SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK - CRIMINAL TERM - PART: 59

-     -         -             -                 -                     -                         -                             -                                 -                                     -                                         -                                             -                                                 -                                                     -                                                         -                                                             -                                                                 -                                                                     -                                                                         -                                                                             - X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, Indict. No. 71543-2023
-against- CHARGE
DONALD J. TRUMP,
FALSIFYING BUSINESS RECORDS 1ST DEGREE
DEFENDANT.
JURY TRIAL
100 Centre Street
New York, New York 10013
April 18, 2024
B E F ORE:
HONORABLE JUAN M. MERCHAN
JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

A P P E A R A N C E S:
FOR THE PEOPLE:
ALVIN BRAGG, JR., ESQ.
DISTRICT ATTORNEY, NEW YORK COUNTY
One Hogan Place
New York, New York 10013
BY: JOSHUA STEINGLASS, ESQ. MATTHEW COLANGELO, ESQ. SUSAN HOFFINGER, ESQ. CHRISTOPHER CONROY, ESQ. BECKY MANGOLD, ESQ. KATHERINE ELLIS, ESQ.
Assistant District Attorneys
BLANCHE LAW
BY: TODD BLANCHE, ESQ. EMIL BOVE, ESQ. NECHELES LAW, LLP
BY: SUSAN NECHELES, ESQ. GEDALIA M. STERN, ESQ.
Attorneys for the Defendant

THE CLERK: This is the case of the People of the State of New York, against Donald Trump, indictment 71543 of '23. Appearances with the People please.

MR. STEINGLASS: Good morning. For the People, ADA Joshua Steinglass, Susan Hoffinger, Matthew Colangelo, Christopher Conroy, Becky Mangold and Katherine Ellis.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. BLANCHE: Good morning, your Honor.
Todd Blanch on behalf of President Trump who is seated beside me. I am joined at counsel table by Emil Bove, Susan Necheles and Gedalia Stern.

Good morning.
THE COURT: Good morning again.
I think now we are ready to go. There are a couple of preliminary matters we need to take care of.

As you know, we received a call yesterday, from juror number two. I did not speak with juror number two, but, what that juror conveyed was that after sleeping on it overnight she had concerns about her ability to be fair and impartial in this case.

I directed that she be here today at 9:15 so that we could speak to her on the record. I consulted with both parties, you agreed that that was the right thing to do.

I believe she is outside. Please bring her in. (Juror enters the courtroom.)

and unbiased and let the outside influences not affect my decision making in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Thank you. I am sorry that you went through that.

Are there any follow-up questions?
MR. STEINGLASS: No. Are there any objections?
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: You are excused. Thank you.
(Juror is excused.)
THE COURT: So, while we wait for juror number four, there is something I would like to address, really addressing the press, both the press that's in the courtroom here, as well as the press that's in the overflow courtroom.

There is a reason why this is an anonymous jury and why we have taken the measures that we have taken and it kind of defeats the purpose of that when so much information is put out there that it is very, very easy for anyone to identify who the jurors are.

So the press is certainly able and permitted to write about anything that's said on the record, because it's on the record. The press can write about anything that the attorneys and the Court discuss and anything that you observe us do, but I am directing that the press simply apply common sense and refrain from writing about anything
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that has to do, for example, with physical descriptions. That's just not necessary. It serves no purpose.

And by physical descriptions, $I$ just don't mean height, weight and color of hair. I mean physical descriptors.

For example, there was really no need for anyone to mention that one of the jurors had an Irish accent. I just don't see the purpose of how that advanced any interest, whatsoever.

So I am directing that the press refrain from writing about anything that you observe with your eyes and hear with your ears related to the jurors that's not on the record; and if you can't do that, if we can't stick to that, we will have to see what else we need to do to ensure that the jurors remain safe.

We just lost, probably, what probably would have been a very good juror for this case and the first thing that she said was she was afraid and intimidated by the press, all the press, and everything that had happened. So really this is just a matter of common sense and I ask you to please follow that.

Juror number four is not hear yet. I understand that there is an issue that the People would like to take up.

MR. STEINGLASS: Before we get to that, may $I$
make a suggestion?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. STEINGLASS: Perhaps it's worth not eliciting the answers to question three $A$ and $D$ on the questionnaire.

Question three A asks, who is your current employer and question three $D$ asks, who is your prior employer.

It is the most identifying information on the juror questionnaire as far as we can tell and maybe it's appropriate just to direct the jurors when they are answering the questions to not answer those two questions.

THE COURT: I am okay with that. I think it's a great suggestion. It was in there because I believe the parties had requested it.

MS. NECHELES: I understand the concern. We share the concern, in particularly, we have seen that jurors and people that leave the courtroom are surrounded by the press outside and questioned.

There was one person who left who gave multiple interviews. It's a big earn concern. But we asked for a written questionnaire because of that.

THE COURT: It's too late. We are beyond that.
MS. NECHELES: But we can't go forward -- we can't not have the information we need. We can ask the jurors to say it privately or something, but it's the
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government's fault that we don't have a written questionnaire.

We knew this was going to be a problem. They wanted everything to be out there and, you know, being done this way. We can't just say, well, we can't have the information.

That's not fair.
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, you can also order the press, you know, as you just did to not report on the answer's to three A and three B. And granted there is a transcript that there is a record, depriving us of the information because of what just happened, because of what the press is doing, isn't the answer in our view.

THE COURT: All right.
Let's take a minute.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: All right. I agree with the defense, that information is necessary. We all need it, but $I$ also agree that as evidenced by what's happened already, it's become a problem.

So I am going to direct that we are going to continue going through the questionnaire, but those two answers are going to be redacted from the transcript. And those reporters who are here and in the overflow room, if they hear the answers to those questions are directed not
to report those answers.
There is case law that supports that. I have the legal authority to do it.

It's, again, it's information that both sides need to properly select the jury for this case, but it has become a problem.

So, again, the answers to questions, three $A$ and three B will be redacted from all the transcripts and the press is directed not to report on it.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
THE COURT: You're welcome.
I think juror number four is not here yet.
There was another matter you wanted to raise, Mr. Conroy.

MR. CONROY: Thank you very much.
Thank you, Judge, I apologize.
THE COURT: You can have a seat. That's a short microphone for you.

MR. CONROY: Thank you very much.
Judge, I want to hand up to the Court another Order to Show Cause and I am asking the Court to sign that and if the Court should sign it, we will serve it on the defendant and his counsel today. Since you signed the last order that we handed up than Monday, the defendant has violated the order seven more times.

It's ridiculous. It has to stop.
We are not filing a new memo of law. What we are asking you to do Judge is to add these seven violations to the hearing already ordered for Tuesday. We believe our legal arguments are the same.

The posts that violate, one of them I mentioned actually on Monday. It happened on Monday morning at 9:12. We added that to this Order to Show Cause. It posts a link to a New York Post article. There is a picture of Michael Cohen and the following text is in the post.

A serial perjurer will try to prove an old misdemeanor against Trump in an embarrassment for the New York legal system.

That was posted again that same day at 10:26 in the morning. That same day, later that day, on defendant's campaign website he posted the same link and the same text.

The next day on April 16th, the defendant again posted the link to that article with the picture of Michael Cohen at 1:50 in the afternoon and that evening he again posted it on his campaign website.

Last night at 7:09 the defendant published a post on his Truth Social account that contained an article, the article was embedded in the post with, again, with a picture of Michael Cohen and it had the headline, Michael Cohen's guilty plea does not prove Trump committed campaign
finance crimes, and went on to attack Michael Cohen and his credibility.

Finally, and this is the most disturbing post, especially in light of what happened this morning, and in light of the specific direction and order that Your Honor gave the defendant on Tuesday in court related to an outburst he had when the juror was at the rail.

On April 17th, the defendant posted on his Truth Social account the following, they are catching undercover liberal activists trying to -- lying to the judge in order to get on the Trump jury, and that's a quote from a Fox News posting Jessie Brooks (sic).

That was after you ordered counsel to speak to his client because of something that had happened in front of a juror in this courtroom.

These statements all violate your order. We are asking you to sign that Order to Show Cause so that we can address these more fully on Tuesday at a hearing. And while we will ask for financial penalties on Tuesday, we are still considering our options depending on how Tuesday goes as far as what sanctions we will be asking for and we are asking you to hold the defendant in contempt.

THE COURT: Would you like to be heard?
MR. BOVE: Yes, Judge. Thank you.
So we will respond to the papers that were just
filed when we had a chance to review, specifically, what was said.

I think that the comments this morning called to Your Honor's attention a couple of issues that have been challenges with the Gag Order from the outset. And they do not establish that there is any willful violations.

In fact, it brings to light some of the ambiguities in the order.

Mr. Cohen has been attacking President Trump through public statements with respect to his candidacy.

President Trump's responses are political in nature and intended to defend against what Mr. Cohen is saying in connection with the campaign.

Your Honor has said in the April 1st ruling, that the Gag Order did not prohibit President Trump from responding to political attacks. And we submit that's what he is doing in these posts.

In addition, one other point, only recently in connection with the two orders to show cause has the District Attorney taken the position that President Trump reposting statements by others constitutes a violation of the Gag Order.

We dispute that. We are going to brief that in the submission that is due tomorrow. That reposting statements that are already in public by others violates
what Your Honor has set forth.
THE COURT: I look forward to seeing it.
MR. CONROY: Judge, if I may just briefly
respond.
I would just point out that they have an Article 78 Petition pending in the First Department where they can argue the merits of this.

This is a court order. It is not a proposal and you can't violate a court order in order to test whether that order is legitimate.

THE COURT: Mr. Bove, the law is pretty well
settled that even if an order is unlawful, you are still required to follow it.

MR. BOVE: We absolutely respect that, Judge. That's not my point. My point is that in a proceeding seeking contempt sanctions, the government has to establish that both there is not any ambiguity with respect to the posted issue and willfulness. And on those two issues, and under the record that has been established so far which is that there are other instances --

THE COURT: We haven't had the hearing yet.
MR. BOVE: I understand that. I am responding to Mr. Conroy's point.

We understand that we are obligated by the order even though we dispute its merits and are litigating that.
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At the same time, in connection with the contempt proceeding, they have to establish a lack of ambiguity and willfulness. And they are not going to be able to establish neither in the light of what's in the April 1st order and the contents of the posts given the track record that we have.

THE COURT: So after the hearing, I will give you the ruling. After the hearing, I will rule.

MR. BOVE: Could we have -- right now our brief is due 5:00 on Friday with respect to the pending Order to Show Cause that had been signed by Your Honor before this morning.

Can we have some additional time to respond to the new allegations?

THE COURT: I am told there is no new Memorandum of Law filed.

MR. CONROY: Correct.
THE COURT: It is simply and additional incident and it sounds like you have done the research and you are ready to go.

So, no, we will keep the same deadline.
MR. BOVE: Thank you.
THE COURT: I signed the order. I am going to hand it down and we will sort this out at the hearing.

We have 86 jurors ready to come in.
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Because we have not yet been able to address juror number four, I would like to address that before we continue.

Is there any objection to addressing that concern even though the juror is not physically present at the moment?

MR. STEINGLASS: No objection. And for the record, we served counsel and the defendant with the order that Your Honor just signed.

MR. BLANCHE: We have been served.
No objection to addressing it. Obviously, we may reserve our rights to hear from the juror depending on how or the conversation goes.

THE COURT: So yesterday I was notified by Mr. Steinglass, we were all notified by Mr. Steinglass by an email, that the District Attorney's Office as part of their research and investigation, had come across some information from the past that possibly called into question the veracity of some of juror number four's answers.

Based upon that, I did have someone from the staff contact juror number four. He was a directed to be here at 9:15.

Let the record reflect that it is now almost ten to ten. He is still not here.
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So I would ask you to summarize, if you can just summarize, Mr. Steinglass, what it is that you found.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you, Judge.
Although we can't confirm that it involves the juror in question, we did discover an article --

THE COURT: One second.
MR. STEINGLASS: We did discover an article that a juror with the same -- a person with the same name, had been arrested in the 1990 in Westchester for tearing down political advertisements.

And in the course of -- after we discovered that, we were trying to ascertain whether or not that was the juror, we did some additional research and it seems to be that the juror's wife was previously accused of, or involved in, a corruption inquiry and ended up entering into a deferred prosecution agreement in the 1990s, again, with the Manhattan District Attorney's Office.

So, again, $I$ am not saying definitively that this is the juror, or the juror's wife, but question number nineteen asks whether you or anyone close to you has been accused or arrested for a crime. And if it is, in fact, this juror, and/or his wife, that would arguably suggest that the answer to number nineteen was not accurate.

And so, I think the Court should take whatever further inquiry the Court deems appropriate, but $I$ believe

| 1 | we are ethically and legally obligated to bring this |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | information to the Court's attention, so we did. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Did you have any information if the |
| 4 | propaganda favored of one party or the other? |
| 5 | MR. STEINGLASS: I actually believe the |
| 6 | propaganda being ripped down was -- it was propaganda. I |
| 7 | believe it was political posters that was on the right, |
| 8 | political right. |
| 9 | THE COURT: All right. Mr. Blanche. |
| 10 | MR. BLANCHE: We don't have anything to add on |
| 11 | the description of what we hear. We do agree we need to |
| 12 | inquire of the juror about whether it is, in fact him, and, |
| 13 | in fact, I suppose his wife, and then after that inquiry, |
| 14 | figure out what to do. |
| 15 | THE COURT: Again, the Court directed the juror |
| 16 | to appear at 9:15. He is not here yet. I should add that |
| 17 | I see that there is some reluctancy to come in this morning |
| 18 | on the part of the juror. |
| 19 | So, we can wait and we can rule on this later, or |
| 20 | if the two of you consent, we can go ahead and excuse this |
| 21 | juror now. |
| 22 | MR. BLANCHE: One moment. |
| 23 | (Defense counsel confer.) |
| 24 | THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, how would you like to |
| 25 | proceed? |
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MR. BLANCHE: We don't consent to dismissing without hearing from him first.

THE COURT: That is fine.
The next juror that we seat will take seat number two.

We will continue for the time being as though we still have juror number four, okay.

Now that we have 96 jurors, is there any reason we can't bring them in now?

MR. STEINGLASS: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Let's bring the panel in now, please.
Let the record reflect that I am handing counsel copies of the sequence numbers, five copies of each and one copy with the names.

LIEUTENANT: Prospective panel entering.
(Whereupon the prospective panel entered the
courtroom.)
THE COURT: All right. I am informed that this panel has already sworn in. I see that you are indicating that you have.

Good morning, 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.

I want to thank you, again, for coming in this
morning, being prompt, being on time, and I know that's how it was most of Tuesday. Thank you very much.

Jurors, some of you are about to be selected for jurors in a trial in a criminal case and I am about to explain to you what the trial involves and what your role will be and what my role will be.

These introductory remarks will take about 30 minutes.

Before I continue, I want to thank you, again, for coming here.

You are about to participate in a trial by
jurors. A system of trial by jury is one of the cornerstones of our judicial system. Under that system members of the community are asked to determine whether another person accused of committing a crime is found guilty or not guilty of the commission of that crime.

The name of this case is the People of State of New York versus Donald Trump.

The words, People of the State of New York, in the title mean the government, the State of New York.

The fact that this action is brought in the name of the People, or that the evidence is presented by a public official, does not in any way indicate that the public wants a specific verdict.

The People are served by whatever verdict is
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justified by the evidence.
The People, that is the government, is represented by the District Attorney of New York County, Alvin Bragg, and he in turn is represented in this action by Assistant District Attorney's, Joshua Steinglass, Susan Hoffinger, Michael Colangelo, Christopher Conroy, Becky Mangold and Katherine Ellis who are seated to my right. MR. STEINGLASS: Good morning everyone.

THE COURT: The defendant in this case is Donald Trump and he is seated to my right and he will be represented by his attorneys Todd Blanche, Emil Bove, Susan Necheles and Gedalia Stern.

MS. NECHELES: Good morning.
THE COURT: The defendant, Donald Trump, is charged with 34 counts of falsifying business records in the first degree.

The allegations are, in substance, that Donald Trump falsified business records to conceal an agreement with others to unlawfully influence the 2016 presidential election.

Specifically, it is alleged that Donald Trump made or caused false business records to hide the true nature of payments made to Michael Cohen by characterizing them as payments for legal services rendered pursuant to a retainer agreement.

The People allege that, in fact, the payments were intended to reimburse Michael Cohen for money he paid to Stephanie Clifford, who is also known as Stormy Daniels, in the weeks before the presidential election to prevent her from publicly revealing details about a past sexual encounter with Donald Trump.

Donald Trump has pleaded not guilty and denies the allegations.

At the end of trial, I will give you detailed instructions on the crimes charged and it is upon those instructions that you must base your decisions.

I have given you this brief description of the charges only for the purpose of allowing you to consider whether there is anything about the nature of the charges that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial jurors. You are not to use the description $I$ have just given to you for any other purpose.

This case comes to us by way of an indictment. An indictment is a document that contains an acquisition. Neither the indictment itself, nor the fact that the indictment has been filed, constitutes evidence.

The indictment has been filed against the defendant and the defendant has answered that he is not guilty of the accusation.

The trial, therefore, will be conducted for you

1 to decide whether the defendant is guilty, or not guilty.

A jury is composed of 12 people. In addition to the 12 jurors, we will also select alternate jurors. An alternate jurors is one who may serve in place of one of the first 12 jurors should an unforeseen and extraordinary emergency arise and makes it totally impossible for one of the first 12 jurors to complete the trial.

The first person called who is sworn as a juror will serve as the jury's foreperson.

If you have participated in jury selection in a criminal case before, you may notice that the method of jury selection varies from judge to judge. The essence of the procedure is the same. It involves a combination of explanations of the law and questions all designed to help each of you, as well as the lawyers, decide whether you can sit as a juror in this case and be fair in judging whether the defendant is guilty, or not guilty of the charged crimes.

