INDEX NO. 451625/2020

1

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK - CIVIL TERM - PART 3
2	X
3	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, BY LETITIA JAMES, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW
4	YORK,
5	INDEX Plaintiff, NUMBER: 451625/2020
6	V.
7 8	THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., WAYNE LAPIERRE, WILSON PHILLIPS, JOHN FRAZER, and JOSHUA POWELL,
9	Defendants.
10	X
11	Teams Meeting
	Motions New York, New York January 21, 2021
12	
13	BEFORE:
14	HON. JOEL M. COHEN, J.S.C.
15	APPEARANCES:
16	NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
17	Attorneys for the Plaintiff
18	28 Liberty Street New York, New York 10005 BY: JAMES SHEEHAN, ESQ.
19	EMILY STERN, ESQ.
20	JONATHAN CONLEY, ESQ. MONICA CONNELL, ESQ.
21	BREWER, ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS
22	Attorneys for the Defendant - NRA 750 Lexington Avenue, `14th Floor New York, New York 10022
23	BY: SARAH B. ROGERS, ESQ. JENNIFER BLECHER, ESQ.
24	
25	(Continues)
	cb

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021 02:42 PM INDEX NO. 451625/2020

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

A P P E A R A N C E S: (Continued) 2 CORRELL LAW GROUP Attorneys for the Defendant - W. LaPierre 3 250 Park Avenue - 7th Floor New York, New York 10177 4 BY: P. KENT CORRELL, ESQ. 5 GAGE SPENCER & FLEMING Attorneys for the Defendant - J. Frazer 6 410 Park Avenue, Suite 810 New York, New York 10022 7 BY: WILLIAM B. FLEMING, ESQ. 8 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP Attorneys for the Defendant - W. Phillips 9 Met Life Building 200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166 10 BY: SETH FARBER, ESQ. 11 MARK WERBNER, ESQ. 12 13 14 15 16 CAROLYN BARNA 17 SENIOR COURT REPORTER 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 cb

YORK COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021 02:42

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings 1 2 THE COURT: Counsel, I'd like to take appearances, beginning with the plaintiff. 3 MR. SHEEHAN: This is Jim Sheehan, Chief of the 4 5 Charities Bureau, Assistant Attorney General. Thank you for having the hearing today. 6 7 MS. STERN: Good morning, your Honor. This is Emily Stern, Assistant Attorney General and 8 9 Co-Section Chief of the Enforcement Section of the Charities 10 Bureau. 11 THE COURT: Good morning. 12 MR. CONLEY: Good morning, your Honor. 13 This is Jonathan Conley, Assistant Attorney 14 General, with the New York State Attorney General's Office. 15 THE COURT: Good morning. 16 MS. CONNELL: Good morning, your Honor. 17 Monica Connell, Assistant Attorney General, Special 18 Counsel for the plaintiff. Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Good morning. And who is going to be the principal spokesperson 20 21 for the State this morning? MR. CONLEY: Your Honor, Jonathan Conley. I'll be 22 23 handling the argument today. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 Your video doesn't seem to be operating, which will

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

make it a little difficult for the court reporters. 1 2 Anybody else see Mr. Conley or is it just me? THE COURT REPORTER: I don't see him, Judge. 3 MR. SHEEHAN: We can see him. 4 5 MS. CONNELL: Your Honor, this is Monica Connell. 6 We saw him by video until a second ago and now I see just a 7 picture. THE COURT: In the meantime, let's take appearances 8 9 for the defendant, starting with the NRA. 10 MS. ROGERS: Good morning. 11 This is Sarah Rogers. I'm appearing today on 12 behalf of the defendant, The National Rifle Association. 13 I'm joined by my colleague, who you may also be able to see to my left, Jennifer Blecher. 14 15 MS. BLECHER: Good morning, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Good morning. 17 MS. ROGERS: And we are also joined separately by 18 counsel for Mr. LaPierre, who will make his appearance. 19 MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, Kent Correll, for Wayne 20 LaPierre. 21 THE COURT: Good morning. MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, William Fleming, for 22 23 defendant John Frazer. 24 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Fleming. 25 MR. FLEMING: Good morning.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings 1 MR. FARBER: Good morning, your Honor. Seth Farber 2 from Winston & Strawn. I'm joined by my colleague Mark Werbner, who is 3 4 also on separately from Winston & Strawn, on behalf of 5 defendant Wilson Phillips. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 Mr. Farber, you cut out a little bit. MR. FARBER: Is this better? 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. FARBER: What I was saying, Seth Farber from 11 Winston & Strawn. 12 Also on separately is my colleague Mark Werbner 13 from Winston and Strawn, for the defendant Wilson Phillips. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 Anyone else? I hear some echos which is par for 16 the course today so far. Let's see how we do. 17 Good morning, everyone. 18 Before turning to the motions on the agenda today, 19 I want to address briefly the NRA's Notice of Bankruptcy on 20 Friday. I asked the parties to submit their views on the 21 impact of the bankruptcy filing on the issues to be decided at the hearing, which they did by letter yesterday. 22 23

The Attorney General takes the position that although bankruptcy filings usually require that any lawsuits against the debtor be stayed, this case is covered

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

by statutory exception to that rule because it is an action by a governmental entity to enforce police or regulatory powers.

The NRA stated it had no objection to proceeding with this hearing today, but took no immediate position with respect to the bankruptcy stay and, instead, reserved the right to seek further orders from the Bankruptcy Court at a later date. The other defendants conveyed similar positions.

So, with that, I will proceed with the argument on the pending motions. I will say that I would not be proceeding unless I was comfortable, based on my own research, that there were reasonable grounds for doing so under federal law.

As you know, both federal and New York courts have found that state courts have authority to determine the applicability of a bankruptcy stay to cases that are pending before them. It is not the exclusive province of the Bankruptcy Court.

With that introduction, let's proceed. I would like to follow this agenda to keep things organized. Rather than doing all of the motions in series for the parties and then responses, I'd like to break it into two.

The first part would be the venue, the statutory venue motion, which, to me, is a statutory argument that

cb

6 of 102

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 dismissal or transfer to Albany is mandated by statute, and 2 then have the back and forth on that.

> And then turn to the second set of grounds which are discretionary grounds for dismissing or staying the case because of, among other things, the pendency of other litigation in Albany.

So, if we can do it that way, I would appreciate it.

So, given that these are the defendants' motions, Ms. Rogers, I don't know if you want to go first, if we can start with the statutory venue motion.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor.

I believe I am unmuted, so can everyone hear me?

THE COURT: I can.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you very much.

So, let's start with venue. We agree that's the appropriate place to start because, as courts have held, once you determine that the case is in the wrong court, all remaining substantive issues go to the correct court. this case is in the wrong court.

Now, given the choice of where to commence its capital case against this particular political target, it's no surprise that the Attorney General would prefer Manhattan, but they're not given that choice. And, in fact, the statutory scheme that made this lawsuit possible takes

cb

7 of 102

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

_

Proceedings

1 that choice away.

So, it was a deliberate choice by the New York
State Legislature to depart from the parallel statutory
scheme of the General Corporation Law which grants the
Attorney General broad discretion as to where to venue a
dissolution case.

Instead, the mandatory venue for a dissolution case under the N-CPL is prescribed in N-CPL 1110 and it's very simple and it's very discrete. And there's a verbatim definition that I will read that we've set forth in our papers.

So, this action has to venued in the judicial district in which the office of the corporation is located. And according to the definition section of the same statute, the term office means the office, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation.

That's very simple. That's very black and white language. It does not call for a Gestalt contacts analysis; a principal place of business analysis. The question is, you look at the Certificate of Incorporation, which is defined to include amendments thereto, and you identify the office stated therein.

