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THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor. We have this morning criminal case number 17-201-1 and -2 , the United States of America v. Paul Manafort, Jr., and Richard W. Gates, III. Both Mr. Manafort and Mr. Gates are present in the courtroom.

Will counsel for the parties please approach the lectern and identify yourself for the record.

MR. ANDRES: Good morning, Your Honor. Greg Andres, Andrew Weissmann, Kyle Freeny from the Special Counsel's Office. And with us at counsel table is Supervisory Special Agent Omer Meisel.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning.
MR. WU: Good morning, Your Honor. Shanlon Wu, and Mr. Walter Mack are here for Mr. Gates.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning.
MR. DOWNING: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Downing and Tom Zehnle for Mr. Manafort.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning. I don't know how much we can actually do today. And I don't know how much we can actually do on the public record today, but we'll try to do some of it.

I do want to address sealing issues first. The fact that this case is of significant public interest is not a reason to seal things. It's a reason to unseal things. But it does support maintaining the privacy of the
defendant's private information; their addresses, their family members' addresses, their bank account numbers, the dollars in the bank accounts, their family members' personal information, and financial information that isn't part of the indictment. Attorney-client communications are privileged and not public. And Rule 60 requires that the government be scrupulous about not revealing information about ongoing investigations.

So, there's a lot of reasons why a lot of things that people are telling me have to remain sealed and have to remain private at the moment, but I think people are overdoing it just a little bit. The pleading I received Mr. Gates last night, docket 176, doesn't actually have anything private in it. It just asks for more time. So I'm going to order that it be unsealed.

Mr. Manafort's bond motion, I permitted it to be filed under seal, but I've ordered that a redacted version be posted, and I need that done by Friday. The government's response, docket 175, I'm going to grant you leave to file the opposition under seal, but whatever aspects of it can be filed on the public docket -- and I think there are aspects of it that can -- need to be. So that needs to be done by Friday.

That being said, while my goal is to include the public as much as possible in these proceedings, there are a
number of issues I have to address here today that are going to require either bench conferences or sealed proceedings because they relate to attorney-client confidences or the details of financial arrangements. And at some point these issues will be resolved and they will result in orders and the orders will be public.

So, with that, I guess I usually start each of these status conferences with talking about the status of discovery. And hopefully that's something that you can answer on the record. Mr. Andres?

MR. ANDRES: Yes. Good morning, Judge. And there is something that we would like to approach about. I'll tell you about discovery, but there are matters that we would like to address with the Court at the bench.

So with respect to discovery, we've, since the last status conference, made several productions. We're going to make another production this week. As we said last time, we're largely completed with discovery. What remains are the rolling productions; that is, materials that we continue to receive, whether pursuant to a subpoena or some other process. And obviously we try to get that out as quickly as possible. And then as we described last time, there are other parts of the Special Counsel's Office, other investigations, and we're going through the files of those other investigations that don't relate principally to the
defense in this case or the charges in this case. And we're looking through those files to make sure there's nothing in those that are discoverable, and we'll continue to produce those.

So, as with last time, we're substantially completed, but obviously it's an ongoing process.

THE COURT: All right. So, do you need to come to the bench now to --

MR. ANDRES: I think it would just be appropriate, Judge, because it would alert you to certain issues that may come up along the proceedings.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT REPORTER: Is this sealed?
THE COURT: Yes, this portion is sealed.
(Bench conference.)
THE COURT: All right. Do I have at least one lawyer for each defendant who can hear?

MR. DOWNING: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ANDRES: So, Judge, I didn't want to -- I at least wanted defense counsel to know what we wanted to talk to the Court about, which is to update the Court about certain grand jury matters, both in the Eastern District of Virginia and here in the District of Columbia. I think those matters are more appropriately discussed ex parte, at
least in the first instance, and then if there are matters that should be disclosed to the defense, we'll certainly do that. But I think for purposes of updating the Court on grand jury matters, we should do that ex parte.

THE COURT: All right. Well, you all, not ex parte, came up here last time and told me that indictments were anticipated and that they knew about them and that you had discussed with them whether they would be filed, and that they would be brought before today. I was sort of hoping that if they weren't, somebody would move to continue this hearing so we wouldn't be doing this with everybody watching us, not talking to them. But here we are.