My jury selection procedure is as follows: First, I will explain some of the basic law that applies to this case and all criminal trials.

I do this, in part, because if you are selected as a juror you will be required to follow the law whether you agree with the law or not.

Following the preliminary instructions, I will
ask by a show of hands whether there is any reason based solely upon what you heard up to that point why you believe you cannot serve on this jury.

Third, the Clerk of the Court will call at random the numbers of 18 jurors who will take a seat in the area to my left which is called the jury box.

Those jurors will be handed a questionnaire and I will then ask the jurors in the jury box to answer the questions aloud in narrative form. And then each lawyer will address the jurors in the jury back for about 30 minutes.

Finally, all the jurors will be asked to step outside for a short time and during that time the lawyers will be given an opportunity to, as required by our law, to excuse one or more of the jurors in the jury box. Those jurors who are not excused become Members of the Jury and we repeat that procedure until a jury is selected.

Again, the purpose of the trial is for a jury to decide on the basis of the evidence presented in the courtroom whether a person who is accused of a crime by the government is guilty or not guilty of the commission of that crime.

The jury's responsibility is to evaluate fairly the testimony and other evidence presented at the trial in order to judge what believable and accurate facts are, if
any.
The jury is, therefore, also known as the finders of facts or the judges of the facts.

After the jury has found or judged the facts, the jury must apply the law as I explain it to those facts and decide without favor, bias, prejudice, sympathy or consideration of a possible sentence of punishment, whether the People have proven the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

During your deliberations, you may not consider or speculate about matters relating to sentence or punishment. If there is a verdict of guilty, it will be my responsibility to impose an appropriate sentence.

In reaching a verdict of guilty or not guilty the jury must be fair. It is important, therefore, for you to know what makes a person a fair juror so that you can decide whether or not you can be a fair juror in this particular case.

A fair juror is a person who will accept and apply the law of New York as I explain it.

A fair juror is a person who has no bias or prejudice in favor of or against any party or any witness, whether the witness is involved in law enforcement or a civilian.

A fair juror is a person who will keep the
promise to be fair and impartial and will not base the decision in this case on a bias or prejudice in favor of or against the person who may appear in that trial on account of that person's race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, gender identity or expression, religion, religious practice, age, disability, sexual orientation, or political affiliation.

A fair juror must be mindful of any stereotypes or attitudes about people or about groups of people that the juror may have and must not allow those stereotypes or attitudes to affect their decision.

As you learn from the video presentation you saw during orientation, we all develop and hold unconscious views on many subjects.

Some of those unconscious views may come from stereotypes and attitudes about people or about groups of people that may impact on a person's thinking and decision-making without that person even knowing it.

As a juror, you are asked to make a very important decision about another person and I know that you would not want to make that decision based upon such stereotypes or attitude or what we commonly refer to as implicit biases.

A fair juror must guard against the impact of such stereotypes or attitudes. You can do this by asking
yourselves during your deliberations whether your views and conclusions would be different if the defendant, witnesses and others that you heard about or seen in court were of a different race, color, national origin, ancestry, gender, gender identity, or expression, religious practice, age, sexual orientation, or political affiliation.

If the answer is, yes, then, in keeping with your promise to be fair, reconsider your views and conclusions along with the other jurors and make sure your decision is based on the evidence and not on stereotypes or attitudes. Justice requires no less.

A fair juror is a person who will, therefore, base his or her decision solely on the testimony and other evidence presented at this trial and will not make a final decision on the verdict until the end of case, after the juror has heard all the testimony and other evidence and heard the lawyers' summations, has heard the Court's final instructions on the law and had an opportunity after that to discuss the evidence of with the other jurors and to consider their views.

Finally, a fair juror is a person who without fear, favor, bias, prejudice or sympathy, for either the People or the defendant or any witness, whether the witness is a law enforcement officer or civilian, renders a verdict of guilty or not guilty that the juror is convinced is
consistent with that juror's evaluation of the testimony and other evidence and that juror's application of the law.

My role, is to help assure a fair and orderly trial in accordance with our law.

I do that by preceding over the trial, deciding questions of law that arise between and among the parties, and explaining to you, the jury, as $I$ am doing right now, what the law is that the jury must accept and follow.

Thus, we are both judges in the case. It is important to recognize that we judge different things. You, the jury, judge the facts of the case in order to reach a verdict of guilty or not guilty and I judge the law, meaning $I$ decide questions of law and I instruct the jury on the law.

It is not my responsibility to judge the facts here. I do not decide whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

You alone are the judges of the facts and you alone are responsible for deciding whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

So nothing I say or how I say it and no ruling I make on the law is intended to be, nor should it be, considered by you as an expression of my opinions on the facts of the case or whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty.

We now turn to the fundamental principles of our law that apply in all criminal trials, the presumption of innocence, the burden of proof and the requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

Throughout these proceedings the defendant is presumed to be innocent.

As a result, you must find the defendant not guilty unless on the evidence presented at this trial you conclude that the People have proven the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

That a defendant does not testify as a witness is not a factor from which any inference unfavorable to the defendant may be drawn.

The defendant is not required to prove that he is not guilty. In fact, the defendant is not required to prove or disprove anything. The people have the burden of proving the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

That means, before you can find a defendant guilty of a crime, the People must prove beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime, including that the defendant is the person that committed that crime.

The burden of proof never shifts from the People to the defendant.

If the People fail to satisfy their burden of proof, you must find the defendant not guilty and if the
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people satisfy their burden of proof, you must find the defendant guilty.

What does our law mean when it requires proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

The law uses the term, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, to tell you how convincing the evidence of guilt must be to reach a verdict of guilt. The law recognizes that in dealing with human affairs, there are very few things in this world we know with absolute certainty.

Therefore, the law does not require the People to prove a defendant guilty beyond all possible doubt. On the other hand, it is not sufficient to prove that the defendant is probably guilty.

In a criminal case, the proof of guilt must be stronger than that. It must be beyond a reasonable doubt.

A reasonable doubt is an honest doubt of the defendant's guilt for which reason exits based upon the nature and quality of the evidence. It's an actual doubt, not an imaginary doubt.

It's a doubt that a person acting in a matter of this importance would be likely to entertain because of the evidence that was presented or because of the lack of convincing evidence.

Proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leads you so firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt
that you have no reasonable doubt of the existence of any elements of the crime or of the defendant's identity as the person that committed that crime.

In determining whether the People have proven the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, you should be guided solely by a full and fair evaluation of the evidence.

After carefully evaluating the evidence, each of you must decide whether that evidence convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the defendant's guilt.

Whatever your verdict may be, it must not rest on the baseless speculation, nor may it be influenced in any way by bias, prejudice, sympathy, or by a desire to bring an end to your deliberations or to avoid an unpleasant duty.

Again, if you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of a charged crime, you must find the defendant not guilty of that crime. And if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty of a charged crime, you must find the defendant guilty of that crime.

As judges of the facts, you alone determine the truthfulness and accuracy of the testimony of each witness.

You must decide whether a witness told the truth and was accurate or instead testified falsely or was
mistaken.
You must also decide what importance to give to the testimony you accept as truthful and accurate.

It is the quality of the testimony that is controlling, not the number of witnesses that testify.

There is no particular formula for evaluating the truthfulness and accuracy of another person's statements or testimony. You bring to this process all of your varied life experiences.

In life, you frequently decide the truthfulness and accuracy of statements made to you by other people. The same factors used to make those decisions should be used in this case when evaluating the testimony.

I will instruct you further on this subject at the end of trial.

Your verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. That means that each and every single juror must agree to it.

Since 12 people seldomly agree immediately on anything, to reach a unanimous verdict, you must deliberate whether the other jurors. That means you should consult the evidence, consult with each other, listen to each other, give each other's views careful consideration and reason together when considering the evidence.

And when you deliberate, you should do so with a
view towards reaching an agreement, if that could be done without surrendering your individual judgment. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but only after a fair and impartial consideration of the evidence with the other jurors.

You should not surrender an honest view of the evidence simply because you want the trial to end or because you are out voted. At the same tame, you should not hesitate to re-examine your views and change your opinion if you became convinced that it was not correct.

The attorneys have informed me that they expect this trial to last, approximately, six weeks.

Please bear in find mind that that is just an estimate. We will do our best to adhere to that schedule. I cannot predict exactly how long the trial will take.

For example, $I$ don't know how long jury
deliberations will take. I have had cases where jury deliberations lasted less than an hour and I have had cases where a jury deliberation has lasted ed for many days.

In terms of our schedule, $I$ can tell you we will not convene on Wednesdays. The trial will be conducted on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. We will also not convene on Monday, April 29th.

The last note on scheduling. I am aware that we are approaching Passover. Rest assured, if you observe the

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

| 1 | Passover holiday the Court will not convene on any date |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | when a juror will not be able to attend due to a religious |
| 3 | observance. |
| 4 | Again, you do not have to chose between observing |
| 5 | the holiday and sitting as a juror in this case. I will |
| 6 | work around your needs, whether it means not meeting on one |
| 7 | day or breaking at 2:00 in the afternoon so you can attend |
| 8 | your gathering. Just let me know in advance so we can plan |
| 9 | it. |
| 10 | The attorneys have given me the names of the |
| 11 | witnesses they expect to call to the stand during the |
| 12 | course of the trial, as well as names you may hear |
| 13 | mentioned during the course of the trial. Please listen to |
| 14 | the names as I read them. You will be given an opportunity |
| 15 | in a few minutes to let me know if you recognize or know |
| 16 | any of these individuals. |
| 17 | Donald Trump. |
| 18 | Steven Bannon. |
| 19 | Sharon Churcher. |
| 20 | Michael Cohen. |
| 21 | Kellyanne Conway. |
| 22 | Robert Costello. |
| 23 | Doug Daus, D-A-U-S. |
| 24 | Stormy Daniels. |
| 25 | Keith Davidson. |

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

| 1 | Sheri Dillon. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Gary Farro. |
| 3 | Alan Garten. |
| 4 | Rudy Giuliani. |
| 5 | Rhona Graff. |
| 6 | Hope Hicks. |
| 7 | Dylan Howard. |
| 8 | DeWitt Hutchins. |
| 9 | Jaden Jarmel-Schneider. |
| 10 | Marc Kasowitz. |
| 11 | Jared Kirschner. |
| 12 | Georgia Longstreet-Joseph. |
| 13 | Rebacca Manochio. |
| 14 | Jeffrey McConney. |
| 15 | Karen McDougal. |
| 16 | John McEntee, M-C-E-N-T-E-E. |
| 17 | Adav, $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{V}$, Noti, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{I}$. |
| 18 | David Pecker. |
| 19 | Reince Priebus. |
| 20 | Gina Rodriguez. |
| 21 | Jeremy Rosenberg. |
| 22 | Dino Sajudin, S-A-J-D-I-N. |
| 23 | Dan Scavino. |
| 24 | Keith Schiller. |
| 25 | Bradley A. Smith. |

Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

Cameron Stracher, $S-T-R-A-C-H-E-R$.
Deborah Tarasoff.
Donald Trump, Jr.

Ivanka Trump.

Melania Trump.
Eric Trump.
Allen Weisselberg.
And Madeleine Westerhout, $\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{T}$.
Jurors, now that you have heard my preliminary
instructions and some basic information about the case, if you have an honest, legitimate and good-faith reason to believe that you cannot serve on this case or that you cannot be fair and impartial based solely upon what you heard up to this point, please let me know.

Please do not wait until after you are selected as a juror to tell me that you cannot serve or that you cannot be fair and impartial. The law gives me much greater discretion to excuse prospective jurors than it does to excuse sworn jurors.

Having said that, please be advised that simply having work, school or child care responsibilities alone without more will not suffice to excuse you from jury duty.

Jury duty may, at times, be inconvenient, but without more I cannot excuse you. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, if you observe Passover, it does not preclude

## Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

| 1 | you from serving on this case. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Again, based solely upon what you heard up to |
| 3 | this point, if you do not believe that you can serve, you |
| 4 | will be given an opportunity, in a minute, we are going to |
| 5 | divide this into two phases. |
| 6 | First, I am going to ask you to raise your hand |
| 7 | and keep your hand up if you believe that you cannot be |
| 8 | fair and impartial in this case. |
| 9 | Once we go through those people, you can lower |
| 10 | your hands for now. Once we go through those people, I |
| 11 | will follow up with the questions, whether you are unable |
| 12 | to serve for any other reasons. |
| 13 | We will do that row by row. Please follow the |
| 14 | instructions of the court officers. |
| 15 | Again, if you believe that you cannot serve |
| 16 | because you cannot be fair or impartial or because you are |
| 17 | unable to serve for any reason. |
| 18 | First, we are going to do fair and impartial. |
| 19 | When the court officers get to you and you are excused, |
| 20 | please shout out your number so we can take it out of the |
| 21 | drawing. |
| 22 | (Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter, Vincent |
| 23 | Geraldi relieved, Principal Court Reporter, Susan |
| 24 | Pearce-Bates.) |


excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-721.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-721 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-488.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-488 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-643.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-643 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-511.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-511 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-481.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-481 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-723.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-723 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-589.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-589 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-462.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-462 was
excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-676.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-676 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-540.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-540 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-523.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-523 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-489.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-489 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-673.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-673 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-405.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-405 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-678.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-678 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-765.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-765 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-509.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-509 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-636.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-636 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-746.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-746 was

```
excused)
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-710.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-710 was