If you look at the NRA's Certificate of
Incorporation, the only office stated therein is 80 State
Street in Albany. Now, when we raised this challenge, the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

Attorney General responded with a number of, you know, creative defenses of the New York county venue, which I will get to in a moment, but you can tell that they likewise acknowledge the sort of mandatory black and white language of this venue prescription because in their complaint they verified under penalty of perjury in paragraph 26, they allege that venue is proper because:

"The office of the NRA is in New York county as set forth in the Certificate of Incorporation."

But there is no office of the NRA in New York county set forth in the Certificate of Incorporation. The Attorney General knew that was a mandatory condition for venuing the case here, that's why they made that verified allegation, but that verified allegation is inaccurate.

Now, this isn't a mere technicality. It is an important substantive right that the legislature chose to confer on not-for-profit corporations when it drafted N-PCL 1110. If you're a nonprofit and you are fighting for your very existence, you have the right to have that fight in the backyard that you chose. The location that you inscribed in your formation documents.

Now, admittedly, this case is a bit unique because if you form a nonprofit in New York nowadays, the statute requires a newly filed Certificate of Incorporation designate both an office location and a registered agent.

cb

9 of 102

a

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

But because the NRA was formed so early, so early on in the course of New York Corporate Law, there was no such requirement.

So, when the NRA lodged a Certificate of
Incorporation with the Secretary of State in Albany, it did
not designate an office location. It certainly did not
designate one in Manhattan. And, over subsequent years,
although the statute evolved to require a more specific
designation, that requirement was never retroactive.

Now, the response to this from the Attorney

General, I will characterize, is three-fold. The first

argument, as I see it, is that you sort of acted like a New

York county corporation, even if you didn't designate a New

York office in your certificate as the statute requires.

So, for example, in 1871, when the founders of the NRA who, by the way, were military men stationed by the government that would later try to dissolve their organization, that happened to be in Manhattan and the signatures from a judge in Manhattan, the Attorney General argues that you were an active New York City corporation then, so you're a New York City corporation now.

The Attorney General further argues that because the NRA had continued to lodge copies of items that it filed over the years such as amendments in New York county, it acted like a New York county corporation so there must be a

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

constructive office here, even if there is not an actual office here.

But none of the conducts that the Attorney General alleges amounts to a waiver by the NRA of its crucial substantive right to face and fight dissolution in the judicial district it chose and it inscribed on its governing document.

The waiver of that right would have to be a known relinquishment, that's black letter law. And that's not what any of this amounts to. The Attorney General cannot allege that we've waived this right and established some illusory office in New York county.

And if we have, then my question for the Attorney General would be okay, you have alleged in your verified complaint that "The office of the NRA is in New York county", so where is that office? If you want to serve us with dissolution papers, where do you bring them? If you want to send us mail, where do you send it?

There is literally no office in New York county, certainly none designated on the Certificate of Incorporation or any prior iterations of it.

And we have filed with the Court as exhibits to our motion papers an exhaustive record of all of the documents lodged with the Secretary of State by the NRA since the NRA's initial formation in 1871. There's never been an

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

address in New York county designated. By the plain terms of the statute, venue is improper in New York county.

Another cluster argument the Attorney General makes essentially is that, you know, there are other claims in this case, too. So, even if there is a statutory mandatory venue for dissolution action in Albany or the Third Judicial District, they have also lodged claims against certain individual defendants, current and former executives, and those who form flexible venue under CPLR 503, and where there are conflicting venue provisions, the Attorney General gets more leeway.

The problem with that argument is that every single shred of authority on which the Attorney General relies involves cases where there is a genuine conflict in venue. For example, you have a case brought, you get two claims brought simultaneously, one could only have been brought in New York county, one could have only been brought in Albany County, there is no conflict here.

The Attorney General concedes it is a resident of any county, so unless there is a narrower statutory prescription as here, the Attorney General could have brought these claims anywhere it liked. And it could bring its claims against the individual defendants in the Third Judicial District where the dissolution claim belongs.

So, we think that that dispatches with the argument

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

about conflicting venue and how even throwing in additional claims lets you bring dissolution in New York county, but we're certainly happy to discuss that further if the Court would like.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question.

Let's assume, hypothetically, you know, the organization was formed in 1871 and then there was not a single piece of paper filed from then until now, where would venue be appropriate?

MS. ROGERS: That's an interesting hypothetical. Fortunately, not the one before this Court. By the terms of the statute, venue would be appropriate at the office stated on the Certificate of Incorporation.

THE COURT: By definition there isn't one, so then what happens?

MS. ROGERS: So, my recommendation would be, your Honor, that you treat the NRA as sort of the way you would treat a nonresident or a corporation that does not have an office in the state. That seems to be the closest analog in that hypothetical.

THE COURT: And the result of that would be that the State Attorney General could sue in any county it wanted to; correct?

MS. ROGERS: Well, or as in the *Gilinsky* case that we cite in our reply is that you revert to the place where

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 the registered agent is.

But I understand in your hypothetical --

THE COURT: In other words, if there is no "office of the corporation", you just revert back to the regular venue statute; correct?

MS. ROGERS: I think the reason you can't revert back to 503 is that by the terms of the CPLR and controlling Court of Appeals authority, the narrower prescriptive statute that overlays and supersedes 503 has to be given deference.

THE COURT: I know, but right now I'm hypothesizing that there is no office of the corporation. And so the way I look at 503 is it tells you where the venue is, unless another venue is prescribed by law.

So, what I'm getting at is, if there is no office of the corporation, therefore, the other statue doesn't seem to apply, then, the regular venue rules would apply.

I recognize we're going to get to the next question

I have for you which is to talk about what happened in the

150 years, but just analytically, if there is no office of
the corporation, it seems to me that you're back to the
regular venue statute.

MS. ROGERS: Analytically, if the NRA had never amended a Certificate of Incorporation to contain an address, then I think that approach could be viable.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

THE COURT: Let's talk about the evidence that you pointed to. I think you started with that there is an office designated in Albany. Why don't you just walk through what that evidence is.

MS. ROGERS: Certainly.

So, I apologize, your Honor, I don't recall which exhibit it is, but I would be happy to pull it up. We filed, in connection with our transfer motion, copies of all of the documents we've lodged for the Secretary of State over the years.

One of those, which if memory serves, was lodged in 1985, designates the address of 80 State Street in Albany --sorry, in 2002, your Honor. It designated the State Street address for two separate purposes; that is the address of the registered agent and the address for mailing documents which are technically distinctive categories under the statute at that time. But that is, you know, that is the address that we -- the way the Certificate of Incorporation is defined under the N-PCL, and it's inclusive of amendments and documents. And I have that document here, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think it's NYSCEF 109; correct?

MS. ROGERS: I believe that is correct. My copy,

unfortunately, doesn't have the stamp on it, but I think

24 that is correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

And so the document you're talking about, I think it's 29 or so pages in, is the one where an agent for service of process was named; is that correct?

MS. ROGERS: Yes. There's an agent for service of process named in the 2002 Certificate of Change, that's the official title of the document.

And there's two designations made you can see on this document. We designate a registered agent towards the bottom of the page. It says destination of registered agent, the corporation, service of company, 80 State Street.

And then separately, apart from your registered agent, you have to designate an address where the Secretary of State is supposed to forward documents that are addressed to you.

THE COURT: Above those two, which I'm sure is a question that you're expecting, so the company specifically checked boxes to change the address to forward copies of process, and it specifically checked a box to designate an entity to be the registered agent, but it left blank the box directly above it in which a company is permitted to change the "county location within this state in which the office of the corporation is located", which is the exact statutory definition, that was not checked.

So, the Attorney General argues, certainly, there seems to be some force behind that if the NRA intended to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

designate an office of the corporation, they could have easily done so, and the fact that it didn't, arguably cuts the other way.