So, I guess I don't really understand why you could talk about it last time with everybody but you can't talk about it this time.

MR. ANDRES: Sure. So, Judge, we are aware that -- something that has happened. We want to update you about that, but some of those matters are sealed. And in light of that, we wanted to proceed ex parte in the first place.

As for continuing this conference, we talked to defense counsel about that, but because there are other issues relating to Mr. Gates's representation, bail, etcetera, it seemed prudent -- or, defense wanted to proceed with that. So, we just need to now take it to the next step. Obviously, we've had conversations with the defense
counsel about the superseding -- I mean, about the Eastern District charges and other matters. But I think what remains should be done ex parte.

THE COURT: All right. In terms of just enlightening me about the schedule, that has to be done ex parte?

MR. ANDRES: I think this information would help you, alert you as to what should happen next on the scheduling. MR. DOWNING: We would object to ex parte communications.

THE COURT: I understand that.
MR. DOWNING: I understand that Mr. --
THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Wait. You need to come up here, near the microphone, so she can get you. MR. DOWNING: I'm sorry. THE COURT: And don't talk over me, so we can have it.

I understand your objection. Your objection is noted. But until I hear what it is, I don't know that I can solve your problem. So, it does seem that they've been in communication with you about what's coming down the road. So, I need to hear what he has to say before I can order him to tell it to you. But your objection is noted. MR. DOWNING: Thank you. MR. WU: Just for the record, we'll join in the objection.

THE COURT: All right. While you're up here, I want to tell you a few other things. I plan to go from this matter into discussing Manafort's bond issues and then at 10:30 I plan to discuss Mr. Gates's representation issues. And I have summoned Mr. Green for that purpose as well, so he will be here. Not the Mr. Green that bills.

MR. WU: No comment, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm sure you would like to see him faster.

All right. Well, how do you want to handle this? Just have you guys step down. And you can tell me what's going on. Let's do that right now.

So this will continue to be sealed and the record will reflect that the government is now going to speak to me ex parte.

So you can go back to counsel table.
MR. ZEHNLE: Your Honor, yes, if I might raise one issue. With respect to the filing of the supplemental memorandum that you just addressed a moment ago for Mr. Manafort's bond, we can certainly file that by Friday. There's one thing in the minute order --

THE COURT: It isn't a supplemental, it's just a redacted version of your supplemental -- of what you filed.

MR. ZEHNLE: The supplemental memorandum that we filed that related to the motion for reconsideration.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ZEHNLE: Okay. The Court said to -- it's fine, redacted addresses, the financial information. On page 2 of that memorandum there was a brief summary of what we had discussed in the sealed hearing on January 22nd. So, I wanted the Court's guidance before I filed that because technically that's not an address, that's not financial information, but it's certainly under seal. So I didn't know if the Court wanted me to redact that brief summary of the January 22, or not.

THE COURT: Well, I think what I said then was exactly what I had said at the original hearing, which is that you had to have one or the other or both to satisfy. So, you know, if you just want to change it to the Court has emphasized that or something, without specifically referencing -- I mean, I don't think it's -- I don't have a problem with that.

MR. ZEHNLE: We don't either, Your Honor. I just want to make sure that I'm not talking about it.

THE COURT: We sealed the hearing because you were telling me about his expenses and legal fees and things like that. I don't have a problem with that.

MR. ZEHNLE: Okay.
MR. DOWNING: And, Your Honor, just as a matter of administration, we would like to address the Court regarding
discovery issues after we finish at the bench.
THE COURT: Yes. I would like to set a trial
date. I was planning to set a trial date today. I can't set a trial date without knowing who co-counsel is going to be, so that's a little bit of a problem. So we might be able to do it later this morning, we might have to get together early next week and do it. I don't know the answer to that yet. I was hoping to have an answer by yesterday at 5 o'clock, but I didn't get one, so --
(Whereupon defense counsel step back to counsel table. Remaining at the bench is government counsel only.)

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ANDRES: Thank you, Judge. So, we did return a super -- we did return -- the grand jury returned an indictment in the Eastern District of Virginia yesterday against Mr. Manafort; that's still sealed, which was the purpose of doing this ex parte.

