| | Page 1 | | Page 2 |
|--|--|--|--|
| | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | 1 | APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: |
| | COUNTY OF ORANGE - CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER | 2 | |
| | DEPARTMENT C23 | 3 | FOR PLAINTIFF: |
| | LE XUAN KHOA,) | 4 | HOYT E. HART, II, ATTORNEY AT LAW |
| |) | 5 | VAN NGUYEN, LAW STUDENT |
| | PLAINTIFF,) | 6 | P.O. BOX 675670 |
| | VS.) NO. 30-2021-1201012 | 7 | RANCHO SANTA FE, CA 92067 |
| |) | 8 | HOYTH@PRODIGY.NET |
| | NGUYEN DINH THANG; BOAT PEOPLE S.O.S.,) | 9 | |
| | INC., AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100,) TRIAL TESTIMONY OF | 10 | |
| | INCLUSIVE,) NGUYEN DINH THANG | 11 | FOR DEFENDANTS: |
| | DEFENDANTS.) | 12 | DAVID C. VOSS, ESQ. |
| |) | 13 | VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, LLP |
| | | 14 | 4640 ADMIRALTY WAY, SUITE 800 |
| | | 15 | MARINA DEL REY, CA 90292-6602 |
| | | 16 | DAVE@VSBLLP.COM |
| | HONORABLE DAVID J. HESSELTINE, JUDGE PRESIDING | 17 | -AND- |
| | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT | 18 | STEPHEN J. ERIGERO, ESQ. |
| | THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 | 19 | ROPERS MAJESKI PC |
| | | 20 | 801 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 2100 |
| | | 22 | LOS ANGELES, CA 90017 STEPHEN.ERIGERO@ROPERS.COM |
| | | 23 | STEFHEN.ERIGERO@ROFERS.COM |
| | | 24 | |
| | | 25 | |
| | MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR 8226 | 26 | |
| | COURT-APPROVED OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE | | |
| | | | |
| | Page 3 | | Page 4 |
| 1 | Page 3 SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 | 1 | Page 4 MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 | | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURT'S |
| 2 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG | 2 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. |
| 2 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** | 2 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. |
| 2 3 4 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF | 2 3 4 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURT'S ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR |
| 2 3 4 5 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) | 2 3 4 5 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. |
| 2 3 4 5 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO | 2 3 4 5 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE – |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE | 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE – MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN – THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE – MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN – THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: FM CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: FM GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ****** (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED . 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WERE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE - MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WERE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANTS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN THE COURT: PM CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: PM GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANTS TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANTS TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN WE'LL SEE WHERE WE'RE AT. AFTER THAT, WE'LL PROBABLY TAKE A | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME BACK AND THANK YOU YET AGAIN. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANTS TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN WE'LL SEE WHERE WE'RE AT. AFTER THAT, WE'LL PROBABLY TAKE A BREAK SO THAT I CAN READ THE FINISH LOOKING AT THE BRIEF | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME BACK AND THANK YOU YET AGAIN. COUNSEL, FEEL FREE TO SIT DOWN. WE'RE GOING TO |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN WE'LL SEE WHERE WE'RE AT. AFTER THAT, WE'LL PROBABLY TAKE A BREAK SO THAT I CAN READ THE FINISH LOOKING AT THE BRIEF THAT PLAINTIFF SUBMITTED YESTERDAY. AND THEN WE'LL LIKELY | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE — MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN — THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME BACK AND THANK YOU YET AGAIN. COUNSEL, FEEL FREE TO SIT DOWN. WERE GOING TO RESUME. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024 TRIAL TESTIMONY OF NGUYEN DINH THANG ******* (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD OUTSIDE THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. GO AHEAD AND GO ON THE RECORD IN KHOA V. THANG. IF WE COULD PLEASE HAVE THE APPEARANCES TODAY. MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HOYT HART FOR THE PLAINTIFF, LE XUAN KHOA. MR. VOSS: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, DAVID VOSS, VOSS, SILVERMAN & BRAYBROOKE, ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. MR. ERIGERO: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. STEPHEN ERIGERO, ROPERS MAJESKI, ALSO ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS. THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ALL RIGHT. SO WE HAVE ALL COUNSEL AND THE PARTIES PRESENT. SO WE'RE CHECKING IN THE JURORS. SO WE WERE TALKING END OF THE DAY YESTERDAY, WE'RE IN THE HOUR-ISH BETWEEN WHAT'S LEFT WITH DEFENDANT'S TESTIMONY, BETWEEN THE CROSS AND THEN ANY REDIRECT. AND THEN WE'LL SEE WHERE WE'RE AT. AFTER THAT, WE'LL PROBABLY TAKE A BREAK SO THAT I CAN READ THE FINISH LOOKING AT THE BRIEF THAT PLAINTIFF SUBMITTED YESTERDAY. AND THEN WE'LL LIKELY SPEND THE AFTERNOON TRYING TO FINALIZE ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, JUST FOR THE COURTS ATTENTION, WE HAVE FILED A RESPONSE TO THAT BRIEF. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. VOSS: BUT WE DON'T HAVE PAPER COPIES BECAUSE OUR ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE IS BRINGING THEM. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE - MR. VOSS: JUST SO YOU KNOW IT'S IN THE COURT: I'M CHECKING TO SEE NOW, IS IT IN THE REGISTER OF ACTION, OR IS IT IN THE PENDING QUEUE? MR. VOSS: I'M GUESSING IT'S PENDING. MR. HART: ARE 236 AND 237 ADMITTED? AND 238 IS ADMITTED? THE COURT: 236 IS ADMITTED. 237 IS NOT. THE CLERK: 237 WAS ADMITTED 11/12. 236 HAS NOT BEEN ADMITTED. MR. HART: BUT 238? THE COURT: 238 HAS BEEN ADMITTED. (THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT IN THE PRESENCE OF THE JURY:) THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME BACK AND THANK YOU YET AGAIN. COUNSEL, FEEL FREE TO SIT DOWN. WE'RE GOING TO RESUME. DR. THANG, IF YOU WANT TO RETURN TO THE WITNESS |

| | Page 5 | | Page 6 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | THAT OPPORTUNITY TO SETTLE IN THERE, AND THEN WE'LL START WITH | 1 | THAT HE WROTE? |
| 2 | MR. HART'S QUESTIONING IN JUST A MOMENT. | 2 | A IN MY LATER ARTICLE. |
| 3 | CROSS-EXAMINATION RESUMED | 3 | Q NO. I'M JUST SAYING, AS YOU'RE READING, IN |
| 4 | BY MR. HART: | 4 | YOUR MIND, YOU DISAGREE WITH SOME OF THE THINGS HE'S |
| 5 | Q GOOD MORNING, DR. THANG. | 5 | A OH, YES, IN IN HERE, I SAID, MY GOSH |
| 6 | A GOOD MORNING. | 6 | Q JUST A YES OR NO, PLEASE. |
| 7 | Q THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE TODAY. | 7 | A YES. |
| 8 | IF YOU TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT 237, PLEASE. | 8 | Q OKAY. AND SO YOU TOLD US YESTERDAY THAT YOU |
| 9 | A YES. | 9 | DECIDED TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? |
| 10 | Q REMIND THE JURY WHAT EXHIBIT 237 IS, PLEASE. | 10 | A CORRECT. |
| 11 | A 237 IS THE PLAINTIFF ARTICLE DATED MAY 22ND, | 11 | Q AND THAT'S WHY YOU WROTE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 |
| 12 | 2020, PUBLISHED ON S.B.T.N. | 12 | ARTICLE? |
| 13 | Q OKAY. WHAT WAS THE DATE AGAIN? | 13 | A THAT'S CORRECT. |
| 14 | A MAY 22, 2020. | 14 | Q AND THAT'S THE NEXT IN ORDER, EXHIBIT 238; IS |
| 15 | Q 22ND? | 15 | THAT RIGHT? |
| 16 | A YES. | 16 | A THAT'S RIGHT. |
| 17 | Q OKAY. YOU READ THIS ARTICLE AT OR ABOUT THE | 17 | Q NOW, YOUR MAY 25, 2020 ARTICLE SETTING THE |
| 18 | TIME IT WAS PUBLISHED? | 18 | RECORD STRAIGHT ABOUT R.O.V.R.? |
| 19 | A YES. | 19 | A HOW IT CAME ABOUT, YES. |
| 20 | Q AND FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE, THIS ARTICLE | 20 | O SOMETHING THAT WAS REALLY RELEVANT BACK IN THE |
| 21 | AUTHORED BY PROFESSOR KHOA TAKES ISSUE WITH SOME OF THE THINGS | 21 | 908? |
| 22 | THAT APPEARED IN THE DECEMBER 25, 2019 POSTING ON MACH SONG | 22 | A CORRECT. |
| 23 | MEDIA? | 23 | O OKAY. IN YOUR ARTICLE SETTING THE REPORT |
| 24 | A ITHINK SO. | 24 | STRAIGHT ABOUT R.O.V.R. IN THE '90S, YOU INCLUDED THIS |
| 25 | Q OKAY. AND SOME OF THE THINGS HE WROTE IN THERE | 25 | STATEMENT THAT'S WRITTEN ON THE BOARD, ON THE WHITEBOARD, |
| 26 | YOU TOOK ISSUE WITH; CORRECT? YOU DISPUTED SOME OF THE THINGS | 26 | DIDN'T YOU? |
| | The Took Isoch with, colded. The Bistonia Sould of the History | 20 | DIDAT FOO: |
| | Daga 7 | 1 | _ |
| | Page 7 | | Page 8 |
| 1 | A YES. | 1 | Page 8 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| _ | A YES. | | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE |
| 2 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A | 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. |
| 2 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE | 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. |
| 2 3 4 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." | 2 3 4 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I |
| 2 3 4 5 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; | 2 3 4 5 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. |
| 2 3 4 5 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? | 2 3 4 5 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY – AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED – THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90'S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LETS WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 1995, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 1995, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE HOUSE. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE IT WAS. IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. Q OKAY. SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT |
| 2 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 1995, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE HOUSE. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE IT WAS. IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE, PASSED THE SENATE, PASSED THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. Q OKAY. SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT INFORMATION IN YOUR ARTICLE? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE '90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 199S, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE HOUSE. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE IT WAS. IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE, PASSED THE SENATE, PASSED THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO CHAMBERS, AND IT WAS ABOUT TO BE SIGNED INTO LAW BY CLINTON. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. Q OKAY. SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT INFORMATION IN YOUR ARTICLE? A YES. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 1995, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE HOUSE. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE IT WAS. IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE, PASSED THE SENATE, PASSED THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO CHAMBERS, AND IT WAS ABOUT TO BE SIGNED INTO LAW BY CLINTON. AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONTINUE TO OPPOSE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY LINTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. Q OKAY. SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT INFORMATION IN YOUR ARTICLE? A YES. Q HOW DOES THIS SENTENCE CONTRIBUTE TO THAT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A YES. Q "MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. THAT IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE." THAT WAS INCLUDED IN YOUR MAY 25TH ARTICLE; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q CAN YOU TELL US HOW THIS STATEMENT RELATES IN ANY WAY TO WHAT DID OR DIDN'T HAPPEN IN THE 90S ABOUT R.O.V.R.? HOW DOES THIS HELP YOU SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT? A VERY MUCH. BECAUSE AS I EXPLAINED BRIEFLY YESTERDAY — AND YOU ALSO ACKNOWLEDGED — THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND YOUR CLIENT OPPOSED THE LEGISLATION AUTHORED BY CONGRESSMAN CHRISTOPHER SMITH, WHICH WAS ALSO KNOW AS THE ANTI-CPA — "CPA" STANDS FOR "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION" — UNDER WHICH TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE WOULD BE FORCIBLY REPATRIATED TO VIETNAM. SO THEY CONTINUED TO OPPOSE THAT LEGISLATION FROM ITS INCEPTION IN MARCH 1995, ALL THE WAY TO THE WHITE HOUSE. BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE IT WAS. IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE, PASSED THE SENATE, PASSED THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO CHAMBERS, AND IT WAS ABOUT TO BE SIGNED INTO LAW BY CLINTON. AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONTINUE TO OPPOSE IT, WITH MR. KHOA, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, AFTER APRIL 30, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. LET HIM FINISH THE QUESTION, PLEASE. THE COURT: WAIT A MINUTE. IF CAN I SEE THAT QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I WANT TO DOUBLE-CHECK. ALL RIGHT. YOU CAN CONTINUE, BUT LET'S WRAP THIS UP. THE SAME ADMONITION APPLIES ACROSS THE BOARD, TO MAKE SURE AND ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT'S BEING POSED. THE WITNESS: YES. I'LL ANSWER THE QUESTION. SO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUST THE FOLLOWING WEEK, DROPPED ITS OPPOSITION. BY MR. HART: Q I'M REALLY SORRY I INTERRUPTED THAT, BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY INTERESTING ANSWER. DIDN'T YOU WRITE IN THE ARTICLE ALL OF THOSE DETAILS YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A IF YOU GO DOWN TO THE FOLLOWING Q EASY QUESTION. A YES, I DID. YEAH. Q OKAY. SO YOU'VE ALREADY GOT ALL OF THAT INFORMATION IN YOUR ARTICLE? A YES. Q HOW DOES THIS SENTENCE CONTRIBUTE TO THAT? A IT EXPLAIN WHY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE SUDDENLY |

| | Page 9 | | Page 10 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | BE R.O.V.R. | 1 | BY MR. HART: |
| 2 | Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT BECAUSE THERE WAS THIS | 2 | Q DO YOU BELIEVE IN THE CONVENTION THAT WE HOLD |
| 3 | CLAIM ABOUT A FALSIFIED APPLICATION, THAT SUDDENLY PEOPLE'S | 3 | DEAR HERE IN AMERICA THAT YOU ARE INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN |
| 4 | POLITICAL ATTITUDES CHANGED? | 4 | GUILTY? |
| 5 | A YES. BECAUSE MR. KHOA WAS USED BY DEPARTMENT | 5 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. ARGUMENTATIVE. |
| 6 | OF STATE, AS HIS TESTIMONY, TO OPPOSE THE BILL. | 6 | BEYOND THE SCOPE. |
| 7 | Q SO WHAT YOU'RE TELLING US IS, THE PEOPLE ON THE | 7 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. |
| 8 | OTHER SIDE OF THAT ARGUMENT USED THIS CLAIM AGAINST MR. KHOA | 8 | THE WITNESS: YES. |
| 9 | TO NEUTRALIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE? | 9 | BY MR. HART: |
| 10 | A THEY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE REALIZE THAT | 10 | Q WHEN WAS MR. KHOA EVER PROVEN GUILTY OF THIS |
| 11 | THEIR WITNESS WAS NO LONGER CREDIBLE, BECAUSE SOMEONE WHO | 11 | CHARGE THAT YOU PUBLISHED? |
| 12 | MISREPRESENTED HIS ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS CANNOT BE TRUSTED ON | 12 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. THAT IS NOT |
| 13 | ANY MATTER OF POLICY. | 13 | RELEVANT. 352. |
| 14 | Q OKAY. THANK YOU FOR CLEARING THAT UP. | 14 | MAY WE APPROACH? |
| 15 | AS YOU SIT HERE TODAY, YOU CANNOT PROVE THE | 15 | THE COURT: NO. OVERRULED. |
| 16 | TRUTH OF THIS STATEMENT, CAN YOU? | 16 | THE WITNESS: IT DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING THAT MR. KHOA |
| 17 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. | 17 | WAS GUILTY. IT ONLY PRESENTED TWO FACTS. ONE IS THAT HE |
| 18 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 18 | MISREPRESENTED HIS ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS, WHICH HAS BEEN |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: I CAN CERTIFY THAT THIS WAS | 19 | ESTABLISHED THROUGH THE INVESTIGATION BY MR. DORNAN. |
| 20 | WHAT PARAPHRASING WHAT THE CONGRESSMAN DORNAN WROTE. | 20 | THE OTHER FACT IS THAT MISREPRESENTATION OF |
| 21 | MR. HART: BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT I'M ASKING. | 21 | CREDENTIALS OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENTS OF CLAIMS IN ORDER |
| 22 | MOVE TO STRIKE AS NONRESPONSIVE. | 22 | TO OBTAIN FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. |
| 23 | THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. | 23 | BY MR. HART: |
| 24 | IF YOU'RE GOING TO MAKE A MOTION, YOU HAVE TO | 24 | Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT WHAT DORNAN DID WAS GATHER |
| 25 | GIVE ME AND OPPORTUNITY TO RULE UPON IT. | 25 | MATERIALS TO DISPARAGE A POLITICAL OPPONENT? |
| 26 | DENIED. | 26 | A NO. |
| | Dec:- 11 | | |
| | Page 11 | | Page 12 |
| 1 | Page 11 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. | 1 | Page 12 GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. | | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT |
| 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: | 2 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF |
| 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION | 2 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS |
| 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. | 2 3 4 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. |
| 2 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. | 2 3 4 5 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. | 2 3 4 5 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I— THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU - AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I— THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? A NO, I — | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? A NO, I — MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? A NO, I — MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. THE COURT: CONTINUE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I- THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. MY QUESTION WAS — |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? A NO, I — MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. THE COURT: CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: I KNOW FOR SURE, AS A FACT, THAT THIS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I- THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. MY QUESTION WAS A I DON'T REMEMBER WHICH FEDERAL AGENCIES THEY |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. BY MR. HART: Q THERE WAS NO INVESTIGATION — THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. HART: SORRY, JUDGE. THE COURT: SPEAK UP A LITTLE LOUDER. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU HAVE ANY STATE DEPARTMENT DOCUMENT FINDING THAT THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE? A I WAS NOT INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE, SO I DIDN'T LOOK FOR IT. AND AS I EXPLAINED, RIGHT THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE STATE DEPARTMENT STARTED TO COLLABORATE. SO I SPENT ALL MY TIME WORKING WITH CONGRESSMAN SMITH OFFICE TO CREATE THAT NEW PROGRAM TO HELP SAVE TENS OF THOUSAND OF BOAT PEOPLE. Q ARE YOU TELLING US THAT YOU — AT THE TIME YOU PUBLISHED THIS STATEMENT, OR EVEN BACK IN THE '90S, AT NO TIME WERE YOU EVER REALLY CONCERNED WITH WHETHER WHAT THIS STATEMENT SAYS WAS TRUE OR NOT? YOU DIDN'T CARE IF IT WAS TRUE? A NO, I — MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. THE COURT: CONTINUE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | GENERAL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I KNOW FOR SURE THAT MISREPRESENTING ONESELF OR PRESENTING FALSE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS IN ORDER TO GET FUNDING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS A CRIME. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS WHAT YOU HAVE CHARGED IN THIS STATEMENT? A WITNESS? Q DID YOU SEE MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIM A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN AN APPLICATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR A GRANT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. BY MR. HART: Q DID YOU PERSONALLY WITNESS THAT? A I- THE COURT: WAIT. THERE'S AN OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: RELEVANCE AND BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DIRECT. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. THE WITNESS: I HAVE SEEN QUITE MANY GRANT APPLICATIONS, COPIES OF THEM, AT THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. MY QUESTION WAS — |

