1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	CRIMINAL DIVISION
3	x
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
5	versus : Criminal Action Numbers
6	ARTURO VASQUEZ, : 2017 CF2 1369
7	PHILLIP GLASER, : 2017 CF2 1368 CHRISTIAN VALENCIA, : 2017 CF2 1203
8	MOLLY CARTER, : 2017 CF2 1380
9	Defendants. :
10	Washington, D.C.
11	Tuesday, May 29th, 2018
12	The above-entitled action came on for motions before the Honorable ROBERT MORIN, Associate Judge, in
13	Courtion Number 312.
14	THIS TRANSCRIPT REPRESENTS THE PRODUCT OF AN OFFICIAL REPORTER, ENGAGED BY THE
15	IT REPRESENTS TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS OF
16	THE CASE AS RECORDED. APPEARANCES:
17	On behalf of the Government:
18	BRITTANY KEIL, Esquire
19	AHMED BASET, Esquire Assistant United States Attorney
20	On behalf of the Defendants:
21	PATRICK LINEHAN, Esq. (Defendant VASQUEZ)
22	DAVID FRAGALE, Esq. (Defendant VASQUEZ) MICHAEL BRUCKHEIM, Esq. (Defendant GLASER)
23	JON FELLNER, Esq. (Defendant GLASER) PATRICK LINEHAN, Esq. (Defendant VALENCIA) DAVID FRACALE FISC. (Defendant VALENCIA)
24	DAVID FRAGALE, Esq. (Defendant VALENCIA) WILLIAM COFFIELD, Esq. (Defendant CARTER)
25	Stephanie M. Austin, RPR, CRR (202) 879-1289 Official Court Reporter

1 MR. LINEHAN: There should not be a problem with 2 us getting those videos by this afternoon. 3 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 4 And then we have all defendants adopting a 5 previously-filed Brady and Rule 16 motion. 6 Who's arguing that? 7 MR. COFFIELD: I got the short straw, Your 8 Honor. 9 THE COURT: It may be the long straw. You never 10 know. 11 MR. COFFIELD: Your Honor, I appreciate --12 THE COURT: If you could just announce your 13 name. 14 MR. COFFIELD: It's Bill Coffield on behalf of Ms. Carter, and I'm opening on behalf of all of the 15 defendants on this point, Your Honor. 16 17 Your Honor, we filed the motion for joinder. I'm not going to repeat what's said in the written papers. 18 I will say that sometime between 6:30 and 7 on Friday we 19 got an invitation from the Government to join the current 20 21 trial group and the June 4th trial group to sit down with the individual who, at the time, had been working for 22 23 Project Veritas to talk about the two -- to talk to --24 THE COURT: Is this the so-called Matt? 25 MR. COFFIELD: We're not naming any names, Your

22

Honor, simply -- I'm very conscious of the protective 1 2 order, Your Honor. 3 But yes, it was the person --THE COURT: I know. I named the name. 4 5 MR. COFFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: You didn't name it. 6 7 MR. COFFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. 8 And we sat down with him and his attorney. 9 had a short --10 THE COURT: Who did? 11 MR. COFFIELD: Representatives of the June 14th 12 trial group and representatives of the current trial group 13 and I sat down on behalf of the May 29th trial group. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. COFFIELD: We had a short window. counsel. Counsel had come in and was scheduled to leave. 16 We were told we had about an hour. We actually got about 17 an hour and 20 minutes before counsel had to leave. 18 19 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 20 MR. COFFIELD: What we found out in that interview, Your Honor, was that at least two other 21 22 individuals from Project Veritas were at the January 8th, 23 2017 meeting. The individual who Your Honor has identified earlier as Matt, recorded -- who recorded the 24 25 January 8th video that we've seen, attended at least four

23

other meetings with regard to J20.

The protocol for all of the individuals from Project Veritas who would attend these meetings was to record the meetings. They recorded them with a button camera, with a separate audio device, and sometimes added recording with their camera. But at every meeting, recorded with a button camera and with a separate audio recording device.

