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THE CLERK: This is the People of the State of New York against Donald J. Trump, indictment number 71543 of 2023. Appearances starting with the People, please.

MR. STEINGLASS: For the People, ADAs Joshua Steinglass, Matthew Colangelo, Susan Hoffinger, Christopher Conroy, Rebecca Mangold and Katherine Ellis.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. BLANCHE: Good morning, Your Honor. On behalf of President Trump, I am joined at counsel table by Emil Bove, Susan Necheles and Gedalia Stern, and President Trump is here. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Good morning, Mr. Trump.

First I would like to apologize for getting started late. We have been waiting on some jurors. You may have heard that between the jurors that we had in the box and those that we had in the audience we had about 32 jurors left.

There are three jurors that we are still waiting on, two of them were in the box. So seat number two, we are still waiting on and seat number eight we are still waiting on.

Seat number ten is here, but since last night she has expressed that she doesn't feel well. She feels sick. She is experiencing flu like symptoms, but she checked for

| 1 | COVID. It's not COVID. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | She is outside and separated from everybody else. |
| 3 | She was wearing a mask. She was asked if she could serve |
| 4 | day. She said, no. |
| 5 | Is there any objection to excusing her? |
| 6 | MR. STEINGLASS: No. |
| 7 | MR. BLANCHE: No. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Let's excuse juror number ten who is |
| 9 | outside. She can go home. So that leaves the question of |
| 10 | seat two and seat eight. We can wait a couple more minutes |
| 11 | or we can just refill those seats and continue. |
| 12 | MR. STEINGLASS: I would give it a few minutes. |
| 13 | MR. BLANCHE: May I just have two seconds, Your |
| 14 | Honor? |
| 15 | THE COURT: Sure. |
| 16 | (Defense counsel confer.) |
| 17 | MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, our concern is that |
| 18 | this is the second day and they are already over 15 minutes |
| 19 | late. We think they should be excused, those two jurors, |
| 20 | and we should proceed. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Let's give it another few minutes. |
| 22 | MR. BLANCHE: Sure. |
| 23 | (Off the record.) |
| 24 | THE COURT: All right. I asked the sergeant to |
| 25 | get the jurors ready to come in. |

We are told that two of the three jurors missing are here. We are trying to confirm whether they are two and eight or somebody from the audience.
(Off the record.)
THE COURT: Apparently, we don't have the two jurors that we were hoping for, so, the jurors are lining up. They will be brought in in a minute. MR. BLANCHE: We are moving on without those two? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BLANCHE: Assuming that they don't walk in. THE COURT: Yes. If they walk in late, I don't intend to excuse them. I will have them stay in the audience and have them join the second round, unless there is any objection to that.

MR. BLANCHE: Understood.
LIEUTENANT: Panel entering.
(Whereupon the prospective jurors entered the courtroom and were properly seated.)

THE COURT: Good morning jurors. Welcome back. Jurors, I would like to apologize for the late start. I will assure you most of us were here and ready to go for quite some time ago; unfortunately, some of your colleagues on the jury were late.

So this is a good time for me to remind you to please be here on time. The lateness of even one juror
will affect everyone in the courtroom, okay.
I see that one of the seats that we thought we did not have has been filled. So we have to refill seat number eight, please, and seat number ten.

THE CLERK: Refilling seat number eight, B354.
Refilling seat number ten, B402. B402.
THE COURT: Okay. We are ready to start. We will begin with seat number eight.

Good morning. We can start. Just answer the questions.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: One A, I live in NoMad. I have lived there a little over four years. I am not a native New Yorker. I am from Dallas, Texas.

I am a partner in an Italian finance consulting firm. I have been doing that 15 years. My current employer is Riveron.

My firm is over 700 people. I am not self-employed. Prior to Riveron I was at an oil and gas company called Magnum Hunter Resources.

I am not married, I have never been married. I do not have any children.

I am not living with anyone else. And in my spare time I play golf, watch sports, hang out with friends and travel.

I am on the board of Young Catholic Professionals
and I also participate in Make-a-Wish Foundation.
I have never served as a juror before.

From a newsstand point, the New York Times, Google, X, TikTok, Wall Street Journal, New York Post, Fox News, Yahoo.

I don't -- I listen to podcasts every once in a while.

THE COURT: I am sorry. Just one second.
Counsel, please approach.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

THE COURT: So, juror number eight just arrived. I was thinking we can make this juror who is answering now, we can make him seat number ten and put number eight back in seat number eight and ask ten to go back in the audience if that's acceptable.

MR. STEINGLASS: Now they have to live with that. So, we should do what you said earlier, add them to the second round.

THE COURT: We can do that. It's just that they already have gone through it.

MR. STEINGLASS: Whatever you think, Judge.
MR. BLANCHE: We have no objection.
Whatever you think, Judge.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the
following occurred in open court.)
THE COURT: I apologize for interrupting you. Apparently, the juror who sits in seat number eight is here. I would like to you continue.

We will seat you as seat number ten. The juror in seat number ten, we will ask you to step down and go back to the audience.

Okay. Let's continue, sir. So, we are all on the same page, can you read your number to me again, please.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B354.
THE COURT: B354 is now in seat number ten.

B285 remains at number eight.
Please continue.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Number ten, New York times. Google, X, TikTok, Wall Street Journal, New York Post, Fox News, Yahoo.

I don't listen to any podcasts.
If I get bored every once in awhile I will listen to Bartel Sports. I don't listen to talk radio.

Not a victim of a crime.

No, never been employed by a law enforcement agency.

I do have a fraternity brother that is sitting on the State House of Representatives as a Republican.

I am a partner in the accounting and financing firm. And all of my friends and close friends are mainly finance and professionals.

No experience in law. However, I had a lot of friends in the legal field both civil and criminal.

Eighteen no.
Nineteen, yes.
Twenty, no.
THE COURT: With regard to nineteen, was that you or a friend?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I had a DWI.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Twenty-one A, yes.
Twenty-one B.
THE COURT: You said, yes, to twenty-one A.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Can you tell us a little bit more about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, being in this current time in the world a lot of people tend to intellectually slant Republican. So that even though I feel that $I$ can be impartial, there could be some unconscious bias surrounding that.

THE COURT: At this moment as you sit here today, do you think that you can be impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For this twenty-one A, yes. THE COURT: Are there any other questions here that you believe that you would not be able to be fair and impartial for?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think growing up in the State of Texas graduating from a certain university, Texas A\&M University, and having my friends be from Texas, I believe I have some unconscious bias that could be weighed to not being impartial.

THE COURT: Okay. So, as you sit here today, you have concerns about being able to set that aside and be fair and impartial if you from were selected as a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know.
THE COURT: As you can imagine, it's very important to the attorney that they know who they are getting on their jury. So we need an unequivocal assurance from you that you can be fair and impartial and if you can't give us that unequivocal assurance, we need to know now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, growing up with a bunch of family and friends who are Republican, it's probably going to be tough for me to be impartial.

THE COURT: Okay, please approach.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

THE COURT: So before we get to that, I just want to note for the record that we had one bench conference yesterday that your client did not appear for, that was a misunderstanding. You waived his appearance and this is the second one today. He has not appeared for this either. MR. BLANCHE: Waived.

MR. STEINGLASS: I hate to be a stickler here. The Antomarchi, he has to waive on the record himself. The defendant's attorney can't waive for him.

MR. STERN: I think that's actually not correct. By chance $I$ was reading other cases last night. That's incorrect. A lawyer can do it for his client.

THE COURT: I want it on the record from the defendant, because nothing that we discussed involved -everything that we discussed, I believe, nothing involved questions of law.

I feel comfortable and we can continue for the time being, you are representing to me right now that your client is waiving?

MR. BLANCHE: I represent that he has waived and I am happy to have him waive on the record.

THE COURT: And he will need to sign an
Antomarchi document on the record.
Before we end this conference, can we print that paper?

While that's being printed, it seems to me this juror will be excused for cause. MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, of course. MR. BLANCHE: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. (Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

THE COURT: Sir, we appreciate your candor. We are going to have to excuse you at this time. Let's refill seat number ten. THE CLERK: Refilling seat number ten, B158. THE COURT: Good morning, sir. You can start whenever you are ready.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Question number one, I live on Riverside Drive, uptown. I have been there for 14 years and I am a native New Yorker. Number 2, I review disability benefit administrative law decisions for the Social Security Administration as an assistant regional counsel. I have been doing that for 12 years.

My employer is the Social Security
Administration. It's large.
I am not self-employed and this is -- my last job, I guess, would be a locksmith. I have a JD.


|  | Page 13 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Twenty-six, yes. |  |  |
| 2 | Twenty-seven, yes. |  |  |
| 3 | Twenty eight, no. |  |  |
| 4 |  | Twenty-nine, no. |  |
| 5 |  | Twenty-nine C, no. | F, no. |
| 6 | G, no. H, no. |  |  |
| 7 | Thirty, no. |  |  |
| 8 | Thirty-one, no. |  |  |
| 9 | Thirty-two, no. |  |  |
| 10 | Thirty-three, yes. |  |  |
| 11 | Thirty four, no. |  |  |
| 12 | Thirty-five, no. |  |  |
| 13 | Thirty-six, no. |  |  |
| 14 | Thirty-seven, no. |  |  |
| 15 | Thirty-eight, yes. |  |  |
| 16 | Thirty nine, yes. |  |  |
| 17 | Forty, yes. |  |  |
| 18 | Forty-one, yes. |  |  |
| 19 | Forty-two, no. |  |  |
| 20 | THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. |  |  |
| 21 | We will continue with seat number $11 . \mathrm{Good}$ |  |  |
| 22 | morning. |  |  |
| 23 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. I will answer |  |  |
|  | the question you asked yesterday. As I was thinking <br> yesterday, I don't think $I$ can be impartial and unbiased. |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |




Fifteen, no.
Fifteen, no.

Sixteen, yes, I am.
Seventeen, yeah, I have some friends in the legal
field. At least one $I$ can think of that is in civil law.
Eighteen A, no. No, to eighteen.
Nineteen, no. Twenty, no.

Twenty-one A, no. B, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, might have some concerns around my
work schedule with the commitment here.

THE COURT: If you were to be selected as a
juror, you would be meeting four days a week. There might be an occasional holiday, or something like that, or an occasional day when we would break early, but you would be required to be here, obviously.

If you were selected as a juror, would you be able to give this matter the attention that it deserves? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. Honestly, I think it would put a strain on my personal life. I would probably be leaving here and working to get by, you know, kind of $I$ have concerns about that.

THE COURT: Would you be able to set aside those concerns for six weeks if you were selected as a juror or

| 1 | do you think that would interfere with your ability to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | focus, concentrate and do what is expected of you here? |
| 3 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think it might affect my |
| 4 | ability to concentrate. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Okay. We are going to excuse you. |
| 6 | Refill seat number $11, \mathrm{please}$. |
| 7 | THE CLERK: Refilling seat 11, B042. |
| 8 | THE COURT: All right. Before seat number 11 |
| 9 | starts, juror number one, did you have something you want |
| 10 | to say. |
| 11 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I checked in on my |
| 12 | vacation I had planned. It's an international flight and I |
| 13 | am not able to change it. It would go into the weekdays. |
| 14 | THE COURT: Which day would you miss? |
| 15 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The Friday before Memorial |
| 16 | Day and the Tuesday after. |
| 17 | THE COURT: Any objections to refilling seat |
| 18 | number one? |
| 19 | Would you like to approach? |
| 20 | MR. STEINGLASS: Sure. |
| 21 | (Discussion is held at side-bar, on the |
| 22 | record.) |
| 23 | MR. STEINGLASS: Are those the days, one of the |
| 24 | days that you asked for off? |
| 25 | MR. BLANCHE: No. |

MR. STEINGLASS: I am just asking is the thinking that it is two days instead of one?

THE COURT: Yes. The other one is in June, so it was further advanced. This one, you know.

MR. BLANCHE: And it's two days.
THE COURT: It's two days.
MS. NECHELES: And Passover, that's two days.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the
following occurred in open court.)
THE COURT: We are going to excuse you.
Let's refill seat number one. So we will continue with seat number 11.

Good morning again.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live on the upper west side. I have lived there for twenty-eight years. I am a native New Yorker.

I work for a senior living company. I have been doing that for about sixteen, seventeen years.

Atria Senior Living, that's the name of the company for number three. I would say maybe about over a hundred.

Some, I finished high school. I have some college background.

Not married. Never been married.
I have three children, the adult children. One



|  | Page 21 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Yes, for 40. |
| 2 | Forty-one, yes. |
| 3 | Forty-two, no. |
| 4 | No, for forty-two. |
| 5 | (Continued on the following page.) |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

THE COURT: Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-49 is my number.
I just wanted to say, after having more time to
think about it and also looking at the questions, I don't
think I could be as impartial and unbiased as I thought I
would be. So, I would like to be excused.
THE COURT: So, you believe at this time that you
would be unable to be fair and impartial?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not without having more

```
    information.
```

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge.
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: You're excused.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-49 was excused)

THE COURT: Let's refill seat number 12.
THE CLERK: Refilling seat number 12, B-381.
THE COURT: Good morning.
You can start whenever you're ready.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: $1(A)$, Chelsea.
1(B), five years.
C, I am not a native New Yorker. I grew up in
Oregon.

```
I'm an attorney for 2(A).
```

2(B), five years.
THE COURT: What kind of law do you practice?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Corporate.
2(C), inapplicable. I am not retired.
3 (A), Gunderson Dettmer.
$3(B)$, I think about 200 lawyers.
$3(C)$, no.
D, Cravath \& Moore.

Four, J.D.
$5(A)$, no.
5(B), no.
5(C), no.
$6(A)$, inapplicable.
$6(B)$, inapplicable.
7(A), I like to hike and run.
B, same as A.
$8(\mathrm{~A})$, no.
$8(B)$, no.
$9(A)$, no.
$9(B)$, inapplicable.
Ten, New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Google, and that's it.

Eleven, no.
Twelve, no.
Thirteen, no.

Fourteen, no.
Fifteen, no.
Sixteen, yes, friends.
Seventeen, yes, myself and friends.
18(A), no.
B, inapplicable.
C, no.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
21(A), no.
21(B), no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
B, no.
C, no.
D, no.
E, no.
F, no.
G, no.

H, no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, no.
Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi.
I live in the East Village.
B, about four years.
C, not native. I am from Philadelphia.
2(A), I am a technical program manager. I work
in cybersecurity. I've been doing that for about two years.

I'm not retired.
My current employer is Abnormal Security.

We have 600-ish people at the moment.
Not self-employed.
I used to do lighting design for film.
I have a Bachelor's Degree.
Not married.
Never been married.
No children.
Don't live with anyone else.
In my spare time, I like to climb and swim.
No organizations or advocacy groups.

I have never served on a jury.
Ten, Google and I read WIRED, which is tech news.
Eleven, NerdWallet, Morning Brew, and a couple of climbing podcasts.

For talk radio, I listen to Philly sports-talk radio and, occasionally, N.P.R.

Thirteen, no.
Fourteen, not a law enforcement agency, but I do work in cybersecurity, so, kind of.

Fifteen, my father works for the
Department of Defense.
Sixteen, yes, my stepmother is an accountant and a very close family friend is an accountant.

Seventeen, I dated a lawyer for a while. Ended fine. Sorry, lawyers.

18(A), no, except, again, $I$ work in

```
cybersecurity. So, I kind of consider myself law
```

enforcement a bit.
$B$ and $C$, no.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
$21(A)$, no.
B, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, with some difficulty, yes.
THE COURT: It can be a challenge. I certainly
understand that. It wouldn't happen very often. We would
give you as much notice as possible.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
B, no.
C, no.
D, no.
E, no.
F, no.

G, yes, previously.
H, yes, previously.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, $I$ believe the law applies to
everyone, so, yes.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, again, I believe the law applies to everyone.

Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, yes.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, it is very difficult for me to take even a few days off of work due to the nature of my job and the industry in which I work. I would worry quite a bit about that. It's not something where I could get on at 4:30 or afterwards and kind of do my individual work because my work is all involved with other people. I feel a sense of duty with my job. I would worry about how thinking about that would affect how present I was for these proceedings.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: You're excused.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-377 was
excused)
THE COURT: Let's refill seat 13 , please.
THE CLERK: Refilling seat number 13, B-292.
THE COURT: Jurors, while we wait for seat 13, I encourage you, if you have an answer like that for one of the questions, please don't wait until you get to the end of the questionnaire. Just let us know up front so that we can resolve it quickly.

Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I'm B-292.
Number 1, I live in Hell's Kitchen.
I've been there for 12 years.
I am originally from Mexico. I became a citizen in 2017.

I work in asset management. I've been there for 12 years.

I am not retired.
Number 3, my current employer is Lazard.
It's about 3,500 people globally.

I am not self-employed.
My prior employer was a market manager called Fixation Marketing.

My educational background is I have a B.A.
I'm not married.
I've never been married.
I don't have children.
I don't live with anybody else except my dog.
Number 6, I like to travel; I like to spend time with my dog, family, and friends; scuba diving; skiing.

Number 8, no.
Number 9, no, first time serving in jury duty.
Number 10, New York Times, a little bit of Huffington Post, MSNBC, Google, Facebook, X, Tik Tok. That's it.

Number 11, I do listen to a few podcasts. I don't remember the names, but they're LGBT-related.

I don't listen to talk radio, but, every once in a while, $I$ listen to N.P.R.

Number 13, no.
Number 14, no.
Number 15, no.
Number 16, I work in finance myself, but it's not related to finance. I do marketing.

Number 17, no.


Thirty-four, no.
Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live on the
Lower East Side.
I've lived there for more than 40 years.
I'm not a native New Yorker. I'm Puerto Rican.
I was born in Puerto Rico.
I do I.T. training and I.T. consulting. I've been doing this for about 10 years.

I'm not retired.
I work for myself. I'm self-employed.
I have one year of college.
I'm married. I've been married a long time.
I have one child and I have two grandchildren.
My wife is a writer.
My adult -- my child is in sales and research.

I have no spare time.
I guess my hobby is my family.
I participated in some community non-profits that I've worked with.

I served one time on a jury many years ago. THE COURT: Was that criminal or civil? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Civil. THE COURT: Without telling us the verdict, did you reach a verdict?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't remember. It was so long ago.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The Daily News, The Times, I do Google, and I do X.

The podcasts I listen to are on YouTube.
I don't listen to talk radio.
No, I don't have anybody close to me who's been the victim of a crime.

Fourteen is no.
Fifteen is no.
Sixteen is no.
Seventeen is no.
18(A) is no.
$B$ is no.
I guess $C$ is no.

Nineteen is no.
Twenty is no.
$21(A)$ is no.
$B$ is no.
Twenty-two is no.
Twenty-three is no.
Twenty-four is no.
Twenty-five is no.
Twenty-six is yes.
Twenty-seven is yes.
Twenty-eight is no.
29(A) is no.
$B$ is no.
C is no.
D is no.
E is no.
$F$ is no.
G is no.
H is no.
Thirty is no.
No, 31.
Thirty-two is no.
Thirty-three is yes.
Thirty-four is no.
Thirty-five is no.

Thirty-six is no.
Thirty-seven is no.
Thirty-eight is yes.
Thirty-nine is yes.
Forty is yes.
I guess 41 is no.
THE COURT: Let's just go over 41 one more time.
Could you re-read it.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, yeah, I'm not going to hold it against him.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I live in Battery Park City.
I've lived there for eight years.
I've lived in New York for 30 years, but I'm not
a native. I'm originally from Boston.
I run sales and revenue for a software company. I've been doing that for about 25 years.

I'm not retired.
My current employer is BlockApps.
They have about 40 employees.
I'm not self-employed.

My prior employer was Diligent Corporation. I have a Bachelor's Degree.

Yes, married.
I've been married twice.
I had a daughter with my first wife.
I live with my wife, who is a literary translator.

My daughter, who is deceased, was in real estate development and construction management.

I like to spend time at our second home in the country.

