SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE - CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER DEPARTMENT C23

LE XUAN KHOA,)		
PLAINTIFF,)		
VS.)	NO.	30-2021-1201012
NGUYEN DINH THANG; BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S., INC., AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE,)))		
DEFENDANTS.))		

HONORABLE DAVID J. HESSELTINE, JUDGE PRESIDING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2024

MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR 8226

COURT-APPROVED OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE

	Page 2		Page 4
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:	1	EXHIBITS
2	AFFEARANCES OF COUNSEL.	2	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2024
3	FOR PLAINTIFF:	3	(EXHIBITS PREMARKED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED)
4	HOYT E. HART, II, ATTORNEY AT LAW	4	(======================================
5	VAN NGUYEN, LAW STUDENT	5	EXHIBIT ID EVID
6	P.O. BOX 675670	6	(NONE)
7	RANCHO SANTA FE, CA 92067	7	
8	HOYTH@PRODIGY.NET	8	
9		9	
10		10	
11	FOR DEFENDANTS:	11	
12	DAVID C. VOSS, ESQ.	12	
13	VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, LLP	13	
14	4640 ADMIRALTY WAY, SUITE 800	14	
15	MARINA DEL REY, CA 90292-6602	15	
16	DAVE@VSBLLP.COM	16	
17	-AND-	17	
18	STEPHEN J. ERIGERO, ESQ.	18	
19	ROPERS MAJESKI PC	19	
20	801 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 2100	20	
21	LOS ANGELES, CA 90017	21	
22	STEPHEN.ERIGERO@ROPERS.COM	22	
23		23	
24		24	
25		25	
26		26	
	Page 3		Page 5
1	WITNESSINDEX	1	SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2024
2	TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2024	2 3	MORNING SESSION ******
3	(NONE)	4	(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT:)
4 5		5	THE COURT: THEN WE WILL GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE
6		6	RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG.
7		7	AND IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES,
8		8	STARTING WITH THE PLAINTIFF.
9		9	MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR
10		10	THE PLAINTIFF.
11		11	MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. DAVE VOSS,
12		12	VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS.
13		13	MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN
14		14	ERIGERO, ROPERS & MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS.
15		15	THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
16		16	WE ARE OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. THEY
17		17	SHOULD BE HERE IN A FEW MINUTES FOR INSTRUCTIONS AND CLOSINGS.
18		18	OFF THE RECORD, WE HAD A SOME BRIEF
19		19	DISCUSSIONS RELATING TO THE FINAL VERSIONS OF THE JURY
20		20	INSTRUCTIONS AND THE VERDICT FORM.
21		21	IN TERMS OF THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS, WE INSERTED
22 23		22	A REVISED VERSION OF 1700 TO CONFORM TO DISCUSSIONS THAT WE
23		23	HAD LAST WEEK, AND THEN WE ALSO RECEIVED, FROM PLAINTIFF, A
25		24	NEW INSTRUCTION, CORPORATE EMPLOYER LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF AN
26		25	OFFICER. AND THAT HAS BEEN INSERTED AS WELL. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT ANYONE WOLLD LIKE
		26	IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE THAT ANYONE WOULD LIKE
		1	

Page 6 Page 8 TO SAY ABOUT THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS? PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 2 I'LL ALSO NOTE THAT WE HAVE BEEN GIVEN A COPY, 2 THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY. WE'RE BACK HERE 3 AND I'LL ASK YOU, AGAIN, TO FOLLOW ALONG AS I READ TO MAKE 3 IN KHAO V. THANG. WE HAVE ALL OUR JURORS WHO HAVE JOINED US 4 SURE THAT I DON'T MISSPEAK, BUT ANYTHING FOR THE RECORD FOR JURY INSTRUCTIONS? 5 AS WE INDICATED LAST WEEK WHEN WE WRAPPED UP. 5 6 MR. HART: NOT FOR PLAINTIFF, JUDGE. 6 WE WILL START IN TODAY WITH OUR INSTRUCTIONS ON THE LAW FOR MR. VOSS: NOT FOR DEFENDANT, YOUR HONOR. 7 YOU. AND THEN WE'LL GO INTO BOTH SIDES CLOSING ARGUMENTS, AND THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH 8 HOPEFULLY WE'LL GET DONE BEFORE LUNCH. WE COULD ROLL OVER 8 9 AND THEN MOVING ON TO THE VERDICT FORM, WE 9 JUST A TINY BIT AFTER LUNCH BECAUSE OF THE WRAPPING UP OF THE 10 DISCUSSED THAT LAST WEEK, AND THERE'S A FEW LITTLE THINGS THAT 10 CLOSING, BUT THEN DEFINITELY THIS AFTERNOON, WE'LL GET STARTED WE NEEDED TO FINALIZE ON THAT. AND BOTH SIDES DID SUBMIT ON DELIBERATIONS FOR YOU 11 11 12 COPIES OF VERDICT FORM. AND THEY WERE VERY SIMILAR, A FEW 12 YOU WILL RECEIVE COPIES OF THESE INSTRUCTIONS 13 MINOR THINGS. 13 IN THE JURY ROOM. WE'LL SEND IN THREE TO FOUR SETS, SO YOU'LL THE MINOR DIFFERENCES WERE THE INSTRUCTIONS HAVE THEM TO REFER TO DURING YOUR DELIBERATION. 14 14 15 AFTER OUESTION NO. 5 AND 6. AND NEITHER WERE WRONG. WE JUST 15 NONETHELESS, PLEASE DO PAY ATTENTION AS WE READ 16 ENDED UP -- THE COURT ENDED UP GOING WITH THE PLAINTIFF'S 16 THROUGH THESE INSTRUCTIONS. THE ATTORNEYS MAY REFER TO SOME 17 VERSION. IT WAS A LITTLE SIMPLER, BUT THERE'S NOTHING TO 17 OF THEM DURING THEIR CLOSING ARGUMENTS, SO IT'S IMPORTANT TO 18 IMPROPER ABOUT EITHER ONE. IT'S JUST FOR CLARITY. 18 KIND OF PAY ATTENTION AND HEAR THEM ALL IN CONTEXT BEFORE WE 19 AND THEN THE OTHER DIFFERENCE WAS THAT IN 19 GET TO THAT POINT QUESTION 7, PLAINTIFF INCLUDED A QUESTION PART RELATED TO SO WITHOUT FURTHER ADO, WE'RE GOING TO DIVE 20 20 HARM, RELATED TO PLAINTIFF'S OCCUPATION, WHICH DEFENDANTS 21 21 RIGHT IN HERE. 22 OBJECTED, AND THE COURT ULTIMATELY INCLUDED THE OCCUPATION 22 (READING OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS BY THE COURT TO THE JURY. 2.3 OUESTION IN THERE 2.3 REPORTING WAIVED) SO ANYTHING FROM PLAINTIFF RELATING TO THE 24 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. SO VERDICT FORM THAT YOU'D LIKE TO PUT ON THE RECORD? 25 THOSE ARE THE INSTRUCTIONS FOR THIS MATTER. AS INDICATED. 25 26 MR. HART: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 26 WE'LL HAVE A FEW SETS THAT YOU CAN REFER TO DURING YOUR Page 7 Page 9 THE COURT: AND FROM DEFENSE SIDE? 1 1 DELIBERATIONS 2 MR. VOSS: NO, YOUR HONOR. 2 WE ARE NOW GOING TO TRANSITION TO THE CLOSING 3 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THEN WE HAVE EVERYBODY IS 3 ARGUMENTS FROM THE ATTORNEYS. WE'LL START WITH PLAINTIFF, GO IN AGREEMENT AS TO THE SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS AND THE VERDICT TO DEFENDANT, AND THEN PLAINTIFF WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR 4 4 5 FORM IS CONSISTENT WITH THE RULINGS THAT THE COURT HAS MADE ON A BRIEF REBUTTAL. 6 THOSE TOPICS. 6 AS YOU HEARD DURING THE INSTRUCTIONS, ANYTHING 7 THEN ANYTHING AT ALL THAT WE NEED TO HAVE ON 7 THE ATTORNEYS SAY DURING THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS IS NOT 8 THE RECORD? WE'RE A FEW MINUTES FROM OUR JURORS. AND WE WERE 8 EVIDENCE. THE EVIDENCE IS WHAT YOU HEARD DURING THE TRIAL, 9 AND IT WILL BE FOR YOU TO DECIDE WHAT EVIDENCE YOU BELIEVE OR 9 TALKING, OFF THE RECORD, ABOUT TIME ESTIMATES, AND IT SOUNDS LIKE WE'RE SHOOTING, IF WE CAN GET STARTED AT 9, TO MAYBE BE 10 10 DISBELIEVE. ABLE TO HOPEFULLY WRAP UP RIGHT AT THE LUNCH HOUR. WORSE CASE TO THE EXTENT THE ATTORNEYS SAY ANYTHING ABOUT 11 11 SCENARIO, A LITTLE BIT OF REBUTTAL AFTER THE LUNCH HOUR, BUT THE LAW THAT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT YOU 12 12 13 BOTH PARTIES WERE -- ROUGH, FUSSY ESTIMATES OF ABOUT 1.3 JUST HEARD, YOU ARE TO FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT WERE READ 14 60 MINUTES WITH THAT ON THE PLAINTIFF'S SIDE BEING EQUAL, THE 14 TO YOU AS OPPOSED TO ANY INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS THAT MAY BE INITIAL AND THE REBUTTAL. WE'LL HAVE TO SEE THAT ALL UNFOLD. 15 15 MADE. 16 THAT WAS ABOUT WHERE WE'RE AT. 16 AND WITH THAT, WE WILL START WITH PLAINTIFF. 17 SO WE'RE HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN GET IT IN BEFORE 17 MR. HART, THE FLOOR IS YOURS. THAT LUNCH HOUR, BUT, AS I INDICATED, IF WE GO -- I THINK WE 18 18 MR. HART: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. HAVE A FEW WRAP-UP MINUTES AFTER THE LUNCH HOUR, THAT'S 19 19 GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. ACCEPTABLE TO GET THE JURY GOING FROM THERE. A STATEMENT THAT'S BEEN ON THE WHITEBOARD 20 2.0 21 ANYTHING FOR THE RECORD FROM ANYBODY? 21 THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL IS A FALSE STATEMENT. 22 MR. HART: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 22 FOR THIS TO BE TRUE, WE WOULD NEED TO HAVE IN THE COURT: ANYTHING FROM DEFENSE? EVIDENCE AN APPLICATION FOR A GRANT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF 2.3 2.3 24 SO WE CAN GO OFF THE RECORD THEN. 24 STATE, WHEREIN MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A DOCTORAL 25 (OFF THE RECORD.) 25 DEGREE. 2.6 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE 26 WE DIDN'T GET THAT IN EVIDENCE. FAILING THAT.

Page 10 Page 12 THE STATEMENT IS FALSE. BUT IT WASN'T PRODUCED. THE LAW PROVIDES INSTRUCTION FOR YOU ON THIS. 2 WHEN YOU GO THROUGH THE VERDICT FORM, THERE 2 3 WILL BE A PLACE ARE FOR YOU TO SAY WHETHER THIS IS TRUE OR IF HIS LAWYER HAD SUCH A RESUME THAT SAID -- CLAIMED TO BE A 4 FALSE. IF IT'S NOT TRUE, IT'S FALSE. IT'S NOT A LITTLE TRUE PH.D., AND HE DIDN'T SHOW IT, THEN YOU CAN DISTRUST THAT OR VAGUELY TRUE: IT'S TRUE OR IT'S FALSE. TESTIMONY. HE CLAIMED IT, BUT HE DIDN'T SHOW IT. THAT'S 5 5 6 TO BE TRUE, IT REQUIRES ALL THESE THINGS, NONE 7 OF WHICH CAME INTO EVIDENCE. NOW, OCCASIONALLY, WHEN WE'RE DOING THIS KIND OF WORK, ESPECIALLY WITH CONVOLUTED TESTIMONY AND EXPLANATION, 8 A RESUME THAT SAYS "DOCTORAL THESIS" IS NOT A 8 9 RESUME THAT SAYS "DOCTORAL DEGREE." SO THAT DOESN'T GET THE LIKE WE HAVE HAD IN THIS CASE, YOU DON'T ACTUALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT REALLY WENT ON UNTIL IT COMES OUT IN THE TRIAL. WE DO 10 JOB DONE FOR TWO REASONS. IT'S NOT SAYING DOCTORAL DEGREE. 10 AND THE OTHER REASON IS IT'S TRUE. HE HAD A DOCTORAL THESIS. 11 THE BEST WE CAN IN DEPOSITIONS TO FIND OUT WHAT HAPPENED, BUT 11 12 SO YOU WON'T FIND AND YOU HAVEN'T SEEN EVIDENCE TO MAKE THIS 12 SOMETIMES, LIKE THIS CASE, THE REVELATIONS THAT COME OUT 13 STATEMENT TRUE. THEREFORE, IT'S FALSE. 13 DURING TRIAL EXPLAIN THE WHOLE THING. NOW, THERE'S A LOT OF RUMINATING ABOUT WHY THIS WE WENT THROUGH THOSE DORNAN LETTERS OUITE A 14 14 15 WAS DONE, BUT YOU'LL SEE TESTIMONY IN A LITTLE BIT THAT NGUYEN 15 BIT. AND WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT THEM AGAIN IN A MINUTE, BUT 16 DINH THANG DID THIS TO PROTECT B.P.S.O.S.'S ABILITY TO 16 WHAT REALLY -- THE REVELATION THAT I HAD IN THIS CASE, WHILE WE'RE DOING THE TRIAL, COMES FROM WHEN I'M ASKING DR. THANG: FUNDRAISE. 17 17 HOW DO THOSE DORNAN LETTERS PROVE THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? 18 "IF I DIDN'T SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT RIGHT 18 AWAY, IT WOULD INTERFERE WITH B.P.S.O.S.'S ABILITY TO 19 19 AND HE KEPT EXPLAINING INSTEAD OF HOW IT PROVED IT WAS TRUE, HOW EFFECTIVE THE LETTERS WERE. 20 FUNDRAISE." 20 SO THIS PUBLICATION FROM MAY 25, 2020 WAS MADE 21 REMEMBER: "AS SOON AS THESE WERE RELEASED TO 21 22 ON BEHALF OF B.P.S.O.S. SO LET'S PUT UP JURY INSTRUCTION THE PUBLIC, WITHIN A WEEK THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPED ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT.' 2.3 THIS IS ONE OF THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT THE 24 24 AND, YOU KNOW, I'M STRUGGLING WITH THIS. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE. WHY IS THAT HIS EXPLANATION? HE'S COURT READ TO YOU. AND AS YOU CAN SEE, NGUYEN DINH THANG WAS 25 25 26 THE PRESIDENT OF BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S. IF YOU FIND THAT HE WAS 26 CONFLATING TRUTH WITH EFFECTIVENESS. AND THEN YOU REALIZE, AS Page 13 Page 11 HE GIVES FURTHER EXPLANATION, SOME OF WHICH WE'LL LOOK AT HERE 1 ACTING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF B.P.S.O.S. EMPLOYMENT WHEN THE 1 MAY 25TH ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED ON THE B.P.S.O.S. WEBSITE AND IN A LITTLE BIT, THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THOSE DORNAN LETTERS 2 3 SENT BY EMAIL TO THE EMAIL LIST, THEN B.P.S.O.S. IS 3 WERE TO ASSASSINATE THE CHARACTER OF PROFESSOR KHOA. RESPONSIBLE. HE WAS THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S LEAD WITNESS 4 4 5 THE REASON I'M DOING THIS AT THE FRONT IS AGAINST THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. AND THEY COULDN'T GET HIM TO 6 BECAUSE A COUPLE OF OUESTIONS IN THE VERDICT FORM WILL ASK BUDGE. THEY COULDN'T GET HIM TO CHANGE HIS POSITION. SO THEY 7 YOU, LIKE NO. 1: DID NGUYEN DINH THANG MAKE THIS STATEMENT? DID WHAT, UNFORTUNATELY, OFTEN HAPPENS IN POLITICS: THEY 8 HE DID. HE ADMITTED THAT HE DID. STARTED THROWING MUD AT HIM. AND THAT'S WHAT THOSE LETTERS ARE 9 IT ALSO SAYS: DID B.P.S.O.S. MAKE THIS 10 STATEMENT? 10 THE REASON YOU DON'T SEE ANY REPORT OF AN 11 SO WE KNOW THE TESTIMONY WAS THAT HE PUBLISHED INVESTIGATION, THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION. REMEMBER THE 12 IT ON MACH SONG MEDIA. THAT'S BPS OS BUT WITH THIS TESTIMONY: AL SANTOLI HAD ME COME IN AND GAVE ME ALL THESE 13 INSTRUCTION, YOU CAN SEE THAT ANYTHING DR. THANG DID IN THIS DOCUMENTS, ALL THESE THINGS THAT ARE FULL OF INNUENDO BUT NO 14 CASE RELATED TO THIS PUBLICATION, HE DID FOR THE BENEFIT AND PROOF, AND ASKED ME IF I WANTED COPIES. ON BEHALF OF B.P.S.O.S. 15 AND THE DORNAN LETTERS THAT ARE NOT CC'ED TO 15 16 SO EVEN THOUGH YOU'LL BE ASKED TO ANSWER 16 ANYBODY WERE GIVEN OUT TO A LOT OF PEOPLE. WHAT'S THAT ALL 17 INDIVIDUALLY FOR THANG AND B.P.S.O.S., IN REALITY, IF YOU 17 ABOUT? THAT'S ABOUT TAKING OUT THE WITNESS THAT'S 18 ANSWER FOR THANG. THE SAME ANSWER APPLIES TO B P S O S. 18 OKAY. NOW, THERE'S ANOTHER IMPORTANT 19 HOLDING UP THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. AND HERE IS WHERE INSTRUCTION HERE. LET'S PUBLISH 203. 20 DR. THANG COMES IN: HOW EFFECTIVE THAT WAS. SOME OF THE TESTIMONY THAT YOU HEARD FROM 21 WITHIN JUST A WEEK, STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPED 21 22 DR. THANG WAS -- I WAS TRYING TO GET HIM TO EXPLAIN HOW THOSE THEIR OBJECTION. DORNAN LETTERS MADE THIS STATEMENT TRUE, AND I KEPT ASKING 23 23 AND WHY DID THEY DO THAT? HIM: WHERE IS YOUR PROOF OF THIS? BECAUSE PROFESSOR KHOA HAD NO MORE CREDIBILITY. 24 25 AND HE SAID: I'VE SEEN PROOF. I HAVE PROOF. THEY DESTROYED HIS CREDIBILITY. 26 MY LAWYER HAS THE PROOF. 2.6 SO FAST FORWARD. THAT WAS IN '96. COME BACK

Page 14 Page 16 NOW TO 2019, AND YOU'LL SEE IN EXHIBIT 17, APPARENTLY IN LETTER. THIS IS THE BACKGROUND REFERENCE, ACCORDING TO DR. THANG, FOR WHY HE WROTE THE FALSE STATEMENT THAT'S ON THE 2 DECEMBER OF 2019, DR. THANG FEELS THE NEED TO BOLSTER HIS 2 3 PRESTIGE OR CREDIBILITY IN THE REFUGEE CHARITY ARENA. 3 4 AND SO HE PUBLISHES ON MACH SONG MEDIA, THIS AND AS WE LOOK THROUGH THIS, WE MAY SEE VIDEO WITH CAPTIONS CLAIMING THAT HE AND B.P.S.O.S. WERE THE ALLEGATIONS IN THERE, LIKE, S.E.A.R.A.C. OR 5 5 6 ONES RESPONSIBLE FOR RESETTLING 18- TO 20 000 PEOPLE. 6 LR.A.C. MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA AS A DOCTOR, BUT WE DO NOT SEE IN THERE ANY REFERENCE TO ACTUAL EVIDENCE THAT THAT WAS THE WORK OF S.E.A.R.A.C. PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY PRESENTED HIMSELF AS A DOCTORAL DEGREE S E A R A C. DID THAT BACK IN THE '90S. BUT DR. THANG CLAIMS 8 8 THAT CREDIT IN 2019. 9 AND SO WHAT WE HAVE, NOW THAT WE CAN SEE IT 10 SO BY THE SPRING OF 2020, PROFESSOR KHOA HAS 10 PLISHED BACK AND SAID: WAIT A MINUTE. THAT'S NOT CORRECT KIND OF IN CONTEXT, THIS IS THE BEGINNING EFFORT AT A 11 11 12 AND THESE ARE IN EVIDENCE. YOU'LL BE ABLE TO 12 POLITICAL HIT JOB ON PROFESSOR KHOA, BECAUSE, WE NEED TO GET 13 SEE THESE ARTICLES. PROFESSOR KHOA'S ARTICLE IS 237. AND 13 THE STATE DEPARTMENT OUT OF THE WAY, AND HE'S THEIR WITNESS, THEN THE OFFENDING ARTICLE, MAY 25TH, IS 238. AND SO WE'RE GOING TO START TO PUT OUT RUMORS ABOUT HIM. WHAT 14 14 15 SO YOU CAN READ IN THERE -- I DIDN'T GO INTO 15 CAN WE USE TO PUT THOSE RUMORS OUT? 16 DETAIL IN THIS IN THE TRIAL, BECAUSE IT REALLY DOESN'T MATTER. 16 SO HE SENDS THE MARCH 6TH LETTER TO PROFESSOR KHOA ASKING FOR THINGS LIKE A RESUME AND GRANT THIS IS WHAT MATTERS. BUT WHEN WE SEE ALL THE EVIDENCE IN 17 17 18 TOTAL, WE APPRECIATE WHAT'S REALLY GOING ON HERE. 18 APPLICATIONS, WHICH HE DUTIFULLY SENDS IN. 19 SO 2019, 25 YEARS AFTER THE R.O.V.R. PROGRAM IN 19 AND WHAT DOES CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DO WITH THAT MATERIAL? HE STARTS SPREADING IT AROUND TO PEOPLE LIKE NGUYEN THE 1990'S, DR. THANG CLAIMS CREDIT FOR THAT, LONG-RETIRED 20 PROFESSOR KHOA GETS NOTICED BY FRIENDS, "HEY, WHAT'S THE TRUTH 21 DINH THANG. HERE?" 2.2 AND WHEN THAT DOESN'T GET THE JOB DONE EXACTLY. WRITES HIS ARTICLE. HE SET THE RECORD 23 THERE'S ANOTHER LETTER. THAT'S EXHIBIT 234. THE APRIL 30TH 23 LETTER OF DR. THANG CLAIMS THIS IS HIS MAIN PRIMARY RESOURCE STRAIGHT. 24 FOR WHAT HE WROTE HERE IN THIS STATEMENT ON THE WHITEBOARD NOW, DR. THANG IS IN A PICKLE, BECAUSE HE'S 25 25 CLAIMED CREDIT FOR THIS. AND THE GUY WHO ACTUALLY IS ENTITLED 26 NOW THIS ONE, WE HAVE TO LOOK A LITTLE BIT Page 15 Page 17 TO CREDIT FOR IT PUSHED BACK. IT MAKES HIM LOOK LIKE A LIAR. CLOSELY AT. ALL RIGHT. YOU SEE THIS. NOW, THIS IS IMPORTANT 1 WELL, HE SET THAT TRAP FOR HIMSELF. BECAUSE WHEN YOU'RE DOING YOUR POLITICAL HIT JOB ON SOMEBODY, 3 HE TOLD YOU: I HAD TO RESPOND RIGHT AWAY. I 3 YOU WANT TO BE CAREFUL NOT TO SUBJECT YOURSELF TO A DEFAMATION HAD TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT 4 CASE. SO WHAT DOES HE SAY HERE? 4 5 AND IF ALL HE DID WAS GIVE HIS OPINION OF THE I AM CONCERNED THERE MAY BE A CONFLICT OF 6 HISTORY, THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN FINE. TWO OLD GUYS TALKING AND 6 INTEREST. OH, I'M JUST BEING A GOOD CONGRESSMAN, LOOKING OUT 7 ARGUING ABOUT WHO DID WHAT IN THE OLD DAYS. SO WHAT? NO 7 FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST. 8 8 "BEGINNING IN JANUARY '96, I RECEIVED AN 9 HE DIDN'T LIMIT HIMSELF TO THAT. HE ADDED OVERWHELMING NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS AND LETTERS FROM 9 THIS. AND THE REASON IS HE-SAID SHE-SAID IS A STALEMATE. HOW 10 10 RESPECTED VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN MY DISTRICT AND DO I OVERCOME PROFESSOR KHOA'S HISTORICAL FACT STATEMENT? 11 11 ACROSS THE UNITED STATES." 12 OH TREMEMBER WHAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DID. HE 12 WHO ARE THOSE? DID WE SEE ANY OF THAT? DO WE 13 DESTROYED THE CREDIBILITY OF PROFESSOR KHOA BACK IN '96. KNOW? 1.3 14 SO HE GOES INTO HIS ARCHIVES AND HE PULLS OUT 14 TALK IS CHEAP WHEN YOU'RE DOING THIS. THAT'S ALL THOSE PAPERS, AND PRIMARILY THE APRIL 2ND AND APRIL 30TH 15 15 HOW HE CAN LAY OFF THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT HE'S ABOUT TO 16 DORNAN LETTERS. AND HE REVIEWS THAT AND HE COOKS UP THE 16 SAY ON SOMEBODY ELSE. SO I'M JUST REPEATING WHAT I WAS TOLD. 17 MAY 25 ARTICLE, EXHIBIT 238. 17 CLASSIC POLITICAL AVOIDANCE. WHAT DO THEY CALL THAT? AND JUST TO GIVE HIMSELF ONE LEG UP ON THE 18 18 DENIABILITY, OSTENSIBLE DENIABILITY. DISCUSSION, HE PUTS THAT FALSE STATEMENT IN THERE IN ORDER TO WELL, IT MIGHT NOT BE TRUE, BUT IT'S JUST WHAT 19 UNDERMINE THE CREDIBILITY OF HIS ARGUING OPPONENT. 20 PEOPLE TOLD ME. AND SO I'M ASKING YOU TO INVESTIGATE. 21 THAT'S WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS CASE. THIS WAS A 21 WE DON'T SEE WHAT HAPPENED WHEN THE LETTER WAS CASE OF STOLEN VALOR, CLAIMING CREDIT FOR WHAT RECEIVED BY THIS PERSON, THE INSPECTOR GENERAL. WE ONLY SEE 22 S.E.A.R.A.C. DID. AND WHEN YOU WERE CALLED OUT ON IT, YOU DID WHAT'S IN THE LETTER SENT OUT FOR THAT PURPOSE. 23 CHARACTER ASSASSINATION ON PROFESSOR KHOA. 24 SO MOVING TO THE BOTTOM OF THIS FIRST 25 SO LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 232 -- I'M SORRY, 233. 25 PARAGRAPH, WE SEE THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. ARE THE 26 HERE IS THE APRIL 2ND 1996 ROBERT DORNAN TARGETS. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE PROFESSOR KHOA IS. NOBODY ELSE 26

Page 18 Page 20 BUT JUST S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. TO UNRING THAT BELL. 2 WE'RE USING POWERPOINT IN ORDER TO BRING UP 2 AND HERE IS THE KEY PART. AT THE BOTTOM, IT SAYS: THEIR CONCERNS INCLUDE. THE PEOPLE WHO CALLED ME HAVE 3 3 QUESTIONS WITH TESTIMONY TO HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW EASILY THIS CONCERNS. THEIR CONCERNS ARE THESE FIVE THINGS. VERDICT IS MANAGED. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THIS IS CALLED INNUENDO, 5 THIS IS YOUR JOB: WHAT'S RIGHT OR WRONG. 5 6 ASSAULT BY INNUENDO 6 BELIEVABLE OR NOT, WHAT'S TRUE AND WHAT ARE LIES. ITEM NO. 5: "ONE OF THEIR CONCERNS IS "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED HE HAD A DOCTORAL MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION AS A PH.D." DEGREE IN APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF 8 8 DID WE SEE HIM, IN ANY EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE, 9 9 SELF-PROMOTE TO BE A PH.D.? 10 WE CAN PROBABLY ALL RECITE THAT IN OUR SLEEP NOW. 11 11 12 IN FACT, HE PRACTICALLY CRIED WHEN CONFRONTED 12 THE QUESTION IS WHETHER IT'S TRUE OR FALSE. I THINK WE ALL KNOW ALREADY IT'S FALSE. WITH WHETHER HE EVER SAID HE WAS A PH.D. OR NOT. THAT IS A 13 FOR THIS TO BE TRUE, YOU HAVE TO HAVE THE GRANT HORRIBLE INSULT TO HIS PERSONAL INTEGRITY. HE NEVER DID THAT, 14 15 BUT THIS IS ONE OF THE CONCERNS OF THOSE PEOPLE 15 APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, PLUS THE FALSE CLAIMS 16 WHO SUPPOSEDLY CALLED IN. THOSE UNNAMED PEOPLE. 16 OF A DOCTORAL DEGREE. WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE APRIL 2ND AND APRIL 30TH 17 "HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A 17 DEGREE," THAT MUST BE PART OF THE RESPONSE TO THE MARCH 6TH LETTERS. NOW, IT'S INTERESTING, HERE IS THE TRANSCRIPT FROM 18 18 19 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION 19 THURSDAY THE 7TH A QUESTION TO DR THANG-THEN IT SAYS: "HIS MISREPRESENTATION OF 20 "CAN YOU TELL ME WHERE THIS COPY OF 20 THE APRIL 2ND DORNAN LETTER CAME FROM? 21 ACADEMIC CREDENTIAL MAY HAVE RESULTED IN HIS RECEIVING STATE 21 22 DEPARTMENT GRANTS OVER COMPETING APPLICANTS." 2.2 "IT CAME FROM AL SANTOLI, THE STAFF 23 NICE BIT OF SPECULATION, BUT DID WE SEE 23 OF DORNAN." ANYTHING ABOUT THAT? WERE THERE THREE OTHER COMPETING GRANT THAT'S HOW WE LEARNED WHAT ALL THIS WAS. 24 24 THESE ARE REVELATIONS THAT I'M TELLING YOU ABOUT. IT'S A APPLICATIONS THAT DID NOT HAVE PH.D. APPLICANTS WHO HE GOT 25 25 26 OVER THEM BECAUSE OF THIS FALSE CHARGE? 26 LITTLE EMBARRASSING NOT LEARN THE TRUE DETAILS UNTIL TRIAL, Page 19 Page 21 NO. IT'S ALL MADE UP. IT'S ALL MADE UP. BUT AT LEAST WE'VE LEARNED THEM. (AS READ:) 1 1 THIS IS WHY WE NEVER SAW A GRANT APPLICATION 2 "QUESTION: DID YOU SPEAK TO HIM PRIOR TO WITH A RESUME THAT SAID "PH D " IN IT. IT'S ALL FAKE. BUT IT 3 APRIL OF '96 ABOUT THE ISSUES THAT WE SEE IN THESE LETTER? DOESN'T MATTER. IT DOES ITS JOB WHETHER IT'S TRUE OR NOT "ANSWER: HIS STAFF DR ALBERT SANTOLI KNOW 4 ITS JOB IS TO DESTROY THE CREDIBILITY OF SOMEONE IMPORTANT ME WELL, AND HE ASKED ME TO VISIT DORNAN'S OFFICE ONE DAY. ENOUGH TO BE BLOCKING LEGISLATION THAT DORNAN WANTED 6 AND HE SHOWED ME THE STACK OF PROPOSALS DELIVERED BY THE 7 IN MY BOOK, THIS WHOLE THING IS DESPICABLE. TO OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT TO DORNAN'S OFFICE IN RESPONSE 8 SACRIFICE PROFESSOR KHOA'S LIFETIME OF WORK AND DEDICATION AND 8 9 INTEGRITY OVER AN AMENDMENT TO SOMETHING THAT PRESIDENT 9 "AND THEN HE PULL OUT UNDERNEATH, AT THE BACK CLINTON VETOED ANYWAY, THAT'S DESPICABLE. OF THESE PROPOSALS, A C.V. WITH A BIO SAYING 'DR. KHOA,' UNDER 10 10 11 AND TO RESURRECT THIS AND DO IT AGAIN TO 11 I.R.A.C. OFFICIAL LETTERHEAD." PROTECT B.P.S.O.S.'S ABILITY TO FUNDRAISE, THAT'S DESPICABLE. 12 OKAY. SO THAT'S AN EXHIBIT THAT IS IN THERE, 12 13 THE ONE THING A MAN HAS AT THE END OF HIS DAYS 1.3 TOO. IT'S THE BIO. IT'S NOT PART OF THE GRANT APPLICATION. 14 IS HIS GOOD NAME. AND HOW EASY IS IT TO STEAL THAT? HOW EASY 14 THAT IS EXHIBIT 212. AND YOU CAN SEE THIS. IT WILL BE -- A IS IT TO JUST PUBLISH SOMETHING THAT SAYS: OH, HE FALSELY 15 COPY OF THIS WILL BE BOUGHT BACK TO YOU. 15 16 CLAIMED. HE COMMITTED A CRIME. HE DEFRAUDED THE FEDERAL 16 IT'S ACTUALLY INTERESTING WHAT YOU SEE IN THE 17 GOVERNMENT. 17 BIO. PROFESSOR KHOA EXPLAINED WHAT THIS IS USED FOR. THIS IS BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON HIM THAT IS GIVEN TO PEOPLE WHEN HE 18 HOW DO YOU UNRING THAT BELL? 18 19 THIS IS HOW DO YOU IT: WHAT WE'RE ALL DOING 19 GOES TO SPEAK OR IS INTERVIEWED. RIGHT NOW. AND THAT'S WHY THIS IS SO IMPORTANT THAT YOU HAVE NOW, IT SAYS "DR. KHOA." AND WE HEARD FROM 20 2.0 21 COME AND PARTICIPATED, BECAUSE YOU ARE THE WAY WE WILL UNRING CECILE THAT IN CULTURES OUTSIDE THE U.S., NOT SO MUCH HERE, 22 THAT BELL BECAUSE YOU, UNLIKE ANYBODY ELSE BEFORE YOU, GOT TO OTHER PEOPLE WILL INTERCHANGE THE WORD "PROFESSOR" AND ACTUALLY SEE THE EVIDENCE AND YOU KNOW THAT STATEMENT IS 2.3 "DOCTOR." AND SO A LOT OF PEOPLE CALLED HIM "DOCTOR." HE 23 24 FALSE. 24 OBJECTED FOR A WHILE, AND THEN HE JUST GAVE UP. 25 SO WITH THAT BEING SAID, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT 25 YOU DON'T SEE ANYWHERE IN HERE WHERE HE CLAIMED 2.6 THE VERDICT FORM, BECAUSE THIS IS HOW WE EXECUTE THIS PROCESS 26 TO BE A DOCTOR OR A PH D

Page 22 Page 24 THIS BIO IS INTERESTING. TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO "SO WHAT YOU'RE TELLING US IS THE PEOPLE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THAT ARGUMENT USED THIS CLAIM AGAINST 2 READ IT THINGS LIKE: "IN THE AREA OF LEADERSHIP AND 3 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, KHOA HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN THE MR. KHOA TO NEUTRALIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE? 4 DEVELOPMENT OF CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS WITH BROAD SPECTRUM OF "ANSWER: THEY, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, REFUGEE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE ASSOCIATIONS." REALIZED THAT THEIR WITNESS WAS NO LONGER CREDIBLE, BECAUSE 5 SOMEONE WHO MISREPRESENTED HIS ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS CANNOT BE 6 THIS BIO ACTUALLY GIVES YOU A LOT OF BACKGROUND 7 ON WHO PROFESSOR KHOA WAS BACK IN THE '80'S AND '90'S. AND SO TRUSTED ON ANY MATTERS OF POLICY " 8 IT'S INTERESTING AND USEFUL FOR THAT POINT 8 BINGO, LIGHT BULB, THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. HE'S IN A PICKLE BECAUSE HE FALSELY CLAIMED CREDIT FOR 9 FORMALLY, THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF CULTURE OF WHAT S.E.A.R.A.C. DID AND GOT CALLED OUT FOR IT. SO WHAT CAN 10 EDUCATION AND THEN VICE PRESIDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAIGON. 10 VIETNAM WHERE HE TAUGHT ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY FOR 15 YEARS 11 HE DO ABOUT IT? 11 12 SO IF YOU WANT TO KNOW ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND, 12 HE CAN MAKE UP THIS FALSE STATEMENT, WHICH YOU 13 YOU CAN SEE IT HERE IN THE BIO. 13 DON'T SEE ANYWHERE IN THE DORNAN STUFF. IT'S ONLY INNUENDO SO THE EXAMINATION GOES ON (AS READ): WITH THIS. BUT NOW HE COMES RIGHT OUT AND SAYS IT. AND HE 14 14 HAS TO DO THAT BECAUSE HE KNOWS THAT ANYBODY WHO 15 "WHY WERE YOU ASKING IN 1996 FOR CONGRESSMAN 15 MISREPRESENTED THEIR CREDENTIALS HAS NO CREDIBILITY. THAT'S 16 DORNAN TO GIVE YOU THESE DOCUMENTS RELATED TO S.E.A.R.A.C. OR 16 17 WHY HE DID ALL OF THIS. 17 I.R.A.C.." 18 "ANSWER: OH, CONGRESSMAN DORNAN WAS VERY 18 WHY THE DEFAMATION? 19 CONCERNED BECAUSE MR. KHOA WAS OPPOSING THE ANTI-CPA 19 TO DISCREDIT PROFESSOR KHOA. (AS READ:) AMENDMENT AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN SMITH." "IS YOUR CREDIBILITY IMPORTANT TO YOU IN THE 20 20 SO NOW YOU BEGIN TO SEE THE CONNECTIONS COMING 21 WORK YOU DO WITH B.P.S.O.S.," ASKS MR. VOSS. 21 22 TOGETHER. 22 "YES," SAYS PROFESSOR THANG, "VERY MUCH SO. 90 PERCENT OF OUR BUDGET FOR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS CAME 2.3 AND HERE IS THE TESTIMONY YOU CAN SEE -- IF 23 SOME OF YOU WANT TO MAKE NOTES, IF YOU WANT TO HAVE THIS FROM DONATIONS, SMALL DONATIONS, FROM A LOT OF MEMBERS OF THE 24 24 COMMUNITY MANY OF THEM WERE OUR FORMER CLIENTS THAT WE TESTIMONY READ BACK TO YOU, IT'S THE TRANSCRIPT FROM 11-14, 25 25 26 PAGES 7 TO 9. 26 HELPED, FORMER BOAT PEOPLE. Page 23 Page 25 "SO IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT ALL YOU WERE TRYING 1 THE EXPLANATION HERE IS -- AND I'M ASKING HIM 1 2 (AS READ): 2 TO DO WAS TO PROTECT YOUR REPUTATION AND SET THE RECORD 3 "SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT INFORMATION 3 IN THE ARTICLE ALL ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED WITH THE ANTI-CPA "THAT'S CORRECT BUT NOT ONLY THAT IF I 4 4 ARGUMENT. HOW DOES THE SENTENCE ABOUT MR. KHOA AND HIS DIDN'T RESPOND SOON, THAT WOULD JEOPARDIZE OUR CAPACITY TO 6 SUPPOSED FALSE CLAIM, HOW DOES THAT SENTENCE CONTRIBUTE TO 6 RAISE IN THE COMMUNITY." YOUR SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT." 7 IN MATTERS OF POLITICAL CORRUPTION, ALWAYS 8 THIS IS IMPORTANT TESTIMONY. 8 LOOK FOR THE MONEY. WHERE IS THE MONEY? THAT HELPS YOU 9 "HOW DOES THAT HELP YOU SET THE RECORD UNDERSTAND EVERYTHING. 9 STRAIGHT?" 10 DR. THANG GOT HIMSELF IN A PICKLE WHEN HE 10 11 AND HERE IS HIS EXPLANATION: 11 FALSELY CLAIMED CREDIT FOR WHAT SOMEONE ELSE DID. AND WHEN HE 12 "IT EXPLAINS WHY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE 12 GOT CALLED OUT ON IT, HE PUBLISHED THIS ARTICLE WITH THIS SUDDENLY DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION TO THAT BILL AND STARTED TO STATEMENT TO DESTROY THE CREDIBILITY OF HIS OPPONENT. IF 13 1.3 14 COLLABORATE WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH TO CREATE THE PROGRAM THAT 14 THAT'S NOT DESPICABLE OR MALICIOUS, I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS 15 IS KNOWN AS -- THAT'S KNOWN TO BE R.O.V.R." 15 SO HERE ARE THE VERDICT QUESTIONS. THAT'S HIS EXPLANATION FOR WHY THAT'S TRUE AND 16 "NO 1: DID THE DEFENDANTS MAKE THE FOLLOWING 16 WHY THAT MATTERS. IT'S ALL ABOUT MANIPULATING OPPOSITION TO 17 STATEMENTS TO A PERSON OTHER THAN PLAINTIFF LE XUAN KHOA?" THINGS THAT YOU WANT POLITICALLY. THAT'S WHAT I CALL 18 THERE'S YOUR STATEMENT: MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE. THAT WAS A CRIMINAL DESPICABLE 19 20 ALL RIGHT. SO LASKED HIM IN SOME FOLLOWUP (AS 20 21 READ): 21 YES OR NO? "ARE YOU TELLING US THAT BECAUSE THIS WAS A 22 22 BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S., YES OR NO? 23 CLAIM ABOUT A FALSIFIED APPLICATION, THAT SUDDENLY PEOPLE'S 23 REMEMBER THE INSTRUCTION, ANYTHING THAT 24 POLITICAL ATTITUDES CHANGED? 24 DR. THANG DOES IN ORDER TO PROTECT B.P.S.O.S.'S ABILITY TO 25 "ANSWER: YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA WAS USED BY 25 FUNDRAISE IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO B.P.S.O.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE AS HIS TESTIMONY TO OPPOSE THE BILL. WE KNOW BECAUSE HE ADMITTED RIGHT IN THE 26 26