```
excused)
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-599.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-599 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-550.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-550 was

```
excused)
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-528.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-528 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-730.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-730 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-797.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-797 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-522.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-522 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-632.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-632 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-479.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-479 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-444.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-444 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-663.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-663 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-682.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-682 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-724.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-724 was
excused)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-761.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-761 was
excused)



THE COURT: Jurors in the jury box, please follow
the --

THE SERGEANT: Judge, there's one more.
THE COURT: There's another one?
COURT OFFICER: We have one more, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-475.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-475 was excused)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: B-735.
(At this time, Prospective Juror B-735 was excused)

THE COURT: Okay.
Those of you in the jury box, please follow the sergeant. You'll have a seat in the audience.

While we arrange the seating, counsel, can you please come up one more time.
(Off-the-record discussion held at the bench) THE COURT: Jurors, at this time, the clerk of the court is going to call at random the identification numbers of 18 jurors. If your number is called, please come up. You'll be shown where to sit.

You will also be handed a questionnaire. Please review the questionnaire, even if it's not your turn to answer, so you're prepared to answer when it is your turn.

If, as you're reviewing, you see that there's a question or an answer there that would probably disqualify you, please don't wait until we get to Question 30 or Question 35. You could just let us know right up front.

After all 18 jurors are seated, I will ask each juror in the jury box to answer every question aloud.

So, at this time, please have your jury summons handy and listen to the numbers as they are called by the clerk. She will call the juror ID number, which is the number that you have, and then you will be given a seat number as well. Please listen carefully for your number.

THE CLERK: Seat number 1, B-623.
Seat number 2, B-502.
Seat number 3, B-565.
Seat number 4, B-675.
Seat number 5, B-680.
Seat number 6, 784.
Seat number 7, B-470.
Seat number 8, B-639.
Seat number 9, B-555.
Seat number 10, B-742.
Seat number 11, B-430.
Seat number 12, B-423.
Seat number 13, B-496.
Seat number 14, B-789.

Seat number 15, B-744.
Seat 16, B-500.
Seat number 17, B-440.
Seat number 18, B-773.
THE COURT: Jurors, we're going to pass around the microphone. When it's your turn, please use the microphone.

I'm told that the microphone could be a little difficult at times. So, please keep your hand as high up on the microphone as possible.

We'll start with seat number 1 whenever you're ready.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Ready.
THE COURT: You can just answer the questions.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
If you said there were ones that might be disqualifying, should I start with that?

THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have worked for the (REDACTED) .

THE COURT: That's fine.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I worked in the (REDACTED) .

THE COURT: What did you do?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was a (REDACTED).

THE COURT: Okay.
(REDACTED)?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did.
THE COURT: Would anything about that affect your
ability to be fair and impartial?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So, the only thing is I had discussed this case at length (REDACTED), including the Mark Pomerantz book.

THE COURT: That's fine.
You could go ahead and answer the questions. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

I live on the Upper East Side.
I've been there for three years now.
I am a native New Yorker of the
State of New York. I have lived in Cambridge, I have lived here, and I have lived on Long Island.

I'm an (REDACTED). I work for (REDACTED). I do (REDACTED), mainly.

Do I have to say the name of my (REDACTED)? THE COURT: No.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
I work on a very small team. I have to respond to urgent (REDACTED), typically, on very short notice.

I have a Bachelor's Degree and a (REDACTED).

I'm not married, but I'm engaged.
I have no children.
I live with my fiancé. He's an investment
banker.

No children.
My hobbies, I like to bake when my job lets me do
that. I also play tennis.

Organizations or advocacy groups, I was involved in different organizations in (REDACTED)--The Women's Group and the First Generation Group.

I've never served on a jury before.
Publications, I read as much as I can. So, I read a lot of these. I read The Times, CNN, MSNBC, the Wall Street Journal.

I listen to a lot of podcasts. Typically, economic podcasts.

I do not have a friend who's been the victim of a crime.

As I mentioned, I have been employed with
(REDACTED). I have also worked at the
(REDACTED).
THE COURT: (REDACTED)?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (REDACTED).
THE COURT: What did you do there?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was (REDACTED).

|  | Page 425 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 2 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No other friends or relatives |
| 3 | have done that. |
| 4 | I've worked in the (REDACTED). I've worked in |
| 5 | (REDACTED) and have (REDACTED). |
| 6 | Again, I have (REDACTED). I'm currently working |
| 7 | on a (REDACTED). |
| 8 | THE COURT: Well, let me ask you: |
| 9 | (REDACTED), can you give us an assurance that you |
| 10 | will follow my instructions on the law as I give them to |
| 11 | you? |
| 12 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will, as best I can. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Well, we need an assurance from you. |
| 14 | Can you give us an assurance? |
| 15 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will follow your |
| 16 | instructions. |
| 17 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 18 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As I mentioned, I've |
| 19 | discussed this case and the (REDACTED) of this case |
| 20 | (REDACTED) . |
| 21 | THE COURT: You said that none of that would |
| 22 | affect your ability to be fair and impartial; right? |
| 23 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Well, are you not sure? |
| 25 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I, you know, based on |

(REDACTED), will put that aside. You know, it's hard to (REDACTED), but I will put that to the side.

THE COURT: So, are you able to put aside any preconceived ideas that you might have about this case, wait until you hear the evidence, wait until you're given the instructions on the law, and then render a decision that is consistent with the evidence and law? Can you give us that assurance?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No religious beliefs that would interfere.

No moral or intellectual beliefs about a criminal case.

No health conditions.
No medications.
No issue with the schedule. Though, I will have to work a full day when I get out of here.

No religious issues with the scheduling.
No issue with 26.
I'll promise to guard against stereotypes.
No one I know has worked for any organizations in 28.

Nothing in 29, either.
I have attended rallies. I was part of
the Women's March.
THE COURT: You're responding to which question at this point?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry. There's a lot of these.

I guess that's 29(F).
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not a supporter of any
of the ones in 30 .
For 31, I believe that no one is above the law.
For 32 , it's the same, that $I$ have obviously
discussed this case.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will decide based on the evidence I see and hear.

I don't believe, for 34, I have any issues.
As I've mentioned, I have discussed
Mark Pomerantz's book at length.
I have not read the books in 36 .
Thirty-seven, (REDACTED), I have some views on that.

I promise that the verdict will be solely based on the evidence.

I would refrain from discussing this case or looking at the news. I do have to read the news for my job
on a regular basis.
THE COURT: Can you give us an assurance that, if anything comes across your screen that in any way relates to this case, you will not read it?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
I have been reading stuff before $I$ came into jury duty, including on Monday.

THE COURT: That's fine.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will follow the instructions of reasonable doubt and presumption of innocence.

Yeah, 41, assurance given.
Forty-two, I think we talked about it all.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
So, going through all of this, the only thing I could see that would be an issue would be one of my children does work in D.C.

THE COURT: What do they do in D.C.?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry? I can't hear what you said.

THE COURT: What does your child do in D.C.?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He works in the office of one of the representatives.

THE COURT: Okay.
Would that affect your ability to be fair and
impartial in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not.
THE COURT: Okay.
You can go back to Number 1.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live on the
Upper West Side.
I've lived there for about five years.
Before that, I lived in Colorado.
I'm a stay-at-home mom, but (REDACTED).
I've been a mom for 23 years, I guess, or 22.
I've been retired for about 22 years.
I don't have a current employer.
I have a Master's Degree.
I am not married.
I have three children.
My adult children, one is working on -- I spoke of one; I have a 21-year-old who's building a house in Upstate New York; and my other child is 17 , so, she's in high school.

Spare time, $I$ like to be with my kids and go to see shows and music.

I love technology. That's one of my hobbies. I'm very into tech.

Organizations, I have a couple of organizations for technology.

I've never been on a jury.
I may glance at some of these, but I don't follow the news.

THE COURT: I'm sorry? Say that again.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't follow the news. I
know I glance at things, but I don't read deeply.
Podcasts, there's a thing called
The Tech Podcast. Sometimes, I listen to one that's on the -- it's the Scott Galloway Podcast. The rest are V.R., A.R., tech stuff. Julia Louis has one that I like.

No talk radio. I don't have a TV.
No close victims of crime.
I'm supposed to be going through each one;
correct? Am I doing the right thing?
THE COURT: Yes, you are. Perfect.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
No family in the accounting or finance field. My brother does some type of trading stuff in Colorado, but I'm not sure if that would count.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No lawyers in the family.
I have like a speeding ticket. I didn't enjoy that.

I would definitely be fair and impartial.
No criminal family members at this point.
THE COURT: Just tell us which number you're answering.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's 19.
I can go faster, too.
You want me just to say the answers; right?
THE COURT: Just give us the answer, but tell us the number that you're answering.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
Nineteen, no.
21(A), no, I'm good on that.
B, yeah, I'm good on that.
Twenty-two, no health conditions.
Twenty-three, no medication.
Twenty-four, I'm okay with this scheduling.
Twenty-five, I'm okay.
Twenty-six, $I$ definitely could be fair and impartial.

Twenty-seven, yes, no stereotypes or attitudes.
Twenty-eight, no one has ever worked for Donald Trump in my family.

29(A), no one has volunteered.
29(B), I have never attended a rally.
C, I'm not signed up for any listserv.

D, I do not follow social media of any sort. I have no social media.

I have no close friends that are part of the
Trump Organization or any Trump Organization.

I have not attended any rallies or

```
    anti-Trump organization.
```

G, no.
H, no.
Thirty, no.
Thirty-one, no.
No. I don't know the case, to be honest. So, I don't know.

THE COURT: Could you just bring the microphone a little closer.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thirty-three, yes.
Thirty-four, no.
Thirty-five, no.
Thirty-six, no.
Thirty-seven, I'm not crazy about, but I don't know enough about it to have an opinion.

Thirty-eight, I haven't heard anything, so, yes, I can promise.

Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.

enjoying New York City.
Question 8, I do not participate really in any
organizations or advocacy groups.

I have been called to jury duty before, but I was not selected.

Since I work in (REDACTED), I read basically everything. I am on Twitter. I do follow Truth Social posts from Trump on Twitter. I do follow Michael Cohen; Mueller, She Wrote; and some more. They take different views. I do follow the Ukraine and Israel wars.

I don't listen to podcasts.
I listen to SiriusXM for music.
I have lost an uncle due to a crime.
Question 14, I do not have anyone that works in a law enforcement agency or any of that.

A number of my family are attorneys and my uncle, who I lost, was the dean of a law school.

I do (REDACTED) for Question 16.
Seventeen, once again, $I$ do have a number of family members that are attorneys.

Question 18, no, I do not have any family members that have had interaction with the criminal justice system, except for being attorneys.

Question 19, I do not have a criminal past or friends that do.

Question 21, I do not have any beliefs that might prevent me from being fair and impartial.

I do not have any health conditions that might interfere.

I am not really taking any medicine. I may take Tums or something for acid reflux, but that's it.

Twenty-four, 4:30 in the afternoon is fine.
Twenty-five, I'm mostly Agnostic versus Catholic.
I will be fair and impartial.
Question 27, I will promise to guard against stereotypes or implicit biases.

Twenty-eight, I do not have any friends or family that have worked for Donald Trump.

Twenty-nine, once again, no. I have not attended any of his rallies nor have $I$ signed $u p$ for his listservs or -- Well, I do follow Donald Trump on $X$, but it's just his posts reposted from Truth Social.

I do not have any family or friends that volunteer for anti-Trump organizations. Well, except for following Michael Cohen on Twitter or something like that, I don't follow any anti-Trump organizations.

For 30, no.
Thirty-one, no.
Thirty-two, no.
For 33, I can give my assurance that I will
decide solely on the evidence given.
Thirty-four, while I do not have any strong opinions or firmly held beliefs, I have read the news--New York Times and so forth.

For podcasts by Michael Cohen, I do not listen to any podcasts, but I do follow tweets from him on Twitter or X .

I have not read any of President Trump's books. I have seen quotes from, say, The Art of the Deal.

I do not have any opinions about political contributions.

I can promise to set aside anything I may have heard or read previously allowing me to be fair and impartial.

I will give my absolute assurance that I will not discuss this case with anyone, for Question 39.

For Question 40, I will follow your instructions on the law.

Forty-one, I will give my assurance that, if Mr. Trump does not provide evidence, I will not hold that against him.

Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

organizations, P.T.A.
I have been on a jury before. It was a criminal
case. It was declared a mistrial.
THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I follow a lot of
publications due to my job. On this list, the ones that I
read the most are the Wall Street Journal and the
New York Times.
I listen to a lot of podcasts varying, again, for
my work. It's mostly for my work. I follow whatever
subject I'm working on. Currently, it's (REDACTED).
I don't listen to talk radio.
I have been the victim of a crime.
THE COURT: Would anything about that affect your
ability to be fair and impartial in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would not affect me.
I already answered those.
Sixteen, no.
Seventeen, I have seven immediate family members
who are lawyers.
18(A) is no.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
Twenty-one, no to A and no to B.
No to 22.


```
reasons.
```

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: Good morning.
I live in The Village.
I'm retired.
THE COURT: I think you might have turned the
microphone off. I'm not sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: How about now?
THE SERGEANT: Testing. Testing.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: How's that?
THE SERGEANT: Get a little closer.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's in and out. I can't get any closer.

THE SERGEANT: Testing. Testing.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: How's that?
THE COURT: Let's just try a different one.
We're going to give you a different mic.
(Pause in the proceedings)

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There it goes.
I think it's my seat. I think it's the direction
I'm turning in.
THE COURT: Okay.
Try again.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in The Village.
I'm retired. I was a (REDACTED).
I'm not currently employed.
I have an M.B.A.
I'm a widow.
I don't have any children.
I'm not living with anyone.
I don't have any adult children.
Number 7, I read, I listen to music, I garden, and I'm on my building's co-op board.

I do not participate in any organizations or advocacy groups.

Number 9, yes. I served on a jury. I was on a criminal case and I was on Grand Jury. The jury did reach a verdict.

THE COURT: In the criminal case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. It was a small drug case.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a New York Times'
subscriber for most of my adult life. Though, it's mostly for the crossword puzzle.

I do not watch or listen to podcasts.
I don't listen to talk radio.
Number 13, I was mugged but a long time ago and it was very minor. I do have -- Oh, that's the victim. That was just me.

Fourteen, no.
I have a cousin who works for the
Justice Department and another cousin who works for Commerce in D.C. I'm not very close with them.

Sixteen, no.
Seventeen, yeah, there are some lawyers in the family.

Eighteen, no.
Nineteen, yes. I had a cousin who went to prison for drug smuggling.

Twenty, no.
21(A), no.
No, B.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, no.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.


Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I live in the West Village.
I've been there for the past three years.
Prior to that, I lived in various neighborhoods
throughout New York. I'm from Southern New Jersey, outside Philadelphia.

THE COURT: If you could just slow down so that the court reporter could get everything.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sorry.
THE COURT: I want to make sure we get everything you say.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: West Village.
Lived in New York for seven years.
Prior to that, $I$ lived in Southern New Jersey.
I just started working at (REDACTED) last week.
Prior to that, I worked at (REDACTED) for seven years in various levels but the majority in a (REDACTED) capacity.

Number 4, I have a college degree, a
Bachelor's Degree.
I'm single.
I live alone.
No children.
In my spare time, I like to hike, explore

New York, restaurants and bars, play some volleyball. I'm not part of any organizations. I do attend galas and charity events on occasion with friends, but nothing that I'm personally organizing.

I have not served on a jury before.
My job requires me to read a lot of news. Of the ones mentioned, I do read the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, X , and Google the most.

I have listened to podcasts, but I don't listen to any on a regular basis.

I don't listen to talk radio.
Number 13, I was a victim of an attempted
burglary. The suspect was not brought in.
I have some uncles that are local and state police back in New Jersey, but I'm not in regular communication with them outside of holidays.

No federal, state, or local government.
Sixteen, I work (REDACTED).
No training in the legal field.
I think 18 is answered by the previous attempted burglary.

Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
21 (A), no.
21(B), no.


Thirty-eight, yes.
Thirty-nine, yes.
Forty, yes.
Forty-one, yes.
Forty-two, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Can you just go back to Question 32 for one moment.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Is there anything about your answer
to Question 32 that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I will examine the evidence and treat it as any other case, regardless.

MR. STEINGLASS: I couldn't hear that.
THE COURT: Can you repeat that, please.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I will look at the evidence of the case and treat it as if it was anybody else that was sitting across the table.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
I am a person who lives in the West Village.
I have lived there about 15 years.
I am not a native New Yorker. I am from

California.
I am a (REDACTED). I've been doing that for about 25 years.

Do I have to name my employer?
THE COURT: No.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
I'm self-employed.
I have a high school diploma and some college.
I'm married.
I have three children.
My wife is a teacher.
No adult children.
Spare time, various things, but children, mostly, as well as woodworking and metalworking.

I do not, Number 8.
I have served on a jury before, Grand Jury and
criminal, and another one in California a long time ago.
THE COURT: Okay.
Was the criminal one in California?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
You don't remember if there was a verdict?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can't remember. It was a long time ago.

THE COURT: Okay.

|  | Page 449 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: News, a scattering of all of |
| 2 | these here and there. I'm not on social media. I am, but |
| 3 | I don't use it. |
| 4 | I listen to podcasts, but they're comedy ones. |
| 5 | No talk radio. |
| 6 | Thirteen, no. |
| 7 | Fourteen, no. |
| 8 | Fifteen, no. |
| 9 | I do have a relative, Number 16, who's in |
| 10 | finance, my brother-in-law. |
| 11 | I have a couple of brother-in-laws (sic) that are |
| 12 | lawyers. |
| 13 | No for 18. |
| 14 | Nineteen, no. |
| 15 | Twenty, no. |
| 16 | Twenty-one, no. |
| 17 | B, no. |
| 18 | Twenty-two, no. |
| 19 | Twenty-three, no. |
| 20 | Twenty-four, no. |
| 21 | Twenty-five, no. |
| 22 | Twenty-six, yes. |
| 23 | Twenty-seven, yes. |
| 24 | Twenty-eight, no. |
| 25 | Twenty-nine, no to A, B, C. These are all no's, |




I watch CNBC, $B B C$ and nothing else.
No podcasts.
No radio.
No friend who has been victim of crime.
Number 14, no.
My brother is a lawyer.
I have a lot of friends in financial field.
Number 18, no.
Number 19, no.
Number 20, no.
21, no.
Number 22 is no.
I take regular medications.
24, yes.
25, no.
26, yes.
27, no.
28, no.
29, no. All things $A, B, C, D, E, F$ is no.
Number 30, no.
Number 31, no.
Number 32, no.
Number 33, yes.
Number 34 , yes.
THE COURT: I am sorry, your answer is yes to
number 34?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I am a fair impartial
juror.

THE COURT: Do you have any opinions or beliefs about Mr. Trump that would prevent you from being fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Number 35, haven't read any of these books.

Number 36, no.
Number 37, no opinion.
Number 38, yes.
39, yes.

40, yes.
41, yes.
Lastly 42, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good morning, we will continue.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, thank you for having me.

I will answer number one completely. I live in Hell's Kitchen, I was born there, I was raised there, I still live there.

What do I do for a living? I am law enforcement.

How long have I been doing that? 34 years.
My current employer is (-REDACTED-) .
I have been doing this for 34 years.
THE COURT: Which (-REDACTED-) do you work at?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Presently assigned to the
(-REDACTED-).
THE COURT: Would anything about your work with
the (-REDACTED-) and the 34 years with the (-REDACTED-)
prevent you from being fair and impartial in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: None whatsoever.
Educational background, I have a bachelor's degree

```
from John Jay College.
```

I am married, I have been married for almost 35 years.

We do not have any children.
My wife is a nurse.
Number seven, in my spare time I have season tickets to the New York Rangers and I like to go to the games, and I like to go to Yankee games.

My interests and hobbies are $I$ help out with the senior citizens on the west side.

And I am a member, a long time member of the Knights of Columbus.

Number eight, $I$ just stated $I$ am a member of the Knights of Columbus. And I am treasurer of the local
scholarship fund which benefits financially needy children on the west side.

I have served on a jury before, it was in the late 70s, it was in Civil Court at 60 Centre Street, it did come to a verdict, it was an injury trial.

The only publications $I$ read is Daily News and The Post.

For the record, I do not have a smart phone, I still use a flip phone, which $I$ get tons of abuse for. Therefore, $I$ do not watch any podcasts. The only talk radio $I$ listen to is sports radio. I have no friends or relatives, close friends I will say, close friends never been convicted of crime. I have no close relatives that are law enforcement.

I am, of course, employed by the local government.
I have no relatives in accounting or finance.
Number 17, obviously I do have some work experience in the legal field.

I have not had any interaction other than working in the Criminal Justice System. This experience would not prevent me from being a fair and impartial juror.

I have not had a close friend or relative accused or convicted of committing a crime.

I do not have a relative with a pending criminal

21 A, no.
21 B, no.
I do not have any major health conditions. Other than a blood thinner, I do not take any medication.

I have no problem staying past 4:30.
25 is no.
26, yes.
27, yes.
28, no.
29, no, A and B and C through H, no.
30, no.
31, no.
32, no.
33, yes.
34, no.
35, no.
36, no.
37, no.
38, yes.
39, yes.
40, yes.
41, yes.
42 lastly, no.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, sir.
Jurors, we are going to take a short break at this time, we will take about 15 minutes.

I ask you to please not discuss this case either among yourselves or with anyone else, just put it out of your minds, there is nothing to talk about.

We will invite you back in as soon as we are ready.

Please leave the questionnaires on the chairs.
(Whereupon, the panel of prospective jurors left the courtroom)

THE COURT: Apparently Juror Number Four thought we expected him on Friday, but he agreed to come in today. He has been waiting outside for about a half hour, I would like to bring him in now.

Are you ready?
Counsels, we will do this at the bench, counsels please approach.
(Sealed proceedings)
(The following took place in open court)
THE COURT: Do you want to think about it for a couple of minutes and we will take it up?

MS. HOFFINGER: Thank you so much.
THE COURT: We had a conference at the bench with Juror Number Four at which time he was asked some questions about information the People obtained. He provided certain answers.

I am going to direct that portion of the
transcript is going to be sealed, but defense can have a
copy, the People can have a copy, but it will not be public.
It was very personal information that was elicited at that
point.

I also note for the record that he expressed annoyance also at how much information had been out there in the public about him, I don't want to overstate it or
understate it, but he expressed annoyance at that.

So have you decided how you want to handle this juror?

MR. STEINGLASS: Yes.
Can we approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Sealed proceedings)
(The following took place in open court)
THE COURT: I am directing that Juror Number Four be excused and that he should not come back.

MR. BLANCHE: Judge, is it possible just to warm it up a degree or two? It is so freezing in here.

THE COURT: Honest answer to that question is if $I$ did that, it would probably go about up about 30 degrees.

MR. BLANCHE: We are shaking.
THE COURT: We have asked them to turn off the fans.

MR. BLANCHE: I appreciate it, everybody is