| 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 13 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. 15 Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | | Page 13 | | Page 14 |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| A COL MR. VOSS. OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES THE WITNESS | 1 | Q SO YOU SAW GRANT APPLICATIONS? | 1 | A AND APRIL 2ND COPY. |
| A COL MR. VOSS. OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES THE WITNESS | 2 | | 2 | Q OKAY. AND THAT'S YOUR BASIS FOR WRITING THIS? |
| 4 MR VOSS GUECTION MISCHARACTERIZES THE WITNESS 5 A FIRECALL THECVS 5 Q GRAY. 6 Q GRAY. 7 A - SHARITTER ALONG WITH THOSE GRANT 7 A - SHARITTER ALONG WITH THOSE GRANT 8 APPLICATION, WHERE ME RHOW WAS NINCATED TO BE A DIXTON. 9 Q THE GRANT APPLICATION. CAN YOU SHOW MP A GRANT 10 APPLICATION, WHERE ME RHOW WAS NINCATED TO BE A DIXTON. 11 A LIAW WILLIAM TO MORE BUT NOT IN THE BRIDGES OF EXHBITS. 12 AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BRIDGES OF EXHBITS. 13 Q GOAY. YOUTE TRAINED ABOUT THE LETTER HIAT 14 SOMERODY WROTE ADDRESSED TO DOCTOR: 15 THE CHARLES AND HIAT A TEW MORE BUTTON TO NITE BRIDGES OF EXHBITS. 16 THE LIAW RIAD THAY COUNSEL ALERADY BROCKETH THAT 17 A LIAW RIAD THAY COUNSEL ALERADY BROCKETH THAT 18 WAS ADOLT A FEW WAS ADOLT ON THE WORLD AND THE WAS ADOLT ON THE WORLD AND THE WAS ADOLT ON | 3 | | 3 | |
| 1 | 4 | | 4 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, MISCHARACTERIZES THE WITNESS' |
| 6 THE CREATE OFFERINGED. ITS A QUESTION. 7 A - SIRMITTED ALONG WITH TREASE GRANT 9 OTHE CREAT APPLICATION. CON YOU SHOW MEE A GRANT 10 APPLICATIONS WHERE ME HAS CLARKED THAT HE'S A DOCTOR? 11 A LEAW THAT MY COUNSEL ALEXANY BROUGHT IF SOME. 12 AND HAVE A FEW MARE RITT NOT IN THE BRONGES OF EXHIBITS. 13 Q ORAY. YOURSET LAND AGOUTT HE LETTER THAT 14 SOMEBODY WROTE ADDRESSED TO DOCTOR? 15 THE LITTER A FEW MARE RITT NOT IN THE BRONGES OF EXHIBITS. 16 THE LITTER A FEW MARE RITT NOT IN THE BRONGES OF EXHIBITS. 17 OF THE LITTER HE SONY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING 18 A NO. IT'S IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING 19 UP. 19 UP. 20 Q ORAY. BUT DO WE ACTUALLY LETTER THAT 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 NY YOUR ARTHLEE. 24 A THINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT HAT 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAA I GOT A COPY. 26 OY QUEST PALKING ABOUTT HE APRIL SOLETTER BY 27 CONGRESSMAN DORNAA I GOT A COPY. 28 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 29 AND THE HAVE THE THAT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 20 AND A HE MENTIONED IN THE RETTER THAT I SOLETTER? 20 AND A SOLETTER ADDRESSOR KROAT 21 MIS LIMMN. 21 MIS LIMMN. 22 Q SOTHATS NOT PROPESSOR KROAT 23 A OR NO. HE MENTIONED IN THE RETTER THAT I SINT TO 24 YOU, MIS LIMON, A HEMSTLONED IN THE APRIL SOLETTER? 25 MIR LIMINS. 26 MIR LIMINS. 27 A A RESULT THE ADDRESSOR KROAT 28 MIR LIMINS. 29 MIR LIMINS. 20 AND THE HE RESTORDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO 20 AND THAT HE RESTORDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO 21 THE COURSE THAT I SINT TO 22 SOLITATS NOT PROPESSOR KROAT 23 A OR NO. HE MENTIONED IN THESE THAT I SINT TO 24 YOU, MIS LIMON, A COUNTARY THANK YOU. 25 SOLITATS NOT PROPESSOR KROAT 26 MIR LIMINS. 27 THE LIGHT SOLITATE WE CAN DESTRUCE THAT I SINT TO 28 AND THE SENT A SHALL RESTORD THE APRIL SOLITATE? 29 THE COURSE THAT I SINT TO 20 AND THAT THE RESTORD AND GAVE MATERIALS TO 21 THE UTILITY OF THE DEBLEMACH OF THAT. 21 THE COURSE THAT I SINT TO 22 SOLITATS NOT THE APRIL SOLITATE WE HEARD YOUR. 23 THE UTILITY OF THE DEBLEMACH OF THAT I SINT TO 24 YOU, MIS LIMON A SHALL RESTER TO WE KN | 5 | | 5 | |
| A SUMMITTED ALONG WITH THOSE CRANT APPLICATIONS, WHERE MR, KHON WAS INDICATED TO BE A DOCTOR. OTHER CREAT APPLICATIONS, WHERE MR, KHON WAS INDICATED TO BE A DOCTOR. OTHER CREAT APPLICATION, CAN TO SHOW MEA AGRANT APPLICATION WHERE HE HAS CLARIED THAT HE SA DOCTOR? A PROBLEM TO WHERE HE HAS CLARIED THAT HE SA DOCTOR? A RAD HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOTS THE BURDES OF EXHIBITS. O OKAY, YOU'RE TAKING ABOUT THE ETTER THAT SOMEBODY WORT ALORBESSED TO DOCTOR? THE WITH A SAME HAVE WAS BUT OF THE STIPLES OF EXHIBITS. O OKAY, WORSE TAKING ABOUT THE ETTER THAT OF LE KLIAN KROA, MILTIME THANKS, YIE ARE SAYING THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION. THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS ABOUT THE WAS ABOUT AND THE ARRIVES THE ABOUT THE WAS ABOUT AND THE ARRIVES THE AREA AND THE WAS ABOUT AND THE ARRIVES THE AREA AND THE WAS ABOUT AND THE ARRIVES THE AREA AND THE WAS ABOUT AND THE AREA AND THE WAS ABOUT A FEW MEES ANTIBLE WROTE DESCRIPTION THAT THE WAS A FEW AND THE AREA AND THE | 6 | | | |
| ### APPLICATIONS, WHERE MR, KHOA WAS ROBCATED TO BE A DOCTOR. THE GRANT APPLICATION CALABOT THAT HES ADCTOR? | 7 | | | |
| 9 APPLICATION WEREL BE HAS CLAIMED THAT HE'S A DOCTORY 12 AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. 13 A IS AW THAT MY COURSEL ALEADY BROCKED THE STATE 14 SOMEBOTY WORTER ADDRESS ALEADY BROCKED TO HE STATE 15 OF A NO. IT'S IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING. 16 OF LE XILAN KHOA, MILTIPLE TIMES, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 17 Q OKAY, ADDITANY BY SEINT HIGH SPRODLECED? 18 A ITHINK THAT MY CORNEL ALREADY BROCKED TO THE STATE 19 UP. 19 UP. 10 Q OKAY, ADDITANY BY SEINT HIGH SPRODLECED? 21 A ITHINK THAT MY CORNEL ALREADY BROCKED THAT 22 UP. 23 IN YOUR AUTHOLE? 24 A INTERESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CORNESSAMAN DROMAN, LOTOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APPLIA DELETTER? 27 A OH, NO, HE MINTHONED IN THERE THAT. ISN'T TO 28 YOU ARE LIANON, A HOTTEN BOTTONED IN THE RETTAR BY 29 ON THAT'S NOT PROTESSOR KINDAY. 20 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROTESSOR KINDAY. 21 A OH, NO, HE MINTHONED IN THERE THAT. ISN'T TO 29 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APPLIA DELETTER? 20 THE COURT. YOU MAY, THAN YOU. 21 ON THAT SHOT PROTESSOR KINDAY. 22 A YES. 23 A OH, NO, HE MINTHONED IN THERE THAT. ISN'T TO 24 YOU ARE LIANON, A HOTTEN BOTT FROTESSOR KINDAY. 25 SENTENCE, PRANCH SHE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 26 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 27 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 28 SENTENCE, PRANCH SHE SECOND PAGE. 29 THE COURT. TO HEAVE, THAN YOU. 20 ON THAT'S NAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 21 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 22 SENTENCE, PRANCH SHE SECOND PAGE. 23 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 24 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 25 THE COURT. THERE THAT IS NOT THE BOTTOMY YESTERDAY, 26 THE COURT. THE RESON TO QUESTION PEDIDAN, MIL VOSS. 27 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 28 THE COURT. THERE SON TO QUESTION PEDIDAN, MIL VOSS. 29 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND PAGE. 21 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 21 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 21 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND THE WITH THAT THE SECOND PAGE. 22 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND PAGE. 23 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND PA | 8 | | | |
| APPLICATION MIRRE HE HAS CLAIMED THAT HE'S A DOCTOR? 12 AS DI HAPT A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BRINSES OF EXHIBITS. 12 Q OKAY, VOURE TAIKING ABOUT THE LETTER THAT 13 SOMEBOW WROTE ADDRESSED TO DOCTOR? 14 AND ATTERT WOORD APPLICATIONS SAYING 15 "PR. LE XUAN KHOA," MULTIPLE TIMES, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 17 Q OKAY, AND HAVE WE SEIN THISES, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 18 A DOT THEN BROOF OF APPLICATIONS SAYING 19 AT HIS INSTITUTE BOOK APPLICATIONS SAYING 10 OF ORAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET THE GET BACK TO 20 OF ORAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET THE GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ATTELET 24 AND INTERSESTED HE WRITING BY THE LITTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOURE TAIKING ABOUT THE APPLL 30 LETTER? 27 AND ATTELET TO THE ORDER TOWN OF THE APPLL 30 LETTER? 28 ME NOTE ALTER ADDITIONAL THE APPLL 30 LETTER? 29 AND ASSESSMAN DORNAN I GOT A COPY. 20 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 21 APPLL 2, DIG. LETTER TO ME KHOA. 21 APPLL 2, DIG. LETTER BY THE WITHING BY THE LITTER BY 22 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN I GOT A COPY. 23 A OLL NO. HE MINITIONNED IN THESE THAT. SISTENT TO 24 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATE DATE MAY BE THE HE SAID. 25 THE LISTEN AS SIMILAR LETTER TO ME KHOA. 26 MR. HART: LET'S TUT PENIBBIT 33, MICH IS THE 27 APPLL 2, DIG. LETTER. 28 MR. HART: LET'S TOW PENIBBIT 33, MICH IS THE 29 THE COURTY YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 29 A OBJORNAN THANK YOU. 20 Q AND THAT'S AS FARA SI IT WENT, ENT THAT TREE? 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 22 THE COURTY THE RESOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 23 THE COURTY THE RESOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 24 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 25 THE COURTY THE RESOND THE APPLL 2 DECEMBER. 26 Q AND SIMIL'S AS FARA SI IT WENT, ENT THAT TREE? 27 THE COURTY THE RESOND THAT SIMIL THAT TO THAT. 28 THE COURTY THE RESOND THAT SIMIL THAT TO THAT. 29 THE COURTY THE RESOND THAT SIMIL THAT TO THE THAT THE DOT THE APPLL 2 DECEMBER. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 22 THE COURTY | | | | |
| AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. AND HAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. BY THE AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? AND HAVE AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? A I THINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT BY QUESTION. IN YOUR ARTICLE? DID YOU WITHINST HIS INVINIT THAT YOU HAVE STATED IN YOUR ARTICLE? NO OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO DID YOU WITHINST HIS INTINIT THAT YOU HAVE STATED IN YOUR ARTICLE? NO OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO IN YOUR ARTICLE? A I HINTS SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HINTS SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HINTS SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER FOR DORNAN. PAGE 15 WARCH AS DOCTOR. HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER? A IN YOUR SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER FOR DORNAN. A I WINTS SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I WINT SHE LEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I HAVE A PRESS BELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH STH LETTER BY A I WINT SHE LETTER TO ME ARE THAT I SENT TO A THE YOU GO BOKE TO HAVE ABOUT THE AFFEL 3D LETTER, BAD DOWN AND THE DIRECTOR OF OR R. PAGE 15 A YES. PAGE 15 A YES. PAGE 16 A YES. PAGE 16 A YES. PAGE 16 A YES. PAGE 17 A YES. PAGE 18 A YES. PAGE 18 THE COURT HAVE ABOUT THE MARCH STH HAT I WE HAVE ABOUT TH | | | | |
| 12 AND INLAVE A FEW MORE BUT NOT IN THE BINDERS OF EXHIBITS. 13 QO KAY, YOURE TALKING A BOUT THE LETTER THAT 14 SOMEDOY WORDT ADDRESSED TO DOCTORY 15 A NO. IT'S IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING 16 TO BE LEXMAN KIGAA, "MILTIFLE THARS, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS." 17 QO KAY, AND IAIVE SEEN THOSE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 18 A ITHINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT 19 UP. 10 QO KAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO 20 QO KAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUISTION. 22 DD YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONDRESSMAN DORNAN. LOOT A COPY. 26 CONDRESSMAN DORNAN. LOOT A COPY. 27 Q YOURE TALKING ABOUT THE APPEL 30 LETTER. TO ME. HOLD. 28 MS. LIMON. 29 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROPESSOR KHOA? 30 A OH, NO. HE MINITIONED IN THERE THAT. I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCHE, GIVE HE SAME. 4 MR. HART. LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 4 THE COURT. YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 4 MS. REALZ, 1996, LETTER. 5 MR. ROLYTON. ANY WE PURBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 5 THE COURT. YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 5 SENTENCE – PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 5 DID WE NOT.— 6 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 6 Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR THE MARCHED THE THAT THAT THE THE THAT. 6 THE COURT. YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 6 DID WENOT.— 7 A PERAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 7 THE COURT. YOUR WITNESS THE SECOND PAGE. 7 THE COURT. THERES NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERES NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERES NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERES NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE WITNESS. THE SCHOOL PLAGE. 7 THE WITNESS. THE SAY THE MARCHED THE THAT THAT THERE 7 THE COURT. THERE SNOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. YOSS. 7 THE WITNESS. THE SAY THE MARCHED THE THAT THAT THE THAT THE T | | | | |
| O KAY, YOU'SE TALKING ABOUT THE LETTER THAT SOMEBODY WROTE ADDRESSED TO DOCTOR? A NO. IT'S IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING TO LE IX MIAN KIROA, "MILTIPE THAIR IN THIS GRANT APPLICATIONS." O CAY, AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? NO CAY, AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? DO WAY, AND HAVE THE MARK HE HE MARK HE HE HE MARK HE HE LETTER IT IF YOU LOCK AT THE APPL, 20 HETTER, IT'S MINTONED IN THESE AND I NO YOU'S BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED NO YOU'S BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED NO YOU'S BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO MINTONESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY A NOT HIS TO THOSE SOOR KIROA? A ONLY IN THE WITNING BY THE LETTER BY O YOU'S BUT DO TO A COPY. O YOU'S TALKING ABOUT THE APPLI SOLETTER? PAGE 15 I MS. LIMON. PAGE 16 O AND STRAT THE SERVINOUS WHAT DESIRAND WE HEARD YOU'R A YES. O NOR SHARM THE LETTER TO ME KIROA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE MR. KOUYEN. MAY WE PUBLISH YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. O (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) THE WITNISS: THE SECOND PAGE. THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS. CORRECT: A THAT'S NOT COMPILET. THAT SHOW WITH A PRESENT HE MARK HE HE ARD THE WITNING THAT THE WITNING THAT THE WITNING THE WITNING THAT THE WITNING THAT THE WITNING THE WITNING THAT THE WITNINGS THE SECOND PAGE. THE WITNINGS: THE SECOND THAT THAT THE BEAR AND THE MARK HE THAT THE WITNING THE WITNING THAT THE WITNING TH | | | | |
| 14 SOMEBODY WROTE ADDRESSED TO DOCTOR? 15 "A NO. ITS IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS ASYING 16 "OR LIX MANK RICHA," MILITER THAILS, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS. 17 Q OKAY, AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCTED? 18 A ITHINS THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT 19 UP. 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY—LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUISTION. 22 MY QUISTION. 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APPLL 30 LETTER? 27 APPLL 2, 1984, LITTER. 28 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APPLL 30 LETTER? 29 A ON THATS NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH, 6, 1986, AT THE SAME 5 THE LISTEN TO YEM, LITTER. 5 A PRIL 2, 1984, LITTER. 5 MR. NOLIVEN, MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 5 THE COURT: THE RISK COND LAST—NEXT-TO-LAST 10 DID WILL ARROW. 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST—NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE—PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 RELEASE. IT BECAME A PUBLIC SCANDAL IN OUR COMMINITY AT THE 15 THAT, COVERED IN THE MINES. 16 PUBLIS AND THE MARCH OF ILLETTER; UP UP 17 APPLL 2, 1984, LITTER. 18 A LIDONT THAVE THE MARCH OF ILLETTER, BUT IF YOU. 19 ALD REGIT TO MY COUNSEL. 20 AND THAT IN THE MERITING BY THE LETTER BY 21 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APPLL 2D LETTER, HE SAID. 22 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APPLL 2D LETTER, HE SAID. 23 A VES. 24 A VES. 25 THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS. TO CONGRESSMAN DORNANT. 26 A VES. 27 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 28 THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS. CORRECT? 29 ALD RIGHT THAT THE THE THE WITHOUT STITLED AND THE WHOLE 21 THE WITNESS. THE APPLL THE WITHOUT STITLED AND THE WHOLE 22 THE WITNESS. WELL BY YOU GO TO THE —WHAT IS THIS 23 MAY DOE THAN THAT THE THE WITNESS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS. THANK YOU. 25 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST—ORDING, MR. YOSS. 26 THE WITNESS. WELL BY YOU GO TO THE —WHAT IS THIS 27 MAY NOSS. HE SELL TRYNNCTO GET TO THAT. 28 THE COURT: YOU MAY THANK YOU. 29 THE COURT: | | | | |
| THE COVERED IN THE BODY OF APPLICATIONS SAYING THE CE YUAN HARA? "MULTIPLE TIMES, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS." THE CE YUAN HARA? "MULTIPLE TIMES, IN THE GRANT APPLICATIONS." THE COVERED IN THE MARCH STH LETTER? A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. ALBERDY BROUGED? A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. ALBERDY BROUGHT THAT THE COURT OF A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. ALBERDY BROUGHT THAT THE COURT OF A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. ALBERDY BROUGHT THAT THE COURT OF A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. ALBERDY BROUGHT THAT THE COURT OF A LITHING THE MARCH STH LETTER, BUT DY VU THE COURT OF A LITHING THAT MY COLINGE. AND INTERE. AND | | | | |
| 16 BY MR. HART: 17 Q OKAY, AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? 18 A ITHINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT 19 UP. 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY – LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 PUD YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSID THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 28 YOU, MS. LIMON. 29 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON. 21 MS. LIMON. 22 PARIL 2, 1996, LETTER 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON. A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 5 MR. HART: LET'S LIT PET UP PENJIHIET 233, WHICH IS THE 6 MR. HART: LET'S LIT PET UP PENJIHIET 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NOUTEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 MIN HIART: 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 LIMON LIARS: 14 Q ALL BIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WENDT: 16 A GO DOWN PURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 MR. VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 19 MR. VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 10 MR. VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 11 THE UTINESS: YES. 21 DIM WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG - 24 A YES. 25 LOOK BE HANT: HE MARCH GH LETTER, BUT IN THAT THE SAME 26 THE AVER PRESS RELEASE ABOUT THE MARCH GH LETTER, BUT IN THAT THE ME AND IN THE MARCH GH LETTER, BUT IN TOW COUNSEL. 24 A INTO TISE LAND TO MY COUNSEL. 25 A IN THAT IS RELIGIBLE AND TO WE CONGRESSMAN DORNAN THAT TOW COUNTED THE ARCH AND THE BUT ON TOW OF THE ADD THE ARCH AND THE BUT ON THE ARCH AND THE WAS THE LETTER BUT ON THE ARCH AND THE | | | | |
| 17 Q OKAY, AND HAVE WE SEEN THOSE PRODUCED? 18 A ITHINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT 19 UP. 19 UP. 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TAIKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER BY 26 Q YOU'RE TAIKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER BY 27 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 28 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, HE SAID 29 SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 20 YOU, MS, LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996, AT THE SAME 21 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND PAGE. 22 SENTENCE - PAGRAGRAPH, SECOND PAGE. 23 SENTENCE - PAGRAGRAPH SECOND PAGE. 24 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE RISTIMONY YESTERDAY, 25 THE COURT: YOU MAY, THANK YOU. 26 Q AND HAT'S SI HE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 27 THE COURT: YOU MAY, THANK YOU. 28 SENTENCE - PAGRAGRAPH, SECOND PAGE. 29 MR, VOSS, HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 30 AD THIS BY NOT OR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 31 AND THIS BY NOT OR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 32 AND THAT SHORY YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 33 A OUR NO. HE HARD THE RISTIMONY YESTERDAY, 34 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 45 THE COURT: YOU MAY, THANK YOU. 46 PAGRAGRAPH SECOND PAGE. 47 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND PAGE. 48 PAGRAGRAPH SECOND PAGE. 49 WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 40 WAS MR VOSS. 40 DOWN HAVE THE MARCH GIT HETTER, BUT IT HE ALL TO THE WITNESS. WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 41 PAGRAGRAPH SECOND PAGE. 41 THE WITNESS. WELS. 41 THE WITNESS. WELS. 42 THE WITNESS. WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 42 THE WITNESS. WELL IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 43 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 44 YES. 45 THE WITNESS. WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 46 A DO THAT SHOW THE PAGRAGRAPH SECOND PAGE. 47 THE WITNESS. WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 47 THE WITNESS. WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 48 WAY HAVE THE MARCH TO MARCH THE ARE THAT TO THE DRONG THE PAGRAGRAPH. 49 THE ARCH THAT THE TOTAL THE MARCH THE | | | | |
| 18 A ITHINK THAT MY COUNSEL ALREADY BROUGHT THAT 19 UP. 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY – LIT ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTELE? 24 A IWINNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOURE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 A JENSON, I GOT A COPY. 28 Q YOURE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 29 Q AND SHATS NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 20 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 21 MS, LIMON. 22 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 23 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT. I SENT TO 24 YOU, MS, LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996, AT THE SAME 25 THE LETTER TO ME CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. 26 MR, HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 27 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 28 MR, NGUYEN. MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 29 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 29 GO ALK ROHT, SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST 21 BY MR, HART: 21 DID WENOT. 22 SENTENCE. — PARAGRAPH, SECOND PAGE. 23 LINE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST. NEXT-TO-LAST 24 A YES. 25 BY MR, VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 26 MR, VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 27 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 28 AND THIS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 29 MR, VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 20 MR, VOSS. HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 21 THE WITNESS: VES. 22 BY MR, LART: 23 LETTER AND THE SECOND PENDING, MR VOSS. 24 A YES. 25 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 26 AND THE MATCH. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 27 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 28 AND THIS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 29 MR, VOSS. ME'VOSS. 20 DR, THANG — 21 THE WITNESS: VES. 21 THE WITNESS: VES. 22 BY MR HART: 23 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: WELL, HE YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 25 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 26 THE WITNESS: WELL, HE YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 27 THE WITNESS: WELL, HE YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS | | | | |
| 19 UP. 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY — LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A TWINNSSID THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 MS, LIMON. 28 THAT I — THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF ORR. 29 PAGE 15 10 MS, LIMON. 20 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 31 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT. I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS, LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO ME, CHOA. 6 MIR, HART: LET'S DUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR, NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE — PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY WR, HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT.— 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR, VOSS: ME, VOSS. 18 YOUR SET AS MR VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE OKAY. 20 MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND A PAGE. 22 BY MR, HART: 23 Q DR, THANG— 24 A YES. 25 LOOK AT THE APRIL 20D LETTER, HIS SID TO COMPAGE. 26 LAT THE APRIL 20D LETTER, HIS SID TO COMPAGE. 27 A PESS RELLAST ABOUT THE MARCH GITH LETTER TO MICHORANS. 28 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE EIGHT YOU HAVE STATED. 29 LOOK AT THE APRIL 20D HAVE STATED. 20 DID YOU HEAR THAT INSTITUCT THE MODE STATE HE SAID. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT THE SAME. 22 BY MR, HART: 23 Q NAND THAT THE RESPONDED IN THERE AND THE WHOLE 24 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND AND THE APRIL 20D HAVE AND THE WHOLE 25 LITTER TO THE DETECTOR OF ORR. 26 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 27 A YES. 28 DY MR HART: 29 LOOK AT THE APRIL 20D HEAVE. AND THE MARCH GIT LETTER TO THE DETECTOR OF ORR. 29 THE COURT: THE APRIL 20D DETECTOR OF ORR. 20 AND THAT THE RESPONDED AND THE APRIL 20D HEAVE. 21 THE WITNESS: THE MARCH OF ORR. 21 THE WITNESS: THE MARCH OF ORR. 22 THE WITNESS: THE MARCH OF ORR. 23 A YES. 24 THE COURT: THE MARCH AND THE APRIL 20D | | · · | | |
| 20 Q OKAY, BUT DO WE ACTUALLY - LET ME GET BACK TO 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 A RECORD BY YOUR WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 28 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, I GOT A COPY. 29 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 20 AND THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 21 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT IS NOT PROPESSOR KHOA? 3 A OIL NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARGH 6, 1996, AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. ROLYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS. THE SECOND LAST. "EXT.TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE ITSTIMONY VESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT - 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS. HIPS STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS. YES. 21 THE WITNESS. YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 A YES. 24 A INNOT SURE I GAVE IT OMY KHOR AND SURE I GAVE IT OMY YOUR ALD THE APRIL 3D DORNAN SWHAT DORNANS 26 A INTO SURE I GAVE IT OMY YOUR ADDITION THE APRIL 3D DORNAN SWHAT DORNANS 27 THE COURT: THERE TO THE APRIL 3D DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF SEALAR. A CAT THE TIME. 26 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER IT OMY WHAT THE SAID 27 A YES. 28 BY MR. HART: 29 THE COURT: THERE TO MR. KHOA? 21 THE WITNESS WELL JIF YOU GO TO THE APRIL 3D THE COURT: ON THE APRIL 3D THE APRIL 3D THE APRIL 3D THE APRIL 3D T | | | | |
| 21 MY QUESTION. 22 DID YOU WINESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WINESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOURE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 A F YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 20 LETTER, BY 28 A F YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 20 LETTER, BE SAID 29 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R. 20 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LETTS PUT PEXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NGLYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PRELISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT - 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. YOSS: HER STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: HERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WINESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS. YES. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q BR. THANG - 24 YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THAS IS STILL SING IS SECOND PAGE. 25 THE WITNESS: THIS STILL SING IS SECOND PAGE. 26 THE WITNESS: THIS STILL SING IS SECOND PAGE. 27 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 28 NUMBER? 29 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 29 APPEL. 200, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 20 THE WITNESS: THIANK YOU. | | | | |
| 22 DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAM. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 26 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O'RE. PAGE 15 1 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND DAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT - 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: MR. VOSS. 18 AND THANK YOU. 29 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. CKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q P. R. THANK YOU. 24 A THAT'S NOT SELECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 25 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 26 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO MY CONSERNAN DORNAN? 27 A YES. 28 BY MR. HART: 29 Q CONSTRUCTION THERE THAT: WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 29 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 20 THE WITNESS: THE STRUCT THAT. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND THAT. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 25 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 26 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 27 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 28 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 29 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 20 THE WITNESS: THE STILL ITRYING TO GET TO THAT. 21 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 22 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | | | | |
| 23 IN YOUR ARTICLE? 24 A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 27 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, HE SAID. 28 THAT I — THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 29 PAGE 15 1 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO, HE MENTHONDED IN THERE THAT: ISENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME. 5 TIME, ISENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY, THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE — PARAGRAPH, SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT — 16 A GO DOWN PURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THE COURT: YOU THE COURT: YOU AND THE THE STIMONY YESTERDAY, 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE, OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG — 24 A YES. 23 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, HE SAID 24 MARCH 6TH LETTER SAID. DO WE AND LETTER, THE SAID 25 HAT I — THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. 26 MR. CHARLES AND LETTER, HE SAID 27 A PER APRIL 2. NO LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. 28 A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, HE SAID 29 A YES. 20 Q AND THAT HAT I — THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. 21 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 22 A YES. 23 A JES. 24 MARCH 6TH LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. 24 ON STANDAY THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. 25 A JES. 26 A JES. 27 A YES. 28 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 29 A YES. 29 ON AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE SAID 20 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 21 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 22 THE COURT: THE SEPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE SEND OF O.R.R. 26 A YES. 27 THE WITNESS: YES. 28 DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 29 A YES. 29 ON THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE SAID 20 ON THAT | 21 | | | |
| 24 A 1 WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 26 THAT1—THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R Page 15 Page 16 1 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THATS NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTHONED IN THERE THAT: ISENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LETS PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996. LETTER. 8 MR. NOU'YEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE — PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT — 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HES STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERES NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG — 24 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 25 LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 26 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 27 INLOHER. 28 PMR. HART: 29 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 29 APRIL 21, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 22 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 23 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 25 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 26 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 27 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 22 | DID YOU WITNESS THIS EVENT THAT YOU HAVE STATED | 22 | A I'M NOT SURE. I GAVE IT TO MY COUNSEL. |
| 25 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. 26 Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? 26 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., Page 15 Page 16 1 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO ME, KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH L SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT - 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. ME, VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG - 24 A YES. 25 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 26 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 27 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 28 HAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 29 A YES. 20 THAT I - THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 21 THE YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 22 THE WISH AND DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 23 A FIRE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 24 THE YOU GO BACK TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., 25 A IE'YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 26 A YES. 27 THE YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? 28 A YES. 29 AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE APRIL 2ND HEATER THAT TESTIMONY? 29 A NOT THAT THE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE WITH THE SET THAT WE HEARD YOUR 29 AND THAT THE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO THE APRIL 2ND HEATER THAT TESTIMONY? 29 A CORRESS MAN DORNAN? 21 THE WITHESS YES STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 21 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR VOSS. 21 THE WITHESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE — WHAT IS THIS 21 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS TH | 23 | IN YOUR ARTICLE? | 23 | Q ALL RIGHT. SO WE DON'T KNOW WHAT DORNAN'S |
| Page 15 Page 16 Did you hear that testimony? A OH, NO, He mentioned in there that: I sent to You, MS, Limon, a letter date march 6, 1996. At the same MR, Hart: Let's put up exhibit 233, which is the MR, hart: Let's put up exhibit 233, which is the MR, NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. DO AND SIMURATE SEROND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST — NEXT-TO-LAST BY MR, HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT— A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR, VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR, VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR, VOSS: MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. MR, VOSS. M | 24 | A I WITNESSED THE WRITING BY THE LETTER BY | 24 | MARCH 6TH LETTER SAID, DO WE? |
| Page 15 I MS, LIMON. Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO, HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS, LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HABET: LETS PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. MR. THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST MR. MR. THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST MR. MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR. VOSS: MR. VOSS. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS: MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. THE WITNESS: YES. THE WITNESS: YES. A YES. PA AYES. DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? A YES. A Y | 25 | CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. I GOT A COPY. | 25 | A IF YOU GO BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, HE SAID |
| 1 MS. LIMON. 2 Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST – NEXT-TO-LAST 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 SENTENCE – PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT – 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HES STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG – 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THE SCOND PAGE. 25 THE COURT: THIS IS 333. THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 26 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE – WHAT IS THIS 19 THE COURT: THIS IS 18 STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE – WHAT IS THIS 22 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE – WHAT IS THIS 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 26 | Q YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE APRIL 30 LETTER? | 26 | THAT I THAT WAS THE LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R., |
| 2 A YES. 3 A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LETS PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 7 TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 11 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. 3 A YES. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 3 Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO 4 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 4 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 5 A YES. 5 A YES. 5 A YES. 6 Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 7 TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO 7 THE OFFICE AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 7 THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO 8 THE OFFICE AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 8 THE OFFICE AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 9 A YES. 10 Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 11 THE OFFICE AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 12 THE THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOUR 14 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WIFE OF THAT THAT THE? 15 Q CONGRESSMAN DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THAT THE YER AND THE WIFE OFFI THAT THAT THE? 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE - WHAT IS THIS 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL | | Page 15 | | Page 16 |
| A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST – NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE – PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. A GO DOWN FURTHER. A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. MR. VOSS: MR. VOSS. M | 1 | MS LIMON | 1 | |
| 4 YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST - NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE - PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT - 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG - 24 A YES. 4 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 5 A YES. 4 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 5 A YES. 4 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 5 A YES. 5 A YES. 5 A YES. 6 Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 7 TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. A. L SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO 8 THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? 9 A CORRECT. 10 Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLL 13 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. 15 Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 NUMBER? 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | | MB. Elifort. | 1 | DID YOU HEAR THAT TESTIMONY? |
| 5 TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 7 TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL CALLED YOU INTO 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 2 | | | |
| 6 MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE 7 APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE, OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 6 Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR 7 TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO 8 THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? 9 THE OURT: SINT THAT TRUE? 10 Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI 13 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE, OKAY. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 25 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? | 2 | A YES. |
| APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST – NEXT-TO-LAST BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. MR. | 3 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO | 2 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO |
| 8 MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 21 NUMBER? 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 26 A CORRECT. 27 AND THIS IS THE SCOND PAGE. 38 THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? 4 A YES. 4 THE WITNESS: HOR DIOL OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? 5 A CORRECT. 5 A CORRECT. 6 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALS FOR SHEW DR. AL SANTOL. 13 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE THE ITHE. 15 Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 A PRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME | 2 3 4 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? |
| 9 THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 11 A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 20 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. | 2 3 4 5 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. |
| 10 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE | 2 3 4 5 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR |
| 11 THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST – NEXT-TO-LAST 12 SENTENCE – PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 21 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO |
| 12 SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI 23 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 15 Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? |
| 13 BY MR. HART: 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 13 VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 14 S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. 15 Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. |
| 14 Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? |
| 15 DID WE NOT 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 16 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 25 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLL, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? |
| 16 A GO DOWN FURTHER. 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 26 PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY 17 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 NUMBER? 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE |
| 17 MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? 18 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 20 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE – WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? 21 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF |
| 18 THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 21 NUMBER? 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 21 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. 22 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. |
| 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT |
| 19 AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. 20 MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. 21 THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE DORNAN 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY |
| 21 THE WITNESS: YES. 22 BY MR. HART: 23 Q DR. THANG 24 A YES. 21 NUMBER? 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? |
| 22 BY MR. HART: 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 Q DR. THANG 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. |
| 22 BY MR. HART: 22 THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN 23 Q DR. THANG 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. |
| 23 Q DR. THANG 23 APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS |
| 24 A YES. 24 THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? |
| | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN |
| 25 Q WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY FROM 25 THE COURT: LOOK AT THE HARD COPY, IF YOU WOULD LIKE. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. |
| 26 PROFESSOR KHOA THAT HE RECEIVED A LETTER FROM MR. DORNAN. 26 YOU CAN FLIP AROUND. | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG A YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. |
| | 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | Q SO THAT'S NOT PROFESSOR KHOA? A OH, NO. HE MENTIONED IN THERE THAT: I SENT TO YOU, MS. LIMON, A LETTER DATED MARCH 6, 1996. AT THE SAME TIME, I SENT A SIMILAR LETTER TO MR. KHOA. MR. HART: LET'S PUT UP EXHIBIT 233, WHICH IS THE APRIL 2, 1996, LETTER. MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: YOU MAY. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE WITNESS: THE SECOND LAST NEXT-TO-LAST SENTENCE PARAGRAPH. SECOND PAGE. BY MR. HART: Q ALL RIGHT. WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY, DID WE NOT A GO DOWN FURTHER. MR. VOSS: HE'S STILL TRYING TO GET TO THAT. THE COURT: THERE'S NOT A QUESTION PENDING, MR. VOSS. AND THIS IS NOT YOUR WITNESS RIGHT NOW, SO PLEASE. OKAY. MR. VOSS. MR. VOSS. THE WITNESS: YES. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG A YES. Q WE HEARD THE TESTIMONY YESTERDAY FROM | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | A YES. Q AND THAT HE RESPONDED AND GAVE MATERIALS TO CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? A YES. Q AND SOMETIME AFTER THAT, WE HEARD YOUR TESTIMONY THAT YOUR FRIEND, DR. AL SANTOLI, CALLED YOU INTO THE OFFICE AND SHOWED YOU A LOT OF MATERIALS; CORRECT? A CORRECT. Q AND THAT'S AS FAR AS IT WENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE? A THAT'S NOT COMPLETE. THAT'S NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. BECAUSE YOUR CLIENT ALSO CLAIM HE KNEW DR. AL SANTOLI VERY WELL. AND DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. AT THE TIME. Q OKAY. SO DO WE HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT PROFESSOR KHOA DID NOT PRESENT THE MATERIALS REQUESTED BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: WELL, IF YOU GO TO THE WHAT IS THIS NUMBER? THE COURT: THIS IS 233. THIS IS THE DORNAN APRIL 2ND, 1996, LETTER. AND THIS IS THE SECOND PAGE. THE WITNESS: THANK YOU. THE COURT: LOOK AT THE HARD COPY, IF YOU WOULD LIKE. |