	Page 26		Page 28
1	BEGINNING THAT HE PUBLISHED THIS MAY 25TH ARTICLE ON MACH SONG	1	"I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF
2	MEDIA. THAT'S THE WEBSITE FOR B.P.S.O.S. AND THAT ARTICLE IS	2	OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIM IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING
3	EXHIBIT 238. YOU'LL BE ABLE TO SEE IT.	3	FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME."
4	SO HERE'S THE STATEMENT MR. KHOA FALSELY	4	HE ADMITS WHAT HE'S SAYING IS A CRIME. SO THE
5	CLAIMED. IT'S IN THE EXHIBIT THAT HE PUBLISHED. SO THE	5	ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS "YES." THERE'S NO OTHER REASONABLE
6	ANSWER IS "YES," FOR NGUYEN DINH THANG, AND "YES," FOR BOAT	6	EXPLANATION. HE'S ACCUSING HIS POLITICAL OPPONENT IN THIS
7	PEOPLE S.O.S.	7	DISCUSSION OF COMMITTING A CRIME.
8	NOW, IF MR. VOSS ARGUES THAT THIS IS JUST	8	WAS THE STATEMENT FALSE, YES OR NO?
9	PARAPHRASING THE DORNAN LETTER, REMEMBER THAT NOTHING IN THE	9	WE KNOW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE BECAUSE THERE'S
10	DORNAN LETTER SAYS THIS. IF HE TRIES TO ARGUE THAT DR. THANG	10	NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THAT IT'S TRUE. IT'S NOT LOOK AT
11	INNOCENTLY DID THIS, REMEMBER THIS PART RIGHT DOWN HERE:	11	THIS QUESTION. IT'S VERY BINARY. IT'S YES OR NO, IS THE
12	"SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD BECAUSE	12	STATEMENT FALSE?
13	MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE."	13	DO WE HAVE A GRANT APPLICATION FROM THE
14	IF THERE'S ANY CONFUSION ABOUT WHAT DR. THANG	14	DEPARTMENT OF STATE WITH AN ATTACHED RESUME THAT SAYS THAT
15	IS DOING WITH THIS ARTICLE, THAT CONFUSION IS CLEARED UP RIGHT	15	PROFESSOR KHOA IS A DOCTOR?
16	THERE. IT DOESN'T MATTER FOR A PROFESSOR KHOA TO BEG	16	WE DON'T. IT DIDN'T HAPPEN. THIS STATEMENT IS
17	INNOCENCE, "I DIDN'T DO THIS," BECAUSE NOW, ACCORDING TO	17	FALSE.
18	DR. THANG, HE'S SAYING DEFINITIVELY HE DID IT HIMSELF.	18	BUT REMEMBER, IT DIDN'T NEED TO BE TRUE TO BE
19	DID WE SEE ANY EVIDENCE OF THAT?	19	EFFECTIVE, WHICH IS WHAT DR. THANG KEPT TELLING US. AND I'M
20	NO, WE DID NOT. BECAUSE THAT STATEMENT IS	20	SORRY I'M SO THICKHEADED, IT TOOK ME FOUR OR FIVE TIMES BEFORE
21	FALSE. THIS WHOLE THING IS A MALICIOUS LIE.	21	I REALIZED WHAT ME WAS SAYING. HE WASN'T SAYING THAT IT WAS
22	OKAY. SO QUESTION NO. 1, "YES" AS TO BOTH.	22	TRUE; HE WAS SAYING THAT IT WAS EFFECTIVE. IT WAS EFFECTIVE
23	THERE WILL BE SOME INSTRUCTIONS AFTER THERE	23	IN THE '90S, AND IT'S EFFECTIVE NOW.
24	WILL BE SOME INSTRUCTIONS THAT YOU HAVE TO FOLLOW AFTER YOU	24	SO THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE. THE ANSWER IS
25	ANSWER A QUESTION. LIKE FOR NO. 1, THE INSTRUCTION SAYS: IF	25	"YES."
26	YOUR ANSWER TO 1 IS "YES" AS IT EITHER DEFENDANT, THEN ANSWER	26	AND YOU SEE HERE PROFESSOR KHOA, I ASK HIM
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	Page 27		Page 29
1	Page 2/ 2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT.	1	Page 29 SPECIFICALLY:
1 2		1 2	
	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT.		SPECIFICALLY:
2	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT	2	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT
2	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM.	2	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.?
2 3 4	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO	2 3 4	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D.,
2 3 4 5	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE	2 3 4 5	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I
2 3 4 5	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO	2 3 4 5 6	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT."
2 3 4 5 6	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?"	2 3 4 5 6	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S
2 3 4 5 6 7	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3. "DID THESE PEOPLE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU CONCLUDE THE PARTY DID NOT PROVE IT. YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3. "DID THESE PEOPLE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO MEAN THAT LE XUAN KHOA HAD COMMITTED A CRIME".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU CONCLUDE THE PARTY DID NOT PROVE IT. YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE NO MATTER WHICH PARTY PRODUCED THE EVIDENCE."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3. "DID THESE PEOPLE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO MEAN THAT LE XUAN KHOA HAD COMMITTED A CRIME". WELL, WE CAN ALL READ AND WRITE ENGLISH, AND	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU CONCLUDE THE PARTY DID NOT PROVE IT. YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE NO MATTER WHICH PARTY PRODUCED THE EVIDENCE." "IN CRIMINAL TRIALS, PROSECUTION MUST PROVE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3. "DID THESE PEOPLE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO MEAN THAT LE XUAN KHOA HAD COMMITTED A CRIME". WELL, WE CAN ALL READ AND WRITE ENGLISH, AND SO WHEN WE READ WHAT THE STATEMENT IS, HE'S SAYING A FALSE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU CONCLUDE THE PARTY DID NOT PROVE IT. YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE NO MATTER WHICH PARTY PRODUCED THE EVIDENCE."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2 AS TO EACH DEFENDANT. I DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THOSE HERE, BUT YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE VERDICT FORM. OKAY. SO WE ANSWER YES AS TO BOTH OF THEM, SO WE MOVE ON TO QUESTION 2: "DID THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE STATEMENTS WERE MADE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO BE ABOUT LE XUAN KHOA?" THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS YES, BECAUSE MR. KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. DR. THANG ACHIEVED A PH.D. LEVEL DEGREE IN ENGINEERING IN ENGLISH, IN AMERICA. HE UNDERSTANDS WHAT HE'S SAYING. AND ANYONE WHO READS AND UNDERSTANDS ENGLISH CAN ALSO UNDERSTAND. PROFESSOR KHOA IS THE SUBJECT OF THE STATEMENT. ALSO, I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE IT HERE OR NOT, BUT DR. THANG SAID IN DEPOSITION THAT I ASKED HIM, WHO ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT? HE'S TALKING ABOUT KHOA. ANYONE ELSE? NO, ONLY HIM. SO IF YOU ANSWER "YES" TO QUESTION 2, THEN ANSWER 3. OKAY. SO WE'RE MOVING ON TO 3. "DID THESE PEOPLE REASONABLY UNDERSTAND THE STATEMENTS TO MEAN THAT LE XUAN KHOA HAD COMMITTED A CRIME". WELL, WE CAN ALL READ AND WRITE ENGLISH, AND	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SPECIFICALLY: "DID YOU EVER CLAIM TO BE A PH.D. IN A GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C.? "THE WITNESS: I NEVER CLAIMED MYSELF A PH.D., THIS PROPOSAL OR ANY OTHER PROPOSAL, GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE. I CAN SWEAR TO THAT." SO THERE'S YOUR DEFINITIVE STATEMENT THAT IT'S NOT TRUE, AGAINST WHICH WE SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT IT IS TRUE. THAT'S HOW YOU WEIGH THE EVIDENCE. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT BURDEN OF PROOF, BECAUSE THE BURDEN ON THIS IS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. IS IT MORE LIKELY OR LESS LIKELY THAT THIS WAS A FALSE STATEMENT? SO LET'S LOOK AT JURY INSTRUCTION 200. CAN YOU PUT THAT UP, PLEASE. "PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU BY THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN COURT THAT WHAT THEY'RE REQUIRED TO PROVE IS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. THIS IS REFERRED TO AS BURDEN OF PROOF. "AFTER WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE, IF YOU CANNOT DECIDE SOMETHING MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE, YOU CONCLUDE THE PARTY DID NOT PROVE IT. YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL THE EVIDENCE NO MATTER WHICH PARTY PRODUCED THE EVIDENCE." "IN CRIMINAL TRIALS, PROSECUTION MUST PROVE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. BUT IN CIVIL

Page 30 Page 32 NOT TRUE." CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE IS MORE THAN 2 WHAT DOES THAT MEAN, "MORE LIKELY TRUE"? 2 THAT NOT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT BUT MORE THAN 3 YOU COULD HAVE FIVE EQUAL PIECES OF EVIDENCE 3 PREPONDERANCE OF THE -- MORE THAN MORE LIKELY. 4 THAT SAY IT'S TRUE VERSUS FOUR EQUALLY PERSUASIVE PIECES OF "CERTAIN FACTS MUST BE PROVED BY CLEAR AND EVIDENCE THAT SAY IT'S NOT TRUE. YOU WEIGH THAT. THAT'S WHY CONVINCING EVIDENCE, WHICH IS A HIGHER BURDEN OF PROOF. THIS 5 5 6 THE SCALES ARE THE SYMBOL FOR JUSTICE. AND YOU DECIDE NOT 6 MEANS THAT THE PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU THAT IT IS HIGHLY 7 TRUE. OKAY. PROBABLE THAT THE FACT IS TRUE " I WILL TELL YOU SPECIFICALLY WHICH FACTS MUST 8 WHAT DO WE HAVE FOR THIS CASE? 8 9 DO WE HAVE ANY EVIDENCE AT ALL THAT SAYS 9 BE PROVED BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE. WHEN YOU'RE IN THE VERDICT FORM, NO. 5 SAYS: "DID HE PROVE BY CLEAR AND 10 PROFESSOR KHOA ACTUALLY MADE SUCH A FALSE CLAIM IN THE STATE 10 CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT THEY KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE OR 11 DEPARTMENT? 11 12 WE DO NOT. WE'VE BEATEN THAT HORSE TO DEATH. 12 HAD SERIOUS DOUBTS ABOUT THE STATEMENT?" 13 I REALIZE IT. IT'S NOT THERE. 13 AGAIN, WE HAVE A PLACE WHERE YOU ANSWER YES OR WE HAVE HIS TESTIMONY THAT YOU JUST SAW THAT HE NO FOR BOTH DR. THANG AND B.P.S.O.S. 14 14 REMEMBER THE INSTRUCTION THAT ANYTHING HE DOES 15 NEVER DID THAT. 15 ON BEHALF OF B.P.S.O.S. TO PROTECT HIS ABILITY TO FUNDRAISE 16 WHAT DO WE WEIGH AGAINST THOSE TWO THINGS? 16 IMPLICATES B.P.S.O.S. AS WELL. SO THE ANSWER TO THIS THAT'S BOTH ON THE SIDE OF THIS STATEMENT IS 17 17 QUESTION, IF IT'S "YES" TO NGUYEN DING THANG, IT'S ALSO YES TO 18 FALSE. WHAT'S ON THE OTHER SIDE? 18 19 IT'S A BINARY OUESTION. NOTHING. 19 BPSOS PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE IS THE LOWEST STANDARD. IT'S SO DID HE KNOW IT WAS FALSE OR HAVE SERIOUS 20 20 JUST A LITTLE MORE LIKELY TO BE TRUE THAN NOT TRUE. DOUBTS ABOUT THE STATEMENT? 21 21 22 AND THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE PROVED. THIS IS FALSE 2.2 WELL, WE KNOW HE COULDN'T SHOW US THE TRUTH. BECAUSE THERE'S NO EVIDENCE THAT IT'S TRUE, AND PROFESSOR KHOA 23 BECAUSE WE ASKED HIM OVER AND OVER, SHOW US THE PROOF THAT 2.3 SAYS IT'S NOT TRUE. IT'S TRUE. AND HE COULDN'T DO THAT. 24 24 HE TOLD US THAT HE PULLED TOGETHER HIS 25 SO THE ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 4, THE STATEMENT 25 WAS FALSE. "WAS THE STATEMENT FALSE," IS A LITTLE CONFUSING. 26 ARCHIVES, INCLUDING THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS, AND HAD THEM RIGHT 26 Page 33 Page 31 YOU HAVE TO ANSWER "YES." IT WAS FALSE. IN FRONT OF HIM WHEN HE WAS WRITING THE ARTICLE. AND YET, HE 1 1 2 OKAY. NOW, IN ADDITION TO THE FACT THAT PUT THIS UNSUPPORTED STATEMENT UP THERE. AND I THINK WE 3 THERE'S NO EVIDENCE THAT IT'S TRUE, AND PROFESSOR KHOA SAYING 3 UNDERSTAND THE EXPLANATION FOR THAT. IT'S NOT TRUE. WE ACTUALLY ALSO HAVE KIND OF AN ADMISSION FROM 4 SO WHAT DOES HE SAY ABOUT THIS? (AS READ:) 4 5 DR. THANG. I'M ASKING HIM ABOUT THE APRIL 2ND LETTER. (AS "IS IT CORRECT, DR. THANG, THAT YOU STATED IN 6 READ:) 6 THIS DECLARATION, UNDER OATH, THAT THOSE TWO SENTENCES WERE 7 "SO WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME, THEN, THAT THIS 7 WHAT YOU WROTE IN THE ARTICLE? 8 PARTICULAR LETTER, EXHIBIT 233" -- THAT'S THE APRIL 2ND DORNAN 9 LETTER -- "DOES NOT, IN AND OF ITSELF, SUPPORT TRUTH OF THE "AS YOU SIT HERE TODAY, CAN YOU TELL US THAT AT STATEMENT THAT IS ON THE WHITEBOARD?" THE TIME YOU WROTE THOSE TWO SENTENCES IN YOUR ARTICLE, YOU 10 10 HAD NO IDEA WHETHER THEY WERE TRUE OR NOT? 11 AND HIS RESPONSE WAS: "I LIKE THE WAY YOU PRESENTED, 11 12 DOES NOT IN AND OF ITSELF." 12 "THAT'S NOT CORRECT. I HAVE VAGUELY IDEA THEY THAT'S AS CLOSE AS I COULD GET TO AN ADMISSION 13 WERE TRUE " 13 14 DURING THIS TRIAL IN THE EXAMINATION OF DR. THANG BEFORE HE 14 OKAY. WELL, THERE'S YOUR SERIOUS DOUBTS REVERTED TO: BUT IT WAS SO EFFECTIVE. AS SOON AS IT LEAKED ADMITTED RIGHT THERE. AGAIN, WE ASKED HIM TO SHOW US WHAT THE 15 15 16 OUT. THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPED THEIR OBJECTION 16 PROOF WAS THEY WERE TRUE, AND WE NEVER GOT IT. 17 SO NOW WE'VE GOT THREE THINGS ON THE SIDE OF 17 HERE IS A TETE-A-TETE BETWEEN DR. THANG AND 18 IT'S FALSE AND NOTHING ON THE SIDE OF IT'S TRUE. 18 MYSELF THAT YOU MAY RECALL. (AS READ:) 19 ALL RIGHT. MOVING ON TO THE NEXT OUESTION. 19 "I'M NOT REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, I'M REFERRING NOW THIS ONE IS A LITTLE MORE WORK. TO YOU. YOU PUBLISHED THAT STATEMENT. YOU SAID YOU GOT THE 20 2.0 21 NO. 5: "DID LE XUAN KHOA PROVE BY CLEAR AND 21 INFORMATION FROM EXHIBIT 233, THE APRIL 2ND LETTER. I'M 22 CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS 22 ASKING YOU TO SHOW US WHERE IN THAT -- IN EXHIBIT 233 YOU GOT ANY INFORMATION THAT SUPPORTS THE STATEMENT THAT YOU FALSE OR HAD SERIOUS DOUBTS ABOUT THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENT?" 2.3 2.3 24 LET'S PUT UP THE INSTRUCTION ON CLEAR AND 24 PUBLISHED." 25 CONVINCING EVIDENCE. REMEMBER, PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE 25 AND HERE IS HIS STATEMENT (AS READ): 2.6 IS CLOSE TO FOUAL BUT A LITTLE BIT ONE SIDE VERSUS THE OTHER 26 "WHAT I SAID WAS THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30TH

Page 34 Page 36 WAS MY PRIMARY SOURCE." CONVINCING EVIDENCE. THIS MEANS THAT THE PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU THAT IT IS HIGHLY PROBABLE THAT THE FACT IS TRUE." 2 2 OKAY "I PARAPHRASED NO. 5 AT THE BOTTOM OF THE FIRST 3 3 I'M ARGUING THAT QUESTION NO. 5 SHOULD BE 4 PAGE OF THAT LETTER. AND ADDITIONALLY, I LOOKED AT OTHER ANSWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. IT IS HIGHLY PROBABLE THAT DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING APRIL 2ND, 1996, WHICH SUPPORTED THE DR. THANG KNEW WHAT HE WAS SAYING ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA WAS 5 5 6 CONTENTS OF MR. DORNAN'S LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996." 6 FALSE. HE KNEW IT WAS FALSE. HE TOLD US HE HAD ALL THE 7 SO HIS RELIANCE, HIS BEST SUPPORT FOR WHAT HE MATERIALS ON HIS DESK WHEN HE WROTE THE ARTICLE. AND ALL OF DID IS THOSE TWO LETTERS. WHICH, AGAIN, IF YOU UNDERSTAND 8 THOSE MATERIALS WE'VE LOOKED AT DON'T SUPPORT THAT STATEMENT. 8 9 WHAT WE CAME TO LEARN LATE, HE'S REALLY LOOKING TO THEM FOR 9 THIS IS A GUY WHO IS HIGHLY EDUCATED. HE 10 EFFECTIVENESS, NOT TRUTH. TRUTH IS NOT AN ISSUE FOR HIM. 10 DIDN'T MAKE A MISTAKE. HE KNEW EXACTLY WHAT HE WAS DOING. EFFECTIVE COUNTERING HIS OPPONENT IS HIS GOAL. AND WHAT HE WAS DOING WAS FOR HIS OWN BENEFIT AND THE BENEFIT 11 11 12 THEN AS I CONTINUE ON (AS READ): 12 OF B.P.S.O.S., HE WAS SACRIFICING PROFESSOR KHOA'S REPUTATION. 13 "IS IT YOUR POSITION THAT THIS LETTER, THIS 13 DESPICABLE. NICE WORK. APRIL 30, 1996 LETTER, MAKES THE COMMENT YOU WROTE IN YOUR FOR WHAT PURPOSE? 14 14 15 ARTICLE TRUE?" 15 HE'S ALREADY RETIRED. WHAT PURPOSE? 16 SO NOW WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. 16 BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN A PICKLE WHEN HE LIED 17 "IN YOUR OPINION, DR. THANG, WHEN YOU WROTE 17 ABOUT WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE 14- OR 18,000 RESETTLED THESE -- THOSE COMMENTS THAT WE JUST ARGUED ABOUT FOR THE LAST REFUGEES. HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA'S REPUTATION WITH AN 18 18 19 30 MINUTES IN YOUR ARTICLE DID YOU BELIEVE THEY WERE TRUE 19 ARTICLE SENT OUT TO MORE THAN 8 000 PEOPLE TO BENEFIT HIMSELF WHEN YOU WROTE THEM? 20 AND B.P.S.O.S. AND THEIR ABILITY TO FUNDRAISE. 20 21 "I HAVE NO IDEA. IT'S JUST A REOUEST FOR 21 LET THAT SINK IN FOR A SECOND. THAT'S A PRETTY 2.2 INVESTIGATION; RIGHT? THERE HASN'T BEEN ANY RESULT OR REPORT 2.2 DASTARDLY ACT. WE DON'T HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT. THE LAW 23 YET. SO THIS WAS JUST REQUEST. SO I JUST PARAPHRASED EXACTLY 23 PROVIDES THAT MECHANISM TO UNRING THAT BELL. WHAT IS IN THE LETTER FROM DORNAN, THAT IS, THERE IS A REQUEST WHERE I WAS RAISED, IN THE MIDWEST, THIS IS NOT 24 24 25 HOW YOU SETTLE THIS PROBLEM. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN SETTLED 25 FOR INVESTIGATION." 26 NOW, INTERESTING THING THAT HAPPENS SOMETIMES 26 OVERNIGHT IN A DIFFERENT WAY THAT WE CALL SELF-HELP. PROBABLY Page 35 Page 37 WHEN YOU'RE IN THE HOT SEAT, SOMETIMES YOU BREAK RANKS WITH 1 1 NOT BY 93-YEAR-OLDS, BUT... 2 YOUR STORY AND LET THE TRUTH SLIP OUT. I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE 2 WHERE I WAS RAISED, IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE ABOUT 3 HAVE RIGHT HERE. BECAUSE EVEN THOUGH HE SAID MULTIPLE TIMES 3 SOMEBODY, YOU OWN UP TO IT, YOU APOLOGIZE, AND YOU FIX IT. ON THE STAND THAT DORNAN DID A FOUR-MONTH DETAILED 4 4 YOU DON'T EXPLOIT IT INVESTIGATION AND THIS IS WHAT HE FOUND, WE ALL KNOW THAT ITEM 5 AND EXPLOIT IS A BROAD CONCEPT HERE. WHY WAS 6 NO. 5 IS ONE OF THE CONCERNS FROM THE UNNAMED PEOPLE THAT 6 HE DOING THIS? 7 SUPPOSEDLY CALLED DORNAN'S OFFICE. THAT'S NO INVESTIGATION. 7 SO HE COULD CAPITALIZE ON MISREPRESENTING HIS AND, HERE, WHEN HE WASN'T IN COURT, THIS WAS 8 8 CREDENTIALS TO THE CHARITY FUNDRAISING PEOPLE. HE WANTS THEM 9 READ FROM HIS DEPOSITION, HE'S PUT ON THE SPOT TO EXPLAIN WHAT 9 TO BELIEVE, FROM HIS DECEMBER 2019 ARTICLE, THAT HE'S THE GUY THE APRIL 30TH LETTER IS ABOUT, AND HE ACTUALLY SAYS THE 10 10 RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL THESE RESETTLEMENTS. TRUTH. THAT APRIL 30TH LETTER IS A REQUEST FOR AN 11 11 SO TO PROTECT HIS FRAUD ON THE DONORS, HE HAS 12 INVESTIGATION IT WAS USED FOR THE INNUENDO CONTAINED WITHIN 12 TO DESTROY THE OPPONENT. THIS IS HIGHLY PROBABLE THAT HE KNEW 13 THE LETTER TO DESTROY PROFESSOR KHOA'S CREDIBILITY IN '96, BUT EXACTLY WHAT HE WAS DOING AND THIS STATEMENT WAS NOT TRUE. HE 1.3 14 IT DOES NOT PROVE THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENT. 14 HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO SHOW HOW IT WAS TRUE, AND WHAT DID HE 15 AND HERE IS HIS ADMISSION (AS READ): 15 SHOW US? 16 "IS IT CORRECT, DR. THANG, THAT YOU STATED IN 16 IT WAS EFFECTIVE 17 THIS DECLARATION, UNDER OATH, THAT THOSE TWO SENTENCES WERE 17 OKAY. ENOUGH OF THAT. WHAT YOU WROTE IN YOUR ARTICLE? 18 "SIX: WAS DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT A SUBSTANTIAL 18 19 "CORRECT. FACTOR SUBSTANTIAL FACTOR IN CAUSING LE XUAN KHOA ACTUAL 19 20 "AND AS YOU SIT HERE TODAY, CAN YOU TELL US 20 21 THAT'S TRUE?" 21 YOU ALL SAW PROFESSOR KHOA TESTIFY. YOU SAW 22 IT'S NOT. HE WISHES IT WERE TRUE, BUT HE 22 HIM BASICALLY BERATED FOR 20 MINUTES BY MR. VOSS ABOUT WHY HE CAN'T PROVE IT. HE COULDN'T PROVE IT THEN. 23 DIDN'T PUT MORE THINGS IN HIS RESUME THAT HE DIDN'T NEED TO 23 24 SO CLEAR AND CONVINCING, HIGHER STANDARD. LET 24 PUT IN THERE. HIS RESUME WAS ONE HUNDRED PERCENT BULLETPROOF 25 ME SEE THE INSTRUCTION FOR THAT. HIGHLY PROBABLE. 25 ACCURATE THE WAY IT WAS. 26 "CERTAIN FACTS MUST BE PROVED BY CLEAR AND BUT YOU SAW THE PAIN AND ANGUISH ON 26

Page 38 Page 40 PROFESSOR KHOA'S FACE, HIS DEMEANOR, HAVING TO FACE THAT NOT, IN A GENERAL SENSE, HIS OCCUPATION HAS BEEN HARMED BY 2 SCURRILOUS LIE AGAINST HIS INTEGRITY, HIS REPUTATION. THIS IS 2 THIS FALSE STATEMENT 3 WHAT CAUSED THE HARM. THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS "YES." 3 THE NEXT ONE IS: HARM TO HIS REPUTATION. I ASKED HIM (AS READ): REMEMBER THAT DR. THANG EXPLAINED, HE WAS AN "PROFESSOR, HOW HAS THIS PUBLICATION INTERFERED IMPORTANT WITNESS. PEOPLE LISTENED TO HIM. AND SO THIS IS 5 5 6 WITH YOUR ABILITY TO SLEEP SOME OF THE TESTIMONY FROM HIS DAUGHTER, CECILE, ALL THE "WELL, EVERYTHING -- EVERY TIME I TRY TO DIFFERENT PEOPLE WHO SENT HIM WELL WISHES AND CONGRATULATIONS CONTINUE WITH I COULD NOT THINK THROUGH. I COULD NOT REMEMBER AND ELIE WIESEL FROM THE HOLOCAUST FOUNDATION. 8 8 9 WELL THINGS, AND THEN I FELL ASLEEP WHEN I DO TOO TIRED, YEAH, 9 THAT'S WHO HE WAS. THE BIGGER THE REPUTATION. THE MORE -- THE HIGHER IS THE VALUE OF THE HARM. SO FOR 10 LIKE FATIGUE. I REMEMBER SEVERAL TIMES I WAS TYPING AND 10 SUDDENLY OPENED MY EYES AND I WAS SLEEPING SO LIUST 11 SOMEBODY WITH THAT BACKGROUND, THAT ELEVATED REPUTATION, WHEN 11 12 DISCONTINUED THE WRITING BECAUSE OF THAT. AND SOMETIME EVEN 12 YOU MAKE UP A LIE ABOUT THIS, YOU DO MILLIONS OF DOLLARS' 13 THOUGH -- EVEN MY THOUGHT I PUT -- I OPEN MY EYES AND SEE 13 WORTH OF DAMAGE TO THAT PERSON'S REPUTATION. SOMETHING DIFFERENT, ANOTHER IDEA OUITE IRRELEVANT TO MY TEXT. AND HE SUFFERS THOSE DAMAGES UNTIL YOU, LADIES 14 14 15 SO THAT'S MEANS SOMETHING ELSE COME INTO MY HEAD AND I TYPE IT 15 AND GENTLEMEN, DO YOUR JOBS AND UNRING THAT BELL. YOU ARE THE 16 ON THE COMPUTER." 16 ONLY ONES WHO EVER EXAMINED THE EVIDENCE AND CAN SAY WHETHER 17 HE DID THESE THINGS HE'S ACCUSED OF OR DID NOT. 17 WE CAN'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW DEVASTATING THIS LIE WAS TO PROFESSOR KHOA, BUT YOU SAW HIM ON THE STAND MANAGE 18 18 SO THAT'S REPUTATION. SHAME, MORTIFICATION, 19 WITH THESE QUESTIONS, STAND UP FOR HIS OWN INTEGRITY, I NEVER 19 HURT FEELINGS. YOU SAW IT ON THE STAND. HOW ASHAMED WAS HE? 20 DID THAT. 20 FROM THAT, YOU CAN JUDGE THIS IS WHAT CAUSED 21 HE DIDN'T WANT TO GET INTO THIS FIGHT, BUT 21 22 HIS PROBLEM. 22 PEOPLE WERE CALLING HIM AND SAYING: WHAT'S THE TRUTH? YOU 23 NOW, YOU HEARD TESTIMONY THAT HE HAD A HEART 23 HAVE TO WRITE THE TRUTH. ATTACK OR THAT HE HAD CARDIAC SURGERY AND WAS IN ICU FOR A HE HAD A RIGHT TO AND DID STEP UP TO DEFEND HIS 24 24 REPUTATION, AND THAT'S WHAT 237 IS. THAT'S HIS ARTICLE. YOU LONG TIME IN THE YEARS BEFORE THIS WAS PUBLISHED. 25 25 26 BUT YOU ALSO HEARD FROM HIS DAUGHTER, WHO CARES 26 CAN READ EVERY WORD HE WROTE. Page 39 Page 41 FOR HIM, THAT HE MADE A PRETTY GOOD RECOVERY. HE WAS WHAT'S THE VALUE OF THAT SHAME, MORTIFICATION 1 1 2 MOTIVATED BECAUSE HE WANTED TO WRITE HIS SECOND BOOK. THERE 2 AND HURT FEELINGS? 3 IS MORE TO EXPLAIN ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE VIETNAMESE IF YOU GOT SOMEBODY WHO HAS NOT LED A STELLAR MIGRATION TO THE U.S. AND HE WANTED TO WRITE THAT BOOK. AND 4 LIFE WHO LIES ON A REGULAR BASIS SOMETHING LIKE THIS ISN'T 4 5 THIS CAME UP FIRST AND GOT TO WHERE HE COULDN'T DO IT. 5 GOING TO DO MUCH DAMAGE TO THEM. 6 YOU SEE THE EXPLANATION RIGHT HERE: HE CAN'T 6 BUT WHEN YOU HAVE SOMEONE LIKE PROFESSOR KHOA, 7 WHO HAS, THROUGHOUT HIS LIFE, PUT HIS FELLOW REFUGEES FIRST. 7 CONTINUE TO WRITE HIS BOOK. 8 SO YES, AGAIN, ANYTHING DR. THANG, B.P.S.O.S. 8 HE COULD HAVE TAKEN LOTS OF LUCRATIVE POSITIONS IN ACADEMIA. 9 SUBSTANTIAL FACTOR. ALL RIGHT. SO NOW WE GET 9 BUT HE DIDN'T. HE STAYED ON S.E.A.R.A.C. AND ON THE JOB OF 10 HELPING THE VIETNAM REFUGEES INTEGRATE INTO THE U.S. AND WHAT 10 DOWN TO THE CALCULATION. WHAT ARE PROFESSOR KHAO'S ACTUAL 11 11 DAMAGES, ACTUAL DAMAGES AS OPPOSED TO ASSUMED DAMAGES? A GREAT JOB HE DID. 12 THE LAW RECOGNIZES, AND YOU'LL SEE IT IN THE 12 ANYBODY WHO LIVES IN ORANGE COUNTY KNOWS WHAT A 1700 JURY INSTRUCTION -- IN THE JURY INSTRUCTION FOR 1700, 13 DYNAMIC INFLUENCE THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY IS. THAT IS, AT 1.3 14 YOU'LL SEE A PART THAT TALKS ABOUT ACTUAL DAMAGES AND ASSUMED 14 LEAST PARTIALLY, THE PRODUCT OF HIS WORK. I THINK WE HAVE 15 SOME BILLIONAIRES NOW IN THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY. 15 DAMAGES. EVEN IF LE XUAN KHOA HAS NOT PROVED ANY ACTUAL 16 SO SOMEBODY WHO HAS ESCHEWED FAME AND FORTUNE 16 DAMAGES FOR HARM TO REPUTATION SHAME MORTIFICATION AND HURT 17 FOR THE BENEFIT OF HIS COUNTRYMEN IS DOUBLY ASHAMED TO BE 17 FEELING, THE LAW NONETHELESS ASSUMES THAT HE HAS SUFFERED THIS 18 FALSELY CLAIMED A LIAR. 18 HARM. WITHOUT PRESENTING EVIDENCE OF DAMAGE, LE XUAN 19 THE BIGGER THE PERSONALITY, THE BIGGER THE 19 20 DAMAGES. AGAIN, MILLIONS OF DOLLARS' WORTH OF DAMAGE FOR 20 KHOA IS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE COMPENSATION FOR THIS ASSUMED HARM 21 SHAME AND MORTIFICATION. THANK GOD HE HASN'T DIED WITHOUT 21 IN WHATEVER SUM YOU BELIEVE IS REASONABLE. 22 THAT BELL BEING UNRUNG. WE HAVE TO UNRING THAT BELL. 22 SO IF YOU LOOK AT DAMAGES HERE. YOU HAVE THREE 23 LINE ITEMS. ONE IS FOR DAMAGE TO PROFESSOR KHOA'S OCCUPATION. SO I'M NOT GOING TO TELL YOU AN AMOUNT. IT'S 23 24 IN SEVEN FIGURES. I LEAVE IT TO YOU TO DECIDE. 24 THAT REFERS TO HIS ABILITY TO WRITE THAT BOOK. 25 NOW, NO ONE TESTIFIED ABOUT WHAT THE VALUE OF 25 NOW, THE DYNAMIC BETWEEN QUESTION 7 AND 8, IF 26 YOU -- IF, IN THE COURSE OF VOTING ON THIS, YOU DON'T HAVE THAT DELAYED TIME IS, BUT YOU ARE ABLE TO JUDGE WHETHER OR 26

	Page 42		Page 44
1	NINE THAT AGREES ON AN AMOUNT, YOU CAN LEAVE THAT AMOUNT BLANK	1	SO THERE'S OPPRESSION ALSO. DESPICABLE
2	AND ADD IT TO THE ASSUMED DAMAGES. YOU HAVE THAT OPTION. YOU	2	CONDUCT, JUST SO WE HAVE A DEFINITION. THIS FITS MY
3	CAN ASSUME THE AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.	3	DEFINITION: "CONDUCT THAT IS SO VILE, BASE OR CONTEMPTIBLE
4	I MEAN, THE ALTERNATIVE IS, I TRY TO BRING IN A	4	THAT IT WOULD BE LOOKED DOWN ON AND DESPISED BY REASONABLE
5	PSYCHOLOGIST OR A PSYCHIATRIST AND EXPLAIN YOU KNOW, AND	5	PEOPLE."
6	THEN PUT A DOLLAR FIGURE TO THAT. THAT'S YOUR JOB. YOU CAN	6	YOU ARE THE REASONABLE PEOPLE. I TRUST YOU TO
7	DO THAT. I DON'T NEED TO PUT AN EXPERT WITNESS UP THERE TO DO	7	LOOK DOWN ON WHAT DR. THANG DID. HE THREW PROFESSOR KHOA
8	THAT. YOU SAW IT YOURSELF.	8	UNDER THE BUS SO HE COULD CONTINUE TO DO HIS FUNDRAISING
9	SO SEVEN AND EIGHT, THOSE ARE THE DAMAGES.	9	TARGETS.
10	NINE, THIS IS THE LAST QUESTION: "HAS LE XUAN	10	THAT'S DESPICABLE.
11	KHOA APPROVED BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE DEFENDANTS	11	FRAUD MEANS THAT DEFENDANT INTENTIONALLY
12	ACTED WITH MALICE, OPPRESSION OR FRAUD?"	12	MISREPRESENTED OR CONCEALED A MATERIAL FACT AND DID SO
13	OKAY. LETS PUT UP 3948.	13	INTENDING TO HARM LE XUAN KHOA.
14	WHAT'S THAT MEAN, "MALICE, OPPRESSION OR	14	THIS ONLY WORKS IF HE DESTROYS HIS REPUTATION.
15	FRAUD"?	15	IT ONLY BENEFITS HIM IN THE PUBLIC DEBATE IF HE DESTROYS
16	HERE ARE THE DEFINITIONS. AND THEY'LL BE IN	16	PROFESSOR KHOA'S REPRESENTATION. AND THAT'S WHAT IT DID.
17	YOUR PACKAGE OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS. REMEMBER, THIS IS AGAIN A	17	SO WE HAVE ALL OF THESE ITEMS. IS THERE ANY
18	CLEAR AND CONVINCING STANDARD. DID WE REALLY PROVE THIS? AND	18	DOUBT ABOUT ANY OF THESE THINGS THAT I'VE SAID?
19		19	
20	WHAT DID WE PROVE? MALICE MEANS A DEFENDANT ACTED WITH INTENT TO	20	THERE'S NO DOUBT. HE MAY CLAIM, INNOCENTLY, I WAS JUST PARAPHRASING DORNAN'S LETTERS. WELL, WHY?
21	CAUSE INJURY, OR THAT A DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND	21	
22	DONE WITH A WILLFUL AND KNOWING DISREGARD FOR THE RIGHTS OR	22	THIS IS A QUESTION ABOUT: WHAT'S YOUR
23	SAFETY OF ANOTHER.	23	MOTIVATION? WHY DID HE DO THAT?
			BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN A PICKLE ABOUT WHAT
24	THAT DEFINES WHAT DR. THANG DID. HE KNEW IT	24 25	HE SAID IN DECEMBER OF 2019, AND HE THREW PROFESSOR KHOA UNDER
25 26	WASN'T TRUE, BECAUSE IN ALL THE MATERIALS HE WAS LOOKING AT WHEN HE WROTE THE ARTICLE, NONE OF THEM PROVED THE TRUTH OF	26	THE BUS TO SAVE HIMSELF.
20	WHEN HE WROTE THE ARTICLE, NONE OF THEM PROVED THE TRUTH OF	20	THE ANSWER IS "YES."
	Page 43		Page 45
1	THIS STATEMENT, AND YET, HE WROTE IT ANYWAY.	1	NOW, YOU WON'T HEAR FROM ME ANYMORE ABOUT THE
	THATICA PAIGNING AND WILLELII DICRECARD FOR		
2	THAT'S A KNOWING AND WILLFUL DISREGARD FOR	2	DORNAN LETTERS OR ANY OF THE REST OF THIS UNLESS MR. VOSS
3	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC.	3	DORNAN LETTERS OR ANY OF THE REST OF THIS UNLESS MR. VOSS BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE
3	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC.	3	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE
3	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT?	3 4	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT.
3 4 5	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF.	3 4 5	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE
3 4 5 6	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS,	3 4 5 6	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING
3 4 5 6 7	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT	3 4 5 6 7	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM.
3 4 5 6 7 8	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS.	3 4 5 6 7 8	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
3 4 5 6 7 8	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT.	3 4 5 6 7 8	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND LR.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND LR.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE YES, YES, WE AGREE THIS IS DESPICABLE TO DO THIS	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BLEW THAT ESTIMATE.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND LR.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE - YES, YES, WE AGREE THIS IS DESPICABLE TO DO THIS TO SOMEBODY AND SUBJECTED LE XUAN KHOA TO CRUEL AND UNJUST	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BLEW THAT ESTIMATE. MR. HART: HOW LONG WAS THAT?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND L.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE YES, YES, WE AGREE THIS IS DESPICABLE TO DO THIS TO SOMEBODY AND SUBJECTED LE XUAN KHOA TO CRUEL AND UNJUST HARDSHIP IN KNOWING DISREGARD OF HIS RIGHTS.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BLEW THAT ESTIMATE. MR. HART: HOW LONG WAS THAT? THE COURT: THAT WAS 71 MINUTES.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND LR.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE - YES, YES, WE AGREE THIS IS DESPICABLE TO DO THIS TO SOMEBODY AND SUBJECTED LE XUAN KHOA TO CRUEL AND UNJUST HARDSHIP IN KNOWING DISREGARD OF HIS RIGHTS. WHAT HE DID TO PROFESSOR KHOA WAS CRUEL. YOU	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BLEW THAT ESTIMATE. MR. HART: HOW LONG WAS THAT? THE COURT: THAT WAS 71 MINUTES. MR. HART: OKAY.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED ABOUT IN PUBLIC. SO ANY EVIDENCE AGAINST THAT? HE HAD EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN HIMSELF. AND WHAT HE CAME OUT WITH WAS: I HAD ALL THESE MATERIALS, MOSTLY THE APRIL 2ND, APRIL 30TH DORNAN LETTERS, LOOKING AT THEM WHEN I WROTE THIS. NONE OF THAT PROVES IT. AND HE'S NOT STUPID. HE'S GOT A PH.D. FROM AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN ENGLISH. HE KNOWS WHAT THIS MEANS. AND YET, BECAUSE HE GOT HIMSELF IN THAT PICKLE ABOUT WHETHER HE ACTUALLY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR S.E.A.R.A.C.'S AND I.R.A.C.'S BENEFITS, HE SACRIFICED PROFESSOR KHOA TO SAVE HIMSELF. NOW, AS I SAID BEFORE, THE CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE AND DONE WITH A KNOWING DISREGARD FOR PROFESSOR KHOA'S RIGHTS. ALL RIGHT. OPPRESSION, OPPRESSION IS ALSO APPLICABLE. IT MEANS THE DEFENDANT'S CONDUCT WAS DESPICABLE YES, YES, WE AGREE THIS IS DESPICABLE TO DO THIS TO SOMEBODY AND SUBJECTED LE XUAN KHOA TO CRUEL AND UNJUST HARDSHIP IN KNOWING DISREGARD OF HIS RIGHTS. WHAT HE DID TO PROFESSOR KHOA WAS CRUEL. YOU RING THAT PHONEY BELL OF A FEDERAL CRIME TO THE COMMUNITY THAT	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BRINGS IT UP. I DO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK ONE MORE TIME TO ADDRESS WHAT HE SAYS. YOU MAY COUNT ON ME DOING THAT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. YOUR JOB HERE IS SO IMPORTANT. PROFESSOR KHOA IS COUNTING ON YOU TO UNRING THAT BELL FOR HIM. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THANK YOU, MR. HART. ALL RIGHT, THEN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, YES, WE WILL GO AHEAD AND TAKE OUR MORNING RECESS AT THIS POINT IN TIME. YOU SHOULD BE BACK AT FIVE AFTER, AND THEN WE'LL CONTINUE ON WITH THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS. THANK YOU VERY KINDLY. AND, AGAIN, STILL NO OPINIONS, NO DISCUSSION QUITE YET. YOU'RE GETTING REALLY CLOSE, BUT NOT QUITE YET. (JURY EXCUSED FOR MORNING RECESS.) (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. BLEW THAT ESTIMATE. MR. HART: HOW LONG WAS THAT? THE COURT: THAT WAS 71 MINUTES. MR. HART: OKAY. THE COURT: SO WE WILL BE GOING INTO THE AFTERNOON