After each meeting, they would view the recordings or listen to the recordings and make notes.

And then they would go to the Project Veritas operations and turn over the recordings and their notes.

In January of 2017, Project Veritas had rented a house to use as an operations center here in D.C. There were eight undercover individuals and members of management living and working out of that house covering the J20 events.

Between January the 8th of 2017 and January the 20th of 2017, individuals with Project Veritas had at least two meetings with the FBI; between January the 8th and January the 20th, had two meetings with the FBI. One at the house that was used as their operations center, and one at the Washington Field Office.

They were provided recordings from at least some of the meetings, the four meetings, that this individual

had recorded beyond the January 8th meeting.

Significantly, he did not recall anyone talking about property destruction in any of the meetings that he attended.

1.3

Your Honor, I've -- I've been doing this for about 30 years, and I'm not very good at it, but the one thing that I've learned over time is, is that when the FBI's involved in something, there's always a 302 somewhere. There's always notes somewhere.

It's our understanding that the only way that this January 8th video came up is because apparently — and, Your Honor, I am not as steeped in all of the facts as Your Honor most likely is, or some others that are in this room.

But in review -- the brief review of the record that I've been able to do in just the last 24 hours, it's my understanding that this January 8th video apparently came to light because Detective Pemberton saw it online, reached out to Project Veritas, got a copy of it.

There's all sorts of questions that are now created as to -- and his testimony was, was that he got it in some time late February or early March.

The obvious question is: No one from Project Veritas told him that they turned over these tapes to the FBI? There was no communication between the FBI and MPD?

I mean, more and more questions are being raised about 1 these video recordings and why they were or were not 2 3 presented. Significantly, we've got testimony that's been 4 in two trials so far about what was said in one of the 5 videos that we now -- in one of the meetings that we now 6 7 understand was recorded and Project Veritas has that we've never seen. 8 9 So what has happened from this meeting has just 10 exacerbated the issues that we have talked about in our 11 joinder and in the underlying motion. 12 Thank you, Your Honor. 1.3 THE COURT: No. No. No. 14 So what are you requesting? 15 MR. COFFIELD: We're requesting dismissal of the 16 indictment, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Assuming that -- I'll take 18 that under advisement. 19 What are you requesting --20 MR. COFFIELD: Then we would request that any 21 videos associated -- any of the planning meetings 22 videos --23 I'm sorry. You said your THE COURT: 24 information is that the FBI was in possession of other

25

meeting videos?

MR. COFFIELD: Yes, Your Honor. The individual 1 was asked specifically about recordings he made of 2 meetings other than the January 8th meeting. 3 THE COURT: Would that include the January 14th 4 5 meeting? 6 MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And the January 18th meeting? 7 MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor. 8 9 And he said that he had taken -- he had gone to 10 at least four other meetings, had recorded them. 11 specifically remembered American University, he remembered 12 Columbia Heights, he remembered a meeting at 16th Street, 13 and he remembered another meeting at the Episcopal church. 14 Significantly, we've had testimony about that, 15 that seems to conflict with his recollection of what was 16 done at those meetings. 17 THE COURT: You mean a statement by the undercover officer --18 19 MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: -- that would be property damage? 21 MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And the January 14th meeting? 23 MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: And the January 18th meeting as 25 well?

MR. COFFIELD: Correct, Your Honor.

So, to answer your question, Your Honor, if the Court will not entertain dismissing the indictment, the superseding indictments, then we would respectfully request that all of these videos go out, that the Government not be allowed to use them.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. Hold on one second.

MS. LEGRAND: Just because we haven't gotten to argue any of these Brady issues before you at all, I do want to point out how troubling it is to me, having -- I was in court on April 6th when the Government represented that the videos from June 8th had been provided with only two edits, and that there was nothing else out there. And then you ordered them, just in the interest of -- to be sure, produce unedited copies.