| | Page 17 | | Page 18 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? | 1 | ACROSS THE UNITED STATES." |
| 2 | MR. HART: MAYBE I'LL WITHDRAW THAT QUESTION AND | 2 | THAT WAS WHAT PROMPTED HIM TO START THE |
| 3 | REPHRASE AND START OVER. | 3 | INVESTIGATION. |
| 4 | BY MR. HART: | 4 | THE COURT: CAN WE JUST PAUSE FOR A MINUTE. CAN YOU |
| 5 | Q YOU HAVE THE EXHIBIT 233 IN FRONT OF YOU? | 5 | IDENTIFY EXACTLY WHAT YOU'RE READING FROM, INCLUDING BY DATE |
| 6 | A YES. | 6 | AND EXHIBIT NUMBER, SO WE HAVE A CLEAR RECORD. |
| 7 | Q LET'S SCROLL UP TO THE TOP, TO THE BEGINNING. | 7 | THE WITNESS: SORRY. THAT'S EXHIBIT 234, THE |
| 8 | SO WE SEE HERE CAN YOU SEE MY LASER POINTER? | 8 | APRIL 30, 1996 LETTER FROM DORNAN. |
| 9 | A IDO. | 9 | THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT'S JUST FOR THE |
| 10 | Q OKAY. SO WE SEE HERE THAT, APPARENTLY, | 10 | RECORD. |
| 11 | CONGRESSMAN DORNAN SENT A LETTER TO THE DIRECTOR OF O.R.R. ON | 11 | GO AHEAD, MR. HART, WITH YOUR QUESTION. |
| 12 | MARCH 6TH. AND IF WE TURN TO THE SECOND PAGE, WE SEE THAT HE | 12 | BY MR. HART: |
| 13 | ALSO SENT ONE TO PROFESSOR KHOA, AND THAT HIS OFFICE IS | 13 | O OKAY. SO IS IT YOUR CONTENTION THAT SOME PART |
| 14 | CONTINUING THEIR INVESTIGATION. | 14 | OF THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, PROVES THE TRUTH OF |
| 1.5 | AND YOU HAVE EXPLAINED THAT THE GENESIS OF THIS | 15 | THIS STATEMENT THAT'S ON THE WHITEBOARD? |
| 16 | INVESTIGATION WAS STATE DEPARTMENT HOW DO I WANT TO SAY | 16 | A I DIDN'T MAKE ANY CONTENTION. I JUST |
| 17 | THIS STATE DEPARTMENT RETICENCE OR OBJECTION TO THE | 17 | PARAPHRASE EXACTLY WHAT MR. DORNAN WROTE. |
| 18 | ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT OF CONGRESSMAN SMITH? | 18 | O ARE YOU PARAPHRASING FROM THIS PARTICULAR |
| 19 | A NO, I DIDN'T SAY THAT. | 19 | LETTER? |
| 20 | Q OKAY. WHAT DID I GET WRONG ABOUT THAT? | 20 | A FROM, PRIMARILY, THE SECOND LETTER. BUT ALSO |
| 21 | A HE WROTE IN HERE THAT IN THE LETTER DATED | 21 | LOOKING, AS BACKGROUND INFORMATION, AT THIS LETTER DATED |
| 22 | APRIL 30TH HE RECEIVED AN OVERWHELMING NUMBER OF TELEPHONE | 22 | APRIL 7TH. |
| 23 | CALLS AND LETTERS FROM RESPECTED VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS. | 23 | Q OKAY. SO WHAT IS IT ABOUT THIS APRIL 2ND |
| 24 | "BEGINNING IN JANUARY 1996, I HAVE RECEIVED AN | 24 | LETTER THAT, IN YOUR MIND, SUPPORTS YOUR NOTION THAT THIS |
| 25 | OVERWHELMING NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS AND LETTERS FROM | 25 | STATEMENT IS TRUE? |
| 26 | RESPECTED VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN MY DISTRICT AND | 26 | A IN ADDITION I'M SORRY. BACK TO EXHIBIT 233, |
| | | | |
| | Da 10 | 1 | D 20 |
| | Page 19 | | Page 20 |
| 1 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 | 1 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| _ | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 | | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE |
| 2 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE | 2 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT I.R.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT |
| 2 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED S.E.A.R.A.C. AND | 2 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? |
| 2 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE | 2 3 4 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND |
| 2 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT | 2 3 4 5 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE |
| 2 3 4 5 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A | 2 3 4 5 6 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "I'N ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNANS INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" - I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A"AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND LR.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" - I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A - "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND LR.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. AND YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THE HEAD OF | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?" Q DR. THANG, HOW DOES ANY OF THAT PROVE THAT THIS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. AND YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THE HEAD OF ORGANIZATION IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHATEVER IS SENT IN THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?" Q DR. THANG, HOW DOES ANY OF THAT PROVE THAT THIS IS TRUE; THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND LR.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. AND YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THE HEAD OF ORGANIZATION IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHATEVER IS SENT IN THE GRANT APPLICATION BY THE ORGANIZATION. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "I'S O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?" Q DR. THANG, HOW DOES ANY OF THAT PROVE THAT THIS IS TRUE; THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | SECOND PARAGRAPH: "ENCLOSED IS AN ARTICLE FROM THE MARCH 1996 COMMUNITY NEWS MAGAZINE PUBLISHED IN MY DISTRICT IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. THE ARTICLE ENTITLED 'S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. FOUND TO HAVE MISAPPROPRIATED VIETNAMESE COMMUNITY OF ORANGE COUNTY NAME IN EFFORT TO SECURE GOVERNMENT FUNDS." "IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." Q OKAY. SO THIS PARTICULAR STATEMENT, WHICH WE SEE RIGHT HERE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, IS THAT DORNAN'S INVESTIGATION INDICATES THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND I.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR? A THAT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN. Q WOULD YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT THAT DOES NOT PROVE THAT HE FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A STATE DEPARTMENT GRANT APPLICATION? A YOU MUST KNOW THAT WHEN AN ORGANIZATION APPLY FOR FUNDING, IT APPLIES FOR FUNDING AS AN ORGANIZATION, NOT ON BEHALF OF ONE INDIVIDUAL, ON BEHALF OF STAFF OR A MANAGER OR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. AND YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THE HEAD OF ORGANIZATION IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHATEVER IS SENT IN THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | STATEMENT DOES NOT SAY THAT LR.A.C. OR S.E.A.R.A.C. HAVE MISREPRESENTED PROFESSOR KHOA TO BE A DOCTOR IN ANY GRANT APPLICATION? A READ THE NEXT SENTENCE: "WE HAVE ALSO FOUND THAT MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT O.R.R. STAFF AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROCESSED A PREVIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH LR.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. AS PAID STAFF CONSULTANTS." "EVEN MORE DISTURBING" I'M SORRY. THE SECOND PAGE, THE THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM THE BOTTOM UP: "EVEN MORE DISTURBING, WE HAVE EVIDENCE OF THE ABOVE ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING S.E.A.R.A.C., SERVING THE INTEREST OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS" Q SECOND PAGE. A OH, SECOND PAGE. Q YEAH, I WANT THE JURY TO SEE THIS, TOO. A "AND CONDUCTING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO OVERSEAS INTERESTS AT CONFERENCES FUNDED BY O.R.R. AND CONDUCTED BY BOTH S.E.A.R.A.C./N.A.V.A.S.A. NHMD." AND THEN THE LAST SENTENCE IN THAT PARAGRAPH: "IS O.R.R. MONEY BEING USED FOR THESE EVENTS? DOES O.R.R.'S CHARTER PERMIT YOUR AGENCY'S FUNDS TO BE USED FOR INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?" Q DR. THANG, HOW DOES ANY OF THAT PROVE THAT THIS IS TRUE; THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED A DOCTORAL DEGREE |

| | Page 21 | | Page 22 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | MR. DORNAN. AND YOUR CLIENT SHOULD HAVE ASKED MR. DORNAN | 1 | THEN, MR. HART, PLEASE CONTINUE. |
| 2 | HIMSELF. | 2 | MR. HART: EXHIBIT 234. |
| 3 | Q I DON'T THINK DORNAN'S STILL ALIVE, IS HE? | 3 | BY MR. HART: |
| 4 | A HE IS STILL ALIVE. | 4 | Q SO YOU WOULD AGREE WITH ME, THEN, THAT THIS |
| 5 | MR. VOSS: HE IS. | 5 | PARTICULAR LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, DOES NOT IN AND OF ITSELF |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: OH, YOUR CLIENT SHOULD HAVE ASKED THAT | 6 | SUPPORT THE TRUTH OF THE STATEMENT THAT IS ON THE WHITEBOARD? |
| 7 | BACK THEN IN 1996. | 7 | A I LIKE THE WAY YOU PRESENTED IT, DOES NOT, IN |
| 8 | BY MR. HART: | 8 | AND BY ITSELF. BUT COLLECTIVELY THOSE TWO LETTERS AND OTHER |
| 9 | Q WELL, I'M ASKING YOU TODAY: IF YOU'RE RELYING | 9 | DOCUMENTS SUPPORTED WHAT MR. DORNAN WROTE HERE ON APRIL 30, |
| 10 | ON THIS LETTER TO SUPPORT THE STATEMENT THAT YOU PUBLISHED, | 10 | 1996. IT SHOW THAT HE DID CONDUCT A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION |
| 11 | I'M ASKING YOU TO EXPLAIN HOW WHAT YOU JUST TESTIFIED TO IN | 11 | THAT LASTED FOR FOUR MONTHS, AND THEN HE ARRIVE AT THOSE |
| 12 | ANY WAY LOGICALLY SUPPORTS THAT STATEMENT; THAT PROFESSOR KHOA | 12 | FINDINGS THAT HE HAD VERIFIED PLENTY OF TIMES, AT LEAST THREE |
| 13 | FALSELY CLAIMED HIS EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS? | 13 | TIMES. |
| 14 | A I HAVE MADE IT PLENTY | 14 | MR. HART: MOVE TO STRIKE AS NONRESPONSIVE. |
| 15 | THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. | 15 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. |
| 16 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE AS PHRASED. | 16 | BY MR. HART: |
| 17 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 17 | Q WITHIN THIS EXHIBIT 233, CAN YOU PLEASE SHOW ME |
| 18 | YOU MAY RESPOND NOW, SIR. | 18 | WHERE IT SAYS ANYTHING ABOUT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMING |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: I HAVE MADE IT PLENTY CLEAR THAT I RELY | 19 | ANYTHING? |
| 20 | MAINLY ON THE MARCH 30, 1996 LETTER. THIS WAS THE BACKGROUND. | 20 | A AS THE HEAD OF S.E.A.R.A.C., HE WAS RESPONSIBLE |
| 21 | BY MR. HART: | 21 | FOR WHAT'S EVER PRESENTED IN THOSE PAGES OF THE GRANT |
| 22 | Q OKAY. SO, THEN, YOU WOULD AGREE | 22 | APPLICATIONS THAT HE SIGNED AND SUBMITTED TO O.R.R. AND OTHER |
| 23 | THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. I'M SORRY. | 23 | FEDERAL AGENCIES. |
| 24 | MARCH 30, 1996 LETTER? | 24 | Q BUT WE DON'T SEE ANYTHING IN THIS LETTER THAT |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: I'M SORRY. APRIL 30TH, 1996 LETTER. | 25 | SAYS HE'S FALSIFIED ANYTHING SUBMITTED TO O.R.R., DO WE? |
| 26 | THE COURT: THANK YOU. | 26 | A IT'S IN PREVIOUS LETTERS AND IN THE MARCH 6TH |
| | | | |
| | Page 23 | | Page 24 |
| 1 | Page 23 LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. | 1 | Page 24 TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| _ | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. | | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED |
| 2 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. | 2 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. |
| 2 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT | 2 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE |
| 2 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. | 2 3 4 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING |
| 2 3 4 5 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN |
| 2 3 4 5 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS | 2 3 4 5 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE | 2 3 4 5 6 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOURE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT – THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND TO THE EXTENT YOU UNDERSTAND. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO – MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT – THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, ITEM NUMBER 5. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND TO THE EXTENT YOU UNDERSTAND. THE WITNESS: WHICH ONE? EXCUSE ME. WHICH PARAGRAPH | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, ITEM NUMBER 5. Q I'M NOT REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN. I'M REFERRING |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND TO THE EXTENT YOU UNDERSTAND. THE WITNESS: WHICH ONE? EXCUSE ME. WHICH PARAGRAPH ARE YOU REFERRING TO? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOURE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, ITEM NUMBER 5. Q I'M NOT REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN. I'M REFERRING TO YOU. YOU PUBLISHED THAT STATEMENT. YOU SAID YOU GOT THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND TO THE EXTENT YOU UNDERSTAND. THE WITNESS: WHICH ONE? EXCUSE ME. WHICH PARAGRAPH ARE YOU REFERRING TO? BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, ITEM NUMBER 5. Q I'M NOT REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN. I'M REFERRING |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | LETTER AND THE PRESS RELEASE OF MR. DORNAN. MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS HEARSAY. THE COURT: OVERRULED, IN THAT WERE LOOKING AT WHAT HE WAS RELYING UPON. BY MR. HART: Q SPECIFICALLY, WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THIS LETTER, NOT SOME OTHER THINGS THAT ARE NOT IN EVIDENCE, WHERE DOES IT SAY IN THIS LETTER INFORMATION TO THE EFFECT THAT MR. KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING AS PART OF A GRANT APPLICATION? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION WITH RESPECT TO "EVIDENCE". THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, THIS APRIL 2ND LETTER CITES A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, REFERS TO PETITIONS, PROTESTING, NONE OF WHICH IS DESCRIBED IN DETAIL. WOULD YOU AGREE WITH THAT? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. VAGUE. THE COURT: OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND TO THE EXTENT YOU UNDERSTAND. THE WITNESS: WHICH ONE? EXCUSE ME. WHICH PARAGRAPH ARE YOU REFERRING TO? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | TO US HOW THIS LETTER SUPPORTS THE TRUTH OF THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT. A THIS LETTER SHOW THAT MR. DORNAN HAS GONE THROUGH A VERY SYSTEMATIC PROCESS TO INVESTIGATE, INCLUDING TALKING TO COMMUNITY MEMBERS, TALKING TO VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS IN HIS OWN DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY, INCLUDING WRITING TO — MULTIPLE TIMES TO MS. LIMON, WRITING TO MR. KHOA, YOUR CLIENT, IN ORDER TO COME TO A CONCLUSION, WHICH IS NUMBER 5 ON HIS LETTER OF APRIL 30, 1996. Q OKAY. WE'LL GET TO THAT IN A MINUTE. I'M ASKING YOU ABOUT THIS LETTER. A YES. Q BEFORE I MOVE ON TO THE NEXT ONE, WE HAVE TO FINISH WITH THIS ONE. CAN YOU SHOW ME ANY CONTENT IN THIS LETTER, EXHIBIT 233, WHICH SUPPORTS THE ACCUSATION THAT PROFESSOR KHOA FALSELY CLAIMED ANYTHING IN A GRANT APPLICATION? A FIRST, LET ME CLARIFY THAT — THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN; RIGHT. WHEN YOU MENTION "ACCUSATION," YOU'RE REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN, ITEM NUMBER 5. Q I'M NOT REFERRING TO MR. DORNAN. I'M REFERRING TO YOU. YOU PUBLISHED THAT STATEMENT. YOU SAID YOU GOT THE INFORMATION FROM EXHIBIT 233. I'M ASKING YOU TO SHOW US WHERE |

| Page 25 | Page 26 |
|---|--|
| 1 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. | A NO. IT'S IN THAT LETTER, RIGHT THERE I JUST |
| 2 THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 2 READ TO YOU. HE ASK MS. LIMON ABOUT DUE DILIGENCE DUE |
| 3 THE WITNESS: WHAT I SAID WAS, THE LETTER DATED | DILIGENCE OF MONITORING OF FEDERAL FUNDS GRANTED TO |
| 4 APRIL 30, 1996, WAS MY PRIMARY SOURCE. I PARAPHRASE NUMBER 5, | S.E.A.R.A.C. YOU READ THAT. I READ IT TO YOU AGAIN. AND IF |
| 5 ITEM NUMBER 5, AT THE BOTTOM OF THE FIRST PAGE OF THAT LETTER. | YOU NEED ME TO READ IT AGAIN, I WILL DO THAT. I WILL COMPLY. |
| 6 AND, ADDITIONALLY, I LOOKED AT OTHER DOCUMENTS, | Q I JUST WANT YOU TO EXPLAIN HOW ANYTHING IN THIS |
| 7 INCLUDING APRIL 2ND, 1996, WHICH SUPPORTED THE CONTENT OF | 7 LETTER PROVES THAT THAT'S TRUE. |
| 8 MR. DORNAN'S LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996. | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED. |
| 9 BY MR. HART: | THE COURT: WE ARE AT THE ASKED-AND-ANSWERED POINT. |
| 10 Q I PROMISE, DR. THANG, THAT WE WILL MOVE ON TO | SUSTAINED. |
| 11 THAT EXHIBIT AS SOON AS WE'RE FINISHED WITH THIS ONE. 1: | MR. HART: ALL RIGHT. LET'S MOVE ON TO EXHIBIT 234. |
| 12 EXHIBIT 233 DOES NOT CONTAIN ANY CONTENT THAT | MR. NGUYEN: MAY WE PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? |
| 13 SUPPORTS THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT, DOES IT? | THE COURT: YOU MAY. |
| 14 A I CANNOT READ THE MIND OF MR. DORNAN, BUT IN | 4 MR. NGUYEN: THANK YOU. |
| 15 HERE, HE LAY OUT A NUMBER OF FACTS. ONE IS THAT O.R.R. DID | 5 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) |
| 16 FUND S.E.A.R.A.C. AND N.A.V.A.S.A. AND OTHER AFFILIATED | BY MR. HART: |
| 17 ORGANIZATIONS OF S.E.A.R.A.C. | Q PROFESSOR THANG, YOU HAVE TOLD US A NUMBER OF |
| 18 SECOND, HE MENTIONED THAT S.E.A.R.A.C. AND | TIMES THAT THIS EXHIBIT IS YOUR PRIMARY SOURCE FOR WHY YOU |
| 19 I.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. | WROTE THE CHALLENGED STATEMENT IN YOUR MAY 25, 2020 ARTICLE; |
| 20 IT MUST BE THE CONTEXT OF THE FUNDING, BECAUSE 20 | CORRECT? |
| 21 ALL THIS TALK ABOUT FUNDING, THE FUND FROM O.R.R. HAS BEEN 23 | A CORRECT. |
| 22 MISUSED IN THE MIND OF THE AUTHOR OF THIS LETTER. SO THERE HE 22 | Q ALL RIGHT. SO IF WE LOOK AT THIS ARTICLE OR |
| 23 IS TALKING ABOUT FUNDING. | THIS LETTER WRITTEN BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, WE SEE, IN THE |
| Q SO WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS, IT'S NOT NECESSARILY | FIRST PARAGRAPH, THAT HE SAYS HE'S RECEIVED TELEPHONE CALLS |
| 25 IN THIS LETTER, BUT IT'S IN DORNAN'S MIND, IF YOU UNDERSTAND 23 | AND LETTERS FROM HIS DISTRICT EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL |
| 26 THE BACKGROUND ABOUT THE DIFFERENT RELATIONSHIPS? 20 | 6 FUNDING OF PRIVATE 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATION SOUTHEAST ASIA |
| Page 27 | Page 28 |
| 1 RESOURCE CENTER. | MR. HART: I APOLOGIZE. AT LEAST WE'RE NOT ASKING |
| 2 YOU SEE THAT? | 2 WHAT YOUR PRONOUNS ARE. |
| 3 A IDO. | THE COURT: CONTINUE ON. |
| 4 Q DO YOU AGREE THAT WHAT HE'S SAYING THERE IS: | 4 BY MR. HART: |
| 5 I'M GETTING CONTACT FROM MY DISTRICT OPPOSING GOVERNMENT | Q OKAY. SO, DR. THANG, THE OPENING PARAGRAPH OF |
| 6 FUNDING OF S.E.A.R.A.C.? | THIS APRIL 30 LETTER SAYS OR CONGRESSMAN DORNAN EXPLAINING |
| 7 A IN MY DISTRICT AND ACROSS THE UNITED STATES. | 7 THAT HE'S HAD CONTACT FROM PEOPLE IN HIS DISTRICT AND ACROSS |
| 8 Q YEAH. | THE U.S. OPPOSING FURTHER FUNDING OF S.E.A.R.A.C.? |
| 9 A YEAH. | A CORRECT. |
| 10 Q YOU, YOURSELF, WROTE A LETTER REQUESTING THAT | Q AND YOU ARE ONE OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO HAVE |
| 11 S.E.A.R.A.C. NOT RECEIVE GRANT FUNDING, DIDN'T YOU? | OPPOSED FURTHER FUNDING OF S.E.A.R.A.C.; CORRECT? |
| 12 A THIS REFER TO JANUARY 1996 | , |
| 13 MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. | |
| 14 THE COURT: WAIT. | Q OKAY. BUT YOU ARE, IN FACT, ONE OF THE PEOPLE |
| 15 MR. VOSS: BEYOND THE SCOPE OF DEFENDANTS' 15 | |
| 16 CASE-IN-CHIEF DIRECT AND REPEATING WHAT WAS ALREADY ASKED IN 16 | , |
| 17 PLAINTIFF'S CALLING OF THIS WITNESS TO THE STAND. IT'S BEYOND 17 | , |
| 18 THE SCOPE. | |
| 19 THE COURT: OVERRULED. | |
| 20 YOU MAY CONTINUE. | , , , |
| 21 THE WITNESS: YES, IT VERY CLEARLY STATED THAT HE 21 | ,, |
| - | MR. DORNAN HAD ALREADY STARTED INVESTIGATION PRIOR TO |
| 22 RECEIVED OVERWHELMING NUMBER OF CALL 22 | |
| 23 MR. HART: HOLD ON, PROFESSOR THANG. THERE'S NO 23 | MARCH 6TH, BASED ON CALLS AND LETTERS FROM VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN |
| 23 MR. HART: HOLD ON, PROFESSOR THANG. THERE'S NO 23 24 THE WITNESS: I'M DOCTOR, NOT PROFESSOR. SORRY. 24 | MARCH 6TH, BASED ON CALLS AND LETTERS FROM VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS. |
| 23 MR. HART: HOLD ON, PROFESSOR THANG. THERE'S NO 23 | MARCH 6TH, BASED ON CALLS AND LETTERS FROM VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADERS. I WAS NOT A VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN LEADER AT THE |