Page 46 Page 48 THE COURT: I MEAN, IF YOU RUN OVER AND THEN THAT TO PUT THE PIECES TOGETHER AND EXPLAIN HOW OUR SIDE OF THAT -- I HAVE TO BE A LITTLE HARDER ON THE 12 NOON FOR 2 2 THE STORY COMES TOGETHER MUCH AS LITOLD YOU IT WOULD DURING 3 EVERYBODY, BUT DON'T -- FEEL FREE TO FIT IT IN THE OPENING STATEMENT THAT WE GAVE. MR. VOSS: OKAY. THE DIFFERENCE IS, IN THE OPENING STATEMENT, I THE COURT: IF YOU NEED TO PAUSE WHEN WE GET CLOSE, CAN ONLY TELL YOU WHAT THE FACTS ARE GOING TO SHOW. I'M NOT 5 5 6 ONCE WE GET TO THE 11:55 RANGE OR SOMETHING, ANYWHERE AFTER ALLOWED TO OPINE OR ACTUALLY ARGUE ANYTHING. NOW I CAN. SO 11:50, IF YOU FIND -- IF YOU THINK YOU'RE AT A PLACE TO PAUSE, NOW I'M GOING TO PUT THOSE PIECES TOGETHER FOR YOU WHEREVER YOU THINK YOU HIT THAT POINT, DON'T FEEL YOU HAVE TO AND ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS TO 8 8 GO RIGHT UP TO NOON OR DON'T FEEL YOU HAVE TO FINISH BY NOON. 9 9 UNDERSTAND IN PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER IS THE PATTERN. YOU CAN HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF TIME AFTER LUNCH WHEN WE COME IT'S THE PATTERN THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE CASE. AND IT'S A VERY 10 10 BACK. 11 EASY PATTERN TO IDENTIFY. AND THAT IS, WHETHER IT'S MY 11 12 MR. VOSS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 12 CLIENTS, DR. THANG OR THE BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S., OR CONGRESSMAN 13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO WE WILL BE IN RECESS, AND 13 SMITH OR CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, OR THE PUBLIC DEBATE THAT OCCURRED, THE PUBLIC SCANDAL THAT YOU HEARD ABOUT, OR EVEN THE WE'LL START BACK UP AT 11:05. 14 14 DOCUMENTS THEMSELVES THAT EFFECTIVELY, THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE 15 ALL COUNSEL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 15 16 (MORNING RECESS.) 16 CASE, THE PATTERN YOU'VE HEARD IS DR. KHOA -- EXCUSE ME. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE MR. KHOA SAYING THAT EVERYONE ELSE IS WRONG. HE'S THE ONLY 17 17 18 PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 18 GUY WHO IS RIGHT. EVERYBODY ELSE HAS GOT THIS ALL WRONG. 19 THE COURT: WE ARE HERE WITH ALL COUNSEL AND PARTIES 19 THEY'VE GOT IT WRONG IN DOCUMENTS IN 1986. WHEN OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. CONGRESSMAN DORNAN SAYS WHAT HE SAYS. THEY'VE GOT IT WRONG IN 20 20 AND LIKE I SAID BEFORE THE BREAK, MR. VOSS, IF 21 2020, WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH SAYS WHAT SHE SAYS. THEY'VE GOT 21 2.2 YOU FIND A PLACE TO STOP, FEEL FREE TO DO SO ANYTIME AFTER 22 IT WRONG IN EVERY DIRECTION. AND THE ONLY PERSON THAT'S GOT 23 11:50, AND THEN WE'LL PICK UP AFTER THE LUNCH HOUR. 23 TO RIGHT IS MR. KHOA. BUT, YOU KNOW, THERE AREN'T ANY DOCUMENTS FROM 24 ARE WE READY? 24 SOME OTHER CONGRESSMAN TO SAY THAT HE'S RIGHT. THERE AREN'T MR_VOSS: ONE MOMENT_VOUR HONOR_ILIST A MINUTE. 25 25 MR. HART: MY INTERN IS GOING TO PUBLISH FOR THE 26 ANY DOCUMENTS ANYWHERE TO SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THE STATEMENT IS 26 Page 47 Page 49 UNTRUE 1 DEFENSE 1 MR. VOSS: WE ALREADY AGREED TO DO THAT. 2 IN FACT, THE STATEMENT IS TRUE. I HAVE HEARD MR. HART: NO PROBLEM, MR. VOSS. 3 THIS MORNING ABOUT HIT JOBS POLITICALLY AND HOW DESPICABLE THAT IS IT'S A PATTERN OF TRYING TO MUSH IT ALL TOGETHER AND (DISCUSSION BETWEEN COUNSEL.) 4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE BLAME MY CLIENT FOR CONCERNS THAT MR. KHOA HAD WITH OTHER PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 6 PEOPLE. I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH ALL THAT, BUT I JUST WANT TO THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELCOME BACK, LADIES AND REMIND YOU THAT WHENEVER ONE OF THESE THINGS CAME OUT THAT CONCERNED MR. KHOA, HIS RESPONSE TO IT WASN'T TO WRITE TO MY WE HAVE BEEN REJOINED BY ALL OF OUR JURORS. 9 CLIENTS: IT WASN'T TO WRITE TO THEM AND SAY: RETRACT IT. IT'S NOW MR. VOSS' TIME TO SPEAK WITH YOU FOR HIS CLOSING 10 WITHDRAW IT. YOU'VE GOT IT WRONG. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 ARGUMENT. 12 THERE'S A GOOD CHANCE WE'LL HAVE TO PAUSE FOR 13 THAT LUNCH HOUR BREAK, SO HE MAY SPAN OVER THAT LUNCH HOUR, 14 COME BACK AFTER LUNCH, AND PICK UP A LITTLE BIT THERE. SO WE'LL FIND A GOOD BREAKING POINT WHEN WE GET CLOSE TO THAT 15 16 LUNCH HOUR, IF NECESSARY, TO GO AHEAD AND PAUSE, AND THEN GIVE 17 HIM HIS FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE HIS CLOSING ARGUMENTS. SO WITH THAT, MR. VOSS, THE FLOOR IS YOURS. 18 19 MR. VOSS: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, THANK YOU. I 20 21 REALLY DO SINCERELY THANK YOU FOR ALL THE TIME THAT YOU PUT IN 22 LISTENING TO THINGS THAT MIGHT WELL GLAZE YOUR EYES OVER FROM TIME TO TIME BUT THEY'RE REALLY IMPORTANT TO OUR RESPECTIVE 2.3 24 CLIENTS. 25 I ASKED YOU AT THE OUTSET TO PLEASE KEEP AN 2.6 OPEN MIND UNTIL YOU'VE HEARD OUR SIDE OF THE STORY. I KNOW

THAT IS. IT'S A PATTERN OF TRYING TO MUSH IT ALL TOGETHER AND BLAME MY CLIENT FOR CONCERNS THAT MR. KHOA HAD WITH OTHER PEOPLE. I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH ALL THAT, BUT I JUST WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT WHENEVER ONE OF THESE THINGS CAME OUT THAT CONCERNED MR. KHOA, HIS RESPONSE TO IT WASN'T TO WRITE TO MY CLIENTS; IT WASN'T TO WRITE TO THEM AND SAY: RETRACT IT. WITHDRAW IT. YOU'VE GOT IT WRONG.

NO. HE WROTE TO SMITH. HE WROTE TO DORNAN,,
HE WROTE TO OTHER PEOPLE, BECAUSE THEY WERE THE PEOPLE THAT HE REALLY HAD THE CONCERN WITH WHAT THEY WERE SAYING.

MY CLIENT IS GUILTY OF DOING NOTHING MORE THAN REPEATING WHAT THE CONGRESSMAN SAID. LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT THAT BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WHAT YOU'VE LEARNED IN THIS TRIAL, IF I COULD REALLY SUMMARIZE IT, IS THAT MY CLIENT, DR. THANG, HAS DEDICATED HIS LIFE TO SUPPORTING VIETNAMESE REFUGEES. AND HE DID THAT BECAUSE HE WAS A VIETNAMESE BOAT PERSON REFUGEE HIMSELF.

YOU LEARNED THAT NOT ONE, BUT TWO CONGRESSMEN SUPPORT HIS WORDS.

YOU HEARD, IN THE WORDS OF MR. KHOA, ABOUT THE

CLIENT. WE HEARD ALL ABOUT HOW THESE CONGRESSMEN SUPPORT WHAT

HE HAS TO SAY. THERE'S NOTHING ON THE OTHER SIDE.

Page 50 Page 52 SO THE PATTERN HERE IS TO TRY TO CONFLATE THE WHAT HE WAS WRITING WAS ABSOLUTELY TRUE; THE REVERSE OF SAYING ISSUES YOU HAVE WITH OTHER PEOPLE AND TRY AND BLAME DR. THANG THAT THEY KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE. HE BELIEVED IT WAS 2 2 3 FOR ALL OF YOUR LIFE'S WOES, EVEN YOUR OLD AGE, BECAUSE 3 TRUE. AND HE TOLD YOU WHY HE BELIEVED IT WAS TRUE. IN DETAIL. REALISTICALLY, A LOT OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE HEARD ABOUT ARE SO NOW WE HAVE TO ALSO, NOT WITH JUST THAT, BUT REALLY JUST MALADIES OF AGE AND DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH 5 ALSO THE CONTEXT OF THE STATEMENT. SO IF WE LOOK AT EXHIBIT 5 NUMBER 238-7, WHICH IS THE EXHIBIT THAT HAS THE STATEMENT ON 6 THAT STATEMENT ON THE BOARD 6 7 LET'S TALK ABOUT THAT STATEMENT ON THE BOARD THE BOARD YOU HEARD COUNSEL SAY, IN HIS ARGUMENT JUST A FEW MINUTES AGO, 8 8 HERE WE GO. THAT YOU WERE EXPECTED TO DO THE SCALES OF JUSTICE WEIGHING. 9 9 SO YOU CAN SEE, HERE, THE CONTEXT OF THIS 10 BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT'S APPLICABLE HERE. THAT WAS INSTRUCTION 10 STATEMENT. IT IS THAT, "IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE TWO NUMBER 200 HEARINGS" -- THERE WERE CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, IN ADDITION TO 11 11 12 IF WE COULD SHOW THEM INSTRUCTION NUMBER 201. 12 EVERYTHING ELSE -- "CONGRESSMAN SMITH SENT AN OFFICIAL LETTER 13 CERTAIN FACTS HAVE TO BE PROVED BY CLEAR AND 13 REQUESTING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO CONVINCING EVIDENCE, WHICH IS A HIGHER BURDEN OF PROOF. THIS INVESTIGATE MR. KHOA AND S.E.A.R.A.C. ON A FRAUDULENT 14 14 15 MEANS THE PARTY MUST PERSUADE YOU IT IS HIGHLY PROBABLE THAT 15 BACKGROUND STATEMENT USED WHEN APPLYING FOR A FEDERAL GRANT: 16 THE FACT IS TRUE. THIS IS A HIGHER STANDARD THAN JUST AN EVEN 16 "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A DOCTORAL WEIGHING PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE. DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF 17 17 18 THIS IS THE STANDARD, AND YOU DON'T 18 STATE. THAT WAS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." 19 NEED TO -- THESE ARE IN THE PACKAGE OF STUFF THAT YOU GET BACK 19 IT'S COLON BEFORE YOU GET TO THAT. AND THE IN THE JURY ROOM, SO YOU'LL --REASON FOR THAT IS BECAUSE IT IS IN THE CONTEXT THAT MY CLIENT 20 20 MR. HART: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE TO OBJECT TO THIS. THE IS SAYING AN OFFICIAL LETTER WAS SENT REQUESTING AN 21 21 IMPLICATION IS THAT TRUE OR FALSE IS TO THIS STANDARD. THAT 2.2 2.2 INVESTIGATION ON THE FRAUDULENT BACKGROUND STATEMENT. THAT'S 23 QUESTION IS PREPONDERANCE. 23 WHAT IT WAS. HE WAS REQUESTING AN INVESTIGATION IN THIS THE COURT: WAIT. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AS I LETTER. THAT'S WHAT HE'S SAYING. 24 24 INDICATED AT THE START OF THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS, THE AND WHEN YOU SEE EXHIBIT NUMBER 234 WHICH IS 25 25 26 INSTRUCTIONS ARE THE GOVERNING LAW. ANYTHING THAT ANY 26 THE LETTER THAT MY CLIENT IS REFERENCING... Page 51 Page 53 ATTORNEY SAYS THAT YOU BELIEVE IS CONTRARY TO THE NOW LET'S SHOW THEM 234 1 1 2 INSTRUCTIONS, THE INSTRUCTIONS GOVERN. 2 YOU NOW SEE THE LETTER THAT WHEN MY CLIENT YOU MAY CONTINUE. 3 SAYS, HEY, A CONGRESSMAN IS SENDING A LETTER, AND HE'S MR VOSS: WHICH IS WHY -- BEFORE I WAS INVESTIGATING CERTAIN CLAIMS COLON. THAT IN AND AMONGST THE 4 4 INTERRUPTED -- IT SAYS I WILL TELL YOU SPECIFICALLY WHICH 5 THINGS BEING REQUESTED FOR INVESTIGATION IS THOSE WORDS RIGHT 6 FACTS MUST BE PROVED BY THIS, MY WORDS, HIGHER, CLEAR AND 6 THERE. HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT? 7 CONVINCING EVIDENCE. 8 SO NOW LET'S GO TO 1700. 8 AT PARAGRAPH 5: MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION AS A AND 1700 IS THE INSTRUCTION THAT RELATES TO 9 PH D 9 10 DEFAMATION. SO YOU GET A LOT OF GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND SO 10 I'M GOING TO COME BACK TO THAT. THE WHOLE 11 ON, BUT REALLY THE RUBBER HITS THE ROAD ON 1700. 11 PH.D. IS A FALSE HERRING. AND MY CLIENT NEVER ONCE USED THE 12 AND, HERE, YOU CAN SEE THAT BELOW NO. 4, YOU 12 PHRASE "PH D.". THE ONLY PERSON TO EVER USE THE PHRASE HAVE THIS CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE STANDARD. YOU SEE "PH.D." WAS CONGRESSMAN DORNAN IN THIS LETTER. 13 1.3 14 THAT THERE. WHAT IT SAYS IS: IN ADDITION, LE XUAN KHOA, THE 14 SO ALL THESE OUESTIONS THAT GET ASKED OF 15 PLAINTIFF, MUST PROVE BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE -- NOT 15 MR. KHOA ABOUT PH.D., MY CLIENT NEVER ACCUSED THEM OF NOT 16 JUST A WEIGHING -- THAT NGUYEN DINH THANG AND BOAT PEOPLE 16 HAVING A PHID EVER THAT'S NOT THE CASE. BUT NONETHELESS, WHAT DOES THE CONGRESSMAN SAY 17 S.O.S. KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE OR HAD SERIOUS DOUBTS 17 18 ABOUT THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENT. 18 THAT HE WANTS INVESTIGATED? IT'S THE RECENT ADMISSION -- HE SO IT'S NOT JUST THAT THE PLAINTIFF HAS TO RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE. HIS 19 19 PROVE THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE. THE PLAINTIFF ALSO HAS TO 20 20 MISREPRESENTATION OF ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS MAY HAVE RESULTED IN 21 PROVE, BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT WHEN HE MADE THE 21 RECEIVING STATE DEPARTMENT GRANTS OVER COMPETING APPLICANTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PART BEFORE THIS, BEFORE 22 STATEMENT, THAT WE KNEW IT WAS FALSE. 22 23 AND I REASONABLY SUBMIT TO YOU THAT FOR THE 23 THE COLON, WHERE MY CLIENT IS WRITING, HEY, A CONGRESSMAN IS 24 MULTIPLICITY OF REASONS THAT DR. THANG TESTIFIED TO AND THE 2.4 ASKING FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THIS CONCERN, IT'S DEAD-BANG

25

26

ACCURATE. THERE IT IS. DEAD-BANG ACCURATE.

BUT THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, YOU WOULD HAVE

25

26

EVIDENCE YOU'VE SEEN, HE HAD A PLETHORA OF EVIDENCE AT HIS

DISPOSAL WHEN HE WROTE THAT STATEMENT, AND HE BELIEVED THAT

Page 54 Page 56 TO SAY THAT MY CLIENT, WHEN IT COMES TO THE TIME THE AND THAT HE WAS REALLY ANGRY ABOUT THE THINGS 2 DEFENDANTS FOR YOU TO HAVE TO FIND IT ON THE FORM NOT ILIST 2 SAID ABOUT HIM BOTH IN 1986 AND IN 2020 BUT THAT THERE WERE 3 THAT THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE, WHICH WAS TRUE, BUT THAT MY THINGS THAT WERE SAID ABOUT HIM BY CONGRESSMEN DORNAN AND 4 CLIENT WROTE IT THINKING -- KNOWING THAT IT WAS FALSE. SMITH. HIS ISSUE AND HIS COMPLAINT REALLY WASN'T WITH WHAT MY SO HE'S TESTIFIED THAT HE HAS THIS. HE'S READ CLIENT SAID. MY CLIENT SIMPLY REPEATED IT. 5 5 6 IT. HE'S GOT IT IN FRONT OF HIM AS HE WRITES IT. IS THERE IT'S IMPORTANT TO PUT IT ALL IN CONTEXT OF THE 7 TIMELINE. IT'S THE PLAINTIFF, MR. KHOA, WHO FIRST INITIATED ANYTHING ABOUT DR. THANG'S TESTIMONY ON THE STAND THAT WOULD SUGGEST TO YOU THAT HE WAS MAKING IT UP; THAT HE KNOWINGLY AND WROTE THE TWO PUBLICATIONS ON APRIL 27TH AND MAY 22 OF 8 8 DIDN'T PAY ANY ATTENTION TO ANY LETTERS OR ANYTHING, HE JUST 9 9 2020. HE'S SAYING THAT THAT'S A RESPONSE TO WHAT? 10 KNEW IT WAS FALSE AND HE JUST MADE THAT STATEMENT OUT OF 10 AN UNSOLICITED VIDEO BEING POSTED ON YOUTUBE. 11 WHICH IS CHARACTERIZED BY THE PLAINTIFF HIMSELF AS PRAISING MY 11 CLEAR-BLUE SKY? 12 OF COURSE NOT. THAT'S WHY IT'S IN THE CONTEXT 12 CLIENT FOR THE THINGS THAT HE DID IN HIS CAREER. 13 OF SAYING THAT IT WAS -- THAT THE CONGRESSMAN IS SENDING AN 13 THERE'S NOT ONE MENTION IN THAT ARTICLE WHICH OFFICIAL LETTER REQUESTING THE INVESTIGATION. THAT'S THE INCLUDES THE REFERENCE TO THE VIDEO. NOT ONE SINGLE MENTION 14 14 OF MR. KHOA. NOT A THING. BUT HE FEELS COMPELLED, HAVING 15 CONTEXT OF THAT STATEMENT. 15 16 BUT IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE ALSO THAT THE --16 BEEN DONE WITH THIS ISSUE FOR 36 YEARS, TO COME BACK NOW AND SAY, OH, I NEED TO -- I NEED TO CORRECT THINGS. 17 ONLY THE LAST FEW WORDS, "THAT WAS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE," ARE 17 18 REALLY THE WORDS THAT ARE MY CLIENT TALKING. 18 WE DIDN'T GO AFTER MR. KHOA. QUITE THE OTHER 19 AND WHAT DID WE LEARN FROM THE WITNESSES IN 19 WAY AROUND. HE CAME OUT OF NOWHERE AND SAID, WELL, NICE VIDEO BY THE CONGRESSMAN THAT SAYS GOOD THINGS ABOUT YOU, BUT, YOU 20 THAT REGARD? 20 WE LEARNED THAT, EFFECTIVELY, NOBODY DISAGREES. 21 KNOW, YOU DON'T DESERVE TO TAKE CREDIT FOR ANY OF THAT. 21 ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN SAY THAT. BUT HE DIDN'T 22 DID YOU HEAR ANYBODY, ANYBODY, TESTIFY TO YOU THAT IT WOULDN'T 22 23 BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE, THAT IT WASN'T A CRIMINAL OFFENSE TO 23 COMPLAIN TO MY CLIENT. THE TESTIMONY WAS CLEAR THAT HE MISREPRESENT IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT? COMPLAINED TO CONGRESSMAN SMITH. WROTE NOT ONE BUT TWO 24 24 LETTERS TO CONGRESSMAN SMITH THAT WERE UNANSWERED IN RESPONSE 25 I DIDN'T HEAR ANYTHING LIKE THAT. 25 26 TO THE CONTRARY, I HEARD TESTIMONY ABOUT IT 26 TO THE VIDEO. Page 55 Page 57 BEING UNLAWFUL, PERJURY, FEDERAL FALSE CRIMES ACT. THOSE WERE DID NOT ASK US, DID NOT ASK DR. THANG, DID NOT 1 1 2 ALL THINGS PEOPLE TESTIFIED ABOUT WITH RESPECT TO WHETHER OR 2 ASK THE BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S. TO CORRECT THE IMPRESSION HE TOOK 3 NOT THE STATEMENT IS TRUE OR FALSE. 3 FROM A VIDEO THAT DIDN'T EVEN SO MUCH AS MENTION HIM. THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE AT ALL THAT THIS ALL RIGHT. SAME THING HE DID BACK IN 1986. HE 4 4 5 STATEMENT THAT THE -- THAT THAT LAST PART, THAT THIS WAS A DIDN'T COMPLAIN TO MY CLIENT, HE COMPLAINED TO CONGRESSMAN 6 CRIMINAL OFFENSE, NOT ONE PIECE OF EVIDENCE OR TESTIMONY 6 DORNAN. AGAIN, THE PATTERN. EVERYONE ELSE IS WRONG. HE'S 7 DISPUTES THAT IT WAS. 7 THE ONLY ONE RIGHT. 8 THERE'S NO DOCUMENT SAYING, HEY, YOU GET A HALL 8 SO HE SAYS SOME INTERESTING THINGS ON THE 9 PASS 9 STAND. FIRST OF ALL, HE SAYS IN HIS TESTIMONY (AS READ): 10 NOBODY SAID, IF YOU GET -- OH, ON THE 10 "WERE YOU EVER INVESTIGATED BY THE INSPECTOR 11 APPLICATION FORM, IT SAYS OKAY. IT'S CLOSE ENOUGH. YOU KNOW, 11 GENERAL ABOUT MAKING A FRAUDULENT BACKGROUND STATEMENT?" 12 IF YOU'RE SOMEWHAT CLOSE, IT'S OKAY. 12 HIS ANSWER: "I HAVE NEVER BEEN INVESTIGATED AT QUITE TO THE CONTRARY, AS YOU HEARD EVEN THE ALL. THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION." 1.3 1.3 14 PLAINTIFF HIMSELF TESTIFY THAT IT WAS, HE KNEW, UNLAWFUL TO 14 HE REPEATEDLY DENIED -- I MEAN, THERE'S 15 MAKE A MISREPRESENTATION. 15 MULTIPLE PLACES WHERE HE DENIED THERE WAS EVER AN 16 SO I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT AS YOU BREAK 16 INVESTIGATION 17 DOWN THIS PHRASE HERE THAT'S AFTER THE COLON, THAT THAT LAST 17 HOW DO YOU HAVE NO INVESTIGATION IF YOU SUPPLIED DOCUMENTS TO SOMEBODY BECAUSE THEY ASKED FOR THEM IN 18 PART IS UNDISPUTED. IT'S A CRIMINAL OFFENSE. 18 SO WE THEN HAVE TO COME BACK TO SAYING: WHAT THEIR INVESTIGATION? 19 19 20 DID WE EFFECTIVELY LEARN FROM OUR WITNESSES? 20 IT DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE. 21 FIRST, JUST LOOK AT THE PLAINTIFF, MR. KHOA. 21 BUT MR. KHOA SAYS HE WAS ASKED TO PROVIDE THE 22 MR. KHOA, WE BASICALLY LEARNED, HE'S A 93-YEAR-OLD, ELDERLY 22 DOCUMENTS. AND HE PROVIDED THE DOCUMENTS. SO IF HE DID MAN, WHO HAD A CAREER INVOLVED WITH ISSUES RELATING TO PROVIDE DOCUMENTS, CLEARLY THAT WAS IN RESPONSE TO THE 23 23 24 VIETNAMESE REFUGEES, AND THAT HE HAD RETIRED LONG AGO, SHORTLY 24 INVESTIGATION THAT DORNAN'S OFFICE AND STAFF WERE DOING, WHICH 25 AFTER THE 1986 STUFF, SO YEARS AND DECADES EARLIER HAD 25 IS REFERENCED IN THEIR LETTERS. RETIRED. SO I THINK THAT THERE ARE SOME SIGNIFICANT 26 26

Page 58 Page 60 QUESTIONS AS TO THE ACCURACY OF THE MEMORIES OF THE WITNESS IT WASN'T A CRIMINAL OFFENSE, NOT A DOCUMENT, NOT A PIECE OF 2 WITH RESPECT TO HOW THINGS WENT DOWN HE SAYS NO 2 FVIDENCE 3 INVESTIGATION, BUT I GAVE YOU THE DOCUMENTS. DOESN'T MAKE ANY 3 SO HOW ABOUT THE FIRST PART THAT: "MR. KHOA 4 4 FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION 5 INTERESTINGLY, WHEN YOU ASKED MR. KHOA AT THAT 5 FOR A GRANT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE." 6 SAME TIME FRAME IN HIS TESTIMONY ABOUT THE IMPACT ON HIM, HIS 6 WE HAVE TWO CONGRESSIONAL LETTERS THAT SUPPORT 7 7 RESPONSE WAS, I THOUGHT, ILLUMINATING. HE SAID: THAT. WE HAVE MY CLIENT'S EXPERIENCE WITH WRITING GRANT 8 APPLICATIONS. WE HAVE HIS MEETING WITH CONGRESSIONAL STAFF 8 "WHEN PEOPLE CALLED AND SHARED WITH ME THEIR CONCERN AND THEN THAT THEY'RE UPSET, SO I -- I FEEL GOOD TO 9 9 BACK IN 1986. WE HAVE DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT ALL OF THAT. 10 BE -- YEAH, I FEEL GOOD KIND OF." 10 AND WE HAVE A LOT OF TESTIMONY ABOUT THE PUBLIC SCANDAL THAT WAS GOING ON IN THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY ABOUT 11 WHY WAS THAT? 11 12 SOME PEOPLE WE HEARD, FRIENDS, OTHER RELATIVES 12 THIS WHOLE THING, ABOUT HIM ADMITTING THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR. 13 AND SO ON, FROM CECILE, THAT HAD REACHED OUT TO HIM HAD RAISED 13 THAT'S WHAT IS BEING REFERENCED HERE. SOME CONCERNS. IT MADE HIM FEEL GOOD. IT DIDN'T MAKE HIM "BEGINNING IN JANUARY '96, I HAVE RECEIVED AN 14 14 15 FEEL BAD. IT DIDN'T MAKE HIM FEEL SHAME AND MORTIFICATION. 15 OVERWHELMING NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS AND LETTERS FROM 16 IT MADE HIM FEEL GOOD THAT THERE WERE STILL PEOPLE OUT THERE 16 RESPECTED VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN MY DISTRICT AND 17 THAT WERE PAYING ATTENTION AND FELT LIKE THEY WANTED TO SAY 17 ACROSS THE UNITED STATES." AND DOWN HERE: HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES 18 GOOD THINGS ABOUT HIM. 18 19 THAT'S GREAT. I'M GLAD FOR HIM, JUST AS I WAS 19 NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE GLAD FOR MY CLIENT THAT HE HAD A CONGRESSMAN SAYING NICE 20 YOU HEARD DR. THANG TESTIFY THAT, YEAH, THIS 20 WAS IN ALL KINDS OF ARTICLES. IT WAS A BIG PUBLIC SCANDAL. 21 THINGS ABOUT HIM, TOO. 21 22 YOU KNOW, WE HEAR ALL THIS UNRINGING THE BELL. 2.2 IT WAS BEING DISCUSSED BY EVERYBODY IN THE VIETNAMESE WHEN I ASKED MR. KHOA WHETHER HE COULD THINK OF ANY -- EXCUSE 23 COMMUNITY ABOUT HOW MR. KHOA WASN'T A DOCTOR, AND HE WAS 2.3 ME, WHEN MR. HART ASKED HIS OWN CLIENT: "COULD YOU THINK OF MISREPRESENTING THAT HE WAS, AND HE ADMITTED THAT HE WASN'T A 24 24 ANY WAY TO UNRING THE BELL OF THIS PUBLICATION?" 25 25 DOCTOR AS PART OF THAT PUBLIC SCANDAL. 26 THE ANSWER IS: "I THINK I WANT TO GET AN 26 THERE IS NOT ONE PIECE OF EVIDENCE THAT'S BEEN Page 59 Page 61 ANSWER FROM SMITH. THAT'S WHY I WROTE TO HIM AGAIN." PUT IN FRONT OF YOU, NOT A WORD OF TESTIMONY, NOT A DOCUMENT, 1 1 2 NOW, THERE'S SEVERAL INTERESTING THINGS THERE, 2 NOTHING, TO REFUTE THE TESTIMONY FROM DR. THANG ABOUT THE 3 TOO, BECAUSE A LOT OF THE QUESTIONS GOT ASKED IN THE CONTEXT 3 PUBLIC SCANDAL HAPPENING AT THAT TIME IN THE VIETNAMESE OF THE PUBLICATION, AND ALL THESE EVENTS THAT WERE OCCURRING COMMUNITY THAT ADDRESSED THIS EXACT ISSUE BEING RAISED BY 4 4 5 IN THE PUBLIC DISCOURSE AND HOW DID ALL OF THAT IMPACT HIM. CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. NOTHING. 6 BUT THE ONLY THING THAT COUNTS WHEN IT COMES TO 6 IT'S UNREFUTED TESTIMONY AGAINST MY CLIENT THAT HE WAS AWARE OF ALL THIS BECAUSE EVERYBODY WAS AWARE OF IT. 7 THE FORM IS THE IMPACT OF THAT SPECIFIC STATEMENT, NOT HOW HE 8 FELT BECAUSE HE WAS WRONGED BY CONGRESSMAN SMITH, NOT HOW HE 8 THAT THERE WAS, YOU KNOW, INVOLVED AND INTERESTED IN THESE 9 FELT BECAUSE HE WAS WRONGED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. HOW DID IT 9 ISSUES IN THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY. 10 IMPACT HIM TO HAVE THAT STATEMENT MADE? THAT'S A HUGE 10 BUT THE FACT IS THAT, WHILE KHOA KNEW HE WAS 11 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO. 11 BEING HELD OUT BY OTHERS AS DR. KHOA, HE TOOK NO ACTIONS TO 12 IF MY CLIENTS WERE TO BLAME FOR HIS CONCERNS, 12 CORRECT THOSE REPRESENTATIONS. HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE YOU WAS THE REASON HE DID NOT WRITE TO THEM TO RETRACT OR WITHDRAW THE THAT HE STOPPED CORRECTING PEOPLE BEFORE BECOMING PRESIDENT OF 13 1.3 14 STATEMENTS ULTIMATELY IS, I SUBMIT TO YOU, BECAUSE HIS BLAME 14 I.R.A.C. AND S.E.A.R.A.C. 15 WAS FOR THE CONGRESSMAN, NOT FOR HIM. 15 SO FOR THE ENTIRE PERIOD OF TIME THAT HE WAS 16 THAT'S WHY HE WROTE TO THE OTHERS. WHAT DOES 16 SUBMITTING GRANT APPLICATIONS IT'S HIS TESTIMONY THAT AT NO POINT THEREIN WAS HE CORRECTING ANYBODY ANYMORE ABOUT THE FACT 17 HE SAY? HOW DO YOU UNRING THE BELL? I WANT TO GET AN ANSWER 17 18 FROM SMITH. I DON'T WANT TO GET AN ANSWER FROM THANG. I WANT 18 THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR VERSUS BEING MISTER. TO UNRING THE BELL BY GETTING AN ANSWER FROM SMITH. DID HE MAKE HIMSELF BETTER BY PROVIDING THAT 19 19 20 WELL, YOU DON'T HAVE IN YOUR POWER -- SMITH IS 20 INFORMATION? HE EVEN SAID SO. HIS TESTIMONY -- I DON'T KNOW

21

22

23

24

25

26

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE BELL FOR HIM.

NOT A DEFENDANT. SO YOU CAN'T UNRING THE BELL FOR HIM WITH

SMITH. YOU'RE ASKED WHETHER OR NOT YOU CAN UNRING THE BELL

NOW, LET'S COME TO THAT OTHER PART OF THE

FOR THANG. THAT'S NOT WHAT HE, HIMSELF, HAS SAID WOULD UNRING

CLAUSE AFTER THE COLON. WE DON'T HAVE ANYBODY ANYWHERE SAYING

IF YOU CAUGHT IT. IT WAS -- IT STARTLED ME. WOULD IT --

ADMITTED, YEAH, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER.

WOULDN'T IT HAVE BEEN BETTER IF YOU HAD ON YOUR RESUME TAKEN

SOME STEP TO CLARIFY THAT YOUR THESIS WASN'T COMPLETE? HE

WHAT WAS THE BAR STOPPING HIM FROM DOING A

BETTER JOB OF REPRESENTING ACCURATELY THE STATUS OF HIS

Page 62 Page 64 DOCTORAL THESIS? "ANSWER: YES." NONE. NONE. HE'S PRESIDENT OF THE 2 2 MR. HART: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE TO OBJECT. IT APPEARS 3 ORGANIZATION. HE HAD EVERY ABILITY TO CHANGE ANYTHING HE 3 COUNSEL IS READING FROM A DEPOSITION THAT WAS NOT ENTERED INTO WANTED TO IN IT. IT WAS HIS TESTIMONY THAT HE WAS IN THE -- IN CHARGE OF THE ENTIRE PROCESS. 5 5 MR. VOSS: I'M READING FROM HIS TESTIMONY. 6 NOW, WE'VE HEARD PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL IN 6 THE COURT: WAIT CLOSING, SAYING -- AND I WROTE DOWN THE EXACT WORDS -- IT WAS SO, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT IS FOR YOU TO TRUE HE HAD A DOCTORAL THESIS. REALLY? IN 1975, UNDER DECIDE WHAT THE EVIDENCE WAS. YOU SAT THROUGH, YOU HEARD ALL 8 8 CIRCUMSTANCES I'M GLAD I DIDN'T LIVE THROUGH, THE FACT OF THE 9 9 THE EVIDENCE. YOU HAVE THE ABILITY TO HAVE ANYTHING READ BACK MATTER IS WHATEVER THE STATUS OF HIS DOCTORAL THESIS WAS, IT 10 10 TO YOU DURING YOUR DELIBERATIONS. SO, AGAIN, IT IS FOR YOU TO WAS LEFT ON THE TARMAC IN SAIGON AS HE WAS EVACUATED TO SAFETY DECIDE WHAT THE FACTS ARE BASED ON THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN 11 11 12 FROM THE COUNTRY. 12 THE COURSE OF THIS TRIAL. AND, AGAIN, WHAT ANY ATTORNEY SAYS 13 THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT AFTER THAT POINT IN 13 IS NOT EVIDENCE; IT IS WHAT WAS PRESENTED FROM THE STAND. TIME HE EVER DID ANYTHING TO PICK UP A PENCIL, TAKE A YOU MAY CONTINUE. 14 14 15 TYPEWRITER, OR DO ANYTHING TO FURTHER ADVANCE HIS DOCTORAL 15 MR. VOSS: NOT FROM DEPOSITION. THIS IS FROM DAY 16 THESIS EVER AGAIN. 16 TWO, NOVEMBER 12TH, THE TESTIMONY OF LE XUAN KHOA. THIS IS 36 YEARS LATER, HE'S STILL SAYING, I'M WORKING 17 17 FROM THE OFFICIAL REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT THAT I'M READING FROM. ON IT. AT SOME POINT IT BECOMES UNREASONABLE TO STAND BEHIND, AND, FOR EXAMPLE, EARLIER, WHEN I SAID THAT -- ABOUT ANY WAY 18 18 19 OH MY DOCTORAL THESIS SHOWN IN MY RESUME, 1960, WELL, IT'S 19 TO UNRING THE BELL AND WOULD YOU -- HE SAID I WANT TO GET AN OKAY BECAUSE I WAS STILL WORKING ON IT. NO, YOU HADN'T WORKED ANSWER FROM SMITH, I'M READING FROM THE TRANSCRIPT THAT YOU 20 20 ON IT SINCE 1975. BUT YOU'RE STILL HIDING BEHIND, I'M WORKING HEARD. I'M NOT READING YOU THINGS YOU DIDN'T HEAR WHERE YOU 21 21 2.2 ON IT 2.2 WEREN'T AT THE DEPOSITION. I'M ONLY READING THINGS YOU HEARD 23 I SUPPOSE HE'S STILL WORKING ON IT NOW BECAUSE 23 SO HE SAID -- I'LL RE-READ MY QUESTION (AS HE SAID HE WAS STILL WORKING ON IT SOME 50 YEARS LATER. 24 24 READ): BUT HE DIDN'T DO ANYTHING TO CORRECT THE "SO YOU KNOW YOU COULDN'T SUBMIT AN UNLAWFUL 25 25 26 MISTAKES. ALL HE HAD TO DO WAS PUT THE SLIGHTEST MENTION OF 26 GRANT APPLICATION; CORRECT? Page 63 Page 65 1 1 INCOMPLETE NATURE OF THE DOCTORAL DEGREE AND STOP THE STAFF "YES 2 FROM USING TERM "DOCTOR" TO ADDRESS HIM. DON'T USE LETTERS 2 "AND YOU UNDERSTOOD, AT ALL TIMES, WHEN YOU 3 WRITTEN TO HIM AS DR. KHOA IN THE GRANT. DON'T INCLUDE THOSE 3 WERE SIGNING ALL THOSE GRANT APPLICATIONS, THAT IF IT WAS THINGS THAT WOULD BE MISLEADING TO THE READER. AND THERE'S INACCURATE OR MISREPRESENTED FACTS. THAT WOULD BE UNLAWFUL: 4 4 5 JUST NO MENTION ANYWHERE OF THAT BEING SOMEHOW A TERM OF 5 ISN'T THAT CORRECT? 6 ENDEARMENT. NONE. 6 "YES " 7 I ASKED MR. KHOA (AS READ): 7 AGAIN, NOBODY DISAGREES THAT IT WOULD BE 8 "IS IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT NO GRANT APPLICATION 8 UNLAWFUL, THAT IT WOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE. NOT EVEN THE 9 EVER WENT OUT WITHOUT YOUR APPROVAL AND SUPERVISION OF THE 9 PLAINTIFF HIMSELF. GRANT APPLICATION DURING YOUR TIME AS PRESIDENT UNTIL YOU 10 10 AND WHAT HE SAYS, AND THE IMPORTANT THING TO 11 RETIRED?" 11 TAKE WITH THIS IS, HIS SIGNED AND WAS DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR 12 ANSWER IS: "YES " 12 EVERY PART OF EVERY GRANT APPLICATION SUBMITTED DURING YOUR "DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN YOU WERE TIME AS PRESIDENT UNTIL THE TIME YOU RETIRED. 13 1.3 14 SUBMITTING THE GRANT APPLICATIONS, THEY HAD TO BE ACCURATE? 14 SO WE HAVE PIECES OF VARIOUS GRANT APPLICATIONS "ANSWER: DEFINITELY 15 15 THAT HAVE BEEN ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE. AND WE HAVE HIS 16 "DID YOU UNDERSTAND YOU COULD NOT MAKE A 16 TESTIMONY THAT THE RESUME IN PARTICULAR WAS INCLUDED IN EACH 17 REPRESENTATION UNDER GRANT APPLICATION? 17 AND EVERY ONE OF THEM, INCLUDING THE ONE THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN "I UNDERSTAND THAT 18 18 REFERENCED UP HERE. IT WAS IN ALL OF THEM. "DID YOU UNDERSTAND YOU HAVE TO HAVE TRUTHFUL 19 SO WHEN WE ARE LOOKING TO SAY, DID HE FALSELY 19 20 INFORMATION ON THE GRANT APPLICATIONS? CLAIM THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A 20 21 "I UNDERSTAND THAT. 21 GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WE SAY HE DID BECAUSE HE 22 "DID YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THIS WAS BECAUSE, 22 SAID, I HAVE THIS DOCTORAL THESIS. OTHERWISE, IT WOULD NOT BE LAWFUL? 23 23 PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL HAS JUST TOLD YOU IT IS 24 24 TRUE HE HAD A DOCTORAL THESIS. 25 "BECAUSE IF IT WASN'T TRUTHFUL, THAT WOULDN'T 25 HE DID NOT. PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL IS WRONG. HE 26 BE LAWFUL, IN YOUR MIND? HAD STARTED A DOCTORAL THESIS, HE LEFT THAT ON THE TARMAC IN 26

