STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE 17th CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF KENT

MALINDA PEGO, ALI HOSSEIN, HASSAN NEHME, ANNE DELISLE, JESSICA BAREFIELD, NORM SHINKLE, and WARREN CARPENTER,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 24-00658-CZ

VS

KRISTINA KARAMO,

Defendant.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

VOLUME II OF III

BEFORE THE HONORABLE J. JOSEPH ROSSI, CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE Grand Rapids, Michigan - Thursday, February 22, 2024

APPEARANCES:

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs: Attorneys for the Defendant: JONATHAN E. LAUDERBACH, P51313 Collins Einhorn Farrell, PC TROY M. CUMINGS, P63278 KATHERINE G. BOOTHROYD, P85881

Warner Norcross & Judd, LLP

150 Ottawa Ave., N.W., Ste 1500

DARYLE HOUSTON, P79536

4000 Town Center, 9th 1

Southfield, MI 48075 Grand Rapids, MI 49503 616-752-2000

DONALD D. CAMPBELL, P43088 4000 Town Center, 9th Floor 248-355-4141

Attorney for the Defendant: DANIEL J. HARTMAN, P52632 Law Office of Daniel J. Hartman P.O. Box 307 Petoskey, MI 49770 231-348-5100

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED VIA VIDEO RECORDING PROGRAM

Recorded by: Transcribed by:

Wendy White, CER-8273 Barbara J. Ingram, CER-3509 Certified Electronic Reporter 616-799-0969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TIBEL OF CONTENTS
PAGE
WITNESSES:
ANNE DELISLE
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CAMPBELL
MARGARET KURTZWEIL
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAUDERBACH
MOTION BY MR. CAMPBELL
ADMITTED EXHIBITS:
PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT #24

2 Thursday, February 22, 2024 - 9:05 a.m. THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. 3 THE CLERK: We are here in the matter of Malinda Pego versus Kristina Karamo, Case Number 24-00658-CZ. 5 THE COURT: Very good. And, we are returning --6 this is the Evidentiary Hearing pursuant to the Plaintiff's 7 Application for a Preliminary Injunction. 8 Mr. Lauderbach, you may continue. 9 MR. LAUDERBACH: Actually, Your Honor, I believe we 10 -- we were in the middle of the cross of Ms. DeLisle, who is 11 here in the courtroom. 12 13 THE COURT: You're correct. So let's get Ms. DeLisle back on the stand. I'll re-swear Ms. DeLisle 14 since it is a new day. 15 And, then I'll let Mr. Campbell continue with cross-16 17 examination. MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Your Honor, I do want to 18 acknowledge -- first of all, Donald Campbell on behalf of 19 Kristina Karamo. 20 Also at the table with me is my partner, Daryle 21 22 Houston, and I guess we should make the record in this, Judge. You know there's counsel -- co-counsel in this matter. I'm 23 co-counsel with Dan Hartman. Mr. Hartman is here. You have 24 25 granted the request that he be subject to the sequestration

Grand Rapids, Michigan

order. He is on my witness list.

I -- and just so everybody is clear, if you see me talking to Mr. Hartman, Judge, you acknowledge I'm allowed to consult with him outside of this courtroom. I just can't tell him what witnesses have said, and the other things that are going on, effecting sequestration; correct?

THE COURT: Yes. That -- that is correct. You're more than willing and able to consult with him on any legal issue. And, for that matter, your synopsis of the facts, you know, as they currently stand, right. You just can't repeat verbatim any witness testimony from the courtroom.

everyone acknowledging the sequestration order. Of course, you know, just for general knowledge, a sequestration order is normally -- we call it the Rule, and attorneys normally invoke the Rule at the start of any evidentiary procedure or trial.

And, that's so that witnesses aren't present in the courtroom to hear what the prior witness said, and make their testimony either the same or contrary to that.

There's a good reason for it and, after a witness has testified, of course, the witness then can be present in the courtroom -- it's an open courtroom and can listen to the rest of the proceedings.

So that's the reason for sequestration. Mr. Hartman has been listed as a potential material witness. Thus subject

to the sequestration rules. 1 2 There are different mechanics here for deciding, you know, when someone has kind of a dual role as an attorney and 3 a potential -- potential witness. But because of the time constraints, we haven't had time to brief or wade into those 5 in any depth. So Mr. Hartman's graciously agreed to obey the 6 sequestration rule. 7 I would mention to anyone else that's a potential 8 material witness, if you're in the courtroom, you're also 9 subject to sequestration and you should step outside during 10 witness testimony. 11 And, with that, I'll re-swear you, Ms. DeLisle. 12 If you'll raise your right hand? 13 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that your testimony 14 today will be the truth and nothing but the truth? 15 MS. DELISLE: I do. 16 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. And, Mr. Campbell? 18 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 19 ANNE DELISLE 20 recalled on behalf of the Defendant, sworn by the Court, 21 22 testified as follows: CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 24 25 You have, I believe, before you the two binders?

- A Yes, sir.
- 2 Q And, you'll need those now. If you could pull out first the
- binders with the numbers -- with the letters, that would be
- 4 the Defendant's binder. If you can turn to Exhibit A?
- 5 A (Witness complies).
- 6 Q You know there are motions for reconsideration; correct?
- 7 A I don't know what that means.
- 8 Q Okay. In -- under the bylaws are -- if a motion passes or
- 9 carries, is there an opportunity to reconsider that motion?
- 10 A I don't recall that being in the bylaws.
- 11 Q Thank you. Do you know if it's in Robert's Rules?
- 12 A I'm not an expert on Robert's Rules. I wouldn't know the
- exact section on that.
- 14 $\| \mathbb{Q} \|$ Okay. Without knowing the exact section, you do know about
- the availability of a reconsideration; correct?
- 16 A I've never been part of one.
- 17 Q You've never made a reconsideration; correct?
- 18 A I've never been part of one. I've -- I've -- I'm not familiar
- 19 with them.
- 20 Q You've not moved to have the Michigan GOP State Committee
- 21 reconsider its decision to remove you as District Chair on
- January 13th, 2024; correct?
- 23 A I honestly don't know what you're talking about.
- 24 Q You do know that you -- there was a vote to remove you as the
- 25 District Chair on January 13th, 2024; correct?

- A That was not my understanding.
- 2 Q What is your understanding -- well, what's -- did I hear you
- 3 testify yesterday that people are confused about your status?
- 4 A That would be true. But you also -- you also said that I
- couldn't use the word "confused" in the court. You objected
- 6 to my use of the word, "confused.
- 7 Q So, ma'am --
- 8 A I'm not trying to be difficult. I'm just --
- 9 Q Maybe -- maybe you can do it without trying, but let's move
- 10 forward. The question I have for you is, has anybody ever
- 11 told you that you were removed as the -- as the District
- 12 Chair?
- 13 A I was not told I was removed as District Chair. I was told
- there was a vote to remove me from the State Committee. There
- is a distinction.
- 16 Q And, you were told that that vote was successful in terms of
- 17 the vote that was held; correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Okay. So you have never sought to reconsider that vote that
- you learned about; correct?
- 21 A No. Because I did not believe the meeting on January 13th was
- valid. Because Acting Chair Pego rescinded the Call to the
- 23 meeting.
- 24 Q And, when did that happen?
- 25 A I believe the email was sent on January 9th.

- 1 Q You believe that Chair Pego rescinded the January 13th meeting
- on January 9th?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 4 Q The January 13th meeting considered a report from the Sub-
- 5 Committee of the Policy Committee? Correct?
- 6 A That is what I was told. I have not seen it.
- 7 Q You've not seen that report?
- 8 A No, sir.
- 9 Q Okay. If you go to -- well, let's do this first. You were
- 10 the District -- you, on January 6th, you were the District
- 11 Chair for the 8th District; correct?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q You also on January 6th, served as the Secretary Pro Tem at
- 14 the January 6th meeting? Correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q You agree with me that you cannot both act as -- you cannot be
- a Secretary and be a District Chair; correct?
- 18 A I disagree with you.
- 19 Q Okay. You think you can be both persons?
- 20 A I can be a District Chair and I can fill in for an elected
- officer without becoming an elected officer.
- 22 Q So let's go to Page 5 of Exhibit A. Let me know when you're
- there.
- 24 A I am there.
- 25 | Q You see under E, this is Article III; correct? You recognize

- this as that? If not, you can turn to Page 3.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q You see under (E) it colors -- it covers qualifications or
- 4 rights of regular members. Do you see that?
- 5 A I do.
- 6 Q And, there's various provisions within there. For example, if
- 7 you read three lines down, it says regular members shall have
- 8 the right to vote on all matters which come before the
- 9 Committee. Do you see that?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 | Q It says "except as otherwise provided in these bylaws." Do
- 12 you see that?
- 13 A I do.
- 14 Q And, we went over the word "except" yesterday extensively as
- it appears in other rules here; correct? Do you remember
- 16 that?
- 17 A We -- we did discuss that. But I don't think we came to a
- consensus.
- 19 Q Thank you. With regard to a couple of lines down from there,
- 20 there's a sentence that begins, failure of a regular member.
- 21 Do you see that?
- 22 A I do.
- 23 Q Failure of a regular member of the Committee to contribute to
- 24 a regularly -- to a regulated fund of the Committee, or on --
- on or before April 2nd, shall result in an automatic

suspension of all rights and privileges of such regular member 1 2 until the contribution is made. Do you see that? Α I do. 3 And, then there's also a penalty provision of up to -- of another \$50 or up to \$50, do you see that a couple lines down? 5 Α I do. 6 Then it says no individual may serve as a regular member of 7 the Committee in more than one capacity. Do you see that? 8 I do. 9 Α Okay. So you would agree that you cannot serve as a regular 10 member in more than one capacity; correct? 11 Could you define what you mean by capacity? 12 Α These are not the bylaws of Donald Campbell, do you agree with 13 me? 14 I do, sir. Α 15 Thank you. These are not the bylaws of --16 17 Α We just don't agree ---- hold on. If I could --18 Q -- we also agreed that portion --19 MR. CAMPBELL: If I may, Your Honor? 20 THE COURT: Yeah. You do have to respond, 21 22 Ms. DeLisle, to Mr. Campbell's questions. It is crossexamination, so they're gonna be in general leading questions. 23 So wait till he gets the question out, then you can respond. 24 25 Mr. Lauderbach will have an opportunity to re-

```
examine you on a redirect afterwards to clarify.
1
2
                   THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
                   THE COURT: Thank you. You may proceed,
3
         Mr. Campbell.
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
5
         These are the bylaws of the Michigan GOP; correct?
6
         Yes, sir.
7
   Α
8
         And, you are a member of the -- you claim that you are a
         member of the Michigan GOP; correct?
9
10
   Α
         I am.
         And, you claim that you are the 8th District Chair of the GOP;
11
         correct?
12
   Α
         I am.
13
         And, you claim that you've served some time as the Secretary
14
15
         Pro Tem of the Michigan GOP; correct?
   Α
         Yes.
16
17
         And, is it your testimony here today that you don't know what
         the word capacity means in this rule?
18
         It is my understanding of the word capacity that if you're
19
   Α
         referring to the fact of an elected officer, that I did not
20
         serve in the capacity of an elected officer for the Committee.
21
22
         The word Pro Tem means for the time, the temporary. And,
         since the elected Secretary did not attend the meeting, I
23
24
         served in her place for that time. But I was not the officer
25
         for the position of Secretary in the sense of elected officer
```

that we see later on in the bylaws. 1 2 Q It's your testimony that you were not in the capacity of a Secretary when you served as a Secretary Pro Tem? 3 I served Secretary Pro Tem. But that is not the same as being an elected officer. 5 We can agree with that. The question is, it doesn't say serve 6 as an elected officer here; right? The word is capacity. 7 8 More than one capacity. You understand that; right? 9 I think that your use of the word capacity and my understanding of the word capacity have two different 10 meanings. 11 Your meaning is serve as an elected officer; correct? 12 Q 13 Α Yes. But that's not the word the bylaws use; correct? I would base my belief upon the fact that later it talks about 15 elected officers. 16 17 Doesn't that suggest to you that they would have used the word elected officers shall not serve as an officer rather than, 18 you know, working in more than one capacity? 19 I think that, in my opinion, it would be understood. 20 21 Q There is -- and you can read the remainder of that rule, it 22 indicates that if you serve in more than one capacity, your prior -- the original capacity in which you were in, is 23 considered vacant? 24 25 I understand that. And, I was concerned about that, so I

actually asked more than one individual, including two 1 2 separate parliamentarians. And, they both informed me that I would not be basically --3 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to object, Your Honor. That would be hearsay. 5 THE COURT: Response, Mr. Lauderbach, on hearsay? 6 MR. LAUDERBACH: She's answering the question he 7 8 asked. MR. CAMPBELL: No. I asked her if the word vacant 9 is in the rule and she's decided to go on beyond that, Judge. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I --11 MR. LAUDERBACH: Well, if he's not asking a good 12 13 question --THE COURT: Hang on. One at a time. Go ahead, 14 Mr. Campbell, finish your objection. 15 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. It is a good question. I asked have you seen that the result is that your prior position becomes vacant. She said, yes, and then she began to continue to talk. It's not like telling people to, you know, be quiet and things like that. If I'm -- if that's the way this is going to have to be conducted, we can do it. I thought I'd let her talk a little bit. When she got into hearsay, that's when I then basically said it's beyond the scope of the question answered or -- asked.

THE COURT: All right. Response, Mr. Lauderbach?

MR. LAUDERBACH: She's answering the question he asked to the best of her ability. If he doesn't like the answers he's getting, he should ask better questions.

THE COURT: All right. Well, however I did hear the witness was going to venture into hearsay and to what other people told her. And, of course, we can only take first person testimony, although the nature of an evidentiary hearing, there is a little more flexibility on the evidentiary rules because I as the judge evaluate the weight of the testimony.

Nonetheless, I'll ask Ms. DeLisle if -- not to relate what anyone else said.

And, do remember, Mr. Lauderbach will be able to ask you some questions to clarify after cross-examination.

So with that cautionary instruction, you may proceed. I guess the objection is sustained to hearsay. You may proceed with your guestions.

MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, one -- one additional thing. What she's answering was why she did what she did.

That's not offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted.

That's not hearsay. Why I did what I did, doesn't go to the truth of the matter asserted.

MR. CAMPBELL: That wasn't the question.

THE COURT: Well, I think that probably she extrapolated to that question which was probably reasonable

from your cross-examination question. 1 2 However, we are treading perilously close to the truth of the matter asserted because the truth -- the matter 3 being asserted here was official capacity and what a person can do and cannot do. Under that that would essentially be a 5 legal question and could involve consultation with a 6 parliamentarian. 7 So I'll continue with the objection sustained. 8 may proceed, Mr. Campbell. 9 10 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. BY MR. CAMPBELL: 11 And that vacancy that would be created under this rule, can 12 only be filled pursuant to the bylaws; correct? 13 Α (No response). 14 You can read the -- I'm asking whether those -- it says, 15 automatically become vacant to be filled pursuant to these 16 bylaws. Those are -- that's the wording of this rule; 17 18 correct? Α Yes. 19 So if you were wrong, you'll agree with me, if you were wrong 20 in your assessment of whether you could fill more than one 21 22 capacity, then your seat as District Chair became vacant; correct? 23 24 That is not what I was told.

25

Q

I'm going to --

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, I believe that's non-1 2 responsive. THE COURT: Okay. Well, and I think however you 3 have as much of an answer to that question as you're going to get. You know, she's read the bylaws, she was told perhaps 5 other things by other people there. 6 What I will do is agree with you, that is non-7 responsive and ask you to rephrase the question. 8 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 9 10 BY MR. CAMPBELL: If a vacancy occurred when you took that role as Secretary Pro 11 Tem, then the vacancy could only be filled pursuant to the 12 bylaws; correct? I'm not asking you to agree whether you 13 were, I'm just asking you to agree with the concept that if 14 15 you were. THE COURT: And, also, Ms. DeLisle, if you don't 16 17 know, it's also acceptable to say that I don't know that 18 answer. THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't know. 19 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 20 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 21 22 To your knowledge, under the bylaws, has the 8th District -it's the 8th District; correct? 23 24 Α Yes. 25 Q Has the 8th District Chair been filled? Since January 6th?

- 1 A I am the 8th District Chair.
- 2 Q Okay. But you claim you were before and have continued
- 3 through; correct?
- 4 A I've claimed that I was and am.
- 5 Q Okay. But it hasn't been filled under the bylaws since then?
- 6 Since January 6th? Correct?
- 7 A Cor -- I -- I don't know how to answer that.
- 8 Q Okay. How about this, you're unaware of it being filled since
- 9 then?
- 10 A I don't know how to answer that question.
- 11 Q When you arrived at the meeting of January 6th, were you the
- 12 8th District Chair?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q When did you stop becoming the 8th District Chair?
- 15 A I have never stopped becoming the 8th District Chair.
- 16 Q So you did serve as 8th District Chair and Secretary Pro Tem
- 17 at the same time?
- 18 A I served as the Secretary Pro Tem, which is a substitute
- 19 person, it's like a pinch hitter.
- 20 Q Okay. So you think you can be a pinch hitter and some other
- player at the same time? I'm just trying to figure this out.
- 22 If -- if you were the District 8th -- did you act as the
- District 8th Chairperson at the meeting? At the same time you
- 24 were acting as Pro Tem?
- 25 A No. I did not.

- Okay. So at some point, you stopped being, for some period of time, the 8th District Chair, on January 6th? Is that a fair statement?
- A Sir, I feel like you're trying to split hairs, and I don't understand your question. I don't understand what you're trying to say, and so I'm not trying to be -- to frustrate you.
- 8 Q You're not frustrating me.
- 9 A But I don't understand your point, sir.
- 10 Q It's an important point, so I'll try again. And, I appreciate
 11 you letting me know that. If it happens again, please let me
 12 know. So here we'll try.
 - I heard you say that you did not serve as both the 8th Chair and Secretary Pro Tem on January 6th at the same time.
- 16 A What I am hearing you ask me --
- 17 Q If I may -- my question is, did you tell me that? That's a yes or a no.
- 19 A What I am hearing you say --
- 20 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to object, Your Honor.
- I've asked for a yes or no. I think I'm entitled to that.
- THE WITNESS: I'm trying to explain why I understand

 -- what I'm under -- what I'm hearing so I can explain my

 answer.

25

13

14

```
BY MR. CAMPBELL:
2
         But what I'm trying to establish your answer.
   Α
         Then --
3
                   THE COURT: Why don't you re-ask the question,
4
         Mr. Campbell? I'm not sure that I have it clearly in my mind.
5
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
6
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
7
         Yes or no, did you tell me that there was a time on
8
         January 6th that you were not acting as District 8 Chair?
9
   Α
         If you mean was I sitting with my District delegation, and was
10
         I sitting with them and -- and leading them as I would in a
11
         normal meeting, the answer would be no, because I was not
12
         sitting in the same row with them, and I was not having
13
         conversation with them during the meeting because I was in a
14
         specifically different location taking minutes. But that does
15
         not -- I --
16
17
         Who was -- when you were sitting there taking minutes, who was
         the District 8 Chair?
18
   Α
         I was.
19
         Okay. So you -- that's important. Thank you. Next question.
20
         These rules are designed to make sure as close as possible the
21
22
         votes are fair and accurate; correct? Yes or no?
         Can I ask you a question, sir?
23
24
         No.
25
                   THE COURT:
                               No, just try to respond to the
```

```
questions.
1
2
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Other -- other than that one.
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
3
         So did you -- did you hear my last question?
   Α
         No.
5
6
         Okay. These rules are designed for fair and accurate votes as
   Q
         much as possible; correct?
7
8
   Α
         Yes.
         Okay. If you -- if I were to be Secretary of the Michigan GOP
9
10
         and District Chair of District 40, I know there aren't 40. If
         I was the Chair of District 40, and the Secretary, I would get
11
         two different votes in that capacity?
12
13
   Α
         No.
         No? Because the rules don't allow two different votes; right?
14
         The rules do not allow two different votes.
15
   Α
         In fact, this is the section that says you can't have two
16
         different votes because you can only serve in one capacity
17
         because the District Chair gets a vote; correct?
18
         There is a distinction between capacity and two different
   Α
19
         votes, sir. If the same thing as asking, can you be a husband
20
         and father at the same time.
21
22
         Again, as District Chair, you get a vote; correct?
   Q
23
   Α
         Yes.
24
         As a Secretary you would get a vote; correct?
25
   Α
         Those are two separate -- I did not vote twice.
```

Q I haven't asked that question, ma'am. This will go quicker, which I think your Counsel would like, if you can answer my questions, and I don't have to ask them two or three times.

Do you remember my question?

- A I remember that you are continuously confusing me. I don't understand the question you're trying to ask.
- Q This is important because I do not want to confuse you. I do want you to understand the questions that I'm asking.

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, I guess I need a little bit of your help. I don't think my question was confusing when I asked her, isn't it true as the Secretary you get a vote.

THE COURT: Okay. Well -- and of course, my definition of confusing might be different than any given witness' definition of confusing.

I will just remind Ms. DeLisle, if a question confuses you, you can say that, and you can also respond simply that you don't understand the question or that you don't know, and then Mr. Lauderbach can re-examine you during direct examination and clarify those issues.

And, further, it also gives Mr. Campbell the opportunity to reframe his question, maybe break it down in even simpler more straightforward manners.

So with that, I will direct you to try to respond, you know, the theory of cross-examination is that the question should be answered with a yes or a no in general, if you can.

If you can't, just say I -- I don't know the answer to that or I don't understand, are also okay answers.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With that, go ahead, Mr. Lauderbach.

MR. LAUDERBACH: I'd like to interpose a relevance objection to this entire line of questioning. The positions, Secretary Pro Tem is not a position under the bylaws. None of these questions have anything to do with an office under the bylaws. She said twelve different ways, twelve different times, she was the Secretary Pro Tem under Robert's Rules of Order, because the Secretary, who is an office holder, didn't show up.

None of this is relevant. But --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah. I could give you an offer of proof if the witness were not here. I'm happy to do that.

But in terms of this, he says office holder. We just went through the rule, Judge. It says capacity. Does -- these are two different capacities. She's acknowledged it by saying I wasn't with them, I was over here doing something else which

is different capacity to be Secretary Pro Tem than it is to be

THE COURT: Response on the relevance, Mr. Campbell?

a District -- and there is importance about what those two offices or if you're -- those two capacities can do.

Because Secretary Pro Tem, if they sit there instead of the Secretary, there's limitations on a Secretary that

don't exist on a District Chair that become important to this.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to trust you to connect those up for me. I mean, it would certainly seem -- seem to me that she has answered the rule. One of the foremost questions is that didn't give me two votes, I still only had one vote for the meetings that were important here.

I'd ask you to connect that up quickly for me, or
I'll grant the objection on relevance and have you move on to
a new topic.

10 BY MR. CAMPBELL:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

- 11 Q The vote that you cast, in what capacity did you cast it, as
 12 District Chair or Secretary Pro Tem?
- 13 A As the 8th District Chair.
- Q So sitting as the Secretary Pro Tem, you cast a vote for the 8th -- as the 8th District Chair?
- 16 A I am the 8th Congressional District Chair. I cast my vote as
 17 the 8th Congressional District Chair.
- Q So we're clear. Nobody made you become the Secretary Pro Tem, you accepted that position; correct?
- 20 A I was asked to take minutes and I took the minutes.
- Q Well, you were asked to serve as the Secretary Pro Tem instead of the Secretary; right?
- 23 A The Secretary did not show up. And, I was asked to take the
 24 minutes because they knew I had served in that capacity
 25 before.

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, you've already instructed us on time. I've got to tell you, we're going to have to reset all the time levels that we have set because I've asked a very simple question that cannot be broken down any easier, and I'm not getting an answer to it.

So I have to ask it again and again and again. And, so I'm just pointing that out. This is not me wasting time, this is me trying to get and establish an important point.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then I'd like you to get to that important point. I'm having a difficult time seeing it.

I did hear her testify she cast her vote as the Chair, which seems like her one vote that she got in these proceedings.

Why don't you close that up and then we can quickly move on to a different topic?