Let me be clear. There were two things that got produced after that. There was an additional statement at the end that I know you've seen heavy briefing on, about upper echelons not knowing what's going on. There was also 50 minutes, 50 minutes of video from the same meeting, from the same day, that was produced only after April 6th. And that was not flagged for defense counsel. It was put in a folder called "preplanning meeting videos."

Now we know it was the same --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. It was there, but it wasn't flagged, is what you're saying?

MS. LEGRAND: It was not produced until after the April 6th motions hearing. So it was only made available in response to your order saying, just make sure they've got everything. And when everything was provided, it turned out not only that — a segment at the end where Project Veritas undercover operative is talking to someone else, not only had that been excised, but these three other videos that immediately — they flow into the first planning meeting video, all three of those, 50 minutes of video, had never been produced before.

THE COURT: Can I ask you just a generally -- MS. LEGRAND: Yes.

THE COURT: And this isn't a comment on the work, but with regard to any defense counsel, Project Veritas is subject to subpoena. You have the right, or have had the right to subpoena.

MS. LEGRAND: So two --

THE COURT: I'm -- the information that I've just been provided of the Government in terms of the FBI may have been in possession of videos is one thing.

MS. LEGRAND: Right.

THE COURT: But complaints about Project Veritas and their role, I mean, it's subject to investigation and

subpoena.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LEGRAND: So if I may, Your Honor.

First of all, we have now subpoenaed Matt. didn't know Matt's name until Friday.

So we had suspicions that Project Veritas was involved in the planning meeting video, but we had no idea that they had eight people going to all these different meetings, that those people were going to meetings after meeting with the FBI. And I should add, I believe, based on records I've seen, that there were meetings with MPD as well between --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. That's a very important representation.

Where does that come from?

MS. LEGRAND: It's coming from James -- so I'm a little embarrassed to do this, Your Honor, but I was forced to purchase James O'Keefe's book.

And what -- so here's the bigger story, as I dig for the book. We were -- there were thousands and thousands of files produced by the Government. Not a single one of them was labeled "Project Veritas."

People -- we asked repeatedly, who made these videos, tell us who made these videos so that we can contact them.

> THE COURT: I got all that.

MS. LEGRAND: All right. We didn't know. We didn't know, because they hid it. They hid how many people --

THE COURT: Okay. I asked you about the representation that MPD --

MS. LEGRAND: James O'Keefe's book came out just this year. So I just ordered and didn't realize I needed it until this happened.

He says -- James O'Keefe, the head of Project Veritas.

"As the inauguration approached, we had gathered a ton of material, disturbing enough to warrant sharing it with the authorities. Our attorney, Ben Barr, set up a meeting in Washington with the FBI for January 13th.

Tyler, Adam and Max went with him."

Those are all -- I can't subpoena those people, because those aren't their real names.

"In the past, our engagement with law enforcement has not always been congenial, but these guys were an exception. There were four of them; three FBI and one D.C. Metro, all casually dressed. They had done a fair share of undercover work as well, but we had the goods, the video, and they greeted us like brothers in arms. Three days later, on January 16th, we went public with our first published video."

We would need some more discovery.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. Yes.

MS. LEGRAND: If I can briefly just address what I think will be an argument the Government makes.

My client wasn't at the planning meetings.

These videos are, nonetheless, getting used against him.

And for my purposes, perhaps more importantly, I keep

learning more.

We got Jencks material a week ago, as well, which included grand jury testimony. A grand juror asked specifically: Why aren't you investigating Project Veritas. I saw them online inciting these riots. A grand juror asked that. That's Brady. That was not disclosed to us.

I care about that because of more I learn, now that I know, which I didn't before, how much the videos at issue here were either created by Project Veritas or in the presence of Project Veritas, I started looking for, is this — first of all, I found this grand juror's testimony. A random grand juror witness said: Hey, I know they were incited riots. Then I bought James O'Keefe's book. It basically says, we offered to pay people to engage in rioting.

So I now have reason to believe, not fully investigated yet, because I just found it all out, that