| | Page 29 | | Page 30 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | _ | | - |
| 1 | FOUND OUT, HE COMMUNICATED IN THIS LETTER DATED APRIL 2ND TO | 1 | Q SO THAT'S A CONCERN OF THE MULTIPLE PEOPLE WHO |
| 2 | O.R.R. AND THEN FOLLOWING THE SECOND THE NEXT STAGE OF HIS | 2 | HAVE CONTACTED HIM ACCORDING TO CLEAR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRANSLATION OF THIS LETTER: RIGHT? |
| 3 | INVESTIGATION, HE CONTACTED THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE | 3 | , |
| 4 | DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON APRIL 30, 1996. | 4 | A YOU TOOK IT OUT OF CONTEXT. THAT'S WHAT I HAVE |
| 5 | MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS | 5 | TRIED TO POINT OUT ALL ALONG FOR THE PAST 20 MINUTES; THAT I |
| 6 | NONRESPONSIVE. | 6 | HAVE TO REFER TO HIS PRIOR LETTER DATED APRIL 2ND, WHERE IT |
| 7 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. THAT WILL BE STRICKEN AND | 7 | SAID THAT: MY STAFF HAS CONTINUED OUR INVESTIGATION. BE |
| 8 | DISREGARDED. | 8 | AWARE THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HAVE THE POWER TO INVESTIGATE |
| 9 | YOU WILL NEED TO REASK THE QUESTION. | 9 | INTO THE S.E.A.R.A.C. ORGANIZATION, INCLUDING OTHER AFFILIATED |
| 10 | BY MR. HART: | 10 | ORGANIZATIONS. AND WE HAVE FOUND WE HAVE FOUND THAT |
| 11 | Q DR. THANG, THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF DORNAN'S | 11 | I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A |
| 12 | APRIL 30 LETTER COMMUNICATES THAT HE HAS RECEIVED OPPOSITION | 12 | DOCTOR. |
| 13 | TO FURTHER FUNDING OF S.E.A.R.A.C.; CORRECT? | 13 | SO HE DIDN'T JUST RELY ON THIS AS CONCERNS AND |
| 14 | A CORRECT. | 14 | SUDDENLY HE JUST PASS IT ON TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL. NO. HE |
| 15 | Q FROM MULTIPLE PARTIES? | 15 | DID A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION. AND HE INFORMED THE INSPECTOR |
| 16 | A YES. | 16 | GENERAL OF HIS FINDING, HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE TIMES VERIFIED BY |
| 17 | Q OKAY. AND AT THE BOTTOM OF THAT PARAGRAPH, HE | 17 | HIS STAFF. |
| 18 | SAYS: "THEIR CONCERNS INCLUDE." | 18 | MR. HART: OBJECTION. MOVE TO STRIKE AS |
| 19 | YOU SEE THAT? | 19 | NONRESPONSIVE. I'M TRYING NOT TO INTERRUPT YOU. |
| 20 | A CORRECT. | 20 | THE COURT: GRANTED. THAT WILL BE STRICKEN AND |
| 21 | Q REFERRING TO THE MULTIPLE PARTIES WHO CONTACTED | 21 | DISREGARDED. |
| 22 | HIM? | 22 | BY MR. HART: |
| 23 | A CORRECT. | 23 | Q DR. THANG, THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS ONE OF FIVE |
| 24 | Q "THEIR CONCERNS INCLUDE" AND WE LOOK AT | 24 | CONCERNS OF UNNAMED PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS WHO ARE |
| 25 | NUMBER 5 "MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION AS A PH.D."; CORRECT? | 25 | CONTACTING CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. |
| 26 | A CORRECT. | 26 | DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT THAT'S WHAT THIS LETTER |
| | | | |
| | Page 31 | | Page 32 |
| 1 | Page 31 SAYS? | 1 | Page 32 THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| _ | SAYS? | | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. |
| 2 | SAYS? A NO. | 2 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A |
| 2 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? | 2 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. |
| 2 3 4 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T | 2 3 4 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF |
| 2 3 4 5 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. | 2 3 4 5 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. |
| 2 3 4 5 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE | 2 3 4 5 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO — THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO – THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO – THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO – THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO — THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE WAS ALSO A PART OF, AND I THINK THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH AL SANTOLI AND | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE WAS ALSO A PART OF, AND I THINK THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO SOMEWHERE IN HERE, THAT HE ALSO HE WAS A BOARD |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO – THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH AL SANTOLI AND CONGRESSMAN DORNAN WHEN THESE LETTERS WERE CREATED? DO YOU | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE WAS ALSO A PART OF, AND I THINK THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO SOMEWHERE IN HERE, THAT HE ALSO HE WAS A BOARD CHAIR, ALSO PRESENTED HIMSELF HAS A PH.D. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO – THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH AL SANTOLI AND CONGRESSMAN DORNAN WHEN THESE LETTERS WERE CREATED? DO YOU HAVE SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION THAT WE DON'T KNOW ABOUT, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE WAS ALSO A PART OF, AND I THINK THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO SOMEWHERE IN HERE, THAT HE ALSO HE WAS A BOARD CHAIR, ALSO PRESENTED HIMSELF HAS A PH.D. BUT, AGAIN, IN MY ARTICLE, I WROTE "DOCTOR." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | SAYS? A NO. Q WHY DON'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT? A YES, IT WAS A CONCERN. AND NO, THAT DIDN'T MEAN THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. Q OKAY. I'LL GRANT THAT. I'M NOT SAYING HE DIDN'T INVESTIGATE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE DID. BUT MY QUESTION IS: THIS ITEM NUMBER 5 IS NOT SOME FINDING OF AN INVESTIGATION. ACCORDING TO THIS LETTER, IT IS A CONCERN OF PEOPLE CONTACTING THE CONGRESSMAN? A THAT'S WHY YOU NEED TO — THIS IS AMBIGUOUS. I WOULD AGREE TO THAT. BUT YOU NEED TO REFER BACK TO THE APRIL 2ND, 1996. Q WHY IS THIS AMBIGUOUS? A BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SAY THAT, "THIS CAME OUT OF MY INVESTIGATION." Q BECAUSE MAYBE THAT'S NOT WHERE IT CAME FROM? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: SUSTAINED. BY MR. HART: Q WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH AL SANTOLI AND CONGRESSMAN DORNAN WHEN THESE LETTERS WERE CREATED? DO YOU HAVE SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION THAT WE DON'T KNOW ABOUT, ABOUT WHAT THEY MEANT WHEN THEY WROTE THESE THINGS? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. THE WITNESS: AS A THE COURT: WAIT. WAIT. MR. VOSS, YOU MUMBLED. SHE DIDN'T GET ALL OF YOUR OBJECTIONS ON THE RECORD. MR. VOSS: I DON'T KNOW, BUT IT WAS DENIED ANYWAY. SO FAIR ENOUGH. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THE WITNESS: CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION? MR. HART: MR. HART WILL. BY MR. HART: Q THIS ITEM NUMBER 5, ON EXHIBIT 234, ABOUT MR. KHOA'S SELF-PROMOTION OF A PH.D., YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q HAVE YOU SEEN ANYWHERE, IN ANY OF YOUR MATERIALS, WHERE HE PROMOTED HIMSELF AS A PH.D.? A NO. WELL, EXCEPT FOR TWO DOCUMENTS. ONE ALREADY CITED BY MY COUNSEL, WHERE HE WAS A BOARD MEMBER, A DIRECTOR OF V.A.E.F. AND THERE'S ANOTHER ORGANIZATION THAT HE WAS ALSO A PART OF, AND I THINK THAT IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN REFERRED TO SOMEWHERE IN HERE, THAT HE ALSO HE WAS A BOARD CHAIR, ALSO PRESENTED HIMSELF HAS A PH.D. BUT, AGAIN, IN MY ARTICLE, I WROTE "DOCTOR." Q OKAY. ALL RIGHT. AND SO THE SENTENCE ACTUALLY |

| DORANGO GITAC HILLI DEMONSTRALL PROMISSION AND ASTRUMENT OF THE CORRESPONDATION OF THE CO | | Page 33 | | Page 34 |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Second Second Color Relevance 1922 1 | 1 | DORNAN'S OFFICE THAT DEMONSTRATED PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTED | 1 | THE WITNESS: NO, IT'S NOT. IT'S NOT THE ONE I |
| Second Second Color Relevance 1922 1 | | | | |
| 1 | 3 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. 352. | 3 | |
| 1 | 4 | | 4 | |
| C. V. HIAY WAS ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION. C. P. | 5 | | 5 | |
| O CALV. NOT THAT CV. THAT WAS ATTACHED TO | 6 | | | |
| | 7 | | | |
| SEVERAL GRANT APPLICATIONS DOES NOT SELF-ROMOTINE | 8 | O OKAY, AND THAT C.V. THAT WAS ATTACHED TO | | · |
| 10 | 9 | | 9 | BY UNNAMED OTHERS THAT PROFESSOR KHOA WAS SELF-PROMOTING |
| 12 | 10 | | 10 | |
| THE CORRY OVERHALD. THE WITNESS IT SAIL, THE KINDA* THE WITNESS IT SAIL, THE KINDA SHE BY WE CAN FIND THE WITNESS IT SAIL ALOK AND SHE BY WE CAN FIND THE WITNESS IN THAT SHE GOOG TO GET THE EXHIBIT. THE COURT: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HEAR MY RULING? MELIART: THE COURT: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HEAR MY RULING? MELIART: THE COURT: WERE GOOG TO GET THE EXHIBIT. THE COURT: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HEAR MY RULING? MELIART: THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE ME A MOMENT TO LOOK MELIART: THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE ME A MOMENT TO LOOK MELIART: THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE ME A MOMENT TO LOOK MAY BE PUBLISHED. THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE ME A MOMENT TO LOOK AND WITH PERFURSION TO AND THE REPRORTS TO BE RELYING UPON THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE ME A MOMENT TO LOOK AND WITH PERFURSION YOUR HONDAY, WERE GOING BACK. 2347 THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE THE RULIN, BUT WHAT HE BERRYSS Page 35 THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE THE RULIN, BUT WHAT HE BERRYSS AND WHY BE PUBLISHED. THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE THE RULIN, BUT WHAT HE BERRYSS AND WHY BE RULIND UPON IT. MELIART: WAS AND WHITHER TOUL HAD COPIES Page 35 THE COURT: ORAY. THEN GIVE THE RULIN, BUT WHAT HE BERRYSS AND WHY BE RULIND UPON IT. THE WITNESS YES. PAGE 36 THE COURT: ORAY. WITHER GOING BACK. 2347 THE WITNESS YES. THE WITNESS YES | | | 11 | |
| 12 SHOWED THAT HE CLAIM HIMSELF TO BE A DOCTOR. | 12 | | 12 | |
| 14 Q CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS SHOW THAT 15 Q IT SAYS. TOCTORAL THISIST? 15 A YES, HE TSTITED— 16 AND THE CY, SAID, THE SHOW. 17 BY MR. HART. 18 WINESS. TON TO SURE WHETHER IT HAS BEEN 18 THAT. 19 THAT. 19 THAT. 20 OKAY, LEISTAKE ALOK AND SEE BY ECAN FIND 21 THAT. 22 ADMITTED. 23 ADMITTED. 24 ADMITTED. 25 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 26 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 27 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 28 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 29 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 20 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 20 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 21 THE COURT. WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 22 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURPORTS TO BE RELYING UPON 23 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURPORTS TO BE RELYING UPON 24 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURPORTS TO BE RELYING UPON 25 MAY BE PURLISHED. 26 THE COURT. THAY BY PURLISHED. 27 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURPORTS TO BE RELYING UPON 26 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 27 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 28 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 29 THE COURT. SHAW WERE GOING BACK TO THE 20 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 20 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 21 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 22 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 23 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 24 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 25 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 26 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 27 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 28 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 29 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 20 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 20 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 21 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 22 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 23 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 24 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 25 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 26 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 27 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 28 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 29 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 20 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 20 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 21 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 22 APPRIL WHEN PURLISHED. 23 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 24 A YES, DESTRUCT OF THE PURLISHED. 25 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 26 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 27 THE COURT. SHAW THE PURLISHED. 28 THE PURLISHED. 29 APPRIL WHE | | | | |
| 15 A VIS. HE TISTIPHED- A NO. THE CV. SAID. TREAD ALOOK AND SEE IF WE CAN PROD 17 Q OKAY, LETS TAKE ALOOK AND SEE IF WE CAN PROD 18 THAT. 19 THE WITNISS IN MOST SIZE WHETHER IT HAS BEEN 10 AUMITED. 20 ARMITTED. 21 THE COURT. WERE GOIND TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 22 MR. HART. 23 THE COURT. WERE GOIND TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 24 THE COURT. WERE GOIND TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 25 MR. HART. 26 OVERRULED. WHAT HE PREVIOUS OF THE EXHIBIT. 27 THE COURT. DAY. THEN GIVE ME AMOMENT TO LOOK 28 THE COURT. SEAT. YES, RIDGE. 29 THE COURT. SEAT. YES, RIDGE. 20 WE DAY HE RELED DROSS IT. 20 WE RANT. WERE MOST ME ME RELEVING UPON 21 THE COURT. SEAT. YES, RIDGE. 22 BACK. 23 TO EXHIBIT 21. 24 IS NOT OFFIRED NEEDS AND WITH HE RELIED DROSS IT. 25 MAY HE PRIBUSHED. 26 (DOCLIMENT PURESHED). 27 THE COURT. SEAT. WERE GOIND BACK TO THE 28 AND WITH HE RELIED DROSS IT. 39 THE COURT. GRAY. WERE GOIND BACK TO THE 40 MR. NGLYEN. YES. 41 MR. NGLYEN. YES. 42 APPELL THE OLDER. GRAY. WERE GOIND BACK TO THE 43 THE COURT. GRAY. WERE GOIND BACK TO THE 44 MR. NGLYEN. YES. 45 MR. NGLYEN. YES. 46 MR. NGLYEN. YES. 47 THE COURT. THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES 48 MR. HART. EFTS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 48 AND THE LEED DROSS IT. 49 MR. HART. EFTS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 48 AND THE LEED DROSS IT. 40 OR AND THE MET HE PUBLISHED. 41 THE COURT. THE QUESTION NAS WHETHER YOU. 41 THE COURT. THE QUESTION NAS WHETHER YOU. 42 ARRIVE THE WITH SESS YES. 43 ARRIVE THE WITH SESS YES. 44 MR. HART. EFTS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 45 ARRIVE WITH SESS THE TO THE THAT THE PUBLISHED. 45 ARRIVE WERE GOIND AND THE WITH THE PUBLISHED. 46 AND TO THE WITH SESS THE NORTH THE PUBLISHED. 47 THE COURT. AND YOU MAY. 48 OUT OF THE PUBLISHED. 48 AND THE MET WE PUBLISHED. 49 AND THE RELEASED HE ANT THE AND THE PUBLISHED. 40 AND THE AND THE PUBLISHED. 40 ORD TO SEED THE PUBLISHED. 41 THE COURT. AND YOUR CLIEB. 41 THE COURT. AND YOU MAY. 42 OR OWE AND THE AND THE PUBLISHED. 43 ART THE THE THAT THE AND THE THAT THE | 14 | | | |
| 15 MR. HART: MOVETO STRIKE. HES TESTEVING HEARSAY. 17 Q OKAY, LETS TAKE A LOOK AND SEE IF WE CAN FIND 18 THAT. 19 THE WITNESS: IM NOT SURE WHETHER IT HAS BEEN 19 THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ESHIBIT. 20 ADMITTID. 21 THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ESHIBIT. 22 MAR, HART: HEBN'S TO UCAN FIND THE RESIME ATTACHED 23 TO ENHBERT 221. 24 THE COURT: 21', YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT 25 MAY BE PIBLISHED. 26 (IXCUMENT PURLISHED) 27 APRIL JUTIL LETTER 28 APRIL JUTIL LETTER 29 APRIL JUTIL LETTER 30 THE COURT: STAKE A LOOK AND WERE GOING BACK TO THE 41 MR. NGLYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 42 APRIL JUTIL LETTER 43 THE COURT: THAN YEE FORNOR BACK — 247 44 MR. NGLYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 45 MR. NGLYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 46 MR. NGLYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK — 247 47 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 48 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 49 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 40 MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 41 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 41 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 42 APRIL JUTIL LETTER 43 THE COURT: THAN YEE PURLISHED. 44 MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 45 ARTICLE. WHICH IS SURHER! THAN YEAR. 46 (DOCLOMINT PURLISHED.) 47 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. 48 Q DR. THAND, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONCRESSMAN 49 Q DR. THAND, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONCRESSMAN 40 MR. HART: 41 THE COURT: AND YOUR MAY. 41 THE COURT: AND YOUR MAY. 42 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1998. AND 43 THE THAND THAND, THE PURLISHED. 44 THE COURT: THE PURLISHED. 45 THE COURT: THE QUESTION NOT THE OVERHELAD. 46 AND THE COURT: THE PURLISHED. 47 THE COURT: THE YEAR ADMITTER. 48 THE THE NORTH THE REMEMBER WHEN CONCRESSMAN 49 Q OKAY, AND WAST I EVER PASSED? 40 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1998. AND 41 PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? 41 PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? 42 A YES, DETRITIED. 43 THE THAND THAND THE PURLISHED. 44 PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? 45 A PORT THE THE THAND THAND THIN THAND THE PURLISHED. 46 ORRECTION, RIGHT THAND THAND THE | 15 | | 15 | · |
| 17 O OKAY, LETS TAKE A LOOK AND SEEF WECAN FIND 18 THAT. 19 THE WITNESS: IM NOT SURE WHETHER IT HAS BEEN 20 ADDITTED. 21 THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 22 THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. 23 THE COURT: YER, THEN YOU CAN FIND THE RESIME ATTACHED 24 THE COURT: YER, THEN YOU CAN FIND THE RESIME ATTACHED 25 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 26 (DOCUMENT FURLISHED) 27 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 28 ADD WITH HE PUBLISHED. 29 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 20 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 21 THE COURT: YEA, THEN WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT 22 APPEL SYMILLED. WHAT HE PUBLISHED HE RELIEVES 23 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 24 APPEL SYMILLED. WHAT HE PUBLISHED HE RELIEVES 25 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 26 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 27 APPEL SYMILLED. WHAT HE PUBLISHED. THEN YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 28 THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES 29 THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES 20 THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES 21 THE COURT: THE VIBER BY BUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 22 APPEL SYMILLED. 23 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 24 APPEL SYMILLED. 25 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 26 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 27 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 28 ARTICLE, WHICH HE SERHIED 28, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. 39 AND HAVE THE PUBLISHED. 30 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 30 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 31 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 32 APPEL SYMILLED. 33 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 34 APPEL SYMILLED. 35 THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. 36 ORD FRANK HAVE: 37 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. 38 WITH RELEASED HIS SANTLETA AMERIMENT? 39 BY MR. HART: 40 Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2030 LETTER. 41 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. 41 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 41 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 42 A YES, ITS PASSED THE HOUSE IN APPEL 195, AND IT WENT IN 44 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 45 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 46 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 47 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 48 THE DESN OF PERSIMENT CHING AND PROBLEMS. 49 CONTROLLED. 40 AND THE RELIES AND PASSED THE SAND AND THE 40 COURT. OF YOUR AND PASSED THE SAND AND THE 41 DESN | 16 | | | |
| THAT. THE WITNESS: IN NOT SURE WHETHER IT HAS BEEN ADMITTED. ADMITTED. THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: WERE GOING TO GET THE ENHIBIT. EVERYOR OF THE COURT: STATE HAT WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT EVERYOR OF THE COURT: CIA, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT EVERYOR OF THE COURT: CIA, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT EVERYOR OF THE COURT: CIA, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED SO, YES, IT EVERYOR OF THE STATE ADMINISTRY OF THE TRUTH, BUT WHAT HE BELEVES AND WITH HE RELICITED WOULD NOT. MR. HART: OKAY, JUDGE. PAGE 35 FAGE 35 THE COURT: CIA, YES, WERE GOING BACK - 2347 ARRIBATILITY OF THE COURT: CIA, YES, WERE GOING BACK - 2347 THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. GOOD CHAINT PUBLISHED) THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. GOOD CHAINT PUBLISHED) THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. GOOD CHAINT PUBLISHED. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. EVERYOR AND WAS IT FUTER PASSED? A YES, IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. BY MER, HART: THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. THE COURT: AND YOU | | | | |
| THE CURT: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HEAR MY RULINCY ADMITTED. THE COURT: WERE GONG TO GET THE EXHBIT: THE COURT: WERE GONG TO GET THE EXHBIT: THE COURT: WAS ADMITTED. THE COURT: WERE GONG TO GET THE EXHBIT: THE COURT: WAS ADMITTED. THE COURT: WAS ADMITTED. SO, YES, IT THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES PAGE 36 THE COURT: WAS | | | | |
| ADMITTED. THE COURT: WERE GONG TO GET THE EXHBIT. MR. HART: I THINK YOU CAN FIND THE RESUME ATTACHED MR. HART: ITHINK YOU CAN FIND THE RESUME ATTACHED THE COURT: 221, VIS. THAT WAS ADMITTED. SO, YIS, IT ANY HE PUBLISHED. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) Page 35 MR. HART: CKAY. JUDGE. Page 36 MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GONG BACK TO THE MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GONG BACK TO THE THE COURT: CRAY. WERE GONG BACK - 2347 MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GONG BACK - 2347 MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. DOCUMENT PUBLISHED. DOCUMENT PUBLISHED. THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: CKAY. JUDGE. Page 36 THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: ETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: ETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: ETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT MAY BE PUBLISHED. MR. HART: ETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHBITE 388, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. THE COURT: MAY BE PUBLISHED. MR. HART: EXHBITE 1388, DR. THANKY 25, 2020 LETTER, THE COURT: THAY SET DEPORTMENT OF THAT THANKS AT THAT SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD THE COURT: THE PUBLISHED. THE | | | | |
|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| 20 | | 20 | |
| 22 MAR. HART: ITHINK YOU CAN FIND THE RESUME ATTACHED 23 TO EXHIBIT 221. 24 THE COURT: 211, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED. SO, YES, IT 25 MAY BE PUBLISHED. 26 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED) 27 APRIL SHITL. 28 MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 29 APRIL 30TH LETTER. 20 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 20 APRIL 30TH LETTER. 30 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK TO THE 41 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 42 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 43 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK - 2447 44 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 45 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK - 2447 46 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 47 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK - 2447 48 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 49 THE COURT: OF ANY, WERE GOING BACK - 2447 49 WINTER LEASED DISSIBLED. THANK YOU. 40 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 40 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 40 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 41 CHOOLOGY OF ANY OF AMENDAMENT? 41 OF ORAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 41 EXHIBIT 2S, BR. THANG? 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1996. 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1996. 42 OF APID AFTER SENTE BY DEFENSE AND HIEN IT REACH 43 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 44 STATE, IT PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1996. 45 OBJECTION, RIGHT? 46 Q APIER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 47 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 48 OBJECTION, RIGHT? 49 A YES, DEFINITELY. 40 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 41 DISAGREEWITH? 42 MINITERS ELEASED HAT OR NOT. 41 STATE, IT PASSED THE FOR NOT. 42 THE WITHDRESS OF THESE LETTERS, CORRECT? 43 WHETHER HE RELIASED THAT OR NOT. 44 WHETHER HE RELIASED THAT OR NOT. 45 THE MY THE APPLICATION OF MY ARTICLE. 46 WHETHER HE RELIASED THAT OR NOT. 47 THE COURT: OVERWLED. 48 WHETHER HE RELIASED THAT OR NOT. 49 WILL HAVE TO BE ADMITTED. AND THESE LETTERS, CORRECT? 40 WILL HAVE TO BE ADMITTED. AND THESE LETTERS, CORRECT? 41 WHETHER HE RELIASED THAT OR NOT. 42 HAVE TO BEAD THE RUPLESS IN ALREADY COMP | | THE COURT: WE'RE GOING TO GET THE EXHIBIT. | 21 | |
| THE COURT: 121, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED. SO, YES, IT WAY BE PUBLISHED. Page 35 Page 35 INFRARCIPE YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE ARE NOUVEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE AVERT YES. MR. NOUVEN: YES. MR. NOUVEN: YES. MR. NOUVEN: YES. THE COURT: THE AVERT YES. THE COURT: AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. WELL ASSED THE HOUSE IN APIEL 1995. AND THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. THE COURT: THE AVERT HE TRUTH, BUT WHAT HE BELEVES AND YOU WAS IT HE PROVED THE AVERT HE AVERT HE PROVED THE AVERT HE AVERT HE PROVED THE AVERT HE | | | 22 | |
| THE COURT: 21, YES, THAT WAS ADMITTED. SO, YES, IT THE COURT: PUBLISHED. Page 35 MAY BE PUBLISHED. Page 35 MR. HART: OKAY. JUDGE. Page 36 THE COURT: OKAY. WERE GOING BACK TO THE THE COURT: OKAY. WERE GOING BACK - 2347 MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. HART: CKAY. WERE GOING BACK - 2347 MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 THE COURT: THAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 THE COURT: AND ID LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. DO RITHANK, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A AND OVER WITH SELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A TIBE COURT: AND YOUR AND WAY. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A TIBE COURT: AND YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A TIBE COURT: AND YOU MAY. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A TIBE MARCH 1995. DO OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THE SELECT IN NOT SURE A YES. AND TO PUBLISHED. A YES. AND TO PUBLISHED. A YES. AND TO JUMP WE RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT IN THE WITH SELECT IN NOT SURE A YES. O OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DEPARTMENT OF THE COWERS OF SECTION, YOUR HONOR, ITS BEYOND THE COMPANY AND PART OF THAT TRANSLATION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I THE COURT: OKAY. WERE CORDS OF THE SELECT IN NOT SURE A PASSECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. IM NOT SURE WHETHER H | | | | |
| 25 AND WITH HE RELIED UPON IT. 26 MR HART: OKAY, JUDGE. Page 35 Page 36 MR, NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. 3 THE COURT: OKAY, WERE GOING BACK — 224? 4 MR, NGUYEN: YES. 4 MR, NGUYEN: YES. 5 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 7 BY MR, HART: 8 Q DE THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELIESED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN NARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY, AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLEENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE COSPERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER, AND IT HEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AND AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION, RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 ADOUT PROFESSOR KHOAZ 22 A A PERT THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TRANSLATION, THE OVERHEAD COMPARE THAT TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION, TO HE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION THE TRANSLATION, THE TRANSLATION THE THE TRANSLATION THE TRANSLATIO | | | | |
| Page 35 IMR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE ARRIL STITL LETTER. ARRIL SOTH LETTER. THE COURT: CKAY. WERE GOING BACK - 234? THE COURT: CKAY. WERE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. COCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. COCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: COURT: AND YOU MAY. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 288, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND FULKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. BY MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 288, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND FULKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. BY MR. HART: UNIT TO WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 288, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND FULKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY 25TH, 2020 BY MR. HART: UNIT TO WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 288, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND FULKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 288, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND FULKE TO PUBLISH THAT Y SERVED. BY MR. HART: UNIT STAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A PRICE THAT STAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 BY MR. HART: UTIES TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A PRICE THE COURT: THAD WITHOUT MAY 25TH, 2020 BY MR. HART: UTIES TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 BY MR. HART: UTIES TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A PRICE THAT STAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 A PRICE THE STATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND THE WITH IN THE ALL THAT STAKE A LOOK AT YOUR AND AS THE ALL THAS SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD THE COURT STAKE ALL THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS A YES, DEFENDED THAT THAN SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD THE COURT STATE ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED A YES DEFENDED THAT THAN SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD THE COURT STATE ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED A YES DEFENDED THAT THAN SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD THE COURT STAKE ALL THESE SOME BY DO | 25 | | 25 | |
| Page 35 IMR NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WERE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE WITNESS: YES. A MIR NAUTE: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 25R, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT PLEASE. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES AND TO LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT PLEASE. THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES AND TO LIKE THE PUBLISHED. BY MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 AND HE THAN GO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN BY MR. HART: THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES AND TO LIKE THE YOU HAD COPIES AND THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT: THE QUESTION HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT: THE QUESTION HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE MANILATION HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE COURT: THE THAT TO THAT THAN LATION HAD COPIES THE COURT: THE COURT | 26 | (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) | 26 | |
| 1 THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES 2 APRIL 30TH LETTER. 2 OF THESE LETTERS? 3 THE COURT: OKAY. WERE GOING BACK – 234? 3 THE WITNESS: YES. 4 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 4 MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 5 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 5 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 AND ID LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. 7 BY MR. HART: 7 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 9 BY MR. HART: 10 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 10 Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, 11 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 12 A YES. 13 Q AND IS THIS PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 12 A YES. 17 PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 12 A YES. 17 PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 14 PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? 15 A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 16 YES. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 17 Q OKAY. AND WAS ITEDER MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 12 A YES. 15 PASSED THE LISTTER SENT BY DORNAN ITS 17 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE YES. 14 PAGE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 11 PROPERTY OF THAT TRANSLATION. 12 THE COURT. OVERRULED. 12 THE COURT. OVERRULED. 13 PROPERTY OF THAT TRANSLATION. 12 THE COURT. OVERRULED. 14 PAY TO THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 12 THE COURT. OVERRULED. 14 PAY TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO 15 PROPERTY OF THE SELECTERS. CORRECT? 15 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | | | - | |
| 2 OF THESE LETTERS? 3 THE COURT: OKAY. WERE GOING BACK – 234? 4 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 4 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 5 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 AND ID LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. 7 BY MR. HART: 8 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE BOECEMBER 1995. AND IT IN THE THAT SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD 15 THE CONFRENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION, RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 A A FIRE THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 22 THE WINTENS: LALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT ON NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | | | | |
| THE COURT: OKAY, WERE GOING BACK – 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. MR. HART: LETS TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED.) MR. HART: OCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: OCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) MR. HART: OCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) MR. HART: OCCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: OCCUMENT PUBLISHED. A YES, DETAIL PUBLISHED. A YES, DETAIL PUBLISHED. A YES, DETAIL PUBLISHED. A THAT STHE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. OCCUMENT PUBLISHED. A THAT STHE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. OCCUMENT PUBLISHED. A THAT STHE ENGLISH P | | Page 35 | | - |
| 4 MR. NGUYEN: YES. 5 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 (AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. 7 BY MR. HART: 8 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY, AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APPILL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION, RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 Q AND AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 A AFTER THE LETTERS MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 23 RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN PRIGLISH. | 1 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE | | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES |
| 5 THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 (AND ID LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. 7 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. 8 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 11 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 12 A YES. 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 Q AND AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 THE COURT: AND YOU AAY. 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. | 2 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? |
| 6 (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) 6 AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. 7 THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. 8 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 11 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 THE COURT: ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 22 DA AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 DA WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. 27 RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? | 2 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. |
| PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? BY MR. HART: O DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. O OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND I EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND I EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND I EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES, I HEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF I STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN I PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? I THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH I THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. I PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? I DISAGREE WITH? O BUBCTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. O WAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU B OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. O WAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. B WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. | 2 3 4 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 |
| 8 Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A ITS IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 11 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 12 A YES, ITS PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 THE WITHOUSE IN A FINE SENATE IN DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. IM NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN RENGLISH. | 2 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. | 2 3 4 5 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. |
| 9 SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? 10 A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 11 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, 21 EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? 21 A YES. 22 A A THAT'S THE MAY IN THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) | 2 3 4 5 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. |
| 10 Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 10 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 11 DISAGREE WITH? 12 DISAGREE WITH? 13 DISAGREE WITH? 14 PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? 15 A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, 16 YES. 17 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK – 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: | 2 3 4 5 6 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. |
| 11 Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? 12 A YES, ITS PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) |
| 12 A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND 13 THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 13 Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 16 YES. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 17 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: |
| THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF 13 Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 16 YES. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 DISAGREE WITH? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD 27 A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, |
| 14 STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN 15 THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 16 YES. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 17 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? |
| THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS DISAGREE WITH? B DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE VES. MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE COPPE AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? THE STATE SHATE THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAR THAT TO THE TORRAD THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. |
| 16 THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. 17 Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 18 OBJECTION; RIGHT? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK – 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD |
| Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS 17 Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU 18 DISAGREE WITH? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? |
| 18 DISAGREE WITH? 19 A YES, DEFINITELY. 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, |
| 19 MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE 20 Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. |
| Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED 20 SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. 21 ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? 21 THE COURT: OVERRULED. 22 THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 23 RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU |
| ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. VEHICLE OF THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY A RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK – 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? |
| 22 THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY 27 RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I 28 HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO 29 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE |
| 23 INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I 27 HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO 28 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. |
| 24 WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 26 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. 27 HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. |
| 25 Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? 25 THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK - 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WERE RELEASED ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO |
| , I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | MR. NGUYEN: YOUR HONOR, WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE APRIL 30TH LETTER. THE COURT: OKAY. WE'RE GOING BACK 234? MR. NGUYEN: YES. THE COURT: IT MAY BE PUBLISHED. THANK YOU. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DR. THANG, DO YOU REMEMBER WHEN CONGRESSMAN SMITH RELEASED HIS ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? A IT'S IN MARCH 1995. Q OKAY. AND WAS IT EVER PASSED? A YES, IT'S PASSED THE HOUSE IN APRIL 1995. AND THEN DESPITE OPPOSITION BY YOUR CLIENT AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE, IT PASSED THE SENATE IN DECEMBER 1995. AND IT WENT IN THE CONFERENCE SOMETIME A FEW MONTHS LATER. AND THEN IT REACH THE DESK OF PRESIDENT CLINTON IN APRIL 1996. Q AFTER THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD WITHDRAWN ITS OBJECTION; RIGHT? A YES, DEFINITELY. Q AND AFTER ALL THESE MATERIALS WE'RE RELEASED ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA? A AFTER THE LETTER SENT BY DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I'M NOT SURE WHETHER HE RELEASED THAT OR NOT. Q WELL, YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS; CORRECT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | THE COURT: THE QUESTION WAS WHETHER YOU HAD COPIES OF THESE LETTERS? THE WITNESS: YES. MR. HART: LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR MAY 25TH, 2020 ARTICLE, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 238, SPECIFICALLY PAGE 7. AND I'D LIKE TO PUBLISH THAT, PLEASE. THE COURT: AND YOU MAY. (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) BY MR. HART: Q DO YOU SEE YOUR MAY 25, 2020 LETTER, EXHIBIT 238, DR. THANG? A YES. Q AND IS THIS PART THAT'S SHOWN ON THE OVERHEAD PART OF YOUR ARTICLE? A THAT'S THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF MY ARTICLE, YES. Q OKAY. ANY PART OF THAT TRANSLATION YOU DISAGREE WITH? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. IT'S BEYOND THE SCOPE AND RELEVANCE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSLATION. THE COURT: OVERRULED. THE WITNESS: I ALREADY EXPRESS SOME OF MY RESERVATIONS DURING DEPOSITION. NOW, IF YOU ASK ME AGAIN, I HAVE TO READ THE ORIGINAL IN VIETNAMESE AND COMPARE THAT TO THIS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH. |