15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:

- Q Can a Secretary assign a proxy? Yes or no?
- 17 A Secretary -- the Secretary of the Committee could only sign 18 proxy -- assign a proxy for herself or himself.
- 19 Q Okay. Thank you. You signed proxies for people who are not yourself for that meeting; correct?
 - A As the 8th Congressional District Chair prior to the beginning of the meeting.
 - Q Well, no. This is what we were talking about before. I asked when did you become, when did you not. So you think you can sign a proxy before you get to the meeting, and then you can

then assume the position of the Chair (sic) which could not 1 2 sign a proxy at all; correct? For that meeting? I think you need to restate the question because I think you 3 Α mis-spoke, sir. Well, so you don't have an answer to the question that I did 5 Q 6 spoke (sic); right? Α No. You said that once I -- when I got to the meeting as the 7 Chair (sic), I could not sign --8 If I said Chair, I do apologize at that, but let's go to 9 Exhibit 30. The other item. 10 (Witness complies). Α 11 Let me know when you're there. 12 Q I'm looking at Exhibit 30. 13 Α If you go 14 pages in, let me know when you're there. You 14 should be to -- actually it would be 15 pages in, I think. 15 have some questions for you. 16 MR. CAMPBELL: I believe, Judge, you have admitted 17 30 over my objection, but you admitted it. 18 THE COURT: That is correct. 19 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 20 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 21 22 So are you at a document that says it's from the -- the handwritten part has an 8 and then it says Anne DeLisle, 23 24 Chair. Do you see that?

25

Α

Yes, sir.

```
1 Q Okay. Chair of --
2 A The 8th District.
```

- 2 A The 8th District.
- 3 Q Thank you. And, this -- you recognize is a proxy form;
- 4 correct?
- 5 A I do.
- 6 Q It's a proxy form for January 6th, it says it right on there;
- 7 correct?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q And, you signed this proxy; correct?
- 10 A I did.
- 11 Q And, you are not Amy Mosher-Robb; correct?
- 12 A I am not.
- 13 Q Turn the page. You signed the proxy for the next item as
- 14 well; correct?
- 15 A I did.
- 16 Q And, this is for somebody named Jay?
- 17 A Fedewa.
- 18 Q F-e-d-e-w-a?
- 19 A w-a. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q And, you are not Jay? Correct.
- 21 A I am not.
- 22 Q You signed the proxy for Shannon --
- 23 A Elenbaas.
- 24 Q Elenbaas, E-l-e-n-b-a-a-s; correct?
- 25 A I did.

- 1 Q Did you sign any other proxies for January 6th?
- 2 A Not that I recall.
- 3 Q If there's a violation of Section (E) of Article III,
- concerning a regular member taking on two capacities that are
- not permitted, where would that issue go to? Well, let me ask
- 6 you this. Isn't it true it would go to the Policy Committee?
- 7 A That is what -- it's my understanding that's what the bylaws
- 8 state in the conflict of interest clause.
- 9 Q And, to your knowledge, nobody from the Policy Committee has
- ever been removed by any action on January 6th; correct?
- 11 A Could you restate the question?
- 12 Q Yes. Do you need to see the minutes from January 6th, would
- that be helpful? Again, I want to make sure you have
- 14 everything in front of you.
- 15 A No. It's my understanding --
- 16 Q Okay. I will -- I will restate the question.
- 17 A Please. Thank you.
- 18 Q Isn't it true that no member of the Policy Committee has been
- removed since before January 6th? In other words, it's the
- same Policy Committee on January 5th as it was on January 7th?
- 21 A No one was removed from the Policy Committee on January 6th.
- 22 Q Thank you. So the Policy Committee that existed on
- January 5th is the same Policy Committee that existed on
- January 7th, to your knowledge; correct? I'm not trying to be
- 25 tricky, I just want to make sure we're talking about the same

```
thing.
1
2
         Well, the Chairwoman -- I'm trying to recall, the Chairwoman
         -- former Chairwoman removed several members of several
3
         committees. I just can't recall the date that she did that.
         Okay. Do you know if any of them were in the Policy
5
   Q
6
         Committee?
7
   Α
         Yes.
8
         Okay. Who was that?
         From my district, she removed Ian Shetron and from the
9
   Α
         2nd District, she removed the Chair, Andy Sebolt.
10
         Okay. But you don't recall when that occurred?
11
         I don't recall the exact date.
12
   Α
13
   0
         Thank you. Do you know how many members are on the Policy
         Committee?
14
         There should be 13.
15
   Α
         Okay. And, the Policy Committee would take up issues of, for
16
         example, how to define capacity? Correct?
17
   Α
         I don't know that.
18
         Okay. But if they're the ones that enforce violations of that
19
         rule, they would be the ones to enforce that rule and to
20
         enforce an understanding of that rule; correct?
21
22
   Α
         That would be my understanding.
         Okay. And, have you ever seen the Policy Committee report
23
         concerning your activities on January 6th?
24
25
         I have not, but I have a text message from the member from my
```

```
1
         committee.
2
   Q
         Okay. So -- but you haven't actually read the report?
         I have not.
3
   Α
         Okay. Give me a moment because that's an exhibit here. I
         believe it's Exhibit -- give me a moment -- I've got to get
5
6
         back to it.
                   MR. CAMPBELL: I had that before the meeting. I
7
         apologize. Oh, there it is. No, that's the Special Meeting.
8
         Why can't I find the Special Committee Report?
9
10
                   Give me a moment. I just need a moment, I'm trying
         to look for an exhibit. I apologize.
11
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: It's our 28.
12
                   MR. CAMPBELL: It's your 28? That's -- it should be
13
         in mine, too. I'll take that. Thank you.
14
                   (At 9:39 a.m., Mr. Lauderbach hands exhibit to
15
                   Mr. Campbell)
16
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
17
18
       Could you turn to Exhibit 28, please?
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Jon.
19
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: Um-hmm.
20
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
21
22
         I'll ask you just -- having the document in front of you, have
         you ever seen that document?
23
24
   Α
         I have not.
25
         So you couldn't comment on it one way or another?
```

- 1 A I've not read it. If you'd like me to take the time to read
 2 it, I can.
- 3 Q Well, there is a portion that I'd like you to read. It's the
- 4 second paragraph. It says, "This preliminary report also
- 5 includes additional details, examples of why the unauthorized
- January 6th meeting was invalid, deceptive. And, counter to
- 7 the true Republican spirit of an open, transparent,
- 8 deliberative process." You see that; correct?
- 9 A I do.
- 10 Q And -- and in terms of the -- I'm talking about the Policy
- 11 Committee, the Policy Committee has Sub-Committees; correct?
- 12 A I -- I would make an assumption that they do, but I don't
- 13 know, I'm not on the Policy Committee.
- 14 Q Okay. If you go to the last page of this document,
- 15 Exhibit 28, you'll see four names who are identified as the
- 16 Policy Sub-Committee.
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And, not only do they have names, but they have District
- identifications. You see that; correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q And, there -- there's somebody from District 6; correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Somebody from District 9?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Somebody from District 1?

```
1  A Yes.
2  Q And, again, I talked about I know there's not 40 districts,
3  how many districts are there?
4  A Thirteen.
```

- 5 Q Thank you. Then there's a District 8; correct?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q That's the same District 8 that you're from; correct?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q And, it's a Joey Storer --
- 10 A Storer.
- 11 Q S-t-o-r-e-r; correct?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 Q Do you know Joey Storer?
- 14 A I do.
- 15 Q Okay. And, Joey Storer is still a member of your district?
- 16 A He is.
- 17 | Q And, the recommendation is made by the sub-committee to the
- 18 Committee, you're -- you're aware of that; correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And, the Committee then passes it on, if it chooses, to the
- 21 State Committee; correct?
- 22 A I believe that's how it works.
- 23 Q If you look at Page 3 of 7, the sub-committee has a section
- 24 that's entitled, "Whether Valid Quorum Existed for the Conduct
- of the Business." Do you see that?

- 1 A I do.
- 2 Q And, do you see that it starts with a three-word sentence, It
- did not, and ended with an exclamation point. Do you see
- 4 that?
- 5 A I do.
- 6 Q You are not a member of the Policy Committee; correct?
- 7 A That is correct.
- 8 | Q You're not a member of the Sub-Committee; correct?
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 Q And, you're not a member of the officers of the Michigan GOP;
- 11 correct?
- 12 A I am not a member of the Policy Committee, or the sub-
- committee, and I am not an officer of the Michigan Republican
- 14 State Committee.
- 15 Q Give me just a moment. There is a provision for removal of a
- individual from a committee; correct? In the bylaws, let me
- 17 be very specific.
- 18 A There are, I think, three separate provisions.
- 19 Q There is a provision for the removal of a -- an officer?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q We've covered that, it's (G)(2), I think it's Section --
- 22 Article II. There's also a provision in the bylaws, let's go
- back to A, that provides for disciplinary action in the event
- 24 -- or it applies -- sorry. It applies disciplinary action
- 25 under the bylaws; correct? Short of removal from the

- 1 Committee? Are you aware of that?
- 2 A I don't recall that particular provision.
- 3 Q Okay. Let's look Article III (M)(10). This is Page 10 of my
- 4 Exhibit A. There's a penalty provision. Do you see that?
- 5 A I do.
- 6 Q And, it is any member of the Committee who violates this
- 7 section shall lose their position on the Committee, and shall
- 8 remain ineligible for service on the Committee for a period of
- 9 five years from the time of discovery of the violation. And,
- then it goes on to say, an expelled member may become eligible
- for membership on the Committee -- sorry, yeah, before the
- 12 five year penalty period expires only if his or her penalty is
- waived by the majority vote of the regular members of the
- 14 Committee. Do you see that?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q And, this is the Conflict of Interest section under (M), do
- 17 you see that at Page 8?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And, it sets forth -- forth a purpose and requirements of
- 20 members of the Committee; correct?
- 21 A I -- I believe -- I believe I understand the question, yes.
- 22 Q And, then there's a Section IX, above X in respect to Page 10.
- 23 So learn that there is a penalty, but this is the section that
- covers the determination of a violation. Do you see that?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q The Compliance Officer appointed on Section -- Sub-Section (6) 2 above, either after receiving a complaint, or utilizing his or
- her own discretion, will make a recommendation to the Policy
- 4 Committee whether or not a violation of this section occurred.
- 5 The Policy Committee, in turn, shall make a recommendation to
- 6 this Committee whether or not a violation of this section has
- occurred. Thereafter whether or not a violation of this
- 8 section has been committed, shall be determined by a
- 9 66-2/3 percent vote of the regular members of this committee.
- 10 Do you see that?
- 11 A I do.
- 12 Q So this is one of those sections that we talked about
- 13 yesterday where it takes a higher number of votes to exercise
- the action; correct?
- 15 A Correct.
- 16 Q Than a normal quorum, which would be just a majority; correct?
- 17 A Correct.
- 18 Q And, it is -- do you agree the design here is to make it
- 19 harder to --
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q -- make a determination of a violation?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And, that the protections to make it harder would include it
- 24 | being a 66 and .6 --
- 25 A 2/3.

- 1 Q -- well, 66.6 is the way that -- or .67 I guess, is the way
- 2 that -- yeah, they do say 2/3. Let's go with you, 2/3;
- 3 correct?
- 4 A Yeah.
- 5 Q You have to say yes or no. I'm sorry.
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Thank you. That is a means, however, of removal that requires
- 8 a lower threshold than the 75 percent which is normally used
- 9 -- needed in order to remove somebody from the Committee;
- 10 correct?
- 11 A It would seem so.
- 12 Q In addition, it also -- this section, does not include any
- number of petitions that need to be filed or anything like
- 14 that; right?
- 15 A I don't believe so.
- 16 Q Yeah. In other words, this can be done through the Policy
- 17 Committee up to the State Committee, and it can be taken on in
- the course of a meeting and resolved; correct?
- 19 A I believe so.
- 20 Q And, I know you don't agree with it, but at least is that your
- understanding what was done on January 13th, concerning your
- circumstances? You were not removed under the 75 percent
- requirement, it was an issue of discipline under the 66-2/3
- 24 provision? Again, not -- not making you agree with it, but
- 25 that is the provision that was at issue; correct?

- 1 A That is my understanding, but I have two reservations.
- 2 Q Okay. Your Counsel can ask you those and I'm sure he will.
- 3 So I'm not ignoring you, I don't want to take his questions
- 4 away from -- from you. But, thank you for that.
- Section IV (G)(2), I think I have the correct one.
- 6 We'll go there next. It's kinda, sorta where we were when we
- 7 broke yesterday. So I think we're back here.
- 8 That covers removal of officers and that provision
- 9 does require 50 percent petition to Call the vote; correct?
- 10 A I believe so.
- 11 Q And, we saw the phrase in the last Rule about regular members
- of the Committee or whatever it was, it's not important, but
- there was a way of saying regular members of this Committee,
- 14 that was the phrase at Paragraph 9 on Page 10 under the
- 15 Conflict section? Regular members of this Committee; right?
- 16 A One moment -- I just need to look something up real quick.
- 17 Q Is it responsive to my question on what's on Page 10 because
- that's the only question before you right now?
- 19 A It -- it is.
- 20 Q Okay. Thank you.
- 21 A Could you please restate your question, sir?
- 22 Q Sure. Am I correct when I read at Page 10, under Paragraph 9,
- 23 the following phrase: 66-2/3 vote of the regular members of
- 24 this Committee is the way this rule was designed?
- 25 A That would be my understanding.

- And, I want to pull out another phrase where we're going here, this (G)(2), actually let's go to the quorum rule -- rule for a second. That's where I want to go.
- And, the quorum rule is VI, VI(C). Do you see where
 they use in that rule, it says a majority of the total
 membership of the Committee. Do you see that?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Okay. You're not a parliamentarian; right?
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 Q You're not a language construction kind of person; right?
- 11 A I don't know what you mean by that.
- 12 Q I probably -- I'm not a language construction person either,
- so maybe I'll try again. That's a fair comment. These are
- two different descriptions, regular members and total -- I
- mean total membership. Those are two different statements;
- 16 correct? You would agree with me?
- 17 A (No response).
- 18 Q I'm not asking what they mean yet. I'm just asking if you agree, those are different words?
- 20 A They're different phrases.
- 21 Q Thank you. They knew how to write the word regular members of
- 22 the Committee in an earlier bylaw. Here a later bylaw,
- 23 they've chosen to write a majority of the total membership.
- Do you agree with me there?
- 25 A (No response).

- 1 Q This was -- this was not an accident, this is on purpose
- 2 somebody wrote this?
- 3 A The words total membership appear there, yes.
- 4 Q Okay. And, you don't think it's a typo, do you?
- 5 A I don't know what the author -- I don't -- I don't know what
- 6 their original intent was. I --
- 7 Q Other than to say that they --
- 8 A -- other than what's on the page.
- 9 Q Right. They clearly use two different phrases; correct?
- 10 A Um-hmm. Yes.
- 11 Q Now let's talk about what could be meant by the total
- membership. And, let me see if I can find my exhibit to
- highlight this. I'll try to do it real quick. There's an
- email from Chairperson Karamo where she makes reference to
- 15 200 members. I don't know -- I don't want to catch you off
- guard. Let me see if I can find it. I might be able to find
- it in the other one quicker.
- 18 (At 9:54 a.m., Mr. Campbell looking for document)
- 19 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
- 20 Q Yes. If you can go to Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, they're in the
- 21 number binder. I apologize for making you bounce back and
- forth. When you're there, let me know.
- 23 A I'm there.
- 24 Q So it is -- four pages; correct?
- 25 A It is four pages.

- 1 Q If you go to the third of those four pages, you'll see at the
- top of the page, there are points -- literally points on the
- page, and there's writing behind each point; correct?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q And, to be fair, it's a carry-over from the same point
- 6 structure of the previous page under a description Timeline;
- 7 correct?
- 8 A They're bullet points, yes.
- 9 Q Good. It's not how I refer to them, but I understand what
- 10 you're saying. The very first point reads, "As MIGOP Chair, I
- 11 have almost 200 members to consider, including those from
- northern and western Michigan, maximum member participation
- was my priority." Do you see that statement?
- 14 A I do.
- 15 Q Do you know why the number is almost 200? We've been talking
- about 107 and 106. What would justify a number of 200?
- 17 A My assumption, you want my assumption?
- 18 Q Well, let me ask you this. Beyond the 107 members of the
- 19 State Committee, there are other members; correct?
- 20 A There are Ex Officio members.
- 21 Q Okay. And, how many of them are there?
- 22 A I believe that there's 83 County Chairs -- and 82 County
- Chairs and three from Wayne County Committee.
- 24 Q And, so if you take --
- 25 A So 86.

- 1 Q -- if you take our number of 106 or 107, and you add those up,
- that's close to 200; correct?
- 3 A That would be 100 and -- or approximately 190 and then you
- 4 also have Statutory -- or Ex Officio members from the Michigan
- 5 House of Representatives, and the Michigan Senate and
- 6 Congressional Delegation.
- 7 Q So you may get in excess of 200 if you keep counting high
- 8 enough; right?
- 9 A You wouldn't, no it would just be under.
- 10 Q Just under 200? Okay. So when she used that phrase in that
- email, at least you would understand her references to this
- larger group beyond the State Committee; correct?
- 13 A That would be what would make sense to me.
- 14 Q Yes. And, it's true the Chair is the Chair for the larger
- group as well as for the State Committee; is that a fair
- 16 statement?
- 17 A I think so.
- 18 Q When it says total membership, as opposed to regular
- membership, would you agree with me the State Committee, to be
- 20 a regular member, is actually described in that rule about
- 21 paying -- it's Page 5, Section -- is it III (E)?
- 22 A (No response).
- 23 Q It tells you about regular members shall have the right to
- vote on all matters which come before the Committee; correct?
- 25 A I believe so.

- 1 Q Okay. So an Ex Officio is not a regular member, you would
- 2 agree with me?
- 3 A I would agree that an Ex Officio member is not a regular
- 4 member. They do not have voting rights.
- 5 Q Thank you. The 83 County Chairs, that includes the three also
- from Wayne County; correct?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q That includes all the other folks that you described in terms
- of public offices and things like that; right?
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q Okay. So they're not regular members? Correct?
- 12 A That would be my understanding.
- 13 Q We talked about members, you know, total membership -- total
- membership would be those folks; right?
- 15 A That's not my understanding.
- 16 Q Okay. But you don't have a special understanding, you weren't
- 17 there when they wrote this; right?
- 18 A That is correct.
- 19 Q Okay. You could -- but total membership is different than
- 20 regular membership; correct?
- 21 A Sir --
- 22 Q Yes.
- 23 A -- if what you are leading to means that business cannot be
- conducted without the quorum of the total membership, then no
- 25 business should have occurred at all in the last year on the

State Committee.

2 Q So in other words, what you're saying is there has to be
3 reasonable accommodations for words that may not have the -4 that if applied as written, would lead to an absurd result;
5 correct?

- A That would be my understanding. But I am neither an attorney nor a parliamentarian.
- Q Okay. Do you think the bylaw -- well, I'll withdraw that question, I'll go to another.

So now we want to take -- I want to take you to Article IV (G). It's back a couple pages. Removal -- removal of officers. And, the second item is removal by the Committee. This rule requires signatures of at least 50 percent of the entire Committee, no proxies allowed, to be filed with the Chairman, or if the Chairman is the officer in question, then such petition shall be filed with the Secretary.

So you agree that there had to be petitions with 50 percent of the members; correct?

- A I disagree. The word entire does not come before the word Committee.
- 22 Q So I misread is what you're saying?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- Q Thank you. I -- we do agree that as written here, these are the rules? Not how I read 'em, but how -- how they're

- written. You have it in front of you, too.
- 2 A I accept the Rules as written.
- 3 Q Thank you. And, the total, you believe, was 106 Committee
- 4 members on January 6th?
- 5 A There is a discrepancy in the total -- in the understanding.
- 6 Chair Karamo used the number 107 in August to deny our Special
- 7 Meeting request in August. So we based the total membership
- 8 on the number of seats versus the number of those holding
- 9 seats. And, so we based our number on 107, half of 107 is
- 10 53.5, rounding up to 54.
- 11 Q Okay. So you believe that with 54 signatures, you would
- satisfy this rule and any other construction there, you know,
- anybody's -- I guess it would be clearly under this rule,
- that's what you thought?
- 15 A I believe so.
- 16 Q Okay. This is the first mention of August that I've heard.
- 17 So as early as August you were trying to remove Chairperson
- 18 Karamo?
- 19 A No.
- 20 Q Okay.
- 21 A As early as August, we requested another Special Meeting and
- she denied that request because she said that we were one
- signature short because we based our request on a number of
- seats that we knew were filled, and she said that we didn't
- 25 have enough signatures even though according to the number of

```
seats filled, we did.
1
2
   Q
         And, that's that 39 signatures that you did gather. So we're
         not talking about the 50 petitions, we're talking about the 39
3
         signatures --
         To request a Special Meeting.
5
   Α
         -- correct. On December 2nd, is that when those were
6
   Q
         gathered; correct?
7
         Yes. Those signatures for the Special Meeting, were -- they
8
         were -- yes, they were gathered on December 2nd.
9
         Okay. And -- but as early as August, you had the idea of
10
         having a Special Meeting and the purpose of that Special
11
         Meeting would have been to remove Chairperson Karamo; correct?
12
         No. It was a different request.
13
   Α
         Okay. Thank you.
14
         It may have been in late July, but it was late summer -- or it
15
         was in the summer.
16
17
         You -- you're now saying you can't remember the exact date of
         the issue coming up?
18
19
```

A It was the other Special Meeting that we -- we requested. It was either late July or very early August. I can't remember the exact date, but I believe the meeting was held in August.

We have -- we just had another informal meting.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. So we're at IV (G)(2), which is the removal and the 50 petitions, and I wanted to look at those -- well, you know -- that's Exhibit J.

```
MR. CAMPBELL: Actually I think it is -- give me a
1
2
         moment. This is the one where I think I need you to have both
         J and 11 open.
3
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
         Isn't -- yes, it is J. I know I need to get -- I need you to
5
6
         have Exhibit J and Exhibit 11 open, please. They are related.
         Do you have them both in front of you?
7
8
   Α
         Yes, sir.
         Thank you. If you look at Exhibit 11, you would agree with me
9
10
         that behind the highlighted list that's there, these are the
         petitions that were submitted at 1:49, just after 1:49 in the
11
         afternoon of July (sic) 6th, 2024; correct? Not July, January
12
13
         6th.
   Α
         Correct.
14
         And, of the -- if you go to the second page of Petitioners,
15
         there's Mr. Balog's petition; correct?
16
17
   Α
         Yes.
         Behind his is Mr. Marcum's; correct?
18
   Q
   Α
         Yes.
19
         And, then if you go -- I think his last name I may have showed
20
   Q
         you before we broke -- there's Ms. Linting's petition later in
21
22
         there; correct?
         Yes.
23
   Α
24
         Okay. So they're among the 54 signatures -- signatures that
25
         were gathered; correct?
```

Α Yes. 2 And, now if you look at Exhibit J, on the third page of that exhibit, there is a statement, and then it continues on to the 3 fourth page. Do you see that? Α I do. 5 And, there are -- it's purported to be signed by Mr. Balog, 6 Mr. Marcum, and Ms. Linting; correct? 7 8 Α Yes. And, above that, you can read on the first line of that page, 9 our signatures were misappropriated. And, we did not 10 authorize them to be filed today for a meeting that took place 11 today. Do you see that? 12 13 Α I do. Do you see how they disavowed the use of their names among the 14 54 submitted as they did not sign today for this meeting. 15 you see that? 16 I do. 17 Α They also take issues -- issues with the proxy on the previous 18 page, but this -- these statements are attributable to the 19 20 petition; correct? It's my understanding that they're referring to the petitions 21 Α 22 they signed. Thank you. And, you would agree that if you start with 54, 23 24 and you take three away, that that would leave you with 51; 25 correct?

