:8;71:7;82:4;	withdraw (5)
unit (1)	48:16;152:12;	13:9;164:23;165:17;	99:25;234:13	63:8,10;75:14;
144:23	154:18;174:22;179:1;	169:11;202:4;210:21	weekend (25)	185:15;229:8
United (18)	188:14;200:8;217:9;	violates (1)	24:24;32:14,18;35:3;	withdrawing (1)
10:19;17:9;73:20;	219:14;220:5	11:4	83:2,8,9,11,14,21;87:4;	16:1
74:14;76:22;77:22;	usually (1)	violating (3)	90:11;97:12;156:16;	withdrawn (4)
, , 0.22, , ,				

63:13;69:11;193:20;	220:8	10 (16)	178:19	187:17
218:22	writing (2)	15:6;30:15;41:1,2;	140 (13)	20 (8)
within (11)	63:11;130:16	84:5;86:11;87:12;	62:16;112:19,22;	15:7,15;23:14;60:10,
46:21;81:20;86:25;	written (12)	95:23;115:5;119:15;	140:13,17,24;141:1,7;	18;110:23;173:14;
131:8;132:14,15,23;	8:2;33:20;57:3;	121:13;126:11;175:3;	195:13,16;198:22,23;	210:18
	86:20,21;87:6;92:9;			
133:12;206:24;210:23;		187:15;233:25;234:2	199:2	<b>20/20 (1)</b> 154:23
212:14	121:18;122:16;124:17;	<b>10:40 (1)</b> 79:13	14th (19)	
without (10)	129:9;153:21		41:23;49:5;50:20;	2003 (1)
32:15;138:17;	wrong (3)	10:53 (1)	65:20,21;67:23;68:1;	126:7
139:24;191:8;200:21;	52:5;95:13;189:4	79:13	71:13,24;72:10,19,23;	2004 (1)
206:6;221:14;222:25;	wrote (12)	10-17 (1)	115:25;116:14;157:11;	126:7
233:10;236:23	31:20;33:17;37:15;	15:15	178:12;182:8,20;	2008 (7)
witness (37)	64:9;76:24;92:7;108:2;	10th (18)	222:20	121:11,19;122:17,
13:21;14:4,15,18,19;	160:25;169:21;173:8;	25:2,3,4;28:4;29:3,4;	15 (7)	22;123:3;125:2;126:10
17:13,15;26:2;29:9;	225:13,22	30:8;33:9;40:16;62:9;	15:6;53:7,11;79:11;	2010 (1)
79:1;80:8;84:12;93:11;	Wylie (4)	71:5,17;77:24;81:25;	160:22;189:5;193:23	126:19
94:6;112:9;115:22;	142:22;243:18;	82:4;83:11;84:7;	<b>16 (8)</b>	2017 (1)
119:10,12,16,19;120:5;	244:3,6	197:24	15:7;53:21,23;68:23;	126:20
166:13,15;191:2,3,17;	V	11 (21)	96:13;107:20;110:6;	2018 (2)
219:11;226:5,7,9,11;	Y	15:6;40:3;44:20,22;	161:1	126:24;230:24
227:10;229:11;230:8;		68:4;82:12;91:19;	16th (4)	2019 (1)
242:12;243:7,16	year (5)	108:25;109:23;146:12,	53:8,19;160:19;	230:21
witnessed (1)	6:10;126:8;137:24;	18;147:2;156:18;	188:10	2020 (1)
106:7	147:9,9	182:15,19;234:11,13;	17 (8)	127:3
witnesses (7)	years (21)	235:1,6;236:7,16	15:7;20:21;55:7,9,	2021 (32)
13:25;14:2;226:15;	17:16;19:10,11,24;	11:00 (1)	13,18;162:20;168:10	5:25;8:3;13:11;
243:10,13,25;245:25	20:1,21;45:22;54:24;	79:12	18 (11)	17:22;23:14;30:16;