I like TV. I have a lot of interests--books, movies, current events, politics, travel, spend time with friends. I have some collectibles.

I'm on the board of my synagogue. My wife and I are members of the A.C.L.U. I belong to some charitable organizations either in a fundraising capacity or more direct capacity.

I have never been on a jury.
Question 10, New York Times, USA Today, Huffington Post, CNN, Google, Facebook, X, Tik Tok, Wall Street Journal, New York Post, Washington Post, and New York One.

Podcasts, yes, a lot of Serial, New York Times' podcasts, Rumble Strip.

Talk radio, N.P.R., sometimes.
Question 13, I was robbed at knifepoint once, I had a girlfriend once who was mugged and punched in the face, my mother was a victim of a violent assault from a burglar, and my daughter was a victim of a violent sexual assault.

Question 14, I had an uncle who was a cop in Pennsylvania, but he is deceased.

My mother worked in both state and local governments in North Carolina in a program-planning capacity. That was a long time ago.

I have close friends who either work or have worked on Wall Street.

I'm happy to say I have some friends who are lawyers, although, it tends to be corporate law, general counsels, or things like that as opposed to trial law. Although, I do have a close friend whose son is an ADA, I think here in Manhattan.

THE COURT: Would that affect your ability to be fair and impartial if you're selected as a juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would not.
Eighteen, there was a trial related to my daughter's assault. I would describe that as primarily a traumatic experience, but $I$ think that $I$ was left with a generally favorable impression of the legal system. It

```
certainly would not--I don't think--have any impact on this
```

case.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
21 (A) and $21(B)$, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, fine.
Twenty-five, you discussed Passover yesterday.
THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's the only pending issue
I would have.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), it says, "political entity affiliated with
Mr. Trump," Republican Party.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have some relatives on my
wife's side who are lobbyists and have done fundraising for
the Republican Party.
$29(B)$, no.
29(C), no.
29(D), when Mr. Trump was President, I followed
him on X , or what was Twitter at the time.
E, no.
F, no.
G, no.
H, no.
Thirty, no to any of those.
Thirty-one, yes. I feel that no one is above the
law.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, I don't think there's anything that
will prevent me from being a fair and impartial juror.
Thirty-five, I'm not familiar with any of these
things.
Thirty-six, yes. I read The Art of the Deal and
I want to say How to be Rich and Think Like a Champion or
something like that. Those aren't quite correct, but, yes,
I read a lot of books.
Thirty-seven, yes.
Thirty-eight, yes.
I do have a question about 39.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Where it says if I refrain
from watching, reading, or listening to any accounts of
this case or discussing it in general, I mean, I would be
lying if $I$ said $I$ would not discuss it to some degree with my wife.

THE COURT: Okay.
Well, obviously, that's your wife. You can tell her that you're here and you could tell her that you heard from witnesses, but you would not be permitted to discuss anything of substance with your wife because we would run the risk there that someone who's not a sworn juror could influence you. So, we would need your assurance that you would not discuss anything of substance with your wife--your thoughts or opinions about how things are going, things like credibility, and things of that nature.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That would be tough, but
okay.
THE COURT: Can you do that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, but she won't like
that.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've lived on the
Lower East Side for 51 years.
I'm not a native New Yorker. I was born in
Westchester in White Plains, New York.
I am retired, happily. That was since 2019.
Before that, I worked for the
M.T.A./New York City Transit. Then, I became the
chief of staff to the president of
M.T.A. Capital Construction.
No current employer.
Two years after $I$ retired, $I$ was walking and
training dogs in obedience. I was training dogs.
My educational background is I have a Bachelor's.
I was married. I am no longer married now.
I have four children and I have four
grandchildren.

One of my adult children lives with me; two of them are in Boise, Idaho; and one is in Michigan.

The kids in Boise, Idaho, one is the manager of an electrical warehouse and my daughter owns a nightclub. My daughter in Chelsea, Michigan, is a Pilates instructor. She's got three of my grandchildren that live there.

In my spare time, I love the theater, I love music, and I travel back and forth between Boise and Ann Arbor a lot. I hike with my dog. I spend a lot of time on Cape Cod. I really like the ocean.

As far as interests, $I$ play the guitar and $I$ do a lot of reading books, not political stuff.

None right now, no.
I have never been put on a jury before, even though I've been here many times.

Just to be clear, $I$ do not read these every day. I mix them up:

New York Times, I watch CNN and MSNBC, and Daily News once in a while. I have a Facebook account. Wall Street Journal, when my next-door neighbor gives it to me. I do Fox News, sometimes. I also watch New York One and PBS.

I do have a couple of podcasts that I listen to--This American Life, The Argument with Ross Douthat, Jennifer Rubin, Ezra Klein. I listen to Hardcore History with Dan Carlin. Those are mostly in the car. If I'm in the car, I'll listen to Brian Lehrer in the morning.

The answer to 13 is no.
No.
I know people in the government only because I worked for the M.T.A. for years. My sister worked for the M.T.A. and my brother and father worked for Metro-North.

Nobody in accounting or finance, no.
My brother-in-law graduated law school, but he didn't practice law. He's my late brother-in-law. He owned a computer company. I also have two friends in Upstate New York. One of them, who's very close, is a
other is in personal injury.
No.
No on 19.
Twenty, no.
21(A), no.
$B$, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, no.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
29(B), no.
No, C.
D, no.
E, no.
No to G.

```
lawyer in general law. He did some criminal law. The
```

    F, my granddaughter asked me to go to a
    pro-choice rally. I don't know that it had anything to do
    with Mr. Trump. It was in 2017, maybe. I can't remember
    whether it was in New York or it might have been in
    H, if you were to look at my Facebook page, there's a lot of things on there that I didn't ask to be put on there and I can't seem to remove them. I try not to have too much, but there are a couple of things on there that would be considered -- one of them is called Occupy Democrats and stuff like that.

Thirty, no.
I think everybody should be treated fairly.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
No.
No on 35.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, I'm resigned to the political contribution system we have. It just makes me sad that we spend so much money and candidates have to raise so much money for campaigns when there could be better use for that money.

Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Yes.
Yes.
No.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a Harlem native. I still reside there, born and raised.

I am a school teacher. I teach middle school E.L.A. I've been doing that for eight years.

Before that, $I$ was fresh out of undergrad and I was a case worker in a juvenile delinquent transitional home. Pretty much, I was just adjusting them back to home and school.

My current employer is KIPP NYC Charter School. I did five years with D.O.E., the Department of Ed, and I'm now in the charter school system.

I have a Master's in Education.
Never been married.
I don't have any children.
My brother is a basketball coach. He resides with me.

In my spare time, I'm a creator at heart. My friends are photographers and will do photo shoots. I love theater, $I$ love writing, and I love traveling.

I'm not in any organizations.
I've never been to jury duty. Maybe before, but this is my first time with this.

For 10, Google and Tik Tok. I don't like the news or newspapers.

As to listen or watch podcasts, mainly
inspirational things like relationship topics, pop culture, and thinks like that.

Talk radio, Breakfast Club every now and then.
Myself nor anyone close to me has been a victim of a crime.

Number 14, my mother and my godfather are retired with the Police Department. My mother wasn't a police officer. She was an administrative aide. My godfather was a homicide sergeant. They're both retired.

For 15, I guess that would be yes.
Sixteen, no.
Seventeen, no.
Eighteen is no for all of those.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
Twenty-one, no for both.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, my classroom is digital. I actually discussed that with my principal yesterday. As long as I have my work posted that workday, it's fine, or their classwork, rather.

Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.

Twenty-eight, no.
Twenty-nine, no for all of those.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, I'm not going to sit here and
pretend. Being in my generation during that candidacy, there was a divide in the country. I can't ignore that. However, I never equated that to one individual. So, I'm going to say I don't think that would allow me to be impartial, if that makes sense.

Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
For 39 , to be honest, my generation is on social media a lot. So, if I'm scrolling, I usually see it, but I'm not necessarily looking at anything on the case, if that makes sense. It may just pop up.

THE COURT: If it pops up, you can't control that, but can you give us an assurance that you will not read it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yeah, I won't hold that against him.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I have a question:
I realize this is way beyond the extent of what is expected for this trial, but my sister is getting married in September on a Sunday. Would that be any problem?

THE COURT: That should not be a problem. Well, if you are still here in September, that would be a big problem.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Chelsea.
I have lived there for about a year-and-a-half.
I am a native New Yorker.
I am a software engineer. I have been doing that for a year-and-a-half.

Number $3(A)$, my current employer is the Walt Disney Company.

B, I think there is over 200,000 employees.
I am not self-employed.
D, I was a student prior to this.

Four, I have a Bachelor's Degree.
5(A), I am not married.

I have never been married.

I don't have any children.
6(A), I have three roommates. One of them is a software engineer, one of them does fundraising for a non-profit, and one of them is a consultant.

I don't have any adult children.
Seven, in my spare time, I like to spend time with friends and family, go to restaurants, go to plays. For hobbies, I like to dance, snowboard, and watch TV.
$8(A)$, no.
9(A), I've never served on a jury.
Ten, the New York Times, Google, Facebook, Tik Tok.

Eleven, I do not listen to podcasts.
Twelve, I don't listen to talk radio.
Thirteen, no.
Fourteen, no.
Fifteen, yes, a close friend in the past.
Sixteen, no.
Seventeen, yes, relatives.
$18(A)$, no. So, no to the rest.
Nineteen, no.

Twenty, no.
$21(A)$, no.
21(B), no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
29(B), no.
I guess C, D, E, F, G, and $H$ are all no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, I will be fair and impartial.
Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.

Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
We need to refill seat number 1 , please.
THE CLERK: Refilling seat number 1, B-250.
THE COURT: Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I live on the Upper East Side.
I have lived there for 25 years.
I am not a native New Yorker, but I've lived here most of my life.

My husband and I are self-employed. We have a healthcare consulting company that we've had for 20 years. So, I'm not retired.

My current employer is Cotton Consulting.
There are three of us in the company.
Yes, I'm self-employed. I own my own business.
My prior employers were large advertising agencies--Saatchi \& Saatchi and Young \& Rubicam.

I have a Bachelor's Degree.
I went to graduate school twice for an M.B.A. and also in Narrative Medicine, but $I$ didn't finish either of those.

I'm married.
I don't have children. I have a dog.
My husband and I work together in healthcare
consulting.
I don't have adult children.
In my spare time, I like to go to museums, I like to travel, and I like to read. Those are my interests and hobbies.

I don't participate in any organizations or advocacy groups.

I served on a jury before twice on criminal cases.

THE COURT: Did you reach verdicts in those

```
    cases?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, both times.
Number 10, the New York Times, CNN, MSNBC,

```
Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post. That's it.
```

I don't listen to or watch podcasts.
I don't listen to talk radio.
Thirteen, no, no one $I$ know nor myself have been the victim of a crime.

Fourteen, no.
Fifteen, my husband was in wage price administration in the '70's before I met him, but, otherwise, no.

We have a close friend who was an accountant, but he's retired.

In the legal field, my husband has a law degree,
but he's never practiced law.
18(A), criminal justice system, no.
$B$, no.
C, irrelevant.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
21(A), no.
B, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Yes.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
29(B), no.
C, no.
D, no.
E, no.
F, no.
G, no.
H, no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, $I$ believe no one is above the law.

So, I guess that's a strong opinion.
Thirty-two, I think he's being treated fairly.
So, 33 and 34 , I'm not sure that $I$ can say that $I$ can beyond a reasonable doubt. I would certainly try and I think I can, but I'm not a hundred percent sure that I could be fair.

THE COURT: Okay. Any objections? MR. BLANCHE: No, Judge. MR. STEINGLASS: No. THE COURT: We're going to excuse you. (At this time, Prospective Juror B-250 was excused)

THE CLERK: Refilling seat number 1, B-133. THE COURT: Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
Number 1, Upper West Side.
Seven years.
I'm not a native New Yorker. I was born in New Jersey and spent some time in Maryland.

I am a high school teacher for 20 -some years.
I'm not retired.
My employer is the Department of Education, which is very large. My school has about 80 employees or maybe 80 to 100 at school.

I'm not self-employed.
My prior employer was Montgomery County
Public School in Maryland.
I have a Master's Degree.
I am married.
I have two children.
My husband is a computer programmer.
I have no adult children.
I sew in my spare time and I spend time with my kids, my dog, and my family.

I love reading, biking, hiking.
Eight, no.
Nine, no.
Ten, New York Times, scrolling Facebook, occasional articles probably from USA Today and Huffington Post, CNN, Google, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post.

No podcasts.
No talk radio.
My brother was shot by a stray bullet in his leg.
My catalytic converter was stolen from my car, if that counts as a crime.

No, 14.
No, 15.
No, 16.

I have a close friend, who is a lawyer. She did

```
family law. She now works for a non-profit.
```

18 (A), no.
No for $B$ and C also.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
$21(A)$, no.
B, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes, my schedule would permit me to work later.

Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, $I$ can give assurance.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
29(A), no.
B, no.
C, somehow, I get e-mails from it's called
The Daily Caller or something. I don't know. I ended up on an e-mail list, but $I$ don't generally read the e-mails.

D, no.
E, no.
F, no.
G, no.

H, no.

Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, no.

Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.

Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.

*     *         *             *                 * (At this time, Vincent M. Geraldi, III was relieved by Susan Pearce-Bates as Senior Court Reporter)
(Continued from the previous page.)
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, jurors.
If you haven't done so already, please pass the questionnaires to your right. You are going to be handed a second microphone.

At this time the attorneys will address you in the jury box. They will each speak to you for about 30 minutes.

The law requires that the Assistant District Attorney speak to you first. Please remember that whatever the lawyers say at any time is not evidence. So, what the lawyers are about to say to you now is not evidence.

As with all stages of the criminal trial, there are rules that the lawyers must follow. If one lawyer believes that another lawyer is not following one of those rules, that lawyer will object and that objection creates a question of law for me to decide.

The objection will be one word only and I may on occasion ask for the basis or grounds for the objection. At that time the attorney will provide only the legal basis, such as for example, hearsay.

If $I$ sustain an objection to the question, or comment to the lawyer, that question or comment will be stricken from the record and you must disregard that question or comment as though it was never said.

If $I$ overrule any objection, the question or comments stands.

Of course whether I sustain or overrule an objection, my ruling indicates only that the question or comment is, or is not, in accord with one of the rules of law set out for lawyers to follow during this stage of the proceedings.

The ruling expresses no opinion about the facts of the case or whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

Remember, you the jury, and you alone, judge the facts and reach a verdict of guilty, or not guilty, not $I$ and not the lawyers.

MR. STEINGLASS: This is so far away.
THE COURT: You can move it a little closer if you want.

Not a whole lot.
MR. STEINGLASS: Good morning everyone. My name is Joshua Steinglass. I am an Assistant District Attorney here in Manhattan together with Susan Hoffinger, Matthew Colangelo, Christopher Conroy, Betty Mangold and Katherine Ellis, we represent The People of the State of New York and I am sure many of you are -- I don't have a microphone. I am loud but --

THE COURT: So, jurors, you are going to have one
microphone. Please pass it around as necessary.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
So, I am sure many of you are saying to yourself, how am I being considered for this case?

And we are going to ask you to not try to get out of it without being too obvious, if that's what you are thinking, and just to kind of resist the urge to flee the courtroom if you are feeling that and just give us the most honest answers you can.

That's what we are really trying to do here, not pry into your lives. We are trying to pick a jury that can be fair to both sides, fair to the defense and fair to the prosecution.

You are really the best judge's of that. If you have some issues, we are hoping you raise them with us.

Let's start with the obvious, the defendant in this case is both the former President and a current candidate for that office.

And no one is suggesting that you can't be a fair juror because you heard of Donald Trump. We don't expect you to have been living under a rook for the last eight years or the last thirty years.

That said, as the Judge suggested, we need jurors who can set aside any strong feelings that they may have one way or the other and focus on the evidence.

This case has nothing to do with your personal politics, your views on a particular political issue. It's not a referendum on the Trump presidency or a popularity contest or any indication of who you are going to vote for in November. We don't care.

This case is about whether this man broke the law.

Did he falsify business records in order to cover up an agreement to unlawfully influence the 2016 presentation election.

That's all this case is about and at the end of case the Judge will give you the law pertaining to falsifying business records, 34 counts of falsifying business records and he will tell you exactly what it is we have to prove and that's all we have to prove.

Can you promise to do that, to follow the Judge's instructions on what we have to prove to find the defendant guilty.

In other words, does anyone feel that some how because of the defendant's position we should have to prove more than what the judge says the law requires?

Does anyone feel that way?
No. No.
This defendant is just like any other defendant in any other criminal case. There is no special formula
that applies to him simply because of who he is.
Does anyone feel that they question whether they are able to follow the law as the Judge gives it simply because the defendant is Donald Trump?

Does anyone feel that way?
It is a little strange to call people by number, but B133, how do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think that this job of the jury, like the judge said yesterday, is to understand what's fact. I don't think it matters what my political beliefs are or in relation to the defendant. I think you listen to the facts of the case and you rule on the facts of the case.

MR. STEINGLASS: That's right. You are judges of the fact and what we want you to do is faithfully find those facts.

Any reason to believe you won't be able to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: How do other people feel?
Do they agree with B133?
I feel like we are playing Bingo here.
Anyone disagree or would like to share any
thoughts that they have on this matter?
Does anyone have such strong feelings about

Donald Trump that they think that they can't just set that aside and judge this case based on the evidence?

May we start passing the mike down.
How do you fell about that B038?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have strong feelings about that.

MR. STEINGLASS: You can follow the law and give both sides a fair trial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. Nobody is above the law.

MR. STEINGLASS: Nobody is above the law.
B330, how do you feel about this?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am a public servant and I built my entire career upon trying to serve the city I live in and this is an extension of that. We have to follow policies regularly and I think about this as, again, an extension of what's required of me as a citizen.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you for that.
Now, I thought yesterday you said something about having some opinions about campaign finance limits?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I did say that.
MR. STEINGLASS: Why don't you tell us what those opinions are?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think that I am actively pursuing those opinions. I have strong ones.

I think currently the idea that you have to raise a lot of money to serve and to be in service or elected is, unfortunate because there are a lot of people committed and devoted to making their city and states and country great and they are discouraged from that because they have to raise a lot of money.

MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything about those feelings, your understandable feelings, anything about that that's going to affect your ability to listen to the evidence in this case knowing the little you do about what it is about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe so.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you pass the microphone back to, I guess it is B146?

I thought I heard you answer that question yesterday as well, that you had some opinions about campaign finance limits?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I do. I do. I
would -- sorry. Trying to find the sweet spot.
I would agree with what the previous B330 said
about the -- about the --
THE COURT: Hand up on the microphone.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
MR. STEINGLASS: Nothing that would affect your ability to be fair.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, because it really doesn't have anything to do with this case.

MR. STEINGLASS: I thought you also said that you had opinions about how Mr. Trump is being treated in this case?

Did I misunderstand that or did you answer that, yes?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If I implied that I have feelings about how he was being mistreated, I misspoke, because I don't have any opinion on that.

MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything that you heard so far that causes you to doubt your ability to be a fair and impartial juror and give both sides a fair shake?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I think that the -because of the particulars of this case, it really doesn't have anything to do with my political inclinations or however I might feel about the defendant.

MR. STEINGLASS: That's a perfect example, or a good way to say it, because this case really is not about whether or not you like Donald Trump. This case is about the rule of law and whether or not Donald Trump broke it.

Do you think that whatever feelings you have about Donald Trump, whether they be favorable or unfavorable, that you can put that aside and just answer the question that you are being asked which is, did he
commit this crime and have we proven it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, absolutely. I mean, I can judge this case for the merits of the case.

MR. STEINGLASS: That's exactly what we want.
Does anybody else want to have anything to say
about this matter or want to share an opinion about this?
Because this is really the crux of the case, your ability to do this. We are kind of counting on you to kind of raise it with us.

Is that $a, y e s$, or want to say anything?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I agree with you.

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay, good.
Now, as you know, this case has generated a fair amount of publicity. It's been all over the news, newspapers, TV, social media.

We don't expect you not to have heard about it or not to have even discussed the case with friends. What we do need is your assurance that you can keep an open mind.

I am sure we can all agree that media accounts may be inaccurate or only tell parts of the story. After all, the media has not yet had access to the evidence that you are going to see in this case.

Similarly, it seems that everyone and their mother has an opinion about this case and what the right outcome should be, however uninformed that opinion may be.

But unlike the opinionated masses, you are going to have two things by the end of this case that they don't have, or at least haven't had yet, and that is access to all of the evidence and testimony in this case and the Judge's instructions on the law.

So, my question is, can you all promise to faithfully find the facts?

Like the judge said and talked about a minute ago, you are the judges of the facts. Can you all promise to faithfully find the facts as they actually are and apply the law as the Judge gives it?

Does anybody have any question about their ability to do that?

Can you pass the mike over to B128?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was away all of February and half of March living on a lake with no Wi-Fi, not anything.

MR. STEINGLASS: That sounds lovely.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It wasn't tough at all.
MR. STEINGLASS: Lovely.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was. Before I left I had postponed jury duty. The lady was very nice. It was my second postponement.

When I came back I realized I had said mid-April. And knowing that this was going to happen, I really did
try, and I don't really know the particulars of this case, I am coming to it, I really tried not to, and $I$ do have two news blocked days that $I$ will listen to no news and it's off in my house, much to the consternation of my daughter.

So I don't really have -- I don't really know what exactly this case is about at this point. So I am -I mean, if you want me to have that knowledge, if you wish I did have more, may be I am not the person you want sitting here, but $I$ really haven't followed this exact case.

MR. STEINGLASS: We don't want you to have heard about it, or not to have heard with it. What we want you to be able to do, is if you have heard hit, put aside what you heard and judge the case based on the evidence. And if you haven't heard about it, all the easier to do that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will absolutely put that aside. I do believe we have a great judicial system. It could use some tweaking in some places certainly, everything else can. I will absolutely be able to do that and give this man a fair shake.

MR. STEINGLASS: If we had more time I would ask you more about that. We will have to save that.

Does anybody else have a view one way or the other in this case?

Is everybody going to be able to keep an open
mind, notwithstanding anything they may have heard and judge the case based on the facts that come out during this trial, the witnesses who testify, the documents that are introduced?

Anybody question their ability to do that?
Could you pass the microphone up to some folks in the front row?

Okay, B285?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi.
MR. STEINGLASS: Hi. Any concerns about this?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No concerns.
MR. STEINGLASS: Anything you heard so far makes you wonder whether you are able to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO, I really haven't heard anything.

MR. STEINGLASS: Now, you will learn that the charged crimes in this case took place in 2017, and some of the key evidence in this case, includes conduct that happened as far back as 2015.

And you may be curious why the case is going to trial now, but you are never going to learn the answer to that question. And you are not allowed to speculate as to why the trial hasn't happened until now.

Can you all give us your assurance that you won't