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, obviously the NRA was not required to designate an office. Again, this is just a historical anomaly. If the NRA had been formed five or ten years later, they would have had to designate an office and that office would have been the office, unless we changed it via this form. But that's not what happened.

THE COURT: Right. But this is, as I read your papers, the only piece of evidence that you rely on for an Albany address, or a principal one.

And, in this one, it very specifically, I think, does not designate an office of the corporation. So, I don't know how you connect the two because the office of the corporation is a statutory phrase and the only thing that this provision, this form does, is it designates an agent for service of process. Which, I understand the point that, you know it has its certain meaning, but it's not the words of the statute.

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, two responses to that. First, it's not technically true that the 2002 Certificate of Change is the only piece of evidence that we're citing.

We also filed a Certificate of Amendment in 1985, and that's also an exhibit to our brief. And in the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

Certificate of Amendment, paragraph 2 and paragraph 6, we designate the Secretary of State as the agent for service of process which, again, it's the agent for service of process, but the Secretary of State is located in Albany. There's two separate documents that designate an address in Albany. There are zero documents that designate an address in New York City.

Now, the Court may wonder, okay, aren't a registered agent and principal office distinct concepts.

And that's ideally true, but we've seen courts, in imperfect situations like this, in the *Gilinsky* case we cite, we've seen them look to the registered agent when there is not a designated principal office.

THE COURT: You are using that word principal office as a careful lawyer because that is a phrase that has some relevance outside of the statutory context in trying to figure other things out for venue. But I have a statute to apply, so principal office is not the word. Service of process agent is not the word. It is "office of the corporation." So, I don't really understand how those cases are relevant.

MS. ROGERS: Well, your Honor, I think from a straight textual approach, the actual language is, "The office, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation."

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

And the Certificate of Incorporation is defined to include amendments like the one that I just cited.

So, applying the statute most strictly by plain terms, you first look to the Certificate of Incorporation for an address, for a location that is stated. And the only location that is stated in any of the documents that comprise our Certificate of Incorporation as defined under the statute is the 80 State Street, Albany address.

The statutory framework and the legislature's deliberate choice to depart from the General Corporation Law scheme which gives the AG more discretion as to where to venue a case, but we would argue should guide the Court's interpretation.

The NRA is fighting for its very existence. And to the extent that there's any ambiguity, why not let us fight for our existence in the place we chose, not the place that is sort of constructively construed; not a place where we throw up our hands and say well, this is a historical anomaly so the AG can sue anywhere it wants.

Venue is clearly proper in Albany. It's not clearly proper in New York county. So, we would urge the Court to sort of vindicate the intent of 1110, which is, you know, not to resort to these other constructs that exist under 503 or that exists under the Business Corporation Law.

THE COURT: Look, you have discretionary arguments

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

to come, and I get that, but this is not discretionary. The venue statute says that it's the normal venue unless otherwise prescribed by law. That is not some judge deciding what, you know, what makes sense. It's either prescribed by law or it isn't. It's binary, I think, on this one.

There's a discretionary venue argument that you make later, which we'll get to. You know, I can't straddle here, this one. This is one or the other.

MS. ROGERS: We agree, your Honor, and we think the most straightforward reading of the text is, is there a venue prescribed by law. Clearly, yes. That is the obvious purpose and effect. And it prescribes a venue as a matter of statute. What does the statute say? It says that dissolution can only be brought in the judicial district or the offices. An office means the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation.

So what the statute prescribes is that this dissolution case can only be brought in the judicial district, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation. There is only one location stated in our Certificate of Incorporation, and that's 80 State Street, Albany.

THE COURT: You were just reading from the statutory definition of the phrase "office of the

cb

20 of 102

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

21

Proceedings

corporation"; right?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROGERS: That's correct. Yes.

THE COURT: And the State gives companies a form to change the office of the corporation. So, whatever the embedded definition of it is, there was a way to do it, and you didn't.

MS. ROGERS: There would have been a way to be even more explicit about it, but I don't think it changes the straightforward application of the statute. There is a location stated in the Certificate of Incorporation and that's Albany.

THE COURT: Okay.

Anything else on this issue before I turn to the Attorney General? Do you or any of the other defendants have anything to add?

MS. ROGERS: One moment, your Honor.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MS. ROGERS: One additional thing, your Honor.

We don't think this ought to be dispositive, but the New York Attorney General in its papers references, you know, if you go to the Secretary of State website, that there are certain menu options you can toggle to produce a New York county address, but -- actually, I'm just going to let my co-defendant counsel address this because he's spent more time on the website than I have.

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

22

Proceedings

MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, the Certificate of Incorporation is the only document that the Court should be looking at, but if the Court wants the color on that, the Attorney General has put into the record a printout, something that purports to be a printout of the website of the New York State Department of State.

And under selected entity address, the selected entity being National Rifle Association, it shows the address 80 State Street, Albany, New York.

So, apparently, the New York State Department of State regards the address of the NRA as 80 State Street, Albany, New York and that's -- -

THE COURT: Doesn't the website also -- and I may be confusing things in the record, and I'm sure the Attorney General will correct me, but I thought there was something on the website that you actually disputed because it lists the office of the corporation in New York county. I may be misremembering.

MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, we dispute the characterization that the Attorney General has put on that document, but they've read a line that says date of, I believe it's the date of filing of the original Certificate of Incorporation, and it's listed as November 20, 1871, and then below that it says county, New York.

And the fact is that the original Certificate of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

23

Proceedings

Incorporation was filed in New York county on November 17, 1871, so that date is incorrect. But the filing in New York county, that's an inference they are trying to draw from those two things which are not, in our view, connected. I think it's a misreading of the information set forth on the website.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that.

Anything else before I turn to Mr. Conley, whose image has now --

MS. ROGERS: Vanished to me, but if you can see him, your Honor, that's the important part.

THE COURT: I can. It appears to be somewhat of an aberration.

Anyway, as long as Carolyn, can you see Mr. Conley?

THE COURT REPORTER: I can. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Fire away.

MR. CONLEY: Thank you, your Honor.

To take a step back, the defendants do not dispute 16 of the 18 causes of action asserted in the complaint are properly venued in this court. The defendants are challenging venue for the two dissolution causes of action which are governed by a separate venue provision and N-PCL 1110.

Under N-PCL 1110, the proper venue for a

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

dissolution action is in the Supreme Court in the judicial district in which the office of the corporation is located.

And for purposes of this statute, the location of the office of the corporation is determined by an organization Certificate of Incorporation. As we established in our opposition papers, the NRA's office of the corporation is, and has always been, located in New York county.

Under the law in effect at the time of its formation, the NRA was required to file a Certificate of Incorporation in the office of the clerk of the county in which the office of such society shall be situated.

In accordance with this law, the NRA filed a Certificate of Incorporation in New York county, thereby designating it the county location of its office of the corporation. The NRA repeatedly reaffirmed that choice in later amendments to its Certificates of Incorporation which were filed in New York county and approved by justices of the First Department.

This designation of New York county is also reflected in current Department of State records for the NRA, the accuracy of which the defendants did not dispute in their reply papers.

And I do contest a couple of points made about the database records, which I'll get to in a moment. But, in

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

any event, venue is a matter of the plaintiff's choice. And on a motion to change venue, it's the defendant's burden to establish that the plaintiff's choice of venue is improper and that the defendant's choice of venue is proper. And the defendants have not established either here.

They put forth no credible evidence to establish that its office of corporation is in Albany county. To the contrary, the NRA's incorporations, both its historical and modern, reflected its office of corporation as in New York county.

Now, the defendants argue that the NRA has never had a physical office in the State of New York and the venue should, therefore, default to where its registered agent is located in Albany county, but this argument is flawed in several respects.