```
freezing.
```

THE COURT: It is cold, there is no question.
I would rather be real cold than sweating, and really those are your choices.

Counsel, we will work until we get done with the second row, if that is a little bit before one or after one, whatever it is, when we are done with the second row we will do the lunch recess.
(Whereupon, the panel of prospective jurors

```
entered the courtroom)
```

THE COURT: You can be seated.
Jurors, welcome back.
We are going to continue with seat number ten in the second row.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I live in Gramercy Park. I have lived there for five years, since I moved to New York.

I am not a native New Yorker, I was born and raised in Miami, Florida.

I have moved around, lived in Wellesley
Massachusetts, St. Louis, Missouri, Paris, France, and my
family lived for a few years in Hong Kong.

I am an attorney.
I am privacy counsel for a large (-REDACTED-),
large.
My prior employer was a (-REDACTED-).
My education, $I$ have a BA, a JD, as well as what

```
is equivalent to a master's two in France.
```

Not married, never been married.
I have no children.
Again, I live alone with my dog.
In my spare time I like to explore the City, I
play violin, attend indie rock and classical music concerts, love the opera.

And my interests again are music related, as well as $I$ was a coxswain in university, so $I$ follow rowing quite closely.

I participate in organizations, $I$ am on the board
of the Hispanic National Bar Foundation, otherwise, you know, just general pro bono through my current employer firm, as well as attending galas for different charities on behalf of my current employer.

I have not served on jury duty before.
I follow news loosely, I tend to follow news that is specific to my field of law, so New York Times, CNN, Google.

I don't use Facebook for news, but $I$ do use Facebook occasionally.

Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, on occasion Fox News just to try to see what is going on on all sides.

That's about it from this list.
I do follow also foreign newspapers and foreign news media, a lot of French vividiets, as well as South China Daily Mail.

Do I listen or watch podcasts? Yes, they are all just reality $T V$ related, so nothing too high brow.

I do not listen to talk radio.
Yes, I had my phone stolen from me while $I$ was in Paris, from my pocket.

My family car was incidentally burned in an arson in Italy.

And in Venezuela, like so many, I unfortunately I had family members held up at gunpoint.

I don't think the heavy more serious crimes that we unfortunately have been exposed to should muddy the waters for my assessment on this case.

I have it is like a distant cousin who worked for the $F B I$ who is an attorney for them many years ago, $I$ want to say he left in like 2004. So it was quite a while ago.

Yes, I have been employed by the government. I was a summer honors intern for the New York Law Department in the Appellate Division and I also was a legislative intern in the U.S. House of Representatives when $I$ was the summer of my sophomore year going into my junior year of college.

Again, $I$ don't think that the representative for whom I worked for or any of the cases I was exposed to with the New York City Law Department should have any effect or impact on my assessment of the facts of this case.

No one, not myself nor anyone close to me, thankfully ever been convicted of a crime.

And no pending criminal cases against anybody that I know personally or myself.

I don't have a health condition that might interfere with my ability to be here. That said, I do have allergies, so $I$ do carry an Epi-pen, as well as antihistamines, they are non drowsy, so $I$ will be attentive.

Yes, I can end around 4:30, that is fine. I will
probably do some work right after that.
I do not practice a religion that will prevent me
from sitting on this panel.
I can give my assurance that $I$ will be fair and
impartial.
I have no bias or prejudices in favor of any of --
in favor or against any of the classes listed below.
I can promise to guard against stereotypes or
attitudes etcetera on 27.
For number 28, no one $I$ know has worked for a
company or organization owned or run by Donald Trump.
Number 30, I have never considered myself a
supporter of any of the enumerated or listed organizations.
I don't have any strong opinions for number 31.
I don't have any feelings or opinions on number
32.
I can give my assurance that I will base my
decision off evidence of the facts exposed during this case
for number 33.

For number 34, I have opinions. With that said, I am very comfortable that $I$ can put those aside to decide this case based only and exclusively on the evidence and facts presented in this case.

I have not read any of the below publications for number 35, nor have $I$ discussed them.

I have not read any of the defendant's books for number 36 or listened to any audio book or podcasts about them.

I mean the issues around my final exam was about legal contributions, so $I$ have written for that exam on the subject and have an opinion, as any legal practitioner would. At the same time, my opinion is not strong and $I$ do not think it would have any effect on my ability to decide this case as a juror.

Yes for number 38.
Yes for number 39.

Yes for number 40.
Yes for number 41.
I will hold the burden innocent until proven guilty, yes, just as a lawyer.

Yes for number 42, echo my prior statement.
THE COURT: You said yes to number 42?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I meant no as in, yes, I can be impartial.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi, all right.
I am a resident of Northern Manhattan, Inwood.
I have lived there 20 years.
I am from New York State but not a native New
Yorker, from Long Island originally, but I live in Manhattan

```
now for about 30 years.
    I am paralegal at a (-REDACTED-).
    I have been doing that for about 30 years.
    Education, I have a BFA.
    I am married.
    I have two adult children.
    My husband is in real estate, he is a realtor.
    I have two adult children.
    One of them is an adjunct college professor.
    And the other is working as a ratings analyst in
Manhattan.
    What do I do in my spare time? I originally came
to New York to work in the theater and I still work in the
theater. In my spare time I am a theatrical director and
usually involved in several productions a year in my leisure
time.
    I enjoy nature, hiking.
    And I have done some work with animal placement
organizations like ASPCA, that kind of thing.
    Have I served on a jury? Yes, I have served on
three juries.
    I have served on a criminal case that did go to a
verdict.
    I also served on an insurance fraud case that went
to a verdict.
```

And I was an alternate on a medical malpractice
that ended up settling after they got to deliberations, so I
was off on that.
This is the fifth time $I$ am being called for jury
duty.
Publications, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,
sometimes Washington Post.
I don't actually do network $T V$, so sometimes NPR,
BBC.
No podcasts.
No talk radio, no.
Well, I have been mugged, but it was a long time
ago. It has no effect on this particular situation.
I have no relatives in law enforcement.
No to 15.
So 16, yeah, my son works as a rating analyst, I
don't honestly know what he does, so I don't think it has no
bearing on me.
Of course $I$ work in a law firm, so $I$ have many
friends and colleagues who are attorneys.
18, no.
19, no.
20, no.
21, no. A, no. B, no.
No health conditions.

| 1 | No medications. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The schedule is fine. |
| 3 | No religious conflicts. |
| 4 | 26, yes, I will be unbiased, I will be fair and |
| 5 | impartial. |
| 6 | 27, yes, I will guard against stereotypes and so |
| 7 | forth. |
| 8 | 28, no, I have never -- I would just say no. |
| 9 | 29, no to A, to the entire string there. |
| 10 | 30, no, I am not a member of any of those |
| 11 | organizations. |
| 12 | 31, no. |
| 13 | 32, no. |
| 14 | 33, yes, I can assure you. |
| 15 | 34, no. |
| 16 | 35, uhm, no, I have not read any of those books. |
| 17 | 36, no I have not read any. |
| 18 | 37, no. |
| 19 | 38, yes. |
| 20 | 39, yes. |
| 21 | 40, yes. |
| 22 | 41, yes, will not hold it against him. |
| 23 | 42, I see this is that trick question, is there |
| 24 | any reason why -- no, there is no reason. |
| 25 | THE COURT: Thank you. |

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi, good afternoon.
I live in the Upper East Side, I been there for
three years.

Not a native New Yorker, originally from New
Jersey. I grew up there and lived there for a little bit
before I moved to New York.
I am a speech therapist, I have been doing it for
five years.

I work for the (-REDACTED-).
I have a bachelor's and master's degree.
Not married.
And I do not have any children.
I live alone.
In my spare time I like to hang out with my
friends, go to restaurants, watch TV, go on walks, take
advantage of living in New York City.

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

I have been called to jury duty before in New Jersey, but never like been on a case.

I don't watch any news or follow it too closely.
I do have some like E-mail subscriptions, like the CNN Five Things and The New York Times Morning, whatever,
that $I$ do sometimes read during my morning commute, but I
don't follow them very strictly.
I do use social media.
I don't normally get news from there, but I
definitely am on it and obviously see things on Tik Tok and
Instagram and Facebook.
I listen to podcasts, but they are also just
reality TV podcasts, nothing crazy.
I don't listen to talk radio.
13, no.
14, no.
15, I don't know if the (-REDACTED-) counts, but I
do obviously work for the (-REDACTED-)
And my mom worked for the State of New Jersey, she
worked in the Civil Service Commission, I don't know exactly
what she did there but.
I don't have any relatives or close friends in the
accounting field or finance.
For 17, no, no one in the legal field.
18, $A, B$, and $C$ is no.
19 is no.
20 is no.
21 is no for $A$ and $B$.
22 is no.
23 is no.

24, the schedule is fine.

25, I don't have any religion that would prevent me from sitting.

26 is yes, I can give assurance that $I$ can be fair and impartial.

27, I can promise to guard against stereotypes to influence my decision.

28, no, no relatives.
29, A is no, B is no, C through $H$ is also no.
30, I have never considered myself a supporter or belong to any of those groups.

31 is no.
32 is no.
33 is yes.
34, I do have opinions, but $I$ do firmly believe
that I can be fair and impartial and leave those outside of
the facts of this case.

35, I never read any of those books.
36, also never read any of the defendant's books.
37, no.

38 is yes.
39, yes.
40 is yes.
41 is yes.
And 42 also the trick question, no.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
Number 1 A and B, Upper East Side for 20 years, previously on the Upper West Side for 18 years.

Born and raised in Las Vegas, Nevada.
Number 2A, I own a (-REDACTED-) company.
Small boutique business.
Sorry, 3A, I am self-employed, small boutique
business.
My business, yes.
I have always been freelance.
High school diploma and a few credits short of a college degree, which kills my parents.

Married.
I do have one stepson.
6 A, banker with JP Morgan.
B, real estate investor.
My spare time, tennis, family, food, workout a lot.

Interests and hobbies, I am interested in architecture, world monuments, tribal education.

8 A and B , no.
Nine is yes, in criminal court.
Yes.



Vikki J. Benkel

```
summer.
```

For number 17 about other legal professionals and
close friends or family, both my parents are attorneys.
Sorry about that.
THE COURT: That is all right.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
I am currently living in Murray Hill, been there
for six years.
Prior to that $I$ was born and raised in Ohio.
What I do for a living? I work for a (-REDACTED-)
company in E commerce for eight years, it is a very large
(-REDACTED-) company.
Educational background, I have a college degree.
I am not married.
Never been married.
No children.
I live with another adult, he is in accountant.
No adult children.
In my spare time I love to spend time outdoors and
with animals.
Number eight is no.
Number nine is no.
Number ten, I don't really follow the news, but if
anything it is The New York Times.


(Continued from the previous page.)
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
I live in Gramercy.
I have lived there for almost two years.
I am not a native New York, but I spent almost
half of my life in New York in various neighborhoods.
I am (REDACTED)
I have been doing that all of my working life.
My current employee (REDACTED)
Less than (REDACTED) _
Before this I spent most of my working life
(REDACTED)
I have an MBA in finance.
I am married.
I am a parent.
In my spare time I like to explore the outdoors.
I like to travel. I like photography.
Number eight, not in a personal capacity.
I do not participate in any organizations or advocacy groups.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you repeat that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have -- I have not -THE COURT: I think you have to point the bottom
up.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have not served on a jury before.

For my news, my primary source is Wall Street
Journal. I also read the New York Times.
I listen to Bloomberg radio, sometimes, Fox News, Fox Business.

I do not listen to podcasts. I do not listen to