Page 66 Page 68 SAIGON. PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL'S STATEMENT IN CLOSING TO YOU DISTINGUISHED FROM ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT HE'S COMPLAINING THAT HE HAD A DOCTORAL THESIS, UNLESS HE'S SAYING I HAD ONE 2 2 ABOUT IN THE PUBLICATION, IN GENERAL? 3 UNTIL 1975, AND THEN I NEVER HAD ONE AFTER THAT, IS AN 3 AND I ASKED HIM (AS READ): INACCURATE STATEMENT. SO HE'S SUPERVISED EVERYTHING. "WHEN YOU TESTIFIED HOW YOU FELT AFTER SEEING I ASKED HIM (AS READ): THE PUBLICATION, WERE YOUR ANSWERS RELATED TO JUST THIS 5 5 "ISN'T IT REQUIRED THAT YOU BE ACCURATE? STATEMENT ON THE WHITEBOARD, OR WERE YOU REFERRING TO THE "VFS PUBLICATION AS A WHOLE?" "ISN'T THIS THE CRUX OF THE ISSUE," I ASKED 8 8 AND HIS ANSWER WAS THAT IT'S A PART OF THE 9 MR. KHOA, "THAT YOU PUT DOWN DOCTORAL THESIS 1960, A SPECIFIC 9 PUBLICATION, SO, "I'M TALKING ABOUT THE PUBLICATION AS A DATE, AND YOU DIDN'T HAVE A DOCTORAL THESIS AT THAT POINT; 10 10 WHOLE." RIGHT? WHAT DAMAGES HE MAY HAVE HAD HE SLIED SMITH OR 11 11 12 "ANSWER: YES, THAT'S THE DATE I -- THAT I WAS 12 DORNAN, I DON'T KNOW. BUT THE ISSUE IS WHAT DAMAGES DOES HE 13 WORKING ON THE THESIS." 13 HAVE FROM THAT STATEMENT? AND I SAID: "AND IT'S NOW 1996, GIVE OR TAKE, SO WHEN YOU GET THESE CATEGORICAL ANSWERS ABOUT 14 14 15 THAT WE'RE HAVING THIS DISCUSSION WITH CONGRESSMAN DORNAN'S 15 HUMILIATION AND SHAME AND SO ON, THOSE ANSWERS HAVE TO DO. LETTER. 36 YEARS HAVE GONE BY. DO YOU THINK IT'S ACCURATE 16 16 ACCORDING TO HIM, WITH THE PUBLICATION AS A WHOLE, NOT JUST AND NOT A MISCHARACTERIZATION THAT, WHAT, YOU'RE STILL WORKING 17 17 THAT STATEMENT. IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT AS 18 ON IT 36 YEARS LATER; IS THAT RIGHT?" 18 YOU GO THROUGH THE VERDICT FORM. 19 AND HIS ANSWER TO THAT IS THAT: "I'VE BEEN 19 WHY DOES HE SAY HE HAS A SLEEPING PROBLEM? PROMOTED TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN VIETNAM, SO I DON'T NEED 20 INITIALLY, I WAS CERTAINLY LED TO BELIEVE FROM 20 THE QUESTIONS THAT HE WAS BEING ASKED LIKE HE COULDN'T SLEEP. 21 21 2.2 REALLY? IS THAT TRUTHFUL AND ACCURATE? TO 22 AND IT WAS IRONIC THAT THE ANSWER WAS THAT HE 23 YOU, THE READER, DOES THE GRANT READER KNOW THAT YOU DON'T FALLS ASLEEP WHILE TRYING TO DO THINGS. NOT THAT HE HAS A 2.3 HAVE THE DOCTORAL THESIS THAT YOU'RE SAYING YOU HAVE? SLEEPING PROBLEM THAT'S BEING INSOMNIAC, BUT HE HAS A SLEEPING 24 24 AND I ASKED HIM AGAIN (AS READ): 25 25 PROBLEM WITH BEING RIP VAN WINKLE. 26 "SO ONCE IT WAS LOST" -- SINCE THERE'S A 26 AND WHAT DOES HE SAY ABOUT THAT? HE SAID, I'M Page 67 Page 69 CONCERN ABOUT WHETHER YOU HEARD THIS TESTIMONY, I'LL GIVE YOU 1 1 TOO OLD NOW 2 A LITTLE MORE OF IT. 2 I MEAN, WE ALL GET TIRED. I GET A LOT MORE 3 "SO ONCE IT WAS LOST, NOTHING WAS EVER 3 TIRED AT 62 THAN I GOT AT 42. I COME HOME FROM TRIAL, AND I SUBMITTED TO COMPLETE YOUR THESIS WITH THE SORBONNE YOU HAVE A NAP BEFORE I START TO WORK TO COME BACK TO SEE YOU THE 4 4 5 AGREE? NEXT DAY. I'M GETTING A LITTLE OLD TO BE DOING THIS MYSELF 6 "ANSWER: I DON'T NEED TO ANYMORE. AS I SAID, 6 NOW 7 I WAS ALREADY PROMOTED." BUT THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS, THAT'S NOT ISSUE 7 8 I SAID: "NOTHING FURTHER FROM 19 -- WELL, THAT'S SPECIFICALLY SOMEHOW RELATED TO THAT STATEMENT OVER CERTAINLY AFTER 1975, WHEN YOUR HANDWRITTEN NOTES WERE LOST, 9 9 THERE. THAT'S A HUGE STRETCH TO SUGGEST THAT IT WAS. AT NO TIME AFTER THAT DATE DID YOU EVER SUBMIT A SINGLE PAGE 10 10 WHAT DID WE LEARN FROM CECILE? I'M JUST GOING TO THE SORBONNE TO SUPPORT THE COMPLETION OF YOUR DOCTORAL 11 11 TO DIGRESS FROM KHOA. 12 DEGREE: DID YOU? 12 ULTIMATELY, WHAT I WROTE DOWN IS, WE LEARNED "ANSWER: NO, I SENT NOTHING TO SORBONNE THAT HE'S BLESSED WITH A LOVING DAUGHTER WHO WOULD DO ANYTHING 13 13 14 ANYMORE." 14 FOR HER FATHER. LUCKY MAN. SHE DESCRIBES HIS FRAILTIES, AND 15 A MISREPRESENTATION OF ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS? 15 THEY'RE ALL FRAILTIES FROM HIS ADVANCING AGE AND HIS MEDICAL 16 I THINK THAT'S PRETTY CLEAR. BUT THAT'S NOT 16 CONDITIONS THAT HE SUFFERED FROM HE HAD OPEN-HEART SURGERY 17 THE ONLY PLACE. SO IT'S NOT JUST IN THE MISREPRESENTATION IN IN 2017, WITH AN EXTENSIVE PERIOD OF TIME IN RECOVERY. HE WAS 17 THE PARAGRAPH IN THE RESUME WHERE HE WAS SAYING -- HIS COUNSEL 18 18 ON A VENTILATOR. SAYS, I HAVE THIS DOCTORAL DEGREE -- OR DOCTORAL THESIS. 19 19 AND INTERESTINGLY, IT WAS HER TESTIMONY THAT HE IT IS ALSO -- STRIKE THAT. 20 20 DID THE OPEN-HEART SURGERY BECAUSE IT WAS DONE. IN PART, TO 21 I COME BACK TO THE FIRST PART OF THAT, THE 21 FINISH HIS SECOND BOOK. HE WAS -- APPARENTLY, HAD A HARD TIME 22 COLON PHRASE, IS REFERENCING WHAT IT IS THAT THE CONGRESSMAN FINISHING HIS SECOND BOOK. AND HE FELT THE NEED THAT IF I HAD 22 IS ASKING BE INVESTIGATED 2.3 THIS OPEN-HEART SURGERY, IT WOULD SOMEHOW MAKE ME FEEL BETTER, 23 24 THE SECOND PART OF THAT WAS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE, 2.4 AND I WOULD BE ABLE TO THEN FINISH MY SECOND BOOK. 25 IS MY CLIENT'S WORDS. BUT WHAT YOU HAVEN'T HEARD PARSED FOR 25 IT'S NOW BEING SUGGESTED TO YOU THAT HIS 2.6 YOU IS HOW DID THIS SPECIFIC STATEMENT IMPACT MR. KHOA AS INABILITY TO FINISH HIS SECOND BOOK IS SOMEHOW DAMAGES RELATED 26

Page 70 Page 72 TO THAT STATEMENT. THAT WAS WRITTEN ABOUT ME, PRAISING MY WORK AND MY CAREER AND 2 WELL, IF HE WAS HAVING PROBLEMS FINISHING HIS WHAT WE'VE DONE FOR VIETNAMESE REFUGEES, HECK YEAH, I'D POST 2 3 SECOND BOOK BEFORE HE HAD THE OPEN-HEART SURGERY, AND THAT'S 3 IT TOO. THAT'S ALL HE DID. 4 THE PRIMARY REASON WHY HE HAD THE OPEN-HEART SURGERY, I THINK HE DIDN'T POST ANYTHING SAYING: HA HA. WE DID 5 WE'RE PRETTY HARD-PRESSED TO TRY AND SOMEHOW RELATE HIS THIS AND KHOA DIDN'T. 5 INABILITY TO FINISH THE SECOND BOOK TO JUST THIS ONE STATEMENT 6 6 KHOA IS NOT EVEN MENTIONED. OUT OF EVERYTHING IN THE PUBLICATION. ANOTHER HUGE STRETCH. IT'S JUST A, WOW. GO LOOK AT THE DOCUMENT. AND ISN'T IT JUST LIKE HIS THESIS? STARTS THE 8 YOU'VE GOT IT IN YOUR EXHIBIT BOOKS. WOW, LOOK AT THIS NICE 8 9 THESIS, DOESN'T FINISH IT. STARTS THE SECOND BOOK, DOESN'T 9 VIDEO THAT CAME OUT FROM CONGRESSMAN SMITH. THANKS. I'M HONORED TO HAVE A CONGRESSMAN RECOGNIZE ME FOR MY WORK FROM FINISH IT 10 10 ARE THERE OTHER EXTENUATING FACTORS WHY YOU 11 36 YEARS AGO, IN 1986 -- GOT THAT RIGHT? YEAH, 36 YEARS AGO. 11 12 HAVEN'T FINISH YOUR SECOND BOOK THAT AREN'T JUST BECAUSE THIS 12 SO THERE IS, AT THIS TIME, THE PUBLIC SCANDAL, 13 STATEMENT WAS MADE? 13 OF MISREPRESENTING HIMSELF AS A DOCTOR. MY CLIENT TESTIFIED SHE DIDN'T EVEN KNOW ABOUT THE STATEMENT. THAT THIS APPEARED IN MANY ARTICLES, IN HIS WORDS. THAT'S NOT 14 14 CECILE, HIS DAUGHTER, UNTIL YEARS LATER, IN 2022, OR MORE 15 15 REFUTED BY ANYBODY. SPECIFICALLY, OBSERVATIONS SHE TESTIFIED TO ABOUT IN SO UNCONTROVERTED EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU, THAT 16 16 SEPTEMBER OF 2023, WHEN SHE DISCUSSED, IN HER TESTIMONY TO THERE WAS A PUBLIC SCANDAL, AND THIS ISSUE OF WHETHER HE WAS 17 17 YOU, HIS DETERIORATING HEALTH. THIS WAS DONE IN 2020. HOLDING HIMSELF OUT AS A DOCTOR OR NOT WAS THE CENTER POINT OF 18 18 19 SO ANOTHER FEW YEARS GO BY WITH A GENTLEMAN WHO 19 THAT SCANDAL. 20 IS 93 YEARS OLD AND SUFFERING AGE-RELATED DEBILITIES, HER 20 AND YOU DON'T NEED TO FRANKLY DECIDE WHETHER STATEMENTS ABOUT HIS ISSUES, HIS MEDICAL ISSUES AND MEDICAL DR. THANG IS RIGHT OR WRONG. WHAT YOU CAN REALLY LOOK AT AND 21 21 2.2 PROBLEMS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE STATEMENT. SHE DIDN'T 2.2 SAY IS, DID HE ACT REASONABLY IN RELYING ON THE FINDINGS OF 23 EVEN KNOW THERE WAS A STATEMENT UNTIL YEARS LATER. 23 THE CONGRESSMAN, BOTH THE FIRST INVESTIGATION AND THE SECOND AND SHE EVEN SAID, AND I WROTE THIS DOWN IN MY 24 24 ACCOLADES. NOTES THAT SHE DIDN'T HAVE EXPERTISE TO CLAIM WORSENING 25 FOR THOSE THINGS WE KNOW THAT THE 25 26 SYMPTOMS IN AN ELDERLY MAN. I THOUGHT THAT PRETTY WELL SUMMED 26 CONGRESSMAN'S STATEMENTS THAT YOU HAVE SEEN, AND I'M GOING TO Page 73 Page 71 SHOW YOU MORE AFTER LUNCH, THAT THOSE STATEMENTS ARE THINGS IT UP SHE DOESN'T 1 1 2 WHAT DID WE TELL YOU IN THE OPENING? I TOLD 2 UPON WHICH HE WAS REASONABLE TO RELY. 3 THAT YOU THAT YOU WEREN'T GOING TO HEAR FROM, AND YOU DID NOT 3 IN YOUR JURY INSTRUCTIONS, "DESPICABLE HEAR FROM AN EXPERT A DOCTOR MEDICAL RECORDS OF ANY KIND TO CONDUCT " NUMBER 3948: "DESPICABLE CONDUCT IS SO VILE BASE 4 4 5 SUPPORT ANY DAMAGES PURPORTEDLY CAUSED BY THE FEW WORDS OR CONTEMPTIBLE, IT WOULD BE LOOKED DOWN ON AND DESPISED BY 6 ALLEGED TO BE DEFAMATORY. 6 REASONABLE PEOPLE." 7 WHAT I TOLD YOU WOULD HAPPEN PROVED TO BE TRUE. 7 ARE WERE SUGGESTING THAT THE CONGRESSMEN ARE 8 THERE'S AN ABSENCE OF CONNECTING ANY OF HIS MEDICAL ISSUES FOR 8 NOT REASONABLE PEOPLE? 9 A 93-YEAR-OLD MAN TO THAT SPECIFIC STATEMENT. 9 BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE THE STATEMENTS ARE COMING 10 LET ME COME TO DR. THANG, YOUR THIRD WITNESS. 10 FROM. THERE IT IS. HIS MISREPRESENTATION OF ACADEMIC 11 DR. THANG, MY CLIENT, THE DEFENDANT, ALONG WITH 11 CREDENTIALS MAY RESULT IN HIS RECEIVING STATE DEPARTMENT 12 THE OUTFIT HE WORKS FOR, THE BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S., HAD, WHAT I 12 GRANTS OVER COMPETING APPLICANTS. WOULD ARGUE TO YOU, IS THE GREATEST DETAIL IN THE ACCURACY OF HECK, WE DON'T EVEN HAVE THAT PART IN OUR 1.3 1.3 14 HIS RECOLLECTION OF FACTS AND EVENTS OF ANY OF THE WITNESSES 14 STATEMENT, NOR THE PH.D. PART. BUT HE HAS RECENTLY ADMITTED 15 THAT CAME BEFORE YOU. 15 HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE. FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A 16 HE WAS ABLE TO RECITE CHAPTER AND VERSE OF WHAT 16 DOCTORAL DEGREE 17 HAPPENED IN 1986. WHO HE MET WITH, WHAT HAPPENED WHEN HE MET 17 SO WE'RE DESPICABLE TO RELY ON CONGRESSMAN WHEN WITH THEM. HE WAS ABLE GIVE YOU GREAT DETAIL, NOT 18 18 THE CONGRESSMAN WRITES SUCH A THING? I DON'T BELIEVE THAT GENERALITIES, BUT ABLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS DIRECTLY AND THAT'S WHAT YOU SHOULD BE FINDING WHEN YOU GET TO THAT PART OF 19 19 20 20 21 WE KNOW THAT THIS ALL STARTS BECAUSE IN AN 21 I BELIEVE THAT, AND I'M GOING TO HAVE TO -- AS 22 UNSOLICITED WAY IN 2020, MY CLIENTS WERE FORTUNATE TO BE 22 WE RAN A LITTLE LONG THIS MORNING. I'M GOING TO HAVE TO BREAK RECOGNIZED FOR THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY CONGRESSMAN SMITH. THIS UP INTO TWO PARTS AND ADDRESS YOU AGAIN FURTHER AFTER 23 23 24 THAT WAS UNSOLICITED. THAT WAS WITHOUT ANY COMMENTARY ABOUT 24 LUNCH. BUT I BELIEVE THAT WHEN YOU GO THROUGH THIS STATEMENT. 25 THE PLAINTIFF WHATSOEVER. 25 THE VERDICT FORM, AND YOU COME TO NUMBER 4: "WAS THE JUST, WOW, I MEAN IF I HAD A VIDEO LIKE THAT STATEMENT FALSE?" 26 26

Page 74 1 COUNSEL SAID THAT THAT RELATED TO DID YOU EVER 2 CLAIM TO BE A PH.D.? 3 NOPE. NEVER SAID THAT. WE DIDN'T SAY PH.D., 4 BUT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DID. 5 AND DID LE XUAN KHOA PROVE, BY CLEAR AND 6 CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT 7 WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, 8 WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 10 SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - TUESDAY, NOVEMBE 1 SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - TUESDAY, NOVEMBE 1 THE SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - TUESDAY, NOVEMBE 1 THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD 5 THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD 6 THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE 7 INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YO 8 QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YOU SEED THAT THE DEFENDANCE INTERPRETATION 10 MR. VOSS: LLOVE IT. IT'S PERFECT. WHY DO YOU	DPEN COURT:)
2 CLAIM TO BE A PH.D.? 3 NOPE. NEVER SAID THAT. WE DIDN'T SAY PH.D., 4 BUT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DID. 5 AND DID LE XUAN KHOA PROVE, BY CLEAR AND 6 CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT 7 WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, 8 WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 2 AFTERNOON SESSION ****** 4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN CONTINUED TO THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD 5 THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE 7 INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YOUR OUTPOUT OF THE COURT O	DPEN COURT:)
3 NOPE. NEVER SAID THAT. WE DIDN'T SAY PH.D., 4 BUT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DID. 5 AND DID LE XUAN KHOA PROVE, BY CLEAR AND 6 CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT 7 WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, 8 WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 3 ****** 4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN C 5 THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD 6 THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE 7 INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YO 8 QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YO 9 YES, STOP HERE."	<i>'</i>
BUT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DID. 4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN CONTROL OF THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD THE CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS WHO DOING THIS. 4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN CONTROL OF THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YOUR WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 9 YES, STOP HERE."	<i>'</i>
5 AND DID LE XUAN KHOA PROVE, BY CLEAR AND 6 CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT 7 WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, 8 WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 5 THE COURT: WE'LL GO BACK ON THE RECORD 6 THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE 7 INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YO 8 QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YOUR DOING THIS. 9 YES, STOP HERE."	<i>'</i>
CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE DEFENDANTS KNEW THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS WHO DOING THIS. THANG. CLERK FOUND A QUICK TYPO HERE IN THE INSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YO QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YO YES, STOP HERE."	
WAS FALSE, NOT JUST THAT IT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT DR. THANG, WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS I'M DOING THIS. TINSTRUCTIONS AFTER QUESTION NUMBER 3. "IF YO QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YOU YES, STOP HERE."	
8 WHEN HE WAYS MAKING THAT STATEMENT, KNEW, I'M WRITING A LIE AS 9 I'M DOING THIS. 8 QUESTION 3 IS YES, THEN ANSWER QUESTION 4. IF YOUR STOPHERE."	
9 I'M DOING THIS. 9 YES, STOP HERE."	
	1 o o Th to W Elab
±0 TO THAT REALL I A REASONABLE INTERPRETATION 10 MK, VUSS: 1 LOVE II, IT'S PERFECT, WHY DO)	YOU SAY
11 UNDER THE TOTALITY OF ALL OF THE INFORMATION YOU'VE SEEN, OF 11 THAT'S A MISTAKE?	
12 ALL OF THE INFORMATION HE'S PROVIDED TO YOU ABOUT WHERE HE 12 THE COURT: SO YOU PLANTED IT. SO I THINK	WE'LL JUST
13 CAME UP WERE THAT FROM, THAT HE JUST MADE IT UP, HE KNEW IT 13 WHITE IT OUT. IT SHOULD BE: IF YOU ANSWERED "	NO," STOP HERE.
14 WAS COMPLETELY FALSE, OR THAT HE HAD I HAVEN'T HEARD A 14 SO I'LL ASK THE CLERK TO WHITE THAT OU	JT, AND
THING ABOUT ANY SERIOUS DOUBT OF ANY KIND, NOT A PIECE OF 15 WE'LL HAVE TO MAKE SOME MORE COPIES. BUT TH	IAT WAS A
16 EVIDENCE WHATSOEVER. 16 MR. HART: GOOD CATCH. WAY TO GO, MR. BU	JRNS.
NO. HE RELIED ON THE CONGRESSMAN, THE PUBLIC 17 THE COURT: QUICKLY. WHERE DO WE STAND	
SCANDAL, THE DOCUMENTATION. I'LL FINISH GOING THROUGH IT WITH 18 ESTIMATE-WISE?	
19 YOU AFTER LUNCH. THANK YOU." 19 NOW I'LL START WITH MR. VOSS, AND I'LL CO	ЭО ТО
THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. VOSS. 20 MR. HART FOR HIS REBUTTAL.	
21 ALL RIGHT. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, SO WE WILL 21 MR. VOSS: TWO HOURS MORE.	
TAKE THAT LUNCH BREAK AT THIS POINT IN TIME. AGAIN, JUST A 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO	
23 LITTLE REMINDER. WE'RE CLOSE, BUT WE'RE NOT THERE YET. SO NO 23 MR. VOSS: HE TOOK IT WITH A STRAIGHT FACE	E.
24 FORMING ANY OPINIONS QUITE YET. NO DISCUSSIONS OR ANYTHING 24 THE COURT: THERE'S SOME ROCKS UNDER TH	E CHAIRS THAT
25 ALONG THOSE LINES. HOPE TO GO OUTSIDE. HAVE A BEAUTIFUL 25 THEY MAY START TO HURL.	
26 LUNCH. WE'LL SEE YOU BACK AT 1:30 TO WRAP UP WITH THE CLOSING 26 MR. VOSS: TRYING TO BE SOMEWHERE IN THE	NEIGHBORHOOD
Page 75	Page 77
1 STATEMENTS. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME. 1 OF A HALF-HOUR.	
2 (JURY EXCUSED FOR LUNCH.) 2 THE COURT: THEN, MR. HART, DO YOU HAVE I K	NOW
3 HE'S NOT DONE YET, BUT IN TERMS OF A GUESSTIMATE	OF WHERE YOU
4 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT OUTSIDE THE 4 WILL BE ON YOUR REBUTTAL?	
5 PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) 5 MR. HART: 20 TO 30.	
6 THE COURT: WE ARE OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY. 6 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THEN WE'LL BRING THE	HEM IN.
7 SO YES, TAKE THAT LUNCH RECESS. WE'LL COME BACK AND GIVE 7 LET'S GET ROLLING. HOPEFULLY, WE'LL BE DONE BY OU	UR AFTERNOON
8 MR. VOSS THE OPPORTUNITY TO WRAP UP, AND THEN WE'LL HAVE 8 BREAK.	
9 REBUTTAL FROM MR. HART, AND GET THE JURY OUT FOR THEIR 9 (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN	COURT IN THE
10 DELIBERATION. 10 PRESENCE OF THE JURY:)	
11 THANK YOU VERY MUCH, EVERYONE. 11	
12 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE BEEN REJOINED	D BY ALL
13 (LUNCH RECESS.) 13 OF OUR JURORS.	
14 WELCOME BACK, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. TH	IANK YOU,
15 YET, AGAIN, FOR ALL YOUR TIME AND SERVICE.	
16 MR. VOSS, YOU CAN GET THE LECTERN OVER TO	HERE TO
17 GET STARTED.	
18 YOU'VE HEARD ALREADY, WE'LL GIVE MR. VOS	
19 BALANCE OF HIS CLOSING. AND THEN WE'LL HAVE THE	KEBUTTAL FROM
20 MR. HART HERE THIS AFTERNOON. 21 GO RIGHT AHEAD, MR. VOSS.	
	IDEE OD
CO. FOUR MODE HOURS AS THAT OF AVE	KLE UK
23 FOUR MORE HOURS. IS THAT OKAY?	'H I'M
OVAN AND STATEMENT OF A COOR LINE	1171
24 OKAY. I HOPE EVERYBODY HAD A GOOD LUNC	KING ABOUT THE
OKAWA MARKET MENUNDAN MARKATAN AND A COOR MARK	

Page 78 Page 80 AND THE ONE THING I WANT TO DO RIGHT OFF THE TO, AND THAT'S A WHAT'S BEING REFERENCED IN THE LETTER. 2 2 SO WHEN I SAY TO YOU THAT THERE'S EVIDENCE ON BAT IS, IT WAS POINTED OUT TO ME THAT I KEPT SAYING "1986," 3 AND IT'S 1996, WHICH DOES ADD UP WITH MY MATH FOR THE 3 OUR SIDE, AND THERE'S NOT ANY EVIDENCE ON THE OTHER SIDE, I'M 4 4 ABLE TO DOVETAIL IT ALL TOGETHER, IT'S THE TESTIMONY. IT'S 5 SO ALL THESE LETTERS, AND YOU'LL SEE THEM, THE 5 THE PUBLIC SCANDAL, IT'S IN THE LETTER, IT'S IN MY CLIENT'S 6 CONGRESSMEN'S LETTERS AND SO ON, THOSE ARE '96, WHEN ALL THAT 6 TESTIMONY. IT ALL PULLS TOGETHER AND MATCHES UP. THE STORY 7 WAS HAPPENING. MY APOLOGIES THAT I KEPT SAYING '86. HOLDS WATER WHEN YOU PUT ALL THE PIECES TOGETHER. SO WE SEE 8 SO WITH THAT, I AM GOING TO GO TO ONE OF THOSE 8 THAT THAT'S THERE WHAT WE HEARD BY CONTRAST IN DISCUSSING THIS 9 LETTERS IN PARTICULAR. IF I COULD ASK FOR EXHIBIT NUMBER 233 9 10 TO BE PUBLISHED, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2 LETTER. SO THERE WERE 10 WAS THAT, OH, THIS IS JUST A POLITICAL HIP JOB. WELL, HIP JOB TWO LETTERS FROM CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. AND THIS ONE IS THE 11 BY WHO? MY CLIENT DIDN'T WRITE THIS LETTER. MY CLIENT WROTE 11 12 FIRST ONE OF THE TWO. THIS IS THE APRIL 2 LETTER. 12 A STATEMENT THAT SAID THAT A LETTER HAS BEEN WRITTEN THAT'S 13 AND WITH RESPECT TO THE APRIL 2 LETTER, THERE 13 INQUIRING. WELL, THERE IT IS. SO THIS IS ALSO, BY THE WAY, TO FOLLOW UP ON ARE SEVERAL THINGS I WANT YOU ALL TO THINK ABOUT IN TERMS OF 14 14 THE LETTER OF MARCH 6, 1996, AND IT WAS IN THAT LETTER, IF WE 15 THIS. 15 16 FIRST OF ALL, IN THE CLOSING FROM THE 16 CAN SCROLL TO PAGE 2, TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH, WHERE IT SAYS: PLAINTIFF'S THIS MORNING, THE COMMENT WAS MADE THAT IN THIS "ENCLOSED IS A COPY OF THE MARCH 6TH LETTER TO YOUR OFFICE. 17 17 18 FIRST PARAGRAPH, THERE'S NOTHING ABOUT MR. KHOA. 18 IN ADDITION, I AM ENCLOSING MY MARCH 6TH LETTER TO LE XUAN 19 AND I APPRECIATE HE'S NOT MENTIONED IN THE 19 KHOA LEXPECT MR KHOA TO DELIVER THE RECORDS LHAVE 20 FIRST PARAGRAPH, BUT LET'S GO UP A LITTLE BIT AND LOOK AT THE 20 REQUESTED." SECOND ONE TO REMIND YOU THAT THIS LETTER IS ALL ABOUT WE HEARD MR. KHOA SAY HE DELIVERED THE RECORDS 21 21 22 MR. KHOA, AND IT'S ALL RIGHT ON THE MONEY RELATED TO THE 22 THAT WERE REQUESTED. STATEMENT THAT'S ON THE BOARD. 2.3 2.3 WELL THIS DOCUMENT SAYS THIS LETTER THAT IT IS -- AND I'M QUOTING IT: "MY STAFF HAS CONTINUED OUR 24 THIS IS THE ONE THAT SAYS, "IN ADDITION, WE 24 25 HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C. AND S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED 25 INVESTIGATION." 26 LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR." 26 SO WHEN MR. KHOA IS ON THE STAND REPEATEDLY Page 81 Page 79 IT COULDN'T BE MORE PLAIN IN TERMS OF WHAT MY 1 PROTESTING THAT THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION, IT'S JUST PATENTLY 1 2 CLIENT SAID, AND AGAIN, THE CONTEXT OF THAT BEING THAT A 2 FALSE. SO AGAIN, I'M CONCERNED THAT YOU ALL WILL BE ABLE 3 LETTER WAS SENT WHICH REQUIRES -- MADE THESE STATEMENTS THAT 3 WEIGH THE CREDIBILITY OF THE WITNESSES AND THEIR MEMORY AND 4 IT WAS A FALSE CLAIM TO BE A DOCTOR WHETHER OR NOT THEY'RE REMEMBERING THE DETAILS OF HOW THINGS 4 5 SO THIS ALSO, JUST TO PUT INTO PERSPECTIVE FOR 5 HAPPENED PROPERLY. 6 YOU, COMES BACK TO MY CLIENT'S TESTIMONY ABOUT THE PUBLIC 6 SO THAT'S THE SITUATION WITH RESPECT TO THAT 7 SCANDAL, AS IT WERE. SO WHERE IT SAYS, "ENCLOSED IS AN 7 LETTER, YOU ALL SAW IT THROUGHOUT THE TRIAL, IT CLEARLY 8 ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE." THAT'S 8 BACKS UP THE CONCERNS ABOUT HAVING AN APPLICATION THAT HELD 9 NOT COMMUNITY NEWS, JUST GENERALLY COMMUNITY NEWS; IT IS A 9 YOU, HAD A DOCTORAL DEGREE, AND THIS HERE, THAT MR, KHOA HAS MAGAZINE NAMED "COMMUNITY NEWS." OKAY. AND THAT IT WAS 10 10 ADMITTED HE IS NOT A DOCTOR. 11 PUBLISHED IN HIS DISTRICT, AND THAT IT'S THERE THAT WE SEE 11 MY CLIENT HAS TO BE FOUND, YOU'RE GOING TO SEE 12 THAT HE SAYS WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT THIS MISREPRESENTATION 12 THE INSTRUCTIONS AGAIN, HAS TO BE FOUND NOT ONLY THAT THE 13 "AND I HAVE UNCOVERED TROUBLING INFORMATION STATEMENT WAS FALSE, BUT THAT HE KNEW IT WAS FALSE WHEN HE WAS 1.3 14 REGARDING THESE ORGANIZATIONS." BECAUSE THIS WAS THE PUBLIC 14 MAKING IT. 15 SCANDAL THAT MY CLIENT TESTIFIED TO WAS GOING ON OUT IN THE 15 MY CLIENT HAS SUBMITTED TO HE DIDN'T KNOW IT 16 COMMUNITY; THAT PEOPLE WERE TALKING ABOUT THIS; THAT OTHER 16 WAS FALSE, HE KNEW IT WAS TRUE. IT'S SUPPORTED BY THE 17 VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS WERE TALKING ABOUT THIS. 17 DOCUMENTATION. 18 AND YOU HEARD HIM SAY, ARTICLES WERE WRITTEN 18 WHAT ELSE IS IT SUPPORTED BY? ABOUT THIS, INCLUDING THIS ARTICLE IN MARCH OF 1996, ALL OF 19 IT IS SUPPORTED BY HIS EXPERIENCE IN APPLYING 19 20 WHICH IMPORTANTLY PREDATES MY CLIENT DOING ANYTHING. 20 FOR GRANTS. HE, LIKE MR. KHOA, RAN A NONPROFIT ENTITY THAT 21 SO THIS IS ALL GOING ON BEFORE YOU GET TO ANY 21 APPLIED FOR GRANT MONEY. 22 LETTER WRITTEN BY MY CLIENT IN 1996. 22 WHAT WAS HIS TESTIMONY?

23

24

25

26

THE GRANTS.

23

24

25

26

SO DO YOU SEE THAT THERE? ADDITIONALLY, THE --

IT IS IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY THAT MR. KHOA ADMITTED

THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR. OKAY. SO RECENTLY IN THE FACE OF

PUBLIC INOUIRY, AGAIN, THE PUBLIC SCANDAL THAT HE'S TALKING

WELL, YOU GOT THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT CAME ALONG

WITH THE GRANTS. THE INSTRUCTIONS MADE IT CLEAR THAT YOU HAD

TO TELL THE TRUTH, YOU COULDN'T MISREPRESENT IN APPLYING FOR

Page 82 Page 84 AND HE'S SAYING, FROM HIS OWN PERSONAL BIOGRAPHY THAT IS FOR LE XUAN KHOA FROM I.R.A.C., AND IT VERY KNOWLEDGE OF HAVING APPLIED FOR THESE EXACT SAME KINDS OF 2 CLEARLY TALKS ABOUT, RIGHT THERE, "DR. KHOA HAS BEEN ACTIVE IN 2 3 GRANTS, YOU CAN'T MAKE A MISREPRESENTATION OR THAT WOULD BE A 3 REFUGEE AFFAIRS." CRIMINAL OFFENSE. AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF 212. SO HE KNOWS THIS BECAUSE THE CONGRESSMAN SAYS IF WE COULD SCROLL TO THAT ON PAGE 2. 5 5 6 IT. HE KNOWS THIS BECAUSE HE HIMSELF HAD TO DO IT. AND HE ALSO 6 AGAIN, "DR. KHOA." THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO KNOWS THIS BECAUSE HE HAD MEETINGS WITH CONGRESSIONAL STAFF. HOLDING HIM OUT ABSOLUTELY THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE. REMEMBER THE TESTIMONY THAT CAME IN ABOUT DR. ALBERT SANTOLI IT'S DR. KHOA. THERE'S NO IF'S, AND'S, OR BUTS AROUND THIS. 8 8 IN -- IN CONGRESSMAN DORNAN'S OFFICE, THAT DR. SANTOLI WAS THE IT'S NOT LIKE A, WELL, IS IT A THESIS? DID HE HAVE IT DONE? 9 9 10 ONE WHO BROUGHT HIM DOWN AND SHOWED HIM A STACK OF PROPOSALS. 10 DID HE LOSE IT ON THE TARMAC? AND IN THOSE PROPOSALS, THESE GRANT PROPOSALS, 11 11 NO IT'S "DR KHOA" 12 WAS THIS RESUME. AND YOU'VE HEARD THE TESTIMONY THAT THE 12 NOW, LET'S GO BACK TO PAGE 1. AND WHAT DO YOU 13 RESUME WAS INCLUDED IN ALL THE PROPOSALS. 13 SEE ON THE TOP RIGHT CORNER? SEE IT THERE? APPENDIX C-1. SO LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT, IF WE COULD. YOU KNOW WHY IT'S APPENDIX C-1? BECAUSE MY 14 14 15 221-5. 15 CLIENT TESTIFIED THAT WHEN HE SAW DR. SANTOLI AND HE WAS 16 I'M GOING TO TRY TO PICK UP THE PACE. 16 LOOKING THROUGH THE GRANT APPLICATIONS, HE ONLY ASKED FOR ONE ALL RIGHT. HERE WE GO. 221-5. THIS IS THE DOCUMENT FROM WHAT? FROM THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 17 17 18 18 RESUME. AND IF WE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE. ONE MORE. PAGE 7, THIS WAS THE DOCUMENT. HE GOT A COPY OF IT. 19 "EDUCATION " 19 HE KEPT A COPY OF IT. YOU KNOW IT'S FROM A GRANT APPLICATION. SO THIS IS WHAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THIS IT HAS "APPENDIX C-1" RIGHT AT THE TOP CORNER, CONSISTENT WITH 20 20 MORNING WHEN I WAS ARGUING WITH YOU. THAT'S -- THE DOCTORAL THE OTHER DOCUMENTS THAT ARE PARTS OF THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 21 21 2.2 THESIS IS INCLUDED ON THIS DOCUMENT. 2.2 AND IT'S CONSISTENT AGAIN, DOES IT ALL, THE 23 BUT NOW LET'S GO BACK TO PAGE 1, IF WE COULD, 23 WHOLE STORY, HOLD WATER? YES, HE TESTIFIES THAT HE SAW IT IN OF THIS DOCUMENT. AND I WANT TO POINT OUT SOMETHING TO YOU --THE OFFICE WITH THAT BEING A VARIETY OF THE GRANTS THAT HE SAW 24 24 EXCUSE ME. PAGE 1 OF THE RESUME. SO IT WOULD BE 221-4 -- 5 25 25 AND WAS PART OF THE GRANTS. 26 THERE YOU GO. 26 WELL, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, HERE Page 83 Page 85 ON THE TOP RIGHT, YOU SEE THAT WHERE IT SAYS, YOU GO, LE XUAN KHOA'S BIO DATA. DR. KHOA HAS BEEN ACTIVE. 1 1 2 "APPENDIX H-1.1," OKAY, BECAUSE THESE ARE ATTACHMENTS TO THE 2 STATEMENT ON THE BOARD IS, AND AGAIN, IN CONTEXT, THE LETTER 3 GRANT. SO YOU HAVE YOUR GRANT APPLICATION, THEN YOU ATTACH 3 IS SENT, AND IT'S ASKING FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION ABOUT 4 OTHER INFORMATION TO THE GRANT WHETHER MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN 4 5 AND LIKEWISE, IF WE GO TO PAGE 4 OF THIS 5 THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. 6 EXHIBIT, NOT ONLY IS THIS LETTER SOMETHING THAT WAS 6 YES, SURE DID. IT'S RIGHT THERE, APPENDIX C-1. 7 CONSCIOUSLY CHOSEN TO BE INCLUDED IN THE GRANT THAT REFERS TO SO, YOU KNOW, THE IMPORTANCE OF THAT IS -- IT'S 7 8 HIM AS DR. LE XUAN KHOA AND ADDRESSES HIM AS, "DEAR DR. KHOA." 8 KEY, BECAUSE WE HAVE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE. WE HAVE 9 LOOK AT THE TOP RIGHT CORNER. WHAT DO YOU SEE? 9 TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE. WE HAVE THE CONGRESSMEN'S LETTERS, ALL THIS IS APPENDIX NUMBER F-7, ANOTHER ATTACHMENT 10 10 OF THEM ALL SUPPORT THE CONTENTION ON THE BOARD. 11 TO THE GRANT APPLICATION. ALL RIGHT. SO YOU'VE SEEN THAT, 11 AND, AGAIN, THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE 12 YOU'VE HEARD ABOUT THAT I THINK IT SPEAKS FOR ITSELF. THERE 12 PLAINTIFF, WE DON'T HAVE TO PROVE IT'S TRUE. THEY HAVE TO 13 HE IS BEING HELD OUT AS A DOCTOR IN THE GRANT APPLICATION. PROVE IT'S FALSE. 1.3 14 NOW, LET'S LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 212. 14 AND NOT ONLY DO THEY HAVE TO PROVE IT'S FALSE. 15 AND WHILE WE'RE PULLING UP 212, REMINDER, MY 15 THEY HAVE TO PROVE THAT WE KNEW BETTER, THAT WE DIDN'T 16 CLIENT GETS CALLED IN BY DR. ALBERT SANTOLI TO COME LOOK AT 16 KNOWINGLY MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT 17 ALL THESE GRANT APPS, AND HE SAYS, WHILE I'M THERE -- HIS 17 SO WHAT HAVE I GOT NOW? I'VE GOT A PUBLIC TESTIMONY WAS TO US THAT HE SHOWED YOU A -- LIKE A STACK OF 18 18 SCANDAL. I'VE GOT DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE FROM A GRANT 19 THE GRANTS AND THE -- THAT WERE IN RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST, APPLICATION SHOWING HIM AS DR. KHOA. WE HAVE THE MISLEADING 19 20 AND HE SAYS, "DO YOU WANT COPIES OF THEM?" STATEMENTS ON THE DOCTORAL THESIS. WE HAVE HIS EXPERIENCE IN 20 21 AND HE SAYS: NO, I DON'T WANT COPIES OF 21 APPLYING FOR THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. WE HAVE HIS EXPERIENCE 22 EVERYTHING. I ONLY WANT COPIES OF THAT ONE THING. 22 IN MEETING WITH THE CONGRESSMAN'S AID, DR. SANTOLL, I MEAN, 23 AND HE TESTIFIES THAT THE ONE THING THAT HE GOT MY GOODNESS, HOW MUCH MORE INFORMATION COULD HE HAVE TO BACK 23 24 IS A COPY THAT DATE FROM THE GRANT APPLICATIONS WAS THIS 2.4 UP HIS STATEMENT THAT ALL OF THESE THINGS, AND BALANCED 25 DOCUMENT, NUMBER 212. 25 AGAINST WHAT? 26 AND NUMBER 212 IS A BIOGRAPHY AND IT'S A THAT DR. KHOA SAYS -- OR MR. KHOA SAYS, IT'S 26

12

13

14

26

1

Page 89

- NOT CORRECT? THAT WHEN MR. SMITH COMES BACK 36 YEARS LATER
 AND PRAISES HIM FOR THE WORK THAT HE DID IN THIS TIME FRAME,
 THAT SMITH MUST BE WRONG, TOO? DORNAN'S WRONG. EVERYBODY'S
 WRONG. THAT'S THE PATTERN. THAT'S THE THEME.
 SO WHEN PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL, IN HIS CLOSING.
- 6 SAID THIS MORNING THAT HE CLAIMED IT, BUT HE DIDN'T SHOW IT.
- $7\,$ $\,$ HE DID. IT'S RIGHT THERE. COUNSEL JUST WASN'T LISTENING.
- 8 THAT'S A PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION.
- 9 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE DOCTORAL THESIS STUFF,

 10 YOU, AS THE READER, DOES IT SAY ANYWHERE THAT IT'S INCOMPLETE?

 11 THAT IT WAS LOST? THAT I'M STILL WORKING ON IT? NO.
- 11 THAT IT WAS LOST? THAT I'M STILL WORKING ON IT? NO.

 12 EVEN COUNSEL SAID IT'S TRUE THAT HE HAD A

 13 DOCTORAL THESIS, NOT A COMPLETE ONE HE DIDN'T. AND IT WOULD

 14 HAVE BEEN BETTER IF HE HAD MADE THAT CLARIFICATION, AND HE

 15 COULD HAVE DONE SO. AND AS HE SAID, ALL THE GRANTS HAD THIS

 16 SAME RESUME ATTACHED. EVERY ONE OF THEM. THAT ONE AND EVERY

 17 OTHER ONE OF THEM, THEY USED THAT RESUME THROUGHOUT.

 18 IT IS INDEED COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT TO ASK ABOUT

 19 THE PH.D. RED HERRING THAT MY CLIENT NEVER USED THE PHRASE
- 19 THE PH.D. RED HERRING THAT MY CLIENT NEVER USED THE PHRASE
 20 FOR, ALTHOUGH THE CONGRESSMAN DID, AS YOU SAW.
 21 BUT DO I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT MR. KHOA WAS
 22 ASKED ABOUT WHAT DEGREE IS CONFERRED IN FRANCE. AND YOU MAY
 23 RECOLLECT THAT WHAT HE SAID WAS THAT THEY DO NOT CONFER A
 24 PH.D. IN FRANCE. THEY CONFER THE TITLE OF DOCTOR. THAT WAS
- 26 SO THIS WHOLE FALSE ARGUMENT THAT'S BEING MADE,

WHAT HIS TESTIMONY WAS.