Second, the government is planning on superseding in this case this Friday, and we'll ask the grand jury to return a superseding indictment against Mr. Manafort. Both of those instruments only charge Mr. Manafort because of the ongoing nature of the negotiations with Mr. Gates. We don't know how that's going to resolve itself yet. We have some hope that it will happen in the next week to ten days. And our hope is that if, in fact, that happens, after that
happens, we can unseal both of those indictments, have Mr. Manafort arraigned here on the District of Columbia cases and proceed that way.

So we were uncomfortable with disclosing to the defense the fact that there's a sealed indictment in the Eastern District of Virginia. But that's what's happening. I think both of those -- or, all three of those events substantially affect what the schedule is going forward. But, once we resolve with Mr. Gates, or not, we can then unseal those indictments and the Court can proceed to have an arraignment and have the schedule go forward that way.

THE COURT: Well, if there's not an agreement with Mr. Gates, is he a codefendant in any of these?

MR. ANDRES: Yeah, if we don't resolve things with Mr. Gates -- and I think we'll know that within the next ten days -- then we would probably supersede on both of those instruments, to include him in both of those. But in light of the negotiations, it would seem prudent to do that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, is there any reason why we can't call them back up here and have you say that what you've told me is that you still intend to supersede and you still intend to proceed in the Eastern District of Virginia? I mean, they already know the substance of the pending indictment.

MR. ANDRES: Absolutely.

THE COURT: So there's nothing about that that's changed.

MR. ANDRES: Correct.
THE COURT: Well, just so they don't think that there's something else.

MR. ANDRES: Yeah.
THE COURT: I mean --
MR. ANDRES: Yeah. I mean, I think what we don't want to disclose, anything that's sealed. We don't want to disclose that Mr. Manafort is the only defendant in those. But we can certainly say --

THE COURT: But I think you can say that you're still intending to proceed to supersede and to proceed there and the schedule is uncertain and is --

MR. WEISMANN: I think the thing that we're trying to avoid is having -- we are hopeful that Mr. Gates's situation will resolve itself quickly and that we will be in front of the Court with the papers and the Court can schedule the plea hearing. We also are cognizant that if it doesn't work out, we don't want to have Mr. Gates in a position where the public knows he's intending to plead guilty and the public -- the issues that are raised but didn't --

THE COURT: But that's different than having you -- Yes, I understand that. Okay.

Counsel, can you return to the bench?
(Defense counsel returns to the bench.)
THE COURT: All right. Based on what's been told to me, I just want to let you know that what was told to me is fundamentally that everything that you -- is not a change to what you already know; that are there are charges contemplated in the Eastern District of Virginia and that there are superseding charges contemplated here and that the timing is still uncertain. But, it is not something else that they're planning to do that they told me about that they haven't told you about.

So, that much I can tell you. I think, given
that -- well, I, too, believe we need to set a trial date. I don't think we can set a trial date until you see what the new charges are because, you know, you won't know how long it's going to take you to get ready. So I'm also hamstrung by the counsel issues, in terms of setting a trial date. But I will let you put your position on the record about setting a trial date and discovery.

MR. DOWNING: I understand that. It doesn't make any sense to me to take a futile position. But I do think that we should set a status conference for next week, so we can come back here, because there are a lot of issues going on. But we, for Mr. Manafort, we ought to set a firm date because that's what we're getting ready for. I don't know
how much more time the government is asking for, but we do have a pending deadline on the 23rd for some motions that, obviously -- I don't know what the new one looks like, but I have a good idea. So I don't think we need more than a week on that, if they're going to return something next week. But I don't know, so I think a status conference would be appropriate.

THE COURT: I don't know either. And I can set a status conference for the end of next week. My problem with that is, you know, then we have a million people sitting here. And maybe the better thing to do is just set it on shorter notice, like --

MR. DOWNING: Okay.
THE COURT: -- kind of take it a day at a time and see if something breaks one way or the other that makes it clear what we need to do and when we need to do it.

MR. DOWNING: Okay.
THE COURT: But, I'm not exactly -- we're all sort of in unchartered waters at this point.

Did you want to say something?
MR. MACK: Just to make a comment to Mr. Wu briefly, because he doesn't always trust me to say what I should be saying.