witness's (2)	89:3;112:24;117:10,	11:23 (4)	15:22,24;56:21;69:5,	57:5;70:12;82:12;
195:25;196:1	16,23;121:13;122:18;	34:3;91:19;94:24;	6,7;74:12;110:11;	83:12;84:6;87:12;
Wolf (1)	126:11,20;127:2;	95:9	169:18;184:15;222:6	91:19;108:1;109:4,23;
127:1	137:24;154:5;194:8	11:46 (1)	1-8 (1)	110:11;116:1;119:1;
wondering (1)	Yep (4)	119:25	15:15	188:14;194:4,7;197:6,
226:12	40:5;110:22;137:12;	11th (18)	18th (2)	24;207:3;231:1;
word (9)	224:9	28:4;29:1;31:21;	53:24;160:24	234:11,13;235:2,6;
59:9;106:22;135:18;	yesterday (1)	33:9,18;34:2;37:13;	19 (10)	236:7,16
151:2,2;171:17;	16:4	40:13,17,20;41:4;42:2;	15:7,15;57:1,3,5;	2022 (2)
178:25;181:22;182:5	youth (1)	50:3;83:8,12;115:8;	69:13;110:23;111:1;	77:5;207:5
words (7)	23:25	157:6;197:24	169:22;225:21	2024 (1)
50:14;124:25;	youth-in-need-of-care (3)	12 (9)	1975 (1)	95:23
144:20;176:19;178:25;	24:8,13;52:22	15:6;19:11;43:23,24;	17:5	21 (37)
217:19;223:8	7	44:22;109:4;147:1;	1979 (2)	15:22,24;40:3;41:4;
work (12)	Z	156:5;169:15	16:24;17:7	44:23;53:25;55:11;
17:8,16,23,25;25:6;		12:00 (1)	1981 (1)	62:8,9;65:20;67:8;
46:13;127:19;160:1;	zealous (2)	119:15	17:17	68:5;70:14,22;71:13;
231:13,16;234:15;	12:22;176:11	12:58 (1)	1988 (1)	72:24;136:18,24;
235:12	zealously (4)	119:25	8:2	138:22;141:14;142:4,
worked (1)	13:17;159:5,10;	12-day (1)	1998 (1)	7;145:24,24;146:13;
50:12	176:8	197:16	121:10	147:1;154:24;156:2,
working (2)	zero (1)	12th (8)	1st (1)	18;157:11;162:16;
18:21;126:14	46:14	44:1;49:24;109:22;	196:18	169:15;173:11;178:12,
works (3)	1	156:8;157:22;169:20;	2	19;183:19;222:20
5:5;20:19;130:22	<b>I</b>	173:13;204:5	<b>_</b>	<b>21-094 (3)</b>
worries (2)	1 (15)	13 (9)	2 (12)	4:19;79:16;188:1
17:15;116:9	1 (15)	10:1;11:6;15:6;49:1;	2(12) 15.6.20.25.41.6.	22 (6)
<b>wrap (1)</b> 115:2	15:6;34:5;39:22;	61:19;68:16;109:11; 157:16:175:12	15:6;30:25;41:6;	15:7,15;20:20;63:1; 138:7;179:13
	40:1,2;55:13;57:13;	157:16;175:12	44:3,4;45:9;50:22;	
writ (13)	91:18;136:18,24;	1-3 (1)	58:13;170:15;190:6;	23 (3)
67:13;71:21;72:2,5; 72:2 6 22:77:1:112:14:	141:14;142:7;161:3;	41:22 13th (1)	222:1,4	15:22,24;65:10
73:2,6,22;77:1;113:14;	171:15;184:6	13th (1)	2,000 (3)	23-0496 (3)
179:11;184:1;194:11;	1.6 (1)	197:5	42:13,16,18	4:18;79:16;188:1
211:24	106:4	14 (8)	2:25 (1)	24 (12)
write (4)	1:00 (2)	4:23;8:3;15:6;41:19;	187:17	15:22,24;65:18;66:2;
129:12,24;155:15;	119:24;226:20	50:18;67:8;119:1;	2:35 (1)	77:5;115:20,21,22,22;