- 1 HIM AT ALL. HE WAS THE ONE WHO NAMED US FIRST, WHICH CAUSED
- 2 DR. THANG TO SAY, HEY, NOT CORRECT WE DID WHAT WE DID. THIS
- 3 IS WHAT WAS REALLY HAPPENING.
- 4 SO IS HE ENTITLED TO DO THAT, IS HE ENTITLED TO
- 5 HAVE FREE SPEECH TO BE ABLE DEFEND HIS OPEN REPUTATION? THE
- 6 PERSON THAT WENT AFTER SOMEBODY WAS ACTUALLY MR. KHOA, NOT
 - DR. THANG. SO DR. THANG WAS EVEN BEFORE YOU.
- 8 I'M JUST GOING TO TAKE YOU THROUGH THAT
- 9 TIMELINE AGAIN. IN 1986, WE HAVE PHONE CALLS COMING IN ON THE
- 10 CONGRESSMAN'S LETTERS ON THE TIMELINE. THE OVERWHELMING
- 11 TELEPHONE CALLS, JANUARY OF 1996, RAISING THE ISSUES INCLUDING
 - MISREPRESENTATION OF ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS.
 - THE LETTER IN APRIL 2 SAYING, I DID A MARCH 6

 LETTER THAT WAS INVESTIGATED TO WHICH MR. KHOA RESPONDED, AND
- 15 IT WASN'T UNTIL THEN AFTER KHOA IS ALREADY RESPONDING TO THE
- 16 CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE ON THIS ISSUE THAT MY CLIENT PUBLISHES
- 17 ANYTHING, WHICH WAS EXHIBIT NO. 18, WHICH WAS THE 10TH OF
- 18 MARCH. WE DIDN'T PLANT THE SEED OR CAUSE THE ISSUE TO BE
- 19 RAISED, IT WAS ALREADY RAISED BY THE CONGRESSMAN.
- $20\,$ SO HE WRITES THE TWO ARTICLES IN REPLY. AGAIN,
- 21 DOESN'T WRITE TO US. HE JUST COMPLAINS ABOUT CONGRESSMAN
- 22 SMITH TO CONGRESSMAN SMITH.
- 23 AT THE END OF THE DAY, THESE WORDS WERE WRITTEN
- 24 AT A POINT IN TIME WHILE MY CLIENT WAS LOOKING AT A MOUNTAIN
- 25 OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THEM, A MOUNTAIN OF EVIDENCE, THAT HE
 - DID HOLD HIMSELF OUT TO BE A DOCTOR WITH PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF

Page 87

- THIS FAKE NEWS BEING CREATED ABOUT PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL ABOUT.
- $\,\,$ OH, WELL, HE DIDN'T MISREPRESENT THAT HE WAS A PH.D.
- 3 HE WAS NEVER GOING TO BE A PH.D. HE WOULDN'T
- 4 HAVE BEEN A PH.D. IF HE HAD FINISHED IN FRANCE. A PH.D. IS A
- $\,^5\,$ $\,$ RED HERRING, A MISDIRECTION, A WAY OF GETTING YOU TO LOOK FOR
- 6 SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T EXIST. HE WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN ANYTHING
- 7 OTHER THAN A DOCTOR EVEN IF HE HAD FINISHED IT.
- 8 WE HAD A TIMELINE THAT I TOOK YOU ALL THROUGH
- 9 AS TO WHEN THINGS HAPPENED, AND THE FACT THAT NOTHING MY
- 10 CLIENT DID WAS THE PRECIPITATING FACTOR TO CAUSE THE
- 11 CONGRESSMAN TO DO THE INVESTIGATION INTO THIS ISSUE.
- 12 HE DIDN'T RAISE IT FIRST, THE CONGRESSMAN DID.
- 13 BUT DURING CLOSING, COUNSEL SAYS, WELL, THEY STARTED THROWING
- 14 MUD AT HIM.

18

25

1

- 15 AGAIN, THIS IS BACK TO THE THEME OF WHAT I SAY
- $16\,$ $\,$ $\,$ IS THAT THEY TRY AND CONFLATE EVERYTHING TOGETHER.
- 17 THEY DIDN'T START TO THROW MUD, MY CLIENT
 - DIDN'T THROW MUD. MY CLIENT PUBLISHED THE VIDEO THAT GAVE HIM
- 19 ACCOLADES FOR BEING A GREAT GUY AND FOR HIS SUCCESSES AND IN
- 20 HIS CAREER, AND FOR B.P.S.O.S. AND WHAT THEY'VE DONE FOR BOAT
- 21 PEOPLE LIKE HIMSELF. THEY DIDN'T START THROWING MUD AT HIM.
- 22 MY CLIENT DIDN'T THROW ANY MUD AT HIM AT ALL.
- 23 THE TWO ARTICLES THAT ARE THEN WRITTEN BY
- 24 MR. KHOA WHERE HE CHOOSES TO FIND A BOOGIEMAN BEHIND THE
- 25 LETTER THERE, IN HIS COMPLAINTS, HIS COMPLAINTS WITH
- 26 CONGRESSMAN SMITH ARE NOT WITH US. WE DIDN'T THROW ANY MUD AT

- THE PUBLIC SCANDAL THAT HAPPENED WHEN THE TRUTH CAME OUT ALL
- 2 THOSE YEARS AGO, IN 1996.
- 3 IF I SAY '86 AGAIN, I APOLOGIZE.
- 4 BUT WHERE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE REVERSE? YOU
- 5 SEE ANY DOCUMENTS THAT SUPPORT THE PROPOSITION THAT THAT'S A
- 6 FALSE STATEMENTS? IS THERE ANY DOCUMENTS THAT SAY DR. THANG
- 7 WAS ACTING IN DISREGARD FOR THE TRUTH, THAT HE WAS JUST MAKING
- 8 IT UP, NONE OF THESE THINGS FACTORED INTO IT, HE JUST MADE IT
- 9 UP WHOLE CLOTH?
- 10 IT JUST HAPPENS THAT ALL OF THESE THINGS
- 11 SUPPORT HIS WRITING THAT HE POSTED. EVERYONE ELSE IS WRONG,
- 12 AND ONLY MR. KHOA IS RIGHT.
- 13 I DO WANT TO POINT OUT, SHOULD YOU EVEN GET
- 14 THAT FAR IN THE VERDICT FORM, THAT THERE ARE NO ACTUAL DAMAGES
- 15 HERE THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED TO YOU THAT ARE LIMITED TO THAT
- 16 SPECIFIC PHRASE. NONE.
- 17 THE GENERALITIES THAT WERE DRAWN FROM, YOU
- 18 KNOW, SMITH IMPUGNING HIS REPUTATION OR DORNAN HIS REPUTATION
- 19 WITH THINGS THAT THEY SAID AREN'T APPLICABLE TO MY CLIENTS.
- 20 THAT'S A FACT.

21

26

- SO WHEN HE SAYS THAT HE HAD SHAME, WELL, THERE
- 22 WAS A PUBLIC SCANDAL IN 1996. AND IN THAT, HE HAD TO BACK
- 23 DOWN AND ADMIT HE WAS NOT A DOCTOR.
- 24 SO IS IT MORE LIKELY, I SUBMIT TO YOU, LADIES
- $\,$ 25 $\,$ AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, THAT HIS SHAME, IF HE HAS CAME OUT
 - DECADES AGO, DECADES AGO, AND THAT THERE'S NOTHING OUT THERE

Page 90 Page 92 THAT CORRECTS THAT OR STATES THAT HIS POSITION IS CORRECT. SUGGESTION THAT THERE WAS A DOUBT QUESTION HERE. I DON'T 2 2 NOTHING THAT'S BEEN BROUGHT BEFORE US AS A JURY THINK YOU HEARD ANY DOUBT FROM DR. THANG, WHEN HE WAS 3 SO BLAME EVERYONE ELSE. THEY'RE ALL WRONG. 3 TESTIFYING, ABOUT HOW HE WAS ABLE BACK UP HIS WORDS. 4 TAKE IT OUT OF CONTEXT, IGNORE THE COLON. IGNORE THE FACT SO AT THE END OF THE DAY, I DO BELIEVE, AS I'VE THAT THIS PHRASE IS OFFERED AFTER THE COLON AS PART OF --5 ORIGINALLY INDICATED TO YOU, THAT YOU NEED TO KEEP YOUR OPEN 5 6 THERE'S A LETTER REGARDING AN INVESTIGATION OF THAT. THOSE 6 MIND TO HAVE HEARD THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY I THINK YOU NOW 7 ARE ALL TRUE STATEMENTS. HAVE. I THINK THE PATTERN IS ONE OF BLAMING EVERYTHING FROM AND THERE IS NOT ONE DOCUMENT SAYING IT'S EVERYONE, EVERYWHERE ON THIS ONE STATEMENT. AND YOU JUST 8 8 9 UNTRUE. THERE'S NOT ONE DOCUMENT, THERE'S NOT ONE PIECE OF 9 CAN'T DO THAT. YOU CAN'T SHOVE THAT SOUARE PEG INTO THAT 10 TESTIMONY THAT SAYS THAT MAKING A MISREPRESENTATION WOULD BE 10 ROUND HOLE. IT DOESN'T FIT. LAWFUL. THE PLAINTIFF HIMSELF ADMITS IT WOULD BE UNLAWFUL. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE VERDICT FORM "AWARD 11 11 12 I DON'T EVEN NEED TO GET MY OWN CLIENT TO SAY 12 DAMAGES FOR OCCUPATION." HE'S RETIRED. WHAT OCCUPATION? 13 SO WHEN THE PLAINTIFF HIMSELF SAYS IT ON THE STAND THAT IT'S 13 HE'S WRITING A BOOK? YOU MEAN THE SAME BOOK UNLAWFUL TO MAKE MISREPRESENTATION ON THE APPLICATION. THAT HE WAS WRITING BEFORE HE HAD THE OPEN-HEART SURGERY IN 14 14 SO YOU WILL BE GIVEN A VERDICT FORM. I'M NOT 15 15 2017, YEARS BEFORE THIS EVER COMES UP? 16 GOING TO TAKE YOU THROUGH ALL NINE OUESTIONS, FOLKS, I'M JUST 16 CLEARLY, YOU CAN'T BE BLAMING THIS STATEMENT 17 REALLY GOING TO ADDRESS YOUR ATTENTION TO TWO 17 FOR THE FACT THAT HE CAN'T WRITE A BOOK NOW AT AGE 93. 18 QUESTION NUMBER 4: "WAS THE STATEMENT FALSE?" REPUTATION? YOU HEARD THE TESTIMONY. HE WAS 18 19 COUNSEL SAYS, WELL, THAT SHOULD BE WHETHER OR 19 HAPPY THAT HIS GOOD FRIENDS BELIEVED HIM HE DIDN'T SEE HIS NOT YOU EVER CLAIMED TO BE A PH.D. I HAVE NO IDEA WHERE THAT REPUTATION AS DAMAGED. HE SAW HIS REPUTATION AS PEOPLE THAT 20 20 WOULD COME FROM FROM A STATEMENT FROM MY CLIENT. THAT'S NOT WERE HIS FRIENDS CONTACTING HIM AND MAKING HIM FEEL GOOD THAT 21 21 2.2 THE LITMUS TEST FOR YOU ON THAT STATEMENT. THAT'S THE 2.2 THEY SUPPORTED HIM. 23 STATEMENT OVER THERE IN THE CONTEXT OF SENTENCE BEFORE. 23 SO THERE'S NO ACTUAL DAMAGES THERE TO BE AWARDED, AND THE NOTION THAT SOMEHOW THIS IS -- YOU'RE GOING 24 THAT'S THE OUESTION. 24 TO MAKE HIM BILLIONAIRE IN THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY IS A BUNCH 25 AND THE ISSUE THEN IS TO SAY: DID -- IF YOU 25 26 LOOK AT THAT CONTEXT, THE FULL SENTENCE SAYS, "IMMEDIATELY 2.6 OF HYPERBOLE AND OVERSTATEMENT. Page 91 Page 93 AFTER THE TWO HEARINGS, CONGRESSMAN SMITH SENT IN OFFICIAL 1 LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I DO WANT TO THANK YOU 1 2 LETTER REQUESTING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF FOR YOUR SERVICE. IT TAKES US A LONG TIME, AS LAWYERS, 3 STATE TO INVESTIGATE MR. KHOA AND S.E.A.R.A.C. ON A FRAUDULENT 3 SOMETIMES TO PROVE THE OBVIOUS, BUT WE HAVE TO GIVE YOU EACH BACKGROUND STATEMENT USED WHEN APPLYING FOR A GRANT: FALSELY 4 AND EVERY PIECE OF EVIDENCE THAT WE'VE GOT TO BE ABLE TO GET 4 5 CLAIMED HE HAD HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN APPLICATION FROM A 5 THERE. 6 GRANT DEPARTMENT OF STATE." 6 SO I APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE AS WE HAVE PUT 7 ALL THESE THING ON THE BOARD AND GIVEN YOU THE TESTIMONY THAT 7 YAP, ABSOLUTELY TRUE. WE KNOW THAT CONGRESSMAN 8 SMITH DID SEND SUCH A LETTER -- EXCUSE ME, IT WAS DORNAN THAT 8 WE'VE GIVEN YOU. HOPEFULLY, WE HAVEN'T BORED YOU TOO MUCH. 9 BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, MY CLIENT DID NOT DO ANYTHING 9 SENT IT. THAT WAS THAT CONFUSION. WRONG. MY CLIENT TOLD THE TRUTH. HE MOST CERTAINLY DID NOT 10 BUT THAT THE CONGRESSMAN DID SEND SUCH A 10 WRITE SOMETHING THAT WAS FALSE AND BELIEVE IT TO BE FALSE AS 11 LETTER, IT IS BEFORE YOU. YOU HAVE 233 AND 234. 234 IS THE 11 HE WAS WRITING IT. AND YOU'D HAVE TO FIND THAT TO BE ABLE TO 12 12 ONE WHERE HE DOES EXACTLY THAT, REQUEST THE INSPECTOR GENERAL TO INVESTIGATE THE FRAUDULENT BACKGROUND STATEMENT, NAMELY 13 FIND AGAINST HIM. 1.3 14 THAT ONE. A HUNDRED PERCENT TRUE. CONGRESSMAN DID DO THAT. 14 WHAT WAS IT KHOA SAID? HE SAID, WHAT I WANT TO 15 DO TO UNRING THE BELL, IS HE WANTED ANSWERS FROM CONGRESSMAN 15 SO WAS THE STATEMENT FALSE? NO, THE STATEMENT WAS TRUE. 16 SMITH. 16 IF SOMEHOW YOU COULD GET PAST THAT YOU WOULD 17 I BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE MISPLACED IRE, MISPLACED 17 STILL HIT QUESTION NUMBER 5: WHICH IS, "DID LE XUAN KHOA ANGER THAT HAS BEEN DIRECT AT MY CLIENT UNJUSTLY. AND I HOPE 18 18 PROVE BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT DEFENDANTS KNEW THAT YOU WILL FIND IN FAVOR OF THE DEFENDANTS. THANK YOU. 19 THE STATEMENT WAS FALSE?" 19

THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. VOSS. SO NOT ONLY DID YOU HAVE TO FIND THAT IT WAS 2.0 21 ALL RIGHT. THEN, MR. HART, THE FINAL WORD IN FALSE. YOU WOULD HAVE TO FIND THAT DR. THANG KNEW IT WAS FALSE WHEN HE WAS MAKING IT IGNORING EVERYTHING THAT HE'S 22 YOUR REBUTTAL. 2.3 MR. HART: THANK YOU, JUDGE. TESTIFIED TO AT ALL THE DOCUMENTS THAT BACK HIM UP ON HAVING 24 SO THE GOOD NEWS IS NOT A SINGLE THING YOU JUST MADE THE STATEMENT THAT HE DID. OR THAT HE HAD SERIOUS DOUBTS ABOUT THE TRUTH 25 HEARD FROM MR. VOSS CHANGED THE TWO MOST IMPORTANT POINTS, 26 FACTS: THAT THE DEFENDANT PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT TO OF THE STATEMENT. I HAVEN'T HEARD EVEN ANY DISCUSSION OR

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Page 94 Page 96 THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE AND THAT IT WAS AND IS FALSE. THAT'S WHAT THE SCANDAL WAS ABOUT. IT WASN'T 2 THE REASON THAT I'M SO RELIEVED IN ALL OF THIS ABOUT THIS PHONEY CLAIM THAT PROFESSOR KHOA HAD CLAIMED TO BE 3 IS BECAUSE, IF YOU ACTUALLY LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE, IT DOESN'T A PH.D. OR DOCTORAL DEGREE. NOBODY CARED ABOUT THAT. THAT 4 SUPPORT ANYTHING MR. VOSS JUST SAID. I WAS INTERESTED TO HEAR CLAIM DIDN'T MATTER TO ANYRODY EXCEPT DORNAN WHEN HE NEEDED TO HIM ATTRIBUTE A NUMBER OF THINGS TO ME THAT I DON'T REMEMBER STOP THE OPPOSITION FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO HIS ANTI-CPA 5 AMENDMENT. THAT'S ALL THAT AMOUNTS TO. 6 SAYING, LIKE THAT I'M HOOKED ON THE PH.D. ISSUE, I DIDN'T SAY 7 THAT. WHILE WE'RE ON 233, WHEN YOU GET A CHANCE, LOOK 8 THIS STATEMENT PUBLISHED TO THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE 8 THROUGH HERE. MR. VOSS SAID. THIS PROVES THAT THAT'S TRUE. HOW DOES THIS PROVE IT'S TRUE? BECAUSE HE SAID SO? DON'T 9 CLAIMS THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN 10 APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. 10 BELIEVE YOUR LYING EYES? IS THAT WHAT WE'RE HEARING? WHERE IS THAT? THAT IS NOWHERE. 11 THIS DOESN'T SAY ANYTHING ABOUT PROVING THAT 11 12 IS THAT THIS BIO? NO. THIS BIO, WHAT DID WE PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR. 13 HEAR? WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THIS BIO? IT SAYS, "APPENDIX 13 IT SAYS THAT WE'VE LEARNED C-1." THAT IS A TWO-PAGE DOCUMENT. LR A C. S E A R A C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA'S AS A 14 14 15 WHAT EXHIBIT NUMBER IS THAT? DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA 16 THE COURT: 212, I BELIEVE. ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR. MR. HART: OKAY. 212. THAT'S A TWO-PAGE DOCUMENT. 17 SO IN MY READING THAT'S THE OPPOSITE OF WHAT 17 THAT SAYS. THAT'S DOCUMENTATION THAT HE'S NOT CLAIMING TO BE 18 WHERE DID THAT COME FROM? 18 19 AT THE BOTTOM OF MOST OF THESE DOCUMENTS YOU 19 A DOCTOR CAN SEE THANG'S NAME AT THE BOTTOM. WHERE DID THIS COME FROM? SO IF YOU'RE ASKED TO SUSPEND YOUR DISBELIEF IN 20 20 21 ORDER TO FOLLOW THE DEFENDANTS' CLAIM, PLEASE UNSUSPEND YOUR 21 DISBELIEF, USE YOUR LOGICAL MINDS AND READ WHAT THE WORDS SAY 22 APPENDIX TO WHAT? WHERE IS THE REST OF THE 22 DOCUMENT? WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THIS IS ATTACHED TO. YOU CAN'T 23 AND COMPARE THEM TO WHAT HE'S CHARGED WITH. THIS LETTER DOES 2.3 SAY THIS MUST BE PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION BECAUSE IT SAYS NOT SUPPORT THAT CLAIM, AND HE KNEW IT WHEN HE WAS READING 24 24 APPENDIX C-1 ON IT. THAT DOESN'T PROVE THAT, IT'S AN THIS BECAUSE THIS SAYS HE DOES NOT CLAIM TO BE A DOCTOR AND 25 25 26 APPENDIX TO SOMETHING. WHY WOULD IT BE A GRANT APPLICATION? IT TALKS ABOUT THE ACTUAL SCANDAL AS SOMETHING ELSE. Page 95 Page 97 THERE'S NO TESTIMONY THAT THIS WAS ATTACHED TO 1 IF WE MOVE ON TO 234 THE APRIL 30 LETTER 1 GRANT APPLICATIONS. IN FACT, THE TESTIMONY IS THE OPPOSITE. AGAIN, THIS IS NOT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN IN ITEM NO. 5, SAYING PROFESSOR KHOA TESTIFIED THAT THIS BIO IS WHAT 3 THAT KHOA HAS FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE. IT ALSO SAYS HIS STAFF USED TO EDUCATION PEOPLE ABOUT HIS BACKGROUND WHEN THE OPPOSITE. "SELF-PROMOTION AS A PH.D." WE DIDN'T SEE ANY 4 HE WAS GOING TO GO OUT AND SPEAK. THIS IS NOT A CLAIM TO BE A OF THAT. PH.D. DIDN'T COME UP ANYWHERE. HE'S NOT DOCTORAL DEGREE HOLDER. 6 SELF-PROMOTING HIMSELF AS A PH.D. SO THIS DOESN'T PROVE IT. 7 AND HERE, AGAIN, HE ADMITS THAT HE'S NOT A 7 LET'S GO TO 233. THIS IS -- WHAT DR. THANG DOCTOR. AGAIN, THIS IS DOCUMENT DISPROVES THAT STATEMENT. IS HE CLAIMING A DOCTORAL DEGREE OR IS HE ADMITTING HE DOESN'T 9 SAID WAS HIS SOURCE FOR THIS INFORMATION WAS THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS. PRIMARILY THE APRIL 30TH AND THE BACKGROUND FROM THE HAVE A DEGREE? 10 AND THIS ISN'T DORNAN'S WORDS ANYWAY. THESE 11 APRIL 2ND. HE DIDN'T SAY HE GOT IT FROM A BIO THAT CAME OUT 11 OF WHO KNOWS WHAT DOCUMENT. 12 ARE THE UNNAMED PERSONS WHO SUPPOSEDLY CALLED IN THE REALITY OF THE SCANDAL, IF YOU READ IN THE REMEMBER WHAT THIS IS THIS IS A POLITICAL. 13 1.3 THIRD PARAGRAPH, "S.E.A.R.A.C. N.A.V.A.S.A. RELATIONSHIP TO HIT. THIS IS SLOPPY INNUENDO IN ORDER TO EMBARRASS SOMEONE SO THAT THEY WILL WITHDRAW THEIR OBJECTION, OR THE STATE THE COMMUNISTS GOVERNMENT IN VIETNAM HAS CONTINUED TO CAUSE DEPARTMENT WILL STOP RELYING ON HIM CONFLICT WITHIN THE COMMUNITY " THAT'S ANOTHER COMMONLY MADE FALSE CHARGE IN 17 THIS DOES NOT PROVE THIS. NEITHER OF THESE LETTERS PROVE WHAT'S SAID IN THAT STATEMENT. 18 THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY. SOMEBODY HAS COMMUNISTS LEANINGS OR 19 LET'S TURN TO 238, PAGE 7. SYMPATHIES. THAT'S THE EASIEST WAY IN THE VIETNAMESE THIS IS THE ARTICLE. AND SOMETHING THAT'S EXPATRIATE COMMUNITY TO DISCREDIT SOMEBODY. THEY LIKE THE 2.0 21 ALWAYS SEEMED CURIOUS TO ME, IF YOU'VE GOT THESE DORNAN COMMINISTS GO ONTO THE TOP OF THE NEXT PAGE. 22 LETTERS RIGHT IN FRONT OF YOU WHEN YOU'RE WRITING THIS, WHY DO 22 YOU WRITE THAT CONGRESSMAN SMITH SENT AN OFFICIAL LETTER 2.3 THAT IGNITES A FIRESTORM WHENEVER YOU DO THAT. 23 24 REQUESTING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO 24 AND WHAT DOES THIS TELL US HERE? 1,400 SIGNED PETITIONS 25 PROTESTING THE FUNDING OF THE HMONG NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 25 INVESTIGATE MR. KHOA? 26 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY CLOSING AGENCY BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT. 26

Page 98 Page 100 ARGUMENT. SOMEBODY ELSE, FROM THE REFUGEE POLICY GROUP. YES, IT SAYS 2 "APPENDIX." BUT HOW CAN WE TELL WHERE THIS BELONGS? 2 THE COURT: AGAIN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY. 3 TWO THINGS: YOU'LL HEAR THE -- IT'S FOR YOU TO DECIDE THE 3 THIS IS NOT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMING TO 4 EVIDENCE, AND IN TERMS OF BEING REBUTTAL VERSUS NONREBUTTAL. 4 BE A DOCTOR. THIS IS SOMEBODY WHO SENT HIM A LETTER. AND WE LET'S CONTINUE ON, MR. HART. DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT BELONGS IN HERE OR NOT. NOBODY 5 5 6 MR. HART: THANK YOU, JUDGE. 6 TESTIFIED THAT THIS IS A PART OF THIS APPLICATION. IF YOU LOOK DOWN AT IT THE SECOND -- BELOW THE MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR, MISCHARACTERIZES 8 PARAGRAPH THAT'S HIGHLIGHTED YOU SEE WHAT DR THANG WRITES: 8 THE EXHIBIT. 9 "EVEN THOUGH MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER 9 THE COURT: AND, AGAIN, THE SAME INSTRUCTION I JUST 10 PEOPLE SHOWED HIM RESPECT AND HE WAS NOT A DOCTOR, SUCH AN 10 PROVIDED TO YOU, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: THAT YOU HEARD AND YOU CAN HAVE READ BACK WHATEVER TESTIMONY YOU LIKE ABOUT HOW EXPLANATION IS NOT GOOD BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED 11 11 12 TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A RESUME ATTACHED TO A GRANT 12 EVIDENCE AND DOCUMENTS CAME AND WERE PRESENTED DURING THE 13 APPLICATION." 13 COURSE OF THE TRIAL. HE'S NOT PARAPHRASING WHAT'S IN ONE OF THESE MR. HART: SO IF YOU WANT THE REPRESENTATION THAT 14 14 15 DORNAN LETTERS. HE'S DRIVING THE KNIFE HOME. HE CLAIMS HE 15 PROFESSOR KHOA DID MAKE, YOU JUST LOOK AT PAGE 7 OF 221, AND YOU SEE THE SAME RESUME THAT WE SEE REPEATEDLY WHERE HE LAYS 16 DIDN'T MISREPRESENT HIMSELF TO BE A DOCTOR, BUT THAT'S NO GOOD 16 OUT HIS EDUCATION, AND SAYS HE HAS A DOCTORAL THESIS ENTITLED 17 BECAUSE HE DID PERSONALLY. THAT'S WHAT IS SAID IN THIS 17 18 18 LETTER, IN THIS ARTICLE. "THE PHILOSOPHY OF DHYANA." 19 RIGHT HERE: "SUCH EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD. 19 HE DOESN'T OWE MR. VOSS ANYTHING. HE DOESN'T BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL 20 OWE HIM ANY EXPLANATION. HE DOESN'T OWE HIM ANY CORRECTION TO 20 THIS RESUME. THAT IS 100 PERCENT TRUE. AND IT IS NOT MEANT 21 DEGREE." 21 22 IF THERE'S ANY CONFUSION ABOUT WHAT HE'S SAYING 2.2 TO BE MISLEADING. 23 DID WE SEE ANY GRANTORS CHALLENGE 2.3 IN THE DEFAMATORY COMMENTS. THAT'S WHAT HE'S SAYING. HE CLEARS IT ALL UP. PROFESSOR KHOA? WAS THERE ANY LETTER FROM A GRANTOR OR THE 24 24 STATE DEPARTMENT SAYING: DR. KHOA, IS YOUR DOCTORAL THESIS 25 IF, TO THE EXTENT THAT HE'S WRITING UP HERE 25 26 ABOUT HOW AN INVESTIGATION WAS REQUESTED, THE DEFAMATORY 2.6 COMPLETED YET? HAVE YOU DEFENDED YOUR THESIS? ARE YOU A Page 99 Page 101 STATEMENTS EXPLAIN THE NEED FOR THE INVESTIGATION. WE WANT AN 1 1 DOCTOR? 2 INVESTIGATION BECAUSE MR. KHOA HAS FALSELY CLAIMED TO HAVE A 2 NOBODY CARED. NOBODY EVER ASKED ABOUT THAT. 3 DOCTORAL DEGREE. 3 AND WE HAVE NO EVIDENCE OF IT. THIS IS NOT SOME INNOCENT MISUNDERSTOOD 4 HE'S ACCURATELY STATED WHAT HIS EDUCATION IS. 4 STATEMENT. THIS IS A CHARACTER-ASSASSINATING, FALSE CLAIM OF IF YOU LOOK DOWN HERE, YOU'LL SEE HIS HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER 6 A CRIME. AND ANY CONFUSION IS CLEARED UP IN THE SENTENCE 6 DIPLOMA. HIS MA FACULTY OF LETTERS, UNIVERSITY OF HANOI, 7 BELOW. 7 MAJOR IN ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY, AND THEN HIS DESCRIPTION OF HIS 8 OKAY. LET'S LOOK AT 221, THE SMOKING GUN OF 8 DOCTORAL THESIS. THERE'S NOTHING INCORRECT ABOUT THIS. AND 9 SMOKING GUNS. 9 NOBODY ASKED ABOUT IT ANYWAY. THIS ALL CAME UP WHEN DORNAN NEEDED TO 10 THIS IS APPARENTLY A GRANT PROPOSAL SIGNED 10 ELIMINATE HIM AS A FACTOR IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S OBJECTION 11 BY -- ON PAGE 1, BY LE XUAN KHOA, PRESIDENT OF I.R.A.C. NOT 12 DR., NOT PH.D., PRESIDENT. TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT, WHICH WAS ULTIMATELY VETOED BY 13 AND THE NEXT PAGE, PAGE 2, STARTS AS PAGE 61. 14 WHERE IS THE REST OF THE DOCUMENT? 14 SO BACK TO WHAT THIS IS ABOUT, DR. THANG GOT MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR, MISCHARACTERIZES 15 HIMSELF IN A PICKLE WHEN HE PUBLISHED THAT VIDEO WITH A LITTLE 15 16 THE EVIDENCE THAT WAS RECEIVED ON THE APPLICATION OF PLAINTIFF 16 SUBTITLE TO IT CLAIMING CREDIT FOR WHAT S.E.A.R.A.C. HAD DONE. 17 TO INTRODUCE THE EVIDENCE. 17 AND WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE DATE OF THE VIDEO 18 THE COURT: ONE MOMENT, SO AGAIN, LADIES AND 18 IS THAT NEVER CAME INTO EVIDENCE. WE DON'T KNOW IF THAT WAS GENTLEMEN, YOU WILL REVIEW ALL THE EVIDENCE YOURSELF. YOU OLD OR NEW OR RESENT. YOU CAN'T NECESSARILY SAY THAT WAS A 19 19 WILL HEAR THE TESTIMONY ABOUT HOW THINGS WERE BROUGHT INTO 20 20 2020 VIDEO, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT WAS POSTED IN 2019 OR THAT IT 21 EVIDENCE. SO THAT WILL BE ALL FOR YOU TO DETERMINE. 21 WAS EVEN A 2019 VIDEO. 22 MR. HART: I BRING THIS UP BECAUSE MR. VOSS INSISTS 22 FOR WHATEVER REASON, DR. THANG NEEDED TO THAT 221 PROVES PROFESSOR KHOA WAS MISREPRESENTING HIMSELF 2.3 23 BOLSTER HIS APPEARANCE IN THE CHARITY COMMUNITY, AND HE -- SO 24 BECAUSE IT'S GOT A LETTER IN HERE THAT'S ADDRESSED TO "DR. LE HE DID THAT CLAIM. 24 25 XUAN KHOA." 25 PROFESSOR KHOA IS ENTIRELY ENTITLED TO WRITE 2.6 THIS LETTER ON PAGE 4 IS A LETTER FROM 26 HIS LETTER, PUBLISH FACT STATEMENTS FROM HIS MEMORY OF WHAT

Page 102 Page 104 THE TRUTH WAS ON THESE SUBJECT MATTERS. HE DID NOT MAKE A MR. MULDOON AS THE COURTROOM ATTENDANT, THERE ARE ROOMS IN 2 FALSE CLAIM ABOUT DR. THANG. 2 THERE 3 BUT THAT CREATED A PICKLE FOR DR. THANG --3 THE ONLY MANDATED BREAK IS THE BEGINNING OF THE 4 SORRY. FIRST TIME IN MY LIFE I EVER USED THAT TERM, HE'S IN A 4 DAY, THE END OF DAY AND THE LUNCH AT 12:00 TO 1:30. BUT OTHER "PICKLE," BECAUSE HE'S -- HE'S MADE HIMSELF LOOK LIKE A LIAR. THAN THAT AFTERNOON SESSION OR MORNING SESSION, TAKE YOUR 5 5 6 AND THE ONLY WAY OUT IS TO SLANDER PROFESSOR KHOA. AND THAT'S BREAKS WHENEVER YOU. AS A COLLECTIVE, WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THAT. 7 WHAT HE DID. AS YOU ALSO HEARD, WE WILL SEND IN THE EXHIBITS, SO YOU'LL HAVE ANY EXHIBIT THAT WAS ADMITTED. 8 ALL OF THESE TRUTH-STRETCHING EXERCISES THAT 8 9 YOU WENT THROUGH WITH MR. VOSS DON'T CHANGE A SIMPLE BASIC 9 YOU'LL HAVE THOSE. 10 FACT: THAT'S WHAT HE PUBLISHED. IT WASN'T TRUE. HE KNEW IT 10 IF THERE IS THE NEED FOR ANY READBACK, YOU'LL HAVE A FORM THAT YOU CAN FILL OUT AS INSTRUCTIONS SUGGEST, WASN'T TRUE WHEN HE DID IT BECAUSE HE'S GOT ALL THE SAME 11 11 12 MATERIALS WE'VE LOOKED AT AND NONE OF THEM SUPPORT THAT. 12 PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS POSSIBLE FOR US TO HELP THAT. 13 SO, PLEASE, UNSUSPEND YOUR DISBELIEF AND 13 THE MORE INFORMATION WE GET, THE QUICKER AND EASIER IT IS FOR BELIEVE YOUR OWN EYES AND YOUR OWN COMMON SENSE AS YOU'RE THE COURT REPORTER TO FIND THAT TESTIMONY, THEN BE ABLE READ 14 14 15 WALKING THROUGH THE VERDICT FORM. 15 IT BACK TO YOU. 16 I THINK THERE WAS SOMETHING ELSE VERY IMPORTANT 16 LIKEWISE, YOU CAN USE THOSE FORMS TO WRITE ANY I WANTED TO TELL YOU ABOUT. PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT TELL YOU 17 17 OUESTIONS YOU HAVE. 18 THAT HE WAS STILL WORKING ON HIS DOCTORAL THESIS. HE DIDN'T 18 CONTINUE YOUR DELIBERATIONS. IT WILL TAKE A 19 NEED TO WORK ON HIS DOCTORAL THESIS. HE ALREADY HAD BEEN 19 LITTLE BIT OF TIME FOR THE COURT REPORTER TO FIND ANY PROMOTED TO THE POSITION THAT THAT WOULD HAVE FACILITATED TESTIMONY, FOR A NEED TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS, BECAUSE I NEED 20 20 21 TO GET THE ATTORNEYS BACK TOGETHER AND GO THROUGH AND COME UP 21 22 MR. VOSS SAID INCORRECTLY THAT HE WAS 22 WITH A RESPONSE, SO CONTINUE YOUR DELIBERATIONS WHILE YOU'RE 23 WAITING FOR ANY RESPONSE OR READBACK OF THAT. 2.3 CONTINUING TO WORK ON IT. THAT'S NOT TRUE. HE DIDN'T NEED TO, AND HE WASN'T, AND HE DIDN'T SAY HE WAS. IT JUST HAPPENS THE NEXT THING IS, IN TERMS OF WHEN YOU DO 24 24 TO BE A MATTER OF FACT, WHEN YOU LOOK AT HIS EDUCATIONAL REACH A VERDICT AND YOU ADVISE MR. MULDOON THAT YOU'VE REACHED 25 25 26 BACKGROUND, THAT'S PART OF IT. IT'S TRUTHFULLY STATED. 26 IT, THERE IS A PROCESS THAT GOES INTO TAKING THAT VERDICT. SO Page 103 Page 105 SO, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, PLEASE UNSUSPEND YOUR IF YOU GET TO 4:05, WE'VE GOT A VERDICT HERE, THAT DOESN'T 1 1 2 DISBELIEF AND UNRING THAT BELL. THANK YOU. 2 LEAVE ENOUGH TIME IN THE DAY TO COMPLETE THE PROCESS OF TAKING 3 THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY KINDLY, MR. HART. 3 THE VERDICT. ALL RIGHT. THEN LADIES AND GENTLEMEN JUST A WE HAVE TO GET EVERYBODY GROUPED UP BACK 4 4 5 FEW LITTLE THINGS HERE BEFORE WE'RE GOING TO GIVE YOU THAT TOGETHER. WE HAVE TO RECEIVE THE VERDICT. IF THERE'S 6 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DELIBERATION. 6 POLLING, WE HAVE TO DO THE POLLING. WE HAVE TO READ THE 7 VERDICT. SO THERE'S A NUMBER OF STEPS THAT GO INTO THAT. 7 SO YOU'VE OBVIOUSLY NOW HEARD ALL THE EVIDENCE. 8 ALL THE ARGUMENT, ALL THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO 8 SO IT REALLY IS, YOU KNOW, 3:30, PROBABLY, 9 RECEIVE, AND WE WILL SEND YOU IN THERE IN JUST A MOMENT. MAYBE 3:40, THAT'S REALLY PUSHING IT, PROBABLY 3:30 WOULD BE 9 10 AS YOU'VE HEARD THROUGHOUT BUT JUST TO 10 AT THE END OF DAY IN TERMS OF LETTING US KNOW THAT THERE'S A 11 REITERATE, WE'LL SEND IN THREE OR FOUR SETS OF JURY 11 VERDICT AND THEN HAVING TIME TO COMPLETE THE PROCESS OF TAKING 12 INSTRUCTIONS, SO YOU'LL HAVE THOSE TO CONSULT WITH. 12 THAT VERDICT. SO I JUST WANT TO LET YOU KNOW BEFORE YOU GO WE WILL ALSO THEN SEND IN 13 COPIES OF VERDICT IN, THAT I DON'T WANT YOU SAYING, WE GOT IT, IT'S 4:05, BUT 1.3 1.3 14 FORM. SO ONE WILL BE THE OFFICIAL FOR YOUR COLLECTIVE VOTE AS 14 THERE'S NOT ENOUGH TIME AT THE END OF THE DAY. SO I DON'T 15 A BODY, AND THEN THERE WILL BE ONE FOR EACH ONE OF YOU TO 15 WANT TO MISLEAD ANYONE IN THAT REGARD. 16 INDIVIDUALLY TRACK YOUR OWN VOTES SO THAT IF THERE IS THE 16 AND SO WITH THAT YOU HAVE YOUR NOTEPADS YOU 17 NEED TO POLL, YOU'LL HAVE YOUR OWN NOTES ABOUT EXACTLY HOW YOU 17 CAN TAKE THOSE. PLEASE TAKE THOSE INTO THE JURY ROOM. AND 18 VOTED ON EACH INDIVIDUAL QUESTION. SO PLEASE DO USE YOUR OWN 18 THEN IF THERE'S AN OVERNIGHT, JUST LEAVE THEM IN THERE. THAT COPY TO TRACK HOW YOU INDIVIDUALLY VOTE ON EACH QUESTION ON JURY ROOM WILL BE OFF LIMITS, AND SO ALL YOUR PADS WILL BE IN 19 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

415ISH END OF THE DAY.

THAT VERDICT FORM SO THAT WILL MAKE THINGS GO A LITTLE BETTER

IN TERMS OF SCHEDULING, OUR SCHEDULING WILL

REMAIN LARGELY THE SAME. WE'LL GO HERE TODAY UNTIL THAT

IN TERMS OF BREAKS, YOU GUYS WILL BE FREE TO

LIKE TO TAKE YOUR BREAKS. YOU'LL BE COMMUNICATING WITH

TAKE YOUR BREAKS WHEN YOU DECIDE COLLECTIVELY THAT YOU WOULD

THERE WHEN YOU RETURN IN THE MORNING.