| | Page 37 | | Page 38 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Q WHAT I'M REALLY ASKING YOU TO DO IS TELL US | 1 | YOU SEE THAT? |
| 2 | WHETHER THE QUOTE FROM YOUR ARTICLE, WHICH I'VE WRITTEN ON THE | 2 | A YES. |
| 3 | WHITEBOARD, ACCURATELY STATES WHAT YOU INTENDED TO SAY IN YOUR | 3 | Q DID YOU GET THAT FROM DORNAN'S APRIL 2ND |
| 4 | ARTICLE? | 4 | LETTER? |
| 5 | A I THINK THAT IN DEPOSITION I POINTED OUT THAT I | 5 | A NO. PARTIALLY, IN THE DORNAN'S LETTER, BOTH |
| 6 | DIDN'T SAY HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE. | 6 | LETTERS, THEY DID REFER TO KHOA ADMITTING NOT BEING A DOCTOR. |
| 7 | (REPORTER ASKS FOR CLARIFICATION.) | 7 | BUT THEN, AS MENTIONED, IT WAS A SCANDAL IN OUR COMMUNITY, AND |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: IN MY DEPOSITION, I THINK I NOTED THAT | 8 | THERE ARE MANY ARTICLES WRITTEN ABOUT THIS, TO THE POINT THAT |
| 9 | TO YOU, THAT MY ORIGINAL ARTICLE SAID THAT MR, KHOA FALSELY | 9 | KHOA HAD TO COME OUT. |
| 10 | CLAIMED TO BE A DOCTOR. AND, HERE, IT WAS TRANSLATED INTO | 10 | Q I'M GOING TO HAVE TO INTERRUPT YOU, DR. THANG. |
| 11 | THAT HE HELD A DOCTORAL DEGREE. IT MIGHT BE JUST A MINOR | 11 | I NEED YOU TO JUST BE RESPONSIVE TO MY QUESTION. |
| 12 | DIFFERENCE. | 12 | A ALL RIGHT. |
| 13 | BY MR. HART: | 13 | MR. HART: MOVE TO STRIKE AS NONRESPONSIVE. |
| 14 | O ANY OTHER DIFFERENCE? | 14 | THE COURT: THAT WILL BE GRANTED. THAT LAST RESPONSE |
| 15 | A THERE ARE TWO OTHERS THAT I CAN'T REMEMBER. | 15 | WILL BE DISREGARDED. |
| 16 | O "THAT WAS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE" VERSUS "THAT IS A | 16 | BY MR. HART: |
| 17 | CRIMINAL OFFENSE"? | 17 | Q IN THE APRIL 2ND LETTER, CONGRESSMAN DORNAN |
| 18 | A YES. BECAUSE IN VIETNAMESE, WE DON'T | 18 | WRITES THAT: "RECENTLY. IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC INOUIRY. |
| 19 | DIFFERENTIATE TOO MUCH ABOUT PAST TENSE. | 19 | MR. KHOA ADMITTED THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR." |
| 20 | O OKAY. SO DO YOU THINK YOU SAID "WAS" OR "IS"? | 20 | YOU REMEMBER THAT? |
| 21 | A IT COULD BE INTERPRETED AS EITHER "WAS" OR | 21 | A YES. |
| 22 | "IS." | 22 | Q AND IN THE APRIL 30 LETTER, AT ITEM NUMBER 5, |
| 23 | Q OKAY. GOING DOWN TO THE PARAGRAPH BELOW THE | 23 | IT SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED THAT HE DOES NOT HAVE |
| 24 | HIGHLIGHTED PART, IT SAYS: "WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA | 24 | SUCH A DEGREE." |
| 25 | EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND | 25 | DO YOU SEE THAT? |
| 26 | ADDRESSED HIM BY THE TITLE 'DOCTOR' EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED." | 26 | A I DON'T SEE IT OR REMEMBER THAT. |
| 20 | ABBRESSED HIM DE THE DOCTOR EVEN HOOGH HE OBJECTED. | 20 | A 1000 I SEE II ON NEWEWENDER HIAT. |
| | Page 39 | | - 10 |
| | rage 39 | | Page 40 |
| 1 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? | 1 | Page 40 secondary sources, but I mentioned to You I had a box of |
| 1 2 | | 1 2 | |
| | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? | | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF |
| 2 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. | 2 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF |
| 2 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. | 2 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. |
| 2 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? | 2 3 4 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. | 2 3 4 5 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. | 2 3 4 5 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE I. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE I, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE – PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE I. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE I, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE – PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-O, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE – PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-O, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, THAT TOLD THE STORY. SO IT WAS COVERED IN THE NEWS. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE — PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-O, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, THAT TOLD THE STORY. SO IT WAS COVERED IN THE NEWS. Q OKAY. SO ALL THAT MATTERS TO ME FOR THIS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION." CAN YOU SHOW US WHAT RESUME ATTACHED TO A GRANT |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE 1. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE 1, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-Q, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, THAT TOLD THE STORY. SO IT WAS COVERED IN THE NEWS. Q OKAY. SO ALL THAT MATTERS TO ME FOR THIS QUESTION | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION." CAN YOU SHOW US WHAT RESUME ATTACHED TO A GRANT APPLICATION PROFESSOR KHOA CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE I. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE I, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE — PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-Q, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, THAT TOLD THE STORY. SO IT WAS COVERED IN THE NEWS. Q OKAY. SO ALL THAT MATTERS TO ME FOR THIS QUESTION — A YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION." CAN YOU SHOW US WHAT RESUME ATTACHED TO A GRANT APPLICATION PROFESSOR KHOA CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q YOU REMEMBER IT? A I'M STILL LOOKING FOR THAT. Q OKAY. 234, PAGE I. A CAN YOU REPEAT THAT, PLEASE? Q 234. A I'M THERE. Q PAGE I, ITEM 5, ROBERT DORNAN SAYS: "HOWEVER, HE RECENTLY ADMITTED HE DOES NOT HAVE SUCH A DEGREE." DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. SO IS THAT WHERE YOU GOT THIS INFORMATION, WHEN INVESTIGATED, MR. KHOA EXPLAINED THAT OTHER PEOPLE SHOWED RESPECT TO HIM AND ADDRESSED HIM BY "DOCTOR," EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED? A AS I MENTIONED TO YOU, THERE'S SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT I REFER TO. AND ONE OF THE DOCUMENTS I HAPPEN TO FIND THAT IT'S IN THE BINDER OF EXHIBITS, IT'S AN ARTICLE BY THE – PUBLISHED IN A VERY WELL-RESPECTED PUBLICATION, "TUDO," WHICH MEANS "FREEDOM," T-U-D-O, "FREEDOM," IN MARCH, THAT TOLD THE STORY. SO IT WAS COVERED IN THE NEWS. Q OKAY. SO ALL THAT MATTERS TO ME FOR THIS QUESTION A YES. Q IS WHETHER THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE AT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | SECONDARY SOURCES, BUT I MENTIONED TO YOU I HAD A BOX OF DOCUMENTS ARCHIVED. SO I LOOKED THEM UP AND REVIEW A LOT OF THEM AND THEN USE MANY OF THEM TO WRITE THIS ARTICLE. Q OKAY. AND THE TWO DORNAN LETTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU PRESENTED AS YOUR SOURCE FOR THE STATEMENTS THAT YOU WROTE? MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES HIS ANSWER. THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. MR. VOSS: THEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. THE COURT: YOU MAY RESPOND, SIR. THE WITNESS: NO. THOSE ARE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES, BUT NOT ALL THE SOURCES. BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. THEY'RE THE TWO PRIMARY SOURCES? A YES. Q ALL RIGHT. AND SO WHEN WE MOVE LOWER IN THIS ARTICLE, YOU SAY: "EVEN THOUGH HE OBJECTED. BUT SUCH AN EXPLANATION WAS NOT GOOD, BECAUSE MR. KHOA HIMSELF HAD CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE IN THE RESUME HE ATTACHED TO THE GRANT APPLICATION." CAN YOU SHOW US WHAT RESUME ATTACHED TO A GRANT APPLICATION PROFESSOR KHOA CLAIMED TO HAVE A DOCTORAL DEGREE? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED IN PLAINTIFFS CASE-IN-CHIEF. |

| | Page 41 | | Page 42 |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 1 | TIME TO WRAP UP. | 1 | BY MR. HART: |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: IT IS IN HIS BIO. I CALL IT RESUME, | 2 | Q OKAY. HAS THAT BEEN ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE? |
| 3 | BUT YOU CHARACTERIZE THAT AS A BIO. | 3 | A THAT QUESTION MUST BE ASKED OF MY COUNSEL. |
| 4 | BY MR. HART: | 4 | Q ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT THE BIO OR THE RESUME? |
| 5 | Q OKAY. AND WHERE DID YOU GET THE INFORMATION | 5 | A THE BIO. |
| 6 | THAT THAT BIO WAS ATTACHED TO A GRANT APPLICATION? | 6 | Q OKAY. SO THE QUESTION REMAINS: WHAT EVIDENCE |
| 7 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED. BEYOND | 7 | DO YOU HAVE THAT THAT BIO WAS EVER ATTACHED TO A GRANT |
| 8 | THE SCOPE OF THE DIRECT IN THE DEFENSE CASE. | 8 | APPLICATION? |
| 9 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 9 | A FIRST OF ALL, I SAW IT BEING PULLED OUT OF A |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: AGAIN, I'VE OBTAINED THAT FROM | 10 | GRANT APPLICATION. |
| 11 | DR. SANTOLI, WHO SHOWED ME MULTIPLE GRANT | 11 | SECONDLY, IF YOU INSPECT THAT BIO, YOU WILL SEE |
| 12 | APPLICATIONS COPIES OF THOSE GRANT APPLICATIONS THAT HIS | 12 | THAT ON THE RIGHT-HAND CORNER, UP TOP RIGHT-HAND CORNER, IT |
| 13 | OFFICE HAD RECEIVED FROM DIFFERENT FEDERAL AGENCIES, AND | 13 | SAYS "APPENDIX C1." SO IT MEANS THIS MUST BE APPENDIX IT |
| 14 | EXPLAIN TO ME WHY THEY WERE THERE, ET CETERA. | 14 | WAS AN APPENDIX OF APPENDIX C OF A GRANT APPLICATION. |
| 15 | AND HE ASK ME WHETHER I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN | 15 | Q SO THAT'S YOUR EXTRAPOLATION OF DIFFERENT FACTS |
| 16 | GETTING ONE FULL COPIES. I SAID: NO, THAT'S TOO MANY PAGES. | 16 | YOU PULLED TOGETHER? |
| 17 | JUST ONE C.V. WILL BE ENOUGH FOR ME TO KEEP. | 17 | A NO, I SAW IT PULLED OUT |
| 18 | THAT'S HOW I GOT IT. | 18 | THE COURT: WAIT. |
| 19 | BY MR. HART: | 19 | THE WITNESS: I'M SORRY. |
| 20 | Q DR. THANG, THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS YOU DON'T | 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE. |
| 21 | HAVE ANY RESUME OR BIO ATTACHED TO A GRANT APPLICATION WHERE | 21 | THE COURT: THANK YOU. I'VE JUST GOT TO MAKE SURE WE |
| 22 | PROFESSOR KHOA CLAIMED TO BE A DOCTOR, DO YOU? | 22 | DON'T HAVE EVERYBODY TALKING OVER ONE ANOTHER. |
| 23 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ARGUMENTATIVE. CALLS FOR A | 23 | THE WITNESS: SORRY. |
| 24 | LEGAL CONCLUSION. | 24 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. YOU MAY REPHRASE. |
| 25 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 25 | MR. HART: I'LL WITHDRAW THE QUESTION, JUDGE. |
| 26 | THE WITNESS: 1 DO. | 26 | BY MR. HART: |
| | Page 43 | | Page 44 |
| 1 | Q DR. THANG, WHY DID YOU INCLUDE THIS PARTICULAR | 1 | MEANS? |
| 2 | STATEMENT IN YOUR ARTICLE? | 2 | A I PARAPHRASE, YES. |
| 3 | A WHICH STATEMENT? | 3 | Q OKAY. YOU PARAPHRASED IT FROM |
| 4 | Q THE STATEMENT WHERE WE'RE CLAIMING YOU DEFAMED | 4 | A THE SAME INFORMATION. |
| 5 | PROFESSOR KHOA, THE ONE THAT'S ON THE WHITEBOARD? | 5 | Q OKAY. AND IN DOING THAT, IT DIDN'T OCCUR TO |
| 6 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED | 6 | YOU THAT IT MIGHT NOT BE TRUE AND THAT THAT LACK OF TRUTH |
| 7 | ON THE DIRECT BY THE PLAINTIFF. | 7 | MIGHT HURT SOMEBODY? |
| 8 | THE COURT: WE'RE GETTING TO THAT POINT, YES. | 8 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION, YOUR HONOR. ARGUMENTATIVE. |
| 9 | SUSTAINED. | 9 | RELEVANCE. 352. |
| 10 | BY MR. HART: | 10 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. |
| 11 | Q DID IT MATTER TO YOU, DR. THANG, WHETHER THIS | 11 | MR. HART: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, YOUR HONOR. |
| 12 | STATEMENT WAS TRUE OR NOT WHEN YOU PUBLISHED IT? | 12 | THE COURT: MR. VOSS. |
| 13 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. ASKED AND ANSWERED TODAY. | 13 | MR. VOSS: YES, YOUR HONOR, A FEW. |
| 14 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. | 14 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 15 | BY MR. HART: | 15 | BY MR. VOSS: |
| 16 | Q WHEN YOU'RE PUBLISHING THIS ARTICLE, DID IT | 16 | Q DR. THANG, I'D JUST LIKE TO GO THROUGH THE |
| 17 | EVER OCCUR TO YOU THAT THERE WAS A RISK THAT YOU COULD BE | 17 | TIMELINE AGAIN. |
| 18 | PUBLISHING SOMETHING THAT WAS INCORRECT THAT WOULD HARM | 18 | IS IT CORRECT TO SAY FROM EXHIBITS 233, 234, |
| 19 | SOMEONE? | 19 | AND YOUR LETTER THAT WAS EXHIBIT 18, THAT THE |
| 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. | 20 | INVESTIGATION THAT THERE WAS AN INVESTIGATION BY |
| 21 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. | 21 | CONGRESSMAN DORNAN THAT WAS COMMENCED ON JANUARY? |
| 22 | YOU MAY RESPOND. | 22 | A YES. THERE WAS AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION. |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: NO, BECAUSE IT'S JUST QUOTED FROM | 23 | Q IS IT ALSO CORRECT TO SAY THAT AS OF MARCH 6TH, THERE WAS A REFERENCE TO NOT HIST THE LETTER TO MS, LIMON BUT |
| | DORNAN. | | THERE WAS A REFERENCE TO NOT JUST THE LETTER TO MS. LIMON, BUT |
| | BV MR HART: | | |
| 25 26 | BY MR. HART: Q OKAY. DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT THE WORD "QUOTE" | 25 26 | ALSO THE REFERENCE TO DORNAN'S LETTER, A MARCH 6TH LETTER DIRECTLY TO LE XUAN KHOA? |

| | Page 45 | | Page 46 |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | A YES. | 1 | O SO YOU HAVE REFERENCED THE PUBLIC SCANDAL. I'D |
| 2 | O SO TWO LETTERS ON MARCH 6TH? | 2 | LIKE TO KNOW A LITTLE MORE ABOUT THAT. |
| 3 | A CORRECT. | 3 | WAS THERE ANYTHING IN THE PUBLIC SCANDAL THAT |
| 4 | Q AND THOSE LETTERS WERE INVESTIGATING ISSUES | 4 | YOU WERE DESCRIBING THAT HAD TO DO WITH THIS PART OF THE |
| 5 | INCLUDING THAT WE HAVE LEARNED THAT I.R.A.C./S.E.A.R.A.C. HAS | 5 | APRIL 2 LETTER REFERRING TO, "RECENTLY, IN THE FACE OF PUBLIC |
| 6 | MISREPRESENTED LE XUAN KHOA AS A DOCTOR. | 6 | INQUIRY, MR. KHOA ADMITTED HE IS NOT A DOCTOR"? |
| 7 | THAT WAS ONE THING REFERENCED; RIGHT? | 7 | A YES. IT'S IN THE COMMUNITY NEWS, REFER HERE IN |
| 8 | A CORRECT. | 8 | THE LETTER BY CONGRESSMAN DORNAN, DATED APRIL 2ND, 1996. IT |
| 9 | Q AND THAT MR. KHOA HAD ADMITTED, IN THE FACE OF | 9 | WAS IN THERE. AND ALSO IN MANY OTHERS. I BELIEVE I SAW ONE |
| 10 | PUBLIC INQUIRY, THAT HE IS NOT A DOCTOR; CORRECT? | 10 | OF THOSE PUBLICATIONS FROM THE EAST COAST IN THE BINDER OF |
| 11 | A CORRECT. | 11 | EXHIBITS. |
| 12 | Q ALL OF THAT HAPPENS BEFORE YOU EVER WRITE | 12 | Q SO BY THE TIME WE GET TO APRIL 30, LESS THAN A |
| 13 | EXHIBIT NUMBER 18 TO MS. LIMON; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? | 13 | MONTH LATER, WE HAVE THE LETTER FROM DORNAN SAYING THAT |
| 14 | A THAT'S CORRECT. | 14 | BEGINNING IN JANUARY OF '96, HE'S RECEIVED AN OVERWHELMING |
| 15 | AND ON TOP OF THAT, THAT LETTER, MARCH 10, MADE | 15 | NUMBER OF TELEPHONE CALLS. |
| 16 | NO REFERENCE TO HIS BEING A DOCTOR OR NOT OR A PH.D. OR NOT. | 16 | IS THAT, DO YOU BELIEVE, AS A RESULT OF THIS |
| 17 | O WHICH IF YOU'LL JUST ANSWER MY QUESTIONS, I'LL | 17 | |
| 17 | Q WHICH IF YOU'LL JUST ANSWER MY QUESTIONS, I'LL GET THERE. | 18 | PUBLIC SCANDAL IN THE VIETNAMESE MEDIA? A NO. IT PRECEDED THE SCANDAL. |
| 18 | A OH, SORRY. | 19 | A NO. II PRECEDED THE SCANDAL. O OKAY. |
| 20 | | | · |
| 20 | Q BUT IT IS CORRECT, THEN, THAT IN THE APRIL 30 | 20 | A THEY CALL FOR OTHER CONCERNS. AND DURING THE |
| 21 | LETTER, THERE IS NOW THE CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE REFERENCING A – MR. HART: OBJECTION, LEADING. | 21 | PROCESS, INVESTIGATION, DORNAN FOUND OUT THAT MR. KHOA WASN'T A DOCTOR. |
| | | 23 | |
| 23 | THE COURT: WE HAVE BEEN LEADING HERE ON THIS WITNESS, HEADING DOWN THAT PATHWAY AS WELL. | 24 | Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO STAY THAT IN YOUR MARCH 10 |
| 24 25 | | 24 | LETTER, YOU NEVER MENTIONED PH.D. ? |
| 25 | MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. | | A NO. |
| 20 | BY MR. VOSS: | 26 | Q ISN'T IT CORRECT |
| | Page 47 | | Page 48 |
| | | 1 | 1 4 9 6 1 6 |
| 1 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. | 1 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. |
| 1 2 | - | 1 2 | - |
| _ | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. | | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. |
| 2 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU | 2 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED |
| 2 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? | 2 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? |
| 2 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF | 2 3 4 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. |
| 2 3 4 5 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. | 2 3 4 5 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS |
| 2 3 4 5 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL | 2 3 4 5 6 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THATS CORRECT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE |
| 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTIOOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THATS CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THATS CORRECT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, LR.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, BORE THE JURY BY INTRODUCING TOO MANY EXHIBITS. I'D LIKE YOU | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A THAT'S ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, BORE THE JURY BY INTRODUCING TOO MANY EXHIBITS. I'D LIKE YOU TO LOOK AT EXHIBIT NO. 220. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THATS CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THAT WILL BE ADMITTED. |
| 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, BORE THE JURY BY INTRODUCING TOO MANY EXHIBITS. I'D LIKE YOU TO LOOK AT EXHIBIT NO. 220. YOU EARLIER TODAY, JUST NOW, TESTIFIED TO | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THAT WILL BE ADMITTED. (EXHIBIT 220 ADMITTED.) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT - YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM - MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, BORE THE JURY BY INTRODUCING TOO MANY EXHIBITS. I'D LIKE YOU TO LOOK AT EXHIBIT NO. 220. YOU EARLIER TODAY, JUST NOW, TESTIFIED TO HAVING SEEN "PH.D." IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD AND WERE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THAT WILL BE ADMITTED. (EXHIBIT 220 ADMITTED.) MR. NGUYEN: PERMISSION TO PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | A I'M SORRY. I NEVER MENTIONED. SORRY. Q ISN'T IT CORRECT TO SAY THAT AT NO TIME DID YOU EVER RAISE "PH.D." IN PARTICULAR IN ANY PUBLICATION YOU WROTE? A THAT'S CORRECT. I NEVER RAISED THE ISSUE OF PH.D. Q AND WOULD YOU AGREE THAT THE ISSUE IS DOCTORAL DEGREE, NOT PH.D.? A I AGREE. Q AND YOUR EXPRESSION OF CONCERN WAS NOT PH.D. BUT USE OF OR THE REPRESENTATION THAT HE WAS A DOCTOR; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q DR. THANG, I'D LIKE YOU TO TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 220. A YES. Q YOU MAY RECOLLECT YOU WERE HERE IN THE COURTROOM MY INQUIRING OF MR. KHOA ABOUT THERE BEING NUMEROUS OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERENCING HIM AS A DOCTOR. WERE YOU HERE FOR THAT? A YES. Q OKAY. AND AT THAT TIME TRYING NOT TO, FRANKLY, BORE THE JURY BY INTRODUCING TOO MANY EXHIBITS. I'D LIKE YOU TO LOOK AT EXHIBIT NO. 220. YOU EARLIER TODAY, JUST NOW, TESTIFIED TO HAVING SEEN "PH.D." IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD AND WERE CHALLENGED ON THAT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | A THATS ONE OF SEVERAL DOCUMENTS. Q THERE ARE OTHERS AS WELL, BUT YOU REFERENCED THIS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DOCUMENT? A I REFERENCED OTHERS AS WELL. Q SO THIS DOCUMENT THAT IS ENTITLED "HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 99TH CONGRESS," IN IT REFERS TO, ON THE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND SEMINARS ATTACHED AS 220-2, A REFERENCE TO "DR. LE XUAN KHOA, I.R.A.C."; ISN'T THAT CORRECT? A THAT'S CORRECT. Q SO EVEN THOUGH YOU MAY NOT HAVE ADMITTED EVERY SIGNAL DOCUMENT YOU SAID YOU WERE LOOKING AT WHEN YOU WROTE WHAT YOU WROTE IN RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATIONS ATTACKING YOU BY MR. KHOA, THIS IS, IN FACT, THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ONE THAT YOU VERY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCED A FEW MOMENTS AGO; RIGHT? A THAT'S CORRECT. MR. VOSS: ALL RIGHT. I WOULD MOVE EXHIBIT NO. 220-1 AND -2 BE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. MR. HART: NO OBJECTION. MR. VOSS: NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: THAT WILL BE ADMITTED. (EXHIBIT 220 ADMITTED.) MR. NGUYEN: PERMISSION TO PUBLISH, YOUR HONOR? THE COURT: WHAT ARE WE PUBLISHING? |