First, the N-PCL expressly states that an entity's office of the corporation is distinct from the physical location where an entity engages in business. That the NRA never had a physical location in New York has no bearing on venue.

Second, the defendant's argument that the NRA was never required to designate a county location for its office of the corporation ignores the legal effect of filing its original certificate in New York county. The act of filing its incorporation papers in the county where its office was

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

to be located was a condition precedent to the NRA's creation and corporate existence. It is as essential to its formation as setting out its name and core purposes.

THE COURT: The difficulty -- the difficulty with relying on an 1871 Act or action is that the statute I'm dealing with now didn't exist then and it references a statutory phrase, "office of the corporation", that didn't exist as a statutory definition until later.

So, I'm not sure how much value you get out of, you know, the initial thing. But I understand the point. It is some piece of evidence.

MR. CONLEY: Yes, your Honor.

And, again, in later amendments to its Certificate of Incorporation, the NRA was required to get approvals for changes to amendments to its Certificate of Incorporation by getting approval from justices in the judicial district in which its office was located. And the NRA got approval for those amendments from justices of the First Department.

Also, while the defendants focus a great deal on the location of the NRA's registered agent, they fail to cite to any legal authority that says the location of a corporation's registered agent is relevant, let alone conclusive evidence of where an entity's office of the corporation is located under N-PCL 1110.

And, as your Honor noted, if the NRA had wanted to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

change its county location by designating a registered agent in Albany, it could have easily done so. The 2002 form had an option for changing its county location, but the NRA declined to make that change.

Since its formation, the NRA has been able to change its county location to wherever it wanted, but never has, instead electing to keep it fixed in New York county.

The Attorney General brought this action in New York county because venue is proper here. All along, the Attorney General has adhered to the statutory venue provision in the N-PCL by bringing and defending its choice to bring dissolution claims here.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you the same question I asked Ms. Rogers. What if there is no office of the corporation, you know, it didn't have to have one when it first started, and let's just assume that all of these shreds of evidence that both sides sort of bring up don't really establish an office of the corporation, what do I do then?

MR. CONLEY: Your Honor, under the venue citing provisions in Article 5 of the CPLR, it would be treated like a foreign corporation and venue would be proper in any county that the Attorney General chose.

THE COURT: Okay.

Anything else on the venue motion?

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

28

Proceedings

I will just note that the Court can resolve the instant venue motions without determining the location of the office of the corporation. Even if venue were improper for the two dissolution claims, which they are not, the Court may and should retain this entire action.

N-PCL 1110 doesn't deprive this Court over jurisdiction over the dissolution claims. And in the interest of judicial economy and efficiency, it plainly weighs in favor of retaining this entire case.

That argument I don't understand as I mean, if the statute has a mandatory venue provision for claims A and B, how do I just ignore that? I'm not aware of anything in here that says I have discretion to ignore something that's prescribed by law.

MR. CONLEY: If the Court were to find that the two dissolution claims were improperly venued, the Court may still find that because of the other 16 of 18 causes of actions are proper in New York county, the Court does have the ability and the authority to keep the entire action. It's not robbed of jurisdiction as the defendants insinuate.

THE COURT: The cases you cite for this proposition, at least my recollection is all or almost all of them, they did not have a mandatory venue provision that the Court was just sort of riding rough shot over. This one does.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

29

Proceedings

MR. CONLEY: I believe the *Tashenberg* decision in the Third Department, your Honor, did involve a dissolution claim. And in that case it held that if venue was proper for one claim, it's proper for all of them.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Why don't I see if Ms. Rogers has anything to add and then she can move on to the other branches of the motion.

MS. ROGERS: Yes, your Honor. I would like to address the *Tashenberg* case. This is a 38 year old cursory opinion in another judicial department and it's distinguishable on a number of grounds.

THE COURT: I now have lost your picture, but I can

MS. ROGERS: Hold on. Let me see if I can --

THE COURT: I'll do the best I can to imagine it.

MS. ROGERS: I'm here.

THE COURT: Okay. There you go.

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, I want to address the Tashenberg case because it is the only case that defendant -- I'm sorry, that the plaintiff marshals that you could struggle to construe as being apposite and there are severe flaws in plaintiff's reliance on it.

So, Tashenberg is a 38 year old cursory opinion in another judicial department. We actually tried to track

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

down the underlying papers and submissions that led to this ruling and we couldn't because the case is so old.

In Tashenberg, it's important that the Court notes that this is an action by a stockholder, director and officer, so an insider action for dissolution, not an adversarial one by the State, was essentially -- the essence of the case was that it sought various types of relief for the stockholder, director and officer and, therefore, you know, it can be brought in a district where the stockholder, director and officer resides.

But that's not the case here. Here, we are dealing with a statutory mandatory venue provision that, when it was drafted, the legislature made a decision to strip the discretion that the AG would have as for for profit corporations.

But the nonprofit corporation, unlike under the General Corporation Law, you can't bring it in any county in which you want. It has to be the location of the office, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation. That's one reason Tashenberg is inapposite.

I also want to point to you, this is a case we cite on page 7 of our reply, controlling Court of Appeals authority in Lazarow, Rettig, & Sundel v. Castle, and that's at 49 NY2D 508, and that's construing --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK U2/U3/2U21 U2:42 PM
NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

THE COURT: You faded out a bit.

MS. ROGERS: I'm sorry.

The Lazarow case, which is controlling Court of Appeals authority, construes a different statutory mandatory venue provision, one applying to banks, but it provides some insight on how the Court of Appeals treats these provisions. They treat them as this protection that is afforded to the entity being sued.

The Court of Appeals says in Lazarow:

"The rule that an actual bank may only be sued in the district or the county in which it is established was prescribed for the convenience of those institutions and to prevent interruption in their business that might result from their books being sent to distant counties. The mandatory character of the statute may not be blunted by judicially created exceptions."

This is pretty similar. The N-PCL 1110 was derived very closely from a parallel provision of the General Corporation Law, but the allowance was intentionally narrowed so that a nonprofit could only face the prospect of a corporate death sentence in the judicial district where it identifies where there is an office, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation.

THE COURT: Okay.

Why don't you move on to the other branches of the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 motion.

MS. ROGERS: Certainly, your Honor.

MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, if I may address this one narrow point going to *Tashenberg* before we move on.

The Tashenberg opinion was four sentences long.

And saying that it's cryptic is an understatement. It's really hard to know exactly what the Court was doing there, but the Court did cite Section 503 of the CPLR without quoting the language and without referencing the exception in that provision.

And it also cited, I believe, CPLR 502 without acknowledging the limiting language of that provision which specifically limits its application to situations where there is a conflict of provisions under Article 5 of the CPLR.

So, our view is that CPLR 502 operates to give the Court discretion to resolve conflicts between venue provisions in Article 5 of the CPLR, but it doesn't give a court discretion to basically ignore a mandatory jurisdiction provision in another statute.

And that analysis is consistent with CPLR Section 101 which says the CPLR applies except where its procedure is regulated by an inconsistent statute.

We don't view the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law as inconsistent with the CPLR. If you read them properly,

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

they're consistent. But the Attorney General seems to be reading them in a way that produces a conflict, and if that's so, then they run up against the bar of CPLR 101 which is if there is conflict, then the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law preempts the CPLR and takes precedence.

On that basis, all of the cases they have relied on are distinguishable in that the parties did not raise those issues and did not cite CPLR Section 101.

And there is Supreme Court authority on that point that where a separate statute sets forth a comprehensive procedural scheme, as the not-for-profit corporation does here, that the Court must give precedence to that other scheme.

And that's kind of an extension of the old rule that if you have a general statute and a specific statute, the specific one applies, not the general one.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CORRELL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think I have what I need on the venue motion.