- A If you subtract three from 54, you have 51.
- 2 Q And, you would agree with me that 51 petitions would not be
- enough in order to Call the question on January 6th?
- 4 A I would agree with you that if there were only 51 petitions
- 5 collected, that that would be insufficient. However, there
- 6 were 54 petitions collected.
- 7 Q Would you agree with me that if there was fraud and deceit in
- 8 the collection of the petitions, those petitions collected
- 9 through fraud and deceit would not be valid?
- 10 A Could you please define what you mean by fraud and deceit?
- 11 Q Sure. Do you know what fraud and deceit mean?
- 12 A I do not.
- 13 Q You do not know what the word fraud means?
- 14 A I do not know what the word fraud means. I'll accept if you
- say credit card fraud, someone stole my credit card out of my
- wallet, and they used it to make purchases in Hong Kong, I
- would understand what that means because that -- something
- 18 similar has happened to me.
- But I do not know what you mean by the word fraud in
- 20 this instance.
- 21 Q You testified yesterday that you take your role and
- responsibility with the Michigan -- Michigan GOP seriously?
- 23 Correct?
- 24 A I do.
- 25 Q Okay. And, seriously you're saying you do not understand what

- the word fraud means; correct?
- 2 A I'm being honest and sincere with you when I say that I do not
- 3 know what the word fraud means.
- 4 Q Do you -- and you don't know what the word deception means?
- 5 A Not in the sense that you're using it, sir, no, I do not.
- 6 Q I haven't asked you for a sense of how I'm using it. I've
- 7 asked you what you think the word decent -- deception means.
- 8 A I would think that if you knew that some -- I would understand
- 9 the word fraud and deception to mean that someone forged their
- names. That would be my understanding of the word fraud and
- 11 deception as you use it. But that's why I'm asking you to
- 12 clarify what you mean.
- 13 Q Well, they have a word for that called forgery. I'm not
- 14 talking about forgery. I'm talking about fraud, obtaining
- somebody's signature by fraud. Do you understand that -- that
- 16 concept? Having them sign something either by promising or
- telling them it's one thing and it's used for another purpose?
- 18 A So --

- 19 Q That would be a form of fraud, wouldn't -- wouldn't that be a
- 20 form of fraud?
- 21 A -- oftentimes when I hear things, I think of instances that I
- 22 -- would understand it in that context. And, to the under --
- only understanding I would have in that context would be when
- 24 an attorney would tell their client to sign something that the
- client doesn't understand. And, the only instance that I can

relate to that is when Mr. Hartman told us to sign something that we didn't understand, even though we hadn't read it yet.

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, I would like that stricken as non-responsive.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I didn't -- I do note that you're venturing into areas here these are obviously legal definitions, and the witness has said she's not a -- an attorney or, you know, a legal expert, nor would anyone, of course, be able to testify as to legal definitions in court.

So I'm going to ask you to move on from the definitional line that you're on. I will strike that last portion of that answer as non-responsive and at the same time ask you to move on to a new line of questions.

For the record, there are legal definitions of fraud and deceit, and if I'm asked to apply them, I'll apply them according to the law.

So please move on to another line of questions.

18 BY MR. CAMPBELL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q Yesterday before we started, you met Mr. Balch; correct?
- 20 A I -- I met him, yes.
- 21 Q Yeah. Was I correct, I heard you ask him for an autograph on
- your Robert's Rules?
- 23 A I did.
- 24 | Q Okay. And, I think he probably gave you one; right?
- 25 A Yes.

- Q Thank you. If Mr. Balch said that the contents of these 2 emails equated to at least a statement of fraud and deception,
- If Mr. Balch says that the contents of those emails --Α

you would not disagree with him; correct?

3

- That if true, this would constitute fraud and deception? If 5 Q 6 true, again, he didn't make a comment on whether it was true, he said the statements here would constitute that. Do you 7 remember -- or not that you remember that --8
- I was sequestered, so I did not hear him say that. 9 Α
- -- but -- but if he said that, you would not disagree with 10 him? 11
- I would probably not disagree with him. Α 12
- 13 Thank you. And, if he said that fraud and deception void abinitio, a petition signed, that you would not disagree with 14 15 that, that's a --
- I don't know what the word that you just used was. Α 16
- Thank you. I appreciate that. I used the word void abinitio 17 with him. But, what it means is it makes it like it never 18 existed. It could never be used if a -- if a petition were 19 gained through fraud and deception, it could not be used for 20 any purpose. If he said that, you would not disagree; right? 21
- 22 I'd have to hear him say that to understand the context to which he applied it. 23
- Okay. Thank you. Give me a moment. How many Committee 24 members were at the January 6th meeting?

- 1 A I'd have to refer back to my minutes.
- 2 Q Do you have those? I can -- I can direct you to them if you
- need it. I think it's -- do you have Tab 8?
- 4 A There were 45 State Committee members present.
- 5 Q And, when the vote was taken on removal, that vote was
- 6 40 to 5; correct?
- 7 A That is correct.
- 8 Q There was a meeting held that you attended on January 20th of
- 9 2024; correct?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And, you took minutes for that as well; correct?
- 12 A I did.
- 13 Q I believe that's Exhibit 17. Do you remember how many --
- isn't it true there were 43 members there; correct?
- 15 A I believe that's correct.
- 16 Q But when it came to the voting, I believe only 41 cast votes.
- 17 Do you remember it differently?
- 18 A I do not. I'd have to go back and listen to the recording.
- 19 Q Well, if you go to Page 3, there were two rounds of voting for
- 20 the Chair. Do you remember that?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q In the first round, Mr. Hoekstra garnered 30 votes; correct?
- 23 A I believe that's what I see it saying, yes.
- 24 Q And, Vance Patrick got 13?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q And, Ms. Epstein got 27; correct?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q There's one abstention?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q And, there's one blank?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Now to be fair, these are votes including proxies; correct?
- 8 A I believe so.
- 9 Q They have to be if there's 43, because that's more than 43
- 10 votes; right?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q But the abstentions almost certainly not a proxy; right?
- 13 A I can't speak to that. I don't know.
- 14 Q Okay. And, the blank is also unlikely to be a proxy; fair to
- 15 say?
- 16 A I don't know that.
- 17 Q There was a second vote and in that, Mr. Hoekstra took 50 and
- Ms. Epstein took 22. Do you see that on Page 4?
- 19 A I do.
- 20 Q But, again, that would be an indication of proxies and of live
- voters; correct?
- 22 A Yes. It does appear to be the case.
- 23 Q Do you know how many people in person voted for Mr. Hoekstra
- on the first ballot?
- 25 A How many people in person?

- 1 Q Yes. As opposed to dividing up proxies from people who were 2 actually there?
- There was a checklist that was taken. Every person when they came to vote, their name -- they presented their credential, they were given a ballot, and their name was checked off on a
- 6 list to make sure that no one voted more than once.
- Q So in that list, could you decide or would you know how many people actually cast a vote for Mr. Hoekstra? In the first ballot.
- 10 A All I would know is what's here. It was a secret ballot.
- 11 Q Okay. So we don't know how many of the 43 who were there
 12 voted for him; correct?
- 13 A The 43, I -- it -- there, yes --
- 14 Q Let's go back to --
- 15 A -- I mean, you have -- you have -- there were 30 in the first round and 50 in the second round.
- 17 Q But, again, that's the proxies; right? There are 38 proxies
 18 there. Go to Page 1. This is -- this is your report; right?
 19 I'm not showing something you didn't write; right? Correct?
 20 This is your report?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Okay. So it says 43 members, 38 proxies -- proxies. Do you see that?
- A I believe that I mis-typed. I believe there was actually
 25 28 proxies at that point, 43 plus 28 would equal 71.

- 1 Q Thank you. Speaking of mis-typing, if we go to Page 4 again,
- this is on the final vote for Ambassador Hoekstra, you see the
- 3 total number 72?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q You'd agree with me 72 is greater than 71?
- 6 A Yes. Vice-Chair Hassan Nehme arrived date to the meeting.
- 7 That would bring the number up by one.
- 8 Q So would it change the 43 to 44 or would -- in other words, or
- 9 was he one of the 43 that you counted?
- 10 A I'd have to look at the roll call sheet and I'd have to --
- 11 Q Okay. But according to your minutes, the indication is that
- there were 43 members there; correct?
- 13 A I believe so.
- 14 Q And, it's fair to say -- well, do you know whether all
- 15 43 members voted for Peter Hoekstra, at any point?
- 16 A I do not know that. I would venture to say no because I know
- 17 that others -- some supported, some did not support.
- 18 Q Thank you. Do you know how many members were at the
- January 13th meeting?
- 20 A I do not.
- 21 Q Give me a moment. I believe it is Exhibit Q in the lettered
- set, if you go there. When you're there, let me know.
- 23 A I'm there.
- 24 Q The third line of this document that's been admitted, it says
- 25 the Secretary announced there were 83 credentialed members

```
1
         present. Do you see that?
2
   Α
         I do.
         And, do you know what it means to be a credentialed member?
3
         I know what I would mean by the term. I do not know what
         Angela Gillisse would mean by that term.
5
         What would -- what would you mean by that -- what do you mean
6
   Q
         that -- what do you understand that term to mean?
7
         I would understand the term credentialed member to be a full
8
         voting member of the State Committee, not a proxy.
9
         If you go back to the last page of that document, there is a
10
         vote on the removal of Co-Chair Malinda Pego. Do you see
11
         that?
12
13
   Α
         I do.
         So it was called and seconded, you said -- at least it says it
14
         there; correct?
15
         Yes.
16
   Α
17
         And, the vote on that was 74 yes, 3 abstained, 2 no. Do you
         see that?
18
         I do.
19
   Α
         They said the motion -- it says the motion carries that
20
         Malinda Pego violated her Conflict of Interest, and the
21
22
         recommendation of the removal stands. Do you see that?
         I see that. You're not asking me if I agree with that. But I
23
24
         do see that.
         That -- that is correct. I'm asking you if you see that.
25
                                                                     You
```

- also see that there's a vote on the retention or actually
- there's a vote on the removal of six members. Do you see
- 3 that?
- 4 A (No response).
- 5 Q At the -- the last page underneath the discussion that begins
- 6 Dan Bonamie -- B-o-n-a-m-i-e, made the motion to remove the
- 7 six members. Do you see that?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And, there is a vote on that. Do you see that?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 \mathbb{Q} Sixty-one voted yes; correct? According to this report.
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q Five no votes?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 O Fifteen abstentions?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q And, the decision was that -- that was 75 percent of the
- 18 Committee voting yes. Do you see that?
- 19 A That's impossible.
- 20 Q I -- I didn't ask you what's possible, I'm asking what's
- 21 written. Do you see that?
- 22 A I see what's written, but 75 -- 75 percent of 107 would be
- closer to 80.
- 24 Q 75 of 60 -- let's see, 76 -- 61 is 75 percent of 80, though;
- 25 right?

- lacksquare A No. I don't know what it ends up being.
- 2 Q I think that's right. Just so you know. I can get my phone.
- THE COURT: And, just as a reminder here, Counsel,
- 4 you know, I'm not -- I'm not certain that, you know, because
- this witness wasn't present, she's testified to someone else's
- 6 -- or no, she did testify -- did she testify -- she was
- 7 present on the 13th?
- 8 MR. CAMPBELL: She was not. She's testifying to the
- 9 minutes. And, that's fine. I'll -- I'll move on, Your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we move on. I can
- 11 translate those from perhaps other witness testimony.
- MR. CAMPBELL: Right. And, they are -- the report
- itself is there.
- 14 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
- 15 Q The County Conventions for the Michigan Republican Party have
- been held; correct?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q The District Conventions have been held; correct?
- 19 A Incorrect.
- 20 Q They were not held on February 17th?
- 21 A Which Conventions are you speaking of, sir?
- 22 Q I'm talking about the District Conventions -- I understood it
- was the Counties on the 15th of February; the Districts on the
- 24 | 17th; and the State will be held on the 2nd of March.
- 25 A That is incorrect, sir.

- 1 Q Okay. What was held -- do you know if anything was held on
- 2 the 17th of -- let me ask. When will the Districts meet?
- 3 A Which year are you speaking of, sir?
- 4 Q 2024.
- 5 A Okay. So February 17th was 2023. That was the vote for our
- 6 election.
- 7 Q Yeah. No. I'm talking about this year.
- 8 A This year?
- 9 Q Yeah.
- 10 A This year. It would be the County Conventions were held on
- 11 February 15th.
- 12 Q Correct.
- 13 A And, at the February 15th, the delegates were elected to the
- District Conventions which will be District Caucuses, which
- will be held March 2nd.
- 16 Q Thank you. Appreciate that. The State Committee meeting will
- be held, at least the Caucuses that you just said, are going
- to be held on March 2nd; correct?
- 19 A The District Caucuses, but there's not a State Convention on
- 20 March 2nd.
- 21 Q The event that was announced yesterday by Ambassador Hoekstra,
- is that intended to be a District Caucus?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q Okay. And, that's to be here in Grand Rapids?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q And, you know about it? Right?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q You know that there's also a prior announced District --
- 4 District Caucus in Detroit at the Huntington Place; correct?
- 5 A It was not Called.
- 6 Q I didn't ask whether it was Called. I asked whether it was
- 7 announced.
- 8 A There is an expectation or announcement, I guess you could say
- 9 that.
- 10 Q Okay. And, the same way there's an expectation announcement
- 11 for Ambassador Hoekstra as well; correct?
- 12 A Correct. But there's -- the word expectation and Called are
- 13 two different things.
- 14 Q I understand. But I didn't say Called, you did, I think.
- 15 A Right. I'm just clarifying.
- 16 Q All right. You don't believe that the meeting in Detroit will
- be valid; correct?
- 18 A That is correct.
- 19 Q You believe that the meeting in Grand Rapids will be valid;
- 20 correct?
- 21 A I do.
- 22 Q You're not confused about it, it's just you have an opinion;
- 23 correct?
- 24 A I am not confused about it.
- 25 Q Why -- I'm going to -- I'm going to withdraw that. Have you,

- 1 yourself, attempted to cause confusion for any of the other
- 2 members of the State Committee?
- 3 A Absolutely not.
- 4 Q You testified yesterday that on December 2nd, 2023, you were
- 5 assembled. Do you remember that?
- 6 A I don't remember using the word assembled.
- 7 Q Okay.
- 8 A But we were -- we came together.
- 9 Q Okay. We, who are "we?"
- 10 A Numerous members of the State Committee.
- 11 Q Thirty-nine members?
- 12 A There were more than 39. There were over 50.
- 13 Q There were over 50?
- 14 A They were over 50 --
- 15 O There were over 50 --
- 16 A There were over 54.
- 17 Q There were over 54 members at that meeting? Since that time,
- there's been a meeting on January 6th where 45 showed up;
- 19 correct?
- 20 A I believe that number is correct.
- 21 Q Forty voted in favor of the position that you've taken in this
- 22 lawsuit; correct?
- 23 A If I understand your question -- question, yes.
- 24 Q Forty-three showed up on January 20th; correct?
- 25 A Of -- full regular members of the -- yes.

- 1 Q And, some number of those supported Ambassador Hoekstra in his
- 2 effort to be made chair; correct?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Less than that full amount; correct?
- 5 A (No response).
- 6 Q Less than 43 voted for him, we don't know how many, but --
- 7 A We don't know how many.
- 8 Q We don't know how few, but we know that it could not be more
- 9 than 43; right?
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q We went through the January 13th numbers and saw the numbers
- on the votes. The numbers of people there. On January -- on
- 13 February 17th, you were aware there was another regular
- meeting of the State Committee as it was called; correct?
- 15 A I don't know that there was a meeting on the 17th.
- 16 Q Do you know how many State Committee members were at that
- meeting?
- 18 A I do not.
- 19 Q Okay. Would it surprise to learn that it was in excess of 39?
- 20 That was your number that you have of the signatures for the
- 21 meeting, remember, on December 7th?
- 22 A I mean, I have no opinion.
- 23 Q Okay. So it wouldn't surprise you to hear that, in fact,
- 24 there were more members present than at the -- at the
- 25 February 17th, than any meeting that has been held on

January 6th, or January 20th? 1 2 Α I have no opinion. If half of the membership is there in person on February 17th, 3 does that suggest to you that there's no confusion that exists? 5 6 Α Sir, what that suggests to me is that Kristina Karamo has not accepted the fact that she is no longer the Chairwoman of the 7 8 Michigan Republican Party, as has been acknowledged by the Republican National Committee, as has been acknowledged by 9 Former President Donald J. Trump, and has been acknowledged by 10 those who attended the January 6th meeting. And, that she is 11 the one who is causing confusion and division in our party. 12 And, you square that with the fact that half of the membership 13 showed up on February 17th in support of her? 14 I do because former -- former Chairwoman Karamo told members 15 of the State Committee not to attend the meeting on 16 17 January 6th. Do you think that was a violation of her duties as a 18 Chairperson or was it -- was it consistent with her duties as 19 a Chairperson? 20 I have no opinion as to whether or not it was consistent or 21 22 inconsistent with her duties as the Chairwoman. But what I do know is that we filed a valid request for a Special Meeting --23 Committee Meeting. And, she refused to acknowledge our 24 25 request for the second time.

- 1 Q So you do know that she did set a meeting for January 13th
- prior to January 6th; right?
- 3 A She did.
- 4 $\mathbb Q$ And, she set that meeting actually December -- what was it,
- 5 the 16th, I believe?
- 6 A I cannot recall the exact date, but that sounds to be about
- 7 correct.
- 8 Q Thank you. And, in between, there was to be a Special Meeting
- on the 27th, that never occurred; right?
- 10 A The meeting on the 27th was never Called.
- 11 Q But it was --
- 12 A Some people had an expectation, but the meeting was never
- 13 Called.
- 14 Q Yes. But that expectation came from the materials that they
- 15 had been provided, including Bree -- I'm forgetting her last
- name.
- 17 A Moeggenberg.
- 18 Q Thank you. Ms. Moeggenberg's email that we've seen with that
- 19 date on. Do you know who Daniel Lawless is?
- 20 A I do know Daniel Lawless.
- 21 Q Okay. You know he sent an email on December 31st or, excuse
- me, on December 26th -- or I forget what date it is. Give me
- a second to pull the document. I'm not going to guess at
- 24 this.
- 25 A He did send an email. There was an expectation that some had

-- I am not aware of what everyone was told, but I did not 1 2 have an expectation for a meeting on December 27th. MR. LAUDERBACH: It's your Exhibit G. 3 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 4 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 5 So if we go to G, the date of this email is December 26th. 6 7 you see that? 8 Α I do. 9 And, he sends it to four -- let's see, Ms. Pego; correct? This is a two-line email? 10 Α Yes. 11 Mr. Chandler? And, Ms. Barefield, do you see that? 12 Q 13 Α I do. And, there's a bunch of cc's. None of those folks are the 14 Treasurer or the Secretary of the -- of the MIGOP; correct? 15 I'd have to read through all of them, but I don't -- I don't 16 17 immediately see their names. Midway down the page, I do see Joey Storer is there on the --18 on the email list. Do you see that? It should stand out as 19 you go down with a bunch of carets and then it stops and you 20 see the name, Joey Storer? 21 22 Α I see Joey's name. And, you recognize that as Joey's email address as well; 23 24 right?

I don't have anyone's email address memorized any more.

- Q That's fair. If you go to the next page, two pages over when 2 we get into the actual text. It had the writing in the second full paragraph is in recognition -- in recognition of the 3 importance of this season, and acknowledging that many of our party members have plans to spend valuable time with their 5 6 families, I am writing to inform you of a decision regarding the proposed Special Meeting scheduled for December 27th. 7 Do 8 you see that?
- 9 A I do see that.
- 10 Q After careful consideration and in respect to the respective
 11 -- the festive period there will be no Special Meeting on the
 12 27th. Do you see that?
- 13 A I do.
- 14 Q So but for those considerations and this is December 26th at
 15 11:06 a.m., but for those considerations that meeting on the
 27th would have gone forward; correct?
- 17 A No. It would not have.
- Q Okay. And, one of the reasons it could -- you did not want it to go forward is because you did not have 50 signatures on the petitions as of that date; correct?
- 21 A I don't know why the reasons were for everyone -- everyone's
 22 reasons for not holding the meeting.
- 23 Q You -- I didn't ask about everybody's reasons. I asked for
 24 your reasons. One of the reasons you did not want to see this
 25 meeting go forward is because you did not have 54 petitions

```
signed?
1
2
   Α
         I'm trying to recall what my reasons were.
         Okay. Let me know when you're done trying to recall and if
3
         you can answer my question.
   Α
         I think that my reasons for advising against a meeting on
5
6
         December 27th were because it was so close to Christmas.
         You don't think the petition issue entered your calculation at
7
8
         all?
         I don't recall, sir.
9
         You know that you did not have 54 petitions as of that day;
10
         right?
11
         That would seem correct.
12
   Α
13
         You've seemed upset a little bit and maybe I mis-read you,
         that Ms. Karamo would tell people not to attend the
14
         January 6th meeting. My question is, was that upsetting to
15
16
         you?
         I would say that what I'm upset about is that Ms. Karamo's
17
   Α
18
         behavior has caused tremendous confusion and injury to the
         Michigan Republican State Party, Michigan Republican Party in
19
         general, and candidates who are running for office in Michigan
20
         at this time who are a part of the Republican Party.
21
22
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, I'm going to ask that that be
         stricken as non-responsive. I asked her about her feelings
23
24
         about --
25
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Those were my feelings.
```

MR. CAMPBELL: -- the -- whether she was upset, 1 2 that's -- she's either upset or she's not upset about her telling people not to attend the January 6th meeting. 3 THE COURT: Well, and I believe she expanded on that a little. However, it was responsive to your question. I'll 5 allow the answer and not strike it at this time. 6 7 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 8 BY MR. CAMPBELL: So let me ask you. Were you upset about the fact, separate 9 from all of that, that she had told people not to attend the 10 January 6th meeting? 11 I was bothered by it, but I wouldn't say I was upset. 12 Α 13 Did you think it was appropriate for her to tell people not to attend that meeting? 14 No, I did not. 15 Α Do you think it's ever appropriate for a Chairperson to tell 16 people to not attend a meeting that has been Called? 17 No. I do not think it's ever appropriate for the Chair to 18 tell people not to attend a meeting that has been Called. 19 Do you think it's ever appropriate for a Committee member to 20 tell people not to attend a meeting that has been properly 21 22 Called? I have no opinion on that. 23 Is -- is the reason you have no opinion about that is because 24 25 you've done that?

- 1 A No. That's not why.
- 2 Q Okay. Is -- have you done that?
- 3 A Not that I recall.
- 4 Q You don't recall whether you told people to not go -- attend
- and hook up virtually to the December 2nd, 2023, meeting?
- 6 A Do you -- if you're referring to the fact that I used the
- 7 parliamentary procedure to withhold quorum, I did do that.
- 8 Q Okay. And, you withhold quorum by people not going to the
- 9 meeting; right?

21

23

25

- 10 A That would be correct.
- 11 Q And, you told people don't go to that meeting; correct?
- 12 A No, I did not say do not go to that meeting, sir.
- 13 | Q Did you say whatever you do, don't attend virtually?
- A No. I said, don't -- I didn't say whatever you do, don't
- 15 attend virtually. What I said is withhold quorum.

And, the reason I encouraged people to withhold

17 quorum was because we were trying to communicate with Kristina

and beg her to allow us to control our Zoom so that we can

19 control our mute buttons so we could participate in the

20 meeting -- meeting. Because prior Zoom meetings that we have

participated in with Chairwoman Karamo, we were muted and not

22 allowed to vote or voice our opinions.

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, I have a recording of the

24 witness saying what I have alleged and she's denied saying.

So I think it's proper impeachment to play it for her and ask

her whether she recognizes that as her statement and whether she -- allow me to perform my impeachment.

So, I'd like to do that now. I don't know how you would like that done. I have the video on my phone. It is impeachment under our preservation of our proposed exhibits. I have, you know, allowed for the fact that I may have impeachment because, you know, we haven't even answered the complaint, there's no discovery. I'm getting stuff daily basically here. I did not -- I was hoping she would tell the truth when I asked her about what she said. She hasn't, now I have an opportunity to impeach her.

It's important for this proceeding because of all the other stuff that she's said because it goes directly to her credibility, and she is apparently the only witness of substance that they are going to call in this matter. So her impeachment is very significant.

THE COURT: Mr. Lauderbach?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, a witness' prior statement can be used to impeach. I don't know what this recording -- where this recording came from. I don't know if it's been edited. I don't know -- I haven't heard it. So I don't know if it's authentic, if there's a written statement she can be -- it can be shown to her.

If there's a newspaper quote that can be shown to her, I have no idea what -- what this audio is other than

Mr. Campbell authenticating it and apparently making himself a witness.

MR. CAMPBELL: No. It's impeachment, first of all. So, we're not offering it as evidence. All I have to do is show it to her and ask her, is this you?

MR. LAUDERBACH: And, then she's -- she's --

MR. CAMPBELL: And, I -- I assume that she knows her -- I'm not offering it for the truth of the matter asserted at this point until she tells me whether or not that's her, that's her voice, those are the things that she said. And, that's the date that she said it.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lauderbach, go ahead quickly.

MR. LAUDERBACH: It's just -- you can't show it to her because it's an audio recording. The only way -- the only way that she --

MR. CAMPBELL: It's a video. It's a video.

MR. LAUDERBACH: -- whether it's valid is to play it and then it's already been heard and you can't unring the bell.