```
    let your curiosity, distract you from listening to and
    judging the evidence in this case?
    I see you nodding, B14.
    How do you feel about that?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, it wouldn't bother me
    at all.
    MR. STEINGLASS: Anybody feel that the case is
    less deserving of their attention because of the passage of
time?
```

    Does anybody feel that way?
    Now, along those lines, you have to keep in mind
    that unlike what you might see on television, the witnesses
        in this case are not actors reading from scripts. They are
        real people testifying about events that happened some time
        ago and as they testify you may or may not notice minor
        inconsistencies between the testimony of different
        witnesses.
            We all agree that people often see or remember
        the same event or different parts of the same event
        differently? Yes?
                            Baseball season just started. Who has been to a
        baseball game?
    Almost everybody. Have you ever gone to a baseball game and disagreed with the umpire about whether a ball was a pitch or a strike? Or maybe with a friend who
happens to be sitting on the other side of the stadium and you realize the next day you were both at the same game and you are disagreeing about whether the guy was safe at second?

That didn't actually, exactly happen that way, did it?

Because I see a lot of people nodding and that would be a lot off people who had the same dispute about second. But you understand what I am getting at here which is kind of minor discrepancies, and unimportant details like that, don't speak to the truth of what happened either at the game or what happened here back in 2015 and 2017.

The real question is, can you be fair in evaluating the testimony of several witnesses, acknowledging that they are real people testifying about events that happened some time ago and that they may have perceived or remembered some things a little bit differently?

Anybody have an opinion on that that they want to share with us?

Can you accept the fact that even the same witness may describe the event differently -- an event differently from the way that he or she has in the past especially regarding less significant details?

For example, a person may remember dates a little
differently or switch the order of a particular conversation or not be able to remember whether the conversation happened in person or on the telephone.

I am just making this stuff up. The question is, can you be realistic and not hold the witnesses to unrealistic standards when they are talking about, testifying about events that happened some time ago?

Anybody question their ability to do that?
Now, you are going to learn, and we are going to be very up front about the fact that several of the witnesses in this case have what you made might consider to be some baggage.

The witnesses include a tabloid publisher, an adult film star, and a former lawyer for Mr. Trump named Michael Cohen who has pled guilty to several federal crimes, including lying to Congress.

Some of these witnesses have written books, done podcasts, or appeared in documentaries in which they discussed some of the same subject matter that they will be testifying about here.

And you will learn that several of the witnesses have in the past publicly denied many of the same facts that they are going to testify to here and you will learn why they spent so long lying to prevent the public from learning the truth.

Furthermore, you are going to learn that some of these witnesses were given immunity as part of an effort to get them to come clean in this case.

In fact, you will learn that any witness that testifies before the Grand Jury is given immunity and every one of those things that $I$ just said is a factor that you can and should take into account in assessing the credibility of those witnesses.

But my question to you is, are those the only factors you are going to take into account?

Does anyone feel that if they learned those things they are going to shut their ears to anything the witness has to say?

Who have I not spoken to yet?
B280, how do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am going to say now, I am going to listen to all the facts and just like everybody said before, whatever outside influences there are, they are not going to influence me here.

MR. STEINGLASS: You can keep an open mind and hear what a witness has to say before you decide whether or not to believe them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Let me give you an example.

Jack and Jill rob a bank together. And when Jill
is first caught she denies having robbed a bank and she denies even knowing Jack, but later she decides to come clean and she cooperates with law enforcement. She tells them the truth about what she did and she testifies against Jack.

Now, the fact that she initially denied having been in the robbery, or even knowing Jack, that's a factor that you should consider in evaluating her credibility when she testifies, am I right?

Right, we can all agree about that, that's relevant to the credibility of the witness?

The question is, is that the only thing that is relevant?

In other words, would you keep an open mind until you hear all of the testimony of a particular witness and to see how does that witness' testimony kind of fit with the other evidence in the case?

Does it make sense? Is it logical?
In fact, the Judge will give a whole host of factors that you can use to help evaluate the believability of a witness.

So the question really is, as $I$ keep saying, can you wait until you hear, not only the witness' testimony, but the rest of the evidence in the case, before you decide whether or not you are going to believe someone?

Can you do that?
Does anybody have any questions about their ability to do that?

Can we pass the mike on down a little bit. I think $I$ have a front row bias. I will get to the back row, I promise.

What do you think B193?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I agree with everything that everyone else said. I have no reservations.

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay. Can you, you know, just as this case is not a referendum on whether or not you like President Trump, former President Trump, it's also not a referendum on whether you like the witnesses, right?

This is not whether you want to socialize with them. This is about whether they have material, reliable truthful evidence to give you about happened in this case.

Can you all separate believability from likability, yes?

Was that a hesitation, is it B374?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I said you actually made a good point.

MR. STEINGLASS: Oh, thank you.
THE COURT: Anyone else have any thoughts on this matter?

Now, the defendant in this case is being charged
under a theory known as accessorial or accomplice liability. And the Judge is going to explain accessorial liability at the end of the case.

But for now, we need to discuss the fact that if two or more people are acting together they can each be held criminally liable for the acts of the others.

So my general question is, would anyone have a problem holding the defendant responsible for something his partners did?

Does anybody think that that's a problem?
I see people shaking their head. Let me give you an example that clearly has nothing to do with this case.

Let's say a hit man hires -- or a husband hires a hit man to kill his wife and the husband may not even be present when the hit man actually carries out the murder, but the husband is every bit as guilty as the person that pulled the trigger, even though he wasn't there.

Can you all follow the same kind of logic in this case?

And can you follow the Judge's instructions about accessorial liability even though it may mean holding the defendant responsible for acts that he may not have committed personally?

Yes? Who has the microphone?
Can you pass it down? Is it B400?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Did you have any problem with the concept of accessorial liability?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: None at all.
MR. STEINGLASS: Any reason to think you couldn't follow the Judge's instructions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: None at all.
MR. STEINGLASS: Now, one of the things that you are going to be asked to do in this case is to determine the defendant's intent.

You will need to decide what Mr. Trump's intent was in making or causing the false entries in his business records. And as you know, we can't get inside someone's head and read their mind. But juries do this every day.

They are routinely called upon -- they don't read minds every day, what they do is determine a defendant's intent every day.

Intent is an element of so many crimes, intentional murder, a lot of crimes involve intent. And as in your every day life, you can rely on common sense clues to help you make this determination.

Most importantly, what are all the surrounding circumstances?

What were Mr. Trump and the other people involved in this case saying or doing leading up, to around the time
of and after the time of the payoffs in this case.
What were Mr. Trump's and his partners saying or
doing leading up, to around the time of and after they
created the false entries in the business records?
What was Mr. Trump and his cohorts saying or
doing around the time that the truth began to come out?
And what was the climate in which the key
decisions were being made?
What was the context that Mr. Trump's actions and the actions of his cohorts were taking place?

Like I said, there are certain -- to determine someone's intent is something we all do on a routine basis.

Here is an example, you are crossing the street and someone drives by and honks at you.

Were they honking to say hello or honking to say get the heck out of the way?

You have to look at the clues, right?
Is the driver speeding up or slowing down?
Are you crossing against the light?
Do you recognize the driver?
Is the driver waving hello or doing some other hand gesture that will let you know whether or not he is honking to say hello or honking to say get the heck out of the way?

That's an obviously simple example.

But can everybody use that same kind of logic in this case to determine the defendant's intent?

If I can't read his mind, how can I possibly know what he intended?

Anybody feel that way?
Can we send it to the back row. I don't think we have talked to some people back there.

B381, how do you feel about that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I don't think I need to read someone's mind to determine their intent or at least make a guess as to it.

MR. STEINGLASS: Common sense. You can look at the clues. What was going on at the time, that kind of reason that you do in your every day live.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.
MR. STEINGLASS: How do you feel B402?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am okay with just understanding exactly what the clues was. You have to see the evidence. You have to see what's going on.

You can't assume. You can't assume what anyone is doing. So I have to look at it and see from what I see, not every way. I can't see what everyone else sees. I just have to know by what was brought in front of me.

MR. STEINGLASS: Can you see a scenario where you would be able to determine the defendant's intent by
looking at those surrounding circumstances, looking at things the people were saying and doing around the time that the key actions and decisions were taking place?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Mr. Steinglass, are you just about done?

MR. STEINGLASS: Am I?
THE COURT: Yes. Just start. MR. STEINGLASS: All right. I will skip to my last question if that's okay.

The bottom line is, there are people who for a variety of reasons may feel uncomfortable with returning a verdict of guilty in a criminal case and you are really the best judge's of that.

It's our burden. We have to proof this case beyond a reasonable doubt and you have to hold us to that burden.

On the other hand, if we do prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt, you have to be able to basically come back in after the deliberations and look the defendant in the eye and say guilty.

And really only you know if you can do that. I am just going to -- you don't even have to pass the microphone.

I am just going down the line and ask each of you