Now, the remaining motions, I think we can argue as a group. Ms. Rogers, you can take us -- and it's hard to group them together, but it's forum non conveniens and, you know, dismissal based on the pending federal action. Those are somewhat related. So, I'll let you argue them however

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 you would like, but --

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, it seems that the concepts implicated in the motions are overlapping and it makes sense to argue them simultaneously.

So, we now depart the land of strict statutory construction to analyze a number of provisions where the Court has a lot of discretion to determine what the interest of substantial justice favors and where good cause exists.

So, the forum non conveniens doctrine simply requires, you know, is there a more convenient forum and would it serve the interest of substantial justice for the action to be heard there.

This action is not only technically commenced after our lawsuit against the New York AG which was commenced on August 6th, it's only the latest in a tangled nest of litigation that is pending largely in federal court, some of it in state court, that raised overlapping factual and legal issues about the NRA's business expenditures.

A lot of the transactions and events that are alleged in this complaint relate to the NRA's dealing with Ackerman McQueen. For example, these travel expenses, these expenses that have garnered a lot of ink in the press, those were all incurred, to the extent they were indeed incurred, were incurred by Ackerman McQueen.

There is a previously pending federal litigation

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

35

Proceedings

between the NRA and Ackerman McQueen where all of the issues are in play. And that's in the Northern District of Texas. That's one of the many federal cases that we are in the process of moving to consolidate in an MDL proceeding.

There is also an ancillary litigation. We had a former Ackerman employee come forward and provide essentially whistleblower testimony that Ackerman was lying to the NRA about the nature of the expenditures. testified in that NRA Ackerman litigation. Ackerman filed oddly a distinct lawsuit against him, and that's also pending in federal court.

Then, we have the Delatil (sic) litigation pending in the Middle District of Tennessee, exact same issues, previously filed action, already in federal court, already in discovery.

The constitutional dispute between the NRA and the New York State of the Office of the Attorney General has been brewing for a while. It was commenced by the NRA in the Northern District of New York on August 6, 2020, and I don't need to belabor, and I won't, but I'll mention because it's so salient, you know, this is a case of historical constitutional importance because the ACLU weighed in for us.

We've had 16 amici states weigh in for us, wave a red flag and say, you know, what the AG is doing here is

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

unusual and wrong. Multiple constitutional scholars;

Jonathan Turley; Feldman, we cite them in our brief, have

come out and said look, even if some of these allegations

were true, it is clear that this effort to dissolve the NRA

is unconstitutional.

Now, we understand that, you know, that's going to be argued and the AG has a different view on it, but those Article 3 constitutional claims were brought in a federal forum and deserve to be heard there. And it's not that we doubt the sophistication of the Court to hear those claims, but they were technically first filed and there are efficiencies to be gained from trying all of these interrelated cases in a federal forum, especially because some of the most salient claims here are the NRA's constitutional claims which are federal questioned claims.

There are --

THE COURT: You said -- you may have used the words technically filed first. I'm not sure what that means. I think it is uncontested that the papers were filed by the Attorney General here first. Then, later, I think in the same day, the NRA filed in federal court.

And, you know, I understand that there was an amendment or a change to the verification, but it wasn't actually filed first; right?

MS. ROGERS: Well, so technically, your Honor, the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

AG's case was filed first, but it wasn't commenced first.

And that's the difference ---

THE COURT: Your reference to technically filed earlier, and I'm just trying to figure out what you meant. It was technically filed here, the question is whether that matters.

MS. ROGERS: Right.

Your Honor, it was technically filed here, but the action filed here was a nullity. That's the term in the CPLR and we are entitled to treat that complaint as a nullity under the CPLR because it was improperly verified.

Now, the AG in its papers urges the Court to exercise its discretion to disregard what it characterizes as something in the nature of a typographical error, but, in fact, that deficit in the verification is not just technical.

It is not a technicality when the Attorney General of the State of New York files a 168 pages of corruption accusations, the statute requires it to verify it at least believes those allegations are true. That's what was left out of the initial filing.

We were entitled to treat it as a nullity if we followed the appropriate procedure; we gave immediate notice, which we did, and an amended filing was made, but the NRA's federal action, when you consider that the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

attempted filing of the State action on August 6th was a nullity, then the first filed of these two overlapping cases is the NRA federal case which was filed and successfully commenced the morning of August 6th a few minutes after Letitia James commenced her press conference announcing that she was going to destroy the National Rifle Association.

THE COURT: One thing I guess I have to note, because it was in front of me, when the NRA decided to bring a lawsuit last year, it brought it in Manhattan, in fact, in front of me. So, it didn't seem terribly inconvenient to litigate in New York City at that point.

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, I have a couple of responses to that.

I mean, I understand that you're raising this in the context of the forum non conveniens and dismissal arguments, but obviously that plays no role in the statutory venue analysis because you can't change the plain text of the venue provision based on some kind of purposeful availment argument.

THE COURT: That's why I'm raising it now.

MS. ROGERS: I apologize, your Honor. I just wanted to cover that for the record.

But we were in a different posture then. Several of the federal cases that we're now seeking to consolidate in a multidistrict litigation either didn't exist or were

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK U2/U3/2U21 U2:42 PM
NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 much, much less advanced at the time.

Also, we have another federal constitutional case pending in Albany. We filed ours as a related case, so the dispute that was in front of your Honor was a pretty narrow indemnity dispute with a director. It did not implicate the broader First Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment issues which are already being tried in a related case in Albany.

THE COURT: So, your point is not that Manhattan is just inherently inconvenient. It's that there's sort of a locus in Albany of other cases; is that what your argument is?

MS. ROGERS: That's one strand of my argument, your Honor. It's not that Manhattan is harder to fly to than Albany.

THE COURT: That's often, when you seek forum non conveniens, it's more along those lines that we're being asked to go to a location distant and hard to get to and it's going to cost all sorts of money and the like. That typically would send you toward a major city center that's easier to travel in and out of rather than away from.

MS. ROGERS: We understand, your Honor. We understand that it's not a typical forum non conveniens argument, but we think that it's one that comes within the statute and the doctrine.

Another aspect of the forum non conveniens argument

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

is that it would be more convenient to be not just in the Northern District, but in federal court where these interrelated actions are pending, where we have the efficiencies of the multidistrict litigation mechanisms and where this case, which has an incredible footprint, and we attach to our motion just a partial list, just based on the AG's allegations, but we have dozens of witnesses and documents in other states, other countries.

Now, we know that the Commercial Division in Manhattan has tried complex cases before, but it's difficult to deny, at least from my perspective, that federal court is designed for this and there are inherent efficiencies there that will make the case more efficient and least costly, among those being the ability to serve subpoenas across state lines.

So, that's another reason the federal forum is more convenient and, you know, we are already going up to Albany for two other constitutional lawsuits against the State.

THE COURT: The federal court thing raises a sort of a different issue, sort of more under the broadened umbrella of federalism. You know, your motion is basically saying that the Chief Law Enforcement Officer of New York potentially shouldn't be able to maintain an action in state court.

You know, we spent the first part of this argument

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

with you telling me that the statute mandated that it be filed with the state court, albeit a different one, and now your argument is well, it actually shouldn't be in state court at all, it should all be swept under the federal case. And I don't know how you square all of that. It's a big lift to ask that the State Attorney General cannot bring suit in state court.

MS. ROGERS: Well, your Honor, this is a unique set of circumstances. One of those circumstances being the existence of a parallel and previously filed federal action litigating these exact same facts. And, you know, when the State Attorney General is being, you know, is credibly alleged to unconstitutionally have targeted the defendant, perhaps the federal court is an even better forum.