| | Page 49 | | Page 50 |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | THE COURT: OKAY. THAT'S FINE. I JUST WANTED TO | 1 | BECAUSE THAT'S OF NO IMPORTANCE TO US AT THE TIME. AND THAT |
| 2 | MAKE SURE. | 2 | WAS MARCH 10TH. |
| 3 | MR. NGUYEN: IT HAS BEEN ADMITTED. | 3 | BY MR. HART: |
| 4 | THE COURT: YES. IT HAS BEEN ADMITTED AND MAY BE | 4 | Q OKAY. MARCH 10TH, NO IMPORTANCE. |
| 5 | PUBLISHED. | 5 | OKAY. SO IF IT HAD NO IMPORTANCE IN MARCH, WHY |
| 6 | (DOCUMENT PUBLISHED.) | 6 | DID IT HAVE IMPORTANCE FOUR OR FIVE YEARS LATER? |
| 7 | FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION | 7 | A ONLY AFTER THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ITS |
| 8 | BY MR. HART: | 8 | OPPOSITION TO CONGRESSMAN SMITH LEGISLATION. EARLIER, I |
| 9 | Q DOCTOR, IN EXHIBIT 18, YOUR LETTER DOES NOT | 9 | EXPLAINED THAT MR. KHOA COULD NO LONGER SERVE AS A CREDIBLE |
| 10 | MENTION ANY ISSUE RELATED TO PROFESSOR KHOA'S EDUCATIONAL | 10 | WITNESS TO SUPPORT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S POSITION. |
| 11 | CREDENTIALS, DOES IT? | 11 | Q SO THAT WAS REALLY THE ULTIMATE PURPOSE OF THE |
| 12 | A IT DOESN'T. | 12 | PUBLICATION OF THESE CHARGES, CORRECT, TO |
| 13 | Q AND THE REASON FOR THAT IS BECAUSE AL SANTOLI | 13 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. |
| 14 | HAD NOT GIVEN YOU ALL THE MATERIALS THAT DORNAN HAD COLLECTED, | 14 | MR. HART: I'M STILL ASKING MY QUESTION, PLEASE. |
| 15 | INCLUDING THE C.V. THAT YOU WERE PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN; | 15 | BY MR. HART: |
| 16 | ISN'T THAT CORRECT? | 16 | Q - WAS TO RENDER PROFESSOR KHOA AN UNCREDIBLE |
| 17 | A NO. | 17 | WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS, SPECIFICALLY ON THE ANTI-CPA |
| 18 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. COMPOUND. | 18 | AMENDMENT ISSUE? |
| 19 | THE COURT: WAIT. GO AHEAD. | 19 | THE COURT: WAIT. |
| 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. COMPOUND. MISCHARACTERIZES | 20 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES THE EVIDENCE |
| 21 | THE WITNESS' TESTIMONY. VAGUE. | 21 | AS CHARGES AND VAGUE AS TO WHO IS MAKING THEM. |
| 22 | THE COURT: OVERRULED. IT'S A QUESTION. IT'S NOT A | 22 | THE COURT: AND TIMING, TOO. |
| 23 | REPRESENTATION OF ANY TESTIMONY. | 23 | I'M GOING TO SUSTAIN AS TO VAGUENESS. YOU MAY |
| 24 | YOU MAY RESPOND. | 24 | REPHRASE IT. AND THEN WE'LL GO FROM THERE. |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: NO. FIRST OF ALL, I DIDN'T DRAFT THAT | 25 | BY MR. HART: |
| 26 | LETTER. BUT LOOKING BACK, I WOULD NOT EVEN MENTION THAT | 26 | Q YOU SAID THAT THIS ISSUE OF MR. KHOA'S |
| | Page 51 | | Page 52 |
| | | | |
| 1 | EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS WAS NOT IMPORTANT IN MARCH OF 1996. | 1 | DON'T THINK I CAN SPECULATE. HOWEVER, LET ME POINT OUT |
| 1 2 | EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS WAS NOT IMPORTANT IN MARCH OF 1996. AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER | 1 2 | DON'T THINK I CAN SPECULATE. HOWEVER, LET ME POINT OUT THAT |
| | | | |
| 2 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER | 2 | THAT |
| 2 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. | 2 | THAT – THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. |
| 2 3 4 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? | 2 3 4 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT |
| 2 3 4 5 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT | 2 3 4 5 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. |
| 2 3 4 5 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY | 2 3 4 5 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I | 2 3 4 5 6 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLI. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | THAT - THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED - DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLI. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLI. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. MR. HART: IT'S FOLLOW-UP, JUDGE. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BECAUSE HE IS A VIETNAMESE; HE WAS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. MR. HART: IT'S FOLLOW-UP, JUDGE. THE COURT: I DON'T NEED TO HEAR ARGUMENT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BECAUSE HE IS A VIETNAMESE; HE WAS WELL KNOWN FOR DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF THE BOAT PEOPLE. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. MR. HART: IT'S FOLLOW-UP, JUDGE. THE COURT: I DON'T NEED TO HEAR ARGUMENT. BUT, NO, IT WAS OPENED UP HERE BY THIS | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | THAT THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BECAUSE HE IS A VIETNAMESE; HE WAS |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. MR. HART: IT'S FOLLOW-UP, JUDGE. THE COURT: I DON'T NEED TO HEAR ARGUMENT. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLL. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BECAUSE HE IS A VIETNAMESE; HE WAS WELL KNOWN FOR DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF THE BOAT PEOPLE. BUT AT HEARINGS ON THAT LEGISLATION, HE CLAIMED |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | AT SOME POINT AFTER 1996, IT WAS IMPORTANT IN ORDER TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS BEFORE CONGRESS. ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU JUST EXPLAINED? A NO. I THINK YOU MIX UP THE TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS. ONE, I MENTION THERE'S CO-RELATION. I DIDN'T SAY CAUSE AND EFFECT. I DIDN'T SAY "MOTIVE" AND "CONSEQUENCE." I JUST EXPRESSED THAT THERE WAS A CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TWO EVENTS. Q WHAT ARE THE TWO EVENTS THAT ARE CO-RELATED? A THE LETTER DATED APRIL 30, 1996, FROM DORNAN TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. AND A FEW DAYS — A WEEK LATER, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE DROPPED ALL OPPOSITION. Q OKAY. AND SO THE APRIL 30 LETTER, WHICH INCLUDED CHARGES ABOUT PROFESSOR KHOA SELF-PROMOTING PH.D., WAS IMPORTANT TO RENDER HIM A NOT-CREDIBLE WITNESS, WHICH CAUSED THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DROP THEIR OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE OF MY REDIRECT. MR. HART: IT'S FOLLOW-UP, JUDGE. THE COURT: I DON'T NEED TO HEAR ARGUMENT. BUT, NO, IT WAS OPENED UP HERE BY THIS STATEMENT. SO OVERRULED. YOU MAY RESPOND. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | THAT — THE COURT: YOU MAY CONTINUE. THE WITNESS: LET ME POINT OUT THAT CONGRESSMAN DORNAN DIDN'T JUST WRITE THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. HE WROTE BEFORE TO THE O.R.R. AND TO KHOA HIMSELF GIVING HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY HIS EXPLANATION; RIGHT? AND KHOA KNEW DORNAN. HE SERVED — DORNAN SERVED ON THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF S.E.A.R.A.C. HE WAS NO STRANGER TO MR. KHOA. KHOA KNEW I WAS VERY CLOSE TO DR. SANTOLI. SO I THINK IT'S A DUE PROCESS EXERCISE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN DORNAN. IT WENT ON FOR FOUR MONTHS. BY MR. HART: Q A DUE PROCESS. DID YOU MEAN DUE DILIGENCE? A YEAH, DUE DILIGENCE. SORRY. THANK YOU. Q SO I THINK I'M BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND. CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT THE CO-RELATION IS BETWEEN THE APRIL 30 LETTER AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT DROPPING ITS OBJECTION TO THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT. A MR. KHOA WAS A VERY POTENT WITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BECAUSE HE IS A VIETNAMESE; HE WAS WELL KNOWN FOR DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF THE BOAT PEOPLE. BUT AT HEARINGS ON THAT LEGISLATION, HE CLAIMED THAT: HE GOT FUNDING FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR THREE |

| | Page 53 | | Page 54 |
|----------|--|----|--|
| 1 | AND HE SAW NO INSTANCE OF ANY RETURNEE BEING PROSECUTED IN | 1 | STATE. |
| 2 | VIETNAM, AND, THEREFORE, THERE'S NO NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION | 2 | AND, THEREFORE, A LOT OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS |
| 3 | INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN SMITH. ALL THESE BOAT PEOPLE | 3 | DID BELIEVE HIM, BECAUSE HE WAS A WELL-RESPECTED PERSON IN THE |
| 4 | DESERVE TO BE SENT BACK BECAUSE THEY WILL NOT FACE | 4 | COMMUNITY, KNOWN FOR DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF THE BOAT PEOPLE. |
| 5 | PERSECUTION. | 5 | BUT NOW HE TESTIFY THAT THESE PEOPLE, IT'S OKAY FOR THEM TO GO |
| 6 | WE HAD PLENTY EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY. THAT'S | 6 | BACK TO VIETNAM. |
| 7 | WHY CHRIS SMITH BELIEVE US AND, AT MY REQUEST, HE INTRODUCED | 7 | BY MR. HART: |
| 8 | THAT LEGISLATION THAT WE NOW CALL THE ANTI-CPA LEGISLATION. | 8 | Q HE SAID THEY WEREN'T BEING PROSECUTED OR |
| 9 | O OKAY. I'M LEARNING MORE AND MORE. | 9 | PERSECUTED? |
| 10 | WHAT WAS THE TESTIMONY OF PROFESSOR KHOA ABOUT | 10 | A CORRECT, NO PERSECUTION. NOT "PROSECUTED." NO |
| 11 | RETURNING REFUGEES? | 11 | PERSECUTION WHATSOEVER, NOT A SINGLE CASE. |
| 12 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, OBJECTION. BEYOND THE SCOPE. | 12 | Q AND YOU'RE TELLING US THAT THAT TESTIMONY |
| 13 | RELEVANCE. | 13 | INTERFERED WITH THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT |
| 14 | THE COURT: WE'RE GETTING LET'S WRAP THIS UP HERE | 14 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE, YOUR HONOR. |
| 15 | BECAUSE WE'RE – I MEAN, HE OPENED IT, BUT – MR. VOSS. | 15 | BY MR. HART: |
| 16 | MR. VOSS: I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR. | 16 | Q OR NECESSITATED THE ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT? |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: YES. CONGRESSMAN SMITH HELD A SERIES | 17 | A IT OPPOSED. IT TRIED TO DEFEAT. |
| 18 | OF THREE HEARINGS, CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, AFTER HIS | 18 | THE COURT: YOUR CLIENT JUMPED IN. |
| 19 | LEGISLATION HAD PASSED THE HOUSE, BECAUSE HE ANTICIPATED THAT | 19 | THE WITNESS: SORRY. |
| 20 | MR. KHOA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE WOULD CONTINUE TO OPPOSE | 20 | MR. VOSS: I OBJECTED. YOU HAVE TO WAIT. AND I |
| 21 | IT IN THE SENATE. | 21 | OBJECT ON RELEVANCE. |
| 22 | SO HE – CONGRESSMAN SMITH CONVENED A SERIES OF | 22 | THE COURT: YES. I'M GIVING SOME LEEWAY HERE, AND |
| 23 | THREE HEARINGS. AND KHOA SUBMITTED STATEMENTS IN TWO OF THOSE | 23 | THIS IS GETTING MUCH TOO FAR AFIELD. |
| 24 | HEARINGS. IN ONE OF THOSE STATEMENTS, HE DECLARED THAT THERE | 24 | MR. HART: OKAY. I'M LOATHE TO ARGUE WITH THE JUDGE, |
| 25 | WAS NO PERSECUTION IN VIETNAM THAT HE HAD EVER FOUND DURING | 25 | BUT I'LL TRY TO CLEAN IT UP, YOUR HONOR. |
| 26 | HIS MULTIPLE TRAVELS TO VIETNAM FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF | 26 | BY MR. HART: |
| | Page 55 | | Page 56 |
| 1 | Q FOLLOWING PROFESSOR KHOA'S TESTIMONY, IS THAT | 1 | THE COURT: I HOPE IT'S A QUESTION AND NOT A COMMENT. |
| 2 | WHEN THE LEADERS FROM DORNAN'S DISTRICT BEGAN TO CONTACT HIM | 2 | MR. HART: OKAY. YES, IT IS. |
| 3 | IN OPPOSITION? | 3 | FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 4 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. RELEVANCE. SPECULATION. | 4 | BY MR. HART: |
| 5 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. | 5 | Q DR. THANG, YOU TOLD ME IN YOUR DEPOSITION THAT |
| 6 | MR. HART: LAST QUESTION. | 6 | YOU HAD NO IDEA WHETHER THE STATEMENT WAS TRUE OR NOT. |
| 7 | BY MR. HART: | 7 | MR. VOSS: YOUR HONOR, MAY WE BE HEARD? |
| 8 | Q WAS THERE ANY WAY, AS YOU RECALL, TO PASS THE | 8 | THE COURT: MAY WE JUST HAVE AN OBJECTION. |
| 9 | ANTI-CPA AMENDMENT WHILE PROFESSOR KHOA WAS OPPOSING IT ON | 9 | MR. VOSS: I OBJECT TO THE QUESTION AS ASSUMING FACTS |
| 10 | BEHALF OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT? | 10 | NOT IN EVIDENCE, ARGUMENTATIVE, AND IRRELEVANT. |
| 11 | MR. VOSS: OBJECTION. SPECULATION AND RELEVANCE. | 11 | MR. HART: I'LL WITHDRAW THE QUESTION. |
| 12 | THE COURT: SUSTAINED. | 12 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. |
| 13 | MR. HART: OKAY. NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. | 13 | MR. VOSS: IT'S BEEN ASKED AND ANSWERED. |
| 14 | THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MAY THIS WITNESS STAND DOWN? | 14 | MR. HART: I'LL WITHDRAW. NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. |
| 15 | MR. VOSS: I HAVE ONE. | 15 | THE COURT: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DOCTOR. YOU MAY |
| 16 | FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION | 16 | STEP DOWN. |
| 17 | BY MR. VOSS: | 17 | (CONCLUSION OF NGUYEN DINH THANG TRIAL TESTIMONY ON |
| 18 | Q DR. THANG, YOU HEARD QUESTIONS ABOUT IMPORTANCE | 18 | NOVEMBER 14, 2024.) |
| 19 20 | AND AT CERTAIN TIMES. WHEN YOU WROTE THE WORDS ON THE BOARD, | 19 | |
| 21 | DID YOU WRITE THOSE WORDS AFTER FIRST REVIEWING SUBSTANTIAL INFORMATION? | 20 | |
| 22 | A YES. I DID HAVE TO GO BACK TO MY OFFICE, LOOK | 21 | |
| 23 | UP ALL THE DOCUMENTS. LUCKILY, I ARCHIVE THEM QUITE WELL. | 23 | |
| 24 | MR. VOSS: THANK YOU. | 24 | |
| 25 | NOTHING FURTHER, YOUR HONOR. | 25 | |
| 26 | MR. HART: ONE COMMENT, JUDGE. | 26 | |
| | | | |

| | Page 57 |
|----|---|
| 1 | REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE |
| 2 | |
| 3 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA) |
| |) SS. |
| 4 | COUNTY OF ORANGE) |
| 5 | |
| 6 | I, MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226, REPORTER |
| 7 | PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY; |
| 9 | THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A FULL, TRUE AND |
| 10 | CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES, AND IS A FULL, TRUE |
| 11 | AND CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN SAID CAUSE. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | DATED THISDAY OF |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| | MICHELLE LOTT-MEYERHOFER, CSR NO. 8226 |
| 18 | OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEM |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| A | 22:4 23:18 | 41:6,21 42:8 | 43:16 | 18:26 21:7 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| ACADEMIC | 27:4 31:12 | 42:10,14 | ARTICLES | 28:21 31:12 |
| 9:12 10:18 | 47:6,8 | APPLICATI | 38:8 | 34:22 35:1,3 |
| ACCURATE | AHEAD 3:6 | 12:21 13:1,8 | ASIA 26:26 | 49:26 53:4 |
| 37:3 | 18:11 49:19 | 13:15,16 22:22 | ASKED 21:1,6 | 54:6 55:22 |
| ACCUSATION | AL 16:7,12 | 33:9 41:12,12 | 26:8 27:16 | BACKGROU |
| 24:16,20 | 31:21 49:13 | APPLIES 8:7 | 40:9,23 41:7 | 18:21 21:20 |
| ACKNOWLE | ALIVE 21:3,4 | 19:20 | 42:3 43:6,13 | 25:26 31:23 |
| 7:12 | AMBIGUOUS | APPLY 19:19 | 56:13 | BASED 28:23 |
| ACTION 4:9 | 31:11,14 | APPROACH | ASKED-AND | BASIS 14:2 |
| 7:15 | AMENDMENT | 10:14 | 26:9 | BEGAN 55:2 |
| ACTIVITIES | 17:18 35:9 | APPROPRIA | ASKING 9:21 | BEGINNING |
| 20:16 | 50:18 51:19 | 48:6 | 14:11 21:9,11 | 17:7,24 46:14 |
| ADDITION | 52:20 54:13,16 | APRIL 7:24 | 24:11,24 28:1 | 52:17 |
| 18:26 19:7 | 55:9 | 13:26 14:1,19 | 37:1 50:14 | BEHALF 3:12 |
| ADDITIONA | AMERICA 10:3 | 14:25 15:7 | 51:26 | 3:14 19:21,21 |
| 25:6 | ANA 3:1 | 16:23 17:22 | ASKS 37:7 | 52:21 55:10 |
| ADDRESSED | AND- 2:17 | 18:8,14,22,23 | ASSESSMENT | BELIEVE 10:2 |
| 13:14 37:26 | ANGELES 2:21 | 21:25 22:9 | 24:19 | 16:15 46:9,16 |
| 39:13 | ANSWER 8:8,9 | 23:15 24:9 | ASSOCIATI | 53:7 54:3 |
| ADMIRALTY | 8:14 40:7 | 25:4,7,8 28:6 | 20:6 | BELIEVES |
| 2:14 | 45:17 | 28:21 29:1,4 | ASSUMES | 34:24 |
| ADMITTED | ANSWERED | 29:12 30:6 | 31:25 | BEYOND 10:6 |
| 4:11,12,13,14 | 26:8 40:9,23 | 31:13 35:2,12 | ASSUMING | 12:17 27:15,17 |
| 4:15,17 19:10 | 41:7 43:6,13 | 35:16 38:3,17 | 56:9 | 36:19 41:7 |
| 33:20,24 38:19 | 56:13 | 38:22 45:20 | ATTACHED | 51:20 53:12 |
| 38:23 39:8 | ANTI-CPA 7:15 | 46:5,8,12 | 33:6,8,22 | BILL 8:25 9:6 |
| 42:2 45:9 46:6 | 17:18 35:9 | 51:11,15 52:19 | 40:19,21 41:6 | BINDER 39:17 |
| 48:11,22,23 | 50:17 51:19 | ARCHIVE | 41:21 42:7 | 46:10 |
| 49:3,4 | 52:20 53:8 | 55:23 | 48:8 | BINDERS 13:12 |
| ADMITTING | 54:13,16 55:9 | ARCHIVED | ATTACKING | BIO 34:5,6 41:2 |
| 38:6 | ANTICIPAT | 40:2 | 48:13 | 41:3,6,21 42:4 |
| ADMONITION | 53:19 | ARGUE 54:24 | ATTENTION | 42:5,7,11 |
| 8:7 | ANYWAY 32:6 | ARGUMENT | 4:2 | BOARD 6:25 |
| ADVISORY | APOLOGIZE | 9:8 51:23 | ATTITUDES | 8:7 32:18,21 |
| 16:13 52:9 | 28:1 | ARGUMENT | 9:4 | 55:19 |
| AFFILIATED | APPARENTLY | 10:5 21:16 | ATTORNEY | BOAT 1:8 7:16 |
| 20:5 25:16 | 17:10 | 25:1 31:18 | 2:4 | 11:16 52:23 |
| 30:9 | APPEARAN | 41:23 42:20 | AUDIBLE | 53:3 54:4 |
| AFIELD 54:23 | 2:1 3:8 | 44:8 56:10 | 28:17 | BODY 13:15 |
| AFTERNOON | APPEARED | ARRIVE 22:11 | AUTHOR 25:22 | BORE 47:21 |
| 3:24 | 5:22 | ARTICLE 5:11 | AUTHORED | BOTTOM 20:9 |
| AGENCIES | APPENDIX | 5:17,20 6:2,12 | 5:21 7:13 | 25:5 29:17 |
| 12:25,26 22:23 | 42:13,13,14,14 | 6:17,23 7:5 | AWARE 30:8 | BOX 2:6 40:1 |
| 41:13 | APPLICATI | 8:15,21 13:23 | 34:8 | BRAYBROO |
| AGENCY'S | 7:3 9:3 12:10 | 19:1,3 23:16 | B | 2:13 3:12 |
| 20:21 | 13:9,10 19:18 | 26:19,22 32:23 | BACK 4:21,25 | BREAK 3:22 |
| AGO 48:15 | 19:25 20:3,25 | 36:5,14,15 | 6:20 11:18 | BRIEF 3:22 4:2 |
| AGREE 19:16 | 23:10 24:17 | 37:2,4,9 39:17 | 13:20 14:25 | BRIEFLY 7:11 |
| 19:26 21:22 | 33:6 40:20,22 | 40:3,17 43:2 | 13.20 17.23 | BRINGING 4:5 |
| 1 | ı | ı | ı | ı |

| | l | I | Ī | l |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| BROUGHT | 41:3 | CO-RELATED | 56:17 | 25:20 30:4 |
| 13:11,18 | CHARGE 10:11 | 51:10 | CONDUCT | CONTINUE |
| | CHARGED | CO-RELATI | 22:10 | 7:23 8:6 11:24 |
| C | 12:7 | 51:6 52:18 | CONDUCTED | 22:1 27:20 |
| C 2:12 42:14 | CHARGES | COAST 46:10 | 20:18 | 28:3 52:3 |
| C.V 33:6,8,16 | 50:12,21 51:16 | COLLABOR | CONDUCTI | 53:20 |
| 41:17 49:15 | CHARTER | 8:25 11:14 | 20:16 | CONTINUED |
| C.V'S 13:5 | 20:21 | COLLEAGUE | CONFEREN | 7:18 30:7 |
| C1 42:13 | CHECKING | 4:5 | 7:21 35:15 | CONTINUING |
| C23 1:3 | 3:17 4:8 | COLLECTED | CONFEREN | 17:14 |
| CA 2:7,15,21 | CHOOSE 23:26 | 49:14 | 20:17 | CONTRARY |
| CALIFORNIA | CHRIS 53:7 | COLLECTIV | CONGRESS | 53:6 |
| 1:1 3:1 19:3 | CHRISTOPH | 22:8 | 30:8 34:12 | CONTRIBUTE |
| 57:3,8 | 7:14 | COME 24:8 | 48:7 50:17 | 8:23 |
| CALL 27:22 | CITED 32:18 | 38:9 | 51:3 54:2 | CONVENED |
| 41:2 46:20 | CITES 23:15 | COMMENCED | CONGRESSI | 53:22 |
| 53:8 | CLAIM 9:3,8 | 44:21 | 34:12,14 47:24 | CONVENTION |
| CALLED 16:7 | 12:9 16:12 | COMMENT | 48:3,14 53:18 | 10:2 |
| CALLING | 34:13 | 55:26 56:1 | CONGRESS | COPIES 4:4 |
| 27:17 | CLAIMED 7:2 | COMMITTEE | 7:14 8:26 9:20 | 12:21 35:25 |
| CALLS 11:7 | 13:10 19:17 | 16:13 52:9 | 11:15 12:21 | 36:1 41:12,16 |
| 16:18 17:23,25 | 20:24 21:13 | COMMUNIC | 13:25 14:9 | COPY 13:25 |
| 26:24 28:23 | 23:9 24:17 | 29:1 | 16:4,17 17:11 | 14:1 16:25 |
| 41:23 46:15 | 37:10 40:18,22 | COMMUNIC | 17:18 24:19 | 33:5 |
| CARE 11:20 | 41:22 52:24 | 29:12 | 26:23 28:6 | CORNER 42:12 |
| CASE 41:8 | CLAIMING | COMMUNITY | 30:25 31:5,10 | 42:12 |
| 54:11 | 22:18 43:4 | 14:14 19:2,5 | 31:22 34:8 | CORRECT |
| CASE-IN-CH | CLAIMS 10:21 | 20:6 24:5 38:7 | 35:8 38:17 | 5:26 6:10,13 |
| 27:16 40:24 | 12:3 | 46:7 54:4 | 44:21 46:8 | 6:22 7:6,7 16:8 |
| CAUSE 51:7 | CLARIFICA | COMPARE | 50:8 52:5,13 | 16:9 26:20,21 |
| 57:11 | 37:7 | 36:24 | 53:3,17,22 | 28:9,11,16 |
| CAUSED 51:18 | CLARIFY | COMPLETE | CONGRESS | 29:13,14,20,23 |
| CENTER 1:2 | 24:18 52:7 | 16:11 | 45:21 | 29:25,26 35:25 |
| 27:1 | CLASSES 48:8 | COMPLY 26:5 | CONSEQUE | 44:18,23 45:3 |
| CENTRAL 1:2 | CLEAN 54:25 | COMPOUND | 51:7 | 45:8,10,11,13 |
| CERTAIN | CLEAR 18:6 | 49:18,20 | CONSULTA | 45:14,20 46:23 |
| 55:19 | 21:19 28:21 | COMPREHE | 20:7 | 46:26 47:2,4 |
| CERTIFICA | 30:2 | 7:15 | CONTACT | 47:11 48:9,10 |
| 57:1 | CLEARING | CONCEPTS | 27:5 28:7 55:2 | 48:17 49:16 |
| CERTIFY 9:19 | 9:14 | 51:6 | CONTACTED | 50:12 54:10 |
| 57:8 | CLEARLY | CONCERN | 29:3,21 30:2 | 57:10,11 |
| CETERA 41:14 | 27:21 | 30:1 31:4,10 | CONTACTING | CORRELATI |
| CHAIR 32:22 | CLERK 4:14 | 47:9 | 30:25 31:10 | 51:8 |
| CHALLENG | CLIENT 7:13 | CONCERNED | CONTAIN | COUNSEL 2:1 |
| 24:1 25:13 | 14:10 16:12 | 11:19 | 25:12 | 3:16 4:22 |
| 26:19 47:25 | 21:1,6 24:8 | CONCERNS | CONTENT | 13:11,18 14:22 |
| CHAMBERS | 35:13 54:18 | 29:18,24 30:13 | 24:15 25:7,12 | 32:18 35:26 |
| 7:22 | CLINTON 7:22 | 30:24 46:20 | CONTENTION | 42:3 |
| CHANGED 9:4 | 35:16 | CONCLUSION | 18:13,16 | COUNTRY |
| CHARACTE | CLOSE 52:10 | 24:8 41:24 | CONTEXT 23:6 | 24:6 |
| | | <u> </u> | | |