```
talk radio.
```

Number 13, no.
Number 14, no.
Number 15, no.
Sixteen, yes, myself.
Seventeen, no.
Eighteen A, no.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
Twenty-one, no.
Twenty-two, no.
Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.



Twenty-three, no.
Twenty-four, yes.
Twenty-five, no.
Twenty-six, yes.
Twenty-seven, yes.
Twenty-eight, no.
Twenty-nine, no for all options there.
Number 30, no.
Number 31, yes.
Number 32, no.
Thirty-three, yes.
Number 34, no.
Number 35, no.
Number 36, no.
Number 37, yes.
Thirty-eight, number 38, yes.
Number 39, yes.
Number 40, yes.
Yes, for 41.
And for 42 , no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Good afternoon.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
I live on the upper east side.
I have lived there for two-and-a-half years.

I am not a native New Yorker.
I previously spent several years living in the states of Minnesota, South Carolina and North Carolina.

I am a (REDACTED) I have been doing that for 15 years.

Number four, I have a bachelor's degree and a doctorate degree in (REDACTED)

Number five, I am married. I do not have any children.

Number six, my husband works as a (REDACTED).
Number seven, $I$ enjoy running, playing tennis, listening to live music, outdoor adventures such as hiking and paddle boarding with my husband and our dog.

Number eight, no.
Number nine, no.

Number ten, I follow the news on the New York Times, USA Today and CNN.

Number 11, I listen to podcasts related to sports and faith based.

Number 12, no.
Number 13, no.
Number 14, no.
Number 15, no.
Sixteen, no.
Seventeen, I have two brother-in-laws and three
sister-in-laws who are attorneys, none of whom practice
criminal or civil law.

Number 18, no.
Number 19, no.
Number 20, no.
Number 21 A, no.
$B$, no.
Number 22, no.
Number 23, no.
Number 24, yes.
Number 25, no.
Number 26, yes.
Number 27, yes.
Number 28, no.
Number 29, no, on all A through H.
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.
If there is a question, there is some questioning, should I start from that time one.

THE COURT: Start with that one.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: So number thirty-four as I read these questions over and over, it's raising some concerns in regards of something that maybe I can call association.

I was born and raised in Italy and the Italian media has a really strong opinion, images and association between Mr. Trump and Silvio Bernasconi. And I think now that I am sitting here, it is -- it will be hard for me to maintain that impartial and fairness.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: You are excused, sir.
Let's refill seat number 18 , please.
THE CLERK: Refilling seat number 18, B714.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.

You can start whenever you are ready. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. I live in midtown
east.

I have lived there about two years.
I have a -- I lived in other places in New York for a couple years, four years, and before that college in North Carolina.

I grew up in England and Hong Kong.
I am an (REDACTED)
I have been doing that for about four years now. Yeah, (REDACTED).

That's my only real employer since graduation.
I have a college degree.
Never been married.
Don't have any children.
I have -- live with my boyfriend and he is self-employed.

No children.
In my spare time I like to go running, hang out with my friends, eat food.

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

I never served on jury before.
I get most of my news from the Wall Street Journal or the New York Times.

> Susan Pearce-Bates, RPR, CCR, RSA Principal Court Reporter

I don't listen to any specific podcasts, maybe like a News One every so often.

I don't listen to talk radio.
No, to number 13.
No, to 14.
No, to 15.
I am in finance for 16.
Seventeen, my sister is a law student.
Eighteen, no, for all of them.
Nineteen, no.
Twenty, no.
Twenty-one, no to A. No to B.
I have no health conditions. No medications.
No issues with the schedule.
No, to 25.
Yes, to 26.
Yes, to 27.
No, to 28.
No, for 29 A, and B.
No, for C. No, for D. No, for E. No, for F.
No, for $G$ and $H$.
No, for 30.
No, for 31.
No, for 32.
Yes, for 33.

No, for 34.
No, I have not read any of those books or
listened to them.
No, for 36 as well.
No, to 37.
Yes, to 38.
Yes, to 39.
Yes to 40.
Yes to 41.
And no for 42.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Jurors, what happens next is the attorneys have the opportunity to ask you some questions, but we are going to take our lunch recess at this time.

Before I excuse you though, I have some instructions that $I$ need to give you.

I ask you to please not discuss this case either amongst yourselves or with anyone else.

Do not discuss anything about the case. You may tell the people with whom you live and your employer that you are a juror and give the 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 case request, accept, agree to accept or discuss with any person the
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receipt or acceptance of any benefit or payment in return for supplying any information concerning the trial.

You must report promptly directly to me any incident within your knowledge involving an attempt by any person to improperly 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 the library or on the internet or by any other means or source.

I 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 telephone, text messages, emails, chat rooms, blogs and social websites.

You must also not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means, whatsoever, and that includes the posting of information about the case or what you are doing on the case on any device or internet site including blogs chat rooms, social websites or any other means.
Finally, you must not Google or otherwise search
for any information about the case or the law that applies to the case or the people involved in the case, including the defendant, witnesses and lawyers or myself.

I would like to start at $2: 15$ sharp. So you will need to work your way back to the building before that time, probably quarter to two.

Thank you.
(Prospective jurors are excused.)
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Judge, may I approach?
THE COURT: Ask the officers.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a question for you.
(All prospective jurors are excused.)
THE COURT: So, as they were stepping out the courtroom, juror 675 wanted to approach and ask a question. She was directed outside.

Once outside she spoke to one of the court officers and says she knows Susan Necheles.

I think $I$ would still need to put her in the box and ask if she can be fair and impartial or would it affect her ability to be fair and impartial.

Thank you.
I will see you at 2:15.
(A luncheon recess was taken.)
(After the luncheon recess, the following occurred:)
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THE SERGEANT: All rise.

Part 59 is now in session.
The Honorable Juan Merchan presiding.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
Please be seated.
We're just checking on the jurors to make sure that they're all back.

While we wait, I believe that the press wanted clarification on which sections of the questionnaire it was that we would like them to not report on and which will be redacted:

That will be Question $3(\mathrm{~A})$ and $3(\mathrm{D})$, as in "dog."
I know, somewhere, I had mentioned B, but that was a mistake.

Anything else that we need to go over right now?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
As soon as all the jurors are back, we'll get started.

Again, the plan today is going to be what we did on Tuesday:

There's a panel that's been waiting around all day. We're going to bring them in. As soon as we have a break this afternoon, we'll bring them in, we'll swear them
in, and then we'll excuse them. I will tell them to come back tomorrow at about 11:00 or 11:30 because we still have over 20 people in the audience here.
(Pause in the proceedings)
THE COURT: We have everyone that was in the box.
We're missing two jurors from the audience. Is there any objection to starting with those that are in the box?

MR. STEINGLASS: No objection.
THE COURT: Counsel, no objection?
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: Okay.
Let's bring them in, please.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors entered the courtroom)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, jurors. Welcome back.

First, jurors, I want to apologize that it's
chilly in here. I know that it is. We're doing what we can to control the temperature, but it seems like it's one extreme or the other. So, bear with us as we try to work that out.

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

The law requires that the
Assistant District Attorney speak to you first.

What the lawyers say to you 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 a 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. I may, on occasion, ask the basis or the grounds for the objection. The attorney will provide the legal basis only, 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 though 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, not I and not the lawyers.

People?
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you.
Good afternoon, everyone.
As the judge told you, my name is
Joshua Steinglass. Along with my colleagues here, we represent the People of the State of New York.

Now, I'm sure many of you say to yourselves, "How am I being considered for this case of all cases? What should I say when they question me?" Well, I know it sounds simple and trite, but the answer is the truth. The reason for that is there's no right answers. What we're trying to do is pick a jury that can be fair--fair to the defense and fair to the prosecution. We're not trying to pry into your lives. We're really just trying to determine whether this is the best case for you.

So, let's start with the obvious:
The defendant in this case is both the former President of the United States and a current candidate for that office. No one is suggesting that you can't be fair because you've heard of Mr. Trump. We don't expect you to have been living under a rock for the last eight years or the last 30 years. This case has nothing to do with your personal politics or your feelings about a particular
political issue. It's not a referendum on the Trump Presidency, a popularity contest, or any indication of who you plan to vote for this fall. This case is about whether this man (Indicating) broke the law. Did he falsify business records in order to cover up an agreement to unlawfully influence the 2016 presidential election?

At the end of the case, the judge will give you the law on false business records--34 counts of falsifying business records--and he'll tell you exactly what it is we have to prove. And that's all we have to prove. What I mean by that is does anybody feel that the fact that the defendant is who he is is going to change what they will require us to prove? Does anybody feel that we're going to have to prove more than the law requires simply because the defendant is Donald Trump?

Where's that microphone? Anyone have it?
(HAND RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: There you go.
I'm sorry I have to call everybody by their numbers.

How do you feel about that, Mr. B-555?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could be objective. No problem.

MR. STEINGLASS: The defendant's just like any other defendant in any other criminal case. There's no
special formula. Any reason to think that you won't be able to follow the judge's instructions on the meaning of "beyond a reasonable doubt?"

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: None whatsoever.
MR. STEINGLASS: Good.
How do you feel, Mr. B-639?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Beyond a reasonable doubt. MR. STEINGLASS: And you can apply that law the way you would to any other defendant in any other case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: This case has generated a fair amount of publicity. We do not expect you not to have heard about this case or not to have discussed the case with friends. What we do need is your assurance that you could keep an open mind.

I'm sure we can all agree that media accounts may
be accurate or they may be inaccurate. After all, the media has not had access to two things that you will have. Number one, by the end of this trial, you will have heard all of the evidence in this case. And, number two, you will have heard the judge's instructions on the law. So, all of those opinions that are floating around out there, they're much less informed than you will be by the end of this case.

Can you all promise to faithfully find the facts
as they actually are and apply the law as the judge gives it and not think about what other people's opinions may have been that you may have come into contact with in the past? Can you promise to do that, B-470?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Any concerns about your ability to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: How about you, B-784?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, no concerns.
MR. STEINGLASS: Now, you mentioned that you have followed the defendant on $X$ and Instagram in the past and, perhaps, still do?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
MR. STEINGLASS: You also mentioned that you have some opinions--unless I misheard you--about how you think the defendant has been treated by the criminal justice system. Did I get that right or did I misunderstand your answer to that question?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe I misinterpreted that question and I corrected that with the judge.

MR. STEINGLASS: Ah, okay.
So, you don't have strong opinions, one way or the other, about how the defendant has been treated?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

MR. STEINGLASS: What about the fact that you follow him on Instagram, Truth Social, or Twitter, or whatever it is? Have you -- Do you still currently follow him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I must have followed him years ago. I don't have notifications turned on to see every time he puts something out there. I'm not on Truth Social. I'm just following the course of any presidential election, campaign, or anything else.

MR. STEINGLASS: So, you followed him because of the fact that he was the President but not necessarily for political reasons?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just generally because it was a news item when he would put a tweet out. So, I just wanted to be aware of that.

MR. STEINGLASS: That's a better way that you said it than I asked that.

So, is there anything about that that would make you question your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: Have you seen him post anything about this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I honestly haven't paid much attention to it.

MR. STEINGLASS: Great.
Thank you.
Anyone else have any thoughts on this--the fact that Donald Trump is a candidate for President, a former President, or the fact that this case has been publicized a lot?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Anybody have any concerns about their ability to be perfectly fair and impartial in this case?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: You're not a bad person if you feel that way. It's okay. The only thing that you could do wrong --
(HAND RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: I see your hand. I'll be with you with the mic in a bit.

The only thing you could do wrong is not tell us because it will be too late after you're in that jury room.

Is it $\mathrm{B}-623$ ?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
I thought about this a bit during lunch. I think, just the fact that I spent a year discussing the case with a federal judge and law clerks, I can't -- I'm worried that I know too much and that, no matter --
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Academically, I know, as a lawyer, I have to put it to the side. I just don't know. I'm worried that it's going to seep in in some way.

MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you for being honest about that.

This is what I've been trying to say. There's no wrong answers.

As a lawyer, you probably feel like, "I could put it aside. I could be dispassionate," but you're also a human being. If the amount of conversations that you've had about this case over the last year--it sounds like you're way more informed about this case than your average person--this may just not be the case for you. Are you concerned about your ability to put that aside?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Frankly, yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Well, again, thank you for your candor.

Anybody else have anything they want to say about any of this?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Speak now.
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
So, you're going to 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. Now, you may be curious as to why it is that this case is going to trial now, but you're never going to learn the answer to that question and you're not allowed to speculate or wonder why the trial hasn't happened in some manner. Can you all give us your assurance that you won't allow your curiosity to distract you from the task at hand, which is to evaluate the evidence and determine whether or not we've proven the case beyond a reasonable doubt? Anybody have any concerns about that?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
Along the same lines, you should keep in mind that the witnesses in this case are not actors reading from scripts. They're real people testifying about events that occurred some time ago. In doing so, you may--you may not--notice some minor inconsistencies between the testimony of different witnesses. Can we all agree that people often see or remember the same events or same parts of an event differently?
(AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. STEINGLASS: That's kind of human nature. You've seen a movie with a friend, maybe, and you may have picked up something that your friend didn't catch. Neither one of you is lying about having seen the movie. Can you
use the same kind of logic or reasoning in this case when you're evaluating the testimony of multiple witnesses?
(AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. STEINGLASS: Does anyone have any concerns about their ability to do that?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you accept the fact that even the same witness might describe the same event a little bit differently than they have in the past, especially, a less significant detail? For example, somebody may mix up the date that something happened or the exact date or not be able to remember whether it was a phone call or a conversation in person or a conversation over text. That, too, is human nature--especially, when you're talking about events that happened some time ago. Does anybody feel that, unless somebody says it exactly the same way every single time they say it, they've got to be lying? Does anybody feel that way?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
Let's talk a little bit about some of the witnesses in this case.

You're going to learn--and we're going to be very up front about the fact--that some of the witnesses have what you might consider to be some edge. These witnesses
include a tabloid publisher; an adult film star; and a former lawyer for Mr. Trump, Michael Cohen, who has pleaded guilty to several federal crimes including campaign finance violations and lying to Congress. Some of the witnesses have written books, done podcasts, or appeared in documentaries regarding some of the same subject matter that they're going to be testifying about during this case. You'll learn that several of the witnesses have publicly denied many of the facts to which they will testify here. You'll also learn why they spent so long trying to prevent the public from learning the truth. Finally, you'll learn that some of these witnesses were given immunity --

MS. NECHELES: Objection.
THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. STEINGLASS: -- as part of an effort to get them to come clean about what they had done.

Every single one of those things that $I$ just said, those are all factors that you can and should take into account when you're assessing their credibility; right? As a matter of fact, at the end of the case, the judge will give you a whole list of factors that you can take into account in assessing their credibility--the credibility of any witness. My question to you is, if you learn any of those things to be true about a particular witness, are you going to shut your ears to anything that
witness might have to say? In other words, can we get you all to give us your assurance that you'll keep an open mind and you'll wait until you hear what the witnesses have to say, whether it makes sense to you, what their demeanor is like on the stand, whether their testimony fits with the other evidence in this case? Can you wait until you hear what they have to say before you make up your mind about whether or not you're going to believe them? Can everybody give us that assurance?
(AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS)
MR. STEINGLASS: Anybody feel like, "Oh, my Lord. If I learn that somebody's been convicted of lying to Congress, I don't even care who they were lying for or why they were lying. I'm not going to listen to another thing this person has to say?" Anybody feel that way?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Does anybody feel that, if a witness has gone on a podcast or written a book, that means you can't possibly listen to anything that they have to say? Does anybody feel that way?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Who's got the microphone?
(HAND RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you pass it on down to B-502.
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| 1 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi. |
| 2 | MR. STEINGLASS: How you doing? |
| 3 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You're very interesting. |
| 4 | MR. STEINGLASS: I'm sorry? |
| 5 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good. |
| 6 | I hope you're doing well today as well. |
| 7 | MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you for asking. |
| 8 | I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I'm just |
| 9 | trying to -- |
| 10 | Any concerns about anything we've talked about? |
| 11 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not. |
| 12 | MR. STEINGLASS: Any -- Do you understand what |
| 13 | I'm saying about witness credibility? Can you wait to hear |
| 14 | and can you keep an open mind until the witnesses have |
| 15 | testified? |
| 16 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hundred percent confident. |
| 17 | MR. STEINGLASS: Good. |
| 18 | How about you, B-555? |
| 19 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have not seen any evidence |
| 20 | or heard testimonies from witnesses. So, I'll try to keep |
|  | an open mind. |
| 22 | MR. STEINGLASS: Perfect. |
| 23 | Now, you did hear me describe some of those |
|  | factors. Are any of those factors the kinds of things |
| 25 | that, if you learn them to be true, that will be the end of |

your open mind?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'd have to wait to hear everything to see if it's compelling or not.

MR. STEINGLASS: Well, that's a very perfect answer. So, of course, I can't argue with that.

B-675, is that right?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Any concerns about anything we've talked about so far?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: Did you mention to maybe one of the court personnel that you actually know Ms. Necheles?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything about your relationship with Ms. Necheles that would cause you to be concerned that you couldn't put that out of your mind and just be a completely fair and impartial juror to both sides?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I met her once 15 years ago through my husband. So, no.

MR. STEINGLASS: So, no, you have no reason to doubt that you could be a fair and impartial juror and give both sides a fair shake?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.

Can you pass the microphone over one more time.
Thank you so much.
Is it $\mathrm{B}-680$ ?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's me.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
You also mentioned that your cousin went to
prison for drug smuggling?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Was that in New York?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was in New York, out on Long Island, a couple years ago.

MR. STEINGLASS: So, it wasn't us?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: Anything about that experience, your experience with the criminal justice system, that would lead you to --

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
MR. STEINGLASS: -- that should cause us to worry about your ability to be a fair juror?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Not a problem.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
Glad to hear that.
Can you pass the microphone back to someone in the back row. We'll just start in the middle.

Is that $\mathrm{B}-789$ ?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
I'm going to go to a new topic with you now that you have the microphone.

So, the defendant in this case is being charged under a theory known as accessorial or accomplice liability. The judge is going to explain the law about that 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 could each be held criminally liable for the acts of the others. So, would anybody have a problem holding the defendant responsible for something that his partners in crime, as you could put it, did?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not sure I understand. MR. STEINGLASS: Yeah, because it was a terrible question. So, I don't disagree with you one bit.

Let me give you an example that has so nothing to do with this case:

Let's say a husband hires a hit man to kill his wife and the husband isn't even there when the hit man carries out the murder.

MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, we object.
THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. STEINGLASS: So, in that instance, the husband is every bit as guilty as the man who pulled the
trigger even though he was in a different state at the time that the murder was carried out. That's what I mean when I say that you could be held liable for the acts of someone else if you ordered those acts. There's a whole bunch of different examples that the judge will give at the end of the case. My question to you is can you accept the law--whatever it is--as the judge gives it of accessorial liability even if it means holding the defendant responsible for acts that he may not have personally committed?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Better question that time, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
What do you think, B-496?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The same.

MR. STEINGLASS: You could follow the judge's instructions about that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
MR. STEINGLASS: You understand the example that I gave?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do.
MR. STEINGLASS: Very good.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The second one.

Just kidding.
MR. STEINGLASS: I'm not going to live this down.
I understand.
B-423, how do you feel about what we've talked about so far?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I fully believe that I can follow the judge's instructions and I understand the examples, which were helpful because I'm not very well-versed in the legal world. So, the example was helpful.

MR. STEINGLASS: Well, you don't have to be, right? Because you have the judge to give you the law. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely. So, I will definitely be able to rely on him for instructions. MR. STEINGLASS: Good. So, new topic:

One of the things that you're going to be asked to do in this case is to determine the defendant's intent. You'll need to decide what Mr. Trump's intent was in making these false entries in his business records. As you know, we can't get inside somebody's head, read their mind, and know what they were actually thinking, but you can rely on your common sense and everyday clues to help you make that determination. Juries do it all the time because intent is an element of so many crimes--intentional murder,
intentional rape, et cetera, et cetera.
What you've got to do in order to do that is kind of look at all of the surrounding circumstances. What did Mr. Trump and his cohorts say or do before, leading up to, during, and after the time of the payoffs in this case? What did Mr. Trump and his cohorts do leading up to, around the time of, and after creating the false entries? What did Mr. Trump and his cohorts do around the time that the truth began to come out? What was the climate in which these decisions were made? Based on that, you can kind of infer, beyond any doubt, what his intent was.

I know you guys all like examples--and, certainly, I'm clear when I use one--so, let me give you an easy one:

You're crossing the street and somebody honks at you. Are they honking to say, "Hello," or are they honking to say, "Get the heck out of the way?" Well, you've got to look at the clues; right? Do you know the person? Are you crossing against the light? Is the driver speeding up or slowing down? Are they waving hello or doing some other hand gesture? From that, you can conclude, beyond any doubt, whether the person is honking to say hello or to get the heck out of the way. You could determine what the driver intended by honking.
B-430, how do you feel about what I just said?
Can you do that same kind of logic in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. I don't see why
not.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
Anybody have any concerns about their ability to
rely on context clues to determine the defendant's intent
at the time that these crimes were committed? Anyone have
any concerns about that?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: This kind of dovetails into what
I would say is the number one quality that we look for in a
jury -- in jurors is common sense. In order to determine
what happened here, you're going to have to be able to
apply that common sense. What are the facts and what are
the logical inferences that can be drawn from those facts?
Somebody I haven't talked to yet, who has kids?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Anybody?
(HAND RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you pass the mic.
I know I'm skipping you, B-742, but I'll come
back to you if $I$ still have time.
It's B-744?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: You've got kids?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
Imagine this:
You walk into the kitchen. A chair has been dragged over to the fridge where the cookie jar sits on top. The cookie jar is lying on its side with the top off and your son or daughter --

Do you have a son or a daughter or one of each? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just a daughter.

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
Your daughter is climbing off the chair and she's got a cookie mustache -- a chocolate mustache. What happened?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (NO RESPONSE)
MR. STEINGLASS: Work with me a little bit here. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Most likely, she took the cookie.

MR. STEINGLASS: Most likely, she took the cookie.

Now, it's possible that someone else snuck into the house, moved the chair, knocked the cookie jar over, and smeared the cookie on your daughter's face. That's possible, but it's not very likely. Can we agree?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It depends. I don't know. It's possible that she took it. It's possible that
somebody smeared it, but it's unlikely.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
We'll come back to that in a minute.
The point that I'm trying to get at is that no one's going to get up on the stand and testify that Mr. Trump directly said, "Hey, let's falsify our business records. Hey, let's commit election fraud. Let's pull the wool over the eyes of the American voter so I can get elected." No one is going to say that.

MS. NECHELES: Judge, we object.
THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. STEINGLASS: No one has to be that explicit.
As jurors, you're going to have to analyze the evidence, apply your common sense, and draw the appropriate conclusions from that evidence. And, I am sorry to tell you, in order to do that, you're going to have to roll up your sleeves and get into the weeds a little bit to actually examine the checks, the invoices, the e-mails, and the texts because they provide strong insight into what was actually going on at the time in people's minds. So, we're going to ask you to be patient as we walk you through all those documents and all that evidence in what, sometimes, might seem like excruciating detail.

The question that I want to come back to is whether you all feel that you have the ability to draw
logical and reasonable inferences from the facts, the documents, and the evidence in this case without engaging in wild speculation or making unrealistic assumptions. Can you all promise to do that?
(AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE FROM PROSPECTIVE JURORS) MR. STEINGLASS: Anybody have any questions about that?
(NO HANDS RAISED)
MR. STEINGLASS: I haven't talked to you yet.
Is it $B-500$ ?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: Can you do that? Can you kind of not only find the facts, but also follow the facts where the facts go and draw reasonable logical inferences from those facts?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, absolutely.

(At this time, Vincent M. Geraldi, III was
relieved by Vikki Benkel as Senior Court Reporter)
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(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Vincent Geraldi
was relieved by Senior Court Reporter Vikki Benkel)
    MR. STEINGLASS: How do you feel, B-440?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I agree.
    MR. STEINGLASS: Is there anything that we talked
about before that gives you any pause or hesitation?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
    MR. STEINGLASS: How about you, B-714 way back in
the corner there? I am sorry, I ignored you up until now.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
    MR. STEINGLASS: Any concerns about any topics
that we talked about already?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
    MR. STEINGLASS: Okay.
    This is my last question, there are many people
who for a variety of reasons feel uncomfortable, may feel
uncomfortable with returning a verdict of guilty in a
criminal case, it could be political, religious, moral,
whatever the case may be. So I will ask each of you to just
take a moment and look within yourselves and look at the
defendant and ask yourselves, if the evidence convinces you
beyond a reasonable doubt, will you be able to come back in
here after your jury deliberations, look the defendant in
the eye and say, guilty, will you be able to do that?
Because not everybody can. And this is the time to tell us
```
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```
if you think maybe you can't.
    So I am going to run down the line, and please
tell us.
    We have already spoken, thank you for your candor.
    How about B-502?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-565?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I can.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-675?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I can.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-680?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-784?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B- 470, any concerns?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-639?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
    MR. STEINGLASS: B-55, if we convince you, what
    would your verdict be?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
    MR. STEINGLASS: That is not a choice.
    Thank you, I threw you off, it was not fair.
    B-714, would you be able to?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
```

MR. STEINGLASS: B-44, any concerns?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-500, if the evidence convinces you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-744, not guilty if we don't
prove it, guilty if we prove it, call it like you see it, no
problem either way?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-789?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MR. STEINGLASS: Any concerns or question, now is the time.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-496?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-423, you can do it?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-430?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can do it.
MR. STEINGLASS: No hesitation, no concern?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have done it before.

MR. STEINGLASS: I will leave it at that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Different jury.
MR. STEINGLASS: B-742, I completely ignored you,