Certainly, in the cases that state law enforcement officers routinely find themselves litigating in federal court against claimants and defendants and objects of their law enforcement activity who allege that they have behaved unconstitutionally, you know, that is the purpose of Section ——

THE COURT: As you know, state courts under our federal system have the ability to address and resolve federal constitutional claims unless congress has granted exclusive jurisdiction to the federal court. So, you do have a forum for it in state court as well.

cb

41 of 102

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

42

Proceedings

But, look, I get your point. You're not saying that it is mandated to go to federal court. You're saying that I should exercise my discretion to essentially cause it to be put in a position where it might be consolidated with the federal action.

You're making a discretionary argument, but to the extent it's based on you need a different forum to raise constitutional arguments, I don't think that's accurate. This may not be the preferred forum, but it's, you know, our doors are open.

Well, certainly, your Honor, we would MS. ROGERS: never contend that the Court isn't equipped or couldn't hear federal constitutional arguments, only that the interest of substantial justice designate federal court as the optimal most convenient forum.

I also wanted to address the idea of a contradictory and inconsistency between the venue argument and the jurisdiction argument. We are already locked in multiple federal lawsuits against the State of New York based on conduct that highly placed New York State officials announced in the press years before we got to court that they were going to target the NRA; they were going to go after the NRA and investors; the NRA is a terrorist organization. And that's what the State of New York did.

Unsurprisingly, we are now up in Albany in our case

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

against Governor Cuomo and the Department of Financial Services and we have our case about, you know, gun stores and COVID and now we have this one. So, we're already in federal court in Albany on several of these actions.

The latest case is technically, the AG's claim is technically a compulsory counterclaim. They're claiming they are technically compulsory counterclaims in our federal action, makes sense to put it there, and although the state court can hear federal constitutional claims, it is also clear that a federal court can adjudicate issues under state corporate law.

THE COURT: Your position is that the dissolution claims in this case would be a compulsory counterclaim in your federal case?

MS. ROGERS: Well, if you read the language of Federal Rule 13, they arise from the same facts and circumstances as the previously filed claims.

We do cite a case, and I'll find it right now, that basically argues that where the New York court basically determines, that is the *Mosdos Chofetz* case that's cited on page 16 of our motion to dismiss, where the Southern District of New York determined that Section 1983 claims were compulsory counterclaims in a state enforcement action. This involved, I believe it was the health department against an Orthodox Jewish Organization.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

And so if our claims are compulsory counterclaims in their first- filed case, then their claims should be compulsory counterclaims in our first-filed case is another argument.

But just to get back briefly to this idea that our forum and venue arguments are inconsistent, we think the best optimal place for these claims is the place where the same facts, the same legal issues are already being litigated, and that's our Third District of New York action.

It is also, you know, consistent with, even though technically -- because it's federal court, it's not technically, but it is consistent with the mandatory venue provision. The only location we have identified in our Certificate of Incorporation was Albany, that needs to be litigated in Albany, it would fit.

Now, if the case were going to be in state court, obviously we would oppose that, but we think that the best and most rational state court would be the Albany state court consistent with 1110 and it would be, as we previously requested, the Commercial Division given the breadth and the complexity of the matter.

THE COURT: Okay.

I'd like to give Carolyn's fingers a few minutes to cool down, so why don't we take five and then we'll pick up with the rest of the defendants and then back to the

cb

44 of 102

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

45

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings 1 Attorney General and see if we can't get close to finishing 2 up. Let's reconvene at 11:30. Don't sign off. You can 3 just turn your microphones off and your cameras off. 4 5 (Brief recess is held.) THE COURT: Ms. Rogers, before I leave you and go 6 7 to see if any other defendants want to discuss, are there any cases that you are aware of where a forum non conveniens 8 9 motion was granted on the ground that a federal forum in the 10 same state is more convenient than a state forum? 11 MS. ROGERS: Not that we've identified, your Honor. 12 We also haven't identified any authority opposing that. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 Are there any other defense counsel who want to be heard on the motions to dismiss or transfer? 15 16

MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, I would just like to ask Ms. Rogers to make one point that we did discuss during the break that I thought might inform the Court on one of the issues the Court had raised.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you.

There is a case that we cite -- actually, it's a case that the Attorney General cites on page 26 of their opposition, that's Astarita v. Acme Bus Corp., 55 Misc. 3d 767, and they cite this for the proposition Secretary of

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

46

Proceedings

1 State -- 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Hang on.

If folks who are not talking can go on mute; we're getting lots of feedback. So, stay on mute until we can hear Ms. Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor.

So, there's actually this sort of policy analysis contained in that opinion talking about why Secretary of State records are dispositive and it's noted that corporations often failed to amend their office location over time. So, that's not unusual.

The language is:

"Business entities often failed to amend even after relocating."

And the implication is that the sort of very straightforward black and white reliance on what the Certificate of Incorporation says is intentional by the state, even knowing that, you know, people might fail to file amendments. There might be opportunity to say what the real location is and you fail to.

Nonetheless, under 1110, you look at the judicial district of the office, the location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation under the definition section of the same statute.

The Certificate of Incorporation is defined to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

include amendments. The 1985 and 2002 documents are part of that four corners that your Honor is supposed to look at.

There is only one location stated there and it's 80 State Street in Albany.

MR. CORRELL: And, your Honor, the frustration here is that the way this should have worked is the Attorney General should have typed in NRA into the website and looked at the selected entity address which would have been 80 State Street, Albany, New York, and then, because they are good and careful lawyers, they should have ordered up the documents and checked to make sure that that was accurate, that's what was actually stated in the Certificate of Incorporation, and then they would be done.

And the legislature intended to create a front line task that was easily applicable, very easy to apply. And I think that this Court, by ruling in our favor, could create a precedent that would create clarity around that issue and encourage people to not get involved in motion practice like this that required people to go back 150 years and be reading handwritten documents from 1871 to try to discern the address of the entity.

THE COURT: One quirky thing about this case is it may be one of a kind in that we're talking about an entity that was created before the statute even existed, and maybe there are others, that both were created before that time

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

48

Proceedings

and where there is no clear amendment changing the office of incorporation. And so I'm not sure if this is going to be precedent setting, really, in any direction. But I get the point.

I suppose you could say that, you know, careful lawyers representing the company would have also been able to see on the website it does list New York county and didn't take steps to change that either.

Anyway, I guess it's over to the State to respond on the remaining motions to dismiss, stay or transfer on discretionary grounds. Is that you again, Mr. Conley?

MR. CORRELL: Your Honor, before we move on, if I may address that last point that you made, which is the reading of the printout on the website.

Again, if you read that printout, it is fair to read that as the New York county referring to the county in which the original Certificate of Incorporation was filed as opposed to the county in which the current office of the corporation is located.

And the statute Section 1110 is very precise in saying it's the -- you have to file in the Supreme Court in the judicial district in which the office of the corporation was located at the time of service on the corporation of the summons and the action.

So, there's a temporal component there that really

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

49

Proceedings

makes those two lines in the printout irrelevant because what happened 150 years ago in what county is sort of irrelevant under this statutory test.

The real question is what is the address of the NRA currently. And it has been, since 2002, the only address of the NRA listed in the New York State Department of State website or information database is 80 State Street, Albany county.

THE COURT: I mean, not to be too persnickety, but the word address is not in the statute. It's the office of the corporation, you know. And I'm trying to be very precise here.

Mr. Conley, I still can't see your picture; you seem to have vanished again, but why don't you start talking and we'll see if you get back on the screen; otherwise, we will make do.

MR. CONLEY: Okay, your Honor.

Do you see me yet?

THE COURT: No, I don't. If others can, I will just --

MS. ROGERS: The NRA, we can see Mr. Conley.

THE COURT: Carolyn, can you?

THE COURT REPORTER: I cannot.