THE COURT: All right. Well, here's what I can do for this issue. First of all, a proper impeachment is by testimony either in a court proceeding, or in another sworn affidavit or proceedings. This does not appear to be that that we're talking about here, whatever this at most would

rise to the level of a prior inconsistent statement.

There are allowances for impeaching or confronting a witness with a prior inconsistent statement in the Rules of Evidence.

However, it appears to me that though the witness' credibility is always at issue, this doesn't necessarily go to the central facts that are before the Court today. Rather, it's just a general statement, you said one thing before, you're saying another thing today.

So what I'm going to do is I'll allow consideration of that as an offer of proof after today's hearing. I don't want to go through it, and nor do I want to excuse everyone and do it. I'm sitting as the finder of fact here. I can weigh its credibility at that time without having it played and going through the ritual with the witness.

So what I will do is I will deny its use for impeachment at this time and allow its entry as an offer of proof subsequent.

MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: $\ --$ that is after the conclusion of the hearing.

MR. CAMPBELL: Again, I'm going to -- so before you deliberate?

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because I'm going to ask for

reconsideration of that. You said it doesn't go to the -- any of the issues that are central here.

The central issue is that they have unclean hands. They created and attempted to create chaos. We have other evidence and other witnesses to call for that.

They have purposefully used the rules in a manner that isn't consistent with majority rule. She just acknowledged that. But she denies that she ever said, oh, don't do that. Don't -- don't log on, go to the virtual meeting. Those are her words, Judge, and that is important and that's very different than what she just said.

Well, I never told anybody not to log on. And, I never told anybody not to go to the meeting. I said don't give 'em quorum.

I have her on this video/audio tape, video as well, her saying there's -- we've got pizza, world famous pizza here, we can, you know, stay, whatever you do, don't log on to the virtual meeting. Her words because she was trying to act as a subterfuge to the entire process as early as December.

And, that goes to the fraud and deception and gathering of the petitions. That goes to whether they had enough votes or enough petitions in order to Call a vote. It goes to the fact that they are 40 people, Judge, 40 people in 106 member committee who are trying to overtake and overturn what is the will of the majority.

So I think that is a central issue. But I'd ask you to reconsider your decision and allow me to play it for this witness so she can tell us right here and now, is that her?

And, she can deny it if she wants and if it's not her, I certainly don't want it out there that she said it. That would be wrong.

THE COURT: You said it's a video and audio?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, certainly I can evaluate a video and audio myself and determine if that's her. Certainly I've heard so much testimony thus far, and we're only after all one substantive witness in. And, you know one expert witness. This is essentially a case about parliamentary maneuvering or bylaws -- party bylaws that's being put before the Court.

You're correct in that a party's unclean hands can enter into my decision in equity both in preliminary injunction and, ultimately my decision after trial in this matter. However, I think I can evaluate that weight sufficiently with an offer of proof.

I'll deny the reconsideration. Please move on to your next question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. CAMPBELL:

The signatures that were required for the Calling of a Special Meeting are in evidence. I'm going to have you turn to that

- if I can. If I can -- I've gotta find it. It's the Bree --
- 2 Moeggenberg email, so let me just find that real quick. Here
- it is, it is Exhibit 3, if you have that in that binder. Let
- 4 me know when you're there.
- 5 A I'm there.
- 6 Q And, this is sent on December 2nd, 2023, at 3:18 p.m. Do you
- 7 see that?
- 8 A I do.
- 9 Q It's a request for the Special Meeting?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And, there are 39 signatures that follow on the following
- pages. Do you see that?
- 13 A I do.
- 14 Q And, there's a purpose and a date of December 27th, do you see
- 15 that?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q And, there are -- all of these signatures are dated
- December 2nd; correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And, all of these people were with you where you were on
- December 2nd, 2023, for the meeting? Or while the meeting was
- 22 taking -- should have been taking place; correct?
- 23 A Meeting did take place.
- 24 Q And, during that meeting, you were with these 39 people and
- 25 that's how you -- you're one of 'em, but the 38 other people

```
were all there together; correct?
1
2
   Α
         Yes.
                   MR. CAMPBELL: If I can have just one moment. I'm
3
         nearing the end, Counsel, of my examination.
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
5
6
         There's an allegation in the request for these proceedings
         filed by your Counsel that says, Plaintiff's and other members
7
         of the Committee --
8
                   MR. CAMPBELL: -- this is Page 13, Counsel, from
9
         your pleading asking for the -- the hearing.
10
   BY MR. CAMPBELL:
11
         -- Plaintiff's and other members of the Committee have been
12
         unable to access the Committee's bank accounts. Were you
13
         aware of that being an issue in these proceedings? You
14
15
         weren't asked that -- anything about that on direct.
         So one, the Plaintiff is Malinda Pego. She's the Co-Chair of
16
17
         the party.
         Um-hmm.
18
   Q
         As Acting Chair, she could not access the bank accounts.
19
   Α
         I was struck by the fact that Plaintiff's is plural. So
20
   Q
         you're not aware of anybody else who would have access to the
21
22
         Committee's bank accounts that are Plaintiff's in this action;
         correct?
23
         I am not.
24
   Α
25
    Q
         And, you do not?
```

- A I have never.
- 2 Q Okay. And, Ms. Pego's not here to testify to what she can or
- cannot do, so it would be hearsay for you to report what you
- 4 have heard from her; correct?
- 5 A I'm not an attorney, I don't know what that means.
- 6 MR. CAMPBELL: I would object, Your Honor, to the
- 7 hearsay that she brought in saying that Ms. Pego cannot access
- 8 the account. We don't have evidence of that.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay. I can weigh the -- granted it is
- 10 hearsay. And, I'll consider it as to the weight of the
- response. I'll overrule the objection to the statement made
- in court. It stands as made. I'll -- I'll rule onto it as to
- weight rather than the substance for admissibility.
- So you can move on to your next question.
- MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
- 16 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
- 17 Q And, you have now seen in the minutes where Ms. Pego was
- removed -- at least according to the January 13th minutes that
- 19 have been adopted; correct?
- 20 A I see that it says that she was removed at a meeting that was
- 21 rescinded.
- 22 Q Give me just a moment.
- MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, if I could take five minutes
- to confer? I believe I'm just about done -- if not done, but
- I want to talk to my Counsel -- Co-Counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. We can take a five-minute recess 1 2 and reconvene here at 10:55. Any redirect or any further cross-examination then any redirect with this witness. 3 Five minute break. MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 5 MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, obviously as the Court 6 is letting him take a break. But he just said, I'm going to 7 go confer with my Co-Counsel. Is that the Co-Counsel that's 8 sequestered because he might be called as a witness in this 9 10 case? THE COURT: He is and I'm going to have to trust 11 that we're going to have conversations that do not break the 12 13 -- while sequestering and that they will be confined to legal consultations. Thank you. 14 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 15 (At 10:50 a.m., recess taken) 16 (At 10:57 a.m., hearing reconvened) 17 18 THE COURT: Will you please be seated. We are back on the record. This is the matter of 19 Pego, et al versus Karamo. Any follow-up? And, I'm sorry. 20 21 I'm jumping ahead of myself. 22 (At 10:57 a.m., Mr. Campbell enters courtroom) THE COURT: Mr. Campbell, a timely entrance. Any 23 additional cross-examination for the witness? 24

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor. I have no

25

further questions for this witness at this point. Thank you, 1 2 Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Lauderbach? 3 MR. LAUDERBACH: Very briefly, Your Honor. Thank 5 you. 6 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LAUDERBACH: 7 Ms. DeLisle, you recall the questions that Mr. Campbell asked 8 about your service as the Secretary Pro Tem at the meeting on 9 January 6th? 10 I do recall most of them, yes. 11 Α All right. And, he suggested that you couldn't be a member --12 a regular member of the State Committee and also serve as the 13 Secretary Pro Tem? 14 Yes, he did say that. 15 Α If that were correct, could any member of the State Committee 16 ever be a Secretary Pro Tem? 17 Α I do not think so. 18 Okay. All right. When you received the email that is 19 Q Exhibit 23, at 8:09 p.m., on January 6th? 20 Yes. 21 Α 22 Q Did you contact Rylee Linting? Α I did. 23 24 All right. Did she say that she did not believe a proxy had 25 been appointed for her?

She did. Α 2 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to object, Your Honor, to 3 the hearsay. MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, under 803 (3), it is a statement of the declarant's then existing state of mind. 5 6 Which she did not believe. MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, it's an out-of-court statement 7 attempting to prove apparently substantively a piece of 8 information that's classic -- hearsay --9 MR. LAUDERBACH: It's --10 MR. CAMPBELL: -- that's not an exception to the 11 declarant's state of mind in the circumstances. 12 MR. LAUDERBACH: A statement of the declarant's then 13 existing state of mind. The evening the email was sent, she 14 said she did not believe that a proxy had been appointed for 15 her. That's all it's offered for. 16 17 MR. CAMPBELL: For the proxy issue? 18 THE COURT: Okay. I'll allow the testimony, limited to the proxy issue as -- as one of an existing state of mind 19 and exception to the hearsay rule under Michigan Rule of 20 Evidence 803. 21 You may proceed. 22 MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you. 23 BY MR. LAUDERBACH: 24 25 Q She did say that?

- 1 A She did by a text message.
- 2 Q Okay. Thank you, in fact, had any proxies been appointed at
- the January 6th meeting for Mr. Balog, Mr. Marcum, or
- 4 Ms. Linting?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q Okay. There were lots of discussions about the design of the
- 7 bylaws, do you recall that?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q All right. Were you a member of the State Committee at the
- 10 time the bylaws were adopted?
- 11 A In 2022?
- 12 Q Yes.
- 13 A No, I was not.
- 14 Q Do you know why the bylaws say what they say?
- 15 A I -- there's typically a good reason for them.
- 16 Q Do you know what it is?
- 17 A Just to -- to keep order and -- and have something to direct
- 18 -- to guide the --
- 19 Q Were you involved in the drafting of the bylaws?
- 20 A I was not.
- 21 Q Okay. Is it fair to say that an outcome you might think is
- fair might be different than an outcome that Ms. Karamo might
- 23 think is fair?
- 24 A That would be a fair statement.
- 25 Q And, is that why we follow bylaws?

Α Yes, sir. 2 All right. There's -- there was questions about the will of the majority. Do you remember that? 3 Yes, I do. Α Is it possible to win the popular vote and not be elected 5 6 President? Α It is. 7 8 MR. LAUDERBACH: All right. Thank you. That's all 9 I have. THE COURT: Any recross? 10 11 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Give me one moment, please. RECROSS-EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 13 You were asked by your Counsel about whether you could be a 14 regular member and a officer; right? Do you remember that? 15 That's my understanding of the question. 16 Yeah. And, of course, you can do that. That's what the rule 17 18 says, you can have one capacity. If you're a regular member, you're serving in one capacity as Secretary; correct? 19 MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, I asked about the 20 Secretary Pro Tem and whether a -- a regular member of the 21 22 Committee could serve as Secretary Pro Tem. The -- the recross is limited to my redirect -- is limited to my 23 redirect. 24 25 THE COURT: I think the objection is a

mischaracterization. Do you intend to rephrase the question? 1 2 MR. CAMPBELL: I will, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Then I'll sustain the 3 objection and you can rephrase. MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. 5 6 BY MR. CAMPBELL: You would agree with me that if a Secretary Pro Tem is a 7 capacity, you could not serve in the capacity of District 8 Chair and as Secretary Pro Tem; correct? 9 Α I do not agree with the word -- I don't -- I don't understand 10 -- we've been through -- we've already talked about this and I 11 -- I think we have a difference of opinion. 12 Well, we can't have a difference of opinion of what the words 13 actually mean. If it is a capacity, you're -- you can get 14 your mind to do that; right? To say, yes, if it is -- if I'm 15 wrong about the advice I got, if I'm wrong about what I 16 thought, if it turns out that capacity includes Secretary Pro 17 Tem, you would have been in violation of that rule; correct? 18 It is for that exact reason that I sought Counsel. 19 Α But what if your Counsel was wrong? That wouldn't make you 20 right, would it? 21 22 It would not make me correct. That's why I sought -- sought Counsel. 23 Would it excuse -- hold on. Would it excuse the mistake you 24 25 made if it turns out your Counsel was wrong?

- 1 A It would mitigate -- it would mitigate my culpability.
- 2 Q Do you know what Counsel Ms. Karamo had when she issued the
- 3 Call for the Special Meeting without the attachment of the
- 4 purpose that had been described in the email that
- 5 Ms. Morganberg (sic) sent on there? Do you know what Counsel
- 6 she had?
- 7 A Do I know what Counsel Ms. Karamo had?
- 8 O Yeah.
- 9 A I do not.
- 10 Q Okay. But it might mitigate whether or not if it turns out
- she wasn't right, it might mitigate that; correct?
- 12 A If her Counsel was incorrect, it could mitigate the -- yes.
- 13 Q Okay. And, in fact, the special purpose of the meeting was
- 14 for removal; correct?
- 15 A The special purpose request that on December 2nd was for
- 16 removal.
- 17 Q It wasn't only that, you had a -- there -- there were other
- 18 stuff?
- 19 A It was other -- yes.
- 20 Q Okay. But it was -- removal was included. And, in order, in
- 21 fact, there was also a bylaw amendment included; correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q In order to do the bylaw, you've got to go through the Policy
- 24 Committee first, though; right?
- 25 A No.

- 1 Q Okay. It did not go through the bylaw -- through the Policy
- 2 Committee; correct?
- 3 A It was sent to the Policy Committee. It is not required to go
- 4 through the Policy Committee.
- 5 Q Thank you. And, as to the removal, you need the 50 petitions.
- Now your point of view is the 50 petitions at any time, even
- 7 after the start of the meeting, is timely; right?
- 8 A 54 and yes. It just has to be submitted prior to the Call of
- 9 the vote.
- 10 Q Okay. That's your interpretation; correct?
- 11 A That is my understanding.
- 12 Q Okay. And, you're not an expert on the bylaws; right? You
- just told your Counsel that; right?
- 14 A I am not an expert.
- 15 Q Okay. And, if your understanding happens to be wrong, that
- really you needed those 50 petitions at the time of the letter
- calling the meeting for that purpose, that would mean the
- letter failed to meet the requirements, and that the Special
- 19 Meeting did not have to be called; right?
- 20 A If I only used 50 petitions, then we would have been golden.
- 21 Q 54.
- 22 A 54.
- 23 Q Correct. And, you aren't golden with 54, are you?
- 24 A We are golden with 54.
- 25 Q Even if they were -- some of them were collected through fraud

and deceit? 2 Α They were not collected through fraud and deceit. But if they were -- are you -- are you incapable of suspending 3 belief? Sir, we are in court --5 Α Are you incapable of -- no, I have a question before you. 6 You are asking me -- a specific question. 7 Α No. I asked you that --8 0 You're asking me for specific answers. 9 MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, I have no further 10 questions of this witness. Thank you. 11 MR. LAUDERBACH: Nor do I. 12 13 THE COURT: Very good. Ms. DeLisle, thank you for your two days on the stand with -- with us. You may step down 14 as a witness. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 (At 11:06 a.m., witness excused) 17 THE COURT: And, Mr. Lauderbach, you may call your 18 next witness. 19 MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 Plaintiff's call Margaret Kurtzweil. 21 22 THE COURT: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that your testimony 23 24 today will be the truth and nothing but the truth? 25 MS.KURTZWEIL: And, nothing but. Yes.

1		THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat.
2		THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
3		MARGARET KURTZWEIL
4		called on behalf of the Plaintiffs at 11:07 a.m., was sworn by
5		the Court, testified as follows:
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	ву м	R. LAUDERBACH:
8	Q	Good morning, Ms. Kurtzweil, how are you?
9	А	Good morning. How are you?
10	Q	Fine. Thank you. Could you state your full name for the
11		record, please?
12	А	Yes. My name is Margaret Kurtzweil.
13	Q	Ms. Kurtzweil, are you a member of the Michigan Republican
14		State Committee?
15	А	Yes, sir, I am.
16	Q	All right. And, how were you elected to that position?
17	А	I was elected at a Convention that the State had, by my a
18		Caucus.
19	Q	Okay. From one of the Congressional Districts?
20	А	Yes. I'm the Sub-Caucus Chair for the Congressional 7th
21		from Oakland County.
22	Q	All right. You're familiar with the Michigan Republican Party
23		bylaws?
24	А	Yes, sir. I am. I've reviewed them as part of my membership
25		with the State Committee.

- 1 Q Okay. And, have you reviewed the Section that relates to
- being a member in good standing?
- 3 A Yes, sir, I have.
- 4 Q All right. Would you turn to Article III (E), please, on --
- 5 look at Exhibit 1 in the binder there in front of you on the
- 6 table.
- 7 A Okay.
- 8 Q And, Article III (E) of the bylaws, Page 5. In Paragraph E,
- 9 the one, two, three, four, fifth line down, the sentence
- starts, To help defray the State Committee meetings costs. Do
- 11 you see that?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q It provides that each regular member of the Committee must
- annually contribute at least \$25 to a regulated fund of the
- 15 Committee by April 1st at 11:59; right?
- 16 A Yes. That would be correct.
- 17 Q Okay. And, then after -- after that, it increases to \$50?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Right?
- 20 A Well, what it is, is it increases by \$25 so that the total
- contribution is \$50.
- 22 Q Is \$50?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q And, if that's not done, the member's rights are suspended;
- 25 correct?

- 1 A The member's rights and I believe it says "and privileges."
- 2 Q And, privileges.
- 3 A So the member's rights and privileges are. And, it uses the
- word "automatic," are automatically suspended.
- 5 Q Until when?
- 6 A Until the contribution has been made.
- 7 Q Okay. Until 50 bucks is contributed?
- 8 A And, to -- exactly.
- 9 Q To a regulated fund?
- 10 A To a regulated fund, yes.
- 11 Q Okay. Have you --
- MR. LAUDERBACH: Actually I made -- Your Honor, I
- mis -- in the interest of time, I'm going to skip ahead to
- Exhibit 24.
- 15 BY MR. LAUDERBACH:
- 16 Q Ms. Kurtzweil, would you turn to Exhibit 24?
- 17 A (Witness complies).
- 18 Q What is Exhibit 24, Ms. Kurtzweil?
- 19 A Exhibit 24 is what you use sometimes. It's called a -- a
- 20 tracking document. And, what a tracking document does, is it
- 21 collects information when you have volumes and volumes and
- volumes of -- of information. And, that's what it is.
- 23 Q Let me come at this at this a little bit. Is this a
- 24 spreadsheet?
- 25 A Yes. It's a spreadsheet.

- 1 Q All right. And, did you participate in the preparation of
- this spreadsheet?
- 3 A Yes. Absolutely.
- 4 Q And -- and does it have columns -- does it have a column for
- the name of a State Committee member?
- 6 A Yes, it does.
- 7 Q And, does it have a column for whether dues were paid?
- 8 A Yes, it does.
- 9 Q Does it have the date the dues were paid?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Now what -- what did you do to determine the date the dues
- were paid?
- 13 A What -- what I did is that there were various sources --
- source documents that were used in order to make these
- determinations. I looked at the Federal Election Commission.
- I went onto their site. It's a very easy site and you go in
- and search individual's contributions. So that was one source
- 18 that was used.
- 19 Q Let me pause you right there. So if you went to the FEC
- 20 website --
- 21 A Um-hmm.
- 22 Q -- and someone made a contribution, there is a record of a
- contribution to the Michigan Republican Party, you'd see the
- 24 date of it, and you'd make a note here in this -- in this
- 25 spreadsheet?

- 1 A Well, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't search by Michigan Republican
- 2 Party because I was interested in what the individual's
- 3 contribution was.
- 4 Q Okay.
- 5 A So I wanted to follow that individual's contribution to
- 6 determine whether or not they made a contribution to the
- 7 Michigan Republican Party.
- 8 Q Okay.
- 9 A So I searched under individual contribution.
- 10 Q But when you did that, you could determine the date of that
- individual's contribution and put it in the spreadsheet?
- 12 A Right. And, if you do an additional click, you can actually
- pull up the FEC statement, and it gives you more detailed
- 14 information.
- 15 Q Did you take screen shots?
- 16 A I took screen shots, yes.
- 17 Q Okay.
- 18 A And, I was able to print out, you know, actually information
- in order to document that the payment had been made.
- 20 Q All right. Did you review the records of the Michigan
- 21 Secretary of State Campaign Finance Bureau?
- 22 A Yes. I did. Actually they have a -- an additional database
- 23 that can be accessed in order to do searching. And, I used
- 24 that.
- 25 Q Okay. Same procedure? If you determined they made a

- contribution, you entered the date of the contribution in this spreadsheet?
- 3 A Yes. Exactly.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 4 Q Okay. Did you review any other information in preparing the spreadsheet?
- A I had a document from the Michigan Republican Party. It was
 their membership list. It had the names of all the State

 Committee Members, and then it had a notation on the left-hand
 side column whether or not the individual had paid.

And, then -- and then another question was asked, I think it was whether or not they had a -- filled out a conflict form, and then it gave their District number. So I was able to look at that and also sort of, you know, see who paid and who had not.

- Q Okay. And, now if you printed all that stuff out, are we talking hundreds of pages? If you -- if you printed it all out in an exhibit to give to the Judge, how many pages are we talking about?
- 19 A Five reams of paper, you're talking about FEC data that is
 20 coming -- to download the data --
- 21 Q Okay. It's voluminous?
- 22 A It's extremely voluminous. Yes.
- 23 Q All right. Do you have the data available?
- 24 A Yeah. As it --
- 25 Q Is it here today?

- 1 A Yes. It's here today.
- 2 Q Is it on a laptop computer?
- 3 A Yes. It's on a laptop computer. Yes.
- 4 Q Is this --
- A Additionally you can access it. I just want to make sure you know, this is public information.
- 7 Q I understand. I'm -- and this spreadsheet then summarizes or
 8 collects -- aggregates, if you will, the data that's available
 9 on that computer, and you prepared this after consulting all
 10 those materials?
- 11 A Exactly. And -- and also there were -- I just wanted to add.

 12 There were also individual interviews because there were some

 13 individuals that we were unable to document in terms of

 14 whether or not they paid. So that resulted in a personal

 15 phone call, and then the individual was asked just to send us

 16 documentation that they had paid.
- 17 Q Okay. Now this -- this spreadsheet also has columns for
 18 whether somebody attended the January 6th meeting, attended
 19 the January 20th meeting, and had a proxy appointed?
- 20 A Correct. Correct.
- Q And, is that -- does that -- is that information aggregated from the -- the actual proxy documents that were obtained?
- 23 A Yeah. That's why this was a tracking document.
- 24 Q Okay.
- 25 A So this was --

- 1 Q So it's a summary?
- 2 A It's a summary of the documents that were used in the process.
- 3 Q All right.
- 4 A It's made to substitute for the five reams of paper.
- 5 Q Right.
- 6 A Instead of going through everything, here it is, so --
- 7 Q And -- and at the -- after the spreadsheet in this Exhibit 24,
- 8 there are some receipts. Do you see those? For example,
- 9 screen shots of FEC report, FEC Form 3X, things like -- and
- 10 credit card receipts?
- 11 A Do you have a specific page that we --
- 12 Q I actually don't because they're not -- they're not --
- 13 A Oh, okay. Yeah. Yes.
- 14 Q And, are these attachments that you have?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q Okay. They're in your custody and control?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q Okay. All right.
- MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, I'm going to move the admission of Exhibit 24 at this time.
- 21 THE COURT: All right. And, is there an objection,
- 22 Mr. Campbell?
- MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. May I voir dire?
- THE COURT: You may.
- MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 1 2 BY MR. CAMPBELL: If you -- let me ask you this. You're aware that the Michigan 3 Republican Party keeps track of all financial information; correct? Dues paid, things like that. 5 Α Well, I would assume. I don't -- I mean I assume, yes. 6 Okay. You know there are all sorts of Federal regulations and 7 all sorts of laws that govern money that goes into political parties, how it has to be tracked, and how it has to be 9 identified. You know that; right? 10 Well, I understand the concept. 11 Okay. If you -- if you wanted to know whether your dues were 12 13 paid -- were paid for the Michigan GOP -- and by the way, are they? 14 Pardon? 15 Α Are your dues paid for the Michigan GOP? 16 Yes, sir. 17 Α Okay. If you wanted to prove that, through the records of the 18 Michigan GOP, where would you go to prove that? 19 To the Michigan GOP. 20 Α Okay. And, do they have a Treasurer? 21 Q 22 Α Pardon? Is there a Treasurer? 23 24 Α Yes. 25 Okay. And, who is that Treasurer?