```
sorry.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All good.
MR. STEINGLASS: Any concerns about what we talked about?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No concerns.
MR. STEINGLASS: Any concern you will not be able
to call it like you see it, however that will be?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No concerns whatsoever.
MR. STEINGLASS: Thank you for your attention.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Steinglass.
Ms. Necheles.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you, Your Honor.
Good afternoon. Long day so far, I appreciate all your time.

My name is Susan Necheles. With Todd Blanche,
Emil Bove and Gedelia Stern we have the honor of representing President Trump here in this case.

Now I want to start with just some general things, then I will ask a number of you individual questions. I will try to get to everybody, but we only have half an hour here so.

I want to just start with some of the things that the prosecutor said just now, Mr. Steinglass. He spoke, he spoke about first he said some of the witnesses may contradict each other. He said, well, you can understand
that witnesses might contradict each other, but you can understand that. But $I$ want to ask you, will you use your common sense when looking at this. He said, well, will you use your common sense and understand people could contradict each other.

Can you use your common sense and understand that if two witnesses get on this witness stand and say under oath two diametrically opposed things, someone is lying. Does anyone have a problem with that?

Anyone have a problem with understanding that some of the witnesses that the People may be putting on the stand may be lying here in this court today, or as this case goes along?

Would anybody have a problem making that kind of evaluation?

Mr. Steinglass said some of the witnesses may contradict each other in little details. Does anyone have a problem understanding that if somebody tells a story a number of different ways over time and keeps changing the details, that might be a sign that they are lying?

Does anyone have a problem understanding that?
Would anybody have a problem finding somebody to be lying up there if it was a government witness?

And the prosecutor spoke about some of their witnesses, a lot about some of their witnesses. And you
will learn that some of these witnesses have expressed great dislike for President Trump, they have personal animus against President Trump. And can you understand that someone who says that they want revenge against President Trump may be someone whose word you should evaluate in that light.

Does anyone have a problem with that?
The prosecutor made a big deal about how this case, the events happened a long time ago, he brought that up and he spent some time on that. In fact, the events happened a long time ago. He asked you questions about that.

I want to ask you this. Does anyone have a problem with holding the People to their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt even though these events happened a long time ago?

Does anyone have a problem with that?
Now I want to ask some of you questions. I will jump around to some of you, I tried to take a little bit of notes when you were talking before, that's why $I$ will jump around.

I want to start with juror number one, you said you think you cannot be fair; is that correct?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I might know too much about this case, yes.

mean by that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For instance if there was a
policy he was promoting and I disagreed about that, I might
have posted something about it.
MS. NECHELES: Do you think you have done it
often?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not recently.
MS. NECHELES: When you say not recently, is that
because recently you don't, you know, feel negative about
him or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would say that, first of all, since the whole Covid situation $I$ just politics just seems like a nasty thing to be posting about during a national crisis, so I backed off of my political posting about everyone.

Also, I think that -- well, are you asking my
opinion? Since time has gone past and policies evolve and I
just don't have strong feelings about President Trump at
this point, as far as, you know, $I$ don't post about him.
MS. NECHELES: I appreciate your honesty, thank
you.
Juror number two, I wanted to ask you if you can
pass that, sorry, $B-502$, hi. You said that one of your
children works for the House of Representatives?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He works for someone that

```
works in the House of Representatives.
    MS. NECHELES: Who does he work for?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hakeem Jeffries.
        MS. NECHELES: How long has he been doing that?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He is new, about a year or so.
        MS. NECHELES: Would that effect your ability to
be fair?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not.
        MS. NECHELES: How old is he?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 24.
        MS. NECHELES: He graduated from college?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
        MS. NECHELES: Congratulations.
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you very much.
        MS. NECHELES: Is there anything about this case
that would effect your ability to be fair?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely not.
        MS. NECHELES: Do you have strong opinions about
President Trump?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is the first time I have
been in a room with him. In the past I am a registered
democrat, but I have no feelings towards him, it is my first
time being with him.
    MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
    Juror B-565, you said you follow Michael Cohen and
```

Mueller; is that correct?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I also follow Kelly Ann Conway and a number of -- anything that might be able to move the markets I need to know about.

MS. NECHELES: Okay.
Is anything that you read in any of these tweets, is it on Twitter or $X$ that you follow them?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Let's go with Twitter.
MS. NECHELES: Anything that you read in any of their tweets that would influence you in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They are talking about politics, not talking about the specifics of this case. I know nothing about what is on Wall Street or New York Times, so until $I$ can see what is in the case and hear from the witnesses, $I$ don't know.

MS. NECHELES: Michael Cohen will be a witness in this case, would you be able to stop following him and just pay attention to what is in the courtroom?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
MS. NECHELES: Would you be able to put aside anything you may have read about him or from him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have any strong opinions
about President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You know, I might not like
some of his policies, but there has been some good for the
United States, so it is ambivalent, it goes both ways.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror B-675, hi.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hi.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have strong opinions about
President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Can you tell us about those?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uhm, I disagree with most of
his policies.
MS. NECHELES: What do you think of him as a
person?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Different topic, don't know
him, it's purely a political opinion.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have an opinion -- you have
no opinion of him personally?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: Does your husband have a strong
opinion of him?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: Has your husband written about him
or posted about him?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He does not do social media.
Oh, that is not true, he is on Twitter, but I don't think

```
so.
```

    MS. NECHELES: Has he written a bulk opinion about
    him or?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know the answer to that, he does book reviews and I don't know about specific answers.

MS. NECHELES: Would you be discussing this case with your husband?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We would talk.
MS. NECHELES: Would any of your feelings about President Trump or your husband's feelings about it interfere at all with your ability to be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I would take the rules seriously.

MS. NECHELES: I understand you would take it seriously, and I believe you. It is the same with all the jurors. I ask you to think about this, you know, we all know President Trump is a person who has inspired strong feelings about the country, lots of people have strong feelings about his policies, but also about him if we are all being honest.

You know, you heard a lot about implicit biases, and the problem with biases is that they color the way we look at the world and what we may believe or may not believe.

We would not allow someone who has a strong dislike for a certain type of people to sit on a jury of that type of person, because it might effect how they would see the evidence about that type of person. So what we are asking you, and the reason $I$ am going on what people feel about President Trump is because what we are asking you is, is this going to effect how you look at the evidence in this case? Even if you want to be fair, and I believe that everybody who is sitting up here wants to be fair, we are asking you to probe yourself, would the way that you view him infect the way that you look at the evidence and evaluate the evidence in this case?

So that is why we are asking all these questions.
So that is what we are asking of you, that you think you could be fair?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, now that you say it that way, I would say I follow politics a lot, but when it gets personal and petty, $I$ am allergic to that.

MS. NECHELES: Thanks, okay, thank you.
Juror 680, do you have strong opinions about
President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have opinions, I am born and raised in Brooklyn and in New York and I have kind of spent my whole life knowing about Donald Trump. I once saw him and Marla Maples in $A B C$ Home shopping for baby things.
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| 1 | I had a cousin who lived in a Trump building, I |
| 2 | had a cousin that lived across the street from a Trump |
| 3 | building that was being built who had nothing but positive |
| 4 | things to say about the whole construction project. |
| 5 | How I feel about him as a president is different, |
| 6 | so I have had feelings in both directions. |
| 7 | MS. NECHELES: I appreciate that. |
| 8 | Do you post about him? |
| 9 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am not on social media at |
| 10 | all. |
| 11 | MS. NECHELES: You said you are a university |
| 12 | administrator? |
| 13 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was. |
| 14 | MS. NECHELES: What did you do? |
| 15 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I ran a transfers program for |
| 16 | community college students who wanted to transfer to NYU. |
| 17 | MS. NECHELES: Thank you. |
| 18 | I will skip right now -- well, I will just keep |
| 19 | going. I have to find my number listing. |
| 20 | If you could pass it on, you are juror 784? |
| 21 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. |
| 22 | MS. NECHELES: Can you, the same, do you have any |
| 23 | strong opinions about President Trump? |
| 24 | PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fairly neutral I would say. |
| 25 | MS. NECHELES: Do you post at all? |

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Occasionally, but nothing
really politically related.

MS. NECHELES: So you feel that you could be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror 470, how are you doing?
You look like you are cold.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am freezing.
MS. NECHELES: Sir, do you have any strong
feelings about President Trump?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, not really.
MS. NECHELES: You feel like you could be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror 639, is that the right number?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have any strong feelings about President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really, I live in New York so I know about the President Trump, but I am more interested in my hobbies and what I do, I don't think too much about politics. And you hear from people, but that's it, I have no really strong opinion about the president.


PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have opinions about him the same way I have opinions about most things. I don't have any personal opinions about him, none that $I$ feel would impact my ability to be impartial.

MS. NECHELES: You have feelings about his
politics?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The same way I have opinions about most things, none that would interfere with like evidence that was presented to me.

MS. NECHELES: Do you have opinions about him personally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't know him so.
MS. NECHELES: Do you think you could be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror 440 , is that correct?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct.
MS. NECHELES: I will ask you the same thing, do you have strong opinions about President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As an eligible voter I feel it is my responsibility in regard to elections to establish an educated decision so that $I$ can vote.

In regards to this court case and the defendant in the room, I have no opinions until I am presented the
information in the courtroom.
MS. NECHELES: I understand that.
I am asking really about this, what your opinions are of him. I understand that you believe and that everybody here believes they can set those opinions aside, but I am asking, even putting that aside, what are your opinions of him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have any strong opinions of him.

MS. NECHELES: Do you post at all about President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: You feel like you could be fair in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror 500.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have strong opinions about President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't have strong opinions about him, but I don't like his persona, how he presents himself in public. I don't really agree with some of his politics, but that does not mean $I$ can't be impartial. I don't like some of my co-workers, but I am not going to --
but $I$ can hear him out and understand his point of view and understand his issues.

MS. NECHELES: I appreciate you saying that.
When you say that you don't like his persona, can you elaborate?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: The way he presents himself in public and $I$ would want to think that is what he wants to portray going forward, he just seems very self, selfish and self serving, so $I$ don't really appreciate that in any public servant. So $I$ don't, $I$ mean $I$ don't know him as a person, so $I$ don't know how he is in terms of his integrity or anything in his personal life. But how he is in public and how he himself portrays himself in public, it just seems to me it is not my cup of tea.

MS. NECHELES: I appreciate your sharing your honesty.

It sounds like what you are saying is that you don't like him based on the way he presents himself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Do you post at all?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you juror 500.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: So juror 744.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

MS. NECHELES: Do you have any opinions about

```
President Trump?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not as a person.
MS. NECHELES: Do you have opinions on his
politics, is that what you are saying?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Some politics, some are good, some are outrageous.

MS. NECHELES: Would those outrageous politics of his effect you at all here?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't think so, everybody has a spectrum of policies.

MS. NECHELES: When you say you don't think so, are you certain or a little -- is that a phrase?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is not going to effect my ability in this case.

MS. NECHELES: Even though he has some outrageous opinions on politics, you don't have any opinion about him personally?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, absolutely not.
MS. NECHELES: Do you post at all about him?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: Could you be fair in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Juror 789 -- so odd to be calling people by their
numbers.

Sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same question?
MS. NECHELES: Yes, do you have an opinion?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't have a strong opinion about Mr. Trump, but politically I have a similar answer, for some things $I$ am in favor, for things $I$ am not in favor, but definitely something that everybody collectively has those same similar not viewpoints, but opinions.

MS. NECHELES: Sure, sure.
Could you set any of that aside whatever?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All of it aside, yes.
MS. NECHELES: Promise me that?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I can promise you that.
MS. NECHELES: Do you post about him?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do not.
MS. NECHELES: You could be fair in this case?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: Mr. 496, do you have opinions about
President Trump?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean he was our president, pretty amazing, he is a business man in New York, he has forged his way, you know, he made kind of history in terms of like where he started and where he has become, that sort
of thing, so I am a bit impressed with that.
So to be clear, I started as an entrepreneur as
well and worked pretty hard in my life and made a lot of
things happen, just as he has, so I see that as a positive
thing.
MS. NECHELES: I appreciate that.
Could you set aside any feelings that you have
about him and judge this case fairly?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of course.
MS. NECHELES: Do you post about him at all?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
MS. NECHELES: You feel that you could judge this
case fairly?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair, absolutely.
MS. NECHELES: 423.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same question?
MS. NECHELES: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't really know a lot
about business, so I don't know about Mr. Trump in that
state. I do not agree with a lot of his politics and his
decisions as a president, but I have really taken the past
two days to reflect and make sure that I could leave that at
the door and be a totally impartial juror, and $I$ feel like I
can.

MS. NECHELES: What do you feel like you have to

```
leave at the door, what are your feelings?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean there is so much
information about him everywhere. So whether no matter how
you feel you are seeing things online, friends or family or
anybody that has opinions about him, most people do because
of how popular, he was our president, everyone knows who he
is. So we have to leave them at the door, meaning I don't
know who this person is, I have zero opinions of them and
being able to be totally neutral in this.
    MS. NECHELES: Do you post about him?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I try to stay away from
politics on social media.
    MS. NECHELES: Do you think you could be fair?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A hundred percent.
    MS. NECHELES: Have people spoken to you about him
or have things been said?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Obviously when he was
president like everyone was kind of talking about politics
when he was president throughout his presidency, so I have
definitely had conversations with friends and family just
    while that was happening. But it is not something that
    happens now that he is not president. But obviously when he
was.
    MS. NECHELES: Do you feel like you will be
pressured from people you know or feel any pressure to judge
```