```
to take a moment and look at the defendant and look inside
```

yourselves and ask yourselves if this case is proven beyond
a reasonable doubt, will you be able to render a verdict of
guilty? Can you do that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If you prove it, yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Answer out loud for the court
reporter.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I could.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you so much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Steinglass.
MR. BLANCHE: May we have a very brief side-bar? THE COURT: Sure.

Can you bring that along with you?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, of course.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

THE COURT: All right. Just for the record, let the record reflect that I am holding the Antomarchi Waiver which has been signed by the Court.

And is that your signature, Mr. Blanch?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
THE COURT: Your client at this time is waiving his Antomarchi Rights.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes. My question is, can we take a very quick break?

Myself and my client, it's been about two-and-a-half hours, over two-and-a-half hours.

THE COURT: We are literally taking a ten-minute break. I need everybody back in their seats in ten minutes.

MR. BLANCHE: Understood, thank you.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the following occurred in open court.)

THE COURT: Jurors, we are going to take a very
short recess, literally ten minutes. I would like everybody back here in ten minutes.

Don't come in until you are invited back in. Right now the clock says, 12:05. I want to be starting again at 12:15. Please follow the instructions of the officers.
(The prospective jurors exited the courtroom and the following occurred:)

THE COURT: All right. Before everybody steps out, I just want to go over the Antommarchi waiver with your client.

And so, Mr. Trump, yesterday we discussed whether you wanted to be present at side-bars. You indicated that you did and that's how we proceeded.

Your attorney has today indicated to me that you changed your mind and that you are now willing to waive your Antommarchi Rights to be present at side-bars.

There is a form that is in front of you that appears to indicate that you have signed that form?

MR. TRUMP: Yes, I have.
THE COURT: Is that your signature?
MR. TRUMP: Yes.
THE COURT: And have you discussed the issue with your attorney?

MR. TRUMP: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: And so, you agreed that you would like to have waive right to be present at side-bars?

MR. TRUMP: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. See you in ten.
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: Let the record reflect that all the parties are back in the courtroom. Let's lineup the jurors. As soon as they are ready to come in, let's bring them in.
(Continued on the following page.)
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors entered the courtroom)

THE COURT: Welcome back, jurors.
Thank you for being so prompt.
Let the record reflect that all the jurors are back and properly seated.

Mr. Blanche?
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.
Hi, everybody.
You heard us introduced earlier. My name is
Todd Blanche. I represent President Trump. You all see President Trump here and the rest of our team--Emil Bove, Gedalia Stern at the very end, and Susan Necheles.

You just did 30 minutes of this. Thank you for another half hour. I appreciate it.

I want to start off by saying that you heard Mr. Steinglass talk about some examples like a baseball game. This isn't a baseball game. This is extraordinarily serious. It's extraordinarily important to President Trump that we know that we're going to get a fair shake. I'm not judging at all, but it's easy to read something off of a sheet of paper and say, "Yes, I could be fair and impartial," but what I want to do is test that a little bit.

This is not like every other case. Most cases,
as you can imagine, if a potential juror raised their hand and said, "Wait, I know that guy," everybody would agree that they can leave, but, here, we all know that every one of you knows President Trump. You all know him in different ways and you all have different views of him based upon all kinds of factors in your life--maybe they're recent views, maybe they're views from before he ran for President from years and years ago, maybe they're while he was President.

Look, there are no wrong answers. I mean that. You're not going to offend me, you're not going to offend the Court, the People, or even President Trump by really talking about your opinion of President Trump. It's extraordinarily important and I really want to spend our time doing that.

You know what, I will start at the end just because the microphone is down there.

Juror $B-280$, can you talk a little bit more about your opinion of President Trump.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't really have one, especially in this courtroom. I think that he will be treated as anybody else would be treated. No one is above the law. So, I am here just to hear the facts, both sides, and make a decision based on what is factual here.

MR. BLANCHE: That's fair. I appreciate that.

How about beyond this case? I understand that you're going to hear about the facts and the law, but what about your opinion of him having nothing to do with this case? What I mean by that is what opinion did you walk in here with, having heard no evidence yet?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't even know I was walking into this. So, I didn't even have an opinion. I thought I was going home yesterday and going to work.

I mean, I just -- I'm here for my civic duty. I'm here just to listen to the facts and to not let anything persuade me either way.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Can you pass the microphone to Juror number 285.
The same question to you:
One thing to think about, by the way--and there is no right way or wrong way to think about this--but think about your social media. I think almost every one of you gets some news from Facebook or X or most of you read the New York Times. So, think about your social media, "What do I see on social media? What do I post on social media?" That can go to your opinion of President Trump. So, go ahead.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not someone who's really into politics. I have a career in sports. So, all my social media revolves around sports. Obviously, I know
about President Trump. I'm a female. He's targeted some females. I would say that some of my friends have strong opinions on him, but, that being said, I'm not political. I really don't pay attention to a lot of this stuff.

MR. BLANCHE: What do you mean when you say you're a female? What's that mean?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm a female. I know there's been cases--well, maybe not cases--but I know that there's been opinions on how he doesn't treat females correctly, stuff like that.

MR. BLANCHE: What's your view of that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I obviously don't really know the story. So, I just don't really, like, have a view on it.

MR. BLANCHE: Understood.
B-14--if you could pass it on--how about for you?
For you, let me start with something different:
You're a prosecutor?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am.
MR. BLANCHE: So, you have the same job but in a different borough as the folks here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MR. BLANCHE: You said you could be fair and impartial to that, but how would you deal with that? How would you deal with the fact that you know the rules as
well or maybe even better than some of the prosecutors or some of the lawyers in this case? A lot of what happens maybe at sidebar or during the case that may not be obvious to the jury, you might have an assumption about what that means.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I think what it really boils down to at the end of the day is to listen to the law as given by the judge. No matter what things I've learned or things $I$ have from my job, at the end of the day, it's about whether or not the People, over here (Indicating), can prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt because, at this point, he's presumed innocent. So, he has that presumption. I haven't heard anything from the People. It's up to them to actually prove the case and then apply the law as the judge gives it.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
What about the general question I'm asking? What's your view, putting aside the facts of this case, of President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't really follow national politics that much. There's things associated with him that $I$ agree with and things that $I$ don't really have an opinion on. I have a lot of friends in law enforcement who are fairly pro Trump, but I don't really have an opinion on a national level.

MR. BLANCHE: Great.
Can you pass the microphone down.
We might jump around a little bit, but, for now, we'll just continue with what we're doing.

I believe you're Juror number 113?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
MR. BLANCHE: You said yesterday, "No one's above the law, whether a former President, a sitting President, and not even a janitor." Talk about that, but also talk about my question that $I$ posed to the group, which is you came in here with an opinion about President Trump. It's impossible not to. Talk a little bit about that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, first of all, I think that my opinion of President Trump--whether as a President, former President, or candidate--has absolutely no bearing on the case that you're presenting or you're defending. That is a separate thing. That's what I'm here to do as a juror--is decide those facts on their own. What $I$ think about President Trump outside of this room has nothing to do with what goes on inside this room and would not, in my mind, prejudice my view.

MR. BLANCHE: I appreciate that.
What is your view of President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's what I'm saying. My view doesn't matter.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, what --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If you were sitting in a bar, I'd be happy to tell you, but, in this room, what $I$ feel about President Trump is not important or imperative to either the case you're presenting or the case you're defending. It just isn't.

MR. BLANCHE: So, do you remember yesterday when--and this isn't directed to you; it's directed to everybody--there was $I$ think a video that you were all shown downstairs about the idea of bias, implicit bias, and things like that? That's real. That's real. That's extraordinarily important to everybody in this room--not just to President Trump, but to everybody. So, while I do appreciate the distinction you're trying to make, I still would ask you to give us a little bit because we want to evaluate whether you're fair and impartial--not just me and not just President Trump, but everybody in this room.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But you're asking me to play my political views into a criminal case and, to me, they're two different things. At this juncture, what we're doing right now, is apples and oranges. They're not the same.

Look, I'll say I'm a Democrat. So, there you go, but that's it. That's where it goes for me. I walk in here and he's a defendant. That's all he is. If I'm picked for the jury, my job is to judge him as a defendant.

MR. BLANCHE: I agree with that--I do--and I think everybody agrees with that, but I think the question is whether you're separating what your view of somebody who you know outside of this courtroom and inside of this courtroom -- the question is whether you can do that and whether we get a fair shake without us knowing what that view is.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe I can. The whole thing is that it doesn't matter what my view is because I honestly believe that $I$ can view this as completely separate. I can compartmentalize. My view outside of here doesn't play into what's going on in this room.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you very much.
Can you pass it along.
You're an attorney. You work at Davis \& Polk?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: I may have misheard, but did you say something happened during your clerkship that was either negative or positive?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I just had a criminal docket when I clerked.

MR. BLANCHE: I understand. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: An appellate docket. MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.

So, same question to you about your views of

President Trump outside of the facts of this case and your opinion of President Trump.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I followed everything like everyone else. I was a big fan of The Apprentice when I was in middle school at the time. I watched that. When he became President, there were some things I agreed with and some things I disagreed with.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.
I'm going to jump around a little bit because I'm going to run out of time.

Can you pass it two over, not that I don't want to speak with you, sir.

So, the same question:
I think you said you use Facebook and you follow the news. This is not an unfamiliar face to you. When you came in here, what's your opinion? What's your view of President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I disagree with several policies. As far as information shared on social media, I have a diverse collection of friends and family and they all sort of post things in favor of or opposed to previous presidential policies and federal policies. I feel like I try to stay the middle ground. I'm not trying to make enemies of past friends and family members over politics. I see a lot on both sides and I just try to keep
my head down and do what $I$ need to do every day.
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
You can pass the microphone.
By the way--and Mr. Steinglass said this
earlier--I don't care about your politics. I'm really genuinely not asking about that. I'm not trying to put anybody on the spot on who you voted for or if you're a Democrat or a Republican. I'm asking about the individual. So, try to separate that. It doesn't matter who you voted for.

So, with that being said, $B-38$, same question to you, sir. Again, not politics, just your opinion of President Trump.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can separate the politics from the person and my opinion. I don't have a strong opinion either way. I mean, like she said and everyone else said, we all follow politics or see what we see, but I'm here to judge the facts that are presented and not the individual. So, I can separate the two.

MR. BLANCHE: I appreciate you could judge the facts, but what is your opinion of President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My opinion?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He was our President. Like he said, I agree with some things and, some things, I don't
agree with. That's based on my feelings, I guess.
MR. BLANCHE: You think whatever your agreements and disagreements are wouldn't affect your ability in this courtroom to be --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all because I don't look at the person as the President or whatever. I look at the person sitting there as an individual. So, I can separate the two.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Can you -- Actually, I don't need to speak with you. Can you go right behind. That's perfect.

Juror number 158, same question to you, sir:
You're an attorney. You read a lot of the same news that everybody else reads, which would necessarily give you a lot of information about President Trump. What's your opinion of President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I agree with the others about separating politics from in here. I think I read less than the others. My wife does not like the news. So, she doesn't really keep it on in the house. I probably have stronger opinions about local stuff than national stuff. MR. BLANCHE: Thank you. Can you actually pass the microphone three people down to you, sir, Juror number 292.

Is that you?

1

2

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's me.

MR. BLANCHE: All right.
Same question to you:
What's your opinion of President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I don't -- Feelings are not facts, right? So, we're here to see the evidence, to look at the facts, to look at the time line, and all of that. Policy, of course, I disagree with some things. I also agree with some others. I think the media and the opinions of my Facebook friends or whoever shouldn't be consequential to this trial. Yeah, that's how I feel about it. Feelings are not facts.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.
So, you also became a citizen while
President Trump was President; correct?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MR. BLANCHE: Anything about that experience or the time leading up to that that gives you any concern one way or another about your ability to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not at all. I'm very grateful to be an American and that happens on the first year that he was President.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Could we pass one over to $B-89$.
Sir, same question to you:

You talked a little bit about what you're doing now and your background, but what is your opinion over the past eight, 10 , or 12 years observing President Trump or of President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I find him fascinating and mysterious. He walks into a room and he sets people off, one way or the other. I find that really interesting. "Really? This one guy could do all of this? Wow." That's what I think.

MR. BLANCHE: With that foundation, is that as far as it goes, just fascinating and interesting?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, certainly, he makes things interesting, one way or the other. So, I find that interesting. I follow it because so many people are set off one way or the other and that is interesting to me.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
How about two over? We'll go to, I think, Juror number 128. Is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: Sorry. We're using numbers.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've lived in New York for 50 years. So, President Trump has been a notable figure in real estate here as a developer--although, I don't follow that. There's very little we probably agree on policy-wise. Sometimes, I get frustrated with it, like
anybody does.
I have family members that support him. We manage to have decent conversations about that.

I feel sort of embarrassed. I don't even know much about this because $I$ wasn't paying attention to this particular issue, but I don't think -- I consider myself a thoughtful person and I understand how important this is to everybody here. I think I would be able to -- I know I'll be able to separate my policy issues from what's going on here. I don't think those will touch on that for me.

MR. BLANCHE: As Mr. Steinglass mentioned a little bit ago, you're going to hear evidence of stuff that happened a really long time ago--as late as 2015, 2016, when President Trump first took office that first year. You're going to be going back a long time and maybe bringing up memories that you haven't thought about in a long time. It's another question; right? Normally, there would be no memory. You would be hearing about a fact for the first time. Here, you're going to see potentially--potentially--tweets and you're going to remember seeing that tweet and where you were seven or eight years ago or think you might remember. So, again, what we're trying to make sure is that President Trump is starting out at zero with you--literally, at zero. So, you know who he is--of course, you do--but that you have no
opinion of him that will cause you to not be completely fair and impartial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Whatever came of tweets and whatever I read or pull out on the news, somebody's behind that filtering it in a way. I am very very skeptical of what I get on the news. I don't tweet. I was on Twitter for two days and that was it. I do not tweet. So, I don't think that I am going to have a problem separating that and starting out at zero. I don't know how to convince you of that. I understand your dilemma. I truly do. You want your client to have a fair shake here, just like the District Attorney wants the same thing. I will do my level-headed best to make sure that happens if I'm sitting here. I don't know how to give you any more assurance than I possibly can. I didn't sleep last night thinking about, "Could I really do that?" It's just so important. Nobody is sitting here that doesn't have that. I get what you're doing and why you have to do this.

MR. BLANCHE: Can you pass it one over.
Thank you very much.
So, look, you've heard everybody talk and all
those questions. Same question to you:
At its root, your opinion of President Trump?
It's tough to talk about him. He's right here, but --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think it's difficult,
not to cut you off.
MR. BLANCHE: Go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not a political person. I'm not just saying that just because. I'm not into politics. I don't really care for the news. I have friends that are in entertainment media. So, I know how that could get construed.

During the election, obviously, I'm a person of color. So, I'm around people who did have an opinion during the election. I try to avoid political conversations. To be completely honest with you, my response is President Trump speaks his mind. I would rather that in a person than someone who's in office and you don't know what they're doing behind the scenes. So, my opinion was never -- I don't feel like I have a strong opinion either way. It's just, like, this is the case.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Could you pass it to B-297.
Same question for you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would say that I think that Trump and I probably have different beliefs, but I don't think that that invalidates anything about who he is as a person. This is a free country. We can think certain things and that's fine. I think that I can look at this as a person on trial, any other American citizen, and not take
this person who used to be the President as that and just stick to what's being shown to me.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
So, let me ask you a question:
Almost everybody here reads the
New York Times--not everybody, but most of you guys--and follows the news. Who knows that President Trump is charged in other cases? Raise your hands.
(HANDS RAISED)
MR. BLANCHE: Who knows what he's charged with outside of this case?
(HANDS RAISED)
MR. BLANCHE: It looks like we got mostly

## everybody.

Anybody have no idea? Is anybody getting this news for the first time?
(HAND RAISED)
MR. BLANCHE: One, 374.
Fair enough.
My last question--I'm running out of time--is how does that affect you? I'm not saying that it should or shouldn't, but it's important that we understand that. Those of you who read the New York Times or watch CNN, it's difficult to watch that at all without hearing about one of the other charges that President Trump faces. So, how does
that, if in any way, affect you?
Why don't we go back to you, sir, B-113.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think this is a different case than any of those cases. I didn't follow them specifically line by line, but $I$ know there are other cases. I know there are other cases in other states, but they're about different things and different courts, if I'm correct. This is a case that we have to take, all of us, on its own merits here. Again, to me, it feels relatively simple to do, to compartmentalize like that.

MR. BLANCHE: Okay.
You could pass two more over and I will give you a shot to speak, sir.

That's 400?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: Same question to you:
Do you have any opinion, positive or negative? What is your opinion of the fact that there are other charges that exist for President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have an opinion at all.

MR. BLANCHE: Do you know about the other charges?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've heard of some of them, yeah.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.
Can you pass it back 381. Is that you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: Same question to you about the other charges:

You read the news. You constantly are seeing information about other charges. Where does that leave you, if anywhere, with respect to what you're supposed to do here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm actually not super familiar with the other charges. I don't really follow the news that closely, unfortunately. It's a little embarrassing to say. So, I just don't have that much information. I'm sorry.

MR. BLANCHE: That's fair. That's an honest answer. That's fine.

Can you pass it to your left.
Juror 402, how about you?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can't judge him. I've heard about the other cases--and I'm not following it all the way through--but $I$ just feel like, with anyone, until you prove him guilty, why should I just outright judge him? I don't know his business. I can't say. He speaks his mind. That's something that -- He stirs the pot. He stirs the pot. He speaks his mind. You can't judge him
because he speaks his mind. The way that everyone wants to judge him for speaking his mind, $I$ just can't say. Will I be impartial to things? Of course. I know what's right and what's wrong. The evidence has to be brought to me for me to see. He speaks his mind. I mean, come on. What can you say about that? If I told you what $I$ thought all the time about people --

MR. BLANCHE: Sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He just says it and that's it. You can't blame him for speaking. He says what he wants to say. I want to say some things to people, but my mother said to be nice. So, that's it.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.
The last question is just to the group. You
heard Mr. Steinglass talk about this, but you also heard it yesterday from Judge Merchan:

You're going to hear a lot of names besides President Trump, a lot of names that some of you would have heard a lot about over the past eight years--Kellyanne Conway; Michael Cohen; Hope Hicks, potentially; people that were involved with President Trump during the White House before and even up to now for some reason. So, back it out and remember what it was like in your life during President Trump's presidency, which, now, with what we're going to be talking about, was a really
long time ago. Is there anything about hearing testimony about those other witnesses, who, in their own right, you know at least over social media and video news, that makes you feel like, "You know what, I can't commit to being fair and impartial," or, "I have an opinion about those individuals that will keep me from being fair and impartial?" Anybody?
(NEGATIVE RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. BLANCHE: Everybody is shaking their heads. So, the last area that I want to talk about, which Mr. Steinglass addressed a little bit, is President Trump and the fact that he has no burden to do anything here. Judge Merchan said that and I expect that Judge Merchan will say that again:

We can literally sit here and do nothing the entire time. From the moment this trial starts until the end, the entire burden is on the folks in front of me, with the People. We've all heard that since grade school. It's easy just to say, "Yeah, you don't have to do anything. It's the government's job to prove you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt," but think about whether you will have any issues or maybe question if there isn't a defense raised or if there isn't a question asked that you think should be asked. Think about whether you can accept the burden from now until the end that President Trump is
innocent--innocent--until such time that you go back to
deliberate and, then, we expect he'll still be innocent,
but that's the point. Can you commit from now until the
end that that will be what you come into this courtroom
with every day--that he is innocent of any crime charged?
Anybody have any concerns?
(NO RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. BLANCHE: By the way, there's no wrong
answers. If you raise your hand and have a question or a
follow-up or you want to understand what $I$ mean, please do.
Please do. It's extraordinarily important.
(HAND RAISED)
MR. BLANCHE: Go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He's innocent until proven
guilty. That's it.
MR. BLANCHE: Look, you say that and --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But I believe it.
MR. BLANCHE: You believe it. That's the
question; right? That's the important question. It's not
only whether you say it.
Go ahead, ma'am.
Where's the microphone?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's all right.
MR. BLANCHE: Speak loudly. Go for it.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Your client has no -- If he
decides not to speak and you decide not to present anything, that's your right. That's a right thing. So, we can't presume that that makes him guilty because he's not saying anything. It's really -- The prosecutor is the one that has to prove that.

MR. BLANCHE: That's right.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They have to present those facts and prove them.

As I said, he has the right not to say anything. Any right that you have, if you decide to assert that right, that means you're being quiet. I'm sorry, but that's not a presumption of guilt.

MR. BLANCHE: I don't think I could have said it better myself. I wish you would have had the microphone.

Thank you.
That is something that's important. It's something that, maybe, we sometimes not take for granted, but we just put it in the back of our head instead of the beginning of our heads.

So, one last question and I'm out of time:
Is there something that $I$ didn't ask that you think I need to know about you so that, when we go back and decide who would be the fairest and the most impartial juror, you think we should know something, one way or the other? It's an open-ended question. Please feel free to
answer it. There's no right answers.
(NO RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. BLANCHE: Nothing.
Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Blanche.
Jurors, at this time, the law provides that the
attorneys be given some time to review their notes and make
some decisions. So, I'm going to ask you to please step
outside. We'll try to be as quick as we can, but it will
be a few minutes.
I remind you of my instructions yesterday:
Please do not discuss this case either among
yourselves or with anyone else.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors
exited the courtroom)

MR. STEINGLASS: Can we approach for one second, Judge?

THE COURT: Sure.
(The following occurred at sidebar)
MR. STEINGLASS: I didn't necessarily need the record.

I was just going to ask if you might want to -- I don't know if we're going to have an answer in five minutes or 10 minutes.

THE COURT: We're not going to stop at 1:00. If

```
we have to go to 1:15, we'll do that.
```

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
MS. NECHELES: Judge, where can we work since we need to talk with the client?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MS. NECHELES: Where can we do this? We need to talk to the client. We can't really do it here. Can we go back to --

THE COURT: You can go back, but I need you back at $1: 00$ sharp.

MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, I'm afraid it's not going to be enough time to discuss it with the client. He really needs to be able to have his participation in this. By the time we get back there and get back here, we just won't be able to get this done with the client, I'm afraid. MS. HOFFINGER: I believe you have access to the courtroom across the way.

MS. NECHELES: I know, but, by the time we --
THE COURT: It's right across the hall and you're wasting time right now. Why don't you go ahead and get started. It's literally right across the hall.

(RECESS TAKEN)


THE COURT: Let the record reflect counsel is
back in the courtroom.
The jurors are not present.
Counsel, is there anything you wanted to say?
Ms. Necheles, is there anything you wanted to say?
MS. NECHELES: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Did you have enough time to review
your notes?
MS. NECHELES: No, your Honor.
MR. BLANCHE: No. We need more time.
THE COURT: Okay.
So, we're going to adjourn to 2:15.
When you come back at $2: 15$, I expect you to be prepared to go through it.

MR. BLANCHE: Of course.
THE COURT: We still have six people in the audience. I'm going to put them in the box. I want to go through them. Then, I still want to be able to get to a new panel today to at least swear them in.

MS. HOFFINGER: Your Honor, will we be questioning the six in the box before we get the new panel?

THE COURT: Yes.
My rationale for that is we know that those six people did not self-excuse. So, hopefully, they're viable candidates.

Let's bring the jurors in so that $I$ could excuse
them for lunch.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors entered the courtroom)

THE COURT: Let the record reflect that the 18 jurors are back in the jury box and the six jurors who are still in the audience are back in the audience.

Jurors, as you know, this is a very important part of the process here and I don't want to rush the attorneys through it. So, rather than having you wait outside while we go through what we need to do here, I'm going to excuse you now for lunch--that will be the 18 of you and the six of you in the audience. I'm going to excuse you for lunch. I would like you to be back in the building at whatever time you need to get back so you could be up here at $2: 15$. I want to start at $2: 15$.

Before I excuse you, I remind you of the instructions you heard me give yesterday:

Please do not discuss this case either among yourselves or with anyone else.

Please continue to keep an open mind.
Do not form or express an opinion as to the defendant's guilt or innocence until you have heard the evidence, you've heard my instructions on the law, and I have directed you to begin your deliberations.
Again, do not, at any time during the trial,
request, accept, agree to accept, or discuss with any person the receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefit in return for supplying any information concerning the trial.

You must promptly report directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person improperly to influence you or any member of the jury.

Do not read, view, or listen to any accounts or discussions of the case reported by newspapers, television, radio, the internet, or any other news media.

Do not attempt to research any fact, issue, or law related to the case whether by discussion with others, by research in a library or on the internet, or by any other means or source.

When you step outside, the court officers and lieutenant will tell you what time you need to get back to the building to ensure that you're back up here by $2: 15$.

Enjoy your lunch.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors exited the courtroom)

THE COURT: At 2:15, I will be back on the bench and I'll start taking your challenges.

The way $I$ do it is we take as many challenges as there are available seats. The first go-through, we will

```
    go through 12 seats, which will be the first }12\mathrm{ seats.
    First, will be challenges for cause from the People, then
    challenges for cause from the defense, then peremptory
    challenges by the People, and then peremptory challenges by
    the defense. Let's say we got }11\mathrm{ jurors out of that, then
    we would only look at one more seat at a time because
    that's all we would have available.
    Enjoy your lunch.
        * * * * *
```



```
        the trial adjourned to 2:15 p.m.)
        * * * * *
            (At this time, Vincent M. Geraldi, III was
        relieved by Vikki Benkel as Senior Court Reporter)
```

```
    A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N
    *
        *
        *
        THE COURT: Good afternoon.
        Case on trial continued.
        Let the record reflect the People are present, the
Defense counsel are present, Mr. Trump is present.
    Anyone else we are waiting for?
    MR. BLANCHE: No.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    Are you ready now to go through the challenges?
    MR. BLANCHE: Yes, we appreciate the extra time.
    Your Honor, I am sorry, we are ready to start, we
certainly have issues to discuss and for cause challenges.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    MR. BLANCHE: So I did not understand your
question, I am sorry.
    THE COURT: I was ready to take the challenges, I
did not know if there was an issue.
    What is the issue?
    MR. BLANCHE: The issue that we can take up now as
part of the for cause challenges, there is a number of the
jurors that we have social media posts for that are very
much contrary to the answers that they gave.
    Because there is the names are anonymous, we
```

certainly did not want to confront them in open court with their social media posts, which would then let them know that we knew their names and whatnot.

THE COURT: You asked that $I$ not tell anybody that this was an anonymous jury. I have not told them it is an anonymous jury.

MR. BLANCHE: Our understanding is they were told downstairs.

THE COURT: They were told downstairs they would go by number, no one told them it is an anonymous jury.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, Your Honor, we certainly did not want to point out to them after using numbers the whole time in open court with reporters confronting them with that. So our asking, we can certainly talk about the posts and if there is an issue, either if there is not an agreement that they should be struck for cause, we would very much respectfully request they be brought back in and questioned, whether outside the presence of the press or whatever.

It is a difficult situation, we don't want to embarrass them, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine. If there is a question we will bring each juror in, as we get to that juror we will bring that juror in.

MR. BLANCHE: Okay.

THE COURT: We can start taking the challenges