THE COURT: It's also more for Carolyn, but if you're the only one talking then, and hopefully we can

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 figure this out.

So, go ahead, Mr. Conley.

MR. CONLEY: Thank you, your Honor.

The defendants' forum non conveniens arguments boil down to their preference for federal court, but that's not a legitimate basis for dismissing or staying the State enforcement action. This action has a substantial nexus to New York and this Court is clearly the proper forum to adjudicate this case.

Under New York law, the plaintiff's choice of forum should rarely be disturbed and the defendants have not met the heavy burden required to upset that choice here. The State of New York and this Court have a vital interest in retaining this State enforcement action.

The New York Attorney General brings this action in the name and on behalf of the People of The State of New York, pursuant to her supervisory authority of her New York charities and their fiduciaries.

The complaint is premised entirely on New York law.

Adjudicating the merits of this action will require the interpretation and application of New York law that was enacted by the legislature to safeguard the public against fraud and misconduct and ensure New York charities and their assets are not misused or abused.

This action implicates public interest and

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

Proceedings

questions of state law that are of critical importance to this state and this Court.

The defendants argue that the federal countersuit pending in the Northern District of New York is a suitable alternative forum to litigate the merits of the State enforcement action, but that federal court has no nexus to jurisdiction over or interest in the merits of this case.

The defendants' unsupported argument that a federal court could, in theory, exercise supplemental jurisdiction over this case ignores what federal courts have done in practice for the last century.

The defendants have failed to identify a single instance where a federal court has exercised supplemental jurisdiction over a State enforcement action brought by a State Attorney General.

THE COURT: Mr. Conley, can you just talk a little more slowly. I'm watching Carolyn and I trying to --

MR. CONLEY: Of course, your Honor. Yes.

And every federal court that has confronted a state law dissolution claim in the Second Circuit has either declined jurisdiction on abstention grounds or noted abstention would be appropriate if jurisdiction existed in order to avoid improper interference with the strong interest that New York has in regulating corporations formed under its own laws.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

As this Department has recognized, business entities are creatures of state law and the state under whose law and entity was created should be the place that determines whether its existence should be terminated.

None of the other applicable factors in a forum non conveniens analysis weigh in the defendants' favor. It is undisputed that there are no potential witnesses or relevant evidence in Albany. None of the underlying transactions took place there. And litigating this action in this Court will impose no hardship on the defendants.

The defendants focus a lot on the need for out of state discovery, but that's not a legitimate basis for dismissing a case in a New York State court on forum non conveniens grounds.

As your Honor observed, New York courts have procedures in place that are used every day to deal with out of state non-party witnesses and discovery. And complex disputes frequently involve out of state discovery.

The scope and complexity of a matter has never been deemed a legitimate ground for dismissal under the forum non conveniens doctrine. And there's a good reason for that.

Because if that's all it took to upset a plaintiff's choice of forum, the doctrine would quickly morph into a de facto federal removal statute invoked any time a defendant needed an alternative vehicle to move a case to federal court.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

That's not what the doctrine was intended to do which is why there is no precedent for what the defendants are asking of this Court. No New York State court has ever dismissed a case on forum non grounds in favor of a federal court located in the same State. And this Court should reject the defendants' invitation to be the first.

And notwithstanding the defendants' claims in their motion papers, this Court is perfectly capable of adjudicating this action fairly.

Also unavailing is the defendants' false claim that this action would place unnecessary burdens on this Court. The Commercial Division routinely adjudicates complex disputes which the defendants are well aware of, given that's why they petitioned to have the action here. And there is no reason to believe this action would place an undue burden on this Court.

The forum non conveniens doctrine is intended to give defendants hailed into a foreign jurisdiction a procedural device to move for dismissal in the interest of substantial justice. It is not a tool to force a state court action into federal court simply because that is where the defendant would prefer to be.

This Court should reject the defendants' invitation to fundamentally alter and expand the scope of the forum non conveniens doctrine as it asks the Court to depart from

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

settled precedent and to undermine the comity of the state courts and the respect properly accorded to a sovereign state prosecuting violations of its own laws.

Turning briefly to the Rule of 3211(a)(4) motions. The same equitable factors that are relevant in a forum non conveniens analysis apply here as well. And it similarly militate against dismissing or staying this action. There is no legal or equitable basis for the NRA's collateral lawsuit challenging this enforcement action to take precedent over the State enforcement action itself.

The motions also fail for several independent reasons that are fully set out in our opposition papers.

But the federal countersuit that the NRA filed against the Attorney General in the Northern District of New York was filed after this action was commenced. A necessary but not sufficient factor for moving for dismissal under 3211(a)(4) is that the NRA's federal action must have been already pending. It was not, so the defendants' motions fail.

The defendants argue that an error in the original verification somehow nullify the commencement of this action, but that's wrong as a matter of law. The defendants were not entitled to a verified complaint, and even if they were, the CPLR provides that actions are commenced by the filing of a summons and complaint. And an error in the

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

55

Proceedings

1 original verification did not change that.

> The defendants have failed to rebut in their reply papers that that type of error in the verification is properly ignored under the CPLR. CPLR 3026 provides that an error of this nature should be ignored absent a showing of substantial prejudice and does not nullify the commencement of this action.

> The defendants have not identified any prejudice that resulted from the original verification and their claim that the defective verification itself affects the substantial right runs counter to the plain language of CPLR 3026 and lacks any support in the case law.

> The defendants' elevation of form over substance finds no home in the liberal pleading standards of the CPLR. Rule 3026 in 2001 admonished against precisely this type of rigid reading of the law by providing proof of prejudice by the defect and form which the defendants have not shown here.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a practical question about how these two cases are going to work if they both So, the defendants here, the plaintiffs in the federal case, are making a bunch of arguments that would undermine or undercut or outright say this present action cannot go forward.

Now, they may, if this case proceeds here, raise

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

56

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings 1 those defenses here, but you're then going to have two 2 courts working on the same sets of issues. How do you -and that happens from time to time, but how do you -- why 3 does it make sense and how would I do that? 4 MR. CONLEY: Your Honor, while the NDNY action 5 arises from and is related to this action, the two cases are 6 7 not the same. This action is brought under state law to enforce state law against an entity and individuals who are 8 9 subject to state oversight. 10 It's a regulatory law enforcement action. 11 multiple forms of relief including restitution; an 12 accounting; removal of defendants LaPierre and Frazer, and 13 judicial dissolution. The NDNY action involves none of the individual 14 15 defendants --16 THE COURT: You're saying N-D-N-Y; right? 17 MR. CONLEY: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. CONLEY: The federal action involves none of the individual defendants and it raises distinct 20 21 constitutional claims that collaterally challenge --22 THE COURT: You have to go slower. 23 MR. CONLEY: Challenge the propriety of the 24 Attorney General's investigation into the NRA and the

cb

propriety of bringing dissolution claims here.

25

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

Now, in the NDNY action, the Attorney General has moved to dismiss on multiple dispositive grounds, including that on abstention, the NRA's constitutional claims should be raised, if at all, before this Court on a proper record.

We fully expect the federal court will dismiss the action because this court will assess and determine whether the Attorney General's claims against the NRA have merit.

That federal action is a textbook case for abstention under the Younger and Burford abstention doctrines.

But to the extent there are any overlapping factual or legal issues, those can be dealt with, and that case does proceed, those can be dealt with with well settled doctrines of preclusion and res judicata. It certainly doesn't warrant staying or dismissing this case and giving precedence to collateral challenge to the state enforcement action itself.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CONLEY: Just to turn back briefly, opposing counsel mentioned the nullity point. I think the defendants fundamentally misunderstand the relief that is available to them in the event of a defective verification.