```
this case one way or the other?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
    Obviously we cannot talk about it to anyone, so I
would make sure that I was not saying anything to anybody
and not think of anything other than the facts being
presented.
    MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
    We already spoke so I will skip over you and go to
juror 430.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 742.
    MS. NECHELES: 742.
    Do you have any strong opinion about President
Trump?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not strong opinion about him
personally, no.
    MS. NECHELES: But you have an opinion?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think about certain
policies, yes, both in favor of some and against others,
like I have that with any politician.
    MS. NECHELES: What is your opinion?
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My personal opinion about
certain --
    MS. NECHELES: Your personal or political opinion.
I am not asking you who you are voting for.
    PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Personally I find myself to be
```

quite centric, $I$ know a lot of people say that. I think to the extent $I$ think what $I$ have done, $I$ really don't know, $I$ am a pretty balanced person. I surround myself with people on both sides of the aisle, you know, on some things I may lean more one way or.

I really don't think this case is about my personal politics, this case is ultimately about the evidence and facts presented, so that's what is going to determine how $I$ view the defendant, not --

MS. NECHELES: I understand that right now we are trying to understand what your feelings about him might be, I thought you said when you were answering questions that you did have an opinion about him.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, the same way $I$ do for most politicians, I have an opinion about any public figure, it does not necessarily mean it is all one negative or all positive.

MS. NECHELES: I was trying to understand what your opinion of him was.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I mean I think, uhm, I think sometimes similar to what one of the jurors said, sometimes the way he may carry himself in public leaves something to be desired.

At the same time, $I$ can relate to sometimes being a bit unfiltered, so that is something that, you know,
sorry. I just have to think of it, really at the same time
I see him speak to a lot of people in America, I think there
is something to be said about that.
Part of my schooling, I went to Massachusetts, to
Missouri, $I$ think that in doing that $I$ have seen people on
all sides of the political spectrum and learned to
appreciate that diversity, I learned to appreciate democracy
and representing somewhat different when it comes to
different political opinions. Which again, I feel are not
dispositive or will not be dispositive of my personal view
of this case.
I do want to say unfortunately my family
background comes from totalitarian regimes, so $I$ am like the
number one kind of person, I like to say to really
appreciate that everybody needs a chance, regardless of who
they are, to be proven like innocent until proven guilty. I
think you see it too much in my own family background,
people being sent to prison without a fair trial. I really
firmly disagree with that.
MS. NECHELES: I appreciate that.
Because I want to end my questions with that, for
each of you I will ask each of you, you have heard
throughout this case that the government carries the burden
of proving this case beyond a reasonable doubt for each and
every count, and for each and every element as the judge is
going to explain them to you. So I will ask you that at the end of the case if the government has failed to meet that burden, is there any reason why you would not be able to return a verdict of guilty -- would you be able to return a verdict of not guilty at the end of the case.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If they do not prove I will not be returning a guilty verdict.

MS. NECHELES: You will return a verdict of not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
MS. NECHELES: Would you be able to return a verdict of not guilty?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I just want to say that I have done that before too, I have served on juries and I have gone both ways, and you have to listen to the law, the law is the most important and valuable thing we have.

MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
Would you be able to return a verdict of not

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Absolutely.
MS. NECHELES: Thank you.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

your decisions.

MR. STEINGLASS: I am sorry?
THE COURT: I am waiting for the next panel to be bought in.

MR. STEINGLASS: So we can talk?
THE COURT: You can talk.
(Whereupon, there was a pause in the proceedings)
THE COURT: Can you please take your seats, the
panel is coming in.
THE SERGEANT: Panel entering.
(Whereupon, the new panel of prospective jurors

```
entered the courtroom)
```

THE COURT: Counsels, please approach.
(Whereupon, there was a side-bar discussion outside the presence of open court as follows:)

THE COURT: So there is a person in the jury box who used to work not for the Court, she used to work for the Veterans Affairs related to the veterans court that I preside over. So it was her job to coordinate participants with benefits.

I don't know her personally, I have not spent any time with her personally, but she worked with the Court for a few years.

Is that objectionable to anyone?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.

MR. BLANCHE: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.
(The following took place in open court)
COURT 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?

ALL PROSPECTIVE JURORS: Yes.
COURT 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, I am the judge presiding over this matter.

I know you have all been waiting around since this morning, waiting for some direction. Rather than keeping you waiting any longer, I asked that you be bought in so we can swear you in and you can go home now and not come back until tomorrow morning. I will need you at about 11:30 in the morning.

Before I excuse you, I do want to give you some instructions regarding this case.

Vikki J. Benkel

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

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 any attempt by any person to improperly 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 or 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 the library or on the internet or by any other means or source.

I emphasize in addition to not conversing face-to-face with anyone about the case, you must not communicate with anybody about the case by any other means, including by telephone, text messages, E-mail, blogs, social websites and the like.

You must not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means whatsoever, that includes posting of information about the case, what we are doing on
the case, on any device or on the internet, including blogs, chat rooms, social websites or any other means.

Also do not Google or otherwise search for any information about the case, or the law which applies to the case, or the people involved in the case, including the attorneys, witnesses and myself.

I would like to start at 11:30 tomorrow morning, so you will need to arrive before that. I know the officers will give you some more specific instructions as to what time to get to the building so you can all get here at 11:30.

Thank you for your patience.
You can ask the question outside.
THE SERGEANT: You can step this way.
(Whereupon, the panel of prospective jurors left the courtroom)
(Whereupon, Senior Court Reporter Vikki Benkel was relieved by Principal Court Reporter Susan Pearce-Bates)
(Continued from the previous page.)
THE COURT: Counsel do you need a few minutes?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: Counsel, how are you doing?
Are you ready, or do you need another minute?
MR. STEINGLASS: Ready.
THE COURT: People ready?
MR. STEINGLASS: We are ready.
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, we are ready for cause.
If we can have one minute after we do the cause?
THE COURT: You can have a minute or two after you do the cause.

So we started the day with seven. Unfortunately, we lost two. So we are down to five.

The first two seats that we are going to fill are seat number two and seat number four and then jump up to number eight.

We are looking at seven seats, one through seven.
One through seven only, People, are there any challenges for cause?

MR. STEINGLASS: Yes. Seat number one.
THE COURT: You need to put on the record why.
MR. STEINGLASS: Number one stated that she could not be fair. That she had heard so much about this case.
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That she would not be able to put it aside and she was just fairly clear that she could not give us an assurance that she could do that.

THE COURT: Do you agree?
MS. NECHELES: Yes, Your Honor. We agree.
THE COURT: Granted challenge to causes number one.

And any other in the seven.
MR. STEINGLASS: No.

THE COURT: The defendant, any challenges for cause through seven.

MS. NECHELES: Yes. We would also challenge number four.

First of all, while she says we only met once 15 years ago, it might have been 15 years ago, but she stayed at my house one night. I was friendly with her husband. She and her kids and her husband stayed at my house.

She said she'll talk to her husband throughout this trial.

THE COURT: Is that what she said?

I thought she said she would not.
MS. NECHELES: I thought she said she would.
THE COURT: Let's bring in seat number four.
That would be 675.

She can use the podium.
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COURT OFFICER: Judge, what was the number? THE COURT: 675.

Are there any other issues with her that you want
to bring up before we bring her in?

MR. BOVE: Yes.

MS. NECHELES: Well, Your Honor, let me just move on to the next person.

THE COURT: 675.
MS. NECHELES: Her husband's article, really
is -- it talks about President Trump.
He says, books about Trump, his presidency and his associates tend to be chronical sub-crimes, misdemeanors, outrages and transgressions without much analysis, and such.

For her husband to be talking about how -- books about our client are about crimes, it's disturbing. It's very --

THE COURT: Now, was that a book that he wrote?

MS. NECHELES: In a book review.
THE COURT: What book was he reviewing?
MS. NECHELES: Maggie Haberman's book.
THE COURT: And would you say that your
friendship was more with the husband than with her?
MS. NECHELES: Absolutely. Absolutely. And I haven't seen him in years, so --
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COURT OFFICER: Prospective juror entering.
(Prospective juror entered the courtroom.)
THE COURT: Hi. Thank you for coming back in.
I just have a couple of follow-up questions for you.

One has to do, can you tell me a little bit more about your friendship, if any, that you had with Ms. Necheles and your husband's friendship with Ms. Necheles?

I want to understand that better.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About 15 years ago, I met her through my husband. They are both lawyers. At the time -I believe at the time he was at a firm and we went and stayed at her house.

THE COURT: Okay. After that, or other than that, have you spent any time with her?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, and I don't think I would have recalled the connection if he hadn't reminded me.

THE COURT: So is there anything about that interaction that you had that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all.
THE COURT: Turning to your husband's work. I am trying to remember what you said exactly about what he has written or not written about Mr. Trump.

I think you said he may have written -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, so why don't you tell us what you said.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He is general counsel of a company and he also writes for a publication and he mostly does book reviews.

And I have been thinking since she asked me that question, he must have said something. So I have been trying to remember what that is. And he did a review of Maggie Haberman's book, so I assume that's what she is referring to.

THE COURT: Now, when he does the review, the book is not his opinion, right; the review is his opinion, not the book itself?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right, correct.
THE COURT: Have you discussed his opinions about Mr. Trump and how he feels about Mr. Trump? Have you discussed that with him?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We talk about policies all the time, of course. About this case, no.

THE COURT: Is there anything about your husband's opinions or conversations that you have had with your husband in the past about Mr. Trump that would affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: Is there anything in your mind, any
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doubts you have, whatsoever, about your ability to sit here in this case, listen to the evidence and return a verdict that's consistent with the facts and the law?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I should say I work in publishing also and I have published voices on both sides. So I do believe everyone deserves a voice.

THE COURT: Any follow-up questions?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Any follow-up questions?
MS. NECHELES: No.
THE COURT: Thank you. You can step out.
(Prospective juror is excused.)
THE COURT: Well.
MS. NECHELES: Judge, I would renew the objection to it. I mean, it's awkward. I never seen a case where somebody who didn't know of the lawyers be dismissed, I mean --

THE COURT: That's not grounds.
MS. NECHELES: But, in addition to that --
THE COURT: She doesn't really know you.
She said she met you once about 15 years ago, spent the night with the kids. That's it.

MS. NECHELES: But I know her husband very well at the time.

THE COURT: He is not on the jury.

MS. NECHELES: I understand but the first thing she did when she got on the case was call her husband.

THE COURT: How do you know that?
MS. NECHELES: She just said it.
THE COURT: No. What she said was she spoke to her husband about the case and she knows that you are on it. She didn't say that she did that today.

MS. NECHELES: It had to be on today because she didn't know $I$ was on it until she sat on the jury.

THE COURT: Everybody knows you have been on this case for months.

MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, when she first sat down, she didn't remember me until her husband reminded her and her husband knew $I$ was on the case. She didn't remember my name.

THE COURT: And then when she spoke to her husband today and he told her that you were on the case. MS. NECHELES: Right. When she was sitting there she called her husband. I don't blame her for it. She called her husband.

And then he said, oh, remember you know her. You know Susan Necheles.

THE COURT: She had to be reminded of that, yes. Your challenge for cause is denied. Any other than seven?
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MS. NECHELES: Seat number 11?
THE COURT: We are just going through seven right now.

MS. NECHELES: Just one through seven. I am sorry.

THE COURT: People peremptory challenges, one
through seven?
MR. STEINGLASS: I am ready to do that. I
thought they needed a minute.
THE COURT: I am sorry. Do you need a minute?
MR. BLANCHE: I am sorry. Yes.
(Short recess is taken.)
THE COURT: Ms. Necheles, how are we doing?
The people, one through seven, any peremptory challenges.

MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge, number six, B784.
THE COURT: Is that it?
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes.
THE COURT: All right.
Through seven, any peremptory challenges for the defense?

MS. NECHELES: Yes, Your Honor. We strike seat two, B502; seat four, B675 and seat five, B680.

THE COURT: Okay. So that means that seat number three, B565 becomes juror number two. Okay.

Looking at seats -- I am sorry. And seat seven becomes juror number four.

So the next seat that we fill is seat eight.
The seats eight through twelve, any challenges for cause from the People, eight through twelve?

MR. STEINGLASS: No judge.
THE COURT: The defense for counsels.
MS. NECHELES: Yes, Judge. Seat number 11. If I can pass this up and I will give it to the people as well. THE COURT: Sure.

MS. NECHELES: One for the Court and one for the People.

These are all from her social media, except for the last page, which is her husband's social media. THE COURT: Okay.

MS. NECHELES: And, Your Honor, we specifically asked about social media. She said she stopped posting in 2020 and I believe she said because of COVID. She said it didn't seem nice to post anymore given that we had a crisis in the country.

And she said she only posted about politics, but these posts are vitriol.

This woman harbors, at least until 2020 when she stopped posting because of COVID, not because she started a liking President Trump, but only because of COVID.

[^0]She harbors a deep hatred for him.
She wrote things like, that you need to protect this country to stop the election of a racist, sexist narcissist.

She said that -- that was the first post that we have here.

She said that, I wouldn't believe Donald Trump if his tongue were notarized.

This is a woman who is going to be judging if he testifies on his truth or not, failure to tell the truth.

And then the final post, there are a number of others. I am not reading them all. But the final one by her in 2020, she said -- posts that, something that she is quoting someone else, it says, Trump is an anathema to everything I was taught to love about Jesus, everything I was taught about how to live out my faith.

His disdain for decency, disrespect toward basic tenets of right and wrong and complete disregard for the most vulnerable amongst us could not be more fundamentally un-Christian.

She then goes on, so, there is no question that these are -- this is as strong language as you can get about her dislike for President Trump. And I submit that this is not a person who could be fair.

THE COURT: All right. I just want to make sure
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we are looking at the same things.
So, the first page that you gave me has a post
from 2016 and another post from 2016, right?
MS. NECHELES: Yes.
THE COURT: And the next page has a post from 2016 and one from 2017?

MS. NECHELES: That's correct.
THE COURT: The next page is from 2016. I am not reading them. I don't know what they say yet. I am just looking at the dates.

And then there is one from 2018, one from 2019. I see one February 1, 2020.

MS. NECHELES: And then the next page is her post as well that's from, I believe, 2024, from a post she posted about the latest that --

THE COURT: Why don't you let me make a record of what I am seeing.

So I see a date February 6th. I don't see the year. I assume it was this year. I am making that assumption.

It says, next stop SCOTUS, but still. It is an imagine of a black imagine BBC News. And it says, Donald Trump has no presidential immunity from election fraud charges, court rules. Live updates.

And then after that there is one that is dated
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February 6th. I don't see anything here, so I am going to
assume it's 2024.

MS. NECHELES: It is the same article.
THE COURT: So it says here, court denies Trump's presidential immunity claims.

A US court ruled Donald Trump does not have presidential immunity.

That means he can be prosecuted on charges of plotting to overturn the 2020 election.

The three judge ruling says Trump's stance, and it's a summary of a decision.

Is there anything I am missing there that is offensive language or inflammatory?

MS. NECHELES: No. The language that shows a view on this comes more on the page before where she said, next stop SCOTUS.

But, still, you know, she is happy with this decision. This is a good decision. Next stop SCOTUS.

THE COURT: Now, I am looking at a post from 2021, May 28, 2021, it says there is no center between reality and the GOP cult. Refusing to abolish the filibuster is essentially a vote to allow Trump's mob to decide America's future.

And that's what I see. The language that you were referring to earlier that sounded pretty extreme,
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which post is that from? What year?
MS. NECHELES: First from 2016. That's where she
talks about a racist, sexist, narcissist.
THE COURT: Is that on the first page?
MS. NECHELES: That's the first page.
THE COURT: Down at the bottom?
MS. NECHELES: Yes.
THE COURT: Just give me a second to read it,
please.
Okay. And the next one.
MS. NECHELES: The next one is the next page.
The bottom tweet.
THE COURT: That is the one from 2017.
I wouldn't believe Donald Trump if his tongue
were notarized.
This is a fascinating glimpse into what it must
have been like dealing with T-Rump in his earlier days. I
love the description of the planned phone call interrupting
the meeting. Okay.

And I am going back to the first page. I am
trying to find language.
MS. NECHELES: It's in the second to the bottom
line, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
So it is a fairly lengthy paragraph and near the
bottom it says, it is certainly a broken system. And we badly need electoral reforms like campaign finance restrictions, run-off, voting, et cetera.

But in the meantime, let's be civil and try to protect the rights of the many at risk should we fail to stop the election of a racist, sexist, narcissist. Okay. That's it from this Bernie Gal.

Okay, People.
MR. STEINGLASS: What we would point out, Judge, is unlike juror from yesterday, or from Tuesday, who said that Mr. Trump should be locked up, this is certainly anti-Trump rhetoric, but it is old. And the juror said that post-COVID she has mellowed quite a bit both in terms of what she posts and how she feels.

I think it's worth bringing her back in to just get a better since before we make a decision.

THE COURT: Let's bring juror B430 back, please.
MR. STEINGLASS: And maybe to confirm that it is her.

THE COURT: Ms. Necheles, do you have another copy we can hand her?

MS. NECHELES: No. I marked up my copy. I don't have another copy.

THE COURT: Mine is not marked up. I will hand mine up.
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MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, I would just note one other thing, the events in this case were all when she is posting. That part that you just read about her strong feelings about we need election reform and campaign reform is at the exact time that we are talking about the campaign violation.

THE COURT: But nobody knew about it then, right? MS. NECHELES: That's when she is -- this is a woman who is saying, I have strong feelings and posting. THE COURT: We are going to talk to her about it. LIEUTENANT: Juror entering.
(Prospective juror entered the courtroom.) THE COURT: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming back in. We just want to follow-up with some additional questions regarding some of your posts online in the past. Do you have a copy in front of you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do you have a copy of the posts?

THE COURT: You are being handed a copy now.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
THE COURT: In some of these posts, let's begin with the first page, the bottom article?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, hold on a second. I need to get my glasses out. Okay.

THE COURT: Sure.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Apologies.
THE COURT: That's okay.
So I am looking at the one on the bottom.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Okay.
THE COURT: First, are these your posts?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, that's my picture.
This dates back to 2016.
THE COURT: Do you remember making these posts? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't, but let's see. THE COURT: Well, I would like to direct your attention to the one on the bottom.

If you can just read the bottom portion of it or I can read it and you can follow with me.

Beginning with, it is certainly, do you see that part?

Four lines from the bottom?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is certainly a broken system, yes.

THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead and read that.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was certainly a broken system and we badly needed electoral reforms like campaign financing restrictions, run-off voting, etc. And in the meanwhile let's be civil and try to protect the rights of the many at risk should we fail to stop the election of a
racist, sexist, narcissist. Oops. That sounds bad. Thanks guys.

Okay. Okay. That is from -- that is from a Bernie Gal piece.

THE COURT: It is from a what?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A Bernie Gal. I was
responding to comments about Bernie Bros at the time.
THE COURT: So who is Bernie Gal?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Me. I was a Sanders supporter at that time.

THE COURT: Those are pretty strong sentiments?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, they were.
THE COURT: I am sure you can appreciate how if you are sitting at the defense table you would be concerned.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I can understand.
THE COURT: Can you tell us, help us understand what you were thinking?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They are strong words and I do feel I was in a -- I was in a disturbed frame of mind during that election cycle.

I was very concerned. I do not -- I do not hold those -- I do not hold those positions today.

THE COURT: Okay.
If you can look at the section, the next page,
the second post.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh gosh. Okay. Let's see.
THE COURT: The first sentence says, I wouldn't
believe Donald Trump if his tongue were notarized, from 2017.

Do you remember that one?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. Honestly, that is a long time ago.

THE COURT: All right. So most of it --
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They are very negative posts. THE COURT: Except for the last two appear to be about $2 / 20$ or prior to $2 / 20$.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, they are from the 2016, 20 -- it's the last election cycle.

THE COURT: If you could look at the very last one. The one from November 30, 2021.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. Pardon me, so this is the very last BBC News.

THE COURT: Yes. I can hold it up.
There is no center.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: This is a meme, yes.
THE COURT: Do you remember posting that one.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
THE COURT: Okay. So you refer to Defendant's followers as a mob?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, hold on a second. MS. NECHELES: I am sorry. I believe that's her husband. The one before that is her's. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: And I can't vouch for what he said.

MS. NECHELES: The one before that is from 2024. THE COURT: So the one before that, it deals with presidential immunity claims, right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am sorry, guys. I am
trying to cooperate. It's just that I am a little confused.

THE COURT: It is a little confusing. Do you see the BBC post?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I see. Okay. So the presidential immunity thing?

THE COURT: Yes.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, I don't believe in presidential immunity, but that's a different case, as I understand it.

And I said the next court, stop Supreme Court, which I think is an interesting political situation.

I mean, I am just interested to see how the Supreme Court handles that.

THE COURT: All right. So, as you stand here
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PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: In 2024, how do you feel about Mr. Trump and, specifically, can you give us an assurance that if you were to be selected on this jury that you could be fair and impartial and set aside these -- these were pretty strong views.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
THE COURT: How can you give me an assurance that you will be a fair and impartial juror if you are selected for this case?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, first of all, I would like to say that, electoral politics can get pretty spicy. And Mr. Trump can get pretty spicy with his politics sometimes too.

And I actually feel I should apologize for some of the tone in my posts. And as I mentioned, I have stopped making such harsh political posts because I have sort of dialed back that.

I don't think it's appropriate.
But, and I did have some strong feelings about the politics at that time. However, I, in my core, believe that everybody is entitled to a fair trial.

Everybody in this country needs to be seen as a human being before the law. And we are all vulnerable and we can all be accused of things. We all need to be able to
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be innocent until proven guilty.
And also, nobody is above the law. So I see both sides of that. I certainly can understand the concern of the defendant's counsel.

THE COURT: And just to be clear, the post that we are referring to right now with the strong language, that was from July 26, 2016.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
THE COURT: So we are coming up on eight years on that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
THE COURT: Any follow-up?
MS. NECHELES: Thank you for your honesty.
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
MS. NECHELES: So, given that this trial is about the things that occurred during the election cycle when you were obviously so upset about President Trump being elected, and so concerned about it, do you have any doubt at all in your mind that you could be -- that that wouldn't color your perception of things?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I feel like on some level I have to hold myself to a higher standard because I need to make sure that it is not coloring my mind.

I think you have to look at the facts, ma'am, just the facts. And the facts will either be convincing or
they won't be convincing, the facts as presented.
I -- I feel that on my honor, I would have to be fair and not be judging with a bias against anyone who I would be on a jury to look at the facts with, so.

MS. NECHELES: So at this point my other question for you is, I know we have all learned to be nicer on the internet.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
MS. NECHELES: But I don't know whether that means that you have changed your views.

You know, I hear you saying that you are not going to, that you don't want to be saying those kinds of things publicly anymore.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-hum.
MS. NECHELES: But you had really strong opinions.

Have you changed your view?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I have changed some of those views significantly. I would say I withdraw the term, racist.

I would say that sometimes there have been behaviors that I have not approved of by President Trump towards females, but that is not what this is about.

It is my understanding -- it is not about me judging him ethically, his ethics, or personal business.
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I think there is -- politicians often get judged for the ethics in ways that normal people wouldn't be and I don't think that's particularly fair.

MS. NECHELES: Also, one of your views was he is a liar and you wouldn't believe anything he said.

Have you changed that view?
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I believe that President Trump is swearing in the court and is going to tell us the truth. He is going to tell us the truth.

I would not -- there have been times when I have not believed things that he has said at speeches and rallies. That's just the honest truth.

I think in a courtroom situation, we are doing a courtroom situation.

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Necheles. Thank you. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
(Prospective juror is excused.)
THE COURT: The People, do you want to be heard on this.

MR. STEINGLASS: Judge -- no, judge. I think her answers speaks for themselves.

THE COURT: All right. I think that this is a close call. I think that I could easily find that she is actually quite credible and she apologized to Mr. Trump.

But I think that viewed as a whole, viewed in its
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totality, I don't think that we need to take a chance with this juror and I am going to grant the challenge for cause to number 11.

Those are pretty strong views that she expressed.
That is not to say that everyone that expresses strong views needs to be excused for cause. I am just looking at it as a whole.

So that's it through 12 for cause?
MS. NECHELES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: People. Peremptory challenges, eight through 12.

MR. STEINGLASS: Number nine, B555.
THE COURT: Is that it.
MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: How about for the defense?
I believe you have one peremptory challenge left.
MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, can we have a minute?
(Defense counsel confer.)
MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, we would strike juror number ten.

THE COURT: Okay, juror number ten.
And that's your last strike.
MS. NECHELES: 742.
MR. BLANCHE: Juror number ten was.
THE COURT: 742.
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All right. So that means seat number eight becomes juror number eight. And seat number 12 becomes juror number nine.

Looking at seat 13 -- is there something wrong?
MR. BOVE: I have seat nine.
THE COURT: For seat 12, becomes juror number nine, right?

MS. HOFFINGER: Yes.
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, that's right.
THE COURT: Looking at seats 13 through 15, any challenges for cause from the People.

MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Cause from the defense?
MS. NECHELES: No.
THE COURT: No. People any peremptory challenges?

MR. STEINGLASS: I am confirming that we used eight peremptories, correct?

That's your understanding as well?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. STEINGLASS: We are doing 13 through 15.
Can we have one minute, please?
THE COURT: Sure.
(Counsel confer.)
MR. STEINGLASS: All right.
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THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: Okay. Thank you, judge. THE COURT: Sure.

MR. STEINGLASS: We are going to strike number -seat number 13, juror 496.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STEINGLASS: And seat number 15, juror 744.
THE COURT: Okay. So seat 14 , number 789 , is
juror number ten.
And we are looking at those two seats now, seats sixteen and seventeen.

Any challenges for cause from the People? MR. STEINGLASS: No.

THE COURT: Cause from the defense?

MS. NECHELES: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Which one.

MS. NECHELES: Juror number 16.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, this woman said about
President Trump that she was selfish, self-serving. She doesn't like his persona and I don't like him.

THE COURT: She said that amongst many other things that she said.

MS. NECHELES: I think that while it is not as strong language, this is current language. And I
appreciate her honesty. She starts off disliking him and we respectfully submit that that person should not be on the jury.

THE COURT: People.
MR. STEINGLASS: That's not close to a cause challenge. If Your Honor has any concern we could bring her back in to confirm this, but she was pretty clear that what she was talking about, despite a lot of prompting, was his persona.

That had nothing to do with the case. She was very clear about that.

I mean, if the defendant were a skinhead, lots of people wouldn't like his persona, but that wouldn't give anybody who doesn't like skinheads a cause challenge.

THE COURT: Right. I think that we touched on it. It took a lot of prompting to get those words out.

But more importantly, look, again, it doesn't come down to whether she likes your client or not.

I am not done.
I preside over trials all the time involving defendants who are not really likeable, gang members, people accused of committing terrible acts of child sex abuse, kingpin drug smugglers. And when you ask the jurors, how do you feel about sex abusers, nobody says that they like them.
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MS. NECHELES: Your Honor, I hear you, but I think that the case is clear. I think that the difference between what your Honor is saying and what the situation that stands here is nobody likes a sex offender, but you don't like the crime. Nobody likes when you learn in a case as it's going along that--it's my client, but, usually, it's not someone you particularly know--maybe he acted despicable. That's stuff they learn in the case. That's evidence they learn in the case that I have a chance to fight back against. Here, we're talking about--and this is exactly what Torpey talks about--people who come into the case with preconceived notions about how they feel about him. We won't have a chance to fight against that.

THE COURT: There's also a case that says that it's understood and expected that everybody comes into cases with opinions and preconceived ideas. If we eliminated everybody who comes into a case having an opinion or a preconceived idea, we would never be able to pick a jury. There's case law that says that.

I'm denying your challenge for cause.
Seat number 16 becomes Juror number 11.
Seat number 17 becomes Juror number 12.
We have our jury.
Let's start to pick our alternates.
Looking at Seat 18, any challenge for cause by
the People?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: For cause from the defense?
MR. BLANCHE: No.
THE COURT: Peremptory challenge, People?
MR. STEINGLASS: No.
THE COURT: Defense, peremptory challenge as to
Number 18?
(Counsel consulting with co-counsel)
(Pause in the proceedings)
MS. NECHELES: We're fine.
THE COURT: All right.
Seat number 18 becomes Alternate number 1.
Before we bring the jurors back in, I think we have about $20,21,22$, or something like that in the audience. Just so you know, we're going to seat all of them in the next round. We might have to have someone in the front row move over, but we're going to put 18 in the box and we'll put two, three, four, or whatever it is that we have in the front row and we'll conduct our voir dire for everybody that remains and see if we could get it done.

Let's bring the jurors back in, please.
MS. HOFFINGER: We're doing it this afternoon or tomorrow?

THE COURT: I think we can sit them today and
then we'll move on.
MS. HOFFINGER: Okay.
THE COURT: Let's bring the jurors back in, please.
(At this time, the panel of prospective jurors entered the courtroom)

THE COURT: Welcome back, jurors.
The clerk of the court is going to call out a few numbers. If your name is called, please come up with your belongings and the court officer will show you where to sit.

Please remember your seat. That's going to be your seat for the remainder of the trial.

THE CLERK: Seat number 2, B-565.
Juror number 4, B-470.
Juror number 8, B-639.
Juror number 9, B-423.
Juror number 10, B-789.
Juror number 11, B-500.
Juror number 12, B-440.
Alternate 1, B-714.
THE COURT: Jurors, if you were in the jury box and your number was not called, you're excused. Thank you very much for your service. You're excused at this time.

If you were in the audience and you have not yet
had a chance to sit in the jury box, please remain in the audience.
(At this time, the unselected prospective jurors
from the jury box exited the courtroom)
THE CLERK: Are the remaining jurors satisfactory to the People?

MR. STEINGLASS: Yes, they are.
THE CLERK: To the defense?
MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: 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 J. Trump in a fair and impartial manner and, to the best of your ability, render a true verdict according to the law and evidence? Do you swear or affirm?
(AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE FROM JURORS)
THE COURT: Thank you.
Please have a seat.
Jurors, we're not quite done with jury selection.
We're going to continue that tomorrow.
I'm hopeful we will finish tomorrow. So, I'm going to ask you to please come back on Monday morning at 9:30. If everything goes according to plan, at that time, you will hear my instructions at the start of the
trial and then you will hear opening statements.
You've heard me give you certain admonitions several times today. I apologize, but I have to give them to you again. It's very very important that you follow these instructions:

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

Please continue to keep an open mind as to the defendant's guilt or innocence.

Please do not form or express an opinion as to the defendant's guilt or innocence.

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 any attempt by any person to improperly 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, 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 the library or on the internet, or by any
other means or source.
I stress that you are not to talk face-to-face with anyone about the case.

You must also not communicate with anyone about the case by any other means including telephone, text messages, e-mails, chat rooms, blogs, and social websites.

You must not provide any information about the case with anyone by any means whatsoever. That includes the posting of information about the case or what you're doing on the case on any device or internet site including blogs, chat rooms, and social websites.

You must also not Google or otherwise search for any information about the case, the law which applies to the case, or the people involved in the case including the attorneys, the witnesses, and myself.

On Monday, I expect that we will have our 12 jurors and we will also have six alternate jurors--18 of you total. We can't start until every single one of you is here. So, if you're going to be delayed for any reason, give us a call and let us know. If you're going to be delayed, let us know how long you're going to be delayed so that we could let everybody else know.

When I say I want to get started here at 9:30, it means you probably have to get to the building at about a
quarter to 9:00 or so. So, give yourself plenty of time. Thank you.

Please follow the instructions of the officers.
(At this time, the sworn jurors exited the courtroom)

THE COURT: Those of you that remain out in the audience, we're not done with you.

We're going to call out every one of your numbers right now. When your number is called, please come up. You'll be shown to your seat.

We're doing this now, but we're not going to actually start with the questionnaire this afternoon. We're doing it now so that we could know where your seated tomorrow and we could get started at 9:30 sharp.

Whatever seat you get this afternoon will be the same seat that you have tomorrow.

Please listen for your number.
THE CLERK: Seat number 1, B-428.
Seat number 2, B-441.
Seat number 3, B-706.
Seat number 4, B-644.
Seat number 5, B-616.
Seat number 6, B-447.
Seat number 7, B-530.
Seat number 8, B-624.

Seat number 9, B-445.
Seat number 10, B-483.
Seat 11, B-647.
Seat 12, B-800.
Seat 13, B-456.
Seat 14, B-561.
Seat 15, B-557.
Seat 16, B-596.
Seat 17, B-588.
Seat 18, B-651.
Seat 19, B-468.
Seat 20, B-620.
Seat 21, B-662.
Seat number 22, B-763.
THE COURT: Jurors, these are your seats for tomorrow. Try to remember where you're seated.

I really want to get started at 9:30 sharp and, hopefully, we could get you out of here at a decent time.

Those of you in the audience, those are your seats.

The plan is to go through the questionnaires first thing tomorrow at 9:30. Then, you will hear from the attorneys, just as you saw them do earlier today.

Again, in order for you to be here at 9:30, you need to arrive around 8:30, 8:45.

|  | Page 584 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Thank you. |
| 2 | Have a good night. |
| 3 | Please remember all of my instructions. |
| 4 | (At this time, the panel of prospective jurors |
| 5 | exited the courtroom) |
| 6 | THE COURT: Counsel, in case we get done tomorrow |
|  | picking our jury and there's some time left in the day, I |
| 8 | intend to have a Sandoval hearing at that time. |
| 9 | Is there anything else you wanted to go over? |
| 10 | MR. STEINGLASS: There's two things that I need |
| 11 | to put on the record--one brief, one mostly brief: |
| 12 | The brief one is I know your Honor had offered to |
| 13 | break early for counsel on Monday and Tuesday. I'm just |
| 14 | inquiring as to whether that's what we're going to do. |
| 15 | THE COURT: Yes. That's the request. We can do |
| 16 | that. |
| 17 | What we'll do is we'll work through lunch and |
| 18 | we'll break at 2:00. |
| 19 | MR. STEINGLASS: On both Monday and Tuesday? |
| 20 | THE COURT: On Monday and Tuesday. If that's the |
| 21 | request, we could do that. |
| 22 | Is that what you're asking? |
| 23 | MR. STEINGLASS: That is what I'm asking. |
| 24 | MR. BLANCHE: Yes. |
| 25 | (Counsel consulting with the People) |

(Pause in the proceedings)
MR. BLANCHE: Let me just check one thing, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.
(Counsel consulting with co-counsel)
(Pause in the proceedings)
MR. BLANCHE: Your Honor, Tuesday, for Mr. Stern, it's a religious day all day. A half a day doesn't help. It certainly helps other members of the team. Monday, we very much would ask to do what you just said and break after lunch. Tuesday, we would ask that we not sit. He can't be here at all. That's our ask.

THE COURT: People, what's your position on that?
MR. STEINGLASS: I think we discussed this
already and filed a letter with our position. We'll leave it to the Court.

THE COURT: I can appreciate that it's a holiday the entire day for him, but it's not a court holiday. What I'm doing is I'm trying to work with everyone by breaking at 2:00. We're working through lunch, which means everyone that you see in the courtroom is going to have to work through lunch so that we can stop at $2: 00$ so that everyone can get to their destinations. Unfortunately, we can't take the whole day off. I'm sorry.