- 1 A Um -- I -- I've never met her. I think her name it starts
- 2 Anne -- no, Jennifer maybe. Jennifer.
- 3 Q Jennifer Standerfer? Does that sound right?
- 4 A It might be her, yeah. That --
- 5 Q Okay. And, these records are not from the Michigan GOP?
- 6 Whatever -- whatever sources you have, they don't actually
- 7 come from the Michigan GOP; correct?
- 8 A What source are you referring to?
- 9 Q Your Exhibit 24. That's your Counsel -- the Counsel asked you
- 10 questions --
- 11 A Correct.
- 12 Q -- and asked you how did you gather this information?
- 13 A Right.
- 14 Q And, basically you said I went on the internet, and I sleuthed
- all this information; correct? Fair? Fair statement?
- 16 A Well, I also said that one of the documents was a record from
- 17 the Michigan Republican Party.
- 18 Q And, which document is that?
- 19 A That would be -- on here it's known as Exhibit 21.
- 20 Q It's Exhibit 21 in the book?
- 21 A No.
- MR. LAUDERBACH: No.
- MR. CAMPBELL: No. Sorry.
- 24 MR. LAUDERBACH: Just -- if I can interject?
- THE WITNESS: Yeah.

```
MR. LAUDERBACH: It's Exhibit 21 that's saved on
1
2
         your computer, which is the voluminous -- voluminous --
                   THE WITNESS: Yeah.
3
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: -- spreadsheet.
                   THE WITNESS: The voluminous spreadsheet. Yeah.
5
6
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Okay.
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: I'll hold for inspections?
7
8
                   MR. CAMPBELL: Right.
                   THE WITNESS: Yeah. You can inspect it today.
9
10
   BY MR. CAMPELL:
         But -- but not in the Exhibit 24. I just wanted -- the stuff
11
         that's in the paper that the Judge is getting, none of that
12
         came from the Michigan GOP; correct?
13
   Α
         No. That's not true.
14
         Okay. Of the stuff that's in -- the paper in front of you,
15
         what came directly from the Michigan GOP?
16
         I just answered that. Exhibit 21. But you don't have it in
17
   Α
18
         this pack, but that information was used to compile this
         document. This is a data document.
19
         Yeah. I get that.
20
   Α
         Oh.
21
22
         I appreciate that this is a compilation. But after the
         compilation of the spreadsheet, we'll call it, okay, you
23
         understand me?
24
25
   Α
         Okay.
```

- Q All the stuff that follows there, all of the evidence that supports the spreadsheet, none of that came from the Michigan
- 4 A No. No. I wouldn't have any access to that.

GOP; correct?

3

- Okay. In fact, there is a bylaw about access to financial information within the Michigan GOP bylaws, did you know that?
- 7 A Um -- I'd have to check that and read that again.
- 8 Q Okay. So you're not aware of it as you sit here?
- 9 A I'm aware that there is a provision in there.
- Okay. If -- so let's just -- so I understand the first page
 in -- of what's called Dues Receipts? Where it says Dues
 Receipts, that's your typing; right?
- 13 A Correct.
- Q Okay. So that's not part of the information that you've pulled off from wherever you pulled it from? It didn't say

 Dues Receipts? And, likewise, anything outside of sort of the four corners of any of the receipts that you have here, that would be your writing; correct?
- 19 A Correct.
- 20 Q Okay. What is WinRed?
- 21 A WinRed is a donation site for Republicans. That's why they call it Red.
- 23 Q Okay. Is it a PAC as we eval -- a Political Action Committee?
- A Not that I'm aware of. What it is is a software company that processes donations to various organizations. So if you go

into WinRed and you want to make a donation, you pick your 1 2 state, you pick whether you want to donate to a congress person, would be one. Wherever you want to donate. It's a 3 software processing. Thank you. 5 Q MR. CAMPBELL: I have no other -- further questions 6 for the witness, Your Honor. I do have an opposition which is 7 8 my regular opposition means that, again, a compilation of records from an organization, we have the -- if they wanted 9 and we've had discovery, they could have gotten the financial 10 information. The best evidence of when anybody's paid their 11 dues will come from the Michigan GOP, I am calling the 12 13 Treasurer for that purpose. And, this is not the best evidence, Your Honor. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Response, Mr. Lauderbach?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Yes. The Treasurer of the Michigan

Republican Party signed an affidavit under oath saying people

were not in good standing. These documents prove that they

were.

So I'm -- it's offered to show that they made contributions.

THE COURT: This is an anticipatory rebuttal of witness testimony from the Treasurer. All right.

Well, and compilations of business records can be admitted. And, just for practical purposes, because obviously

the Court's already contending with a stack of documents that 1 2 are in front of me here. And, I have no doubt that the printout of the FEC filings would make that one thousand times 3 worse. So I do believe in this case that the compilation 5 can be admitted as a compilation. You know, with the 6 understanding that it's admitted subject to the underlying 7 records that it references. And that, you know, I'm accepting 8 the statement of the witness, Ms. Kurtzweil here, that she 9 accurately recorded what she learned on the internet and, also 10 that it did not come from the financial records of the 11 Michigan GOP. Although Ms. Kurtzweil did testify that she 12 reviewed some records of the Michigan GOP. 13 So subject to all those objections and their 14 representation, I'll accept the document. 15 MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm 16 tendering the exhibit (hands Exhibit 24 to the Court) 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Number 24 may be admitted. 18 (At 11:21 a.m., Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 24 19 admitted) 20 21 MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you. 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION, CONTINUED BY MR. LAUDERBACH: 23 24 Ms. Kurtzweil, do you know Kristin Lee? 25 Α Yes. Yes.

- 1 Q All right. Is she a member of the State Committee?
- 2 A Yes, she is.
- 3 Q Did you see Kristin Lee at the April 20, 2023, State Committee
- 4 Meeting in Clare, Michigan?
- 5 A That -- that State Committee meeting was on April 15th. Yes.
- 6 Q Okay. The one in April?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Okay. She was there?
- 9 A She was definitely there.
- 10 Q And, did she -- was she wearing credentials?
- 11 A Yes. Yes, she was.
- 12 Q In order to be credentialed for that meeting, would she have
- 13 had to pay \$50?
- 14 A Yes. The registration fee for that was \$50. Yes.
- 15 Q To the Michigan Republican Party?
- 16 A Yes. That's where you made your donation.
- 17 Q All right. Okay. So in order to have the credentials, she
- had to have paid the fifty bucks?
- 19 A Correct.
- 20 Q All right. Do you know Sue Allor?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q All right. Did Sue Allor make a contribution to a regulated
- 23 fund?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q All right.

Α I believe it was signed on --2 If you look at -- if you want to look at --MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, I'm going to -- I'm going 3 to object to the statement that she knows that she made the donation. She can say that she has evidence of it. Or again, 5 a document that has her name on it. But she doesn't have 6 personal knowledge of that. 7 THE COURT: Response on the objection, 8 Mr. Lauderbach? 9 MR. LAUDERBACH: I'm going to rephrase the question. 10 THE COURT: Very well. I'll sustain the objection, 11 you may rephrase. 12 BY MR. LAUDERBACH: 13 Ms. Kurtzweil, would you look at the first name on Exhibit 24? 14 Q Okay. 15 Α On the spreadsheet, is that Sue Allor? 16 17 Α Yes. Does it indicate date of dues paid, April 26th, 2023? 18 Q Yes. I believe it says April 26th. 19 Α Now would you turn to the -- go back to the page that has the 20 Q heading, Dues Receipts. 21 22 Α Um-hmm. Go to the next page. What is that? 23 24 Α This is a -- who is this from? 25 Q Does it say Susan Allor?

- 1 A Yes. Susan Allor. It's Sue Allor. Yes.
- 2 Q Okay.
- 3 A Yeah. This is her -- this is one of the times in which we
- 4 contacted individuals and asked them to send us verification
- 5 that --
- 6 Q Okay.
- 7 A -- they had paid. Yes.
- 8 Q This -- this says April 26th?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q A hundred twenty-five dollars? Michigan GOP, Lansing?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And, it says a hundred twenty-five dollars will appear on your
- May 19th, 2023, statement as Michigan GOP, Lansing, Michigan?
- 14 A Correct.
- 15 Q All right. Do you know Justin Marcum?
- 16 A Well, I know of him, and I -- yes.
- 17 Q All right. Turn to the next page, please.
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q All right. The print on here is pretty small. Does this show
- 20 that Justin Marcum made a \$50 contribution on January 1st of
- 21 2024?
- 22 A Yes, it does. But technically I think the contribution was
- made on December 31st, it was on New Year's Eve, but I think
- 24 he was in a different time zone. So it kicked it over into
- January 1st.

- 1 Q Do you -- do you remember communicating with him on Christmas
- 2 Eve -- New Year's Eve?
- 3 A I was on the phone when he made the donation.
- 4 Q Okay. Thank you. If you keep turning, please, to -- let's
- see, I'll just start counting the pages. Let's start with
- 6 where we are with Mr. Marcum and we go one, two, three, four,
- five, six, seventh page. Do you know Hima Kolanagireddy?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Is Hima Kolanagireddy a member of the Michigan Republican
- 10 State Committee?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q What is this document that we're looking at here?
- 13 A Yes. This is a -- this is a really good document. This shows
- 14 exactly how information was being retrieved off of the FEC
- website.
- 16 Q Okay.
- 17 A And, what this is, is -- I went in, put her name in to see if
- she had made any contributions. And, then what I wanted to do
- is I wanted additional information on that contribution.
- 20 So this is what pulls up. What pulls up is the name
- of the committee. And, this is why I said if you had to print
- all this information off, you'd -- you'd need stacks of paper.
- 23 But --
- 24 | Q All right. It shows Michigan Republican Party --
- 25 A Party. Right.

- I Q Hima Kolanagireddy; right?
- 2 A Yeah. And, here's the date --
- 3 Q And, it gives the date?
- 4 A It gives the date. Yeah.
- 5 Q May 26th, 2023?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q A thousand bucks?
- 8 A A thousand dollars.
- 9 Q Okay. Right below it, it says dues received for Steve
- 10 Cloutier. Do you see that?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Who is Steve Cloutier?
- 13 A Steve Cloutier -- I have not personally met him, but he is a
- member, I believe, of the 6th Circuit, and he was recently
- appointed to the State Committee.
- 16 Q Okay. Does this show that Steve Cloutier made -- made a
- 17 contribution to the Michigan Republican Party on May 2nd of
- 18 2023?
- 19 A Yes. And, that's one of those WinRed accounts where he made
- 20 the donation through WinRed.
- 21 Q And, also April 29th of 2023?
- 22 A Yes. On April 29th, that's \$150.
- 23 Q All right. And, have you reviewed the records of the Michigan
- 24 Secretary of State Campaign Finance Bureau to see if he made
- any other contributions after he was appointed to the State

```
Committee?
1
2
         Yeah, you always want to check particularly with somebody who
         is recently appointed.
3
         Did he?
         Yes, he did.
5
   Α
         Okay. How much was it?
6
   Q
         I believe it was -- just give me a second, it was $45 that he
7
8
         paid on December 26th.
         And, he -- when was he -- when was he appointed?
9
         Steve was appointed on November 6th.
10
   Α
         And, he had 60 days to make the -- the $25 contribution?
11
         Right. The bylaws provide anybody who is recently appointed a
12
         60-day window to go in and make their donation. So he was
13
         within the 60-day window when he made that -- that particular
14
         donation.
15
         All right.
16
         On -- on December 26th.
17
   Α
         Okay. So let's keep turning. And, we'll keep going from
18
         Ms. Kolanagireddy and Mr. Cloutier. We'll go one, two, three,
19
20
         four, five, six, seven, eighth page.
         What name do you have?
21
   Α
22
   Q
         Kristin Lee?
         This may be it here. Okay.
   Α
23
24
         Are these dues receipts for -- or I'm sorry, records of
25
         payment of $25 contribution made by Kristin Lee?
```

- 1 A Yes. She forwarded those to us.
- 2 Q All right. And, if you go to the next page, is there a WinRed
- receipt dated December 1st from the Michigan Republican Party
- 4 to Kristin Lee?
- 5 A Correct. Yeah. That's part of Kristin's payment.
- 6 Q For another twenty-five bucks.
- 7 A Yeah. It says her name right up there, Kristin Lee, Michigan
- 8 Republican Party.
- 9 Q All right. And, if you'd go, please, one, two more pages.
- 10 Dues receipt for Rola Makki.
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Did it show a contribution made by Rola Makki on December 22nd
- of 2023?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q All right.
- 16 A I was on the phone with her, too, when she made that.
- 17 Q Okay. Ms. Kurtzweil, one additional point that I want to
- make. Could you turn to Exhibit 9, please, in the binder.
- 19 Were you at the January 20th meeting of the Michigan
- 20 Republican State Committee?
- 21 A Yes, I was.
- 22 Q Okay. Were you involved in reviewing the proxies that were
- 23 submitted in connection with the -- with the -- of the State
- 24 | Committee meeting on January 20?
- 25 A Well, yes. Yes.

Q Okay. Do these appear -- does Exhibit 9 appear to be the 2 proxies that were submitted for the January 20th meeting? 3 Α Yes. What was done with these proxies after that meeting? Well, after the meeting, they came to me 'cause it was a 5 Α business meeting, so I was actually keeping the records of --6 And, the -- have you kept them in your possession since that 7 Q 8 time? 9 Α Yes. 10 Okay. MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, I'd move the admission 11 of Exhibit 9. 12 13 THE COURT: Any objection to Number 9, Mr. Maxwell (sic)? 14 MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, my standing objection 15 because they're not the records of the GOP, because they would 16 come through the proper record holder. 17 18 THE COURT: I acknowledge that they are not, but otherwise, you don't find them objectionable on any other 19 basis? 20 MR. CAMPBELL: Obviously I have questions about 21 22 individual lines, but I'll reserve that for questions during the examination. 23

THE COURT: Very well. Then I'll admit Number 9 subject to the objection that it's not the -- it's in dispute

24

25

```
whether or not because it would state it's an official record.
1
2
         Therefore, with that objection, it may be admitted.
                   (At 11:31 a.m., Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 9
3
                   admitted)
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you, Your Honor.
5
6
   BY MR. LAUDERBACH:
         Ms. Kurtzweil, what do you do for a living?
7
         I'm a business attorney.
8
   Α
         Okay. You're a licensed attorney in Michigan?
9
   Α
10
         Yes.
         Okay. Does the Michigan Republican Party need to raise money?
11
         Yes, they do.
12
   Α
13
   0
         Okay. As a member of the State Committee, would you like to
         assist in the fundraising?
14
         Absolutely.
15
   Α
         Are you familiar with 52 USC Section 30124?
16
         I'm very familiar with it.
17
   Α
         Okay. What does it provide?
18
   Q
   Α
         That's a very powerful Federal Statute. That particular
19
         statute is about fraudulent solicitation of funds.
20
         Does it provide that no person shall fraudulently --
21
   Q
22
         fraudulently misrepresent the person as speaking, writing, or
         otherwise acting for or on behalf of any candidate or
23
24
         political party?
25
   Α
         That is correct.
```

Okay. Knowing what that statute says, does this controversy Q 2 give you pause? I will not raise money for the Michigan Republican Party until 3 this dispute is resolved because the criminal consequences are way too severe. 5 Okay. And, you -- you believe that your political activity is 6 Q part of the exercise of your First Amendment freedoms? 7 8 I think it's pretty well established in Buckley versus Valeo. I think anybody who is active in political campaigning First 9 Right Amendments is very familiar with Buckley. 10 And, that particularly in the United States Supreme 11 Court case has given individuals like me the absolute right to 12 13 go out and raise money for my candidates and for my party. Except that now there's this controversy about --14 0 It's no right --15 Α -- who the actual party is; right? 16 I will not touch a donation right now. So my Constitutional 17 Α rights under the First Amendment are clearly being chilled 18 until this controversy is done. I can't risk -- I hold two 19 licenses. So I can't risk it. 20 21 MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, I-- I pass the witness. 22 THE COURT: Very well. Cross-examination, Mr. Maxwell (sic). 23 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry? 24 25 THE COURT: Any cross-examination? Oh,

Mr. Campbell. I have you as Mr. Maxwell after all this time. 1 2 I -- that's uncertain. MR. HOUSTON: He's been called worse. I don't know 3 if you're talking about that or not --MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'd -- but, I'm unaware of that 5 -- so I'm not going to ask you to take judicial notice of 6 7 that. 8 (Laughter) MR. CAMPBELL: If I could please have a moment. I'm 9 10 finishing up --THE COURT: And, for the record, my point on Maxwell 11 is General Maxwell Taylor, the former chairman of The Joint 12 13 Chiefs. So it's not you, too. CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. CAMPBELL: 15 Okay. I just got the -- thank you. You have before you, I 16 believe, Exhibit 11. So if you could look and find 17 Exhibit 11, I'd appreciate it. 18 Α Good morning. 19 Good morning. 20 Q You have to identify the book. Am I working on the Plaintiff 21 Α 22 or Defendant? Well, one of them has letters, one of them has numbers. 23 24 Okay. And, which one would you like --25 Q Well, I don't think 11 is a letter, so let's go with the

```
1
         numbers.
2
   Α
         Okay. I got that.
         You've got 11?
3
         Yes, sir.
   Α
         All right. It's sitting in front of you. If Kristina Karamo
5
6
         is named the Chair of the -- well, let me back up. If at the
         end of this proceeding, the Court does not enter the requested
7
         preliminary injunction, and things go forward, you're saying
8
         you would not give money to the Michigan Republican Party?
9
10
   Α
         No.
         Even though the Treasurer and the Secretary are undisputed;
11
         correct?
12
13
         I will not give money -- the criminal ramifications are too
14
         severe.
         For you? Correct?
15
         But that's what the stature applies to. It applies to me, an
16
         individual.
17
         Okay. Right. You're -- you're one person?
18
   Q
   Α
         Yes.
19
         You know there are still some donations; right? Other people
20
   Q
         might disagree with your legal assessment; right?
21
22
   Α
         That's fine.
23
         Okay.
24
         But it's me. It's my law license --
25
   Q
         Okay. But you're a lawyer; right?
```

```
Α
1
         Yes.
2
         You know what preliminary injunctions are; right?
         Correct.
3
   Α
         And, we don't grant preliminary injunctions because one person
         says that they don't feel comfortable about their donation;
5
6
         right?
   Α
         That's -- that's my -- you asked my opinion. I've given you
7
8
         my opinion.
         I just -- I just right now, I said you know that we don't
9
10
         grant preliminary injunctions because one person says that
         they're concerned about a donation; right? You know that
11
         doesn't meet the threshold; right?
12
         I'm not going to opine on the legal test for that. That's for
13
         someone else to make.
14
         So you're opining on some legal test, but not others?
15
         No. I -- for my personal -- me personally.
16
   Α
         Okay. So Exhibit 11 shows us a couple of interesting things.
17
         These are the petitions for the --
18
   Α
         Okay.
19
         -- removal of the Chair that were submitted 49 minutes or so
20
         after the meeting began on January 6th. You were at that
21
22
         meeting?
         No. No. That -- that's not correct.
23
         Well, let's back up here. Were you at the meeting of
24
25
         January 6th?
```

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 \mathbb{Q} Okay. Are you aware of when the petitions were sent to the
- 3 Secretary?
- 4 A They were sent prior to the meeting at 1:49, prior to the
- 5 meeting.
- 6 Q When was the meeting set for?
- 7 A I believe at some point in the morning. What -- whatever.
- 8 Q It -- if I said 1:00 p.m., would you quarrel with me?
- 9 A I'm not going to quarrel. I know there were some delays in
- 10 getting the meeting started. But --
- 11 Q Okay. So 49 minutes -- well, the delays were that you didn't
- have all of the petitions; right?
- 13 A I don't believe that's correct. That may be, I don't know.
- 14 Q Do you know who sent the petitions?
- 15 A Who -- who did what?
- 16 Q Do you know who sent the petitions to the Secretary?
- 17 A The petitions were sent to the Secretary. One was sent at, I
- 18 believe, 1:49 by Matt DePerno. And, it had all the petitions
- 19 with it. And, then there was a second send, which was mine,
- and that was shortly after the meeting was set, and that was,
- I believe, around 2:00, 2:04, somewhere around there.
- 22 Q Okay. So is that after the vote took place? Or before the
- vote took place? At the meeting?
- 24 A (No response).
- 25 Q Your version of the petitions? I haven't seen what you're

- talking about. I've only seen Mr. DePerno's email.
- 2 A There was no vote at the time -- that's why I'm a little
- 3 confused by your question.
- 4 Q Well, the petition called the question of the rule --
- 5 A Right. But there was no vote at -- at the time the petitions
- 6 were delivered to the Secretary, that was the beginning of the
- 7 meeting. There was no vote until maybe an hour later.
- 8 Q Okay. So you're saying both Mr. DePerno and your versions
- 9 were sent to the Secretary; correct?
- 10 A Correct.
- 11 Q Okay. And, you're not aware of any version being sent before,
- say, 1:00 that day; correct?
- 13 A I'm not aware, no.
- 14 Q You're not aware of the Secretary vetting those petitions when
- they were received, are you?
- 16 A And, what needed to be vetted?
- 17 Q Okay. So you went to law school; right?
- 18 A Yes, I -- along with you, too.
- 19 Q Okay. Great. You know I get to ask the guestions and your
- 20 responsibility is to answer 'em; right?
- 21 A Yes, I -- right.
- 22 Q Okay. So let's try this again.
- 23 A Okay.
- 24 Q You're not aware of the Secretary vetting these petitions, are
- 25 you?

- 1 A And, then my question is, what do you mean by vetting?
- 2 Q Okay. I'll ask --
- 3 A How -- what --
- 4 Q So you don't understand what the word "vet" means in -- in the
- 5 context of my sentence?
- 6 A No, I don't.
- 7 Q Okay. Do you know if anybody examined these petitions for
- 8 purposes of determining whether the people, when they signed
- 9 them, were proper paid -- dues paying members. Do you know if
- 10 that was done?
- 11 A Yes, that was done.
- 12 Q Okay. By who?
- 13 A That was done by me.
- 14 Q Okay. So you weren't aware of the Secretary doing it;
- 15 correct?
- 16 A No. I don't -- no, she was not providing the information we
- needed. So that's why we went to the FEC and the other
- documents.
- 19 Q So this all -- okay. Let's try this again. When the
- 20 petitions were submitted to the Secretary, are you aware of
- 21 whether the Secretary had the opportunity to review them prior
- 22 to the vote?
- 23 A Yes, she could have. Yes.
- Q Okay. Could have, if she saw them when they were sent; right?
- 25 A Correct.