(COURT ATTENDANT SWORN.)

AT THIS TIME, WE'LL GO AHEAD AND GET

MR. MULDOON SWORN IN TO TAKE CUSTODY OF THE JURY.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. AND WITH THAT, OUR FIRST

12 -- MS. L AND MS. C, IF YOU COULD HOLD ON FOR JUST A MOMENT

AS OUR ALTERNATES. BUT THE OTHER 12, IF YOU COULD PLEASE

Page 106

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

1

14

16

20

21

22

Page 108

RISE, AND MR. MULDOON WILL SHOW YOU INTO THE JURY DELIBERATION 2 ROOM. AND, AGAIN, JUST LET HIM KNOW ABOUT THE BREAKS OR 3 ANYTHING THAT YOU MAY NEED.

(JURY ESCORTED TO JURY ROOM.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

2.6

5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. OUR 12 JURORS HAVE BEEN SHOWN 6 INTO THE JURY DELIBERATION ROOM. SO WE DO HAVE OUR TWO ALTERNATES HERE, SO JUST IN TERMS OF THE PROCESS FOR BOTH OF 8 YOU.

YOUR SERVICE IS NOT YET COMPLETE. YOU'RE STILL THE POTENTIAL FOR THE NEED TO POTENTIALLY SUB SOMEBODY OUT IF ANYTHING WERE TO HAPPEN TO ANYONE. BUT AT THE SAME TIME, WE ALSO AREN'T GOING TO HOLD YOU HOSTAGE HERE IN THE COURTHOUSE EITHER.

SO WHAT -- THE PROCESS THAT I FOLLOW IS THAT BASICALLY HAVING YOU ON CALL, A ONE-HOUR CALL, DURING THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT WE'RE IN SESSION. SO FROM 9 O'CLOCK IN THE MORNING TO 4:15-ISH IN THE AFTERNOON. WE JUST NEED TO YOU BE ABLE GET BACK TO THE COURTHOUSE WITHIN AN HOUR OF RECEIVING PHONE CALL, THAT, OH, MY GOODNESS, SOMETHING HAS HAPPENED WITH ONE OF THE JURORS. WE NEED TO YOU RETURN AND COME BACK IN.

IT WILL BE A RANDOM DRAW OF WHICH ONE OF YOU --21 22 IT WILL BE A RANDOM SELECTION AS TO WHICH ONE OF YOU WILL BE 23 THE FIRST ONE TO SUBSTITUTE IN.

SO YOU DON'T HAVE TO STAY IN THE COURTHOUSE. 24 25 BEFORE YOU LEAVE, WE'LL MAKE SURE WE HAVE THE CURRENT

26 CELLPHONE NUMBERS FOR YOU SO THAT WE CAN GET AHOLD OF YOU.

THE VERY END OF IT ALL. THEY WILL START ANEW FOR YOU. 2 I HAVE ONE LAST INSTRUCTION FOR YOU IN ILIST A 3 MOMENT, BUT I WILL REMIND YOU THAT YOU DO REMAIN SUBJECT TO THE ALL THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT YOU'VE ALREADY RECEIVED ABOUT,

5 KEEPING AN OPEN MIND, NOT DOING ANY RESEARCH, NOT FORMING ANY

6 OPINIONS, NOT TALKING TO ANYONE. AND THEN NOT TALKING TO

ANYONE WILL EXTEND TO THE DELIBERATING JURORS AS WELL UNTIL 8 YOU'RE NOTIFIED THAT YOUR JURY SERVICE IS COMPLETE.

9 LET ME GO AHEAD AND READ THIS INSTRUCTION FOR 10 YOU. AND THEN I WILL HAVE ONE LAST THING. AND THE INSTRUCTION READS AS FOLLOWS: 11

THE JURY IS NOW DELIBERATING, BUT YOU ARE STILL ALTERNATE JURORS AND BOUND BY MY EARLIER INSTRUCTIONS ABOUT YOUR CONDUCT. UNTIL THE JURY IS DISCHARGED, DO NOT TALK ABOUT THE CASE OR ABOUT ANY OF THE PEOPLE, OR ANY SUBJECT INVOLVED IN IT WITH ANYONE. NOT EVEN YOUR FAMILY OR FRIENDS AND NOT EVEN WITH EACH OTHER.

DO NOT HAVE ANY CONTACT WITH DELIBERATING JURORS DO NOT DECIDE HOW YOU WOULD VOTE IF YOU WERE DELIBERATING. DO NOT FORM OR EXPRESS AN OPINION ABOUT THE ISSUES IN THE CASE UNLESS YOU ARE SUBSTITUTED FOR ONE OF THE DELIBERATING JURORS.

MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE THE BEST CELLPHONES FOR

YOU. BEFORE I RELEASE YOU, I WANT TO SAY THANK YOU VERY, VERY 24 MUCH. I'M ALWAYS AMAZED AT OUR WONDERFUL CITIZENS AND THE 25

26 SACRIFICES THAT YOU DO MAKE IN ORDER TO BE HERE AND SERVE ON

Page 107

BUT AS LONG AS YOU CAN GET BACK HERE WITHIN AN HOUR, THEN 1

2 YOU'RE FREE TO GO ABOUT YOUR LIFE AND OTHER BUSINESS OF THE

DAY IN THAT REGARD

YOUR NOTEPADS MR MULDOON WILL HOLD ON TO THOSE FOR YOU, SO THAT IF YOU DO GET CALLED BACK, WE'LL HAVE THAT FOR YOU. AND JUST LIKE ALL THE OTHER ONES, AT THE END OF TRIAL IF -- THOSE WILL BE DESTROYED SO THEY'RE NOT SAVED WITH THE JURORS IN ANY WAY.

THE CLERK WILL CONTACT YOU AT THE END OF EACH DAY TO LET YOU KNOW WHERE WE STAND. SO IF WE -- EITHER THEY RETURNED A VERDICT, THEN YOUR JURY SERVICE IS COMPLETE, OR WE GOT TO END OF DAY, THEY HAVEN'T YET GOT A VERDICT. THEY'RE COMING BACK TOMORROW. SO WE'LL, AT THE END OF EACH DAY, LET YOU KNOW WHERE WE STAND IN TERMS OF IF YOUR SERVICE IS COMPLETE OR IF WE'RE GOING TO NEED YOU TO BE ON CALL THE NEXT DAY. WE'LL CONTINUE WITH THAT TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY

SCHEDULE THAT WE HAVE HAD. THEN, I GUESS, TO USE A LITTLE BIT OF A SPORTS ANALOGY, IF THERE IS THE NEED TO -- FOR YOU TO STEP IN AND REPLACE ONE OF THE JURORS, THE -- YOU DON'T COME IN AT THE --YOU KNOW, THE EIGHTH INNING OR THE 11TH HOUR, WHICHEVER ANALOGY, THE INSTRUCTION WHENEVER THERE IS THAT SORT OF SUBSTITUTION IS THAT THE DELIBERATIONS ARE TO START ANEW SO YOU DON'T COME IN, THEY'RE ALREADY, YOU KNOW, TWO QUESTIONS LEFT ON THE VERDICT FORM. THE INSTRUCTION IS TO START ANEW, FRESH WITH THE DELIBERATION SO YOU WON'T BE THROWN IN THERE AT

Page 109 JURORS AND MAKE OUR SYSTEM WORK. WITHOUT CITIZENS, LIKE

2 YOURSELVES, IF THIS WONDERFUL SYSTEM WE HAVE. IT'S NOT

3 PERFECT, BUT -- I'M A LITTLE BIASED, BUT IT'S THE BEST ONE OUT

THERE AND IT DOESN'T WORK WITHOUT CITIZENS SUCH AS 4

5 YOURSELVES, THAT ARE CAPABLE AND WILLING TO SERVE ON THE JURY.

6 SO WE OWE YOU A HUGE DEBT OF GRATITUDE, AND WE

7 ARE VERY THANKFUL BECAUSE YOU GIVE MEANING TO THE

8 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS THAT MANY OF US -- THAT WE ALL ENJOY.

9 SO MUCH THANK YOU VERY, VERY MUCH FOR THE TIME AND SERVICE

10 YOU'VE GIVEN SO FAR AND MAY THAT POTENTIALLY CONTINUE.

11 ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT PROCESS BEFORE WE 12 EXCUSE YOU FOR THE DAY? AGAIN, WE THANK YOU VERY MUCH. LEAVE THOSE NOTEPADS THERE ON THOSE CHAIRS, AND WE'LL PRESERVE THOSE 1.3

FOR YOU. AND IF YOU DON'T COME BACK, THEY'LL BE DESTROYED.

15 AND WITH THAT, AGAIN, WE THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

AND MR BURNS WILL WALK YOU OUT MAKE SURE WE 17 GOT ALL THE APPROPRIATE INFORMATION FOR YOU. HAVE A WONDERFUL 18 AFTERNOON, LADIES.

(ALTERNATES ARE EXCUSED.) 19

THE COURT: WE ARE NOW OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF ALL OF THE JURORS. I THINK WE KIND OF TOUCHED ON THIS A LITTLE BIT THIS MORNING OFF THE RECORD, BUT JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE

ALL CLEAR IN TERMS OF THE ON-CALL FOR YOU AND ANY OF YOUR 23

24 CLIENTS, THE OPTIONS ARE OBVIOUSLY ARE READBACK, A OUESTION OR

25 A VERDICT, ARE THE THREE THINGS THAT CAN COME OUT OF THE JURY

ROOM.

24

25

26

BACK TO LA.

THE COURT: YES, THAT'S FINE.

WE ALSO NEED TO -- I GUESS A COUPLE OF POINTS.

24

25

26

THE COURT: MAKE SURE MR. MULDOON HAS THE ABSOLUTELY

BEST NUMBERS TO GET AHOLD OF YOU, AND WE WILL CONTACT YOU OR

MR. BURNS, WHICHEVER, JUST SO WE MAKE SURE WE HAVE IT. EITHER

	Page 114
1	ONE IS FINE. AND AS SOON AS WE HEAR ANYTHING, WE'LL LET YOU
2	KNOW.
3	ALL COUNSEL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
4	THE COURT: OFF THE RECORD.
5	(OFF THE RECORD.)
6	(EVENING ADJOURNMENT.)
7	(EVENING ADJOURNIVENT.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
1	Page 115
1 2	Page 115 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS.
2 3 4	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 3 4 5	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE)
2 3 4 5 6	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER
2 3 4 5 6 7	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF ORANGE) I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. DATED THISDAY OF, 2024.

	89:7	ADVISE 104:25	19:9 22:20	7.21 12.16
A	ACTIONS	AFFAIRS 84:3	96:6 101:12	7:21 13:16 19:22 24:15
ABILITY 10:16	61:11	AFFIRMATI	AMERICA	41:12 54:22,22
10:19 19:12	ACTIVE 84:2	36:4	27:10	59:26 61:17
25:24 32:16	85:1	AFTERNOON	AMERICAN	72:15 96:4
36:20 38:6	ACTS 5:24	8:10 45:24	43:11	113:12
39:24 62:3	ACTUAL 16:7	76:2 77:7,20	AMOUNT	ANYMORE
64:9	37:19 39:10,11	104:5 106:17	41:23 42:1,1,3	45:1 61:17
ABLE 7:11	39:14,15 89:14	104.3 100.17	AMOUNTS	67:6,14
14:12 26:3	92:23 96:26	112:18,22	96:6	ANYTIME
39:26 69:24	ADD 42:2 78:3	AGE 50:3,5	ANA 5:1 76:1	46:22
71:16,18,19	ADD 4 2.2 78.3 ADDED 15:9	69:15 92:17	ANALOGY	ANYWAY
80:4 81:2 88:5	ADDITION	AGE-RELAT	107:19,22	19:10 43:1
92:3 93:4,12	31:2 51:14	70:20	AND'S 84:8	97:11 101:9,13
104:14 106:18	52:11 78:24	AGENCY 95:26	AND-2:17	APOLOGIES
ABSENCE 71:8	80:18	AGO 50:8 55:24	ANEW 107:23	78:7
ABSOLUTELY	ADDITIONA	72:11,11 89:2	107:25 108:1	APOLOGIZE
52:1 84:7 91:7	34:4 79:23	89:26,26	ANGELES 2:21	37:3 89:3
113:24	ADDRESS 45:4	AGREE 31:7	ANGER 93:18	APPARENTLY
ACADEMIA	63:2 73:23	43:20 67:5	ANGRY 56:1	14:1 69:21
41:8	90:17	AGREED 47:2	ANGUISH	99:10
ACADEMIC 18:21 24:6	ADDRESSED	AGREEMENT	37:26	APPEARANCE
53:20 67:15	61:4 99:24	7:4	ANSWER 11:16	101:23
73:10 88:12	ADDRESSES	AGREES 42:1	11:18,18 21:4	APPEARAN
ACCEPT 36:22	83:8	AHEAD 5:5	22:18 23:25	2:1 5:7
ACCEPTABLE	ADJOURNM	45:11 47:16	24:4 26:6,25	APPEARED
7:20 111:22	114:6	77:21 105:21	26:26,26 27:4	72:14
ACCOLADES	ADMIRALTY	108:9	27:8,19,20	APPEARS 64:2
72:24 87:19	2:14	AHOLD 106:26	28:5,24 30:25	APPENDIX
ACCOMPLIS	ADMISSION	110:4 113:25	31:1 32:13,17	83:2,10 84:13
71:23	31:4,13 35:15	AID 85:22	38:3 44:26	84:14,20 85:6
ACCURACY	53:18	AL 13:12 20:22	57:12 58:26	94:13,21,22,25
58:1 71:13	ADMIT 89:23	ALBERT 21:4	59:1,17,18,19	94:26 100:2
ACCURATE	ADMITS 28:4	82:8 83:16	63:12,15 64:1	APPLICABLE
37:25 53:25,25	90:11 97:7	ALLEGATIO	64:20 66:12,19	43:19 50:10
63:14 66:6,16	ADMITTED	16:5	67:6,13 68:8	89:19
66:22	11:8 18:17	ALLEGED 71:6	68:22 71:19	APPLICANTS
ACCURATE	25:26 33:15	ALLOWED	76:7,8 104:20	18:22,25 53:21
61:26 101:4	53:19 60:18,24	48:6	110:8	73:12
ACCUSED	61:24 65:15	ALTERNATE	ANSWERED	APPLICATI
40:17 53:15	73:14 79:24	108:13	36:4 76:8,13	9:23 19:2 20:8
ACCUSING	81:10 96:16	ALTERNATES	ANSWERS 68:5	20:15 21:13
28:6	104:8	105:26 106:7	68:14,15 93:15	23:23 28:13
ACHIEVED	ADMITTING	109:19	ANTI-CPA	29:3 52:17
27:9	60:12 97:9	ALTERNATI	12:23 13:5,19	54:24 55:11
ACT 36:22 55:1	ADO 8:20	42:4	22:19 23:4	60:4 63:8,10
72:22	ADVANCE	AMAZED	96:5 101:12	63:17 64:26
ACTED 42:12	62:15	108:25	ANTICIPATE	65:12,20 81:8
42:20	ADVANCING	AMENDMENT	113:2	83:3,11,13
ACTING 11:1	69:15	12:23 13:5,19	ANYBODY	84:19 85:5,19
	I			I

	1	1	1	
86:8 90:14	23:5 24:2	ASSAULT 18:6	B.P.S.O.S 10:22	BASE 44:3 73:4
91:5 94:10,24	47:11 50:8	ASSISTANCE	11:1,2,3,9,12	BASED 64:11
94:26 98:13	86:26 98:1	22:5	11:15,17,18	113:10
99:16 100:6	103:8 113:5	ASSOCIATE	14:5 24:21	BASIC 102:9
APPLICATI	ARGUMENTS	66:20	25:25 26:2	BASICALLY
16:18 18:25	8:7,17 9:3,7	ASSOCIATI	32:14,16,17,19	37:22 55:22
60:8 61:16	45:13 47:17	22:5	36:12,20 39:8	106:15
63:14,20 65:3	50:25 113:1	ASSUME 42:3	87:20	BASIS 41:4
65:14 83:24	ARTICLE 11:2	ASSUMED	B.P.S.O.S.'S	BAT 78:2 110:3
84:16,17,21	14:13,14,23	39:11,14,20	10:16,19 19:12	BEAT 111:23
85:21 95:2	15:17 23:4	42:2	25:24	BEATEN 30:12
APPLIED 81:21	25:12 26:1,2	ASSUMES	BACK 8:2 13:26	BEAUTIFUL
82:2	26:15 33:1,7	39:17	14:8,11 15:1	74:25
APPLIES 11:18	33:10 34:15,19	ATTACH 83:3	15:13 21:9,15	BECOMING
APPLYING	35:18 36:7,19	ATTACHED	22:7,25 45:3	61:13
52:15 81:19,25	37:9 40:25	28:14 86:16	45:12 46:11,14	BEG 26:16
85:21 91:4	42:26 56:13	94:23 95:1	47:7,14 50:19	BEGINNING
APPRECIATE	79:8,19 97:20	98:12	53:10 55:19	16:11 17:8
14:18 78:19	98:18	ATTACHME	56:16 57:4	26:1 60:14
93:6	ARTICLES	83:10	60:9 64:9	104:3
APPROPRIA	14:13 60:21	ATTACHME	67:21 69:4	BEHALF 5:12
109:17	72:14 79:18	83:2	74:26 75:7	5:14 10:22
APPROVAL	87:23 88:20	ATTACK 38:24	76:5 77:14	11:15 32:16
63:9	ASHAMED	ATTENDANT	79:6 82:23	BELIEVABLE
APPROVED	40:20 41:17	104:1 105:23	84:12 85:23	20:6
42:11	ASKED 11:16	ATTENTION	86:1 87:15	BELIEVE 9:9
APPS 83:17	13:14 21:5	8:15,18 54:9	89:22 91:23	34:19 37:9
APRIL 15:15,15	23:20 27:15	58:17 90:17	92:3 100:11	39:21 51:1
15:26 16:23	32:23 33:15	ATTITUDES	101:14 104:15	68:20 73:18,21
20:17,17,21	38:4 47:25	23:24	104:21 105:4	73:24 92:4
21:3 31:5,8	53:14 57:18,21	ATTORNEY	106:18,20	93:11,17 94:16
33:21,26 34:5	58:5,23,24	2:4 51:1 64:12	107:1,5,13	96:10 102:14
34:6,14,16	59:3,22 63:7	ATTORNEYS	109:14 110:5	113:12
35:10,11 43:7	66:5,8,25 68:3	8:16 9:3,7,11	110:18,20,23	BELIEVED
43:7 56:8	68:21 84:16	104:21	110:26 111:24	51:26 52:2,3
78:10,12,13	86:22 96:20	ATTRIBUTA	112:2,13,14,16	92:19
88:13 95:10,11	101:2,9	25:25	112:20	BELL 19:18,22
97:1	ASKING 11:23	ATTRIBUTE	BACKGROU	20:1 36:23
ARCHIVES	12:17 16:17	94:5	16:1 21:18	40:15 41:22,22
15:14 32:26	17:20 22:15	AUTHORED	22:6,12 40:11	43:24,26 45:7
AREA 22:2	23:1 31:5	22:20	52:15,22 57:11	58:22,25 59:17
ARENA 14:3	33:22 53:24	AVOIDANCE	91:4,13 95:4	59:19,21,22,24
ARGUE 26:10	67:23 85:3	17:17	95:10 102:26	64:19 93:15
48:6 71:13	ASKS 24:21	AWARD 92:11	BACKS 81:8	103:2
ARGUED 34:18	ASLEEP 38:9	AWARDED	BAD 58:15	BELONGS
ARGUES 26:8	68:23	92:24	BALANCE	100:2,5
ARGUING 15:7	ASSASSINATE	AWARE 61:7,7	77:19	BENEFIT 11:14
15:20 36:3	13:3	B	BALANCED	36:11,11,19
82:21	ASSASSINA	$\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\mathbf{B}4:1}$	85:24 BAD 61:25	41:17
ARGUMENT	15:24	D 7.1	BAR 61:25	BENEFITS
	l	I	l	1

	l	Ī	l	
43:14 44:15	19:6	99:20	CAPABLE	53:4
BERATED	BOARD 50:6,7	BUDGE 13:6	109:5	CERTAINLY
37:22	52:7 78:23	BUDGET 24:23	CAPACITY	67:9 68:20
BEST 12:11	85:2,10 93:7	BULB 24:8	25:5	93:10
34:7 108:23	BOAT 1:8 10:26	BULLETPR	CAPITALIZE	CERTIFICA
109:3 113:25	24:26 25:22	37:24	37:7	115:1
BETTER 61:19	26:6 48:12	BUNCH 92:25	CAPTIONS	CERTIFY
61:22,24,26	49:19 51:16	BURDEN 29:10	14:5	115:8
69:23 85:15	57:2 71:12	29:11,18 32:5	CARDIAC	CHAIRS 76:24
86:14 103:20	87:20	50:14	38:24	109:13
BEYOND 29:24	BODY 103:15	BURNS 76:16	CARE 113:18	CHALLENGE
32:2 97:26	BOLSTER 14:2	109:16 110:2	CARED 96:3	100:23
BIASED 109:3	101:23	113:26	101:2	CHANCE 47:12
BIFURCATED	BOOGIEMAN	BUS 44:8,25	CAREER 55:23	96:7 112:11,23
113:10	87:24	BUSINESS	56:12 72:1	CHANGE 13:6
BIG 60:21	BOOK 19:7	107:2	87:20	62:3 102:9
BIGGER 40:9	39:2,4,7,24	BUTS 84:8	CAREFUL 17:3	CHANGED
41:19,19	69:21,22,24,26	BUZZER	CARES 38:26	23:24 93:25
BILL 23:13,26	70:3,6,9,12	111:11	CASE 7:11	CHAPTER
BILLIONAIRE	92:13,13,17	BUZZES 111:12	11:14 12:9,12	71:16
92:25	BOOKS 72:8		12:16 15:21,22	CHARACTER
BILLIONAIR	BORED 93:8	C	17:4 18:9 30:8	13:3 15:24
41:15	BOTTOM	C 2:12 105:25	48:10,16 53:16	CHARACTE
BINARY 28:11	17:24 18:2	C-1 84:13,14,20	108:15,21	99:5
30:19	34:3 94:19,20	85:6 94:14,21	110:14	CHARACTE
BINGO 24:8	BOUGHT 21:15	94:25	CATCH 76:16	56:11
BIO 21:10,13,17	BOUND 108:13	C.V 21:10	CATEGORI	CHARGE 18:26
22:1,6,13 85:1	BOX 2:6	C23 1:3	68:14	62:5 95:17
94:12,12,13	BOXES 113:17	CA 2:7,15,21	CAUGHT 61:21	CHARGED
95:3,11	BRAYBROO	CALCULATI	CAUSE 42:21	96:23
BIOGRAPHY	2:13 5:12	39:10	87:10 88:18	CHARITY 14:3
83:26 84:1	BREAK 35:1	CALIFORNIA	95:15 115:11	37:8 101:23
BIT 7:12 8:9	46:21 47:13	1:1 5:1 76:1	CAUSED 38:3	CHEAP 17:14
10:15 12:15	55:16 73:22	115:3,8	38:21 71:5	CHECK 111:5
13:2 16:26	74:22 77:8	CALL 17:17	88:1	113:17
18:23 31:26	104:3	23:18 36:26	CAUSING	CHOOSES
46:10 47:14	BREAKING	106:15,15,19	37:19	87:24
78:20 104:19	47:15	107:15 110:2,3	CC'ED 13:15	CHOSEN 83:7
107:18 109:21	BREAKS	110:6,7,10,16	CECILE 21:21	CIRCUMST
112:7	103:24,25,26	110:20 111:9	40:6 58:13	62:9
BLAME 49:5	104:6 106:2	CALLED 15:23	69:10 70:15	CITIZENS
50:2 59:12,14	BRIEF 5:18 9:5	18:3,5,16	CELLPHONE	108:25 109:1,4
90:3	BRING 20:2	21:23 24:10	106:26	CIVIL 29:24
BLAMING 92:7	42:4 77:6	25:12 35:7	CELLPHONES	CLAIM 23:6,23
92:16	99:22 112:14	58:8 83:16	108:23	24:2 27:25
BLANK 42:1	BRINGS 45:3	97:12 107:5	CENTER 1:2	28:2 29:2
BLESSED	BROAD 22:4	CALLING 40:22	72:18	30:10 44:19
69:13	37:5	CALLS 17:9	CENTRAL 1:2	65:20 70:25
BLEW 45:20	BROUGHT	60:15 88:9,11	CERTAIN 32:4	74:2 79:4 95:5
BLOCKING	82:10 90:2	00.13 88:9,11	35:26 50:13	96:2,4,21,24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

	ı	I	I	
101:24 102:2	107:9 110:17	COLLECTIVE	95:15,18,21	58:9 67:1
CLAIMED 9:24	111:5,10	103:14 104:6	COMMUNITY	CONCERNED
12:3,5 14:26	CLICKER	COLLECTIV	22:3 24:25	17:5 22:19
19:16 20:7	111:12	103:25	25:6 41:13,15	49:8 81:2
21:25 24:9	CLIENT 49:5	COLON 52:19	43:24 60:11,23	CONCERNS
25:11,19 26:5	49:14,17,25	53:4,23 55:17	61:4,9 79:8,9,9	18:3,4,4,7,15
26:13 29:4	52:20,26 53:2	59:26 67:22	79:10,16,17	35:6 49:5
41:18 52:16	53:11,15,23	90:4,5	92:25 95:16,18	58:14 59:12
60:4 73:15	54:1,4,18 56:5	COME 12:12	95:20 101:23	81:8
85:4 86:6	56:5,12,23	13:12,26 19:21	COMPARE	CONCLUDE
90:20 91:5	57:5 58:20,24	38:15 45:3	96:23	29:21
94:9 96:2,12	61:6 71:11	46:10 47:14	COMPELLED	CONDITIONS
97:3 98:11,20	72:13 77:26	53:10 55:19	56:15	69:16
99:2	79:2,15,20,22	56:16 59:25	COMPENSA	CONDUCT
CLAIMING	80:11,11 81:11	67:21 69:3,4	39:20	37:18 42:21
14:5 15:22	81:15 83:16	71:10 73:25	COMPETING	43:15,19 44:2
96:18 97:9	84:15 86:19	75:7 83:16	18:22,24 53:21	44:3 73:4,4
100:3 101:16	87:10,17,18,22	90:21 94:18,20	73:12	108:14
CLAIMS 14:8	88:16,24 90:12	97:5 104:21	COMPLAIN	CONFER 86:23
14:20 16:24	90:21 93:9,10	106:20 107:20	56:23 57:5	86:24
20:15 53:4	93:18 110:18	107:24 109:14	COMPLAIN	CONFERRED
94:9 98:15	110:20	109:25 110:1	56:24 57:5	86:22
CLARIFICA	CLIENT'S 60:7	110:18,22	COMPLAINI	CONFLATE
86:14	67:25 79:6	112:2,13,16,20	68:1	50:1 87:16
CLARIFY	80:5	COMES 12:10	COMPLAINS	CONFLATING
61:23	CLIENTS 24:25	12:17 13:20	88:21	12:26
CLARITY 6:18	47:24 48:12	24:14 48:2	COMPLAINT	CONFLICT
CLASSIC 17:17	49:9 59:12	54:1 59:6 79:6	56:4	17:5,7 95:16
CLAUSE 59:26	71:22 89:19	86:1 92:15	COMPLAINTS	CONFORM
CLEANING	109:24 110:11	113:15	87:25,25	5:22
111:13	CLINTON	COMING 22:21	COMPLETE	CONFRONT
CLEAR 31:21	19:10 101:13	73:9 88:9	61:23 67:4	18:12
31:24 32:1,4,9	CLOSE 22:4	107:13	86:13 105:2,11	CONFUSING
32:10 35:24,26	31:13,26 45:16	COMMENT	106:9 107:11	30:26
42:11,18 50:13	46:5 47:15	34:14 78:17	107:15 108:8	CONFUSION
51:6,13,15,21	55:11,12 74:23	COMMENT	COMPLETED	26:14,15 91:9
56:23 67:16	CLOSELY 17:1	71:24	100:26	98:22 99:6
74:5 81:24	CLOSING 8:7	COMMENTS	COMPLETE	CONGRATU
91:18 109:23	8:10,17 9:2,7	34:18 98:23	74:14 86:18	40:7
110:25	45:13 47:10,17	COMMITTED	COMPLETI	CONGRESSI
CLEAR-BLUE	50:25 62:7	19:16 27:22	67:11	52:11 60:6,8
54:11	66:1 74:26	COMMITTI	COMPULSION	82:7
CLEARED	77:19 78:16	28:7	110:14	CONGRESS
26:15 99:6	86:5 87:13	COMMON	COMPUTER	15:12 16:19
112:8	97:26	102:14	38:16	17:6 22:15,18
CLEARLY	CLOSINGS	COMMONLY	CONCEALED	22:20 23:14
57:23 81:7	5:17	95:17	44:12	48:12,13,20,21
84:2 92:16	CLOTH 89:9	COMMUNIC	CONCEPT 37:5	48:25 49:15,24
CLEARS 98:24	COLLABOR	103:26	CONCERN	52:12 53:3,13
CLERK 76:6,14	23:14	COMMUNIS	49:13 53:24	53:17,23 54:13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				-
56:20,24,25	16:11 52:5,9	35:16,19 56:17	74:20 75:4,6	25:19 27:25
57:5 58:20	52:20 53:22	57:2 61:12	76:4,5,12,17	29:23 52:18
59:8,9,15 61:5	54:12,15 56:6	62:25 63:8	76:22,24 77:2	54:17,23,23
66:15 67:22	59:3 79:2 85:2	64:26 65:5	77:6,9,12	55:6,18 60:1
71:23 72:9,10	90:4,23,26	86:1 88:2 90:1	93:20 94:16	65:8 67:24
72:23 73:17,18	CONTINUE	115:10,11	98:2 99:18	82:4
74:4,17 78:11	34:12 38:8	CORRECTING	100:9 103:3	CRUEL 43:21
82:5,9 86:20	39:7 44:8	61:13,17	104:14,19	43:23
87:11,12,26	45:13 51:3	CORRECTION	105:23,24	CRUX 66:8
88:19,21,22	64:14 98:5	100:20	106:5 109:20	CSR 1:25 115:6
91:1,7,10,14	104:18,22	CORRECTS	111:6,11,22,25	115:17
93:15 97:2,23	107:16 109:10	90:1	112:9 113:16	CULTURE 22:9
CONGRESS	CONTINUED	CORRUPTION	113:22,24	CULTURES
72:26 85:22	80:24 95:15	25:7	114:4 115:7	21:21
88:10,16	CONTINUING	COUNSEL 2:1	COURT-APP	CURIOUS
CONGRESS	102:23	46:15,19 47:4	1:26	97:21
49:21,25 56:3	CONTRARY	50:8 62:6 64:3	COURTHOU	CURRENT
73:7	51:1 54:26	65:23,25 67:18	106:12,18,24	106:25
CONGRESS	55:13	74:1 86:5,7,12	COURTROOM	CUSTODY
78:6 85:9	CONTRAST	87:1,13 90:19	104:1 110:5	105:22
CONNECTING	80:9	114:3	111:15	
71:8	CONTRIBUTE	COUNSEL'S	COVERED	D
CONNECTI	23:6	66:1	111:18	D 3:1
22:21	CONVINCING	COUNT 45:4	CREATE 23:14	DAMAGE
CONSCIOUS	31:22,25 32:1	COUNTERING	CREATED 87:1	39:19,23 40:13
83:7	32:5,9,11	34:11	102:3	41:5,20
CONSIDER	35:24 36:1	COUNTING	CREDENTIAL	DAMAGED
29:21	42:11,18 50:14	45:6	18:21	92:20
CONSISTENT	51:7,13,15,21	COUNTRY	CREDENTIA	DAMAGES
7:5 84:20,22	74:6 91:18	62:12	24:6,16 37:8	39:11,11,11,14
CONSTITUT	CONVOLUT	COUNTRYM	53:20 67:15	39:15,16,22
109:8	12:8	41:17	73:11 88:12	40:14 41:20
CONSULT	COOKS 15:16	COUNTS 59:6	CREDIBILITY	42:2,3,9 68:11
103:12	COPIES 6:12	COUNTY 1:2	13:24,25 14:3	68:12 69:26
CONTACT	8:12 13:14	41:12 115:4,8	15:13,20 19:5	71:5 89:14
107:9 108:18	76:15 83:20,21	COUPLE 11:6	24:16,20 25:13	92:12,23 112:3
113:25	83:22 103:13	111:26	35:13 81:3	113:9
CONTACTING	COPY 6:2 20:20	COURSE 41:26	CREDIBLE	DARK 112:10
92:21	21:15 80:17	54:12 64:12	24:5	DASTARDLY
CONTAINED	83:24 84:18,19	100:13	CREDIT 14:9	36:22 DATE 05.1
35:12	103:19	COURT 1:1 5:4	14:20,26 15:1	DATA 85:1
CONTEMPL	CORNER 83:9	5:5,15 6:8,16	15:22 24:9	DATE 66:10,12
112:12	84:13,20	6:22 7:1,3,5,23	25:11 56:21	67:10 83:24
CONTEMPT	CORPORATE	7:26 8:2,22,24	101:16	101:17
44:3 73:5	5:24 113:9,9	10:25 29:16	CRIED 18:12	DATED 33:26
CONTENTION	CORPORATI	35:8 45:9,18	CRIME 19:16	34:6 115:13
85:10	24:23	45:20,22,24	27:22 28:3,4,7	DAUGHTER
CONTENTS	CORRECT	46:1,5,13,17	43:24 99:6	38:26 40:6
34:6	14:11 25:4	46:19 47:5,7	CRIMES 55:1	69:13 70:15
CONTEXT 8:18	33:5,8,12	50:24 64:6	CRIMINAL	DAVE 5:11
I		I	I	l

	I		I	I
DAVE@VSB	42:20 44:11	DELIBERAT	56:21	16:21 26:6
2:16	59:21 71:11	108:7,12,18,20	DESK 36:7	51:16
DAVID 1:15	93:26	108:22	111:12	DIPLOMA
2:12	DEFENDAN	DELIBERAT	DESPICABLE	101:6
DAY 21:5 64:15	37:18 42:21	8:14 75:10	19:7,10,12	DIRECT 93:18
69:5 88:23	43:19	103:6 106:1,6	23:19 25:14	DIRECTION
92:4 93:9	DEFENDANTS	107:26	36:13 42:21	48:22
103:23 104:4,4	1:10 2:11 5:12	DELIBERAT	43:16,20,20	DIRECTLY
105:2,10,14	5:14 6:21	8:11 9:1 64:10	44:1,10 49:3	65:11 71:19
107:3,10,12,13	25:16 31:22	104:18,22	73:3,4,17	DISAGREES
107:16 109:12	42:11 54:2	107:23 110:9	DESPISED 44:4	54:21 65:7
112:8,10	74:6 91:18	111:2 112:15	73:5	DISBELIEF
115:13	93:19 112:4	DELIVER	DESTROY 19:5	96:20,22
DAYS 15:7	113:9	80:19	25:13 35:13	102:13 103:2
19:13	DEFENDAN	DELIVERED	37:12	DISBELIEVE
DEAD-BANG	96:21	21:6 80:21	DESTROYED	9:10
53:24,25	DEFENDED	DEMEANOR	13:25 15:13	DISCHARGED
DEAR 83:8	100:26	38:1	107:7 109:14	108:14
DEATH 30:12	DEFENSE 7:1	DEMONSTR	DESTROYS	DISCONTIN
DEBATE 44:15	7:23 47:1	111:9	44:14,15	38:12
48:13	DEFINES 42:24	DENIABILITY	DETAIL 14:16	DISCOURSE
DEBILITIES	DEFINITELY	17:18,18	52:3 71:13,18	59:5
70:20	8:10 63:15	DENIED 57:14	DETAILED	DISCREDIT
DEBT 109:6	DEFINITION	57:15	35:4	24:19 95:20
DECADES	44:2,3	DEPARTME	DETAILS 20:26	DISCUSSED
55:25 89:26,26	DEFINITIONS	1:3 9:23 12:22	81:4	6:10 60:22
DECEMBER	42:16	13:21 16:13	DETERIORA	70:17
14:2 37:9	DEFINITIVE	18:22 20:8,15	70:18	DISCUSSING
44:24	29:7	23:12,26 24:3	DETERMINE	80:9
DECIDE 9:9	DEFINITIVE	24:4 28:14	99:21	DISCUSSION
29:20 30:6	26:18	30:11 31:16	DEVASTATI	15:19 28:7
41:24 64:8,11	DEFRAUDED	52:13,17 53:21	38:17	45:15 47:4
72:20 98:3	19:16	65:21 73:11	DEVELOPM	66:15 91:26
103:25 108:19	DEGREE 9:25	85:5 91:2,6	22:3,4 95:25	110:18
DECLARATI	10:9,10 16:8	94:10 96:5	DHYANA	DISCUSSIONS
33:6 35:17	18:18 20:8,16	97:16,24	100:18	5:19,22 74:24
DEDICATED	25:19 26:13	100:25	DIED 41:21	DISPOSAL
49:18	27:10 52:17	DEPARTME	DIFFERENCE	51:26
DEDICATION	53:19 60:4,19	13:4 101:11	6:19 48:4	DISPROVES
19:8	63:1 65:20	DEPOSITION	59:11	97:8
DEFAMATI	67:12,19 73:15	27:15 35:9	DIFFERENC	DISPUTES 55:7
17:3 24:18	73:16 81:9	64:3,15,22	6:14	DISREGARD
51:10	84:7 85:4	DEPOSITIONS	DIFFERENT	42:22 43:2,16
DEFAMATO	86:22 91:5	12:11	36:26 38:14	43:22 89:7
71:6 98:23,26	94:9 95:6 96:3	DEPUTY 22:9	40:7	DISTINGUIS
DEFEND 40:24	97:3,9,10	DESCRIBES	DIGEST 112:19	68:1
88:5	98:12,21 99:3	69:14	DIGRESS 69:11	DISTRICT
DEFENDANT	DEL 2:15	DESCRIPTI	DING 32:18	17:10 60:16
6:7 9:4 26:26	DELAYED	101:7	DINH 1:8 10:16	79:11
27:1 29:24	39:26	DESERVE	10:25 11:7	DISTRUST
	l		l	l

	I	İ	I	I
12:4	34:5 48:15,19	74:15 92:1,2	EARLIER	11:1
DIVE 8:20	48:24,26 57:18	DOUBTS 31:23	55:25 64:18	ENCLOSED
DOCTOR 16:6	57:22,22,23	32:12,21 33:14	108:13	79:7 80:17
21:23,23,26	58:3 60:9	51:17 91:25	EASIER 104:13	ENCLOSING
28:15 60:12,23	84:21 89:4,5,6	DOVETAIL	EASIEST 95:19	80:18
60:25 61:18	91:23 94:19	80:4	EASILY 20:3	ENDEARME
63:2 71:4	100:12	DR 11:13,22	EASY 19:14,14	63:6
72:13,18 78:26	DOING 11:5	12:17 13:20	48:11	ENDED 6:16,16
79:4,25 81:10	12:7,17 17:2	14:2,8,20,25	EDUCATED	ENGAGED
83:13 86:24	17:14 19:19	16:2,24 20:19	36:9	110:9
87:7 88:26	26:15 36:10,11	21:4,10,20	EDUCATION	ENGINEERI
89:23 96:12,15	37:6,13 45:4	25:10,24 26:10	22:10 82:19	27:10
96:16,19,25	49:14 57:24	26:14,18 27:9	95:4 100:17	ENGLISH
97:8 98:10,16	61:25 69:5	27:15,26 28:19	101:4	27:10,12,23
100:4 101:1	74:9 79:20	31:5,14 32:14	EDUCATION	43:11
DOCTORAL	108:5	33:5,17 34:17	102:25	ENJOY 109:8
9:24 10:8,9,10	DOLLAR 42:6	35:16 36:5	EFFECTIVE	ENTERED 64:3
10:11 16:8	DOLLARS'	39:8 40:4	12:20 13:20	ENTIRE 48:10
20:7,16 25:19	40:12 41:20	42:24 44:7	28:19,22,22,23	48:15 61:15
26:13 52:16	DONATIONS	48:12,16 49:17	31:15 34:11	62:5
60:4 62:1,8,10	24:24,24	50:2 51:24	37:16	ENTIRELY
62:15,19 63:1	DONORS 37:11	54:7 57:1	EFFECTIVE	101:25
65:20,22,24,26	DOOR 111:4,7	60:20 61:2,11	48:15 54:21	ENTITLED
66:2,9,10,24	DORNAN 11:23	63:3 71:10,11	55:20	14:26 39:20
67:11,19,19	12:14,18 13:2	72:21 74:7	EFFECTIVE	88:4,4 100:17
73:16 81:9	13:15 15:12,16	82:8,9 83:8,8	12:26 34:10	101:25 110:12
82:21 84:7	15:26 16:19	83:16 84:2,6,8	EFFICIENT	ENTITY 81:20
85:4,20 86:9	19:6 20:21,23	84:11,15 85:1	113:18	EQUAL 7:14
86:13 91:5	22:16,18 24:13	85:19,22,26	EFFORT 16:11	30:3 31:26
94:9 95:6 96:3	26:9,10 31:8	88:2,7,7 89:6	EIGHT 42:9	EQUALLY 30:4
97:3,9 98:12	32:26 33:19	91:21 92:2	EIGHTH	ERIGERO 2:18
98:20 99:3	34:24 35:4	95:8 98:8	107:21	5:13,14
100:17,25	43:7 45:2	99:12,24	EITHER 6:18	ESCHEWED
101:8 102:18	48:13,20 49:11	100:25 101:14	26:26 106:13	41:16
102:19	53:13 56:3	101:22 102:2,3	107:10 113:26	ESCORTED
DOCUMENT	57:6 59:9 61:5	DRAG 110:8	ELDERLY	106:4
55:8 60:1 61:1	68:12 74:4	DRAW 106:21	55:22 70:26	ESPECIALLY
72:7 80:23	78:11 89:18	DRAWN 89:17	ELEVATED	12:8
82:22,24 83:25	91:8 95:9 96:4	DRIVING	40:11	ESQ 2:12,18
84:6,17,18	97:2,21 98:15	98:15	ELIE 40:8	ESTIMATE
90:8,9 94:14	101:10	DROPPED	ELIMINATE	45:20
94:17,23 95:12	DORNAN'S	12:22 13:21	101:11	ESTIMATE
97:8 99:14	21:5,7 34:6	23:13 31:16	EMAIL 11:3,3	76:18
DOCUMENT	35:7 44:20	DUTIFULLY	EMBARRASS	ESTIMATES
85:8,18	57:24 66:15	16:18	97:14	7:9,13
DOCUMENT	82:9 86:3	DYNAMIC	EMBARRAS	EVACUATED
74:18 81:17	97:11	41:13,25	20:26	62:11
96:18	DOUBLY 41:17		EMPLOYER	EVENING
DOCUMENTS	DOUBT 29:24	E 2:4 3:1,1 4:1	5:24 ENGRI OVACE	111:14,15
13:13 22:16	32:2 44:18,19	L 2.4 3:1,1 4:1	EMPLOYME	114:6
	I		I	I