```
now.
```

So looking at seats one through 12. People, are there any challenges for cause?

MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Defense, one through 12, any challenges for cause?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
First juror number one.
THE COURT: Tell me why?
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, juror number one in answer to questions about opinions of President Trump, indicated that she did not have any, and that whatever opinions she has, you know, did not rise to the level of not being fair and impartial, she can decide fairly.

Juror number one has a series of extraordinarily hostile Facebook posts.

THE COURT: Can I see them?
(Whereupon, the documents were handed to the Judge)

THE COURT: I am not sure was I handed the right thing?

MR. BLANCHE: Pardon me?
Yes, Your Honor, I can put some context around it.
THE COURT: Just so the record shows, I was handed
a sheet that appears to have, and I apologize if I use the wrong terminology, please correct me if $I$ do, two screen grabs. The first one depicts a number of people in what looks like some sort of ocular location, at the top it says, "I had to get in the car to spread the honking cheer". "There is an actual dance party at 96 th Street".

Then beneath that is another screen grab that looks like it might have been taken from a fire escape of some sort.

Are we all looking at the same thing?
MR. STEINGLASS: I am not looking at anything.
MR. BLANCHE: Sorry.
THE COURT: It appears to be looking across to another building and it says "Okay, so I have been in the middle of the ocean for the last week, what is going on".

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
So those two posts are on the day of the election. It was shortly after it was announced that President Trump had lost the election.

So the first post says, there is a full out party, and the rest of the post she had to get in the car and spread the honking cheer, it is a full on dance party at $96 t h$ Street.

I mean that is somebody who is actively --
THE COURT: Where does it refer here to your

```
client or to the election?
```

MR. BLANCHE: I mean it is the date at the top, Your Honor, the date that it was posted.

It is clear from the video, we can pull up the video if Your Honor wants, it is clear from the video it is a celebration of the results of the election.

THE COURT: People?
MR. STEINGLASS: This seems to me to be ridiculous. A juror, even if this is the juror's, which we have no idea how it is because we don't know how they conducted this research, that they appear to have conducted, there is no reference at all to any anti Trump bias.

THE COURT: Show me the bias, show me? I am serious. I am sorry, I don't mean to be signaling for you to sit, I am trying to understand how is this that $I$ am looking at here, how does that call into question what the juror said when that juror was answering questions?

MR. BLANCHE: When the question was asked, what is your opinion not about the facts of this case, but what is your opinion of the defendant, of President Trump, is there anything we should know about your opinion? The juror answered no. And fair, this has nothing to do with whether they happen to vote or not vote for President Trump. It is somebody that thought it significant and important enough when President Trump lost the election to not only take
video, but post on Facebook the fact that they were
celebrating, and there was a celebration of his loss. Not
only just celebrations from their house, they actually were
getting in the car and spreading the honking cheer.
If you step back from this case, Your Honor,
imagine a regular case.
THE COURT: Hold on a second, can you play this
for me so I can see it in context?
MR. BLANCHE: Pardon me?
THE COURT: Can you play what you are describing
for me so I can see it in context?
MR. BLANCHE: We should be able to, Your Honor.
I am worried about the juror's name.
THE COURT: We don't want to give out the juror's
name, so bring it up here to the bench so I can look at it.
People, you can come up as well.
Can we turn off the screen and leave the volume
on, thank you.
We are turning off the screen.
So you can just play it so we can all see it.
MR. BLANCHE: We are getting it, Your Honor, we
are being careful not to go on the website to not violate
any rules.
One second.
THE COURT: How many of these do you have for

```
cause?
```

MR. BLANCHE: Four, there are four -- sorry, there are five, four for the first 12.

THE COURT: While we wait for it to be set up, how have you confirmed this is the juror's account?

MR. BLANCHE: Simply through open source using the juror's name.

THE COURT: So just based on the name?
MS. NECHELES: Her picture.
MR. BLANCHE: Not just based on the name, confirming with information provided and face as well.

THE COURT: Confirming what has been provided?
MR. BLANCHE: For example, information provided by the juror, the way she looks and name.

THE COURT: Okay.
Can we get this going?
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, may I approach and show it on this?

THE COURT: All right.
Let the record reflect that counsel is attempting
to play a video for me. It looks like it is the second video that $I$ referred to earlier.

I don't hear anything or see anything.
(Whereupon, the aformentioned videotape was played up at the bench)

THE COURT: So I hear what sounds like a cowbell, hear people cheering.

And what is the date on this video again?
MR. BLANCHE: It is November 7th of 2020, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that the date after the election?
MS. NECHELES: The election was not decided for a couple of days, that was the day it was decided. That was the parties that were going on in the streets after it was decided.

THE COURT: This is taking way too long.
I definitely want to hear you out on this and I want to give this as much weight as I can possibly give it, but we cannot take this long with each of the four, you need a better system.

MS. NECHELES: The other things we have printed out, the others are much more inflammatory, but we have print outs for them.

THE COURT: Let me see.
MR. BLANCHE: It is loading.
(Whereupon, the aformentioned videotape was played up at the bench)

THE COURT: All right.
MS. NECHELES: Can I just note this is a woman who specifically said --

THE COURT: We will go back to your tables.
Yes, Ms. Necheles, you were saying.
MS. NECHELES: This is a woman who specifically said she had never attended an anti Trump rally or campaign. This is clearly an anti Trump event that she is out celebrating and partying.

THE COURT: Look, it would appear that, I certainly agree with you that it would appear to be, we don't know that for a fact right now, not based on the information we have right now, nor do we know she was there. There is nothing depicting her there. I agree there is enough there for us to want to look further.

People?
MR. STEINGLASS: Judge, if that is your decision I am certainly not going to try to persuade you otherwise.

But to me this is nothing of the sort, this is not a rally, this is somebody filming other people celebrating from a remote distance, maybe celebrating the election, probably it is celebrating the election results.

I fail to see how a juror videotaping other people celebrating the election results somehow indicates an anti Trump bias that she did not reveal during questioning. In fact, she said the exact opposite during questioning.

THE COURT: It may not, it may not, and we don't even know she filmed this, somebody may have sent it to her
and she posted it.
There is enough questions here that I think in order to ensure that there is finality with this case whenever we do get done with it, we just want to clarify this. I am going to ask her to come in and $I$ will allow you to ask her questions about it.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: If you can bring in the juror who was seated in seat number one, that is $B-133$.

Before she comes in, I don't want this to be a cross examination. What $I$ want it to be, I want you to clarify what this is and give her the opportunity to explain why it is inconsistent or is consistent with whatever she said when she was in the jury box. It is not an opportunity to conduct another voir dire with her.

I am satisfied that you gave me enough here that we need to look into it.

I am bringing a juror in and that is what we are going to do, okay.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror stepped into the courtroom)

THE COURT: I thank you for coming back in, we just wanted to clarify something. Counsel has some follow up questions for you.

Go ahead.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
So we had a question about a Facebook post around the time of the 2000 election.

THE COURT: What year?
MR. BLANCHE: The 2020 election.
And it appears from the Facebook post, although it is not clear that you had recorded, a video had been recorded of a celebration maybe around $96 t h$ Street, and there were a couple of videos, and we wanted to understand or just ask you about those.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uhm, I think I went to move the car to alternate side parking or something like that and there were people dancing in the street and stuff. And maybe I was, I don't know where I was going, I do remember being in the car and I do remember people dancing in the street and honking the horns. It reminded me of the 7:00 cheer for the healthcare workers which we did for a very long time with my kids out on the fire escape, and it just was like a New York City celebratory moment.

I think that is the one you are talking about.
MR. BLANCHE: I think you are right.
It looked like I think it was you who posted, it was a celebration in New York City with a heart and exclamation point, that you had to get in the car to spread the honking cheer.

THE COURT: Counsel, we are talking about two different videos and each one has its own caption. So just be clear about which caption refers to each video.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
One of the captions where it appeared that you were recording -- there was a video being recorded from inside suggested there was a full on celebration in New York City with exclamation point and a heart.

The other one which appeared to be from when you were possibly in the car, was that you had to get in the car to spread the honking cheer. It is a full on dance party at 96th Street.

And I guess the question is, whether you were writing that and something about it, what you remember about it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean $I$ can only say what $I$ just said before, that it seemed like a celebratory moment in New York City, I know you are part of history, and yeah, I mean $I$ think that was it, I think.

I don't know if $I$ am allowed to speak further?
THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The question was not or maybe it was already asked of me, I think to the point that I understand the question, you are asking to see if $I$ have biases that lead me one way or the other, I assume that is
where the question comes from. I understand that bias exists, I understand implicit bias exists, we are aware of it or not. I very very strongly believe that regardless of my thoughts about anyone or anything or political feelings or convictions, that the job of a juror is to understand the facts of the trial and to be the judge of those facts. I love the way you phrased it. I have never been on a jury before, I never had this experience, I have never been in a courtroom like this before. That is thoroughly absolutely my belief.

So yesterday when people walked out because they thought they couldn't, I don't believe that about myself at all. So yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Anything else before $I$ ask the juror to step out?
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, I appreciate you coming in.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror left the courtroom)

THE COURT: Before we continue I want to put something on the record.

So Mr. Blanche, while the juror was at the podium maybe 12 feet from your client, your client was audibly uttering something, $I$ don't know exactly what he was
uttering, he was audibly gesturing, speaking in the direction of the juror. I won't tolerate that. I will not have any jurors intimidated in this courtroom. I want to make that crystal clear.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Take a minute, speak to your client about it.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, there was a brief conference between defense counsel and the defendant)

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What is your argument on this?
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, as the Court is aware, there is a different standard when a juror's potential bias is something from other than the case. The Court of Appeals People v Torpe, 63 NY2d 361, 1984 states: "Therefore, where a potential juror's actual bias is caused by a highly unfavorable impression of the defendant's overall reputation or character, the test for whether such bias has been overcome by declaration is even stricter than where the juror has expressed an opinion as to the defendant's guilt".

So the case at large, in a case such as the present one, talking about the case, the prospective juror should be dismissed if there appears to be any possibility that his impressions of the defendant might influence his

```
verdict.
```

And so it is in our view easy to say $I$, you know, I can be fair and impartial. That is not what the law says, it says if there is any possibility.

In a normal case, Your Honor, where any potential juror who is posting something -- I have a copy of the case, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's fine.
MR. BLANCHE: I should have offered it.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can $I$ have it?
MR. BLANCHE: Sure.

In a normal case if we are talking about posting about a defendant on someone's Facebook, it wouldn't. Here we are trying to rehabilitate a juror that has said about the election, which is the People's view not of the election she is talking about, the People's theory of the case has to do with President Trump attempting to commit this crime in order to influence the election.

This is not just her posting a video, she is commenting about it as well. There is no scenario under which given the comment, the Facebook post, and the law which is that any possibility that his impressions of the defendant might influence in this case her verdict, she must be dismissed.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the People.

MR. STEINGLASS: Not withstanding the propriety of trolling the internet looking for any kind of interpreting this as any kind of appropriate inquiry into a juror who has not expressed any bias, let me first point out that the case that counsel is referring to refers to jurors that have a highly unfavorable overall impression of the defendant. This juror has said nothing like that, she does not have to be rehabilitated, she has not endorsed that at all. Her answers to the questions were very clear, she understood what was being asked of her, if she had strong feelings about Mr. Trump one way or the other.

I fail to see how we are even having this conversation where a juror --

THE COURT: I will not go back and forth, this is not going to turn into an appellate argument here. I heard what you had to say, I am listening to the People, then I am going to rule.

MR. STEINGLASS: What $I$ was saying was, $I$ fail to see how posting a video of other people celebrating and even indicating a favorable view of other people celebrating, implicates this juror's ability to be fair.

As we have said, this case is not about politics, people could have favorable or unfavorable views of Mr . Trump, and the question is whether they could be fair and impartial jurors. I don't even think that based on the
record that you have in front of you that you could conclude that anyone could conclude that she has an unfavorable opinion, much less a highly unfavorable overall impression based on this record.

THE COURT: I agree, there is no need for rehabilitation. What $I$ did was brought the juror in to give you an opportunity to explore this.

I don't want a juror on this panel who lies to us. I don't want a juror on this panel who misleads us as to his or her views about your client and opinions about your client. For that reason $I$ did want to hear from this juror. The juror came in, she was confronted with both of these and she provided what I believe were reasonable explanations for both.

The second one, by the way, clearly was taken from a fire escape. She referred to the fact that they celebrated the first responders, healthcare workers, every evening beginning in March of 2020 or around the time of Covid. Nowhere in here does it say, is there anything posted that $I$ find to be, $I$ don't remember what the term was that you used, not offensive, I don't see anything here that is offensive, that is why when $I$ first looked at it $I$ was not sure you had given me the right thing.

More importantly, the juror stood here directly in front of me and I was able to observe her demeanor, I was
able to hear her voice, $I$ was able to form an opinion as to her credibility. And that juror looked me right in the eye and when she said she could be fair and impartial, she meant it.

Once a juror gives that quote unequivocal assurance, then the trial court has discretion to deny the challenge for cause if it determines that the juror's promise to be impartial is credible. I find her to be credible. That is People v Arnold 96 NY2d 358 at 363, 729 New York subsection 51.

Your challenge for cause as to this juror is denied.

I will mark this as Court Exhibit 1 and we will make it part of the file.

So the challenge for number one is denied.
Who is your next one?
MR. BLANCHE: Juror number two.
THE COURT: Tell me more.
MR. BLANCHE: I have something to hand up to the Court.
(Whereupon, the document was handed to the Court)
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BLANCHE: I have redacted the juror's name and replaced it with B-38, Your Honor.

This is a post from right during the conduct
during the case, meaning right during the trial the People are going to offer evidence around what was happening in the White House with President Trump and Michael Cohen and he writes, "Good news, Trump lost his court battle and his unlawful travel ban". Then totally separate says "get him out and lock him up". "Watch out for stupid tweets by DJT". Again, in answering our questions he did not in any way answer in the affirmative around a bias around something that could effect his ability to be fair and impartial.

Look, in this case with this type of a tweet saying "get him out and lock him up", we cannot have a juror like that on the jury, Your Honor.

THE COURT: People, do you want to be heard?
MR. STEINGLASS: First of all, I certainly think
it is worth bringing the juror in for further inquiry on this point.

I am also confused as to how the defense is determining whose Facebook accounts this is, how this research was conducted. I don't see the name, I see the name blacked out, which $I$ understand why. I see a photo that contains two people in the photo, I am not sure what that means.

I think the first inquiry has to be, did this
juror make this post. Then the second inquiry, does that mean the juror cannot be a fair impartial juror.

I do think it is worth bringing the juror in to inquire about that.

MR. BLANCHE: On foundation, Your Honor, that is fine. I want to make sure that we understand when this juror was asked a question about President Trump, he said, I do not have a strong opinion of DJT, President Trump, either way. So to the extent the foundation is laid. We don't think any other questions should be asked.

THE COURT: No, no, the foundation is laid, that warrants further inquiry for sure, no question about that, and we are going to conduct further inquiry.

But you actually touch on an important issue, that is the question that you asked, what is your opinion of Donald Trump, that is really a problematic question. There was no objection so $I$ did not rule on it. Really that is just another way of saying, do you like or not like Donald Trump. The answer to that question could refer to the way he dresses, the way he talks, whether he was a good president or bad president, it could refer to anything. And because it can refer to absolutely anything, we don't know that it goes to the issue in the case.

So I would encourage you to avoid running into these problems and perhaps getting more direct answers from

```
the jurors, to sharpen your question a little bit so it is
```

not so broad.
What is your opinion? I really don't know.
MR. BLANCHE: It is open ended for the reasons
Your Honor said, based on the way he is dressed, that is
certainly no reason for us to be concerned. But because of
who he is and who he has been to the City for the past many
years, past eight years, that is exactly what Torpe talks
about, that is exactly why we are asking open ended
questions, to identify an opinion or bias that does not have
to do with the guilt of the defendant in this case. So
there is a different standard.
THE COURT: I don't think that goes to an opinion
or bias.
But turning back to this, let's bring this juror
back in please, it is B-38.
What kind of account was this, is this a Facebook
account?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: By the way, we are only taking
challenges for cause right now one through 12, not beyond
12.
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror
stepped into the courtroom)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
Thank you for coming back in, we wanted to ask you a follow up question.

Mr. Blanche.
MR. BLANCHE: Good afternoon.
So we have a question about what we believe is a Facebook post of yours from many years ago.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
MR. BLANCHE: I am just going to, is it okay if I show it to him?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: I will show it to you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If it is on my account it has to be me. But $I$ don't remember what this is pertaining to.

MR. BLANCHE: Sorry, did you say it is your account or is not?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is my account.
MR. BLANCHE: Sorry, I misunderstood.
Do you have any recollection of putting this up on Facebook?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't. But again, it is on my account so it has to be me.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough.
Look, I think the question is, reading that, you seem to express your views of President Trump as a person
talking about his character not politics, and asking whether you, reading that, whether you have an unfavorable opinion of President Trump's character or what your reaction to reading this Facebook post, which admittedly is from 2017. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: At the time if I did post it I had strong feelings at the time. Today, like I said, I could be unbiased and open about what we are talking about today. But you know, that was a place and time.

THE COURT: Any follow up questions? MR. STEINGLASS: I little bit, if you don't mind. Do you feel that way now, do you feel, for example, that Mr. Trump should be locked up? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No -- well, unless you prove your case in trial, then the judge decides, that is not my decision.

MR. STEINGLASS: That is a good point, that is not what I meant, but thank you for clarifying that.

Do you feel that -- do you have a highly unfavorable view of Mr. Trump as you stand here now? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything about your previous post or your previous feelings from 2017 that would mean that you could not set any feelings aside and give the defendant and the People a perfectly fair trial? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can set all the prior
feelings aside that you just mentioned.
MR. STEINGLASS: And you don't endorse those feelings currently?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: I am sorry, I don't mean to -but we have to have a clear answer, so what we really need is your unequivocal assurance that you could be fair and impartial if you are selected as a juror to both sides.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can be fair and impartial to both sides should you keep me.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
You can step out.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror left the courtroom)

THE COURT: All right, I had the opportunity to hear the questions that were asked by both Mr. Blanche and Mr. Steinglass, I had the opportunity to observe the prospective juror.

I will just read the language into the record again. Good news exclamation mark, exclamation mark, Trump lost his court battle on his unlawful travel ban, three exclamation marks. If it ended there I would not really have a major problem with it, but it continues and it says, get him out and lock him up.

So this is a person who has expressed, at least at
one time, it was several years ago, the desire that Donald Trump be locked up. Everyone knows that if Mr. Trump is found guilty in this case he faces a potential jail sentence, which would be lock up. I don't think that I can allow this juror to remain.

I am going to grant your challenge for cause as to juror number two.

Who is the next one?
MR. BLANCHE: This is juror number three, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, a document was handed to the Court)
THE COURT: Would you like to describe what you handed me? It is two pages, it appears to be three memes or screen grabs.

Let me go ahead and describe it for the record please.

MR. BLANCHE: Just to be clear, we are talking about juror 330.

This is screen grabs of her husband, not of her. And the screen grabs, again they are three separate screen grabs showing an anti Trump bias.

The first one, you know, is a video the Avengers unite against Donald Trump, then something else.

The second is a picture of President Obama and President Trump and it is from 2016, it says, I don't think
this is what they meant orange is the new black.
The third one from 2016 is just a meme of a character holding President Trump's head in their hands. THE COURT: Sorry, the third one -- the first one was $I$ guess it is a character from the Simpsons.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: What is the name of this character? MR. BLANCHE: I do not know. THE COURT: I don't know either. He is holding what is supposed to be your client's head. There are no words, there is nothing there but it does show him -- I also note he appears to be wearing a mock white shirt and mock red tie. That is dated March 3, 2016.

Beneath that there is one image of Barack Obama, beneath that is an image of your client -- I apologize, I don't mean to offend anyone, but it is important that we make a clear record, the caption beneath it reads, I don't think this is what they meant that orange is the new black. Again this is from March 23, 2016.

The third one is a little bit more difficult to describe, it is a well known comedian whose name escapes me.

Anybody know who that is?
MS. MANGOLD: Keegan Michael Peele.
THE COURT: It is just depicting him and it says decisions in its history, you have a chance, you have an,
then appears to be cut off. Beneath that somebody wrote, the Avengers unite against Donald Trump, and to get Mark Ruffalo naked. This is from September 21, 2016.

And it is from the juror's husband?
MR. BLANCHE: Correct.

Our question here is to follow up, it is not when we ask questions during our voir dire about whether they could be fair and impartial and the questions that the Court asked, and even the People asked, about other people in their lives. Here you have a potential juror whose husband is posting anti Trump. We think it is appropriate to ask an inquiry, even if not about these posts directly, of the juror about whether she has any concerns about whether family is against or has serious views against the defendant, right, which in a normal case this would be of course an issue that you would inquire about.

THE COURT: Why didn't you --
MR. BLANCHE: Well, for the reason $I$ said earlier, we did not want to --

THE COURT: We are not going to keep going through this, we are not going to go through the full panel then break for an hour and 15 minutes and then come back and have argument for what is going on now for 45 minutes now, and then hope to ever pick a jury, we will not, we are not going to do that. If you have the goods on somebody, you need to
politely respectfully figure out a way to confront them with it. I don't think you need to -- all you need to do is ask, do you have any family members who feel a certain way? Who is it? And will that impact upon you, will that effect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

People.
MR. STEINGLASS: Well, of course we agree with that. This is not even the juror who is being asked about it.

Second of all, it is from 2016.
Third of all, if you look at all three of this in context, it quite clearly is humor, people post political humor all the time, that is not a window into their sole. That actually dovetails into my last point about this, which is, I think the problem with using social media posts, especially social media posts from seven or eight years ago, as some kind of litmus test for someone's deep-seated political feelings. People send photographs and things on social media that are reposts of things on social media that seem to be funny at the time or they have an opinion at the time, that is not necessarily as weighty as is being suggested that it is. That is a conceptual problem with the whole notion that something that somebody posts on social media in a remote point in time is really a window into their current views and ability to be fair for the