```
                        Anything else?
```

MR. STEINGLASS: So, does that mean we're going
to work a full day on Tuesday?
THE COURT: No, just until 2:00.
MR. STEINGLASS: I'm not sure that anyone's requesting that if $M r$. Stern's not going to be here.

MR. BLANCHE: We are, your Honor. We have other members who --

MR. STEINGLASS: Okay. I misunderstood.
So, we're working until 2:00 both days. Got it.
The other thing that $I$ wanted to raise for the record, Judge, is we just wish to inquire the Court's preference for potential witnesses at trial being present for other portions of the case including testimony from other witnesses. I believe, in the Trump Corporation trial, your Honor permitted non-factual witnesses--such as summary witnesses--to be present. That's really why I'm asking this--because we have some paralegals that are controlling our technology who also may testify briefly as summary witnesses. I just wanted to clear that in advance because we're going to have to do a lot of training of other paralegals if we can't use these guys for the presentation of evidence.

THE COURT: All right.
Is there any objection to that?
MR. BLANCHE: This is the first I'm hearing of
it. I don't know that there will be an objection. I could talk about it with my team and communicate with the People tonight.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. BLANCHE: On the same theme, I would ask that the People provide us with the names of their first three witnesses so that we can prepare. We're opening now, likely, on Monday morning, which means we maybe won't have evidence, but we could have evidence on Monday.

MR. STEINGLASS: Look, I got to be honest:
That's a courtesy that we normally extend.
Mr. Trump has been tweeting about the witnesses. We're not telling who the witnesses are. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I can't fault the People for that. MR. BLANCHE: What if I commit to the Court and the People that President Trump will not tweet about any witness?

THE COURT: That he will not tweet about any witness?

MR. BLANCHE: Well --
THE COURT: I don't think you can make that representation.

MR. BLANCHE: Well, your Honor --
(Counsel consulting with co-counsel)
(Pause in the proceedings)
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