- 1 Q And, if she doesn't see them when they're sent, then she
- can't; right? You'd agree with me, that's pretty obvious;
- 3 right?
- 4 A Well, if she doesn't open her mail.
- 5 Q Well, people do stuff on the day; right? I mean, did you call
- her and say, hey, by the way, we just sent these petitions?
- 7 A No, I did not.
- 8 Q Okay. This was a procedural advantage you were trying to get
- by the late submission of the petitions; right?
- 10 A No, I don't think so at all.
- 11 Q Okay. Why weren't these attached to the letter that asked for
- 12 the Special Meeting on December 2nd?
- 13 A Well, because at this time, you -- there was no requirement in
- 14 the bylaws that they be attached.
- 15 Q Okay.
- 16 A So why would you do that?
- 17 Q Well, you also didn't have the number of signatures necessary
- in order to call the question as of the date of the request
- 19 for the Special Meeting; correct?
- 20 A I don't know specifically when that time period was in which
- 21 the number of signatures arrived. That -- that I don't know.
- 22 I was just constantly --
- 23 Q So when you vetted these, you vetted them to see if there were
- dues paid, you didn't vet them for the idea of given the date
- 25 that they were signed, and how many were signed as of

- 1 December 2nd, versus how many were signed afterwards?
- 2 A I didn't hold all these petitions during the process. They
- were held by another individual.
- 4 Q Okay.
- 5 A So that they could be confidential.
- 6 Q Okay. But they're in a time that you went through them. You
- just told me, I went through 'em to make sure all the dues had
- been paid; right? I mean did I misunderstand that?
- 9 A It happened on a piecemeal basis.
- 10 Q Okay. So -- have you seen all of these petitions together?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Okay. And, did you use the petitions in any manner to create
- your spreadsheet that you did?
- 14 A Yes. Yes.
- 15 Q Okay. So you actually looked at 'em and -- and -- and you
- 16 | figured out --
- 17 A There's actually a column on that spreadsheet.
- 18 Q Okay.
- 19 A If you look at Exhibit 24 --
- 20 Q Well, does it have to -- let me get Exhibit 24. That would be
- 21 a good idea.
- 22 A Yeah, 24 actually --
- 23 Q Give me a moment so I can get to where you are; okay? Let me
- see if I can find this. I am now where you are. Go ahead.
- 25 A Exhibit 24 actually has a column that says, did they sign a

```
1
         petition.
2
         Um-hmm.
         So you could go through those pages and quickly ascertain who
3
         -- who signed the petition. It's right there.
         And, you were able to gather that information because you had
5
   Q
6
         the petitions; right?
         Correct.
7
   Α
         Terrific. You -- you made this spreadsheet; right?
8
9
   Α
         Yes. I was part of it, yes.
         So you got to pick what went in and what didn't go in; right?
10
         Well, you pick your data points.
   Α
11
12
   Q
         Yeah.
13
   Α
         It's -- it's -- the data points on what was voluminous paper
         was being reduced to information in there.
14
         Okay. Well, I appreciate that. But you picked the data
15
         points and you don't pick the data. I'm not saying you made
16
17
         up any of the data that's in there.
   Α
         Okay. Okay.
18
         I'm saying you picked the points of data that you report.
19
         It's like the top line that's in black with white writing.
20
                                                                      So
         you chose to do last name, first name; right?
21
22
   Α
        (Nods yes).
         You have to say yes or no. You know that.
23
24
         Yeah. I -- yeah. I mean that's -- that's what a tracking
25
         document does. So you have to decide what is the information
```

- you want to put in that document.

 I'm just saying, these are things that you picked. I'm just

 I'm just confirming.

 Yes. Yes. Because --
 - 5 Q Nobody else -- I just want to make sure nobody else picked these for you. Right?
 - 7 A No. No.
 - 8 Q You -- you decided to put in District; right?
 - 9 A Right.
- 10 Q You decided to put in title?
- 11 A Correct.
- 12 Q What did dues -- whether the dues were paid is what you
- decided to put in; correct?
- 14 A Um-hmm.
- 15 Q And, the date of the dues paid; correct?
- 16 A Um-hmm. Yes.
- 17 Q And, again, I don't mean to pick on you, I'm trying to help
- out the court reporter. The dues reference?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And, then you have a status -- dues status. Do you see that?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Status as of when? As of the making of this report?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q Is dues status important?
- 25 A You never know. I mean, who knows?

- 1 Q Well, let's continue. Signed petition to remove KK, do you
- 2 see that?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Attend January 6th, you have that; right?
- 5 A Correct.
- 6 Q Attend January 20th; correct?
- 7 A Correct.
- 8 Q Now that's not information you got off the internet, that's
- 9 your own information; right?
- 10 A That information came off of the attendance sheets.
- 11 Q Okay. And, the January 20th proxy name. You also have that
- 12 there; correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 Q So what's not on here is also your choice? You'd agree with
- me? Right?
- 16 A Okay. Yes.
- 17 Q So, for example, the date of the petition signature is not on
- 18 here; correct?
- 19 A It's -- and why would that be relevant?
- 20 Q Well, that's -- it's just piecemeal, Counselor.
- 21 A Okay. Okay. Okay.
- 22 Q You agree with me the date of the dues payment is not on here?
- 23 A The date of the dues payment is on the document.
- 24 Q It's on your spreadsheet?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q The date of the dues -- excuse me, I was trying to trick you
- and you did a good job there. The date of the petition
- 3 signature is not on there?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q Okay. And, that's your election; right? You decided not to
- 6 have that as a column? Right?
- 7 A The date in which they signed the petition?
- 8 Q Correct.
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 Q And, also, you don't have a column for dues status as of the
- date they by -- they signed the petition; correct?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q Okay. So let's go to the bylaws for a moment. You're not a
- bylaws expert by any means; right?
- 15 A Well, I quess we're going to find out, aren't we?
- 16 Q How much time have you got? Because if you answered yes to
- that, we've got -- it's going to take awhile. If you answered
- no, we can move on.
- 19 A Well, I'm trying to help you out. Okay?
- 20 Q That -- help I don't need.
- 21 A Okay.
- 22 Q I just want to know that you can read bylaws.
- 23 A Okay.
- 24 Q Am I correct -- I'm going to get my version. Do you have the
- 25 A -- the letter A?

A Okay.

1

- 2 Q Give me a minute here. Let's perfect this a little bit. So
- I'm going to stop for a second, and go back to your 24, the
- 4 full -- and I'm going to need to direct you between Exhibit 11
- and Exhibit 24. They're both in the same binder. If it's
- 6 easier, you can take 11 out and we'll work with 24. You'll
- 7 have to put 11 back in, though, that's the only rule that we
- 8 have.
- 9 A Where do you want me -- yeah, okay. I'll try to work from
- memory.
- 11 Q Okay. Exhibit 11, the first page after the highlighted list
- of names, so that would make it the fourth page of the
- exhibit. You have a signed document by Sue Allor, and it is
- dated November 20th of 2023. Do you see that?
- 15 A Okay.
- 16 Q And, when we look on your dues status sheet, we actually don't
- know the dues status as of the date she signed the petition.
- 18 We would have to go back to what you have purported to be the
- documentation that you've recovered either from the internet
- or from individuals that would prove the dues status and then
- we could, of course, extrapolate back to figure out the date;
- 22 right?
- 23 A (No response).
- 24 Q Am I -- am I correct on that?
- 25 A Partially. People make -- people make payments at different

- times. So it's -- sometimes people made three or four
- 2 payments a year. So which date do you pick?
- 3 Q So let's go -- the first document says dues receipt, that's
- 4 plural, and it says dues receipt for Sue Allor. And, again,
- 5 that is you; correct?
- 6 A Correct.
- 7 Q I'm looking for the date on the first document underneath the
- 8 writing that you typed above, and I'm having trouble locating
- 9 it. I see there's a \$50 payment to something called Michigan
- GOP. And, there's an identification of Michigan Republican
- Party, and it's described it as a contribution of \$50.
- 12 A Was that made in November?
- 13 Q I'm looking for the date on this document. I don't see it.
- 14 I'm wondering if I'm missing it. So do you -- is there a date
- 15 there?
- 16 A Which document is that?
- 17 Q I'm sorry. I thought we were looking at the same page. Don't
- 18 go off memory.
- 19 A Okay.
- 20 Q So Exhibit 11, and go to the first -- sorry, this is
- Exhibit 24.
- 22 A Yes. That's the one.
- 23 Q Year dues receipts is what you call it.
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And, then you have dues plural receipt -- well, I guess, no,

- 1 maybe it's not plural. But anyway, dues receipt for Sue
- 2 Allor. And, it shows a -- it purports to show a \$50 payment,
- but I can't find the time on here. I can't find a day, I
- 4 can't find a year. Do you have -- is there one here that I
- 5 have missed?
- 6 A Well, if we're looking at the same document --
- 7 Q Stop for a second. I want to make sure we're looking at the
- 8 same document. I'm going to walk over there and show you my
- 9 document, and you're going to show me yours.
- 10 A I'm looking at this --
- 11 Q If not (inaudible).
- 12 A Okay.
- 13 Q I think we're on the same page.
- 14 A You're -- you are correct, there's not a date on here.
- 15 Q Okay. So it's fair to say from your research and efforts --
- 16 A Um-hmm.
- 17 Q -- which has been considerable, you cannot tell me from this
- document the date that Sue Allor paid her dues?
- 19 A That's not a true statement.
- 20 Q From this document that we're --
- 21 A From -- from that -- from that document.
- 22 Q -- from this page (indicates), you cannot?
- 23 A From that document, but you can't make that general conclusion
- 24 because she made another payment.
- 25 | Q Okay. So this -- well, let me put it this way. This \$50

- payment you have no idea what the date was?
- 2 A On that one.
- 3 Q Correct.
- A That's why there's other documentation in there showing that
- 5 she made payments.
- 6 Q And, behind it is a document that unlike the first one that
- says MIGOP, Michigan Republican Party, has the capital letter
- 8 A, and I think that's an asterisk, and it says Michigan GOP,
- 9 Lansing, with a dot, dot, dot afterwards. And, this document,
- 10 the second document, unlike the first -- the first is sleuthed
- from the internet, fair -- is that a fair description?
- 12 A No. That actually came from Sue Allor.
- 13 Q So the first one came from Sue Allor?
- 14 A Yes. It came from her.
- 15 Q But she didn't tell you what date it was?
- 16 A This was -- well, this is what she gave me.
- 17 Q Okay.
- 18 A And, I didn't want to alter the document and put anything on
- it that wasn't there.
- 20 Q No, no. Well, so then the next one had a date of April 26th
- without a year; right? Although it makes a reference about
- 22 the charge appearing on a May 19th, 2023, statement. So we
- can assume, or at least it's purported to be 2023; correct?
- 24 A Is it 2023, or did she make the payment on April 26th? Are we
- looking at the document for 125?

- 1 Q I'm looking at the document for 125.
 2 A That's --
- 3 Q This document is really -- it appears to be a cell phone 4 picture capture?
- 5 A Yes. But that --
- 6 Q But --
- 7 A -- that payment was April 26th. The notation of it is up in the upper left-hand corner.
- 9 Q And, it does say A-p-r-i-l -- A-p-r 26. I agree with you.
- 10 That's April 26th. I'll agree with that.
- And, but this is -- all it is, is a cell phone video
- 12 -- picture that she sent to you? Correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 Q And, you have no corroboration beyond that; correct?
- 15 A Well, I spoke to her and she verified that she made that
- payment.
- 17 Q When you spoke to her, you didn't ask her when she paid --
- made the \$50 payment?
- 19 A Why? This -- this was -- this was the one I needed. Because
- 20 it had the date on it.
- 21 Q Okay. Then why do you have the other one?
- 22 A Well, why not?
- 23 Q Because I'm trying to figure out if you -- if this satisfies
- 24 you, why did you get extra?
- 25 A Because the first time it didn't have the -- the date

- requirement that I needed. So I asked her for additional documentation, and then she said, I have this and she pulled it up.
- Q Okay. Do you have any confirmation from the Treasurer of the Michigan GOP that this \$125 payment, in fact, satisfied her dues that were owing as of November 20th, 2023?
- 7 A No. Because I never spoke with the Treasurer.
- 8 Q Okay. Why not?
- 9 A I -- that I understand is that she was not being cooperative
 10 in providing information. So I wasn't going to go down that
 11 path.
- 12 Q You weren't going to make a phone call to the Treasurer
 13 because somebody told you she wasn't being cooperative?
- A Well, I heard that from Malinda Pego. I mean, her Co-Chair wasn't able to get financial information.
- Q Okay. You -- did you hear that before or after Malinda Pego was removed on January 13th?
- 18 A Um -- oh, this would be before. Yes.
- Q Okay. And, again, you're a lawyer, you decided you would not call the Treasurer and check to see if Malinda was right, or whether the Treasurer would answer your questions?
- 22 A It didn't matter because I was able to get the documentation 23 regardless of whether I spoke to her or not.
- Q Now doesn't it matter a little bit on what the actual records of the Michigan GOP show?

- 1 A Well I mean, well, it didn't have this in it. I'll tell you
- 2 that.
- 3 Q How do you know they didn't have that in it?
- 4 A I know they don't have that in there.
- 5 Q How do you know that?
- 6 A Because I've seen the membership list. It didn't have it in
- 7 it.
- 8 Q You've seen the membership list or you've seen the actual
- 9 evidence of who's paid dues and who hasn't?
- 10 A Yes. I told -- I said that earlier, yes.
- 11 Q I want to -- no, I think my question's a little bit different
- here. And, I apologize if I was not more descriptive. So
- let's try again. There are membership lists that are issued;
- 14 correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q And, those membership lists will say whether some -- there
- will be a list of who's in good standing; correct?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q And, good standing matters; right?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q It matters because you can't act like a regular member unless
- you are in good standing?
- 23 A Well, you can't vote.
- 24 | Q Well, let's go to the bylaws. Let's go to Exhibit A. I'd
- 25 like you to turn to -- it's Page 5, if you have numbered pages

- of your -- as you should, Page 5, and this is Article III (E), as in Edward. And, it's entitled, Qualification of Rights of
- Regular Members. Do you see that?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q And, there's a line -- three lines in, and halfway across the
- page, begins, Regular members shall have the right to vote on
- 7 all matters which come before the Committee.
- 8 A Correct.
- 9 Q And, then farther down it says, Failure of a Regular Member of
- 10 the Committee to contribute to a regulated fund of the
- 11 Committee on or before April 2nd, shall result in automatic
- 12 suspension of all rights and privileges. You're aware of
- 13 that; right?
- 14 A Correct.
- 15 Q All rights and privileges?
- 16 A Correct.
- 17 Q Of such regular member until the contribution is made. Do you
- 18 see that?
- 19 A Right.
- 20 Q And, there's a further provision about a penalty, so if you --
- or after April 2nd, it's going to cost more, and in order to
- restore your rights and qualification as a regular member;
- 23 correct?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q You just told me that a regular member couldn't vote, but it's

- all rights and privileges that are suspended; correct?
- 2 A Right. Well, how are you -- my question is, how are you
- defining all rights? We had the votes.
- 4 Q You have not placed an appearance as Counsel in this case;
- 5 correct?
- 6 A I get it.
- 7 Q You are a witness; correct?
- 8 A Correct.
- 9 Q That's not a problem. I'm just asking. I'm not bothered by
- it. I've got to do what a lawyer does.
- 11 A You're doing a good job.
- MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I should have no further
- questions, Judge. But I'm going to go out on and --
- 14 THE COURT: I would close on that if I were you.
- 15 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
- 16 Q Okay. So it is a right and a privilege to sign a petition;
- isn't it?
- 18 A I -- it depends on the use of that petition.
- 19 Q Let me ask you this. Matt DePerno is not a member of the
- 20 Michigan GOP State Committee; correct?
- 21 A Correct.
- 22 Q He sent an email with petitions. You're aware of that, we've
- 23 talked about it; right?
- 24 A Correct. Yes.
- 25 Q He didn't sign any of those petitions; right?

- A No, he did not.
- 2 Q Had he signed one of those petitions, it would have been
- invalid. You would agree with me; right?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q Okay. And, the reason his signature, if it existed on that,
- 6 being invalid is because he's not a member; correct?
- 7 A Correct.
- 8 Q More importantly, even if you were a member, he'd have to be a
- 9 member in good standing in order to sign one of those
- 10 petitions; correct?
- 11 A I would disagree.
- 12 Q Okay. You would disagree with that, but I read you the rule
- that says all rights and privileges, not some; correct?
- 14 A No, he didn't -- we disagree on that point.
- 15 Q Okay. I --
- 16 A But -- but --
- 17 Q -- hold on. We started with the fact that you're not a bylaws
- 18 expert; correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Again, if you want to become one, we can go. So the next
- question I have for you is about Mr. Marcum's alleged receipt
- 22 that you have in your materials. That has -- that's another
- cell phone picture. Right?
- 24 A Yes. Correct. He took it that night.
- 25 Q You'd agree with me, it's not a financial record, it's a

```
picture off a quy's cell phone?
1
2
   Α
         Right.
         Okay. And, you don't have anything else from Mr. Marcum;
3
         correct?
         I -- I don't believe there were any payments, no. That this
5
         was his payment.
6
         Okay. Well, you believed this was his payment?
7
8
   Α
         Yes.
         But you're unaware of any other payments; correct?
9
   Α
         No. I'm not aware.
10
         Okay. And, you trust that this is his payment on the -- on
11
         the cell phone? You know Mr. Marcum; right?
12
13
         I don't know him personally. I spoke with him once or twice
         on the phone.
14
         And, did you ever say to him, hey, do you have anything better
15
         than a picture off your cell phone?
16
         It was New Year's Eve and he was enjoying himself and --
17
   Α
         Well, so are you saying you called and said, hey, buddy, pay
18
         your dues?
19
         No, I said we haven't received your dues, but we just didn't
20
         know what he was going to do. So -- so I called him and he as
21
22
         at a party, he was with his friends and --
         Wait a minute. You said we haven't received your dues?
23
24
   Α
         Yes.
25
   Q
         Who's we?
```

- 1 A Well, I meant we had not received confirmation. Maybe I mis-
- worded that a little bit. We had not received confirmation
- that his dues had been paid -- with -- I hadn't seen it. And,
- 4 I was vetting these petitions.
- 5 Q In fact, his petition and that's part of Exhibit 11 that I
- asked you to pull out or at least have available.
- 7 A Okay. Okay.
- 8 Q Do you have that in front of you? That's why they're both in
- 9 the same -- I do suggest you take 11 out of its placement.
- 10 A I'm looking at it.
- 11 Q Because we're going to go back and forth a couple of times.
- 12 A Okay.
- 13 Q Because Mr. Lauderbach went through several people with you,
- and I'm going to go through the same folks.
- 15 A Okay.
- 16 Q You tell me when you're ready.
- 17 A Yeah, I'm ready.
- 18 Q Okay. Thank you. So the next on his petition and, again,
- this is the petition for the removal in Exhibit 11, he signed
- that on December 3rd, 2023.
- 21 A Okay.
- 22 Q If all rights and privileges were withdrawn from him as of
- 23 that date, and I understand you believe otherwise? But if
- 24 they were, and it included the right to sign a petition, you
- agree with me that would make this -- this petition invalid?

- 1 A No. I would disagree.
- 2 Q Even if all rights and privileges were withdrawn and it
- included signing petitions?
- 4 A I would disagree.
- 5 Q All right. The next item I'd like you to look at is where
- 6 Mr. Lauderbach had you go -- this is the receipt of H-i-m-a?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 0 Kolan --
- 9 MR. LAUDERBACH: Kolanagireddy.
- 10 BY MR. CAMPBELL:
- 11 Q What he said. And, I mean no disrespect, I just -- prefer
- 12 to --
- 13 A Just refer to her as Hima. We'll know -- we'll know who
- 14 you're talking about, Hima.
- 15 O Sema? Or Hima?
- 16 A Hima. Just call her Hima.
- 17 Q Thank you. I appreciate that. And, so I don't know if you
- have that page in front of you, but it shows her due payment
- 19 -- dues payment as you've identified, she is also a petition
- 20 signer; correct?
- 21 A Correct.
- 22 Q Okay. Let's make sure I saw that one -- the last one in the
- set, and she signed it on 1-6. She had made her payment of
- \$1,000 on 5-26, and then you also note the dues receipt for
- 25 Mr. -- yeah, Cloutier?

- A Cloutier. Yes.
- 2 Q We just checked that one. Oh, let's -- let me find her
- 3 petition. Just her petition was signed sometime after May 26
- 4 of 2023; right?
- 5 A Correct.
- 6 Q Okay. So the next one that I want to look at -- give me a
- 7 moment. Let's look at Ms. Lee's. Is there any chance you
- 8 could fundraise for a larger table for the Court so lawyers
- 9 can spread their stuff out any more?
- 10 A I am not fundraising right now (laughs).
- 11 Q All right. Here it is, Ms. Lee's. I don't know if you have
- hers. It's the -- are your pages numbered? Mine are,
- fortunately, but yours may not be. Mine is Page 21 within
- this exhibit. If not, we're looking for the Kristin Lee.
- 15 A Those would have been made in December.
- 16 Q Well, let's talk about it. Are you ready?
- 17 A And, you're in Exhibit 11?
- 18 Q I am in Exhibit 24. Your exhibit.
- 19 A Okay. Got it. Okay.
- 20 Q And, when you have a Kristin Lee receipts in front of you, let
- me know because then we're going to go into Exhibit 11 and
- we're going to look at her petition.
- 23 A Okay.
- 24 Q Best if you have both documents in front of you.
- 25 A Yeah, I know what she signed. Yeah.

- 1 Q Okay. She signed the petition on December 19th; correct?
- 2 A Correct.
- 3 Q When we look at these receipts, you -- the first one on my
- 4 copy it's in blue. In your copy, it's probably black -- is it
- 5 colorized? Your copy?
- 6 A Yes. It's blue.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} Oh, good. \$25 -- that's on December 23rd, 2023. Do you see
- 8 that?
- 9 A Correct.
- 10 Q And, that is paid to WinRed Michigan Repub. Do you see that?
- 11 A Correct.
- 12 Q And -- but you would agree with me December 23rd falls after
- December 19th?
- 14 A Correct.
- 15 Q There's one next to it, which is in red, I don't see a date on
- that. It appears to be one of those cell phone pictures;
- 17 correct?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q You -- it's actually very similar to the one that we saw with
- 20 Ms. Allor that had no date. Do you agree with me that this
- item does not appear to have a date either?
- 22 A I received this from Kristin, the -- the date --
- 23 Q Well, let me --
- 24 A Okay.
- 25 Q -- my question is, you'll just agree with me, there's no date

on there? 2 Α Yeah, there's no date. There is a time, we can tell that Ms. Lee really needs to 3 charge her phone more, at least more often. But we can't tell what date this was done; right? 5 Α That's okay. That's okay. 6 Then there is another page -- this one has a date on it of 7 12-1-23, and it has a reference of Michigan Republican Party 9 that appears to be is how it's on her phone. And, it shows \$25? 10 Well, her name is on it, so we know it's Kristin. 11 Α Yeah. I would agree with you it has her name. Again, it is a 12 13 phone picture of something that she says she got from the Michigan Republican Party saying that there was a successful 14 \$25 donation; correct? 15 Donation. Correct. 16 17 She -- if she was not paid by April 2nd of 2023, are you aware how much her dues would be? 18 Α \$50. 19 Thank you. And, she could not regain her status as a regular 20 Q member until the \$50 were paid; correct? 21 22 Α That would be true, but she made a payment on April 15th of 2023. So she was paid. 23 24 In the materials that you have here for Kristin Lee, there are 25 three items that are identified. One of them is dated

```
December 23rd.
1
2
   Α
         Correct.
         One of them is 2023. One is a phone screen shot of
3
         December 1st, and one is undated?
   Α
         Correct.
5
         So what you just said would be hearsay, at least compared to
6
   Q
         the actual proofs that you have here about her payments?
7
8
         Well, part of the proofs are my personal testimony. She was
         at the convention. She was --
9
         Hold on --
10
   Q
         -- she was there, I saw her. She was credentialed. I saw the
11
         credential on her neck.
12
13
         She -- okay. Credentials can be issued in error; correct?
         Well, then they were issued by your Secretary, Angela.
14
         Okay. Your Secretary, too; right?
15
   0
         Well, at that time, yeah.
   Α
16
17
         Who is your Secretary today?
   Α
         I, you know, I don't know. I really don't know.
18
         Why do you think it's not Angela?
19
   Q
         I don't know. I just --
   Α
20
21
   Q
         Wait, wait. So -- you must have a reason. You -- you knew
22
         that she was the Secretary one day; right?
         One day, yeah.
   Α
23
24
         And, then on another day you didn't know that? Right?
25
   Α
         I don't know if I don't know it, I just -- I don't know where
```

```
she's at on this issue. I don't get to --
1
2
   Q
         Whoa, whoa, whoa. How does where you're at on an issue have
         anything to do with what --
3
         I don't know.
   Α
         -- with what your position that you have been elected and
5
6
         appointed to at the Michigan GOP?
         Well --
   Α
7
8
         Come on Counselor. You -- you don't want her to be your
         Secretary? Right?
9
         -- I don't know what you -- well, she can.
10
   Α
         Oh, she can?
11
   Q
         Yeah.
12
   Α
13
   Q
         Well, then why isn't she?
   Α
         Well, I guess she is.
14
         Well, why would you tell me she wasn't?
15
         I don't know.
16
   Α
17
         Well, can I suggest some reasons to you?
   Α
         Well, you can.
18
         Yeah, because you're biased.
19
    Q
   Α
         Well --
20
         Is -- is that true?
21
   Q
22
   Α
         No, it's not.
         Really?
23
   Q
         I've never met her.
24
   Α
25
    Q
         Well, but you're biased because she thinks -- you think she
```