```
other reasons that Your Honor mentioned and I mentioned.
    I don't think it is even necessary to make further
inquiry with this juror.
    THE COURT: I will not make further inquiry.
There are posts from more than eight years ago not involving
the juror, involving the juror's husband. And honestly, if
this is the worst thing that you were able to find about
this juror, that her husband posted this humor, albeit not
very good humor, from eight years ago, then it gives me
confidence that this juror can be fair and impartial.
    I deny your challenge for cause to number three.
    MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Who is your number four?
    MR. BLANCHE: The next one is juror number six,
Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Tell me about that one?
    MR. BLANCHE: Can I have one moment with the
People.
    (Whereupon, there was a brief conference
    between defense counsel and the prosecution)
    THE COURT: I observe that counsel is conferring
with the DA's.
    I am being handed a sheet, bear with me a second
as I try to understand it. I have been handed a sheet that
seems to contain three different posts.
```

The first one says, want to beat Trump in 2024, help fund the local organizing groups who can turn out the exact voter.

Beneath that there appears to be some sort of display table with a Biden Harris poster on it, some other political displays also displaying Biden Harris.

And the third one is a photograph of the defendant and above it says, Trump indicted in documents case.

MR. BLANCHE: Just so Your Honor to complete that last one, the juror wrote, "no one is above the law" to the right of it.

THE COURT: Yes, thank you.
MR. BLANCHE: Two additional issues.
The juror also has an AI video which we can show the Court that was posted, it is a one minute and 30 second video, it is titled, I Am Dumb As Fuck Trump. And it goes on for a minute. It is a parody video that mocks President Trump the whole time.

THE COURT: Do you have the date of when that was posted?

MR. BLANCHE: I will get that date, Your Honor. Moreover, this juror on Facebook in response to an article about the more than half, he posted the article -no, sorry, someone posted the article about yesterday's proceedings, including the 96 jurors, and asked whether he
was a juror. He said, can't comment. And the response was juror's name, understood. And then another question from another Facebook friend asked, did you get picked? To which he said, I have to return tomorrow.

And the video, the AI video I spoke about was posted on March $27 t h$ of this year. And we can play it for Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think that is necessary.
People, what is your position on this?
MR. STEINGLASS: Well, I think there are two separate claims they are making. The first relates to the posts from yesterday, which don't seem violative of the Court's orders at all, it is perfectly appropriate to tell people you are on jury duty. It is also appropriate to say, I cannot discuss anything about the case. Which sounds like that is what the juror did. In response to, did you get picked? The juror said, have to go back tomorrow. So it sounds like, if anything, the juror is honoring Your Honor's instructions not to discuss the case. That is not even worthy of further inquiry, as far as I am concerned.

But the video raises a couple of questions. First of all, is it his account?

Second of all, did he make the video or just
repost it?

And third of all, does it speak to any bias?

I think we have to make inquiry about that.
MR. BLANCHE: Judge, just to make sure which juror
this was, there was extensive colloquy between myself and this juror just asking repeatedly for him to talk about his views of President Trump. And not only did he not discuss his views, he actually affirmatively refused and made it clear in his view his views had nothing to do with this case. That is not the law. We have a right to know his views. We have a right to explore his views. I don't know that a juror can say, $I$ will not tell you my views because in my view my views don't matter.

Now we know why he did not tell us his views, it is pretty obvious from his postings. April 9th --

THE COURT: I hear you.
First of all, you said a juror cannot just say, I am not going to tell you my views. This goes back to that question, it is a very open ended question, what is your opinion? I think a juror can say in response to that, $I$ am not going to tell you my views. I think if you had asked a different question, then you had objected when he said, I really want him to answer, I think you would have had a better leg to stand on.

However, I think there is enough here that we need to bring him in and $I$ would like to confirm this is his account and ask if he posted this.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let's bring B-113.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror stepped into the courtroom)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

Thank you for coming back in.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
THE COURT: We just wanted to follow up with a couple of questions.

Mr. Blanche.
MR. BLANCHE: Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
MR. BLANCHE: I will just show you something and ask you, is that from your account?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That is from my Facebook account. I sell buttons on the street corner of 86 th and Columbus to raise money for a pack that supports grass roots organizations that bring out the vote across the country, just bring out the vote, there is not a specific party.

MR. BLANCHE: What type of organization, what are the names of some of the organizations?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Movement For Voters.
MR. BLANCHE: Any others, are there any other organizations other than the Movement For Voters that you support with the button efforts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As far as things like, no, that I give money to, no.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
I will show you another post.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure.
MR. BLANCHE: Showing you a posting from March 27th. Is that, did you post that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it was just something that I reposted.

MR. BLANCHE: So you did not create that but you reposted it on that date on March 27th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. And as I stated before, my opinion of what $I$ think of the defendant outside of this room has nothing to do with the merits of the case.

MR. BLANCHE: So sir, just to test that a little bit. Did you watch this before you posted it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think I did.
MR. BLANCHE: You just reposted it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so.
MR. BLANCHE: Why?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Probably because if I did watch it, $I$ honestly don't remember if $I$ did or not, it may have been on somebody's page that I know who I trust that I thought it would be funny. I did not -- I don't recall watching it.

THE COURT: Anything else from the People?
MR. STEINGLASS: Is it okay?
THE COURT: If you have a question.
MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything about that
video -- let me ask you this. Do you have a highly unfavorable overall impression of Donald Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Asking directly I would have to say that politically, yes, I do.

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay, thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, sir, you can step out.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror left the courtroom)

THE COURT: Just so you know, the overflow room is expressing some frustration. When we don't use the mic they don't hear us. So let's make sure that we always use the mic.

I would not have a problem with each of these posts in and of itself, and possibly even all three in their totality. However, viewing the prospective juror's answers in conjunction with his post and with these here and some of the answers that he gave, I am having a hard time crediting his responses. If I cannot credit a juror's responses, then we cannot have him on the jury.

So I will grant the challenge for cause as to
number six.
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Can I just have 20 seconds with my team to make sure that $I$ did not miss anything?

THE COURT: Sure.
(Whereupon, there was a brief conference between the defense team)

MR. BLANCHE: For one through 12 that is all the

```
for cause.
```

THE COURT: Okay.
Looking at one through 12. People, any peremptory challenges?

MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge.
The People move to strike seat number seven, that is juror B-14. Seat number eight, that is juror number B-285. And seat number 11 , that is juror number $B-402$.

THE COURT: Okay.
Looking through 12, do you have any peremptory challenges?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor, President Trump strikes seat number one. Let me just get my ducks in a row.

THE COURT: That would be B-123?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
Seat number three, which is I believe B-330. Seat number five, which is B-193. Then seat number ten, which is

```
B-158, I am confirming.
```

    THE COURT: Yes.
    MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
    THE COURT: That's it?
    MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    So seat number four, \(B-400\), becomes juror number
    one and our foreperson.
Seat number nine, B-280, becomes juror number two.
And seat number $12, B-381$, becomes juror number
three.
Looking now at seats 13 through 18 .
People, are there any challenges for cause?
MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Does the defense have any challenges
for cause?
MR. BLANCHE: We do, Your Honor, we have one.
THE COURT: Okay.
I have been handed two pages that contain three
posts. Again, I apologize for the attempt at humor, but it
is important we make a clear record.
So the first page at the top has several
photographs, it appears to depict some young men on the
left, a photo of the defendant and underneath the photo of
the defendant a photo of the White House. It says, Trump
invites Thai boys to White House. Boys request to return to cave.

Beneath that there is another photograph, I cannot really make out what it says. Can you read it into the record, Mr. Blanche? I can read republicans projected to pick up 70 seats in prison.

MR. BLANCHE: That's correct, it appears to be dated, I apologize for the print quality, August 8, 2018. And it is the Borowitz Report not the news. Republicans expected to pick up 70 seats in prison. Then the bolded
title then below that it says, according to these
projections republicans are running for prison especially
well in districts and then it continues on. But that is all
that the post shows.

THE COURT: This is seat 16 , right, $B-128$ ?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The next one appears to be a photograph of some sort of parody of space Wars, instead of Space Wars or Star Wars it says Space Force and it says the new Star Wars team, it depicts your client and several other well known republicans.

Make your record.
MR. BLANCHE: Both sides had a fair amount of colloquy with the juror in seat number 16. She said such things like she lost sleep last night trying to think about
whether she could be fair and impartial. She expressed some, not some hesitation, I think a fair amount of hesitation about reaching that conclusion. And we believe that we understand now why potentially we think we should inquire about these posts. And she did make reference that she thought she probably had posts on Facebook but says she did not remember. I am not sure if she said exactly that, but said she was not sure exactly what was on Facebook.

Certainly these types of posts mocking President Trump, again although it is historical, this case is historical. So it is not the typical situation where you say, this was a post that was six years ago. The evidence at trial will be from six years ago. So the same tweets and the same issues, Kelly Ann Conway will be a witness -- not a witness, sorry, not going to be a witness, will be referenced at trial.

THE COURT: This was from six years ago.
People, would you like to be heard?
MR. STEINGLASS: I suppose it is worth making further inquiry of the juror given Your Honor's previous ruling, so we do that.

Nothing struck me here as anything other than humor.

THE COURT: Let's bring in juror $B-128$.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror

```
stepped into the courtroom)
    THE COURT: Good afternoon.
    Thank you for coming back in. We just have a
couple of follow up questions.
    Mr. Blanche.
    MR. BLANCHE: I will talk into the microphone to
make sure everybody can hear.
    I will share something that we believe is from
your Facebook but we want to confirm.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay, it might be from
Instagram.
    MR. BLANCHE: You could be correct, it could be
Instagram, I am not positive, it is several years old.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When was this, 2018?
    Yeah, I would like to say I remember posting this,
but I do not. I am perfectly willing to admit that I might
have done that. If you look at my social media you can see
there is very little on there that I post now that has
anything to do with politics, it got too vitriolic for
people, people that I known for years, I don't want to do
that.
So yeah, I may have posted this, but I learned a good lesson from it.
MR. BLANCHE: Just to make sure I understand. Is that your Facebook header, does it look familiar to you?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, it is. This little thing here, that is my -- is that my, I think that is my -- wait, wait, I guess it is, yeah. I have my phone here if you wanted to look. It is not my picture, but it is my social media. It looks like there is Central Park, I mean FDR Drive, that picture I took, yeah, yeah. So probably is mine, but $I$ don't remember.

MR. BLANCHE: It is from a long time ago, as you just said. The reason why we wanted, all of us wanted to follow up with you, is to understand when we were talking with you there was some, you know, you said I think you had to sleep on it to make sure you could be fair and impartial.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I did not have to sleep on it about being impartial, $I$ slept on it in terms of seriousness of what is going on in this room, it was not that $I$ could not be impartial, $I$ know $I$ can. But this is, like there is like there is like a bigger weight on this than there is in other trials. Not that it is less important for anybody, but this is, you know, this is like a bigger deal in the grander scheme of things.

But yeah, this is probably mine.
MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
Just the final question is having kind of
appreciating it is from a long time ago, having looked at that and taking a look at it, does that change any of the

```
things that you said earlier today on the questionnaire or
even right now?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What do you mean?
MR. BLANCHE: I mean we use the term refresh your recollection. So looking at a document from something that you posted from many years ago and thinking about your answer to the questionnaire and the questions and my questions and the People's questions, is there anything that you would change in your answer after having reviewed that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In my answer today, no. I think I feel the same way, I feel that politically we have big disagreements, your client and myself. There are certain things he said that \(I\) don't care for. But that -lots of people say things \(I\) don't care for. But when \(I\) came in here, that can't count, that has to go away, it just has to be whatever the facts are on the table before me. And I don't think \(I\) will -- I don't know what to say.
THE COURT: People, do you have any follow up questions?
MR. STEINGLASS: One quick question.
Do you have any doubt in your ability to do that, to base your decision solely on the evidence that is brought forth during this trial?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't have any doubt, I really don't.
```

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Ma'am, do you have any recollection about any of these three posts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I remember seeing this one, this one.

THE COURT: Hold on a second please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, I do like satire and cartoons and irony, but $I$ don't remember, and I do read the Borowitz Report, I find him very funny and I remember the issue, sort of.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am, you can step out. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the aforementioned prospective juror left the courtroom)

THE COURT: So although she has no recollection of having posted the first two, possibly the third one, she does not deny that this is probably her account. She indicates that she enjoys satire. In fact, she refers to the Borowitz Report.

Do you want to bring this all together?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, please, Your Honor.
I think her answer at the end, her answers at the end are instructive. We are trying to -- again, we may be in an alternate universe because President Trump is known to
everybody, but when trying to make sure we have a juror, even though they say they could be fair and impartial in the same sentence as $I$ don't agree with him politically, I don't agree with a lot of things he said, but $I$ will be able to separate that. That cannot be true, it cannot be true that -- I mean you are raising your eyebrows, Your Honor, but if you think about it, the testimony at trial will be in large part around the election and then the first year that President Trump is in office. So politics and whether a juror likes what President Trump says is part of this case. Why take the chance, I mean the cases that we are thinking about and we look to about being sure, being sure that you have a juror that is fair and impartial. In this case when you have somebody that said they already have to think about and talked about it a fair amount before, just said they do not like the politics or some things that the defendant says, then we have the postings, albeit old and satirical, but very critical of President Trump.

THE COURT: I am just obviously I did not look at her page, your team did. Was there anything else in there that was also satire unrelated to Mr. Trump?

MR. BLANCHE: One second, Your Honor.
MS. NECHELES: From a quick look, Your Honor, no, dancing, flowers, family, family, it is not satire.

MR. STEINGLASS: Unlike the juror who we let go
because he said he wanted to see Mr. Trump locked up, and for whom it was certainly arguable that the juror had a highly unfavorable overall impression of Mr. Trump. This juror said nothing of the sort. She didn't even say she did not like him, she did not express anything bad about him other than the fact she disagrees with some of his policies and some of the things he said, and she disagrees with things that lots of people said. That she could be a fair and impartial juror. There is nothing even kind of to suggest that she has a deep-seated anti Trump sentiment or dislikes him as a person.

So I don't think this is even close to a cause challenge.

THE COURT: I tend to agree with the People. These are three posts, they are all fairly characterized as satire $I$ believe, none of them expresses any of the sentiments we saw in some of the others, a desire to see your client locked up or beheaded or anything of that nature. It is three posts that have to do with satire.

She was pretty open and honest that she has disagreements with his political views on many issues. But again, as you agreed, the question is not whether someone agrees with your client politically or not, the question is whether or not they can be fair and impartial, I don't want to put words in your mouth.

I don't believe this calls for a cause challenge. So your challenge for cause is denied.

MR. BLANCHE: Even the statements though, it is not just politics, also things that President Trump says. It is not just that simply saying $I$ am a democrat is not enough, we appreciate the courts decision on that, that is not what she said. She also says, I don't like some of the things he says, that is a different sort.

THE COURT: I imagine he says thing about his political views and his political decisions, right. It is not surprising that she does not like some of his political views.

MR. BLANCHE: There are a lot of political speak.
THE COURT: Hold on.
It is not surprising that she would not like some of the things he says.

MR. BLANCHE: That is not the issue. We have a defendant who potentially has a juror that is not struck for cause who has said, I don't like some of the things that that man has said.

THE COURT: Your record is made.
MR. BLANCHE: So that in and of itself, Your Honor, runs afoul of, especially when it has nothing do with the fact of the case, the Court of Appeals said that you have to hold that type of juror to a much higher standard,
and we are not doing that.
THE COURT: I disagree. Your challenge for cause as to this juror is denied.

Looking now at seats 13 through 18.
People, are there any peremptory challenges?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge, the People strike
juror number 15, or seat number 15, juror number B-146.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: That's all.
THE COURT: Okay.
How about for the defense?
MR. BLANCHE: We strike juror number 13, B-292.
And juror number 16, B-128. That's it.
THE COURT: That's it?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay.
Seat number 14, B-89, becomes juror number four.
Seat number 17, juror B-74, becomes juror number five.

And seat number 18, juror B-297, becomes juror number six.

Before we bring them in, I want to let you know that we are trying to sort out different things at the same time as far as jury selection. We had a panel waiting all day, as you know we will not meet tomorrow and we have a
fresh panel coming in Thursday. The problem is that if we wait for that panel on Thursday, we will not start until about 11:00 again by the time that everything gets sorted out. So what I am trying to work out is to have this panel that is here get sworn in this afternoon and have them come back Thursday at 9:30 so we can shave off a couple of hours.

I am taking my lead from the sergeant, and by the way, the officers, everyone is just really doing an amazing job juggling and coordinating with the Secret Service, and everybody else is doing an amazing job. I am taking my lead from them when we can take certain jurors from over here and when we have to bring them here, just letting you know.

Right now $I$ will ask these jurors to come back Monday at 9:30, with the caveat that could change depending on how long it takes and depending on who else we select on this jury, if there is anyone that needs the day off for Passover, that could possibly change.

Any thoughts about that?
MR. STEINGLASS: I think that sounds fine.
MR. BLANCHE: No objection.
THE COURT: All right, so let's bring in the six jurors that have been selected -- actually, they should all sit in the audience, they should all sit in the audience and we will call the ones that have been selected.
(Whereupon, the panel of prospective jurors

```
entered the courtroom)
```

THE COURT: Jurors, first thank you very much for your patience, I know that took a lot longer than we expected. The clerk of the court will call out a few ballot numbers. If your name is called, please come up with your belongings, the court officer will show you where to sit. Your seat may be different now than it was before, this will be your permanent seat for the duration of the trial.

So please listen for your number.
COURT CLERK: Seat number one will be B-400.
Juror number two is B-280.
Juror number three is B-381.
Juror number four is B-89.
Juror number five is B-374.
And juror number six is $B-297$.
THE COURT: If you are one of the six jurors who have not yet had the opportunity to sit in the jury box, please remain in the seat.

If you are one of the jurors who was in the jury box and your name was not called, you can step out and please follow the instructions of the court officers.

COURT CLERK: Are the remaining jurors
satisfactory to the People?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, they are.
COURT CLERK: Defense?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, Your Honor.
COURT CLERK: Will the unsworn jurors please rise and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will try the case of the People of the State of New York against Donald Trump in a fair impartial manner and to the best of your ability render a true verdict according to the law and evidence, do you swear or affirm?

JURORS: Yes.