In the Mutter of Muslin I	indusen			
118:22;178:9,11	39 (14)	23:7	49:20;68:10;157:18	
<b>25</b> (4)	138:19,20;139:2,5,7;	<b>6:30</b> (1)	<b>9:00 (2)</b>	
15:7;19:10;66:23;	154:25;188:13,18,23;	23:7	245:22,24	
108:15	189:3,10;193:23;	<b>60 (2)</b>	<b>90-minute (1)</b>	
<b>25-35 (1)</b>	220:21;222:6	19:5;20:13	228:13	
15:15	39-15 (1)	611c (2)	9th (5)	
26 (7)	139:2	121:6;166:14	22:20,21;23:1;51:2;	
11:24;15:7;68:3,3;	4	615 (1)	195:4	
110:19;182:15,17	4	13:25		
26th (2)		_		
60:11;173:11	4 (13)	7		
27 (3)	15:6;60:18;61:13;			
15:7;70:10;183:19	136:23;139:6,7;140:4,	7 (16)		
28 (3)	8;145:24;173:17;	15:6;27:21,22;28:1;		
15:7;70:21;108:15	174:21;189:9;220:21	30:22;33:21,25;34:5;		
29 (3)	40 (13)	38:2;75:3;91:17;93:15,		
15:7;71:8;108:16	45:22;89:3;112:24;	23;109:12;122:22;		
29th (1)	117:10,16,23;121:17;	183:19		
65:10	122:1,4,6,14;191:22;	7th (8)		
2a (1)	245:8	70:11,14;121:19;		
60:19	400 (1)	122:17;123:2;125:2;		
2nd (2)	20:22	183:22;230:21		
142:4;143:4	<b>40-plus</b> (1)	0		
2	54:24	8		
3	40-years-plus (2)			
	59:11;62:1	8 (11)		
3 (13)	41 (2)	15:6;23:14;49:20;		
15:6;40:3;41:6,6;	7:6,10	51:7,7;61:13;109:12,		
122:25;140:8;154:25;	43 (2)	18;145:24;157:18;		
155:2,2;188:23;189:3;	75:13;185:13	174:21		
190:7,8	45 (5)	8.2 (2)		
3.4 (4)	75:20;185:20,21,21,	8:12;167:21		
149:4,12,14;164:19	22	8.2a (7)		
<b>3.4</b> c (7)	47 (1)	10:21;11:5;169:3;		
7:19;8:5;10:2,3;	184:10	208:8,10,13;209:4		
148:3;201:19;202:5	101.10	8.3 (1)		
3:00 (1)	5	105:2		
23:1		8.3a (3)		
3:25 (1)	5 (9)			
		104:13;105:15;		
228:25	15:6;51:1;55:21;	106:22 8 2h (1)		
3:38 (1)	96:12;137:2;140:19,	8.3b (1)		
228:25	21;162:24;168:10	105:22		
3:57 (1)	5,000 (5)	8.3c (1)		
246:7	42:14,16,18;51:3;	106:2		
30 (5)	52:6	8.4 (1)		
15:7;73:5,25;184:6;	5.1c (2)	169:1		
245:8	8:6;11:25	8.4a (3)		
<b>30th (2)</b>	5:00 (4)	8:16,18;11:20		
55:11;162:16	23:8;226:19;227:25;	8.4d (5)		
31 (2)	233:20	8:19;11:7;151:10;		
15:7;77:6	50 (1)	210:8,21		
32 (1)	19:5	8:00 (5)		
15:7	57 (2)	226:20;227:19;		
33 (1)	66:1,2	233:20;237:6,9		
15:8	00.1,2	800 (2)		
34 (3)	6	133:22;147:13		
	0			
15:8;74:22;184:22	$\zeta$ (14)	8th (5)		
35 (3)	6 (14)	23:15;70:22;144:3;		
12:4;15:8;65:25	15:6;22:2,5,24;	145:2;195:3		
36 (1)	23:18;61:2;65:25;	Δ		
178:15	140:22;141:1;143:21,	9		
38 (2)	25;146:9;173:17;194:4		1	
75:3;185:5	<b>6:00</b> (1)	9 (3)		