1 doesn't support Mr. Hoekstra -- excuse me, Ambassador 2 Hoekstra. I don't know if she does or not. 3 Α Does that make her suspicious to you because of that? I don't know. Time will tell. You've just got to let this 5 Α stuff evolve. 6 The next item that was gone through with your -- with Counsel, 7 Q is the -- the petition by Rylee Linting, R-y-l-e-e, 8 L-i-n-t-i-n-g. I want to go through that with you and I want 9 to take a look at her records. 10 Did you just say that that spreadsheet that you gave 11 us is a compilation of internet records, FEC information, 12 13 stuff people sent you on the phone, and what you talked to them about? 14 Plus -- plus --15 Α Well, wait. Well, if there's more --16 17 Α Okay. -- we'll get there more -- we'll get into it. But I want to 18 know, have I correctly identified all the stuff that's in 19 there? 20 21 Α No. 22 I'm sorry. All the things that I've identified, am I correct that they're in there? 23 Yes. 24 Α So there's hearsay on the -- in that document? Right? 25 Q

- you'll see somebody with credentials, you don't think that's
- 2 hearsay?
- 3 A Well, I mean if you want to object to it, you object to it.
- 4 I mean, you just said --
- 5 Q Well, I've got to know it's in there first. I was told that
- it was internet sleuthing.
- 7 A (No response).
- 8 Q Now it turns out it was internet sleuthing plus your personal
- 9 observations, plus --
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q -- folks you talked to; right?
- 12 A No. No. Kristin Lee is documented in here as making a
- payment. She made a payment.
- 14 Q Okay.
- 15 A I just provided supplemental -- additional information which
- 16 you can choose to accept or reject.
- 17 Q But, the only payments that you're aware of Kristin -- that
- 18 you have presented on behalf of Kristy -- Kristin Lee, are the
- documents that are attached in Exhibit 24, the two pages that
- 20 you and I have looked at; right?
- 21 A No.
- 22 Q You have other documentary proof of her payments? You said, I
- 23 submitted evidence of her payment. This would be the evidence
- of her payment then, that you submitted; right?
- 25 A Right. But they're --

- 1 Q But you may -- you may have seen other things, but this is the
- 2 evidence you submitted?
- 3 A Oh, okay. Yes, I saw other things.
- 4 Q All right. I apologize if that was confusing.
- 5 A Yeah. That was very confusing.
- 6 Q Okay. So we're on the same page, so to speak, but the only
- 7 evidence of payment that you have submitted in Exhibit 24 --
- 8 A Got it.
- 9 Q Is those two pages; right?
- 10 A Yes. Yes. Okay.
- 11 Q So we were gonna go look --
- 12 A I think you wanted Rylee?
- 13 Q -- Mr. Linting, I thought was the next for me.
- 14 A Yeah. It's a -- it's a woman. It's Rylee.
- 15 Q I'm sorry. Yes.
- 16 A No, that's okay.
- 17 Q You've confused me.
- 18 A And, what exhibit are you in?
- 19 Q Well, I want to look first at the petition, and I want to look
- at the date of the signing of the petition. You were a signer
- 21 -- just as we're looking -- getting our pages right here. You
- were a signer of the December 2nd list of names of folks
- calling for a Special Meeting; right?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q You were with Ms. DeLisle on December 2nd, when you signed

```
that petition; correct?
1
2
   Α
         Yeah. It's -- I was in the same room.
         Yeah. But it -- you were assembled with her; is that a
3
         fair --
         Yeah. That would be fair.
   Α
5
6
         And, it wasn't just you, it was at least you, her, and
   Q
         37 others; right?
7
         I think there were 39, maybe.
8
   Α
         Yeah. And, in fact, there's 39 signatures?
9
   Α
         Right.
10
         Everybody there signed? Or if you know -- you may not know.
11
         No, I don't -- I don't think so.
12
   Α
         Okay. So there may have been more than 39 people, but
13
         39 signatures. Do you remember that was also the day of the
14
         meeting for the State Committee?
15
         Yeah. This was the --
16
   Α
17
         Again, my questions are very directed. Do you remember, yes
18
         or no, the date of the Committee meeting? For a Committee
         Meeting?
19
         Oh, you're talking about December 2nd?
20
21
   Q
         Yes.
22
   Α
         Yes.
         Okay. So we're focusing, yes, that was the date for a
23
24
         meeting. You were there with at least 39 other State
25
         Committee members; correct?
```

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q Pizza was provided; correct?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q Where were you?
- 5 A I was at the meeting.
- 6 Q No, no. Where is it physically -- I'm sorry. Like if I had a
- 7 Google Map it, where would it be?
- 8 A Oh, Multi Lakes.
- 9 Q One more time?
- 10 A Multi Lakes.
- 11 Q What is Multi Lakes?
- 12 A It's a gun reservation -- conservation association.
- 13 Q Thank you. They have a large hall?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q Large enough to hold at least 39 people?
- 16 A About 400. Yeah.
- 17 | Q And, do you remember Ms. DeLisle saying whatever you do, we
- have -- let me bring pizza, world famous pizza coming, and
- whatever you do, don't log onto the virtual meeting?
- 20 A I don't recall her specifically saying that, but she may have
- 21 said it.
- 22 Q Okay.
- 23 A There was a lot going on and I was doing other things, so --
- 24 Q And, the reason for not going on to the virtual meeting was if
- all 39, or even if a significant portion of the 39 went on,

- that would provide a quorum to this meeting; correct, that was being held?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q An idea was to not have quorum established for that
- 5 December 2nd meeting; correct?
- 6 A I -- I don't -- I wouldn't answer that question because that's
- 7 -- that's not correct. The -- the issue was, as people were
- 8 being denied entry into the virtual meeting.
- 9 Q Were you denied entry into the virtual meeting?
- 10 A No. Because the link that they provided -- I didn't have access to.
- 12 Q So -- I'm sorry. I asked whether you were denied and you
- said, no. But you're saying you did not have access?
- 14 A I did not have access to the link. So I personally could not
- have participated in that meeting. There were many of us that
- 16 couldn't. Because the link was a -- it wasn't a Zoom call, it
- was on a different technology or technological platform. And,
- that platform wasn't compatible with my software.
- 19 Q Okay.
- 20 A I couldn't log on.
- 21 Q And, so do you know how it works if one person logs on and
- there are two people on the screen, is that possible that both
- can then be there for virtual appearances? Do you have to log
- on with your own ID to be recognized as a member?
- 25 A That's kind of how these conversation platforms work. So I --

- I can only -- I don't know. I don't know this platform so I
- don't know what the requirements would have been.
- 3 Q Okay. Let's go -- you've got me past Ms. Linting.
- 4 A Okay.
- 5 Q And, we're gonna go to Rola Makki.
- 6 A Okay.
- 7 Q Am I correct, Rola is a woman?
- 8 A Is -- is a woman, yes.
- 9 Q Thank you.
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q So let's -- if her petition is in Exhibit 11.
- 12 A Okay.
- 13 Q And, it is dated January 2nd of 2024. Okay?
- 14 A Okay.
- 15 Q Let's go to her receipt material. I'll let you find those,
- it's near the back, second from the end actually.
- 17 A If I recall, her name is up at the top in white. Do you have
- it in a black --
- 19 Q Yeah. It's a -- it's a picture from a phone?
- 20 A Yeah. Yeah. Black --
- 21 Q She is to be credited with the charging that she keeps on her
- 22 phone. You should note that for the record; right?
- 23 A (No response).
- 24 | Q And, there is a -- a screen shot?
- 25 A Um-hmm.

- 1 Q And, that screen shot, if there's a date on here, I don't --
- oh, there's a December 22, 2023. Do you see that?
- 3 A It's in very small print.
- 4 Q Yeah. Now I see it there.
- 5 A It's paid to the --
- 6 Q Yup. And -- and so that would have been -- would have been
- 7 before she signed the petition; correct?
- 8 A Correct.
- 9 Q Okay. I don't think there's anything else. I think -- this
- 10 will take care of my questions on this.
- 11 You have a dues receipt -- if you go to the next
- page for Marian Sheridan. That one does not appear to have a
- date. Do you know if Ms. Sheridan who -- Marian could be a --
- 14 like John Wayne, I guess could be a guy. Is it a guy or a
- 15 gal?
- 16 A For that -- it's a gal.
- 17 Q Thank you. Do you know if Ms. Sheridan was a signer of a
- 18 petition?
- 19 A Yes, she was.
- 20 Q Okay. And, that's why you have all of these in here, these
- 21 particular ones, was basically anybody who signed a petition,
- you wanted to make sure to gather the information as to their
- payment of their dues; right?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q Okay. So I asked you who your Secretary was. We had that go

```
round. Who's your Treasurer?
1
2
   Α
         Um -- I guess it's Jennifer Standerfer. I'm not going to
         argue with you, so I'm going to sort of bypass this --
3
         Well, is -- is there an argument that she's not?
         I'd say no. It is what it is. When the dispute's resolved,
5
   Α
         well, I guess we'll know.
6
         Do you think that's going to be resolved in this lawsuit?
7
   Q
         I don't know. I -- I can't make that decision.
8
   Α
         But is -- isn't that the goal that you understand from this
9
         lawsuit, it's not just to replace Ms. Karamo, it's to replace
10
         the entire elected --
11
         Well, it's whoever wants to come along and be cooperative and
12
13
         work with whoever is the new chair.
         And, if they don't do it on your rules, on your terms, they're
   Q
         out?
15
         I don't know these people, so I -- I have no say, no input.
16
17
         But does it matter whether you know 'em or not, if they don't
         do it on your terms, in your way --
18
         It doesn't matter -- it doesn't matter what I think.
19
   Α
         I've asked the question. There's no objection.
20
   Q
         And, I'm giving you the answer.
21
   Α
22
   Q
         What do you think?
         It doesn't matter what I think.
   Α
23
24
         No. That's not the issue. What do you think?
25
   Α
         I -- it doesn't matter, sir.
```

Q Where are you going to be on March 2nd, 2024? 2 Α I'm going to be at the Amway Center in Grand Rapids. And, if the Judge in this case rules that there will be no 3 preliminary injunction, that's been asked, before March 2nd, 2024, where are you going to be on March 2nd, 2024? 5 6 Α I'll be in Grand Rapids. MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. I have no further 7 questions for this witness. 8 THE COURT: Mr. Lauderbach? 9 MR. LAUDERBACH: Just brief redirect, Your Honor, if 10 I can? 11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. LAUDERBACH: 13 Ms. Kurtzweil, Mr. Campbell asked you some questions about 14 sending the petitions to Ms. Gillisse, am I pronouncing that 15 correctly? 16 I don't know. I really don't know. 17 Α On January 6th at 1:49 p.m., right? 18 Q I -- no. The one point I made --19 Α He asked you questions about that; right? 20 Q Oh, 1:49 -- yes. Yes, he did. 21 Α 22 All right. All right. Do you remember him asking you or saying that well, she couldn't review them? 23 Yes. 24 Α 25 Q Okay. If she was there on January 6th, could she have

```
reviewed them?
1
2
   Α
         She -- absolutely.
         She wasn't there, was she?
3
         No. She was not there.
   Α
         Okay. Now, we've looked at some receipts of payments, that
5
         show payments made to the Michigan Republican Party; correct?
6
   Α
         Correct.
7
8
         And, the suggestion was, well, that if the Michigan Republican
         Party said that they didn't receive 'em, how do we know they
9
         were received? Right?
10
   Α
         Correct.
11
         Okay. If a contributor is able to produce a receipt that
12
         says, I made $125 contribution, or a $50 contribution to the
13
         Michigan Republican Party on such and such date, and yet that
14
         contribution doesn't show up on a legally required Campaign
15
         Finance Report, would you conclude that the payment didn't get
16
         made, or the contribution wasn't made, or would you conclude
17
         that maybe the Treasurer didn't report it properly?
18
   Α
         I would conclude that the Treasurer was remiss in keeping the
19
         records of the organization.
20
         All right. Ms. Standerfer is a supporter of Ms. Karamo;
21
   Q
22
         correct?
         I assume she is, yeah.
23
                   MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you. That's all I have.
24
25
                   THE COURT: Additional cross, Mr. Campbell?
```

1	MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.
2	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. CAMPBELL:
4	Q I want to go back into
5	MR. CAMPBELL: No. I'm actually good.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Lauderbach?
9	MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, we have no further
10	witnesses.
11	THE COURT: Very good. Thank you, Ms. Kurtzweil,
12	you may step down from the witness stand at this time.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
14	(At 12:23 p.m., witness excused)
15	THE COURT: And, for purposes of today's hearing, I
16	hear that the Plaintiff has rested. And, I will invite
17	Mr. Campbell during, you know, we do have a good 35 minutes
18	here, to at least present or start presenting a witness.
19	MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Judge, I'm going to start by
20	asking permission to do a motion for dismissal involuntary
21	dismissal.
22	Well, I could do it under 2504(B)(2) if this were a
23	bench trial, you've made that reference before. There should
24	be no reason why I can't move at the close of their proofs for
25	dismissal to save time and effort, especially if it's not

needed. Given the testimony that's come in, given the lack of testimony, Judge, on the four main issues that are at issue in a preliminary injunction.

This is -- and that would be appropriate here. They think -- I should be given this right before I have to put on any evidence.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: And, this Judge has been -- I should -- Your -- Your Honor, you have looked at this in a way that is not particularly overly draconian in terms of how you've approached procedure on this matter. And, so I think it's a fair request.

THE COURT: All right. Response, if anything,

Mr. Lauderbach, on the proprieties in acknowledging here as

well, Mr. Campbell's somewhat of a -- what I'm going to call a

tactical or a judgment call, and that I've informed everyone I

have limited time to hear this and that we are all aware that

-- and I'm aware that you're unavailable next week during the

only day that I have available. So your choice would be to

make a time and to make this motion, and have a response and

potentially a ruling from me potentially, I would take it

under advisement.

Mr. Lauderbach, any objection to that Motion to Dismiss at this time?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Your Honor, he can ask you to

dismiss. I think that, first of all, you would have to view the facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. You just listened to -- listened to two days worth of proofs where we've established that there was a -- a meeting that was properly held on January 6th, where Kristina Karamo was removed as the Chair of the Michigan Republican Party.

All of the facts, again, have to be judged in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. So I'll defer to the Court's discretion. If you want to entertain the motion, I think it should be denied -- denied.

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, he's wrong on that legal point, 2.504(B)(2) says you don't take the facts in the light most favorable. It's an Involuntary Dismissal Motion. It's not a Motion for Summary Disposition or a Directed Verdict. It's an Involuntary Dismissal.

You actually take the facts as they were presented.

The real question is, have they made enough to carry their burden? They have not. And, so this case will be shorter if I am allowed to make this Motion, and this Court rules on what it has received in front of it.

THE COURT: All right. Very well. I don't see anything in the Rule that prohibits making the Motion for Involuntary Dismissal at this point.

As to the standard that I have to evaluate the Motion for -- certainly, $2.504\,\mathrm{(B)}$ --

MR. CAMPBELL: (B) (2), Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Yeah, (B) (2) does not appear to give the standard for a Directed Verdict, which is that concerning the 3 facts in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. However, since it is a Motion to Dismiss, at the 5 close of proofs, I think with regard to the testimony I've 6 heard -- after all, this is a bench trial. I'm able to 7 evaluate the credibility of witnesses and exhibits that have 8 been presented before me. 9 I'll -- I'll grant the ability. Why don't we --10 however, I do want to make sure, Mr. Lauderbach gets an 11 opportunity to respond to that. 12 13 So can you confine yourself on your argument to fifteen minutes, and then I'll give Mr. Lauderbach fifteen 14 minutes as well? 15 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Your Honor. Will there be 16 testimony at that? I know you gave us a hard stop at 1:00. 17 That gets us there. I just want to advise my witnesses. 18 THE COURT: There will be no testimony or any other 19 proceedings on this matter past 1:00. 20 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 22 THE COURT: So why don't you lead off with your Motion? 23 MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, I thought you were going to --24 25 may I have three minutes to tell my witnesses that they are

1 not going to --2 THE COURT: I understand. You want to do a logistical step? Yes. We'll stand in recess three minutes. 3 Resume at 11:30. Fifteen minutes per lawyer. MR. CAMPBELL: Do you make everybody sit down while 5 6 I get out of here? Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. (At 12:27 p.m., recess taken) 8 (At 12:31 p.m., hearing reconvened) 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated. 10 And, this is a continuation of the hearing on the 11 Preliminary Injunction in Pego, et al versus Karamo. 12 13 Mr. Campbell? MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, 14 they -- the Plaintiffs have come before you to ask for the 15 most extraordinary remedy that could be available in law. 16 And, they have come nowhere near meeting the well-17 established conditions, precedents, the standards of the four 18 qualifications that are recognized under the Court Rule and 19 the case law. 20 They have come before you saying that justice must 21 22 require what "they" demand. They have come before you saying that there is real, not speculative, injury. 23

They have come nowhere near it.

There is imminent danger of an irreparable injury.

24

25

And, again, the case law says that this irreparable injury must be certain and great. The only evidence that they've brought are two individuals, who at first pause over recognizing the Secretary and Treasurer of their own party, and then clearly show their partisanship in their testimony that they happen to favor one person who claims to be the Chairperson over another.

A classic internal political dispute. It is neither certain for an irreparable injury. We know now that there's a March 2nd meeting in Grand Rapids. We've known for some time there's a March 2nd meeting in Detroit.

There's no injury. People can go to the meeting they choose.

This is not unusual. You can even see in the case law the Motions for Summary Disposition where different conferences elect their delegates. Matters proceed, issues resolve within parties.

THE COURT: You would agree it's less than ideal from anyone's perspective that there are two conventions, one of them then necessarily being their own convention, but that the injury caused has happened before and thus it wouldn't be irreparable, there are ways to decide these things even if we did have two conventions.

MR. CAMPBELL: First of all, it's neither certain

nor great, Judge. So I -- this -- no, I don't agree that it's less than.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. CAMPBELL: This is a political process. In a perfect world, the family all -- would all meet under one roof, break bread. It's not a perfect world, it doesn't need to be.

And, certainly the answer isn't to go to court and sit on one side, we -- the minority of interest -- folks who haven't been able to get more than 40 votes at a meeting out of 107, or 106, depending on how you define it.

They should not be the ones to command it, and this Court, Your Honor, should not take a side. That's what you've been asked to do is grant a Motion for Summary Disposition in the form of a Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, which is exactly the type of abuse that we've given you the case law on, and it says you should not suffer or cause others to suffer from.

THE COURT: What about the confusion that has been argued here among the rank and file as it were, and even other Committee members, and Committee members at least in my mind not necessarily rank and file. These are the folks that aren't calling the shots as to, you know, who's in charge.

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge, you've heard from two people.

THE COURT: Well, they -- know who's in charge?

MR. CAMPBELL: And, one of them -- one of them was removed at a prior meeting, and I have checked the record to see whether Ms. Kurtzweil was, but let's assume she wasn't.

So again, she didn't testify to confusion. She knows where she's gonna go and what she's gonna do. She said even if you deny, that she's still headed to Grand Rapids.

So the only thing -- the only purpose would be to somehow force people who want to go, have been already on -- on March 17th -- sorry, February 17th, and on January 13th, at meetings that they recognized to be the proper meetings.

Your -- the only thing they want you to do is tell them to come to Grand Rapids. And, while --

THE COURT: You said March 17th. I think you mean February the 17th. Okay.

MR. CAMPBELL: February. Thank you. And, again, I'm pressed for time is part of that.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sure the Grand Rapids Chambers of Commerce would join that motion, but that's not what your role is, and should not and cannot be here -- would not be anywhere. So I do want to mention that Article V, Section (1), the articles are in evidence.

They covered fundraising. That's done by the finance chair, Judge. All this issue about fundraising, it's the Finance Chair.

Again, who gets the money? It should be the Treasurer. They can't create their own chaos. They can't not give their money to the Treasurer, and then say, oh, the Treasurer's not collecting the money. That's -- that cannot be the basis and source of any relief.

The financial information, by the way, that could have been gotten, Article VII, that, in fact, is the Budget Standing Committee. That's not even the Treasurer that they have to go through.

But they didn't do it. Why? Because they themselves decided that they're lord over this for this purpose, and they're not going to deal with anybody who doesn't want them (inaudible), you will disenfranchise 53 members who were there on February 17th; 62 members who were there on January 20th; all to appease what is now a coalition of less than 40. We saw that in the vote for Ambassador Hoekstra.

Really? That cannot be the dream and the hope of the bylaws and whoever wrote the Michigan GOP bylaws.

In fact, they created bylaws that are clear that say, three conditions for quorum. You have to have half the membership, you have to -- or sorry, a majority. You have to have proxies -- you can't have proxies, and you have -- you can conduct all business.

There's an "except." Their expert even said, oh, I

hadn't thought of that when I said, doesn't that negate the proxies? And, so he hadn't thought of it.

Secondly, he says well you only take out the phrase before.

Here's the problem, Judge. And, he knows this, from construction you know this. You don't have to be an expert, but you know this from construction. Statutory and otherwise, even those are -- these are bylaws. If you want to "except" only the thing that was said right before, you write "except" only.

The except covers all three of those items. It covers 75 percent, you've got a majority. No proxies, and you have, in fact, the -- the inability to conduct that special business unless you meet those qualifications.

That except without an only afterwards, cannot be right on his own definition. Cannot be right. That is a fair reading. They don't prevail on the merits. They have no injury that they can point to.

There is no irreparable harm.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I want to back up just a minute to the money question because it has been, at least touched upon here. These Federal funds that I would presume are coming in from the Republican National Committee saying that Michigan, spend it as you want. They flow in and the idea that those right now are -- well, certainly, you know,

Plaintiffs are saying that we don't have access, we don't know where that money is. And, we can't direct it towards anyone.

You're saying that's being attended to, that is accounted for and disbursed by the Treasurer?

MR. CAMPBELL: We need to step back here. I understand they have a complaint that they filed and said that. That's not evidence. Okay? And, the second part of that is, who's "we?" We have one person who claims that she's the District 8 Chair, and sometimes she sits as a Secretary Pro Tem.

We have another person who is identified, I believe, as a County member, maybe even a chair of her local county.

If I missed it, I apologize if she is that. But she's not on any Budget Committee. She's not the Treasurer. They don't have -- Judge, this is the reason for the Involuntary Dismissal.

They haven't presented their proofs. They can't point to their complaint, that's not evidence.

Look at the documents you have. There's nothing about that 263,000 going in the wrong place. There's no issue, there's no allegation. You would have heard it from these witnesses.

You have two binders and it's not there. They don't get a chance to try and make it in my case. They have failed to meet their burden. And, so the answer is there are

restrictions and laws and there's a Treasurer who is gonna be the Treasurer after you rule.

So this isn't the issue. There's a Budget Committee that's gonna be the Budget Committee.

And, I just want to make one more point.

Ms. DeLisle was removed because of a Policy Sub-Committee Report that was adopted by the Policy Committee, and then by the Committee on January 13th.

And, one of her own District Members was on that Sub-Committee that came up with that position.

That is far more strife and, again, in one last test of 66-2/3, even if you take my definition of how you define quorum, which is the only reasonable definition.

THE COURT: What about the testimony of the expert that that meeting, in effect, runs roughshod over the notice rules for Special Meetings. Ms. DeLisle didn't know she was gonna be subject to removal at that meeting because it wasn't in the agenda, and things of that nature that kind of grate against me because of my awareness of the law's demand for notice of proceedings.

MR. CAMPBELL: You need to, with all due respect, get over it because the removal, he thought the removal was due to IV(G), or Article -- or the Article (G)(2), the removal of a committee member or removal of a -- yeah, removal of a committee member.

What he didn't know, although I cross-examined him on it, is it was because of the conflicts rules. Again, this guy is supposed to know all the sorts of -- stuff about bylaws, he didn't realize that she got removed under the Conflict rules, which don't require any of those special notices.

THE COURT: Do they require a Special Meeting?

MR. CAMPBELL: They don't require or prohibit a

Special Meeting.

THE COURT: Okay. They're just silent on that issue?

MR. CAMPBELL: They are -- they are the regular business that can be conducted, and was properly conducted on the 13th. And, again, if this -- if you quarrel with that, it doesn't change the fact that they have not made their burden on proving their point.

Their case rests on the concept that they can scheme, and try Ms. Karamo said it was a procedural maneuver that she did. But they were scheming with a significant minority. In other words, a low minority, it comes out to about 37 percent when you figure their number of 40 and apply it to the one of seven. That's what they're trying to take over the Michigan GOP with, with their own thoughts and their own ideas and their own readers.

They tried to do it by going after Ms. Karamo first,

who knows what they'll do afterwards with a ruling from this Court.

But right now, they won't show up in a room with a majority of the Republican Committee people. That's happened twice. That happened on the 13th, that happened on the -
January -- that happened on the 17th of February.