COURT CLERK: Thank you, you may be seated.
THE COURT: Jurors, as you can see you are the first six jurors selected for this trial. We need to select six more jurors to complete the 12 , then we are also going to select some alternate jurors, right now $I$ am thinking perhaps about six. We don't know exactly how long that will take, but for the time being I will ask you to please come back for opening statements or first my instructions then opening statements on Monday at 9:30. If there is any change, if we are delayed or if things run any longer than we anticipate, you will hear from us and we will let you know so you don't have to come Monday morning unnecessarily.

So you are going to go in the back with the court officer and clerk, we will give you our contact information, we will take your contact information. Again, if you are going to be delayed for any reason, please give us a call to

```
let us know so that we can let everybody else know and we
can minimize everyone else's inconvenience.
    As you have seen already, it takes a little while
to get in the building. So in order for us to start at
9:30, you need to arrive downstairs at nine at the latest,
probably earlier than that.
    You heard me give you some instructions before, I
will give them to you again. And I apologize now, because
you are going to hear these instructions many many times
during the course of the trial. I am required by law to
read them to you, so please bear with me.
    I ask you to please not converse either among
yourselves or with anyone else about anything related to the
case. You may tell the people with whom you live and your
employer that you are a juror, and give them information
about when you will be required to be in court. But you may
not talk with them or anyone else about anything related to
the case.
    Do not at any time during the trial request,
accept, agree to accept or discuss with any person the
receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefit in return
for supplying any information concerning the trial.
    You must promptly report directly to me any
incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any
person improperly to influence you or any member of the
```

jury.

```
Do not visit or view any of the locations discussed in the testimony.
Do not use Google Earth or any other program or device to search for any other location.
Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or
``` discussions of the case reported by newspapers, television, radio, internet or any other news media.

And do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law related to the case, whether by discussion with others, by research in a library or on the internet or by any other means or source.

Again, in this age of instant electronic communication and research, I emphasize that in addition to not conversing face to face with anyone about the case, you must not communicate with anyone about the case by any other means, including by telephone, text messages, E-mails, chat room, blogs and social websites.

These rules are designed to help guarantee a fair and orderly trial and our law accordingly does set forth serious consequences if the rules are not followed. I trust that you will follow these rules.

One other instruction, again, if you happen to see me or the attorneys or anybody else that you recognize out in the hallways, please do not be offended if we don't greet
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you or talk to you, we are just trying to comply with our
ethical obligations and avoid even the appearance of
impropriety.
Again, for the time being I will see you Monday at
9:30. If there is any changes, we will let you know.
Please follow the instructions of the court
officers.
(Whereupon, the chosen jurors exit the courtroom)
THE COURT: Addressing the six jurors in the
audience, we are not done with you, we will continue with
jury selection. But I am going to ask you to follow the
officer's instructions in a minute to step out. The reason
we are having you do that is I am bringing in another panel
of 96 jurors. I will swear them in so they can leave for
the day and I will pick it up again on Thursday, but we want
to finish up with you today. We will probably work beyond
4:30. If anyone has a hardship with that, please raise your

```
hand.
    Okay, I see no hands.
    Thank you.
    (Whereupon, the panel of prospective jurors left
the courtroom)
    THE COURT: Counsel, please approach for a minute.
    (Whereupon, a bench conference was held on the
record)

THE COURT: So when we swear in the panel and excuse them until Thursday morning at 9:30, obviously they will know what case they are on.

So I am going to give them the admonitions that I just gave this other group, if that is satisfactory to everyone.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, definitely.
THE COURT: And direct them not to speak to anyone and everything else.

MR. STEINGLASS: That works for us.
(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Vikki Benkel was relieved by Senior Court Reporter Susan Pearce-Bates)
(Continued from the previous page.)
THE COURT: While we wait for the panel, I want to ask the defense team, can you confirm all this media that you are accessing, this is all public media, right? MR. BLANCHE: Very much in the affirmative. THE COURT: Thank you.
(Short recess is taken.)
LIEUTENANT: Panel entering.
COURT OFFICER: This way, please. This way. THE CLERK: Can all the prospective jurors please stand and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will
truthfully answer all questions put to you relative to your qualifications to serve as jurors in the case of the People of the State of New York against Donald J. Trump, do you swear or affirm?
(Whereupon, the prospective jurors were duly sworn.)
(In open court, jurors present.)
THE CLERK: You may be seated. Thank you.
THE COURT: Good afternoon jurors. Welcome to New York County Supreme Court, Part 59. My name is Juan Merchan and I will be the Judge presiding over this matter.

Before going any further, \(I\) just want to
apologize to all of you. I know that you have been sitting around all day waiting for something to happen and I want you to know that that wasn't lost on us. We were very much aware of your presence and we are doing everything possible to make sure that your time is not wasted.

I asked that you be brought in now and that we swear you in now, so that when you come back on Thursday you will not have to sit around.

I am going to excuse you in a minute, but when you come back on Thursday morning, we will be able to get started a right away. As of this moment you are now connected to Part 59.

Because I want to get started at 9:30, I will ask that you please arrive at the building around 8:30, 8:45 the latest. As you know, you have to go through the magnetometers and other security checks and I would like to get started on time.

Before I do excuse you, I am required by law to read admonitions, which you will hear mentioned numerous times during the course of the trial.

I ask you please do not discuss this case either among yourselves or with anyone else.

Do not discuss anything related to the case.
You may tell the people with whom you live and your employer that you are a juror and give them
information about when you are required to be in court, but
you may not talk with them or anyone else about anything
related to the case.

Do not at any time during the trial request, accept, agree to accept or discuss with any person the receipt or acceptance of any payment or benefits in return for supplying any information concerning the trial.

You must promptly report directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person to improperly influence you or any members of the jury.

You are directed to not visit any of the locations discussed, or associated with the case.

You must not use the internet maps, Google Earth or any other program or device to search for and view any of the locations associated with this case.

Do not read, view or listen to any accounts or discussions of this case reported by newspapers, television, radio, the internet or any other news media.

Do not attempt to research any fact, issue or law related to the case whether by discussion with others, by research in a library or on the internet or by any other source.

I want to emphasize that in addition to not talking face-to-face with anyone about the case, you must
not communicate with anyone about the case by any other means, including by telephone, text messages, emails, chat rooms, blogs, social web sites, such as Facebook or X.

These rules are designed to help guarantee a fair trial and our law accordingly sets forth serious consequences if the rules are not followed. I trust that you will follow all of these rules.

The last thing I want to mention, if you happen to see me or any of the attorneys or any of the other people that you see here today out in the hallway, if we don't greet you or acknowledge you, please do not be offended. We are prohibited from engaging during the course of the trial and in an excess of caution we may not even greet you.

I hope you understand that we are just trying to comply with our ethical obligations.

MR. BLANCHE: May we approach?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Discussion is held at side-bar, on the record.)

MR. BLANCHE: I wonder if the court is willing to do the initial dismissal for discord now, so that on Thursday morning when we come back we will -- the only folks returning --

THE COURT: The problem is that when we did that
the first time, they had heard something about the case. I haven't spoken to them. They haven't heard anything.

MR. BLANCHE: Fair enough. Understood.
(Discussion at side-bar concluded, and the
following occurred in open court.)
THE COURT: All right. Jurors, thank you so much for your time. I look forward to seeing you Thursday.

Please follow the instructions of the court officers.
(Prospective jurors are excused.)
THE COURT: All right. Before we bring the other six jurors back, we are going to take a very short ten-minute recess.

Just one thing, when we had spoken about twenty minutes for the second panel, that's when we envisioned having 18 jurors in the box. We are only going to have six jurors in the box. Don't take more than 15 minutes each.

I will see you in ten minutes.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: All right. We are back on the record. We are going to bring in the six remaining jurors and we will get started.

LIEUTENANT: Jurors entering.
(Whereupon, the prospective jurors entered the courtroom.)
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THE COURT: Okay, jurors. The Clerk of the Court is going to call out the ballot numbers. When your number is called, please come up.

THE CLERK: Seat number one, B262.
Seat number two, B270.
Seat number three, B352.
Seat number four, B269.
Seat number five, B364.
And seat number six, B344.
THE COURT: All right, jurors. You have seen how we do this. You have been watching for a while.

You have all been handed a questionnaire. We just ask you to please answer the questions aloud and those of you who are not going, if you want to look at the questionnaire just to familiarize yourselves with the questions so you are ready to answer the questions when it is your turn.

Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
After listening to all of this for the past day-and-a-half, I am a medical director and a full-time doctor, that does surgery and sees patients most days of the week. I am now getting concerned about being able to fulfill that and work and take care of my patients and be present.
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I do feel I could be impartial but I am concerned about my clients and patients.

THE COURT: Only you can tell us whether you would be able to be here and be present. We can't make that decision for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think \(I\) can at this point.

THE COURT: Any objections? We are going to excuse you.

MR. BLANCHE: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. We will continue with you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Harlem. I have lived in Harlem for five years.

I am not a native New Yorker. I am originally from Connecticut.

I am a high school history teacher.
I have been doing that for six years.
I am not retired.
My current employer is the Spence School.
My employer is about 300 people.
I am not self-employed. My prior employer was Columbia university Teachers College.

I have a master's degree in private school
```

education.

```

I am not married. I have never been married. I do not have any children.

Six is not applicable.
In my spare time I like to spend time with my dog.

Hobbies and interests, I really like to read.
I do not participate in any organizations or advocacy groups. I have never served on a jury.

Ten, the New York Times, Huffington Post, CNN, MSNBC, Google, Washington Post, Google I said. Pardon, I said Google.

I don't really listen to podcasts. If I do, it's Stuff you Missed in History Class. I don't listen to talk radio.

Thirteen is no.
Fourteen is no.
Fifteen is no.
Sixteen is no.
Seventeen, yes. My God mother is the attorney in charge at Legal Aid. And my roommate is an Assistant District Attorney in the Bronx.

Eighteen is, I guess the same as seventeen. This would not impact me from being fair or impartial.

Nineteen is no.

Twenty is no.
Twenty-one is no. Twenty-one \(B\) is no.
Twenty-two is no.
Twenty-three is no.
Twenty-four is no.
Twenty-five is no.
THE COURT: I am sorry, just going back to
twenty-four, if we had to work past 4:30 on a particular day, would you be unable to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am sorry. I misread that. That would be, yes.

Twenty-six is yes. I can give that assurance.
Twenty-seven, \(I\) can give that assurance.
Twenty-eight is no.
Twenty-nine is no. B is no. C is no. D is no.
E is no. \(F\) is no. \(G\) is no. \(H\) is no, not to my knowledge.
Thirty is no.
Thirty-one is no.
Thirty-two is no.
Thirty-three, I can give that assurance.
Thirty-four is, yes.
THE COURT: Do you have strong opinions that would interfere with your ability to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As I am sitting here reflecting deeply, \(I\) do have concerns. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objections?
We will excuse you. Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Juror is excused.)
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Before I start, I want to mention that next Friday I need to be out of the court by 12 or 12:30 to catch a flight at JFK. That's my restriction.

THE COURT: That would be Friday the 26th?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
THE COURT: When would you be back?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sunday.
THE COURT: That's fine. We can work that out.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. I live on the upper east side. I have lived on the upper east side since 2004.

I am a native of New York State, not New York
City. I have been living in New York City since 2000 .
I work in the real estate development industry and I have been doing that since 2010.

My current employer is TF Cornerstone. The company is over 450 people.

C is no.
Three D, my prior employer was a BT Alex Brown or Alex Brown.

1
2

3

I have an MBA and a bachelor in science.
I am married and I have two children.
My wife doesn't work. She takes care of the kids and home. I don't have any adult children. They are sixteen and thirteen.

Seven A, in my spare time I play tennis a lot, occasionally golf.

This -- that applies to 7B also.
Eight A, I belong to a Long Island City Partnership, which is a business advocacy group and ReadMe.

I have never served on a jury before.
Ten, Wall Street Journal, occasionally CNN and some other cable news networks.

Podcast number 11, What's News. I don't listen to talk radio.

Thirteen, no.
Fourteen, no -- wait. Yeah, fourteen, no.
Fifteen, yes. My stepfather-in-law was involved in government in New Jersey.

Sixteen, yes. I, you know, as part of my business, tangentally through being in the finance area, but previous to being in the real estate development business, I was in investment banking, private equity which is a finance field. And I know friends also in the world of finance.

Seventeen, no.
Eighteen A, no.
So, nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
Twenty-one A, no. B, no.
Twenty two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes. I could work later than 4:30.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes, \(I\) can give you the assurance
that \(I\) will be fair and impartial.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
Twenty-nine \(A\), no. Twenty-nine \(B\), no. C, no.
D, no. But in full disclosure, with respect to socially, at some point, and I don't use Twitter, but when \(I\) was learning Twitter \(I\) followed the President, but don't use Twitter and that was just as \(I\) was just learning about it.

E, no. F, no. G, no. H, no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, no.
Thirty-five, no.

Thirty-six, yes, The Art of the Deal a long time ago.

Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
And forty-two, no. Forty-two, there is nothing that would bias me. I think that's what it is asking.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wanted to see what the questions were to see if it addressed what \(I\) just wanted to say in full disclosure, for whatever it is worth to either side.

So I live on the upper east side and I am in the real estate business as \(I\) said. So by the nature of both of those things there are people that \(I\) know that know the President. It wouldn't in any way influence my thinking or how I feel about anything, but \(I\) just wanted to state that for the record. That that's out there. That it's not connections that \(I\) have to the President in any way.

I wanted to be clear that there are either people I know who know people or people I know who know people and that's just for the record.
(Continued on the next page.)

THE COURT: Thank you.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
Number 1, I live on the Upper East Side.
I've lived there about 12 years.
I'm not a native New Yorker. I'm originally from
North Carolina.
I'm an attorney. I'm a civil litigator.
THE COURT: Sir, if you could, please speak into the mic.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm an attorney. I'm a civil litigator.

My employer is Hunt Andrews Kurth. I think there are about 1,800 people who work there.

I'm not self-employed.
I previously worked for Gibson Dunn \& Crutcher.
My educational background is I have a J.D.
I'm married.
I have two children.
My wife is in risk management at a bank.
My children are not adults.
In my spare time, I spend time outdoors and spend
time with my kids.
Number 8, no.
Number 9, I never served on a jury.

Number 10, New York Times, Wall Street Journal, New York Post, Washington Post.

Podcasts, I listen to SmartLess and Car Talk.
Talk radio, WNYC.
Number 13 is a no.
Number 14, I have a friend who worked for the Department of Justice, who graduated from law school.

Number 15, beyond the answer to 14, no.
Sixteen, I have many friends that work in finance including my wife.

Seventeen, \(I\) obviously have training in the legal
field. I have many friends and relatives who practice law as well.

Eighteen is no.
Nineteen is no.
Twenty, no.
21(A), no.
21(B), no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, it would not be a problem.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no. 29(A), no. 29(B), no.

C, no.
D, no.
E, no.
F, no.
G, no.
H, no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, no.
Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, no.
Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
Born and raised in Manhattan, Upper West Side, my
whole life.
Native New Yorker.
I'm retired law enforcement in New York City.
THE COURT: Is that with the N.Y.P.D.?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a civilian police photographer for the Chief of Detectives Office for three-and-a-half. Then, I did 16-and-a-half in the New York City Department of Corrections. I'm a retired Corrections officer. I was a photographer there also. I worked in the courts, not in the courts, but behind the courts. I did the paperwork.

THE COURT: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My current employer, I work for two security firms, companies. One has approximately a thousand guys between New York and Texas. The other one, I really don't know the number. So, I imagine it fluctuates.

I own a business. It's a small business. I shoot video and I buy airtime. That's what I do, on top of everything else.

Prior employer, I think I did that one.
I have a B.A. in Communications from
Fordham University. I graduated.
I'm not married.
Never been married.
I have two children, two girls.

I'm not living with anyone.
I have two adult children. One, I don't talk to. The other one is in the medical field.

What do I like to do? The four C's I call them:
Cameras, since I was four. I know a lot about them. I read about them.

Computers, since DOS. I'm pretty good on Mac and P.C.

Cop work. It's a lot of fun. That's why I still do it. I can't help it. I like the guys and the whole thing.

Charity. I like giving.
Hobbies, pretty much the four C's--cameras, computers, cop work, and charity.

I don't know if you call it an organization, but I belong to a political party, democratic, and I was on the board for a while. I kind of walked off on it because I got a job and it would have been a conflict. That has nothing to do with anything. It's just what \(I\) do. I was asked to be on the board and I did it for a while.

I have served on a jury before.
THE COURT: Was that criminal or civil?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Both.
THE COURT: Did you reach verdicts?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was an alternate in a
criminal and, if \(I\) can remember them all, \(I\) was in one where it was decided out of court.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think it was Merv Griffin and Donald Trump. I think that was the case.

THE COURT: Donald Trump was one of the parties? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. I'm not a hundred percent sure, but, if I remember--it was a long time ago--it settled. So, we just sat in the box and we were out of there.

THE COURT: So, you were never actually a sworn juror in that case? You never deliberated?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We didn't do anything. They put it in front of us and we went and walked out the room. They kind of settled whatever it was.

THE COURT: Do you remember which court that was in?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 111.
THE COURT: 111 Centre?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
I think I'm down to 10 now.
I do Google and I do Facebook.
Textbooks, pretty much. I don't do the news.
No podcasts.
No talk radio.

I have a lot of my friends that have committed crimes. That's the best I could tell you. I hold nothing against them and they hold nothing against me. These are guys that I grew up with. They're in my neighborhood. They've done time. We're friends.

THE COURT: Would anything about any of that affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Okay. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a little nervous here. I'm not used to being in the spotlight. THE COURT: Take your time. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Department of Corrections for 14.

My sister worked for the Post Office on 15. No one's an accountant, 16. No legal field or training. I love law enforcement. I just like it. I've had close friends that committed crimes--drunk driving and things like that. I really don't get into their business, but I know. I park my car in the projects' parking lot. I do not live in the projects, but I can park there. It costs me \(\$ 2,233\) to park there a year. So, in coming home and going to the car, I see the guys that I grew up with in the neighborhood. So, we have
```

conversations. It's not my thing, but it is my thing.
THE COURT: Sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 21(A), no.
21(B), no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
I have no problems staying later. That's 24.
I don't practice any religion or church.
I am fair and impartial.
No stereotypes. I treat people like they are. I
love people. I like to help them.
No friends or anyone that has worked for
Donald Trump. That's 28.
29(A), no.
29(B), no.
29(C), no.
29(D), no.
29(E), no.
29(F), no.
29(G), no.
29(H), no.
I do not follow any of those organizations or
whatever they are.
I have no opinion.
Thirty-two, no, no opinion.

```

Yes, I can make a decision based on what I'm presented with and that alone.

I have no opinion for 34. A person on trial is just a person on trial. It doesn't matter.

No books. That's 35 .
Thirty-six, no.
That's a tricky question, 37. I remember a time when a candidate was given a certain amount of money to run. I'm old-school. I'm 71. So, I kind of miss those days, but those days are over. So, I don't really have an opinion on it, but \(I\) remember.

I've already spoken on 38 , only what's presented.
I will not discuss anything about the case.
I will follow the judge's definitions and instructions.

I'm not used to being on stage. I'm nervous.
I'm trying to read and I'm like, "Oh, man." I feel like I'm on the hot seat here.

THE COURT: You're almost done.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
Forty-one, no.
Forty-two is not to testify, it's fine, no. I judge him as \(I\) would judge myself.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
Good afternoon.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
Your Honor, as much as \(I\) would love to serve for New York and one of our great Presidents, I could not give up my job for six-plus weeks, which means I would be working \(80-\mathrm{pl}\) us hours a week. I don't think that I could serve with that many hours of work.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MS. HOFFINGER: No objection.
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: You're excused, sir.
(At this time, the above-mentioned
```

Prospective Juror was excused)

```

THE COURT: Jurors, as you saw earlier, the attorneys now have an opportunity to address you in the jury box.

The law requires that the prosecution addresses you first.

Please remember that whatever the lawyers say at any time is not evidence. Nothing the lawyers say to you now is evidence.

As with all stages of the criminal trial, there are rules that the lawyers must follow. If one lawyer believes that another lawyer is not following one of those rules, that lawyer will object. That objection creates a question of law for me to decide.

The objection will be one word and one word only, "Objection." If necessary, the attorney will provide the legal basis of the objection such as, "Hearsay."

If \(I\) sustain an objection to a question or a comment of a lawyer, that question or comment will be stricken from the record and you must disregard it as if it were never said. If I overrule an objection, the question or comment stands.

Of course, whether I sustain or overrule an objection, my ruling indicates only that the question or comment is or is not in accord with one of the rules of law that the lawyers should follow during this stage of the proceedings. The ruling expresses no opinion about the facts of the case or of whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

Remember, you, the jury--and you alone--judge the facts and reach a verdict of guilty or not guilty.

People?
MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you, your Honor.
Almost good evening.
My name is Susan Hoffinger. I'm an
Assistant District Attorney here in Manhattan. Along with my colleagues, Joshua Steinglass, Matthew Colangelo, Becky Mangold, Christopher Conroy, and Katherine Ellis, we represent the People of the State of New York.

I want to thank you for being here and answering our questions. I'm going to ask you to be as open and as candid as possible. I know you were a little nervous about answering questions. It's important for us. We want to pick a fair jury for both sides--for the defense and for the prosecution. So, we appreciate you being as candid as you can be--no wrong answers--but we thank you. Thank you for answering our questions.

Just to start, is there anything you've heard so far either about the case or from my colleague's questions or from the defense's questions that causes you any concern at all in this case about your ability to be a fair and impartial juror?
(NO RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MS. HOFFINGER: Nothing at all.
I would like to just ask a few follow-ups:
B-352--we're going on numbers--I know that you said you're in the real estate industry. Obviously, so has the defendant been for many many years. You said that you know a lot of people who know him.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know people. I know a lot of people who know people. It's sort of an industry. MS. HOFFINGER: Do you know anybody directly who knows the defendant?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I know people

```
directly.
MS. HOFFINGER: Okay.
Can you tell us a little bit about what you talk to them about about Mr. Trump.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I've not talked to them at all about any of these types of proceedings whatsoever. I try not to talk about politics at all in business or with friends. Occasionally, it comes up. So, sometimes, it's about when he was in office. Sometimes, it's about politics, but not a lot, not about this case, and not about the criminal prosecutions.