We do not know with any detail precisely what is happening with respect to Mr . Gates because he will not tell
us.
MR. WU: This may go to the 10:30 issues, Your
Honor. But I would put on the record, under seal, we do not feel we have any clarity from the government vis-a-vis what will happen to our client on these new charges, and that's the result of their feeling that their position is they cannot speak to us about that.

THE COURT: All right. But you were alerted at some point as to what the potential charges could be. Because you had told me last time that you knew what they were and you wanted to face them there.

MR. WU: Yes, I understand. To be specific, last time we were only aware of the potential second indictment in Virginia. As of yesterday we learned that there also was likely to be, in addition to that, a superseding indictment in D.C.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. WU: The particulars of those charges --
THE COURT: I understand, you're hamstrung. Is there any change in Mr. Manafort's point of view about the Eastern District versus the District? I think the only thing I can imagine that's more unusual than the government offering you the choice is the choice you're making. But, is there any further discussion about that?

MR. DOWNING: No.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ZEHNLE: Thanks, Judge.
(Open Court:)
THE COURT: All right.
MR. WU: Your Honor, may I just clarify one thing from the earlier discussion that you made on the record?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. WU: Which is the pleading that Mr. Gates apparently filed last night, $I$ think you referenced that. Counsel of record has not seen that pleading. I just want to make that clear. We double-checked.

THE COURT: Well, it's on the docket and it's going to be unsealed. It has now been docketed, so you should now be able to see it, even if it was sealed, because it's on the docket. So now it will also be unsealed, so anybody can see it.

MR. WU: I think the delay was because it was not filed via ECF.

THE COURT: Right. He filed it pro se. I can simply tell you that he asked me to put off the consideration of the motion to withdraw for approximately a week, and that is the sum total of what was in the document. And now it's going to be public.

MR. WU: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. All right. We have a
motions schedule in place. The government took issue with the scheduling of briefs related to the $404(\mathrm{~b})$ issue, and Mr. Manafort has weighed in on that and thought that -preferred the schedule I set to the one that the government recommended.

I think I need to have a trial date and a pretrial conference before I answer that question, although I do want to advise the Office of Special Counsel that I'm not sure that the government's proposal of waiting until eight weeks before whatever the trial date is is going to work in connection with all the other work that you're going to have to do it get ready for the pretrial conference.

The schedule was established with an understanding that in advance of the pretrial conference, you're going to file a pretrial statement with me that's going to identify the exhibits and witnesses in advance of trial. And the defense can't do that if they don't know what the allegations are that are going to be tried.

So, I think there's going to come a point where I'm going to order the government to inform the Court and the defense of any 404 (b) evidence it intends to introduce so that they can explain to me why I should exclude it, you can explain to me why I can include it, I can rule on it and then we know what the universe is that's going to trial. Which brings me to another point, which is that I believe
that this case needs a trial date. I realize there are some circumstances that may make that impossible today, but I think it has to happen soon.

These defendants are presumed to be innocent, but they're facing serious charges that expose them to significant penalties and we have spent a lot of time being focused on everything but that. We've been dealing with the minutia of bond and soccer practice and public relations and people changing their minds about where they want to live and unsettled questions concerning representation since October, and it's unacceptable.

The nature of charges they have to face, the evidence that they're going to have to respond to can't be a mystery for long. I don't think we can do it at this minute, until we resolve certain fundamental issues that have to be outside the public eye, but I expect to set another status conference soon, at which a status -- a trial date will be set.

Mr. Downing, is there anything you want to say in response to the discovery issues that were on the record?

MR. DOWNING: Thank you, Your Honor. One, Mr. Manafort joins you in wanting to set a firm trial date. We understand there's some issues that the Court has to deal with today. But, we would request that as soon as practical, that that date get set.

We do think we are rather late in the game to still be getting discovery from the government. We got a dump yesterday. We do have some issues that we think additional materials need to be produced that we have not reached agreement with the government on. So we anticipate, in the middle of all this, starting to file discovery motions with the Court regarding those issues. But to the extent we need to be back in this courtroom on short notice to set a trial date, we're prepared to do it. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I mean, I think making rolling productions as more documents come to you is different than producing what is already in your possession or was in your possession when you decide to bring these charges, and that should already be out the door and in their hands. I'm happy -- I'm not going to set a schedule for the filing of discovery motions. You file them and that will prompt a schedule for a reply and an opposition, and we'll take them up as we get them.