	I			
EVENT 112:1	EXAMPLE	EXPLAINS	35:26 48:5	FAME 41:16
EVENTS 59:4	64:18	23:12	50:13 51:6	FAMILY
71:14	EXCELLENT	EXPLANATI	64:11 65:4	108:16
EVERYBODY	112:11	12:8,25 13:1	71:14 93:26	FAR 89:14
7:3 8:2 46:3	EXCUSE 48:16	23:1,11,16	FACULTY	109:10
48:18 60:22	58:23 82:25	26:12 28:6	101:6	FAST 13:26
61:7 77:24	91:8 109:12	33:3 39:6	FAILING 9:26	FATHER 69:14
105:4 110:26	EXCUSED	98:11,19	FAIR 25:1	FATIGUE
EVERYBOD	45:17 75:2	100:20	47:17	38:10
86:3	109:19	EXPLOIT 37:4	FAKE 19:3 87:1	FAVOR 93:19
EVID 4:5	EXECUTE	37:5	FALLS 68:23	FE 2:7
EVIDENCE 9:8	19:26	EXPRESS	FALSE 9:21	FEDERAL
9:8,9,23,26	EXERCISES	108:20	10:1,4,4,5,13	19:16 28:3
10:7,12 14:12	102:8	EXTEND 108:7	15:19 16:2	43:24 52:15
14:17 16:7	EXHIBIT 4:5	EXTENSIVE	18:26 19:24	55:1
18:9 19:23	14:1 15:17,25	69:17	20:12,13,15	FEEL 46:3,8,9
26:19 28:10	16:23 21:12,14	EXTENT 9:11	23:6 24:12	46:22 58:9,10
29:8,9,11,15	26:3,5 31:8	98:25	26:21 27:24	58:14,15,15,16
29:19,22,22	33:21,22 52:5	EXTENUATI	28:2,8,9,12,17	69:23 92:21
30:3,5,9,20,23	52:6,25 72:8	70:11	28:24 29:12	FEELING
31:3,22,25,25	78:9 82:14	EYES 38:11,13	30:10,18,22,26	39:17
32:1,5,9,11	83:6,14 88:17	47:22 96:10	30:26 31:1,18	FEELINGS
36:1 39:19	94:15 100:8	102:14	31:23 32:11,20	40:19 41:2
40:16 42:11	104:8		36:6,6 40:2	FEELS 14:2
43:4 50:14,17	EXHIBITS 4:3	F	50:22 51:17,20	56:15
51:7,13,15,21	104:8	F-7 83:10	51:22 52:2	FELL 38:9
51:25,25 55:4	EXIST 87:6	FACE 38:1,1	53:11 54:3,4	FELLOW 41:7
55:6 60:2,26	EXPATRIATE	76:23 79:24,25	54:10 55:1,3	FELT 58:17
62:13 64:4,8,9	95:20	96:15	73:26 74:7,7	59:8,9 68:4
64:11,13 65:15	EXPECT 80:19	FACILITAT	74:14 79:4	69:22
72:16 74:6,16	EXPECTATI	102:20	81:2,13,13,16	FIGHT 40:21
80:2,3 85:8,9	112:3	FACT 15:11	85:13,14,16	FIGUEROA
85:18 88:25,25	EXPECTED	18:12 31:2	86:26 89:6	2:20
91:18 93:4	50:9 110:4	32:7 36:2	90:18 91:15,19	FIGURE 42:6
94:3 98:4	EXPERIENCE	44:12 49:2	91:21,22 93:11	45:26
99:16,17,19,21	60:7 81:19	50:16 53:26	93:11 94:1	FIGURES
100:12 101:3	85:20,21	61:10,17 62:9	95:17 99:5	41:24
101:18 103:7	EXPERT 42:7	69:7 87:9	102:2	FILL 104:11
112:14,19	71:4	89:20 90:4	FALSELY 9:24	FINAL 5:19
EXACT 61:4	EXPERTISE	92:17 95:2	16:8 19:15	93:21
62:7 82:2	70:25	101:26 102:10	20:7 24:9	FINALIZE 6:11
EXACTLY	EXPLAIN	102:25	25:11,18 26:4	FINANCIAL
16:22 34:23	11:22 12:13	FACTOR 37:19	41:18 52:16	112:20
36:10 37:13	35:9 39:3 42:5	37:19 39:9	60:4 65:19	FIND 10:12,26
38:17 91:12	43:5 48:1 99:1	87:10 101:11	73:15 85:4	12:11 46:7,22
103:17	EXPLAINED	FACTORED	91:4 94:9	47:15 54:2
EXAMINATI	21:17 40:4	89:8	96:12 97:3	87:24 91:20,21
22:14 31:14	98:9	FACTORS	99:2 100:3	93:12,13,19
EXAMINED	EXPLAINING	70:11	FALSIFIED	104:14,19
40:16	12:19	FACTS 32:4,8	23:23	FINDING 73:19
	l			

				-
FINDINGS	32:10 54:2	FRIENDS 14:21	71:18 75:7	81:11 82:16
72:22	55:11 59:7	58:12 92:19,21	77:18 93:3	87:3 88:8
FINE 15:6	68:18 73:20,25	108:16	103:5 109:7	90:16,17 92:24
111:25 114:1	89:14 90:15	FRONT 11:5	110:2 111:1	95:5 103:5,8
FINISH 46:9	92:11 102:15	33:1 54:6 61:1	112:6,18,19	106:12 107:15
69:21,24,26	103:14,20	97:22	GIVEN 6:2	110:18,24
70:6,9,10,12	104:11 107:25	FULL 13:13	13:16 21:18	111:7 112:5,6
74:18	108:20	90:26 115:9,10	90:15 93:7,8	113:1
FINISHED 87:4	FORMALLY	FUNDING 28:2	109:10	GOOD 5:9,11
87:7	22:9	95:25	GIVES 13:1	5:13 8:2 9:19
FINISHING	FORMER	FUNDRAISE	22:6	17:6 19:14
69:22 70:2	24:25,26	10:17,20 19:12	GLAD 58:19,20	26:12 39:1
FIRESTORM	FORMING	25:25 32:16	62:9	47:12,15 56:20
95:23	74:24 108:5	36:20	GLAZE 47:22	58:9,10,14,16
FIRST 17:24	FORMS 104:16	FUNDRAISI	GO 5:5,5 7:18	58:18 76:16
34:3 39:5 41:7	FORTHRIG	37:8 44:8	7:24 8:7 9:3	77:24 92:19,21
55:21 56:7	71:20	FURTHER 8:20	10:2 14:15	93:24 98:11,16
57:9 60:3	FORTUNATE	13:1 62:15	27:2 45:11	98:19
67:21 72:23	71:22	67:8 73:23	46:9 47:16	GOODNESS
78:12,16,18,20	FORTUNE	85:3	49:6 51:8 52:8	85:23 106:19
87:12 88:1	41:16	FUSSY 7:13	56:18 68:18	GOVERN 51:2
102:4 105:24	FORWARD		70:19 72:7	GOVERNING
106:23 111:6	13:26	G	73:24 74:25	50:26
FIT 46:3 92:10	FOUL 15:8	GENERAL	76:5,16,19	GOVERNME
FITS 44:2	FOUND 35:5	17:22 40:1	77:21 78:8,20	19:17 28:3
FIVE 18:4 28:20	76:6 81:11,12	51:10 52:13	82:17,18,23,26	29:5 95:15,26
30:3 45:12	FOUNDATION	57:11 68:2	83:5 84:12	GRANT 9:23
FIX 37:3	40:8	91:2,12 97:24	85:1 95:5,8,22	16:17 18:24
FLOOR 9:17	FOUR 8:13	GENERALIT	103:20,22	19:2 20:8,14
47:18	28:20 30:4	71:19 89:17	104:21 105:7	21:13 28:13
FOLKS 90:16	77:23 103:11	GENERALLY	105:12,21	29:2 52:15,17
FOLLOW 6:3	FOUR-MON	79:9	107:2 108:9	54:24 60:5,7
9:13 26:24	35:4	GENTLEMAN	112:25 113:11	61:16 63:3,8
80:14 96:21	FRAILTIES	70:19	113:16	63:10,14,17,20
106:14	69:14,15	GENTLEMEN	GOAL 34:11	64:26 65:3,12
FOLLOWING	FRAME 58:6	8:24 9:19 18:5	GOD 41:21	65:14,21 66:23
5:4 7:26 25:16	86:2	40:15 45:10	GOES 15:14	81:21 82:11
45:18 46:17	FRANCE 86:22	47:8,20 50:24	21:19 22:14	83:3,3,4,7,11
47:5 75:4 76:4	86:24 87:4	64:7 74:21	104:26	83:13,17,24
77:9	FRANKLY	77:14 84:26	GOING 6:16	84:16,17,19,21
FOLLOWS	72:20	89:25 93:1	7:20 8:20 9:2	85:5,18,21
108:11	FRAUD 37:11	98:2 99:19	12:15 14:18	86:8 91:4,6
FOLLOWUP	42:12,15 44:11	100:10 103:1,4	16:14 41:5,23	94:10,24,26
23:20 EODECOING	FRAUDULE	GETTING 45:16 59:19	45:24 46:26	95:2 98:12
FOREGOING	52:14,22 57:11	69:5 87:5	48:5,7 49:6	99:10
115:9	91:3,13	110:26	53:10 60:11	GRANTOR
FORM 5:20 6:9	FREE 46:3,22	GIVE 15:5,18	69:10 71:3	100:24
6:12,25 7:5	88:5 103:24	22:16 47:16	72:26 73:21,22	GRANTORS
10:2 11:6	107:2	66:14 67:1	74:18 77:25	100:23
19:26 27:3	FRESH 107:26	00.17 07.1	78:8 79:15,21	GRANTS 18:22
	I	I	I	I

	I	I	I	I
53:21 73:12	102:24	93:25 100:10	91:17 97:14	HOYT 2:4 5:9
81:20,24,26	HAPPY 92:19	103:7,10 104:7	HITS 51:11	HOYTH@PR
82:3 83:19	HARD 43:25	HEARING	HMONG 95:25	2:8
84:24,25 86:15	69:21	96:10	HOLD 84:23	HUGE 59:10
GRATITUDE	HARD-PRES	HEARINGS	88:26 105:25	69:9 70:7
109:6	70:5	52:11,11 91:1	106:12 107:4	109:6
GREAT 41:11	HARDER 46:2	HEART 38:23	110:24	HUMILIATI
58:19 71:18	HARDSHIP	HECK 72:2	HOLDER 16:9	68:15
87:19	43:22	73:13	95:6	HUNDRED
GREATEST	HARM 6:21	HELD 5:4 7:26	HOLDING	37:24 91:14
71:13	15:8 37:20	9:24 25:19	13:19 72:18	HURL 76:25
GROUP 100:1	38:3 39:16,18	45:18 46:17	84:7	HURT 39:16
GROUPED	39:20 40:3,10	47:5 52:16	HOLDS 80:7	40:19 41:2
105:4	44:13	60:4 61:11	HOLE 92:10	HYPERBOLE
GUESS 107:18	HARMED 40:1	65:20 73:15	HOLOCAUST	92:26
111:13,26	HART 2:4 5:9,9	75:4 76:4 77:9	40:8	
GUESSTIMA	6:6,26 7:22	81:8 83:13	HOME 69:3	I
77:3	9:17,18 45:9	84:7 85:4 91:5	98:15	I.R.A.C 16:6
GUILTY 29:24	45:21,23 46:26	HELP 20:3 23:9	HONOR 5:9,11	17:25 18:1
49:14	47:3 50:21	104:12	5:13 6:7,26 7:2	21:11 22:17
GUN 99:8	58:24 64:2	HELPED 24:26	7:22 9:18 45:8	29:3 61:14
GUNS 99:9	75:9 76:16,20	HELPING	46:12,15,25	78:25 84:1
GUY 14:26 36:9	77:2,5,20	41:10	47:19 50:21	96:14 99:11
37:9 48:18	93:21,23 94:17	HELPS 25:8	64:2 99:15	I.R.A.C.'S 43:13
87:19	98:5,6 99:22	HERRING	100:7 111:5	ICU 38:24
GUYS 15:6	100:14 103:3	53:11 86:19	113:14 114:3	ID 4:5
103:24	111:9 113:15	87:5	HONORABLE	IDEA 33:11,12
	113:21	HESSELTINE	1:15	34:21 38:14
<u>H</u>	HE-SAID 15:10	1:15	HONORED	90:20
H 4:1	HEAD 38:15	HEY 14:21 53:3	72:10	IDENTIFY
H-1.1 83:2	HEALTH 70:18	53:23 55:8	HOOKED 94:6	48:11
HA 72:4,4	HEAR 8:18 45:1	88:2	HOPE 74:25	IF'S 84:8
HALF-HOUR	54:22,25 58:22	HIDING 62:21	77:24 93:18	IGNITES 95:23
77:1	64:21 71:3,4	HIGH 49:24	HOPEFUL 7:17	IGNORE 90:4,4
HALL 55:8	94:4,13 98:3	101:5 111:15	HOPEFULLY	IGNORING
HANDWRIT	99:20 114:1	HIGHER 32:5	7:11 8:8 77:7	91:22
67:9	HEARD 9:6,8	35:24 40:10	93:8	II 2:4
HANOI 101:6	9:13 11:21	50:14,16 51:6	HORRIBLE	ILLUMINAT
HAPPEN 28:16	21:20 38:23,26	HIGHLIGHT	18:14	58:7
71:7 106:11	47:26 48:14,16	98:8	HORSE 30:12	IMMEDIATE
HAPPENED	49:2,23,25	HIGHLY 32:6	HOSTAGE	52:10 90:26
12:11 15:21	50:4,8 54:26	35:25 36:2,4,9	106:12	112:4
17:21 23:4	55:13 58:12	37:12 50:15	HOT 35:1	IMPACT 58:6
71:17,17 81:5	60:20 62:6	HIP 80:10,10	HOUR 7:11,12	59:5,7,10
87:9 89:1	64:8,21,22	HISTORICAL	7:18,19 46:23	67:26
106:19	67:1,25 74:14	15:11	47:13,13,16	IMPLICATES
HAPPENING	77:18 79:18	HISTORY 15:6	106:18 107:1	32:17
61:3 78:7 88:3	80:9,21 82:12	39:3	107:21 113:2	IMPLICATI
HAPPENS 13:7	83:12 91:26	HIT 16:12 17:2	HOURS 76:21	50:22
34:26 89:10	92:2,6,18	46:8 49:3	77:23 112:18	IMPORTAN
	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				rage II
85:7	11:17 103:16	29:13 31:24	INTERNATI	44:17
IMPORTANT	103:19	32:15 35:25	24:23	77.1/
8:17 11:19	INDIVIDUALS	39:13,13 50:10	INTERPRET	J
12:6 17:1 19:5	113:10	50:12 51:9	74:10	J 1:15 2:18
19:20 23:8	INFLUENCE	100:9 107:22	INTERRUPT	JANUARY 17:8
24:20 40:5	41:13	107:25 108:2,9	51:5	60:14 88:11
45:6 47:23	INFORMATI	107.23 108.2,9	INTERVIEW	JEOPARDIZE
48:8 54:16	18:19 21:18	113:11,13	21:19	25:5
55:16 56:6	23:3 33:21,23	INSTRUCTI	INTRODUCE	JOB 10:10
65:10 68:17	61:20 63:20	5:17,20,21 6:1	99:17	16:12,22 17:2
93:25 102:16	74:11,12 79:13	6:5,14 7:4 8:6	INVESTIGA	19:4,5 20:5
IMPORTAN	83:4 85:23	8:12,16,22,25	17:20 52:14	41:9,11 42:6
79:20	95:9 104:12,13	9:6,12,13	91:3,13 97:25	45:5 61:26
IMPRESSION	109:17 112:4	10:24 26:23,24	INVESTIGA	80:10,10
57:2	112:20,24	42:17 50:26	53:18 57:10,12	JOBS 40:15
IMPROPER	113:18	51:2,2,10 73:3	67:23 88:14	49:3
6:18	INITIAL 7:15	76:7 81:12,23	INVESTIGA	JOINED 8:3
IMPUGNING	INITIAL 7.13	81:24 103:8,12	53:4	JUDGE 1:15 6:6
89:18	68:20	104:11 108:4	INVESTIGA	38:21 39:26
INABILITY	INITIATED	104.11 108.4	13:11,11 34:22	93:23 98:6
69:26 70:6	56:7	INSTRUMEN	34:25 35:5,7	113:21
INACCURATE	INJURY 42:21	22:3	35:12 52:22,23	JURORS 7:8
65:4 66:4	INNING 107:21	INSULT 18:14	53:5,24 54:14	8:3 47:9 77:13
INCLUDE 18:3	INNOCENCE	INTEGRATE	57:13,16,17,19	106:5,20 107:8
63:3	26:17	41:10	57:24 58:3	107:20 108:7
INCLUDED	INNOCENT	INTEGRITY	72:23 80:25	108:13,19,22
6:20,22 65:16	99:4	18:14 19:9	81:1 85:3	109:1,21
82:13,22 83:7	INNOCENTLY	38:2,19	87:11 90:6	JURY 5:16,19
INCLUDES	26:11 44:19	INTENDING	98:26 99:1,2	5:21 6:1,5 7:20
56:14	INNUENDO	44:13	INVOLVED	8:1,13,22,22
INCLUDING	13:13 18:5,6	INTENT 42:20	55:23 61:8	10:22,24 29:13
32:26 34:5	24:13 35:12	INTENTION	108:15	39:13,13 42:17
65:17 79:19	97:14	44:11	IRE 93:17	45:17,19 46:18
88:11	INQUIRING	INTERCHAN	IRONIC 68:22	46:20 47:6,20
INCLUSIVE	80:13	21:22	IRRELEVANT	50:20 73:3
1:9	INQUIRY	INTEREST	38:14 86:18	75:2,5,6,9
INCOMPLETE	79:24,26 96:15	17:6,7	ISSUE 34:10	77:10 84:26
63:1 86:10	INSERTED	INTERESTED	56:4,16 61:4	89:25 90:2
INCONSIST	5:21,25	61:8 94:4	66:8 68:12	98:2 103:11
9:12,14	INSISTS 99:22	INTERESTI	69:7 72:17	105:17,19,22
INCORRECT	INSOMNIAC	20:18 21:16	87:11 88:16,18	106:1,4,4,6
101:8	68:24	22:1,8 34:26	90:25 94:6	107:11 108:8
INCORRECT	INSPECTOR	57:8 59:2	ISSUES 21:3	108:12,14
102:22	17:22 52:13	INTERESTI	50:2 55:23	109:5,25 111:3
INDICATED	57:10 91:2,12	58:5 69:19	61:9 70:21,21	112:8,11
7:18 8:5,25	97:24	INTERFERE	71:8 88:11	113:13
50:25 92:5	INSTRUCTI	10:19	108:21	JURY'S 110:6
INDIVIDUAL	5:24 10:22	INTERFERED	ITEM 18:7 35:5	111:1
103:18 113:9	11:13,20 12:2	38:5	97:2	JUSTICE 1:2
INDIVIDUA	25:23 26:25	INTERN 46:26	ITEMS 39:23	30:6 50:9

KEEP 47:25	94:9 95:3 96:2	64:25 66:23	93:2	59:25 77:7
92:5	96:12,15 97:3	68:12 70:14,23	LAY 17:15	78:20 82:14,23
KEEPING	97:25 98:9,11	71:21 72:25	LAYS 100:16	83:14 84:12
108:5	98:20 99:2,11	77:2 81:15	LE 1:5 25:17	95:8 97:19
KEPT 11:23	99:23,25 100:3	84:14,19 85:7	27:7,22 31:21	98:5 99:8
12:19 28:19	100:15,24,25	89:18 91:7	37:19 39:15,19	LETTER 16:1
78:2,7 84:19	101:25 102:6	94:13,23 100:5	42:10 43:21	16:16,23,24
KEY 18:2 85:8	102:17	101:17,18	44:13 51:14	17:21,23 20:21
KHAO 8:3	KHOA'S 14:13	105:8,10,12	64:16 74:5	21:3 26:9,10
KHAO'S 39:10	15:11 18:8	106:2 107:10	78:26 80:18	31:5,8,9 33:21
KHOA 1:5 5:6	19:8 35:13	107:14,21,24	83:8 84:1 85:1	33:26 34:4,6
9:24 13:3,24	36:12,18 38:1	110:17 114:2	91:17 96:14	34:13,14,16,24
14:10,21 15:13	39:23 43:3,17	KNOWING	99:11,24	35:10,11,13
15:24 16:6,8	44:16 53:8	42:22 43:2,16	LEAD 13:4	52:12,21,24,26
16:12,17 17:26	85:1 96:14	43:22 54:4	LEADERS	53:2,3,13
20:7 21:17,20	KHOA,' 21:10	KNOWINGLY	17:10 60:16	54:14 66:16
22:3,7,19 23:5	KIND 8:18 12:7	54:8 85:16	LEADERSHIP	78:10,12,13,21
23:25 24:3,19	16:11 31:4	KNOWLEDGE	22:2	79:3,22 80:1,5
25:17,18 26:4	58:10 71:4	82:2 88:26	LEAKED 31:15	80:11,12,15,15
26:13,16 27:7	74:15 109:21	KNOWN 23:15	LEANINGS	80:17,18,23
27:9,12,16,22	110:9 111:17	23:15	95:18	81:7 83:6 85:2
28:15,26 30:10	KINDLY 45:14	KNOWS 24:15	LEARN 20:26	87:25 88:13,14
30:23 31:3,21	103:3	41:12 43:11,25	34:9 54:19	90:6 91:2,8,11
36:5 37:19,21	KINDS 60:21	82:5,6,7 95:12	55:20 69:10	96:23 97:1,23
38:18 39:15,20	82:2		LEARNED	98:18 99:24,26
41:6 42:11	KNEW 31:22	L	20:24 21:1	99:26 100:4,24
43:14,21,23	32:11 36:5,6	L 105:25	49:16,21 54:21	101:26
44:7,13,24	36:10 37:12	LA 111:24	55:22 69:12	LETTERHE
45:6 48:16,17	42:24 51:17,22	LADIES 8:24	78:25 79:12	21:11
48:23 49:5,8	52:2 54:10	9:19 18:5	96:13	LETTERS
49:23 51:14	55:14 61:10	40:14 45:10	LEAVE 41:24	11:23 12:14,18
52:14,16 53:15	74:6,8,13	47:7,20 50:24	42:1 105:2,18	12:20 13:2,8
55:21,22 56:7	81:13,16 85:15	64:7 74:21	106:25 109:12	13:15 15:16
56:15,18 57:21	91:18,21 96:24	77:14 84:26	LECTERN	17:9 20:18
58:5,23 60:3	102:10	89:24 93:1	77:16	32:26 34:8
60:23 61:10,11	KNIFE 98:15	98:2 99:18	LED 41:3 68:20	43:7 44:20
63:3,7 64:16	KNOCK 111:3	100:10 103:1,4	LEFT 62:11	45:2 54:9
66:9 67:26	111:6,7	109:18	65:26 77:25	56:25 57:25
69:11 72:5,6	KNOW 11:11	LARGELY 103:22	107:25	60:6,15 63:2
74:5 76:5	12:24 17:13		LEG 15:18	78:5,6,9,11
78:18,22,26	19:23 20:13	LATE 34:9	LEGISLATI	85:9 88:10
79:24 80:19,19	21:4 22:12	LAW 2:4,5 8:6 9:12 12:2	19:6	95:10 97:18,22
80:21,26 81:9	25:14,26 27:14	36:22 39:12,17	LENGTHY	98:15 101:6
81:20 83:8,8	28:1,9 32:20	50:26	110:7	LETTING
84:1,2,6,8,11	32:22 35:5	LAWFUL 63:23	LET'S 10:22	105:10
85:1,4,19,26	38:17 42:5	63:26 90:11	11:20 15:25	LEVEL 27:10
85:26 86:21	47:26 48:24	LAWYER	19:25 29:10,13	LIABILITY
87:24 88:6,14	49:16 53:7	11:26 12:3	31:24 42:13	5:24 113:10
88:15 89:12	55:11 56:21	LAWYERS	49:15 50:7	LIAR 15:1
91:3,17 93:14	58:22 61:8,20		51:8 53:1	41:18 102:5
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

				rage 13
LIE 26:21 38:2	LONG-RETI	74:22,26 75:2	MATTER 8:25	39:4
38:17 40:12	14:20	75:7,13 77:24	14:16 19:4	MILLIONS
74:8	LONGER 24:5	104:4	26:16 29:22	40:12 41:20
LIED 36:16	LOOK 12:15	LYING 96:10	53:26 62:10	MIND 47:26
43:3	13:1 15:1 16:4	ETH (G)0.10	69:7 96:4	63:26 92:6
LIES 20:6 41:4	16:26 19:25	M	102:25	108:5 113:15
LIFE 41:4,7	25:8 28:10	MA 101:6	MATTERS	MINDS 96:22
49:18 102:4	29:13 39:22	MACH 11:12	14:17 23:17	MINIMIZE
107:2	44:7 49:15	14:4 26:1	24:7 25:7	112:23
LIFE'S 50:3	52:5 55:21	MAGAZINE	102:1	MINISTER
LIFETIME	72:7,8,21	79:8,10	MEAN 27:22	22:9
19:8	78:20 82:14	MAIN 16:24	30:2 42:4,14	MINOR 6:13,14
LIGHT 24:8	83:9,14,16	MAJESKI 2:19	46:1 57:14	MINUTE 12:15
LIKEWISE	84:4 86:9 87:5	5:14	69:2 71:26	14:11 46:25
83:5 104:16	90:26 92:11	MAJOR 101:7	85:22 92:13	MINUTES 5:17
LIMIT 15:9	94:3 96:7 98:7	MAKING 54:8	MEANING	7:8,14,19 22:1
LIMITED	99:8 100:15	57:11 74:8	109:7	34:19 37:22
89:15	101:5 102:5,25	81:14 89:7	MEANS 32:6	45:22 50:8
LIMITS 105:19	LOOKED 34:4	90:10 91:22	36:1 38:15	110:5,10,23
LINE 39:23	36:8 44:4 73:5	92:21	42:20 43:11,19	MISCHARA
LINES 74:25	102:12	MALADIES	44:11 50:15	66:17
LIST 11:3	LOOKING 17:6	50:5	MEANT 100:21	MISCHARA
LISTENED	34:9 42:25	MALICE 42:12	MECHANISM	99:15 100:7
40:5	43:7 65:19	42:14,20	36:23	MISDIRECT
LISTENING	84:16 88:24	MALICIOUS	MEDIA 11:12	87:5
47:22 86:7	LOS 2:21	25:14 26:21	14:4 26:2	MISLEAD
LITMUS 90:22	LOSE 84:10	MAN 19:13	MEDICAL	105:15
LITTLE 6:10	LOSING 112:11	55:23 69:14	69:15 70:21,21	MISLEADING
6:17 7:12 10:4	LOST 66:26	70:26 71:9	71:4,8	63:4 85:19
10:15 13:2	67:3,9 86:11	MANAGE	MEETING 60:8	100:22
16:26 20:26	LOT 10:14	38:18	85:22	MISPLACED
30:21,26 31:20	13:16 21:23	MANAGED	MEETINGS	93:17,17
31:26 46:2,10	22:6 24:24	20:4	82:7	MISREPRES
47:14 67:2	50:4 51:10	MANDATED	MEMBERS	54:24 81:25
69:5 73:22	59:3 60:10	104:3	24:24	87:2 98:16
74:23 78:20	69:2 112:7	MANIPULA	MEMORIES	MISREPRES
101:15 103:5	LOTS 41:8	23:17	58:1	18:20 53:20
103:20 104:19	LOTT-MEYE	MARCH 16:16	MEMORY 81:3	55:15 67:15,17
107:18 109:3	1:25 115:6,17	18:18 79:8,19	101:26	73:10 79:12
109:21 112:7	LOVE 76:10	80:15,17,18	MENTION	82:3 88:12
LIVE 62:9	LOVING 69:13	88:13,18	56:13,14 57:3	90:10,14
LIVES 41:12	LOWEST 30:20	MARINA 2:15	62:26 63:5	MISREPRES
LLP 2:13	LUCKY 69:14	MATCHES	MENTIONED	16:6 24:6,16
LOCKED 111:8	LUCRATIVE	80:6	72:6 78:19	44:12 65:4
LOGICAL	41:8	MATERIAL	MET 71:17,17	78:25 96:14
96:22	LUNCH 7:11,12	16:20 44:12	MICHELLE	MISREPRES
LONG 38:25	7:18,19 8:8,9	MATERIALS	1:25 115:6,17	28:1 37:7
45:21 55:24	46:10,23 47:13	36:7,8 42:25	MIDWEST	60:24 72:13
73:22 93:2	47:13,14,16	43:6 102:12	36:24	99:23
107:1	73:1,24 74:19	MATH 78:3	MIGRATION	MISSPEAK 6:4
	l	l	I	I

MISTAKE	MUSH 49:4	30:15 33:16	NUMBERS	54:14 64:17
36:10 37:2	MUTUAL 22:5	38:19 53:11,15	106:26 110:3,4	91:1 97:23
76:11		57:12 66:3	113:25	103:14 115:18
MISTAKES	N	74:3 86:19		OH 15:12 17:6
62:26	N 3:1,1	87:3 101:18	0	19:15 22:18
MISTER 61:18	N.A.V.A.S.A	NEW 5:24	O'CLOCK	55:10 56:17
MISUNDERS	95:14	101:19	106:16	62:19 80:10
99:4	NAME 19:14	NEWS 79:8,9,9	OATH 33:6	87:2 106:19
MOCK 111:14	94:20	79:10 87:1	35:17	OKAY 11:19
111:16	NAMED 79:10	93:24	OBJECT 50:21	21:12 26:22
MOMENT	88:1 113:10	NGUYEN 1:8	64:2	27:4,20 30:7
46:25 99:18	NAP 69:4	2:5 10:15,25	OBJECTED	31:2 33:14
103:9 105:25	NARROW	11:7 16:20	6:22 21:24	34:2 37:17
108:3	113:3	26:6 32:18	OBJECTION	42:13 45:23
MONEY 25:8,8	NATIONAL	51:16	12:23 13:22	46:4 55:11,12
78:22 81:21	95:25	NICE 18:23	31:16 97:15,26	62:20 77:23,24
MORNING 5:2	NATURE 63:1	36:13 56:19	99:15 100:7	79:10,25 83:2
5:9,11,13 8:2	NECESSARI	58:20 72:8	101:11	94:17 99:8
9:19 45:11,17	101:19	NINE 42:1,10	OBSERVATI	OLD 15:6,7
46:16 49:3	NECESSARY	90:16	70:16	50:3 69:1,5
73:22 78:17	47:16 112:22	NONPROFIT	OBVIOUS 93:3	70:20 101:19
82:21 86:6	NEED 7:7 9:22	81:20	OBVIOUSLY	ON-CALL
104:5 105:20	14:2 16:12	NONREBUT	103:7 109:24	109:23
106:17 109:22	28:18 29:26	98:4	110:12 113:3	ONCE 46:6
111:21 112:21	37:23 42:7	NOON 46:2,9,9	OCCASIONA	53:11 66:26
MORTIFICA	46:5 50:19	NOPE 74:3	12:7	67:3 113:17
39:16 40:18	56:17,17 66:20	NOTE 6:2 54:16	OCCUPATION	ONE-HOUR
41:1,21 58:15	67:6 69:22	NOTED 4:3	6:21,22 39:23	106:15
MOTIVATED	72:20 90:12	NOTEPADS	40:1 92:12,12	ONES 14:6
39:2	92:5 99:1	105:16 107:4	OCCURRED	40:16 107:6
MOTIVATION	102:19,23	109:13	48:14	ONESELF 28:1
44:22	103:17 104:10	NOTES 22:24	OCCURRING	OPEN 5:4 7:26
MOUNTAIN	104:20,20	67:9 70:25	59:4	38:13 45:18
88:24,25	106:3,10,17,20	103:17 115:10	OFFENDING	46:17 47:5,26
MOVE 27:5	107:15,19	NOTICED	14:14	75:4 76:4 77:9
97:1	110:2,6,17	14:21	OFFENSE	88:5 92:5
MOVING 6:9	111:1,20,26	NOTIFIED	25:20 27:25	108:5
17:24 27:20	112:1,5,6,13	108:8	52:18 54:17,23	OPEN-HEART
31:19 111:2	112:24 113:7	NOTION 92:24	54:23 55:6,18	69:16,20,23
MUD 13:8 87:14	113:12	NOVEMBER	60:1 65:8	70:3,4 92:14
87:17,18,21,22	NEEDED 6:11	1:17 3:2 4:2	67:24 82:4	OPENED 38:11
87:26	96:4 101:10,22	5:1 64:16 76:1	OFFERED 90:5	OPENING 48:3
MULDOON	NEIGHBOR	NUMBER 17:9	OFFICE 21:5,7	48:4 71:2
104:1,25	76:26	50:11,12 52:6	21:7 35:7	OPINE 48:6
105:22 106:1	NEITHER 6:15	52:25 60:15	57:24 80:17	OPINION 15:5
107:4 113:24	97:17	73:4,25 76:7	82:9 84:24	34:17 108:20
MULTIPLE	NEUTRALIZE	78:9 83:10,14	88:16	OPINIONS
35:3 57:15	24:3	83:25,26 90:18	OFFICER 5:25	45:15 74:24
MULTIPLIC	NEVER 18:14	91:17 94:5,15	OFFICIAL 1:26	108:6
51:24	19:2 29:4	105:7	21:11 52:12,21	OPPONENT

				1490 10
15:20 25:13	OVERSTAT	19:21	108:15	22:11 100:18
28:6 34:11	92:26	PARTICULAR	PEOPLE'S	101:7
37:12	OVERWHEL	31:8 65:16	23:23	PHONE 88:9
OPPORTUNI	17:9 60:15	78:9	PERCENT	106:19
9:4 37:14 43:5	88:10	PARTICULA	24:23 37:24	PHONES 110:3
45:3 47:17	OWE 100:19,20	101:20	91:14 100:21	PHONEY 43:24
75:8 103:6	100:20 109:6	PARTIES 7:13	PERFECT	96:2
OPPOSE 23:26		46:19	76:10 109:3	PHRASE 53:12
OPPOSED 9:14	P	PARTS 73:23	PERIOD 61:15	53:12 55:17
39:11	P.O 2:6	84:21	69:17 106:16	67:22 86:19
OPPOSING	PACE 82:16	PARTY 29:15	PERJURY 55:1	89:16 90:5
22:19	PACKAGE	29:21,22,25	PERSON 17:22	PICK 46:23
OPPOSITE	42:17 50:19	32:6 36:1	25:17 48:22	47:14 62:14
95:2 96:17	PADS 105:19	50:15	49:19 53:12	77:25 82:16
97:4	PAGE 34:4	PASS 55:9	88:6	PICKLE 14:25
OPPOSITION	67:10 80:16	PATENTLY	PERSON'S	24:9 25:10
23:13,17 96:5	82:18,18,23,25	81:1	40:13	36:16 43:12
OPPRESSION	83:5 84:5,12	PATIENCE	PERSONAL	44:23 101:15
42:12,14 43:18	95:22 97:19	93:6	18:14 82:1	102:3,5
43:18 44:1	99:11,13,13,13	PATTERN 48:9	88:26	PIECE 55:6
OPTION 42:2	99:26 100:15	48:10,11,16	PERSONALI	60:1,26 74:15
OPTIONS	PAGES 22:26	49:4 50:1 57:6	41:19	90:9 93:4
109:24	PAIN 37:26	86:4 92:7	PERSONALLY	PIECES 30:3,4
ORANGE 1:2	PAPERS 15:15	PAUSE 46:5,7	98:17	48:1,7,9 65:14
41:12 115:4,8	PARAGRAPH	47:12,16	PERSONS 27:5	80:7
ORDER 15:19	17:25 53:8	PAY 8:15,18	97:12	PLACE 10:3
20:2 25:24	67:18 78:18,20	54:9	PERSPECTI	32:13 46:7,22
28:2 96:21	80:16 84:4	PAYING 58:17	79:5	67:17
97:14 108:26	95:14 98:8	PC 2:19	PERSUADE	PLACES 57:15
112:3	PARAPHRA	PEG 92:9	29:15 32:6	PLAIN 79:1
ORGANIZAT	34:3,23	PENCIL 62:14	36:1 50:15	PLAINTIFF 1:6
62:3	PARAPHRA	PEOPLE 1:8	PERSUASIVE	2:3 5:8,10,23
ORGANIZAT	26:9 44:20	10:26 13:16	30:4	6:6,20,24 9:3,4
79:14,17	98:14	14:6 16:20	PETITIONS	9:16 25:17
ORIENTAL	PARSED 67:25	17:20 18:3,15	95:24	51:15,19,20
22:11 101:7	PART 6:20 18:2	18:16 21:18,22	PH.D 12:4 18:8	55:14,21 56:7
ORIGINALLY	18:18 21:13	21:23 24:1,26	18:10,13,25	56:11 65:9
92:5	26:11 39:14	25:22 26:7	19:3 21:26	71:25 85:12
OSTENSIBLE	53:22 55:5,18	27:21 35:6	27:10 29:2,4	90:11,13 99:16
17:18	59:25 60:3,25	36:19 37:8	43:10 53:9,11	112:6,19,19
OUTFIT 71:12	65:12 67:21,24	40:5,7,22 44:5	53:12,13,15,16	PLAINTIFF'S
OUTSET 47:25	68:8 69:20	44:6 48:12	73:14 74:2,3	6:16,21 7:14
OUTSIDE 5:16	73:13,14,19	49:6,12,12	86:19,24 87:2	62:6 65:23,25
21:21 45:18	84:25 86:8	50:2 51:16	87:3,4,4 90:20	66:1 78:17
46:17,20 74:25	90:5 94:24	55:2 57:2 58:8	94:6 96:3 97:4	86:5 87:1
75:4,6 109:20	100:6 102:26	58:12,16 61:13	97:5,6 99:12	PLANT 88:18
OVERCOME	111:16	71:12 73:6,8	PHASE 112:3	PLANTED
15:11	PARTIALLY	79:16 87:21	112:17,21	76:12
OVERNIGHT	41:14	92:20 94:1,8	113:3,6,11,13	PLEASE 5:7
36:26 105:18	PARTICIPA	95:4 98:10	PHILOSOPHY	8:15 29:14
			l	

				rage 10
102:13 103:1	18:12	16:24 34:1	45:6 66:20	PROVIDE
103:18 105:17	PRAISE 49:24	70:4	95:3 96:2,12	57:21,23
105:26	77:26	PRIOR 21:2	99:23 100:3,15	104:12
PLETHORA	PRAISES 86:2	PRIVATE 29:5	100:24 101:25	PROVIDED
51:25	PRAISING	PRO 1:26 115:7	102:6,17	57:22 74:12
PLUS 20:15	56:11 72:1	115:18	PROGRAM	100:10
POINT 8:19	PRECIPITA	PROBABLE	14:19 23:14	PROVIDES
22:8 45:11	87:10	32:7 35:25	PROMOTED	12:2 36:23
46:8 47:15	PREDATES	36:2,4 37:12	66:20 67:7	PROVIDING
61:17 62:13,18	79:20	50:15	102:20	61:19
66:10 72:18	PREFERENCE	PROBABLY	PROOF 11:24	PROVING
74:22 82:24	112:17	20:10 36:26	11:25,25,26	96:11
86:21 88:24	PREMARKED	105:8,9 111:9	13:14 29:10,18	PSYCHIATR
89:13	4:3	PROBLEM	32:5,23 33:16	42:5
POINTED 78:2	PREPONDE	36:25 38:22	50:14	PSYCHOLO
POINTS 93:25	29:11 30:20	47:3 68:19,24	PROPERLY	42:5
111:26	31:25 32:3	68:25	81:5	PUBLIC 12:22
POLICY 24:7	50:17,23	PROBLEMS	PROPOSAL	43:3 44:15
100:1	PRESENCE	70:2,22	29:5,5 99:10	48:13,14 59:5
POLITICAL	5:16 8:1 45:19	PROCEEDIN	PROPOSALS	60:10,21,25
16:12 17:2,17	46:18,20 47:6	5:4 7:26 45:18	21:6,10 82:10	61:3 72:12,17
23:24 25:7	75:5,6 77:10	46:17 47:5	82:11,11,13	74:17 79:6,14
28:6 80:10	109:20	75:4 76:4 77:9	PROPOSITI	79:24,26,26
97:13	PRESENT	110:25 115:11	89:5	80:5 85:17
POLITICAL	110:24	PROCESS	PROSECUTI	89:1,22 96:15
23:18 49:3	PRESENTAT	19:26 62:5	29:23	PUBLICATI
POLITICS 13:7	113:5	104:26 105:2	PROTECT	10:21 11:14
POLL 103:17	PRESENTED	105:11 106:7	10:16 19:12	38:5 58:25
POLLING	16:8 29:16	106:14 109:11	25:2,24 32:16	59:4 68:2,5,7,9
105:6,6	31:11 64:11,13	111:16	37:11	68:9,16 70:7
POSITION 13:6	89:15 100:12	PRODUCED	PROTESTING	PUBLICATI
34:13 90:1	PRESENTING	12:1 29:22	81:1 95:25	56:8
102:20	28:2 39:19	PRODUCT	PROVE 12:18	PUBLISH 11:20
POSITIONS	PRESERVE	41:14	29:16,21,23,25	19:15 46:26
41:8	109:13	PROFESSOR	29:26 31:21	101:26
POSSIBLE	PRESIDENT	13:3,24 14:10	32:10 35:14,23	PUBLISHED
104:12	10:26 19:9	14:13,21 15:11	35:23 42:18,19	11:2,11 25:12
POST 72:2,4	22:10 61:13	15:13,24 16:6	51:15,20,21	26:1,5 33:20
POSTED 56:10	62:2 63:10	16:8,12,17	74:5 85:12,13	33:24 38:25
89:11 101:20	65:13 99:11,12	17:26 19:8	85:14,15 91:18	78:10 79:11
POTENTIAL	PRESIDING	21:17,22 22:7	93:3 94:25	87:18 93:26
106:10 POTENTIAL	1:15 PRESTIGE	24:19,22 26:16 27:12 28:15,26	95:7 96:9 97:17,18	94:8 101:15 102:10
106:10 109:10	14:3	30:10,23 31:3	PROVED 12:20	PUBLISHES
POWER 59:20	PRETTY 36:21	35:13 36:5,12	30:22 32:4,9	14:4 88:16
POWERPOI	39:1 67:16	36:18 37:21	35:26 39:15	PULL 21:9
20:2	70:5,26	38:1,5,18	42:26 50:13	PULLED 32:25
PRACTICAL	PRIMARILY	39:10,23 41:6	51:6 71:7	PULLING
111:20	15:15 95:10	43:3,14,17,23	PROVES 43:9	83:15
PRACTICAL	PRIMARY	44:7,16,24	96:8 99:23	PULLS 15:14
		1111,110,21	70.077.23	