| | ı | ı | I | ı |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| COUNTY 1:2 | CREDIBLE | 40:19,22 47:7 | DIRECTOR | DOING 44:5 |
| 19:3,5 57:4,8 | 9:11 50:9 | DEL 2:15 | 14:26 17:11 | DORNAN 7:25 |
| COURT 1:1 3:6 | CRIME 10:22 | DEMONSTR | 19:22 32:19 | 9:20 10:19,24 |
| 3:15 4:3,6,8,13 | 12:4 | 33:1 | DISAGREE 6:4 | 11:26 12:22 |
| 4:17,18,20 8:3 | CRIMINAL 7:4 | DENIED 9:26 | 36:18 | 13:25 14:9,13 |
| 9:18,23 10:7 | 37:16,17 | 32:6 | DISPARAGE | 14:20 15:26 |
| 10:15 11:4,6,8 | CROSS 3:20 | DEPARTME | 10:25 | 16:4,13,17,22 |
| 11:24 12:16,18 | CROSS-EXA | 1:3 7:4,12,23 | DISPUTED | 17:11 18:8,17 |
| 14:6 15:9,18 | 5:3 49:7 | 7:25 8:10,24 | 5:26 | 21:1,1 22:9 |
| 16:19,22,25 | CSR 1:25 57:6 | 9:5,9,10 11:10 | DISREGARD | 23:1 24:3,19 |
| 18:4,9 21:15 | 57:17 | 11:14 12:1,10 | 29:8 30:21 | 24:20,22 25:14 |
| 21:17,23,26 | | 17:16,17 19:18 | 38:15 | 26:23 28:6,22 |
| 22:15 23:3,13 | D | 20:25 29:4 | DISTRICT | 30:25 31:5,22 |
| 23:20 25:2 | DATE 5:13 18:5 | 35:13,17,23 | 17:26 19:2 | 35:22 38:17 |
| 26:9,13 27:14 | DATED 5:11 | 50:7,10 51:12 | 24:6 26:25 | 39:7,24 40:4 |
| 27:19 28:3 | 15:4 17:21 | 51:13,18 52:5 | 27:5,7 28:7 | 43:24 44:21 |
| 29:7 30:20 | 18:21 25:3,8 | 52:19,22,25 | 55:2 | 46:8,13,21 |
| 31:19 32:1,3,8 | 29:1 30:6 46:8 | 53:20,26 55:10 | DISTURBING | 49:14 51:11 |
| 33:4,12,21,24 | 51:11 57:13 | DEPOSITION | 20:8,10 | 52:5,8,8,13 |
| 34:19,21 35:3 | DAVE@VSB | 36:23 37:5,8 | DOCTOR 13:8 | DORNAN'S |
| 35:5 36:1,7,21 | 2:16 | 56:5 | 13:10,14 14:12 | 14:23 19:13 |
| 38:14 40:8,10 | DAVID 1:15 | DESCRIBED | 19:9,10,14 | 21:3 25:8,25 |
| 40:25 41:9,25 | 2:12 3:11 | 23:17 | 20:2 25:19 | 29:11 33:1 |
| 42:18,21,24 | DAY 3:18 57:13 | DESCRIBING | 27:24,26 30:12 | 34:8 38:3,5 |
| 43:8,14,21 | DAYS 51:13 | 46:4 | 32:23 34:11,13 | 44:25 55:2 |
| 44:10,12 45:23 | DEAR 10:3 | DESERVE 53:4 | 37:10 38:6,19 | DOUBLE-CH |
| 48:22,25 49:1 | DECEMBER | DESK 35:16 | 39:13 41:22 | 8:5 |
| 49:4,19,22 | 5:22 35:14 | DESPITE 35:13 | 45:6,10,16 | DR 4:24 5:5 |
| 50:19,22 51:23 | DECIDED 6:9 | DETAIL 23:17 | 46:6,22 47:10 | 13:16 15:23 |
| 52:3 53:14 | DECLARED | DETAILS 8:16 | 47:17 49:9 | 16:7,12 20:23 |
| 54:18,22 55:5 | 53:24 | 13:3 | 56:15 | 23:15 25:10 |
| 55:12,14 56:1 | DEFAMED | DEVELOPM | DOCTOR' | 28:5 29:11 |
| 56:8,12,15 | 43:4 | 20:6 | 37:26 | 30:23 33:13,16 |
| 57:7 | DEFEAT 54:17 | DIFFERENCE | DOCTORAL | 35:8 36:11 |
| COURT'S 4:1 | DEFENDAN | 37:12,14 | 7:3 12:9 19:17 | 38:10 41:11,20 |
| COURT-APP | 3:19 | DIFFERENT | 20:24 33:15 | 43:1,11 44:16 |
| 1:26 | DEFENDANTS | 25:26 41:13 | 37:6,11 40:19 | 47:12 48:9 |
| COURTROOM | 1:10 2:11 3:12 | 42:15 51:5 | 40:22 47:6 | 52:11 55:18 |
| 47:16 | 3:14 DEFENDAN | DIFFERENT | DOCUMENT | 56:5 |
| COVERED | DEFENDAN | 37:19 | 11:10 15:10 | DRAFT 49:25 |
| 14:15 39:20 | 27:15 | DILIGENCE | 26:15 33:26 | DROP 8:25 |
| CPA 7:15 | DEFENDING | 26:2,3 52:15 | 35:6 36:8 | 51:18 |
| CREATE 8:26 | 52:23 54:4 DEFENSE 41:8 | 52:16 | 47:26 48:3,5 | DROPPED 8:11 |
| 11:15 | DEFENSE 41:8 DEFINITELY | DINH 1:8,9 3:2 | 48:12 49:6 | 50:7 51:13 |
| CREATED | 35:19 | 56:17 | DOCUMENTS | DROPPING |
| 31:22 CDEDENITIA | DEGREE 7:3 | DIRECT 12:17 | 14:11 22:9 | 52:19 |
| CREDENTIA | 12:10 19:17 | 27:16 41:8 | 25:6 32:17 | DUE 26:2,2 |
| 9:12 10:18,21 | 20:24 37:6,11 | 43:7 | 39:16,16 40:2 | 52:12,15,15,16 |
| 21:13 49:11 51:1 | 38:24 39:8 | DIRECTLY | 47:17 48:1 | |
| 31.1 | 30.2137.0 | 14:10 44:26 | 55:23 | |
| 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| E 2:4 | 18:26 22:2,5 | FALSELY 7:2 | FOUND 19:4 | GIVEN 49:14 |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| EARLIER | 22:17 23:26 | 12:9 19:17 | 20:4 29:1 | GIVING 52:6 |
| 47:23 50:8 | 24:16,24,25 | 20:24 21:13 | 30:10,10 46:21 | 54:22 |
| EAST 46:10 | 25:11,12 26:11 | 22:18 23:9 | 53:25 | GO 3:6,6 8:17 |
| EASY 8:18 | 26:18 28:19 | 24:17 37:9 | FOUR 22:11 | 14:25 15:16 |
| EDUCATION | 32:12 33:21,23 | FALSIFIED 9:3 | 50:6 52:13 | 16:20 18:11 |
| 21:13 49:10 | 36:5,11 44:19 | 22:25 | FRANKLY | 44:16 49:19 |
| 51:1 | 45:13 47:13,22 | FAR 16:10 | 47:20 | 50:24 54:5 |
| EFFECT 23:8 | 48:18,23 49:9 | 54:23 | FREE 4:22 | 55:22 |
| 51:7 | EXHIBITS | FE 2:7 | FREEDOM | GOING 4:22 |
| EFFORT 19:5 | 13:12 39:17 | FEDERAL | 39:19,19 | 9:24 33:21 |
| EITHER 37:21 | 44:18 46:11 | 10:22 12:3,25 | FRIEND 16:7 | 35:1,3 37:23 |
| ENCLOSED | 47:21 | 12:26 22:23 | FRONT 17:5 | 38:10 50:23 |
| 19:1 | EXPLAIN 8:24 | 26:3,25 41:13 | FULL 41:16 | GOOD 3:6,9,11 |
| ENGLISH 30:2 | 21:11 23:26 | FEEL 4:22 | 57:9,10 | 3:13 4:20 5:5,6 |
| 36:15,25 | 26:6 41:14 | FIGUEROA | FULLY 19:24 | 40:18 |
| ENTITLED | EXPLAINED | 2:20 | FUND 25:16,21 | GOSH 6:5 |
| 19:3 48:5 | 7:11 8:16 | FILED 4:2 | FUNDED 20:17 | GOVERNME |
| ERIGERO 2:18 | 11:13 17:15 | FINALIZE 3:24 | 53:26 | 10:22 12:3 |
| 3:13,14 | 37:25 39:12 | FIND 33:17,22 | FUNDING | 19:5 27:5 |
| ESQ 2:12,18 | 50:9 51:4 | 39:17 | 10:22 12:3 | GOVERNME |
| ESTABLISH | EXPLAINING | FINDING 11:11 | 19:20,20 25:20 | 20:12 |
| 10:19 | 28:6 | 30:16 31:9 | 25:21,23 26:26 | GRANT 7:3 |
| ESTEEMED | EXPLANATI | FINDINGS | 27:6,11 28:8 | 12:11,20 13:1 |
| 4:5 | 40:18 52:7 | 22:12 | 28:11,15 29:13 | 13:7,9,9,16 |
| ET 41:14 | EXPRESS | FINE 49:1 | 52:25,26 | 19:18,25 20:2 |
| EVENT 13:22 | 36:22 | FINISH 3:22 | FUNDS 20:21 | 20:25 22:21 |
| EVENTS 20:20 | EXPRESSED | 8:1 24:14 | 26:3 | 23:9 24:17 |
| 51:9,10 | 51:8 | FINISHED | FUNDS.' 19:6 | 27:11 31:6 |
| EVERYBODY | EXPRESSING | 25:11 | FURTHER | 33:6,9 40:20 |
| 42:22 | 26:25 | FIRST 24:18 | 15:16 28:8,11 | 40:21 41:6,11 |
| EVIDENCE | EXPRESSION | 25:5 26:24 | 28:15 29:13 | 41:12,21 42:7 |
| 14:21 20:10 | 47:9 | 29:11 42:9 | 44:11 48:21 | 42:10,14 |
| 23:7,12 31:25 | EXTENT 23:21 | 49:25 55:20 | 49:7 55:13,16 | GRANTED |
| 31:26 34:7 | EXTRAPOL | FIVE 30:23 50:6 | 55:25 56:3,14 | 26:3 30:20 |
| 42:2,6 48:19 | 42:15 | FLIP 16:26 | | 38:14 |
| 50:20 53:6 | | FOLLOW-UP | G | GRANTS 20:6 |
| 56:10 | F | 51:22 | GATHER 10:24 | GUESSING |
| EXACTLY 18:5 | FACE 19:9 | FOLLOWING | GENERAL 12:1 | 4:10 |
| 18:17 | 38:18 45:9 | 3:4 4:18 7:24 | 29:3 30:14,16 | GUILTY 10:4 |
| EXAMINATI | 46:5 53:4 | 8:10,17 11:13 | 35:23 51:12 | 10:10,17 |
| 44:14 55:16 | FACT 10:20 | 29:2 55:1 | GENESIS 17:15 | |
| EXCUSE 23:22 | 11:25 28:14 | FORCIBLY | GENTLEMEN | H |
| EXECUTIVE | 48:14 | 7:16 | 4:21 | HAPPEN 7:9 |
| 19:22 | FACTS 10:17 | FOREGOING | GETTING 27:5 | 39:16 |
| EXERCISE | 25:15 31:25 | 57:9 | 40:26 41:16 | HAPPENS |
| 52:12 | 42:15 56:9 | FOREIGN | 43:8 53:14 | 45:12 |
| EXHIBIT 5:8 | FAIR 32:7 | 20:11 | 54:23 | HARD 16:25 |
| 5:10 6:14 15:6 | FALSE 10:21 | FORM 3:25 | GIVE 4:26 9:25 | HARM 43:18 |
| 17:5 18:6,7,14 | 12:2 | 23:11 | 32:26 34:21 | HART 2:4 3:9,9 |
| | | | | |

| 4:11,16 5:4 | HESSELTINE | 29:18,24 43:1 | 8:14 | 17:24 27:12 |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 8:12 9:21 10:1 | 1:15 | INCLUDED | INTERESTS | 44:21 46:14 |
| 10:9,23 11:2,5 | HIGHLIGHT | 6:24 7:5 51:16 | 20:17 | JUDGE 1:15 |
| 11:9 12:5,13 | 37:24 | INCLUDING | INTERFERED | 11:5 34:20,26 |
| 12:23 14:16 | HOLD 10:2 | 18:5 20:11 | 54:13 | 42:25 51:22 |
| 15:6,13,22 | 27:23 | 24:4,6 25:7 | INTERNATI | 54:24 55:26 |
| 17:2,4 18:11 | HONOR 3:9,11 | 30:9 45:5 | 20:22 | JUMPED 54:18 |
| 18:12 21:8,21 | 3:13 4:1 8:1 | 49:15 | INTERPRET | JURORS 3:17 |
| 22:1,2,3,14,16 | 10:5,12 15:8 | INCLUSIVE | 37:21 | JURY 3:5 4:19 |
| 23:2,5,14,24 | 25:1 26:12 | 1:9 | INTERRUPT | 5:10 20:15 |
| 25:9 26:11,16 | 27:13 31:18 | INCORRECT | 30:19 38:10 | 47:21 |
| 27:23,25 28:1 | 35:1 36:19 | 43:18 | INTERRUPT | JUSTICE 1:2 |
| 28:4 29:5,10 | 40:23 43:6 | INDICATED | 8:13 | JUSTICE 1.2 |
| 30:18,22 31:20 | 44:8,11,13 | 13:8 | INTRODUCED | K |
| 32:10,10,11 | 48:21,24 51:20 | INDICATES | 53:3,7 | KEEP 41:17 |
| 33:7,14,22 | 53:12,16 54:14 | 19:13 | INTRODUCI | KHOA 1:5 3:7 |
| 34:4,16,17,20 | 54:25 55:25 | INDIVIDUAL | 47:21 | 3:10 5:21 7:2 |
| 34:26 35:7 | 56:7 | 19:21 | INVESTIGA | 7:24 9:5,8 |
| 36:4,9,26 | HONORABLE | INFORMATI | 24:4 30:8 31:5 | 10:10,16 12:9 |
| 37:13 38:13,16 | 1:15 | 8:21 18:21 | 31:7 | 13:8,16 15:2,5 |
| 40:13 41:4,19 | HOPE 56:1 | 23:8 24:24,25 | INVESTIGA | 15:26 16:16 |
| 42:1,25,26 | HOUR-ISH | 31:23 39:12 | 37:24 39:12 | 17:13 19:8,9 |
| 43:10,15,25 | 3:19 | 41:5 44:4 | INVESTIGA | 19:14 20:2,24 |
| 44:11 45:22 | HOUSE 7:20,20 | 55:21 | 45:4 | 21:12 22:18 |
| 48:20 49:8 | 35:12 48:6 | INFORMED | INVESTIGA | 23:9 24:8,16 |
| 50:3,14,15,25 | 53:12 10:0 | 30:15 | 10:19 11:3 | 25:19 30:11 |
| 51:22 52:14 | HOYT 2:4 3:9 | INNOCENT | 17:14,16 18:3 | 33:1,10,13,16 |
| 54:7,15,24,26 | HOYTH@PR | 10:3 | 19:13 22:10 | 34:9 35:21 |
| 55:6,7,13,26 | 2:8 | INQUIRING | 28:13,22,26 | 37:9,24 38:6,9 |
| 56:2,4,11,14 | HURT 44:7 | 47:16 | 29:3 30:7,15 | 38:19 39:12 |
| HART'S 5:2 | | INQUIRY 19:9 | 31:9,16 44:20 | 40:18,22 41:22 |
| HEAD 19:23 | I | 38:18 45:10 | 44:20,22 46:21 | 43:5 44:26 |
| 22:20 | I.R.A.C 19:14 | 46:6 | INVOLVED | 45:6,9 46:6,21 |
| HEADING | 20:1 25:19 | INSPECT 42:11 | 31:21 | 47:16 48:9,14 |
| 45:24 | 48:9 | INSPECTOR | IRRELEVANT | 50:9,16 51:16 |
| HEAR 16:1 | I.R.A.C./S.E | 11:26 29:3 | 56:10 | 52:6,8,10,10 |
| 34:19 51:23 | 19:8 20:7 | 30:14,15 35:23 | ISSUE 5:21,26 | 52:21 53:10,20 |
| HEARD 15:14 | 30:11 34:3 | 51:12 | 11:12 47:4,6 | 53:23 55:9 |
| 15:25 16:6 | 45:5 | INSTANCE | 49:10 50:18,26 | KHOA'S 29:25 |
| 55:18 56:7 | IDEA 56:6 | 53:1 | ISSUED 14:9 | 32:13 49:10 |
| HEARINGS | IDENTIFY 18:5 | INSTRUCTI | ISSUES 20:22 | 50:26 55:1 |
| 48:5 52:24 | II 2:4 | 3:24 | 45:4 | KNEW 16:12 |
| 53:18,18,23,24 | IMPORTAN | INTENDED | ITEM 24:21 | 52:8,10 |
| HEARSAY 23:2 | 50:1,4,5,6 | 37:3 | 25:5 30:23 | KNOW 4:7 7:14 |
| 34:16 | 55:18 | INTEREST | 31:8 32:12 | 11:25 12:1 |
| HELD 3:4 4:18 | IMPORTANT | 20:11 | 38:22 39:7 | 14:23 19:19,23 |
| 7:2 37:6,11 | 51:1,2,17 | INTERESTED | | 31:7,23 32:6 |
| 53:17 | INCEPTION | 11:12 41:15 | J | 46:2 |
| HELP 7:10 | 7:19 | 49:15 | J 1:15 2:18 | KNOWN 8:26 |
| 11:16 | INCLUDE | INTERESTI | JANUARY | 52:23 54:4 |
| | | | | |

| | | | | rage o |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| | 26.1.7.22 | 1:25 57:6,17 | 25:18 34:12 | 26:11 29:5 |
| <u>L</u> | 26:1,7,23 | LOUDER 11:6 | 38:7 39:15 | 30:18 34:16 |
| LACK 44:6 | 27:10 28:6,21 | LOWER 40:16 | 40:1 46:24 | 38:13 40:16 |
| LADIES 4:20 | 29:1,12 30:3,6 30:26 31:9 | LUCKILY | 47:1 | 48:18 |
| LANGUAGE | | | | |
| 30:2 | 35:2,22 36:10 | 55:23 | MICHELLE | MULTIPLE |
| LASER 17:8 | 38:4,5,17,22 | <u> </u> | 1:25 57:6,17 | 13:16 24:7 |
| LASTED 22:11 | 44:19,24,25,25 | MACH 5:22 | MIDDLE 19:12 | 29:15,21 30:1 |
| LATE 14:8 | 45:15,21 46:5 | MAGAZINE | MIND 6:4 18:24 | 30:16 41:11 |
| LAW 2:4,5 7:22 | 46:8,13,24 | 19:2 | 25:14,22,25 | 52:26 53:26 |
| LAY 25:15 | 49:9,26 51:11 | MAJESKI 2:19 | MINOR 37:11 | MUMBLED |
| LE 1:5 3:10 | 51:15 52:19 | 3:14 | MINUTE 8:3 | 32:4 |
| 13:16 19:8 | LETTERHE | MAKING 50:21 | 18:4 24:10 | N |
| 25:19 30:11 | 34:3 | MANAGER | MINUTES 30:5 | $\frac{1}{\text{N.A.V.A.S.A}}$ |
| 44:26 45:6 | LETTERS | 19:21 | MISAPPROP | 19:4 25:16 |
| 48:9 | 17:23,25 22:8 | MARCH 7:19 | 19:4 | |
| LEADER 28:25 | 22:26 26:25 | 14:9,11,17,18 | MISCHARA | NAME 19:5 NECESSARI |
| LEADERS | 28:23 31:22 | , , , | 14:4 31:26 | |
| 17:23,26 24:6 | 35:25 36:2 | 14:20,24 15:4 | 40:7 49:20 | 13:3 25:24 |
| 28:24 55:2 | 38:6 39:24 | 17:12 19:1 | 50:20 | 34:24 |
| LEADING | 40:4 45:2,4 | 21:20,24 22:26 | MISREPRES | NECESSITA |
| 45:22,23 | LIMON 15:1,4 | 28:20,23 35:10 | 10:20 | 54:16 |
| LEARNED 19:7 | 24:7 26:2 | 39:19 44:23,25 | MISREPRES | NEED 20:26 |
| 45:5 | 44:24 45:13 | 45:2,15 46:23 | 9:12 10:18 | 26:5 28:18 |
| LEARNING | LITTLE 11:6 | 50:2,4,5 51:1 | 19:8,14 20:2 | 29:9 31:11,12 |
| 53:9 | 46:2 | MARINA 2:15 | 25:19 30:11 | 38:11 51:23 |
| LEEWAY 54:22 | LLP 2:13 | MATERIALS | 45:6 | 53:2 |
| LEFT 3:19 | LOATHE 54:24 | 10:25 16:3,8 | MISREPRES | NEUTRALIZE |
| LEGAL 41:24 | LOBBYING | 16:16 32:16,26 | 12:2 | 9:9 |
| LEGISLATI | 20:16 | 35:20 49:14 | MISUSED | NEVER 46:24 |
| 7:13,18 50:8 | LOGICALLY | MATTER 9:13 | 25:22 | 47:1,4 |
| 52:24 53:2,8,8 | 21:12 | 41:20 43:11 | MIX 51:5 | NEW 11:16 |
| 53:19 | LONGER 9:11 | MATTERS | MOMENT 5:2 | NEWS 14:15 |
| LET'S 8:6 15:6 | 50:9 | 39:21 | 34:21 | 19:2 39:20 |
| 17:7 26:11 | LOOK 5:8 | MEAN 31:5 | MOMENTS | 46:7 |
| 33:17 36:4 | 11:13 14:19 | 52:15 53:15 | 48:15 | NEWSPAPER |
| 53:14 | 16:25 26:22 | MEANS 39:19 | MONEY 20:20 | 23:16 |
| LETTER 7:25 | 28:18 29:24 | 42:13 44:1 | MONITORING | NEXT-TO-L |
| 11:26 13:13,24 | 33:17 34:21 | MEANT 31:24 | 26:3 | 15:11 |
| 13:26 14:17,18 | 36:4 47:12,22 | MEDIA 5:23 | MONTH 46:13 | NGUYEN 1:8,9 |
| 14:19,20,24,25 | 55:22 | 46:17 | MONTHS | 2:5 3:2 15:8 |
| 14:26 15:4,5,7 | LOOKED 25:6 | MEMBER | 22:11 35:15 | 26:12,14 35:1 |
| 15:26 16:23 | 40:2 | 32:18 | 52:13 | 35:4 48:24,26 |
| 17:11,21 18:8 | LOOKING 3:22 | MEMBERS | MORNING 3:6 | 49:3 56:17 |
| 18:14,19,20,21 | 18:21 23:3 | 20:5 24:5 30:8 | 3:9,11,13 4:20 | NHMD 20:18 |
| 18:24 21:10,20 | 39:2 48:12 | 54:2 | 5:5,6 | NONRESPO |
| 21:24,25 22:5 | 49:26 | MENTION | MOTION 9:24 | 9:22 22:14 |
| 22:24 23:1,7,8 | LOS 2:21 | 24:20 49:10,26 | MOTIVE 51:7 | 29:6 30:19 |
| 23:15 24:1,3,9 | LOT 16:8 40:2 | 51:6 | MOVE 9:22 | 38:13 |
| 24:11,15 25:3 | 54:2 | MENTIONED | 22:14 23:2 | NOT-CREDI |
| 25:5,8,22,25 | LOTT-MEYE | 14:19 15:3 | 24:13 25:10 | 51:3,17 |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | | |

| | • | ī | - | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| NOTED 37:8 | 55:4,11 56:8 | OPEN 4:18 | 20:17 | PAUSE 18:4 |
| NOTES 57:10 | OBJECTIONS | OPENED 51:24 | OVERWHEL | PC 2:19 |
| NOTION 18:24 | 32:5 | 53:15 | 17:22,25 27:22 | PENDING 4:9 |
| NOVEMBER | OBTAIN 10:22 | OPENING 28:5 | 46:14 | 4:10 15:18 |
| 1:17 3:1 56:18 | OBTAINED | OPPONENT | | PEOPLE 1:8 |
| NUMBER 16:21 | 41:10 | 10:25 | P | 7:16 9:7 11:16 |
| 17:22,25 18:6 | OCCUR 43:17 | OPPORTUNI | P.O 2:6 | 28:7,10,14 |
| 24:9,21 25:4,5 | 44:5 | 5:1 9:25 52:7 | PAGE 15:12 | 30:1,24 31:10 |
| 25:15 26:17 | OFFENSE 7:4 | OPPOSE 7:18 | 16:23 17:12 | 37:25 39:13 |
| 27:22 29:25 | 37:16,17 | 7:23 9:6 53:20 | 20:9,13,14 | 52:23 53:3 |
| 30:23 31:8 | OFFERED | OPPOSED 7:13 | 25:5 36:5 39:3 | 54:4,5 |
| 32:12 38:22 | 34:24 | 28:11,15 54:17 | 39:7 | PEOPLE'S 9:3 |
| 45:13 46:15 | OFFICE 11:15 | OPPOSING | PAGES 22:21 | PERMISSION |
| 47:13 | 12:21 16:8 | 27:5 28:8 55:9 | 41:16 | 48:24 |
| NUMEROUS | 17:13 33:1 | OPPOSITION | PAID 20:7 | PERMIT 20:21 |
| 47:17 | 41:13 45:21 | 8:11,25 26:25 | PAPER 4:4 | PERSECUTED |
| 0 | 52:13 55:22 | 29:12 35:13 | PARAGRAPH | 54:9 |
| | OFFICIAL 1:26 | 50:8 51:14 | 15:12 19:1,12 | PERSECUTI |
| O.R.R 14:26 | 57:18 | 55:3 | 20:9,19 23:22 | 53:5,25 54:10 |
| 17:11 20:5,17 | OH 6:5 14:3 | OPTIMISTIC | 26:24 28:5 | 54:11 |
| 20:20 22:22,25 | 15:3 20:14 | 3:25 | 29:11,17 37:23 | PERSON 54:3 |
| 25:15,21 29:2 52:6 | 21:6 34:5,11 | ORANGE 1:2 | PARAGRAP 23:25 | PERSONALLY |
| O.R.R.'S 20:20 | 45:19 | 19:2,5 57:4,8 | PARAPHRASE | 12:6,14 |
| OATH 4:26 | OKAY 4:3 5:13 | ORDER 6:14 | 18:17 25:4 | PERSPECTI |
| OBJECT 54:21 | 5:17,25 6:8,23 | 10:21 12:3 | 44:2 | 5:20 |
| 56:9 | 7:26 8:20 9:14 | 24:8 51:2 | PARAPHRA | PETITIONS |
| OBJECTED | 12:24 13:6,13 | ORGANIZAT | 44:3 | 23:16 PH D 20:25 |
| 37:26 39:14 | 13:17,20 14:2 15:19 16:15 | 19:19,20,24,25 26:26 30:9 | PARAPHRA | PH.D 29:25 |
| 40:17 54:20 | 17:10,20 18:13 | 32:19 | 9:20 18:18 | 32:13,16,22,25 33:2,10 34:10 |
| OBJECTION | 18:23 19:11 | ORGANIZAT | PART 18:13 | 45:16 46:24 |
| 8:1 9:17 10:5 | 21:22 24:10 | 20:10 25:17 | 23:9 32:20 | 47:3,5,7,9,24 |
| 10:12 11:1,7 | 28:5,14 29:17 | 28:15 30:10,24 | 36:13,14,17 | 51:16 |
| 11:23 12:12,16 | 31:6 32:24 | ORIGINAL | 37:24 46:4 | PHRASED |
| 14:4 16:18 | 33:8,17 34:7 | 36:24 37:9 | PARTIALLY | 21:16 |
| 17:17 21:16 | 34:21,26 35:3 | OUTSIDE 3:4 | 38:5 39:25 | PLAINTIFF 1:6 |
| 23:2,11,19 | 35:11 36:17 | OVERHEAD | PARTICULAR | 2:3 3:10,23 |
| 25:1 26:8 | 37:20,23 39:3 | 36:13 | 18:18 19:11,26 | 5:11 43:7 |
| 27:13 29:5 | 39:11,21 40:4 | OVERRULED | 22:5 43:1 47:3 | PLAINTIFF'S |
| 30:18 31:18,25 | 40:14 41:5 | 9:18 10:7,15 | PARTICULA | 27:17 40:24 |
| 33:3,11 35:18 | 42:2,6 43:26 | 12:18 14:6 | 49:15 | PLAN 7:15 |
| 35:26 36:19 | 44:3,5 46:19 | 16:19 21:17 | PARTIES 3:17 | PLEASE 3:7 5:8 |
| 40:7,23 41:7 | 47:20 49:1 | 22:15 23:3,20 | 29:15,21 | 5:10 6:6 8:2 |
| 41:23 42:20 | 50:4,5 51:15 | 25:2 27:19 | PASS 30:14 | 15:19 22:1,17 |
| 43:6,13,20 | 53:9 54:5,24 | 32:1 33:4,12 | 55:8 | 36:6 39:4 |
| 44:8 45:22 | 55:13 56:2 | 34:23 36:21 | PASSED 7:20 | 50:14 |
| 48:20 49:18,20 | ONES 40:4 | 40:8,25 41:9 | 7:21,21 35:11 | PLENTY 21:14 |
| 50:13,20 51:18 | ONESELF 12:2 | 41:25 43:21 | 35:12,14 53:19 | 21:19 22:12 |
| 51:20 52:20 | ONGOING | 49:22 51:25 | PATHWAY | 53:6 |
| 53:12 54:14 | 28:26 44:22 | OVERSEAS | 45:24 | POINT 26:9 |
| | | | | |