Is there anything else -- there are two things that I want to talk about that I do believe I need to talk about in a sealed courtroom, notwithstanding the desire of everyone in the courtroom to be here, and that is Mr. Manafort's pending bond motion and the motion to withdraw filed by counsel.

Are there any other issues I can take up before I
need to do that? Are there any other issues anybody wanted me to take up today? Mr. Wu?

MR. WU: Your Honor, just to put our position on the record with regard to discovery matters. We have been receiving further discovery, but based on what we have brought to your attention in the motion to withdraw, we have been unable to make any significant progress in terms of preparation or review or adhering to the Court's schedule with regard to substantive motion practice.

THE COURT: All right. I think when we resolve the issues that we need to resolve, if the motions for continuances or extensions of time need to be filed, then they'll be filed and we'll take them up at that time. I don't know what else to say at the moment.

MR. WU: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anything further from the government right now?

MR. ANDRES: Judge, just to exclude time. The case has already been designated as complex. There's a motion schedule. But we, in an excess of caution, move to exclude time between now and the time of the -- there is a hearing for motions scheduled in April, so between now and the April hearing date, we would move to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act.

THE COURT: All right. I'm not sure that's
necessary either. I think, certainly in Mr. Gates's case, some of the delay is attributable to Mr. Gates.

Mr. Manafort, what's your position about speedy trial and excluding the time between now and the next hearing?

MR. DOWNING: We would like to take it under consideration, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, you can let me know at the end of the week. I mean, I think as soon as you file motions, the clock is going to stop ticking anyway and this is a complex case and I don't think --

MR. DOWNING: I understand, but I think there also are situations which could be non-excludable time and I would like to take a little time to take a look at that.

I would also ask you to, I guess, hold the February 23rd motions deadline open until we can resolve the issues that --

THE COURT: I don't know what you mean by hold it open. Right now --

MR. DOWNING: Well, right now they're due on the 23rd.

THE COURT: This is a motion that $I$ don't think is dependent on discovery. You stood up and said, I think at the very first status conference, that you wanted to file a motion about the legitimacy of the indictment, just based on the face of the indictment. And then you filed a civil suit
alleging the same thing. And so, I don't -- I deliberately set an earlier schedule for the motion that would either obviate the case or just needs to be resolved up front. So why can't that one be filed on time?

MR. DOWNING: Your Honor, you just had a side bar about issues that obviously come into play with respect to that motion.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm not sure that's entirely true. What it --

MR. DOWNING: I'm not either, so I --
THE COURT: All right. All right. Can you just all approach the bench again?

THE COURT REPORTER: And sealed again?

THE COURT: Yes.
(Bench discussion:)
THE COURT: I understand that in terms of things like bills of particulars or challenging new charges, that you can't challenge those until you see what they are. But, your fundamental problem with the case that is pending now and the fact that you told me that on its face it doesn't state a crime and that it was improper, can you go ahead and brief that yet?

MR. DOWNING: I don't know what the indictment is going to be by next week or the week after, until we get the additional indictment that's going to supersede it. That
doesn't make any sense.
THE COURT: All right. Let's just -- you know, my problem is that we're all just going to end up being so backed up.

MR. DOWNING: Right. What we'll commit to, to the extent there aren't major changes, we can get those motions filed right away. I don't have a problem with that. But I really don't understand --

MR. WEISMANN: Judge, could I just say that as the Court knows and as counsel knows, our view with respect to the civil action that's now before the Court is that that was -- should properly be a motion in a criminal case. There is nothing about the superseding indictment that they would seek -- that would in any way change the legal issues that were raised in that civil case --

THE COURT: Well, I think they had to -- they had substantive issues related to the charges, in addition to the overall concern about the legitimacy of the investigation, and rather than having two motions and two oppositions and two replies, it probably does make sense to see what the indictment is before you move to dismiss it. So that makes sense to me. And I think we can have a phone conference if and when there's a superseding indictment and set a schedule.

MR. DOWNING: When it is appropriate.
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