80:6	QUICK 76:6	104:10,23	7:12,15 9:5	REFERENCI
PUNITIVE	QUICKER	109:24 110:16	75:9 76:20	52:26 67:22
112:3 113:8	104:13	110:19	77:4,19 93:22	REFERRED
PURPORTE	OUICKLY	READER 63:4	98:4	29:17
71:5	76:17 112:5	66:23,23 86:10	RECALL 33:18	REFERRING
PURPOSE 13:2	QUITE 12:14	READING 8:22	RECEIVE 8:12	33:19,19 68:6
17:23 36:14,15	38:14 45:16,16	64:3,5,17,20	39:20 103:9	REFERS 39:24
PUSHED 14:11	55:13 56:18	64:21,22 96:17	105:5 110:16	83:7
15:1	74:24	96:24 110:19	RECEIVED	REFUGEE 14:3
PUSHING	QUOTING	READS 27:11	5:23 17:8,22	21:7 22:5
105:9	80:24	108:11	60:14 77:26	49:19 84:3
PUT 6:25 10:22		READY 46:24	99:16 108:4	100:1
15:25 16:14,15	R	112:4,25,25,25	RECEIVING	REFUGEES
29:14 31:24	R.O.V.R 14:19	113:11	18:21 53:21	36:18 41:7,10
33:2 35:9	23:15	REALISTIC	73:11 106:18	49:18 55:24
37:23,24 38:13	RAISE 25:6	50:4	110:5	72:2
41:7 42:6,7,13	87:12	REALITY	RECESS 45:11	REFUTE 61:2
47:21 48:1,7	RAISED 36:24	11:17 95:13	45:17 46:13,16	REFUTED
56:6 61:1	37:2 58:13	111:20	75:7,13	72:15
62:26 66:9	61:4 88:19,19	REALIZE	RECITE 20:10	REGARD 54:20
79:5 80:7 93:6	RAISING 88:11	12:26 30:13	71:16	105:15 107:3
110:7	RAN 73:22	REALIZED	RECOGNIZE	REGARDING
PUTS 15:19	81:20	24:5 28:21	72:10	79:14 90:6
PUTTING 48:9	RANCHO 2:7	REALLY 12:10	RECOGNIZED	REGULAR
	RANDOM	12:16 14:16,18	71:23	41:4
Q	106:21,22	34:9 42:18	RECOGNIZES	REITERATE
QUESTION	RANGE 46:6	45:16 47:21,23	39:12	103:11
6:15,20,20,23	RANKS 35:1	49:13,17 50:5	RECOLLECT	REJOINED
20:12,19 21:2	RE-READ	51:11 54:18	86:23	47:9 77:12
26:22,25 27:5	64:23	56:1,4 62:8	RECOLLEC	RELATE 70:5
27:8,19 28:5	REACH 104:25	66:22 68:17	71:14	RELATED 6:20
28:11 30:19,25	REACHED	72:21 74:10	RECORD 5:6	6:21 11:14
31:19 32:18	58:13 104:25	88:3 90:17	5:18 6:4,25 7:8	22:16 68:5
36:3 38:3	READ 6:3 8:15	105:8,9 110:8	7:9,21,24,25	69:8,26 74:1
41:25 42:10	9:13 10:25	REASON 10:11	10:18 14:23	78:22
44:21 50:23	14:15 21:1	11:5 13:10	15:4 23:7,9	RELATES 51:9
64:23 76:7,8,8	22:2,14,25	15:10 52:20	25:2 76:5	RELATING
90:18,24 91:17	23:2,21 24:19	59:13 70:4	109:22 114:4,5	5:19 6:24
92:1 103:18,19	27:23,24,26	94:2 101:22	RECORDS 71:4	55:23
109:24 110:13	31:6 33:4,18	REASONABLE	80:19,21	RELATIONS
110:17,19	33:25 34:12	28:5 29:24	RECOVERY	95:14
QUESTIONS	35:9,15 38:4	32:2 39:21	39:1 69:17	RELATIONS
11:6 20:3	40:26 54:5	44:4,6 73:2,6,8	RED 86:19 87:5	22:4
25:15 38:19	57:9 63:7 64:9	74:10	REFER 8:14,16	RELATIVES
53:14 58:1	64:24 66:5,25	REASONAB	8:26	58:12
59:3 68:21	68:3 95:13	27:6,21 51:23	REFERENCE	RELEASE
71:19 90:16	96:22 100:11	72:22	16:1,7 56:14	108:24
104:17,20	104:14 105:6	REASONS	REFERENCED	RELEASED
107:24 109:11	108:9	10:10 51:24	57:25 60:13	12:21
111:19 113:20	READBACK	REBUTTAL	65:18 80:1	RELIANCE

34:7	REPUTATION	88:14	REVIEW 99:19	ROUGH 7:13
RELIED 74:17	25:2 36:12,18	RESPONDING	REVIEWS	ROUND 92:10
RELIEVED	38:2 39:16	88:15	15:16	RUBBER 51:11
94:2	40:3,9,11,13	RESPONSE	REVISED 5:22	RULINGS 7:5
RELY 73:2,17	40:18,25 44:14	18:18 21:7	REY 2:15	RUMINATING
RELYING	88:5 89:18,18	31:11 49:8	RIGHT 7:3,11	10:14
72:22 97:16	92:18,20,20	56:9,25 57:23	8:21,24 10:18	RUMORS
REMAIN	REQUEST	58:7 83:19	15:3 17:1	16:14,15
103:22 108:3	18:19 21:8	104:22,23	19:20 20:5	RUN 46:1
REMEMBER	34:21,23,24	RESPONSIBI	23:20 24:14	RUNNING
12:21 13:11	35:11 83:19	17:15 85:11	25:26 26:11,15	112:23
15:12 25:23	91:12	RESPONSIB	31:19 32:26	
26:9,11 28:18	REQUESTED	11:4 14:6	33:15 34:22	S
31:25 32:15	53:5 80:20,22	36:17 37:10	35:3 39:6,9	S 3:1,1 4:1
38:8,10 40:4	98:26	43:13 65:11	40:24 43:3,18	S.E.A.R.A.C
42:17 82:8	REQUESTING	REST 45:2	45:10,20 46:9	14:7,8 15:23
94:5 97:13	52:13,21,23	94:22 99:14	46:13 47:7	16:5 17:25
REMEMBER	54:14 91:2	RESULT 34:22	48:18,23,25	18:1 22:16
81:4	97:24	73:11	53:5 56:22	24:10 29:3
REMIND 49:7	REQUIRED	RESULTED	57:4,7 66:11	41:9 52:14
78:21 108:3	29:16,25 66:6	18:21 53:20	66:18 72:11,21	61:14 78:25
REMINDER	REQUIRES	RESUME 10:8	74:21 76:22	91:3 95:14
74:23 83:15	10:6 79:3	10:9 12:3	77:6,12,21	96:14 101:16
REPEATED	112:2	16:17 19:3	78:1,22 82:17	S.E.A.R.A.C.'S
56:5	RESEARCH	28:14 37:23,24	83:1,9,11 84:2	43:13
REPEATEDLY	108:5	61:22 62:19	84:13,20 85:6	S.O.S 1:8 10:26
57:14 80:26	RESENT	65:16 67:18	86:7 89:12	25:22 26:7
100:16	101:19	82:12,13,18,25	93:21 97:22	48:12 51:17
REPEATING	RESETTLED	86:16,17 98:12	98:19 103:4	57:2 71:12
17:16 49:15	36:17	100:16,21	105:24 106:5	SACRIFICE
REPLACE	RESETTLE	RESURRECT	110:12,24	19:8
107:20	21:7	19:11	113:22	SACRIFICED
REPLY 88:20	RESETTLE	RETIRED	RIGHTS 42:22	36:18 43:14
REPORT 13:10	37:10	36:15 55:24,26	43:17,22 109:8	SACRIFICES
34:22	RESETTLING	63:11 65:13	RING 43:24	108:26
REPORTER	14:6	92:12	RIP 68:25	SACRIFICING
1:26 104:14,19	RESOURCE	RETRACT 49:9	RISE 106:1	36:12
115:6,18	16:24	59:13	ROAD 51:11	SAFETY 42:23
REPORTER'S	RESPECT 55:2	RETURN	ROBERT 15:26	62:11
1:16 64:17	58:2 78:13	105:20 106:20	ROCKS 76:24	SAIGON 22:10
115:1	81:6 98:10	RETURNED	ROLL 8:8	62:11 66:1 SANTA 2:7 5:1
REPORTING	RESPECTED	107:11	ROLLING 77:7	76:1
8:23	17:10 60:16	REVELATION	ROOM 8:13	SANTOLI
REPRESENT	RESPECTFUL	12:16	50:20 105:17	13:12 20:22
44:16 63:17	110:6,26	REVELATIO	105:19 106:2,4	21:4 82:8,9
100:14	RESPECTIVE	12:12 20:25	106:6 109:26	83:16 84:15
REPRESENT	47:23	REVERSE 52:1	111:3	85:22
61:12	RESPOND 15:3	89:4	ROOMS 104:1	SAT 64:8
REPRESENT	25:5	REVERTED	ROPERS 2:19	SAVE 43:14
61:26	RESPONDED	31:15	5:14	5A V 12 TJ.17
1	I	I	ı	ı

44:25	48:14 60:11,21	84:13 89:5	109:5	49:26 80:3,3
SAVED 107:7	60:25 61:3	92:19 94:20	SERVICE 77:15	92:6
SAW 19:2 30:14	72:12,17,19	97:4 98:8	93:2 106:9	SIDES 6:11 8:7
37:21,21,26	74:18 79:7,15	100:16,16,23	107:11,14	SIGNED 65:11
38:18 40:19	79:26 80:5	101:5	108:8 109:9	95:24 99:10
42:8 81:7	85:18 89:1,22	SEED 88:18	SESSION 5:2	SIGNIFICANT
84:15,23,24	95:13 96:1,26	SEEING 68:4	76:2 104:5,5	57:26
86:20 92:20	SCENARIO	SEEN 10:12	106:16	SIGNING 65:3
SAYING 10:10	7:12	11:25 51:25	SET 10:18 14:23	SILVERMAN
21:10 26:18	SCHEDULE	72:26 74:11	15:2,4 23:9	2:13 5:12
27:11,24 28:4	107:17	83:11	25:2	SIMILAR 6:12
28:21,21,22	SCHEDULING	SELECTION	SETS 8:13,26	SIMPLE 102:9
31:3 36:5	103:21,21	106:22	103:11	SIMPLER 6:17
40:22 48:17	SCHOOL 101:5	SELF-HELP	SETTING 23:7	SIMPLY 56:5
49:13 52:1,21	111:15	36:26	SETTLE 36:25	SINCERELY
52:24 54:13	SCOPE 11:1	SELF-PROM	SETTLED	47:21
55:8,19 56:9	97:26 113:3	18:10	36:25	SINGLE 56:14
58:20 59:26	SCROLL 80:16	SELF-PROM	SEVEN 41:24	67:10 93:24
62:7,17 66:2	84:5	97:6	42:9	SINK 36:21
66:24 67:18	SCURRILOUS	SELF-PROM	SHAME 39:16	SIT 33:9 35:20
72:4 78:2,7	38:2	18:8 53:8 97:4	40:18 41:1,21	SITUATION
82:1 88:13	SEAT 35:1	SEND 8:13 91:8	58:15 68:15	81:6
90:8 94:6 97:2	SECOND 36:21	91:10 103:9,11	89:21,25	SIX 37:18
98:22,23	39:2 67:24	103:13 104:7	SHARED 58:8	SKY 54:11
100:25 105:13	69:21,22,24,26	SENDING 53:3	SHE-SAID	SLANDER
SAYS 10:8,9	70:3,6,9,12	54:13	15:10	102:6
11:9 18:3,20	72:23 78:21	SENDS 16:16	SHOOTING	SLEEP 20:10
19:15 21:20	98:7 112:17	16:18	7:10	38:6 68:21
24:14,22 26:10	113:10	SENSE 12:25	SHORTHAND	SLEEPING
26:25 28:14	SECRETARY	40:1 57:20	115:10	38:11 68:19,24
30:9,24 32:10	60:5	58:4 102:14	SHORTLY	68:24
35:10 45:4	SEE 7:15 10:15	SENT 11:3	55:24	SLIGHTEST
48:20,20,21,21	10:25 11:13	17:23 36:19	SHOVE 92:9	62:26
51:1,5,14 53:3	13:10 14:1,13	40:7 52:12,21	SHOW 12:4,5	SLIP 35:2
55:11 56:20	14:17 16:4,7	67:13 79:3	32:22,23 33:15	SLOPPY 97:14
57:8,9,21 58:2	16:10 17:1,12	85:3 91:1,9	33:22 37:14,15	SMALL 24:24
64:12 65:10	17:21,22,25	97:23 100:4	48:5 50:12	SMITH 22:20
67:19 78:24	18:9,23 19:23	111:17	53:1 73:1 86:6	23:14 48:13,21
79:7,12 80:16	21:3,14,16,25	SENTENCE	106:1	49:11,24 52:12
80:23 82:5	22:13,21,23	23:5,6 90:23	SHOWED 21:6	56:4,24,25
83:1,17,20,21	24:13 26:3,19	90:26 99:6	82:10 83:18	59:1,8,18,19
85:26,26 87:13	27:3 28:26	SENTENCES	98:10	59:20,22 64:20
89:21 90:10,13	29:8 35:25	33:6,10 35:17	SHOWING	68:11 71:23
90:19,26 94:13	38:13 39:6,12	SEPTEMBER	85:19	72:9 86:1,3
94:24 96:13,18	39:14 51:12,13	70:17	SHOWN 62:19	87:26 88:22,22
96:25 97:3	52:9,25 53:2	SERIOUS 31:23	106:5	89:18 91:1,8
100:1,17	69:4 74:26	32:12,20 33:14	SIDE 7:1,14	93:16 97:23
SCALES 30:6	78:5 79:11,23	51:17 74:15	24:2 30:17,18	SMOKING
50:9	80:7 81:11	91:25	31:17,18,26	99:8,9
SCANDAL	83:1,9 84:13	SERVE 108:26	47:26 48:1	SOMEBODY
	l	l	l	l

17:2,16 37:3	21:4 57:24	35:16 101:4	STATES 17:11	SUBJECTED
40:11 41:3,16	60:8 63:1	102:26	60:17 90:1	43:21
43:21 57:18	80:24 82:7	STATEMENT	STATUS 61:26	SUBMIT 6:11
88:6 95:18,20	95:4	9:20,21 10:1	62:10	51:23 59:14
100:1,4 106:10	STALEMATE	10:13 11:7,10	STAY 106:24	64:25 67:10
SOMEWHAT	15:10	11:23 12:18	STAYED 41:9	89:24
55:12	STAND 27:26	15:11,19 16:2	STEAL 19:14	SUBMITTED
SONG 11:12	35:4 38:18,19	16:25 19:23	STELLAR 41:3	29:3 65:12
14:4 26:1	40:19 54:7	24:12 25:13,18	STEP 40:24	67:4 81:15
SOON 12:21	57:9 62:18	26:4,20 27:9	61:23 107:19	SUBMITTING
25:5 31:15	64:13 76:17	27:13,24 28:2	110:13	61:16 63:14
114:1	80:26 90:13	28:8,9,12,16	STEPHEN 2:18	SUBSTANTI
SORBONNE	107:10,14	28:24 29:7,12	5:13	37:18,19 39:9
67:4,11,13	STANDARD	30:17,25,26	STEPHEN.E	SUBSTITUTE
SORRY 15:25	30:20 35:24	31:10,22,23	2:22	106:23
28:20 102:4	42:18 50:16,18	32:11,12,21	STEPS 105:7	SUBSTITUT
SORT 107:22	50:22 51:13	33:2,20,23,25	STOLEN 15:22	108:21
SOUNDED	START 8:6 9:3	35:14 36:8	STOP 46:22	SUBSTITUTI
111:3,7	9:16 16:14	37:13 40:2	63:1 76:9,13	107:23
SOUNDS 7:9	46:14 50:25	43:1 48:3,4,26	96:5 97:16	SUBTITLE
SOURCE 34:1	69:4 76:19,25	49:2 50:6,7	STOPPED	101:16
95:9	87:17,21	51:17,18,20,22	61:13	SUCCESSES
SOUTH 2:20	107:23,25	51:26 52:2,5,6	STOPPING	87:19
SPAN 47:13	108:1 112:17	52:10,15,22	61:25	SUDDENLY
SPEAK 21:2,19	112:21	54:3,10,15	STORY 35:2	23:13,23 38:11
47:10 95:5	STARTED 7:10	55:3,5 57:11	47:26 48:2	SUED 68:11
SPEAKS 83:12	8:10 13:8	59:7,10 66:1,4	80:6 84:23	SUFFER 43:25
SPECIAL 7:4	23:13 65:26	67:26 68:6,13	92:6	SUFFERED
SPECIFIC 59:7	77:17 87:13	68:17 69:8	STRAIGHT	39:17 69:16
66:9 67:26	STARTING 5:8	70:1,6,13,14	10:18 14:24	SUFFERING
71:9 89:16	STARTLED	70:22,23 71:9	15:4 23:7,10	70:20
SPECIFICAL	61:21	73:14,24,26	25:3 76:23	SUFFERS 40:14
29:1 32:8 51:5	STARTS 16:20	74:6,8 78:23	STREET 2:20	SUFFICIENT
69:8 70:16	70:8,9 71:21	80:12 81:13	STRETCH 69:9	113:4
SPECTRUM	99:13	85:2,16,24	70:7	SUGGEST
22:4	STATE 1:1 9:24	90:18,21,22,23	STRIKE 67:20	48:26 54:8
SPECULATI	12:22 13:4,21	91:4,13,15,15	STRUGGLING	69:9 104:11
18:23	16:13 18:21	91:19,24,26	12:24	SUGGESTED
SPEECH 88:5	20:9,15 23:12	92:8,16 93:26	STUDENT 2:5	69:25
SPEED 112:7	23:26 24:3,4	94:8 97:8,18	STUDENTS	SUGGESTING
SPORTS 107:18	28:14 30:10	99:5 115:11	111:16	73:7
SPOT 35:9	31:16 52:13,18	STATEMENTS	STUFF 24:13	SUGGESTION
SPREADING	53:21 60:5	9:14 25:17	50:19 55:25	92:1
16:20 SPRING 14:10	65:21 73:11	27:6,6,22	86:9	SUITE 2:14,20
SPRING 14:10	85:5 91:3,6	59:14 70:21	STUPID 43:10	SUM 39:21
SQUARE 92:9	94:10 96:5	72:26 73:1,9	SUB 106:10	SUMMARIZE
SS 115:3	97:15,24	75:1 79:3	SUBJECT 17:3	49:17
STACK 21:6	100:25 101:11	85:20 89:6	27:9,13 102:1	SUMMED
82:10 83:18 STAFF 20:22	115:3,7 STATED 22:5	90:7 99:1	108:3,15	70:26
STAFF 20:22	STATED 33:5	101:26 113:1	110:20	SUPERIOR 1:1
	ı	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

				rage 21
SUPERVISED	109:2	TEM 115:18	104:20	112:9
66:4	107.2	TEMPORE	TETE-A-TETE	THEME 86:4
SUPERVISION	T	1:26 115:7	33:17	87:15
63:9	T 3:1 4:1	TERM 63:2,5	TEXT 38:14	THESIS 10:8,11
SUPPLIED	TAKE 19:25	102:4	THANG 1:8 5:6	61:23 62:1,8
57:18	22:1 45:11	TERMS 5:21	8:3 10:16,25	62:10,16,19
SUPPORT	49:15 56:21	77:3 78:14	11:7,13,17,18	65:22,24,26
28:10 31:9	62:14 65:11	79:1 98:4	11:22 12:17	66:2,9,10,13
34:7 36:8	66:14 74:22	103:21,24	13:20 14:2,8	66:24 67:4,19
49:22,25 60:6	75:7 82:14	104:24 105:10	14:20,25 16:2	70:8,9 82:22
60:9 67:11	88:8 90:4,16	106:7 107:14	16:21,24 20:19	84:9 85:20
71:5 85:10	103:25,26	109:23 110:11	24:22 25:10,24	86:9,13 100:17
88:25 89:5,11	104:5,6,18	111:13 113:6	26:6,10,14,18	100:25,26
94:4 96:24	105:17,17,22	TEST 90:22	27:9,15,26	101:8 102:18
102:12	TAKEN 41:8	TEST 50.22	28:19 31:5,14	102:19
SUPPORTED	61:22 113:18	39:25 51:24	32:14,18 33:5	THICKHEA
34:5 81:16,18	TAKES 93:2	54:5 55:2 68:4	33:17 34:17	28:20
81:19 92:22	TALK 17:14	70:16 72:13	35:16 36:5	THING 12:13
SUPPORTING	29:10 50:7	79:15 84:15	39:8 40:4	19:7,13 26:21
49:18	108:14	91:23 95:3	42:24 44:7	34:26 43:25
SUPPORTS	TALKED 112:1	100:6	48:12 49:17	56:15 57:4
33:23	TALKING 7:9	TESTIFIES	50:2 51:16,24	59:6 60:12
SUPPOSE	15:6 27:16,16	83:23 84:23	57:1 59:18,23	65:10 73:18
62:23	34:16 54:18	TESTIFY 37:21	60:20 61:2	74:15 78:1
SUPPOSED	68:9 77:25	54:22 55:14	71:10,11 72:21	83:22,23 93:7
23:6	79:16,17,26	60:20	74:7 76:6 88:2	93:24 104:24
SUPPOSEDLY	82:20 108:6,6	TESTIFYING	88:7,7 89:6	108:10
18:16 35:7	TALKS 39:14	92:3	91:21 92:2	THINGS 6:10
97:12	84:2 96:26	TESTIMONI	95:8 98:8	6:13 10:6
SURE 6:4 28:1	TARGETS	85:9	101:14,22	13:13 16:17
85:6 106:25	17:26 44:9	TESTIMONY	101.14,22	18:4 22:2
108:23 109:16	TARMAC	10:15 11:11,21	THANG'S 54:7	23:18 30:16
109:22 110:2	62:11 65:26	12:5,8 13:12	94:20	31:17 37:23
111:3,7 113:24	84:10	20:3 22:23,25	THANK 5:15	38:9 40:17
113:26	TAUGHT 22:11	23:8,26 30:14	6:8,26 7:22	44:18 47:22
SURGERY	TEACHER	38:23 40:6	9:18 41:21	48:8 49:7 50:4
38:24 69:16,20	101:5	54:7,26 55:6	45:5,8,9,14	53:5 55:2 56:1
69:23 70:3,4	TELEPHONE	56:23 57:9	46:12,15 47:19	56:3,12,17,20
92:14	17:9 60:15	58:6 60:10	47:20,21 74:19	57:8 58:2,18
SUSPEND	88:11	61:1,2,6,12,16	74:20,75:1,11	58:21 59:2
96:20	TELL 20:20	61:20 62:4	77:14,22 93:1	63:4 64:21,22
SWEAR 29:6	32:8 33:9	64:5,16 65:16	93:19,20,23	68:1,23 72:25
SWORN 105:22	35:20 41:23	67:1 69:19	98:6 103:2,3	73:1 78:14
105:23	48:5 51:5 71:2	70:17 79:6	108:24 109:9	81:4 85:24
SYMBOL 30:6	81:25 95:24	80:4,6 81:22	108.24 109.9	87:9 89:8,10
SYMPATHIES	100:2 102:17	82:8,12 83:18	114:3	89:19 94:5
95:19	102:17	86:25 90:10	THANKFUL	98:3 99:20
SYMPTOMS	TELLING	92:18 93:7	109:7	103:5,20
70:26	20:25 23:22	95:1,2 99:20	THANKS 72:9	109:25
SYSTEM 109:1	24:1 28:19	100:11 104:14	THANKSGIV	THINK 7:18
SISIEMI 107.1		100.11 107.17		1 1111 11X / . 10
		•	•	•

	•		•	
20:13 33:2	105:2,11,14,21	64:12 69:3	TRUTHFUL	15:20
35:2 38:8	106:11,16	81:7 100:13	102:26	UNDERNEA
41:14 46:7,8	109:9 110:7	107:7 110:10	TRY 38:7 42:4	21:9
55:16 57:26	111:1,21 112:7	111:14,16	50:1,2 70:5	UNDERSTA
58:23,24,26	112:19,22,23	113:10	82:16 87:16	12:9 20:3 25:9
66:16 67:16	113:4	TRIALS 29:23	110:7	27:6,12,21
70:4 76:12	TIMELINE	29:25	TRYING 11:22	33:3 34:8 48:9
78:14 83:12	56:7 87:8 88:9	TRIES 26:10	25:1 45:26	63:13,16,18,19
92:2,6,7	88:10	TROUBLING	49:4 68:23	63:21,22 68:17
102:16 109:21	TIMES 28:20	79:13	76:26 113:16	UNDERSTA
113:4	35:3 38:10	TRUE 9:22 10:3	TUESDAY 1:17	27:11,12
THINKING	65:2	10:4,4,5,5,6,11	3:2 4:2 5:1	UNDERSTO
54:4	TINY 8:9	10:13 11:23	76:1 107:16	65:2
THIRD 71:10	TIRED 38:9	12:18,20 17:19	TURN 97:19	UNDISPUTED
95:14	69:2,3	19:4 20:6,12	112:4,14,25	55:18
THOUGHT	TITLE 86:24	20:14,26 23:16	TWO 10:10	UNFOLD 7:15
38:13 58:7	TODAY 8:6	28:10,18,22	15:6 30:16	UNFORTUN
70:26 111:8	33:9 35:20	29:8,8,17,17	32:26 33:6,10	13:7
112:26	103:22	29:20,20,26	34:8 35:17	UNITED 17:11
THOUSANDS	TOLD 15:3	30:1,2,4,5,7,21	49:21 52:10	60:17
94:1,8	17:16,20 32:25	30:21,23,24	56:8,24 59:11	UNIVERSITY
THREE 8:13	36:6 48:2 52:3	31:3,4,18 32:7	60:6 64:16	22:10 43:11
18:24 31:17	65:23 71:2,7	32:24 33:11,13	73:23 76:21	101:6
39:22 77:22	93:10 110:22	33:16 34:15,19	78:11,12 87:23	UNJUST 43:21
103:11 109:25	TOMORROW	35:21,22 36:2	88:20 90:17	UNJUSTLY
110:1 112:18	107:13 112:14	37:13,14 42:25	91:1 93:25	93:18
THREW 44:7	112:16,17	49:2 50:16,22	95:9 98:3	UNLAWFUL
44:24	TOP 83:1,9	52:1,3,3 54:3	106:6 107:24	55:1,14 64:25
THROW 87:17	84:13,20 95:22	55:3 62:8	112:18 113:2	65:4,8 90:11
87:18,22,26	TOPICS 7:6	65:24 71:7	TWO-PAGE	90:14
THROWING	TOTAL 14:18	81:16 85:12	94:14,17	UNNAMED
13:8 87:13,21	TOTALITY	86:12 90:7	TYPE 38:15	18:16 35:6
THROWN	74:11	91:7,14,15	TYPEWRITER	97:12
107:26	TOUCHED	96:8,9 100:21	62:15	UNREASON
THURSDAY	109:21	102:10,11,23	TYPING 38:10	62:18
20:19 107:16	TRACK 103:16	115:9,10	TYPO 76:6	UNREFUTED
112:9,11	103:19	TRUST 44:6		61:6
TIME 7:9 33:10	TRAFFIC	TRUSTED 24:7	U V C 21 21 20 4	UNRING 19:18
38:7,25 39:26	111:23	TRUTH 12:26	U.S 21:21 39:4	19:21 20:1
45:4,5,12	TRANSCRIPT	14:21 31:9,23	41:10 95:26	36:23 40:15
46:10 47:10,21	1:16 20:18	32:22 34:10,10	ULTIMATELY	41:22 43:26
47:23,23 54:1	22:25 64:17,20	35:2,11,14	6:22 59:14	45:6 58:25
58:6 61:3,15	115:9,10	40:22,23 42:26	69:12 101:12	59:17,19,21,22
62:14 63:10	TRANSITION	51:18 81:25	UNANSWER	59:23 64:19
65:13,13 67:10	9:2	89:1,7 91:25	56:25	93:15 103:2
69:17,21 72:12	TRAP 15:2	93:10 102:1	UNCONTRO	UNRINGING
74:22 75:1	TRIAL 9:8,21	TRUTH-STR	72:16	58:22
77:15 86:2	12:10,13,17	102:8	UNCOVERED	UNRUNG 41:22
88:24 93:2	14:16 20:26	TRUTHFUL	79:13	UNSOLICIT
102:4 104:19	31:14 49:16	63:19,25 66:22	UNDERMINE	56:10 71:22,24
	I		I	I

				rage 25
77:26	6:17	103:19 108:19	31:11 36:26	29:19 50:9,17
UNSUPPORT	VERSIONS	VOTED 103:18	37:25 56:19	51:16
33:2	5:19	VOTES 103:16	58:25 64:18	WELCOME
UNSUSPEND	VERSUS 30:4	VOTES 103.10 VOTING 41:26	71:22 76:16	47:7 77:14
96:21 102:13	31:26 61:18	VS 1:7	80:14 87:5	WENT 12:10,14
103:1	98:4	V S 1.7	95:19 102:6	58:2 63:9 88:6
UNTRUE 49:1	VETOED 19:10	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	107:8 110:13	102:9
90:9	101:12	W 3:1	WAYS 74:8	WEREN'T
UPSET 58:9	VICE 22:10	WAIT 14:11	WE'LL 7:15 8:7	64:22 71:3
URGENT 110:3	VIDEO 14:5	50:24 64:6	8:8,10,13,26	WHATSOEV
USE 16:15	49:24 56:10,14	WAITING	9:3 13:1 45:12	71:25 74:16
53:12 63:2	56:19,26 57:3	104:23	46:14,23 47:12	WHICHEVER
96:22 103:18	71:26 72:9	WAIVED 8:23	47:15 74:26	107:21 113:26
104:16 107:18	87:18 101:15	110:23	75:7,8 76:5,12	WHITE 76:13
111:15 112:22	101:17,20,21	WALK 109:16	76:15 77:6,7	76:14
USEFUL 22:8	VIETNAM	WALKING	77:18,19	WHITEBOA
USEF CE 22.0	22:11 41:10	102:15	103:11,22	9:20 16:3,25
$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	66:20 95:15	WANT 17:3	105:21 106:25	31:10 68:6
V 5:6 8:3 76:5	VIETNAMESE	22:12,24,24	107:5,13,16	WIESEL 40:8
VAGUELY	39:3 41:13,15	23:18 40:21	109:13 110:2	WILLFUL
10:5 33:12	49:18,19 55:24	49:6 58:26	114:1	42:22 43:2
VALOR 15:22	60:11,22 61:3	59:17,18,18	WE'RE 7:8,10	WILLING
VALUE 39:25	61:9 72:2	64:19 78:1,14	7:16,17 8:2,20	109:5
40:10 41:1	79:17 92:25	82:24 83:20,21	12:7,15,17	WINKLE 68:25
VAN 2:5 68:25	95:18,19	83:22 86:21	16:14 19:19	WISHES 35:22
VARIETY	VIETNAMES	89:13 93:1,14	20:2 27:20	40:7
84:24	17:10 60:16	99:1 100:14	34:16 66:15	WITHDRAW
VARIOUS	VILE 44:3 73:4	105:12,13,15	70:5 73:17	49:10 59:13
65:14	VISIT 21:5	108:24 110:25	74:23,23 83:15	97:15
VENTILATOR	VOSS 2:12,13	111:5 112:26	96:7,10 103:5	WITNESS 13:4
69:18	5:11,11,12 6:7	WANTED	106:16 107:15	13:18 16:13
VERDICT 5:20	7:2 24:21 26:8	13:14 19:6	109:22 110:24	24:5 29:4 40:5
6:9,12,25 7:4	37:22 45:2,25	39:2,4 58:17	112:5,6	42:7 58:1
10:2 11:6	45:26 46:4,12	62:4 93:15	WE'VE 20:17	71:10
19:26 20:4	46:21,25 47:2	102:17	21:1 30:12	WITNESSES
25:15 27:3	47:3,18,19	WANTS 37:8	31:17 36:8	54:19 55:20
32:10 68:18	51:4 64:5,15	53:18	50:4 62:6 72:2	71:14 81:3
73:25 76:6	74:20 75:8	WASN'T 12:1	93:4,8 96:13	WOES 50:3
89:14 90:15	76:10,19,21,23	28:21 35:8	102:12 105:1	WONDERFUL
92:11 102:15	76:26 77:16,18	42:25 49:8,9	WEBSITE 11:2	108:25 109:2
103:13,20	77:21,22 93:20	54:23 56:4	26:2	109:17
104:25,26	93:25 94:4	60:1,23,24	WEDNESDAY	WORD 21:22
105:1,3,5,7,11	96:8 97:26	61:23 63:25	107:16	40:26 61:1
105:12 107:11	99:15,22 100:7	86:7 88:15	WEEK 5:23	93:21
107:12,25	100:19 102:9	96:1 102:10,11	6:10 8:5 12:22	WORDS 49:22
109:25 110:13	102:22 111:20	102:24	13:21 112:1,9	49:23 51:6
110:17,19	111:23 113:14	WATER 80:7	112:10	53:5 54:17,18
112:2,21	113:23	84:23	WEIGH 29:9	62:7 67:25
VERSE 71:16	VOSS' 47:10	WAY 2:14	30:5,16 81:3	71:5 72:14
VERSION 5:22	VOTE 103:14	16:13 19:21	WEIGHING	88:23 92:3

				-) -
96:22 97:11	72:1 79:18,22	92:15	1990'S 14:20	97:1
WORK 12:8	80:12 87:23	YOUTUBE	1996 15:26	237 14:13 40:25
14:7 19:8	88:23	56:10		238 14:14 15:17
		30:10	22:15 34:5,6	
24:21 31:20	WRONG 6:15	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	34:14 66:14	26:3 97:19
36:13 41:14	20:5 48:17,18		78:3 79:8,19	238-7 52:6
69:4 72:1,10	48:19,20,22	0	79:22 80:15	25 10:21 14:19
86:2 102:19,23	49:10 57:6		88:11 89:2,22	15:17
109:1,4	65:25 72:21	1	2	25TH 11:2
WORKED	86:3,3,4 89:11	1 1:8 11:7 25:16		14:14 26:1
62:20	90:3 93:10	26:22,25,26	2 27:1,5,19	27TH 56:8
WORKING	WRONGED	82:23,25 84:12	78:10,12,13	2ND 15:15,26
62:17,20,21,23	59:8,9	99:11	80:16 84:5	20:17,21 31:5
62:24 66:13,17	WROTE 16:2	1,400 95:24	88:13 99:13	31:8 33:21
86:11 102:18	16:25 33:7,10	1:30 74:26 104:4	112:21 113:3,6	34:5 43:7
WORKS 44:14	34:14,17,20	100 1:8 100:21	113:13	95:11
71:12	35:18 36:7	100 1.8 100.21 10TH 88:17	20 37:22 77:5	
WORSE 7:11	40:26 42:26		20,000 14:6	3
WORSENING	43:1,8 49:11	11-14 22:25	200 29:13 50:11	3 27:20,20 76:7
70:25	49:11,12 51:26	11:05 46:14	201 50:12	76:8
WORTH 40:13	54:4 56:8,24	11:50 46:7,23	2017 69:17	3:30 105:8,9
41:20	59:1,16 62:7	11:55 46:6	92:15	111:23
WOULDN'T	69:12 70:24	11TH 107:21	2019 14:1,2,9,19	3:40 105:9
54:22 61:22	80:11	12 46:2 105:25	37:9 44:24	30 34:6,14,19
63:25 87:3,6		105:26 106:5	101:20,21	77:5 97:1
113:2	X	12:00 104:4	2020 10:21	30-2021-1201
WOW 71:26	X 3:1 4:1	12TH 64:16	14:10 48:21	1:7
72:7,8	XUAN 1:5 25:17	13 103:13	56:2,9 70:18	30TH 15:15
WRAP 7:11	27:7,22 31:21	14- 36:17	71:22 101:20	16:23 20:17
74:26 75:8	37:19 39:15,19	15 22:11 110:5	2022 70:15	33:26 34:16
WRAP-UP 7:19	42:10 43:21	110:10,23	2023 70:17	35:10,11 43:7
WRAPPED 8:5	44:13 51:14	111:21	2024 1:17 3:2	95:10
WRAPPING	64:16 74:5	15-MINUTE	4:2 5:1 76:1	36 56:16 62:17
8:9	78:26 80:18	110:20	115:13	66:16,18 72:11
WRITE 27:23	83:8 84:1 85:1	17 14:1	203 11:20	72:11 78:4
39:2,4,7,24	91:17 96:14	1700 5:22 39:13	2100 2:20	86:1
	99:11,25	39:13 51:8,9	212 21:14 83:14	3703 10:23
40:23 49:8,9	77.11,23	51:11	83:15,25,26	39 113:8,8
59:13 80:11	<u> </u>	18 88:17	84:4 94:16,17	3948 42:13 73:4
88:21 92:17	YAP 91:7	18- 14:6	22 56:8	3740 42.13 73.4
93:11 97:23	YEAH 38:9	18,000 36:17	221 99:8,23	4
101:25 104:16	58:10 60:20	19 1:17 3:2 4:2	100:15	4 30:25 51:12
WRITES 14:23	61:24 72:2,11	5:1 67:8 76:1	221-4 82:25	73:25 76:8
54:6 73:18	YEARS 14:19	1960 62:19 66:9		83:5 90:18
88:20 98:8	22:11 38:25	1975 62:8,21	221-5 82:15,17	99:26
WRITING 33:1	55:25 56:16	66:3 67:9	232 15:25	4:05 105:1,13
38:12 52:1	62:17,24 66:16	1986 48:19	233 15:25 31:8	4:15-ISH 106:17
53:23 60:7	66:18 70:15,19	55:25 56:2	33:21,22 78:9	4:15-15H 100.17 415ISH 103:23
74:8 89:11	70:20,23 72:11	57:4 60:9	91:11 95:8	42 69:3
92:13,14 93:12	70:20,23 72:11	71:17 72:11	96:7	42 69:3 4640 2:14
97:22 98:25		78:2 88:9	234 16:23 52:25	
WRITTEN 63:3	86:1 89:2	70.2 00.7	53:1 91:11,11	49 113:8
	l			l

				Page 25
	1	I	I	I
5	96 13:26 15:13			
5 6:15 18:7	17:8 21:3			
31:21 32:10	35:13 60:14			
34:3 35:6 36:3	78:6			
53:8 82:25				
91:17 97:2				
50 62:24				
30 02.24				
6				
66:15 80:15				
88:13				
60 7:14				
61 99:13				
62 69:3				
675670 2:6				
6TH 16:16				
18:18 80:17,18				
7				
7 6:20 22:26				
41:25 82:18				
97:19 100:15				
71 45:22				
7TH 20:19				
8				
8 41:25				
8,000 36:19 80'S 22:7				
800 2:14				
801 2:20				
8226 1:25 115:6				
115:17				
86 78:7 89:3				
9				
97:10 22:26				
106:16				
9:15 111:20				
90 24:23				
90 24:23 90'S 22:7				
90017 2:21				
90292-6602 2:15				
90S 14:8 28:23				
92067 2:7				
93 70:20 92:17				
93-YEAR-OLD				
55:22 71:9				
93-YEAR-OL				
37:1				