Judge, this Court cannot be telling those people who make up a majority of the Committee, you're wrong because I'm persuaded that there's no chance to win this case because that's what the level of proof they have to give, they haven't come anywhere close.

Their own expert said, people can disagree with me. Reasonable readings.

THE COURT: I don't probably have to say no chance to win, I have to say unlikely to prevail on the merits, I think, is my standard. Right? That -- that to fulfill that prong number one of the test?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't see any daylight between those two statements, Judge, because I believe it is that high. It is such a significant circumstance. And, I believe the case law backs me up on that.

And, again, as we pled, and I know I'm coming close to my time, as we pled, the standard is even if they could get relief, you must go to the last status quo onto before the problems. We've demonstrated to you that the problems

occurred and started in July of 2024 (sic).

And, so you thought you had to go before that. I understand you -- they would argue it's all after Mr. -- or sorry, Ambassador Hoekstra was done. In fact, you know that that's not true because the reason for Ambassador Hoekstra's meeting, at least the one on the 6th that led to his meeting on the 20th, is -- is because of the upset.

And, already the dispute. The position taken that those petitions needed to be done at the time of the report of the -- of the meeting, of the Call of the Meeting, is also a legitimate position to take because the -- it's a special requirement. You've got to tell people while they're there.

You can't invite everybody because 39 people signed a piece of paper to take a vote on something that takes
75 percent, you cannot invite those people just, hahaha, we didn't really have enough petitions.

You have to wait. Once the petitions were submitted, Chairman -- Chairperson Karamo actually issued the Call on that issue for the 13th. That was the amendment. You have that in your -- in your materials.

Chairman Karamo -- Chairperson, I apologize.

Chairperson Karamo has been willing and twice has appeared in front of her Committee for a vote.

Ambassador Hoekstra can't, won't, and all he hopes on is that you're going to grant the most extraordinary relief

possible on the thinnest of evidence, no way, no how. 1 2 Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Lauderbach? 3 MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you, Your Honor. First of all, I note that the standard for Involuntary Dismissal of the 5 action is that when the Court sitting as finder of fact is 6 satisfied at the close of the Plaintiff -- Plaintiff's 7 8 evidence, that on the facts and the law, Plaintiff has shown no right to relief. That cite is Samual D. Begola Services --9 that's B-e-g-o-l-a, versus Wild Brothers, 210 Mich App report 10 636. 11 Judge, we don't elect candidates based -- based on 12 13 opinion polls. The bylaws of the Michigan Republican Party do not set up a popularity contest. And, what you've heard today 14 is everybody loves Kristina Karamo. 15 What the bylaws do provide, is how you Call a 16 Meeting, how you hold a meeting, and what the guorum 17 requirement is. 18 And, if you don't like what's on the agenda, you 19 show up. So to remove the Chair, four things had to happen. 20 You had to have --21 22 THE COURT: You protect your vote is with your feet. MR. LAUDERBACH: Is that --23 24 THE COURT: In relation to what's laid out by these 25 bylaws, because they place an absolute premium on, boy, if you

show up, and you're a member in good standing of the Committee, then you can cast your vote.

So I -- I get where you're coming from on that.

I do have a question on one of these, and I did note some testimony here as I think, you know, for example,

Mr. Marcum. I heard testimony today, you know, I've got some evidence, but he paid his dues but on the last day of the year.

An admirable wait to the last day of the year in some other circumstances, but here it appears that he would have signed up on his petition, you know, on December 3rd, as supposedly I think there's a fair argument that says he knew, or should have known that his dues weren't paid and that he wasn't in good standing.

How do you square that with the argument that this all passes, according to Hoyle or Robert's in this case?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Right. Because the petitions weren't submitted until January 6th, and he was in good standing when the petition was submitted for the removal of Chair Karamo on January 6th.

Until they are submitted, it's not the exercise of a right or privilege. The right or privilege is to petition for the removal of the Chair by filing that with the Secretary which happened at 1:49 p.m., on January 6th, 2024. And, he was in good standing --

THE COURT: And, your argument is not when Marcum signed it --

MR. LAUDERBACH: Exactly. Correct.

THE COURT: -- or rather it was submitted.

MR. LAUDERBACH: It's kind of like when I sign a deed, if I put it in my desk drawer, I haven't conveyed the title to my -- to my house. Once I deliver it, then it becomes operative and I've conveyed title. I think the law recognizes that merely signing that --

THE COURT: I wouldn't advise doing that.

MR. LAUDERBACH: Right. Exactly. That's why I get -- right. Right. There are reasons we don't do that.

But there's no -- Judge, we've presented proofs, and I want to point out -- I want to respond to something that Counsel said. He said, well, you've only heard from two witnesses. The evidence that comes in -- in a trial or a hearing comes from the testimony of witnesses and exhibits.

You've got two binders full of exhibits that have been received into evidence. And, the evidence shows that there was a properly called -- well, there was a proper request on December 2nd, to Chair Karamo, for a meeting that she chose to not Call. She called a meeting on December 16th for a different purpose.

The bylaws say you have to state a purpose.

Robert's Rules of Order say if you don't state the purpose,

you can't take up the business at the meeting. 1 2 3 5 6 right now. 7 8 9 already been removed. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 because she was --22 23

24

25

THE COURT: What about the rule if she stated the purpose, but it was much later. What if she then waits, you know, on the eve of the meeting, as it were, says by the way, we'll take up this question of my removal as appears to have happened from the timeline at least as I have it in my head

MR. LAUDERBACH: She wasn't the Chair. She'd

THE COURT: She had no ability to notice -- she had the ability to notice the meeting, but when she did that or when she was acting in her official capacity, she failed to do it with the express purpose of that Special Meeting.

MR. LAUDERBACH: Correct. And, yes, on January 6th she had been removed. Anything she did after that date is of no effect. She couldn't cancel a meeting.

THE COURT: What about the idea where --

MR. LAUDERBACH: Actually, I'm sorry, changed the Call -- I'm sorry, changed the Call.

THE COURT: -- changed the Call for the meeting

MR. LAUDERBACH: Right. She couldn't cancel it either, but she -- yeah.

THE COURT: I understand. Right. And -- and for that matter, it doesn't sound like -- your expert even said that, you know, the cancellation that was done subsequently probably was invalid because there was a meeting Called that had an agenda or a set of --

MR. LAUDERBACH: Right. But it also said the only -- the only business that could be taken up at the January 13th meeting in the first place was what was in the original Call.

THE COURT: In -- in the initial Call. Okay. I got it. Now going back to the -- and I think a lot of the questions here are swirling, as it were, around these petitions. And, I think three of the petitions signed as Mr. Balog, Marcum and the youth chair --

MR. LAUDERBACH: Linting?

THE COURT: -- yeah. So they allegedly recant, and at least Mr. Campbell has advanced the argument today that those recantations, and that that email they sent recanting their signatures, amend -- and you know amount to fraud, thus those signatures were void when given. And, they should never, you know, they wouldn't be thus considered by any court for any purpose.

What's your argument there?

MR. LAUDERBACH: My argument there is, first of all, there was testimony this morning that Ms. Linting recanted the recantation.

(Court laughs)

MR. LAUDERBACH: More importantly, look, this came after the vote. And, it is not -- there's no evidence here of fraud. It says we signed the petition for a meeting that was to be scheduled on December 27th. Look at the petitions.

Where does it -- where does the word December even appear? It says nothing about December 27th.

We were interested in having a vote to end the strife and division. And, they may have been -- that might be true, but they signed the petition that says, we want to vote on the removal of Kristina Karamo as Chair of the Michigan Republican Party.

They say we were -- we specifically instructed that no proxy was to go to this meeting. There was no proxy appointed for these three people.

So where's the fraud? I said don't appoint a proxy. Fine, a proxy wasn't appointed for them.

I thought the meeting was on December 27th. Well, when you signed the petition, it didn't say anything about December 27th.

And, actually this December 27th meeting, go back to the December 2nd request. They asked Chair Karamo to schedule a meeting for December 27th. She refused.

In Exhibit 6, she says, you don't get to tell me what time and place the meeting's gonna be. That's her refusal. There was no meeting scheduled for December 27th

because she refused to Call it.

And, now the assertion is that there was fraud?

These people signed a petition saying I want to have a vote on the removal of Chair Karamo. Are they -- they're now retracting that? Who's lying to whom?

We relied on those petitions because they said I want to have a vote on the removal of Kristina Karamo as the Chair of the Michigan Republican Party, and that's exactly what happened.

THE COURT: All right. And, then Mr. Lauderbach, you know, since I have given you both a limited amount of time here, why don't you address the issues of the emergency here, the injury here, the idea that, Judge, you know what, you could schedule this, I currently have a trial date for this scheduled in June. Judge, you can just punt and deny the Preliminary Injunction, leave the status quo in place and, admittedly the status quo was a lot of uncertainty right now. And, we'll go forward with two -- or as I think it is by necessity, one will be a lump Committee, one will be a real Committee, and we'll all proceed to trial in -- in June and conveniently, Judge, you'll make an ingenious decision before the National Convention in July. And, that will resolve all of this.

Why isn't that true?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Well, on the hard question, Your

Honor, I don't have to say that the United States Supreme

Court already did it. The United States Supreme Court has

held that the loss -- the loss of First Amendment freedoms for

even minimal amounts of time, unquestionably constitutes

irreparable injury.

Elrod versus Burns, 427 U.S. 347, a 1976 decision,

interestingly in that case, the Supreme Court held that the

Elrod versus <u>Burns</u>, 427 U.S. 347, a 1976 decision, interestingly in that case, the Supreme Court held that the trial court abused its discretion in not granting a Preliminary Injunction.

The 6th Circuit has recognized that the infringement of First Amendment freedoms constitutes a per se irreparable injury.

One case came out of Michigan. That's <u>GV Lounge</u>,

<u>Incorporated</u> versus <u>Michigan Liquor Control Commission</u>,

23 F.3d 1071, a 1994 case.

Also <u>Dougherty</u> versus <u>City of Maryville, Eastern</u>
District of Tennessee case, from 2009.

You've had testimony here that these -- the two witnesses who testified are members of the State Committee.

They have an expectation that in the exercise of their First Amendment freedoms, the bylaws of the State Party are going to be followed.

They've done that. They have a right to expect that others will.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Karamo, in fact, has been --

for all appearances here -- now, I know your pleading said she was expelled from all activities for five years. It looked a little more narrow than what I saw in that she was expelled from the Committee for five years. What -- I mean, that's what I -- I think is in evidence right now is that she's off the Committee --

MR. LAUDERBACH: No. From the bylaw provision, I believe, is from the Michigan Party -- or Michigan Republican Party for five years. And, that's -- that's what -- in the-the Conflict of Interest section, Judge, I asked her on direct, have you ever received any compensation from a candidate for public office? No.

How in the world do they implement this Conflict of Interest provision when on its face it only provides to financial remuneration for candidates for public office.

THE COURT: So you're saying if she had a conflict between acting as Secretary Pro Tem as it were, she testified she did, and also the 8th District Chair, that's not that sort of conflict?

MR. LAUDERBACH: And, how is it a Conflict of
Interest? It's simply not. They define -- the rules define
what a conflict is, just like the Code of Judicial Conduct
defines recusal. And, we have all kinds of standards.

Lawyers have standards for what's a conflict. These rules
have -- the bylaws have rules for what's a conflict.

She didn't have a conflict. And, she was removed as a result and at a -- at an invalid meeting, which now as she's testified, has created confusion in her own congressional district caucus about is she the chair, isn't she the chair?

Is she on the State Committee? Isn't she? Where are we going on March 2nd, where are all these things going to happen?

Who's going to get elected? What about a slate of candidates from this convention versus that one?

Judge, how much more harm do we need to show you?

THE COURT: Okay. So your argument is -- right,

just the very core of the complaint. And, really drilling

down to the five individual Plaintiffs, even though they're

still participating with who they believe is the rightful

Chair, we have two groups here participating.

That that harm, as long as that situation continues is, indeed, irreparable?

MR. LAUDERBACH: It -- it is. And, every day that somebody's using the MIGOP.com or whatever the domain is, every day that somebody's sending out emails saying who is the Chair, and who isn't the Chair, and who's doing this and who's doing that, that undermines the integrity of the Michigan Republican Party. Because precinct delegates, donors, people who are interested in the affairs of the Michigan Republican Party are receiving those communications and they're saying, well, wait a minute. Who -- who's who?

Who is the -- who is the Michigan Republican Party?

THE COURT: Well, a number of the National

Committee, which you know, you did submit their findings.

Those obviously don't have any legal persuasion in this Court.

Not that they're necessarily totally irrelevant, but you know, they just say I think right at the outset, you know, we don't have anything to say about Michigan law.

In this decision, is there any risk -- if either party prevails here, Michigan sends a delegation to the National Convention, and say even Judge Rossi's solution isn't up to snuff for the RNC at that point.

And, they say, you know what Michigan? You know, somehow that's going to diminish or negate the validity of your delegates to the National Convention, i.e, we're not going to give you -- we're not going to give you as many votes as you ought to have based on your population. You're gonna -- we're diminishing your role at this convention.

Is that a risk?

MR. LAUDERBACH: I -- I think it's a risk. I think everything's on the table because there's so much uncertainty. There -- the -- the additional harm -- yes, so that is absolutely a risk.

There is also the harm that, as Ms. Kurtzweil testified to, there's a Federal statute that makes it a crime to falsely assert that you're acting on behalf of a political

1 party. 2 So somebody is making public statements about being the Chair of a -- of a political party, and those 3 statements are incorrect. Somebody's wrong. There cannot be 5 two. I think that's like from Star Wars or something. 6 Like there can only be one. I mean, it's, you know, but it 7 rings true here. There can only be --8 THE COURT: I think the Outlander is the reference 9 there where he -- the guy said I take a sword. So, we're 10 trying to avoid that here. 11 MR. LAUDERBACH: There you go. My movie references 12 are off. 13 THE COURT: All right. Or the Highlander. I can't 14 even remember. 15 MR. LAUDERBACH; There you go. The Highlander, 16 17 that's right. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Lauderbach? 19 MR. LAUDERBACH: Unless you have any questions, 20 21 Judge, no. 22 THE COURT: No. I'm grateful for you're staying within the time deadline. I already am an hour late for my 23 24 meeting.

MR. CAMPBELL: May -- may I have brief rebuttal?

25

THE COURT: It's got to be real brief, like one 1 2 minute. MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah. 3 THE COURT: Go. 5 and complain about confusion when they're creating it. 6 7 8 we're telling everybody it's confusing. You have no evidence of anybody being confused. 9 10 they said, no. 11 12 13 about well, you can't have everybody calling MIGOP. Judge, nobody's confused. And, there's no evidence of it with regard 14 to that. 15 16 conflict of interest. The capacity issue clearly and they 17 used the word, you know, they used the word capacity to be 18 broad, to keep you from being both Secretary and District 19 Chair. She violated that. And, then she wouldn't live up to 20 it and she wouldn't acknowledge it. 21 22 But most importantly --23 by the Committee don't say anything about boy, if you're out 24

25

MR. CAMPBELL: First of all, they can't come here Right? They can't say, hey, it's confusing because Even the two witnesses I asked, are you confused and There is no evidence of confusion. All this stuff Second of all, Section I is also a basis for the THE COURT: The actual conflict provisions resolved

of capacity when you're doing this, or you're not supposed to

be doing it unless there's money involved --

MR. CAMPBELL: Judge -- disagree. Compensation.

And, again, what's your compensation? She's clearly going to be in with the new folks if they're able to pull off this coup. That's exactly what --

THE COURT: So you think it goes beyond monetary compensation?

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct. It's the word compensation. It doesn't say money, it does -- it says compensation.

Marcum, again, if there's one bad petition, they don't meet the necessary petitions.

We've given you the evidence of four or five of them that are bad, and based on that, you cannot find that there's a likelihood of prevailing because -- even if they think there's a renunciation or renunciation, what a jury is gonna find relative to this question is entirely up in the air.

And, they're asking you for an answer now about who's the one. We're saying, no. It's a process and they're gonna lose that process. When we get to do our discovery, when we get to find all the videotapes of them screaming and yelling at people, don't get on the -- on the meeting virtually, all of that is going to come in our favor.

And, they want to rob us of that before we can get it. That's what this action is. You cannot allow it.

Lastly, it's not that everybody loves Kristina

Karamo. And, few love her more than me maybe. It's that everybody hates a hater. Excuse me, a cheater. Oh, man, I had my line -- everybody hates a cheater. She has more support now, more support than she had before December 2nd. And, that's because the Committee Members have looked at what's going on. That's why she has a majority show up to her meetings. That's why she has more -- their side cannot even dream of getting 53 people physically into any place.

So more than that, lastly, I guess my point is this.

This is not an action to make Ms. DeLisle the

District Chair or make everybody call her that.

This is an action to remove the legitimate

Chairperson of the GOP. You cannot and I'm sure you're not

confused by that. But nobody should be confused about that.

It doesn't have anything to do with the stuff she talked

about.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, it's been well argued, it's been well briefed. I do have volumes of information here that I'm taking under consideration.

I do have this one hanging chad of an exhibit here. It was the first three pages of 11. It looks to me like it's, you know, sort of another compilation here of -- I believe it was attached to the top of those petitions.

You know, my inclination is since it hasn't been

admitted, I would just say it's not admitted and I'm not gonna
-- I'll disregard it.

MR. LAUDERBACH: We don't need it.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I'll disregard the -and this is, just to be clear, the first three pages of
proffered Number 11. It has some highlighted -- sheets that
look like that (indicating). I will not consider those as
part of 11.

I do have what's been proffered for an offer of proof by Mr. Campbell a videotape of Ms. DeLisle and some statements she allegedly made on video.

Again, I think I can evaluate that. I will review that. If you can find a way to submit it to me in a timely fashion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I would like to review that, so again I get the full picture, you know, of what both parties are trying to present.

I will say as a -- as a preliminary point to my preliminary ruling, that this is unquestionably complex. You know, on -- on one -- I always say when lawyers come in and say, Judge, this is simple, I immediately think they're lying. It's extremely complex and it would be hard to imagine a controversy more complex than this because of the number one, the involvement of the whole State of Michigan, we've got

people from District 1, which in my mind goes way up there to Ironwood or Wakefield, or whatever that western half of the UP is called, all the way down to other places I don't frequently get to by Monroe and the lower corner of the state.

I mean, we're a huge state. That would be extraordinarily challenging to get everyone in one place and make any sort of decision. People are using emails and things that, you know, are very strictly regulated under the Court Rules. We only accept filings and, indeed, we won't accept an email filing at this stage unless both parties agree to it. And, are able to submit it in the -- the way required by the Court. We're still working on that on a statewide level.

So I'll be the first to say none of this is something that I would characterize as extremely straightforward or easy. It requires a close reading.

So all that being said, I am going to take the Motion to Dismiss under advisement.

I do intend to get a ruling and I'm going to try to set that within the parameters of the time that I have available, and also with the parameters that are requested. You know, the nature of a Preliminary Injunction.

I will note that this wasn't, you know there is a -a quicker hitting remedy that is the -- a request for a
temporary restrain -- an ex parte request for a temporary
restraining order. That doesn't even get both sides in front

of me all the time. But it triggers a very fast timeline to do so.

I've been operating under an accelerated timeline, recognizing that though that request was not made here, there still is an urgency and, in fact, some of the damage -- irreparable damage that the Plaintiff's are required to prove here is, Judge, you've got to get this decided because these events are happening as we speak.

And, I still need to make a thorough evaluation in my head of how much truth there is to that, or how much harm I would do by delaying -- and there's no question, that in this matter even if I issue a Preliminary Injunction on Tuesday, the matter still is set for trial in the summer. And, we will still conduct a trial after discovery and drill down deeper on some of these same issues that I heard testimony on here in court.

So I don't -- I don't want to under-estimate the complexity of the matter.

What I will do -- I've already offered to Counsel the sacrifice of my monthly Michigan Judge's Association meeting where I am an executive committee member and chair -- Co-Chair of the Civil Committee.

Fortunately my -- my other co-chair, Judge Toia over in Macomb County has said he'll take the reins next Tuesday.

So I do have Tuesday afternoon starting at noon, available for

any additional proofs that the parties intend to put on -- intend to place.

I think I'm going to let today suffice as a closing argument. I'd like Counsel to notify me today is Thursday, the 22nd, by close of business tomorrow on the 23rd, if they intend to present any additional proofs on Tuesday afternoon during that available time.

You don't have to. Just so you know, my -- my goal would be and if I have the afternoon myself Tuesday, I may have my thoughts together in sufficient time to rule from the bench on this matter, which I would think I would do at 4:00 p.m. Tuesday.

You know, I could do it at the conclusion of proofs. I could take some more proofs and do it. I can do it on the proofs that are before me, I just need to spend some time with the evidence and, of course, reviewing the multiple legal sources cited by both sides.

So let me know by 5:00 p.m., tomorrow if you wish to use any of that proofs time. I know you have a conflict with the time, Mr. Campbell, and I understand.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I -- I just want to make sure we're clear. He closed his case. So we're already up here --

THE COURT: Yeah, I know. So --

(At 1:08 p.m., several people talking at once, inaudible)

MR. CAMPBELL: So it's already up to you. Yeah. I know -- I'll get you an answer as soon as I can.

THE COURT: That's a fair point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Lastly, our original exhibits are in the witness folders, meaning the Defendant's side. So do you want -- does the Court want to keep those -- those ones? You have your own copy. I assume you'll keep those as the --

THE COURT: I do. I'll keep those as the file copy. I think that's a great idea.

Anything, Mr. Lauderbach?

MR. LAUDERBACH: Yes, Your Honor. I closed my proofs. This matter was originally scheduled on January 30th. We had a pre-trial conference -- or a status conference when the Court said, I've got two half days for you.

We budgeted the proofs that we presented. We determined the witnesses that we would call, the evidence that we would present based on the extraordinarily limited amount of time that we had for proofs.

And, the Court was very gracious yesterday, and I'm sorry that things pushed on the way they did. They've chosen to cross-examine the way they've chosen to cross-examine.

I would have made different decisions had I known that we were gonna, you know, continue into next week.

If I could know by the end of the day today, what their plan is for Tuesday, I'd ask the Court to at least allow

me the opportunity after I consult with my clients, to call perhaps one very short witness.

THE COURT: All right. And, what -- what are your thoughts on that, Mr. Campbell?

MR. CAMPBELL: Absolutely not. He closed, he closed. I -- we have folks -- we have folks who are scheming and plotting --

THE COURT: As we speak --

MR. CAMPBELL: -- and -- and, again, these are the rules, 2.504(B)(2) is in there. He knew when he closed his proofs he was closing his proofs.

By the way, the fact that he needs to call somebody more, add that to my evidence that he hasn't made his -- made his required --

THE COURT: Well -- let me -- let me consult with you, Mr. Campbell. Can you meet the deadline of making the decision by 5:00 p.m. today? On next Tuesday specifically after consultation, I assume with co-counsel and your clients?

MR. CAMPBELL: If you'll give me till 9:00 tomorrow morning, I know I can do that. But it will be this evening before I can talk to everybody.

THE COURT: Decide by 9:00 a.m., tomorrow morning, that will work for me. That way I can know how to budget my time over the weekend and on Tuesday. I appreciate the arguments, and I just wanted to say for the folks, I know some

of you folks have amazingly stuck it out in the gallery here, 1 for the entirety of this hearing. 2 We've had some pretty dense testimony and, you know, 3 that the very fact that you're here and in court, and willing to work this out without giving each other black eyes and 5 6 shouting matches and things like that, is a sign that, you know, there is still a system that works here. 7 8 9 10

I'm gonna never -- I've been in the system myself too long to say that it's a perfect system. However, I will say that we have come to a system where we can have forcible and persuasive arguments on both sides, and make reasonable decisions.

I thank you for your patience in going through these proceedings, and as we -- come to a decision in the matter. Thank you.

MR. LAUDERBACH: Thank you, Your Honor.

(At 1:12 p.m., proceedings concluded)

18

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

```
1
    STATE OF MICHIGAN
2
3
    COUNTY OF KENT
                    )
              I certify that this transcript, consisting of 188 pages,
4
    is a complete, true, and correct transcript, to the best of my
5
6
    ability, of the proceedings and testimony taken in this case on
    Monday, February 22, 2024.
7
8
9
10
    Date: March 17, 2024
11
12
13
14
                                   Barbara J. Ingram, CER-3509
15
16
                                   Certified Electronic Reporter
17
                                   616-799-0969
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```