Does that answer your question?
MS. HOFFINGER: It does.
Thank you.
Is there anything about your work in the real estate -- Well, let me take that back.

You've been in the real estate industry for quite a few years?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. HOFFINGER: So has Mr. Trump. Do you have any views in terms of his work or his reputation in the real estate industry?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, peripherally or superficially, I would say. On a high level, I've seen the work, but we've never done business together. My company
has never done business with his, to my knowledge, and it does not overlap in any respect. I've seen the work. I'm aware of it. I'm an admirer from afar of some of the work, but that's my opinion. I don't have an opinion on whether he's successful or not or how he conducts himself or anything like that. That's not anything I've been thinking about.

MS. HOFFINGER: Appreciate that.
You also said that you read The Art of the Deal some years ago?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. HOFFINGER: What did you think of it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I felt it was entertaining.
MS. HOFFINGER: You also mentioned that, at one point a while back, you followed him on Twitter?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. At one point, I was trying to figure out Twitter. I haven't looked at it. I assume there's maybe half a dozen things that \(I\) clicked on Twitter when \(I\) was figuring it out. His was one of them. I wasn't getting tweets and following tweets or things like that.

MS. HOFFINGER: Understood.
Do you have any views about his use of Twitter or things that he's posted?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What I've seen of what he's
posted has been on television, not what I've seen hitting my feed because I never look at the feed. I don't have an opinion about his tweets or anyone's tweets generally. MS. HOFFINGER: Nothing on there that was explored?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, because I don't use Twitter. I have an opinion about Twitter about whether or not to use it, but I don't have an opinion about what people put on there any differently than I would have on any other source of information.

MS. HOFFINGER: Do you think there's anything about you being in the same field with Mr. Trump that would cause you to be less than fair to one or --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, but I understand the perception. That's why I said it at the outset. There's nothing here--not where I live, not the people I know that know him or that kind of thing, and not my involvement in the real estate industry--that would, in any way, bias me or not allow me to be impartial.

MS. HOFFINGER: I appreciate that. Thank you. I hope you don't mind me asking those questions. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. That's fine. I expect you to.

MS. HOFFINGER: 269, just a question:
I know you're a lawyer. Do you think that you
would be able to put aside whatever you know as a lawyer in whatever particular field of law we're talking about? This case involves federal election campaign laws. That's part of the charge here. I think you probably heard the judge's summary earlier. Do you have any particular views on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I'm a civil litigator, which means \(I\) know virtually nothing about criminal law. I don't profess to know about it. I don't know anything about election or finance law either. I do financial services and civil litigation, things like that. So, I don't know it, but, to the degree that \(I\) did, \(I\) think \(I\) could put it aside.

MS. HOFFINGER: To the extent that there's any other crossover or anything that you hear that's different from what you dealt with as an experienced lawyer, would you be able to put that aside and follow the judge's instructions?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would certainly follow the judge's instructions, yes.

MS. HOFFINGER: I appreciate that.
364 --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-oh.
MS. HOFFINGER: Don't worry. I'll give you the easy ones.

You mentioned, sir, that you have some friends
who have been convicted of crimes in the past?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, my whole life. MS. HOFFINGER: We all do. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's nothing new. MS. HOFFINGER: You will learn in this case that one of the witnesses named Michael Cohen, who is Mr. Trump's former lawyer, pled guilty back in 2018 to a number of federal crimes including campaign finance violations and, actually, lying to Congress back in 2017 and back in 2018. Anything about the fact that he pled guilty to crimes, anything about that that would prevent you from giving him a fair and open listen to what he has to say and not prejudge him? How do you feel about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I wouldn't prejudge him, but I would definitely have to listen to him based on what he says.

MS. HOFFINGER: Sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In my world -- I'm kind of stuck here. Well, what I can say is that, if you plea bargain or plea deal, it could be one of two things--you're looking out for yourself or you're telling the truth. So, in order to know that, I would have to hear what he's talking about and read his demeanor and if he's telling the truth.

MS. HOFFINGER: That's exactly what we're looking
for. I appreciate that.
So, the fact that he pled guilty years ago doesn't mean that you close your ears to what he has to say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I was a Correction officer in New York City. So, I've heard it all. I could really give a good listen and be honest and fair.

MS. HOFFINGER: The judge will give you some factors to use to determine whether a witness is being truthful and credible--what the person seems like when they're testifying, whether their testimony is corroborated by other testimony in the case or by documents. Those are just some of the things that you can take into consideration when determining whether someone is being truthful. Do you think you could do that without prejudging him what happened in the past?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. Sure. I can definitely listen.

MS. HOFFINGER: You'll give him a fair listen and you won't prejudge his testimony?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can I ask you, 269 -- I really don't mean to say numbers when referencing people. I apologize. Can I ask you the same question with a little bit of a different spin:

You'll hear that Mr. Cohen, for a fairly long period of time, denied a lot of the facts to which he will admit here and he pled guilty to. Will that have an effect on you in terms of how you view his testimony and his credibility?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As I understand it, if that's presented during the course of the trial, it's something that I should consider and weigh the voracity of his testimony, if that answers your question.

MS. HOFFINGER: So, you will take it into consideration, which you should, but my question is will that sort of be the end of your determination of his credibility or will you give him a fair listen, compare his testimony against the evidence in the case--for example, documents or other people's testimony? Will you give that a fair shot and not prejudge him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can I ask you as well, sir, 352?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same question?
MS. HOFFINGER: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same answer. I'll consider what he has said and give a fair listen.

MS. HOFFINGER: Now, there may be others in the case who also, at various times in the past, denied certain things. Will you give them a fair listen and give them a
chance to explain why they denied them and when before you judge their testimony? Can you all do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. HOFFINGER: So, the judge has already told you that this case is about whether the defendant broke the law in this case, whether he falsified business records in order to cover up an agreement with others unlawfully to influence the 2016 presidential election. He's charged with 34 counts of Falsifying Business Records in the First Degree. It is our burden to prove--our burden to prove--every element of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. That's what the judge told you. We accept that burden. If we accomplish that, if the evidence proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find him guilty. If the evidence does not prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find him not guilty. Does anyone feel that, somehow, because of his position--because he is a former President and because he is running again as a candidate for presidency--we should have a higher burden than that, a higher standard than what the law requires, which is beyond a reasonable doubt?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. HOFFINGER: Can I ask you about that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. No.
MS. HOFFINGER: Any chance that, because of his position, you will feel that we should somehow have to prove more than what the law requires?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: NO.
MS. HOFFINGER: Sir, can I ask you the same question.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same answer.
MS. HOFFINGER: Sir, I'm going to ask you the same.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same answer, no.
MS. HOFFINGER: Let me ask you a question:
If we carry our burden and we prove that
Mr. Trump is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, what would your verdict be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Guilty.
MS. HOFFINGER: If we do not carry that burden, similarly, you'll find him not guilty; is that right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MS. HOFFINGER: May I ask you as well:
If we prove that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, what will your verdict be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Guilty.
MS. HOFFINGER: Similarly, if we do not prove that, it will be not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MS. HOFFINGER: May I ask you as well, sir. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same answer, guilty and not guilty.

MS. HOFFINGER: So, if we prove this case beyond a reasonable doubt, what will your verdict be?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Guilty.
MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you.
Now, one of the things I mentioned--and I imagine we wouldn't have any problem with this--is that, in addition to witness testimony, there are going to be quite a few documents in this case. The documents are important. There's an old saying: The documents don't lie. They tell it like it is. Anybody have an issue with the fact that we're going to ask you, if you're going to serve as a juror, to spend a lot of time on the documents--spreadsheets, e-mails, texts?
(NO RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MS. HOFFINGER: Those are important because they corroborate what the witnesses have to say. Anybody feel like they just don't really feel like sitting here? This is what you do for a living, I know. Sir, on the end, any sense that you just don't want to spend your time, in addition to testimony, looking through a lot of documents? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My nature is, from a kid, I
read the encyclopedia. I like reading textbooks and how-to's--how to do this, how to do that. I don't really spend my time on the internet doing a whole bunch of stuff. So, I can pick up a document, go through it, take the challenge, and enjoy it. The harder it is, the more I like working on it.

MS. HOFFINGER: You understand that documents are important because they, in many cases, tell the story that corroborates what a witness has to say?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Ms. Hoffinger, are you just about done?

MS. HOFFINGER: I'm done.
Thank you very much, all of you. THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Hoffinger. MR. BLANCHE: Hi, guys. Sorry I'm the last person to talk to you after a long day, but I appreciate it.

So, you heard a couple times now that my name is Todd Blanche. You all know President Trump and our legal team. You heard its name a few times.

I want to ask the questions a little bit differently about something more granular outside of the case.

We'll start with you, sir, 352:

You've talked a lot about how you're in real estate, how you have friends of friends who maybe know President Trump, and you've talked to them. Do you have a favorable or an unfavorable opinion about President Trump? I'm not talking about this case; right? You haven't heard any evidence. I'm talking about what you bring into this courtroom.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think that's a pretty loaded question.

There's obviously a lot of history there. I think, to answer it, I would say there are things that I disagree with and there are things that I think were done well during his presidency. So, I think, on balance, I can see there might be things on both sides. I wouldn't sort of categorize it as favorable or unfavorable, one way or the other, but I think there are things that I would say are favorable and other things that are unfavorable.

MR. BLANCHE: That makes sense.
I wasn't trying to ask a loaded question.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course.
MR. BLANCHE: Most defendants, if you guys are in this seat, you wouldn't have any idea who this person was; right? So, we're in a little bit of a unique situation because everybody knows who President Trump is. What I'm trying to understand is what you bring in. Earlier, one of
the People said the baggage you bring in. I think that's a good way to describe it. That's what I'm asking about. So, for example, you read the New York Times or the news. Are you familiar with other cases with which President Trump has been charged in recently?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, just to correct, I didn't say I read the New York Times. I read the Wall Street Journal, for whatever that's worth.

MR. BLANCHE: You are right. You did not say the New York Times.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
I am aware of other cases. Is that your question?

MR. BLANCHE: Aware of it, but talk more. What comes to your mind when I ask that question? When you come into this room knowing everything, whatever it is that you know about President Trump and his other cases, does that put you in a position where there is something you want to tell us about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There is nothing I want to tell you other than that I am aware that there are other cases. It's been out there. There's a lot of news that's happened over the course of the last year or so. I'm aware that that's been out there, just for what it's worth. Obviously, it's worth a lot, but it doesn't influence how I
approach the trial here.
MR. BLANCHE: That makes sense.
Can you pass the microphone to Mr. 269.
The same question to you:
First, just a little bit more about your favorable or unfavorable opinion, if you have one, about President Trump and his character and who he is.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have political views as to the Trump Presidency. Similarly, I think there were policies that \(I\) agreed with and policies that I didn't agree with. I don't know the man. I don't have any particular opinions about him personally. I'm not sure if that answers your question.

MR. BLANCHE: That's definitely helpful.
The same question about you don't know the man, but he's in the news a lot and he's in the news that you read every day or most days. So, from what you read, understanding you don't know him personally, how does that form what view you have of him or opinion you have of him or his character?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Again, to answer your question about the opinions on his character, I'm not sure that I have any. I certainly follow the news. I'm certainly aware that there are other lawsuits out there and, again, political views. I'm happy to answer that
question, but I'm not sure \(I\) really know anything about his character.

MR. BLANCHE: The People asked you questions about the fact that you're an attorney and there will be, potentially, a former attorney testifying who's been disbarred. There will certainly be legal documents that are shown to the jury. Do you think that, with your background, which is an experienced one--even if it's civil--you will be able to follow the rules that Judge Merchan says and look at the documents and hear the evidence independent of what you maybe bring in from the outside as it relates to that issue?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
Look, I am a litigator. I take that responsibility seriously and I take following the judge's instructions seriously. So, I do believe I will be able to do that.

MR. BLANCHE: That's great.
Thank you.
Mr. 364, same question to you about
President Trump:
A lot of questions and your answers have talked a lot about where you work and where you live. Do you have any particular views about President Trump outside of what you're going to hear in this courtroom--so, what you've
heard over your life even before he was a candidate and President?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. Oh, boy. You said the word "life." I'm a New Yorker. He's a New Yorker.

MR. BLANCHE: You're a New Yorker.
There's no wrong answers and I mean that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's why I'm going to give it to you.

MR. BLANCHE: That's okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Going back to Central Park, I knew some of the kids, like their cousins and whatnot.

MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I also understood that you have the right to purchase an article and put it there. Just like the internet, you could get something 40 years ago that was wrong. Then, they repeat it and repeat it. Then, 40 years later, today, they put it on the internet and it would be true, but it's changed since then.

I really don't watch the news because it's just like too much information that I don't need. I pick up my information basically from other people talking. I get to hear the debate. They'll say this and they'll say that. This one will say this and that one will say that.

I know people that are very rich and very poor, from the penthouse on Park Avenue to very poor. I fed
families.
What I will tell you is that, when I see Mr. Trump, it's kind of comical. Not that he's a comic, but I like the response that he gets from other people. When he walks into a room and he says something, I kind of enjoy watching him do what he do. He terminates them a lot quicker than prior Presidents. So, I respect that authority. Now, at the same time, I realize that I'm here for a case. I'm not here to judge the man like that. I'm hear to listen to evidence and come up with a determination based on what I'm presented.

He's no different than any other President. It depends on how the media covers you. I have a degree in Communications. That's why I kind of back out of it. Just treat him fair.

MR. BLANCHE: Makes sense.
The People talked about this a little bit and I want to talk a little bit about it from the other side, which is the burden of proof.

What you'll hear Judge Merchan say regularly--because it's true--is that President Trump has no burden of proof. You maybe heard me say this earlier, but we could do nothing this entire trial. We could literally do nothing. The burden is on the People the entire time. In society, you expect people to do
something. You expect maybe something happened. The question is whether, understanding that we have no burden and we don't have to do anything--President Trump doesn't have to testify; we don't have to cross-examine witnesses if we don't want to; and the burden, at all times, remains with this table and not with the table over here--it's easy to say that out loud, but think about that. Do you have any reason to think you couldn't abide by that rule and by that principle of our justice system?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Whatever the judge determines is what happens.

As far as evidence is concerned, both sides, I think the jury has a lot to do with that. If they study and they listen well, they could come up with the right decision. It's how it's presented.

This isn't showmanship. This is real life. A man's life is on the line. The country's on the line. This is serious.

MR. BLANCHE: For sure.
How about for you other two?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I understand the burden and I understand he does not have a burden here. The state has the burden.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I agree with that. I understand where the burden lies and that the burden lies
```

on the state.

```

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you. Give me one second, guys.
(Counsel consulting with co-counsel)
(Pause in the proceedings)
MR. BLANCHE: The last question for you:
You talked about Twitter, that you had it for a minute and then didn't have it. How about the other two? Do you guys post things on social media, on Twitter, on Facebook, and things like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I post pictures of my kids so that my father can see them.

MR. BLANCHE: Beyond family?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. BLANCHE: How about you, sir? Do you use any websites or any Facebook?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm a repost king. So, I'll see something that \(I\) thought was interesting and I'll repost it. I do the Google thing and YouTube. I can control what \(I\) watch and I can look at the thumbnails and decide if \(I\) 'm going to watch it or not. MR. BLANCHE: That makes sense.
(Counsel consulting with co-counsel)
(Pause in the proceedings)
MR. BLANCHE: You said that you're a repost king.
I appreciate that. What kinds of things do you repost? Do
you think you've reposted negative things about
President Trump, negative things about administration,
things like that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, no, no.
I got off Facebook for a while. I just came back maybe three months. It was mostly my personal page. I just kind of watch what other people do. I got my friends from junior high school. That's how I got on Facebook. I wanted to find them all. I found them all. Then, I got kind of stuck there.

The things that \(I\) post and the things that I like to post are music, things that are cultural, Afrocentric. My posts is Harlem. I have a television show called "Harlem: Public Access." I been doing that for 25 years. I kind of stopped for a while. I have a show that I do. That's my hobby, things that I like. It's just reposting.

The only controversial thing that I've done is I took a lot of thought to put this up. When you post, everybody is thinking about what's going to happen when you post it; right? That's the reason why you're posting it; right? You're not posting it so you could write things to yourself. You put the stuff up for other people to see. So, there was a thing with Malcolm X. I was kind of conflicted with this one. What he said was right. What
was said was right. What he was saying--I don't know if I should be saying this, but, just to put it out there--is that African-American, Negro, and the "N" word are recent words from the last 300 years, but the black man has been around for years. It's from the Bible and all that stuff; right? I just found it interesting. So, I posted it. It was like, "Oh, man." I was kind of scared to post it, but it meant something.

MR. BLANCHE: Sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was that sense of pride for African-American people, black men, and black women. It was a thing of pride. So, if you view the stuff that \(I\) put up, it's like things for children and old people as myself.

THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, are you just about done?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes. I have one more question, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very quickly.
MR. BLANCHE: Just one more question for the two of you guys. This is the last question. This is it:

Anything that you would want anybody in this room to know that hasn't come out yet about you as it relates to this trial that hasn't already come out?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that \(I\) can think of.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I don't have anything.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, jurors.
I'll ask you to please step outside while the attorneys review their notes.

Please remember the instructions I've given you before:

Do not discuss this case either among yourselves or with anyone else.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors exited the courtroom)
(Pause in the proceedings)
THE COURT: Are you ready?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
THE COURT: The defense is ready.
MR. STEINGLASS: We need a couple minutes, Judge, please.

THE COURT: Sure.
(Pause in the proceedings)
THE COURT: You all set, People?
MS. HOFFINGER: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
Looking at seats 3, 4, and 5, People, are there any challenges for cause?

MS. HOFFINGER: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Defense, for cause?
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