| 30:5 38:8 43:8 | PROCESSED | PUBLISHED | RAISED 47:4 | 48:4,15 |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 51:2 52:1,4 | 20:6 | 5:12,18 10:11 | RANCHO 2:7 | REFERENCI |
| POINTED 37:5 | PRODUCE | 11:18 15:10 | REACH 35:15 | 45:21 47:17 |
| POINTER 17:8 | 14:11 | 19:2 21:10 | READ 3:22 5:17 | REFERRED |
| POLICY 9:13 | PRODUCED | 24:23,26 26:15 | 20:4 25:14 | 32:21 34:2 |
| POLITICAL | 13:17 | 33:25,26 35:5 | 26:2,4,4,5 | REFERRING |
| 9:4 10:25 | PROFESSOR | 35:6 36:8 | 36:24 | 23:23,25 24:19 |
| POSED 8:8 | 5:21 15:2,26 | 39:18 43:12 | READING 6:3 | 24:20,22,22 |
| POSITION | 16:16 17:13 | 49:5,6 | 18:5 | 29:21 46:5 |
| 50:10 | 19:14 20:2,24 | PUBLISHING | REALIZE 9:10 | 47:26 |
| POSTING 5:22 | 21:12 24:16 | 43:16,18 48:25 | REALLY 6:20 | REFERS 23:16 |
| POTENT 52:21 | 26:17 27:23,24 | PULLED 42:9 | 8:13 11:19 | 48:7 |
| POWER 30:8 | 27:26 33:1,10 | 42:16,17 | 37:1 50:11 | REFRESH |
| PRECEDED | 34:9 35:21 | PURPORTS | REASK 29:9 | 28:18 |
| 46:18 | 40:22 41:22 | 34:23 | REASON 16:15 | REFUGEES |
| PRESENCE 3:4 | 43:5 49:10 | PURPOSE | 49:13 | 53:11 |
| 4:19 | 50:16 51:16 | 50:11 | RECALL 13:4,5 | REGISTER 4:9 |
| PRESENT 3:17 | 53:10 55:1,9 | PUT 15:6 | 55:8 | RELATED |
| 16:16 20:5 | PROGRAM | | RECEIVE | 20:16 49:10 |
| PRESENTED | 8:26 11:16 | Q | 27:11 | RELATES 7:8 |
| 10:17 22:7,21 | PROMISE | QUESTION 8:2 | RECEIVED | RELATIONS |
| 32:22 40:5 | 25:10 | 8:4,8,9,18 | 15:26 17:22,24 | 25:26 |
| PRESENTING | PROMOTED | 12:24 13:21 | 26:24 27:22 | RELEASE 14:9 |
| 10:21 12:2 | 32:16 | 14:6 15:18 | 29:12 41:13 | 14:14,20 23:1 |
| PRESIDENT | PROMPTED | 17:1,2 18:11 | 46:14 48:19 | RELEASED |
| 35:16 | 18:2 | 20:26 23:11 | RECOLLECT | 35:9,20,24 |
| PRESIDING | PRONOUNS | 29:9 31:8 32:1 | 47:15 | RELEVANCE |
| 1:15 | 28:2 | 32:9 36:1 | RECOLLEC | 9:17 12:12,17 |
| PRESS 14:9,13 | PROSECUTED | 38:11 39:22 | 28:18 | 33:3,11 36:20 |
| 14:20 23:1 | 53:1 54:8,10 | 40:8 42:3,6,25 | RECORD 3:7 | 43:20 44:9 |
| PREVIOUS | PROTESTING | 49:22 50:14 | 6:9,18 7:10 | 53:13 54:14,21 |
| 20:6 22:26 | 23:16 | 55:6 56:1,9,11 | 18:6,10 32:5 | 55:4,11 |
| PRIMARILY | PROVE 9:15 | QUESTIONI | 34:12 47:24 | RELEVANT |
| 18:20 | 19:17 20:23 | 5:2 | 48:3,14 | 6:20 10:13 |
| PRIMARY 25:4 | PROVEN 10:3 | QUESTIONS | RECORDS | RELIED 34:25 |
| 26:18 39:26,26 | 10:10 | 44:11 45:17 | 34:14,18 | RELY 21:19 |
| 40:11,14 | PROVES 18:14 | 55:13,18 56:14 | RECROSS-E | 30:13 |
| PRINTED 34:2 | 26:7 | QUEUE 4:9 | 56:3 | RELYING 21:9 |
| PRIOR 14:5 | PUBLIC 14:14 | QUICKLY | REDIRECT | 23:4 34:23 |
| 28:22 30:6 | 19:9 38:18 | 40:26 | 3:20 44:14 | REMAINS 42:6 |
| PRIVATE | 45:10 46:1,3,5 | QUITE 12:20 | 51:21 55:16 | REMEMBER |
| 26:26 | 46:17 | 55:23 | REFER 27:12 | 12:25 35:8 |
| PRO 1:26 57:7 | PUBLICATI | QUOTE 37:2 43:26 | 30:6 31:12 | 37:15 38:20,26 |
| 57:18 | 39:18 47:3 | QUOTED 43:23 | 38:6 39:16 | 39:1 |
| PROBABLY | 50:12 | QUOTED 43:23 | 46:7 | REMIND 4:25 |
| 3:21 | PUBLICATI | R | REFERENCE | 5:10 |
| PROCEEDIN | 46:10 48:13 | R.O.V.R 6:18 | 44:24,25 45:16 | RENDER 50:16 |
| 3:4 4:18 57:11 | PUBLISH 15:8 | 6:24 7:10 9:1 | 48:9 | 51:2,17 |
| PROCESS 24:4 | 26:12 36:6 | RAISE 47:3 | REFERENCED | REPATRIAT |
| 46:21 52:12,15 | 48:24 | | 45:7 46:1 48:2 | 7:17 |
| | I | I | 1 | I |

| | | | | Tage 5 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| REPEAT 17:1 | RESUMED 5:3 | 16:12 31:21 | 47:24 | SINGLE 54:11 |
| 32:9 39:4 | RETICENCE | 32:26 41:11 | SELF-PROM | SINGLE 34:11 SIR 21:18 40:10 |
| REPEATING | 17:17 | 49:13 52:11 | 33:9 | SIT 4:22 9:15 |
| 27:16 | RETURN 4:24 | SAVE 11:16 | SELF-PROM | SMITH 7:14 |
| REPHRASE | RETURNEE | SAW 13:1,11 | 33:1 | 8:26 11:15 |
| 17:3 23:13 | 53:1 | 42:9,17 46:9 | SELF-PROM | 17:18 35:9 |
| 42:24 50:24 | RETURNING | 53:1 | 34:9 51:16 | 50:8 53:3,7,17 |
| REPORT 6:23 | 53:11 | SAYING 6:3 | SELF-PROM | 53:22 |
| 34:8 | REVIEW 40:2 | 13:15 25:24 | 29:25 32:13,25 | SOMEBODY |
| REPORTER | REVIEWING | 27:4 31:6 | SEMINARS | 13:14 44:7 |
| 1:26 37:7 57:6 | 55:20 | 46:13 | 48:8 | SONG 5:22 |
| 57:18 | REY 2:15 | SAYS 11:20 | SENATE 7:21 | SOON 25:11 |
| REPORTER'S | RIGHT 3:16 4:6 | 22:18,25 26:24 | 35:14 53:21 | SORRY 8:13 |
| 1:16 57:1 | 4:20 6:15,16 | 28:6 29:18 | SENT 15:3,5 | 11:5 18:7,26 |
| REPRESENT | 8:6 11:13 | 31:1 32:25 | 17:11,13 19:24 | 20:8 21:23,25 |
| 47:10 49:23 | 14:23 15:14,19 | 33:15 37:24 | 35:22 53:4 | 27:24,25 28:20 |
| REPRESENT | 19:12 24:19 | 38:23 39:7 | SENTENCE | 42:19,23 45:19 |
| 48:7 | 26:1,11,22 | 42:13 | 8:23 15:12 | 47:1,1 52:16 |
| REQUEST 53:7 | 30:3 32:8,24 | SCANDAL | 20:4,19 32:24 | 54:19 |
| REQUESTED | 35:18 38:12 | 14:14 38:7 | SERIES 53:17 | SOURCE 25:4 |
| 16:16 | 40:16 45:7,25 | 46:1,3,17,18 | 53:22 | 26:18 39:25 |
| REQUESTING | 47:10 48:16,18 | SCHEDULE | SERVE 50:9 | 40:5 |
| 27:10 | 52:7 55:14 | 48:8 | SERVED 16:13 | SOURCES |
| RESERVATI | 56:12 | SCOPE 10:6 | 52:8,9 | 39:26 40:1,11 |
| 36:23 | RIGHT-HAND | 12:17 27:15,18 | SERVING | 40:12,14 |
| RESOURCE | 42:12,12 | 36:20 41:8 | 20:11 | SOUTH 2:20 |
| 27:1 | RIGHTS 52:23 | 51:20 53:12 | SET 6:9 7:10 | SOUTHEAST |
| RESPECT | 54:4 | SCROLL 17:7 | SETTING 6:17 | 26:26 |
| 23:12 36:20 | RISK 43:17 | SECOND 15:11 | 6:23 | SPEAK 11:6 |
| 37:25 39:13 | ROBERT 39:7 | 15:12 16:23 | SETTLE 5:1 | SPECIFICAL |
| RESPECTED | ROPERS 2:19 | 17:12 18:20 | SHARE 33:5 | 23:6 36:5 |
| 17:23,26 | 3:14 | 19:1,12 20:9 | SHORTHAND | 48:15 50:17 |
| RESPOND | RULE 9:25 | 20:13,14 25:18 | 57:10 | SPECULATE |
| 12:19 14:7 | RULING 34:19 | 29:2 | SHOW 13:9 | 51:26 52:1 |
| 21:18 23:21 | | SECONDARY | 22:10,17 24:3 | SPECULATI |
| 40:10 43:22 | S | 40:1 | 24:15,24 34:14 | 11:7 16:18 |
| 49:24 51:25 | S.B.T.N 5:12 | SECONDLY | 40:21 | 55:4,11 |
| RESPONDED | S.E.A.R.A.C | 42:11 | SHOWED 16:8 | SPEND 3:24 |
| 16:3 | 16:14 19:3,13 | SECURE 19:5 | 34:13 37:25 | SPENT 11:14 |
| RESPONSE 4:2 | 20:1,11 22:20 | SEE 3:21 4:8 | 39:13 41:11 | SS 57:3 |
| 28:17 38:14 | 25:16,17,18 | 8:4 12:9 17:8,8 | SHOWING | STAFF 19:21 |
| 48:13 | 26:4 27:6,11 | 17:10,12 19:12 | 14:11 | 20:5,7 30:7,17 |
| RESPONSIB | 28:8,11,16 | 20:15 22:24 | SHOWN 36:13 | STAGE 29:2 |
| 19:24 22:20 | 29:13 30:9 | 26:23 27:2 | SIDE 9:8 | STAND 4:25 |
| RESPONSIVE | 52:9 | 29:19 32:13 | SIGNAL 48:12 | 27:17 55:14 |
| 38:11 | S.E.A.R.A.C./ | 33:17 36:10 | SIGNED 7:22 | STANDS 7:15 |
| RESULT 46:16 | 20:18 | 38:1,25,26 | 22:22 | START 5:1 17:3 |
| RESUME 4:23 | S.O.S 1:8 | 39:9 42:11 | SILVERMAN | 18:2 |
| 33:22 40:19,21 | SANTA 2:7 3:1 | SEEN 12:20 | 2:13 3:12 | STARTED 8:25 |
| 41:2,21 42:4 | SANTOLI 16:7 | 13:17 32:15 | SIMILAR 15:5 | 11:14 28:12,22 |
| | I | | l | l |

| | I | I | I | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| STATE 1:1 7:4 | STUDENT 2:5 | TELEPHONE | THINK 5:24 | 54:17 |
| 7:13,23,25 | SUBCOMMI | 17:22,25 26:24 | 13:18 21:3 | TRUE 10:24 |
| 8:10,24 9:6,9 | 48:6 | 46:15 | 32:20 33:22 | 11:11,20,21 |
| 9:10 11:10,14 | SUBMITTED | TELL 7:8 37:1 | 37:5,8,20 51:5 | 16:10 18:25 |
| 12:1,10 17:16 | 3:23 12:26 | 52:18 | 52:1,12,17 | 20:24 26:7 |
| 17:17 19:17 | 13:7 22:22,25 | TELLING 9:2,7 | THIRD 20:9 | 43:12 44:6 |
| 20:25 29:4 | 53:23 | 11:17 54:12 | THOROUGH | 56:6 57:9,10 |
| 35:14,17,23 | SUBSTANTI | TEM 57:18 | 22:10 30:15 | TRUSTED 9:12 |
| 50:7 51:12,13 | 55:20 | TEMPORE | THOUSAND | TRUTH 9:16 |
| 51:18 52:5,19 | SUDDENLY | 1:26 57:7 | 7:16 11:16 | 16:12 18:14 |
| 52:22,25 53:20 | 8:24 9:3 30:14 | TENS 7:16 | THREE 22:12 | 22:6 24:1 |
| 54:1 55:10 | SUITE 2:14,20 | 11:16 | 52:25 53:18,23 | 34:24 41:20 |
| 57:3,7 | SUPERIOR 1:1 | TENSE 37:19 | THURSDAY | 44:6 |
| STATE'S 50:10 | 57:7 | TESTIFIED | 1:17 3:1 | TRY 54:25 |
| STATED 13:22 | SUPPORT | 21:11 34:15 | TIME 5:18 8:4 | TRYING 3:24 |
| 27:21 | 21:10 22:6 | 47:23 | 11:15,17,18 | 15:17 30:19 |
| STATEMENT | 50:10 | TESTIFY 34:11 | 14:8,15 15:5 | 47:20 |
| 6:25 7:8 9:16 | SUPPORTED | 54:5 | 16:14 28:26 | TUDO 39:19 |
| 11:11,18,20 | 22:9 25:7 | TESTIFYING | 41:1 46:12 | TURN 17:12 |
| 12:2,7 18:15 | SUPPORTING | 34:16 | 47:2,20 50:1 | TWO 7:21 |
| 18:25 19:11 | 34:8 | TESTIMONY | TIMELINE | 10:17 14:13 |
| 20:1 21:10,12 | SUPPORTS | 1:8 3:2,20 9:6 | 44:17 | 22:8 32:17 |
| 22:6 24:2,23 | 18:24 21:12 | 14:5 15:14,25 | TIMES 13:16 | 37:15 39:24 |
| 24:26 25:13 | 24:1,16,25 | 16:1,7 49:21 | 22:12,13 24:7 | 40:4,11,14 |
| 26:19 43:2,3,4 | 25:13 | 49:23 53:10 | 26:18 30:16 | 45:2 51:5,8,10 |
| 43:12 51:25 | SURE 8:8 11:25 | 54:12 55:1 | 52:26 55:19 | 53:23 |
| 56:6 57:11 | 12:1 14:22 | 56:17 | TIMING 50:22 | |
| STATEMENTS | 33:19 35:23 | THANG 1:8,9 | TITLE 37:26 | U |
| 10:21 40:5 | 42:21 49:2 | 3:2,7 4:24 5:5 | TODAY 3:8,26 | U.S 28:8 |
| 53:23,24 | SUSTAIN 50:23 | 15:23 20:23 | 5:7 9:15 13:4 | ULTIMATE |
| STATES 18:1 | SUSTAINED | 23:15 25:10 | 21:9 43:13 | 50:11 |
| 27:7 37:3 | 11:8 23:13 | 26:17 27:23 | 47:23 | UNCREDIBLE |
| STAY 46:23 | 26:10 29:7 | 28:5 29:11 | TOLD 6:8 26:17 | 50:16 |
| STEP 56:16 | 31:19 42:24 | 30:23 35:8 | 39:20 56:5 | UNDERSTA |
| STEPHEN 2:18 | 43:9,14 44:10 | 36:11 38:10 | TOP 17:7 42:12 | 23:21 25:25 |
| 3:13 | 55:5,12 | 41:20 43:1,11 | 45:15 | 30:26 31:3 |
| STEPHEN.E | SYSTEMATIC | 44:16 47:12 | TRANSCRIPT | 43:26 52:17 |
| 2:22 | 24:4 | 55:18 56:5,17 | 1:16 57:9,10 | 53:16 |
| STORY 39:20 | | THANK 3:15 | TRANSLATED | UNITED 18:1 |
| STRAIGHT 6:9 | T | 4:21 5:7 9:14 | 37:10 | 27:7 |
| 6:18,24 7:10 | T-U-D-O 39:19 | 15:9 16:24 | TRANSLATI | UNNAMED |
| STRANGER | TAKE 3:21 5:8 | 18:9 21:26 | 30:3 36:15,17 | 30:24 34:9 |
| 52:10 | 33:17 36:4 | 26:14 35:5 | 36:20,25 | USE 40:3 47:10 |
| STREET 2:20 | 47:12 | 42:21 52:16 | TRAVELED | T 7 |
| STRICKEN | TAKES 5:21 | 55:24 56:15 | 52:26 | V |
| 29:7 30:20 | TALK 25:21 | THESIS 33:15 | TRAVELS | V 3:7 |
| STRIKE 9:22 | TALKING 3:18 | THING 45:7 | 53:26 | V.A.E.F 32:19 |
| 22:14 23:2 | 13:13,26 24:5 | THINGS 5:21 | TRIAL 1:8 3:2 | VAGUE 23:19 |
| 29:5 30:18 | 24:5 25:23 | 5:25,26 6:4 | 56:17 | 49:21 50:21 |
| 34:16 38:13 | 34:5 42:4,22 | 23:7 31:24 | TRIED 30:5 | VAGUENESS |
| | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| 50:23 | WANT 4:24 8:5 | 25:3 27:17,21 | 48:9 | 2100 2:20 |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| VAN 2:5 | 17:16 20:15 | 27:24,26 32:2 | | 22 5:14 |
| VERDICT 3:25 | 26:6 | 32:9 33:5,13 | Y | 220 47:13,22 |
| VERIFIED | WANTED 49:1 | 33:19 34:1 | YEAH 8:19 | 48:23,26 |
| 22:12 30:16 | WASN'T 46:21 | 36:3,22 37:8 | 20:15 27:8,9 | 220-1 48:18 |
| VERSUS 37:16 | WAY 2:14 4:25 | 40:11 41:2,10 | 28:20 34:11 | 220-2 48:8 |
| VIETNAM 7:17 | 7:9,19 21:12 | 41:26 42:19,23 | 52:16 | 221 33:23,24 |
| 52:26 53:2,25 | 22:7 55:8 | 43:23 45:24 | YEARS 50:6 | 22ND 5:11,15 |
| 53:26 54:6 | WE'LL 3:21,21 | 49:25 50:10,17 | 52:26 | 233 15:6 16:22 |
| VIETNAMESE | 3:23 5:1 24:10 | 51:3,17,26 | YESTERDAY | 17:5 18:14,26 |
| 19:4 36:24 | 40:26 50:24 | 52:4,21 53:17 | 3:18,23 4:26 | 22:5,17 24:16 |
| 37:18 46:17 | WE'RE 3:17,19 | 54:19 55:14 | 6:8 7:12 15:14 | 24:24,25 25:12 |
| 52:22 | 3:21 4:22 23:3 | WITNESS' 14:4 | 15:25 | 44:18 |
| VIETNAMES | 25:11 28:1 | 49:21 | | 234 18:7 22:2 |
| 17:23,26 24:5 | 33:21 35:1,3 | WITNESSED | Z | 26:11 32:12 |
| 28:23,25 | 40:26 43:4,8 | 13:24 | | 35:3 39:3,5 |
| VOSS 2:12,13 | 53:14,15 | WORD 43:26 | 0 | 44:18 |
| 3:11,11,12 4:1 | WEEK 7:24 | WORDS 55:19 | 1 | 236 4:11,13,14 |
| 4:4,7,10 8:1 | 8:11 11:13 | 55:20 | 11:8 39:3,7 | 237 4:11,13,14 |
| 9:17 10:5,12 | 51:13 | WORKING | 10 45:15 46:23 | 5:8,10,11 |
| 11:1,7,23 | WEEKS 14:10 | 11:15 | 104 5.15 40.25 100 1:8 | 238 4:12,16,17 |
| 12:12,17 14:4 | 14:13 | WRAP 8:6 41:1 | 100 1.8 10TH 50:2,4 | 6:14 36:5,11 |
| 15:17,18,20,20 | WELCOME | 53:14 | 11/12 4:14 | 25 5:22 6:11,17 |
| 16:18 21:5,16 | 4:21 | WRITE 8:15 | 14 1:17 3:1 | 26:19 36:10 |
| 23:11,19 25:1 | WELL-RESP | 40:3 45:12 | 56:18 | 25TH 7:5 36:4 |
| 26:8 27:13,15 | 39:18 54:3 | 52:5 55:20 | 18 28:19 44:19 | 2ND 14:1,19,25 |
| 31:18,25 32:4 | WENT 16:10 | WRITES 38:18 | 45:13 49:9 | 16:23 18:14,23 |
| 32:6 33:3,11 | 35:14 52:13 | WRITING | 1995 7:19 35:10 | 23:15 25:7 |
| 35:26 36:19 | WEREN'T 54:8 | 13:24 14:2 | 35:12,14 | 28:21 29:1 |
| 40:7,9,23 41:7 | WHATSOEV | 24:7,7 | 1996 7:25 14:11 | 30:6 31:13 |
| 41:23 42:20 | 54:11 | WRITTEN 6:25 | 15:4,7 16:23 | 38:3,17 46:8 |
| 43:6,13,20 | WHITE 7:19 | 19:15 26:23 | 17:24 18:8 | |
| 44:8,12,13,15 | WHITEBOA | 37:2 38:8 | 19:1 21:7,20 | $\frac{3}{20.7241226}$ |
| 45:25,26 48:18 | 6:25 18:15 | WRONG 17:20 | 21:24,25 22:10 | 30 7:24 13:26 |
| 48:21 49:18,20 | 22:6 37:3 43:5 | WROTE 5:25 | 24:9 25:4,7,8 | 18:8 21:20,24 |
| 50:13,20 51:20 | WISH 23:26 | 6:1,11 9:20 | 27:12 28:21 | 22:9 24:9 25:4 |
| 53:12,15,16 | WITHDRAW | 11:26 13:14 | 29:4 31:13 | 25:8 28:6 29:4 |
| 54:14,20 55:4 | 17:2 42:25 | 14:10 17:21 | 35:16 46:8 | 29:12 38:22 |
| 55:11,15,17,24 | 56:11,14 | 18:17 22:9 | 51:1,2,11 | 45:20 46:12 |
| 56:7,9,13 | WITHDRAWN | 26:19 27:10 | | 51:11,15 52:19 |
| VS 1:7 | 35:17 | 31:24 32:23 | 2 | 30-2021-1201 |
| | WITNESS 4:24 | 39:25 40:6 | 2 15:7 46:5 | 1:7 |
| WAIT 8:3 9:23 | 8:9 9:11,19 | 47:3 48:12,13 | 48:19 | 30TH 17:22 21:25 35:2 |
| 9:23 11:4,4,4 | 10:8,16 11:25 | 52:6 55:19 | 20 30:5 | 352 10:13 33:3 |
| 12:16 21:15,15 | 12:6,8,14,20 | X | 2019 5:22 | 44:9 |
| 21:15,23,23,23 | 13:22 14:8 | XUAN 1:5 3:10 | 2020 5:12,14 | '11 .7 |
| 27:14 32:3,3,3 | 15:11,19,21 | 13:16 19:8 | 6:11,17 26:19 | 4 |
| 42:18 49:19 | 16:20,24 17:1 | 25:19 30:11 | 36:4,10 | 4640 2:14 |
| 50:19 54:20 | 18:7 21:6,19 | 44:26 45:6 | 2024 1:17 3:1 | 10102.11 |
| 30.19 34.20 | 21:25 23:22 | 77 .20 1 3.0 | 56:18 57:13 | |
| 1 | I | 1 | I | I |

Page 12

| | | | Page 12 |
|-------------------------|---|-----|---------|
| | I | 1 1 | |
| 5 | | | |
| 5 24:9,21 25:4,5 | | | |
| 29:25 30:23 | | | |
| 31:8 32:12 | | | |
| 38:22 39:7 | | | |
| 501(C)(3) 26:26 | | | |
| 301(C)(3) 20.20 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 6 14:11 15:4 | | | |
| 675670 2:6 | | | |
| 6TH 14:17,18 | | | |
| | | | |
| 14:20,24 17:12 | | | |
| 22:26 28:23 | | | |
| 44:23,25 45:2 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| | | | |
| 7 36:5 | | | |
| 7TH 18:22 | | | |
| | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 800 2:14 | | | |
| 801 2:20 | | | |
| 8226 1:25 57:6 | | | |
| 57:17 | | | |
| | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 90017 2:21 | | | |
| 90292-6602 2:15 | | | |
| 90S 6:21,24 7:9 | | | |
| 11:18 | | | |
| 92067 2:7 | | | |
| 96 46:14 | | | |
| 99TH 48:7 | | | |
| <i>))</i> 111 40.7 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 1 | | |