The defendants assume that their filing of a notice to treat the complaint as a nullity, in fact, rendered the complaint a nullity. And this is not the case. Instead, if the defendants were entitled to a verification and if it had

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

58

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

been defective and never corrected, then the complaint would have been susceptible to a motion to dismiss, but the defendants were not entitled to a verification. And they did, in fact, receive a corrected verification. So, there is no basis for dismissal on that ground.

And the defendants unsupported claim that the filing of the corrected verification altered when this case was first commenced is meritless and finds no support in the law.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Conley.

Anything further from the defense before we take a short break for me to consider and see if I have any other questions?

MS. ROGERS: Yes, your Honor. I would just like to respond to a few points Mr. Conley raised.

Mr. Conley argues --

THE COURT: Can you turn your video on just so we can try to follow along?

MS. ROGERS: Unfortunately, I have my video on.

I'll try again. Can you see me now?

THE COURT: No.

You can Just go ahead.

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, Mr. Conley argues that a defective verification does not violate a substantial right.

Courts have held otherwise. We cited some of these cases.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

One is Alden v. Gambino, that's 2016 NY Slip Op. 51394.

That, in turn, cites Jack Vogel Associates v. Color Edge,

2008 Slip Op. 31509.

I'll quote language from the Alden v. Gambino case:

"The failure to sign a verified complaint affects a substantial right of the defendant in that the plaintiff's claims cannot be challenged as false."

THE COURT: When you're reading, you have to read more slowly to enable the reporter to get it down. Sorry.

MS. ROGERS: I apologize.

Well, I'll reread and emphasize this language.:

"The failure to sign a verified complaint affects a substantial right of the defendant."

That is the holding in multiple state cases that we have cited. And it makes sense here. The case was lodged with unprecedented fanfare, very lurid accusations, and did not verify in the first instance that the AG believed the accusations were true.

THE COURT: Well, let's hang on a second.

This was not filed with no verification; right? I mean, the verification was sort of garbled and incomplete for whatever reason, but it had a verification that just wasn't finished. As I have it, and you tell me if I'm wrong, it says:

"To my knowledge, based on such acquaintance with

cb

59 of 102

59

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

the fact, the complaint is true, except as to those allegations made upon information and belief. And as to those allegations", and then it sort of ends.

You know, I don't think you can read that as saying they weren't trying to verify. It's just something seems to have gone wrong. This doesn't seem to be a plaintiff that is backing away from understanding that it should verify the accuracy.

So, I mean, I understand your point and sometimes technicalities matter, but I don't think you can stretch it to the point of somebody trying to distance themselves from having to stand by the allegation that they were very publicly adopting.

MS. ROGERS: Well, your Honor, we do note that after, you know, in accordance with the CPLR, we promptly served notice of our election to treat the defectively verified complaint as a nullity, then the verification was corrected. So, the AG obviously chose to stand behind rather than back away from its initial allegations, but, nonetheless, given the profile and the nature of the allegation, we are reluctant to reduce the verification requirement or even a partial failure to satisfy it to a mere technicality.

And it's not like this was a semi colon. It is language that, you know, whether admitted unintentionally or

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

61

Proceedings

not, has substance of importance especially in respect to a weekend contending with media who were willing to take the AG at their word.

I also want to address that we are entitled to a verification because a petition and complaint are different under the CPLR. Under CPLR 105, that's not true. read the definition. CPLR 105 (b), Action and Special Proceedings:

"The word action includes a special proceeding. The words plaintiff and defendant include petitioner and respondent respectfully. Any special proceeding the word summons and complaint includes notice of petition and petition."

So, the idea that if this had been a summary proceeding, you would have had to verify the truth of the allegation, but because this is a 168 page complaint, they don't. We don't think that's supported by the CPLR.

You know, we didn't have to bring a motion to We can, quote, "elect to treat a defective verified complaint as a nullity", which we did.

THE COURT: You can elect to treat it as one; until a court says it is one, it's not.

MS. ROGERS: We would argue that the election language sort of vests, puts the ball in our court. Not that it, you know, the Court is deprived of discretion, but

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 that we had the election and we took it.

I separately would like to address the argument Mr. Conley made that state dissolution claims are never heard in federal court and that federal court would be an inappropriate forum.

We cite in our briefing one specific instance of a case, Nutronics Imaging v. Danan in the Second Circuit where they were entertaining a state dissolution cause of action. The Attorney General points out that abstention arguments were later made in that case. And in other cases similarly federal courts have not indicated that they don't have jurisdiction over state law dissolution claims, but they have chosen to abstain.

The problem with that argument is that there's a giant and deliberate carve out in the Younger abstention doctrine that occurs, and I'm quoting here, 401 US 37 at pages 45, 46:

"A refusal to abstain is justified where a prosecution or proceeding has been brought to retaliate or to deter constitutionally protected conduct, or where prosecution and proceeding are otherwise brought in bad faith or for the purpose to harass."

So, this is sort of -- we are not questioning the fairness or competence of this Court, but it cannot be denied that in a situation like this one which, as the Court

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

has said, is a one of a kind case, you know, this is part of what federal courts exist for. The situation where you have Eric Schneiderman warning the NRA that the highest level of the New York State government are going to come after it; the NRA bringing constitutional claims in response to the multi-pronged hostilities against it from multiple state agencies which ensued.

We don't impugn this Court whatsoever, but we have real constitutional claims here that we filed promptly and Mr. Conley's effort to diminish or deny the factual overlap vis-a-vis this action, I don't think, would stand scrutiny.

I mean, we've made a selective enforcement claim.

And we've already got a selective enforcement claim, another one, against the State of New York based on its financial blacklisting. It's not central here, but it's in discovery.

So, we've experienced litigation; it's a recent experience.

What the State of New York is going to do is they're going to allege that all of the comparators, the, you know, five page chart of other situations we have analogized where entities that were not the form of political enemies, Governor Cuomo would treat it differently, and would distinguish the fact that the NRA was worse somehow, and they already do that in their abstention briefing in the federal case. They argue that this case is different because the culpable executives are still at the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

helm.

So, the factual question of the specific executive culpability is going to be litigated here, it's going to be litigated there. We brought a First Amendment retaliation claim. I think its highly likely that the State will argue that even, but for the NRA's constitutionally protected activity, it would have taken the same enforcement action. That's what they typically do in response to retaliation claims.

So, we're going to litigate were there real violations of the law, to what extent do they exist. We're going to litigate both of those factual issues in turn and implicate the intent level of the individual defendants and individual executives.

If a transaction was processed through Ackerman McQueen, who knew about it, or who directed it. That's an issue that is being litigated in a previously filed federal case that was filed in 2018 which is the Ackerman litigation. It's also being litigated in the Delatil (sic) litigation.

The point is it's very difficult to overt the overlapping inconsistent adjudication problem. And the notion that we should rely on collateral estoppel and res judicata when there's two cases progressing on an almost identical timeline, is not one that is tenable to us and we

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 think it raises very thorny issues.

And the federal court is competent to hear these claims. And perhaps state court is too. But, again, we're not making argument that this Court is incompetent. We're making argument that the interest of substantial justice favor litigating this latest case arising out of the same facts as all of those other cases in a forum where it can be efficiently consolidated and managed with those other cases in an Article 3 forum where the NRA's Section 1983 claims are, you know, fundamentally designed to be heard.

THE COURT: Well, one could ask that if the main concern, and I'll put aside the state versus federal competence, I'll take you at your word that you acknowledge that I can do it, and I assume you recognize that the judiciary and executive branches are separate and independent, but if the NRA wanted to avoid litigating in two places, why didn't it just bring its case here to have them be in the same place?

The duplicativeness or the existence of a second case in a different place was the NRA's doing, not the State.

MS. ROGERS: A couple of points, your Honor.

First, this isn't really even the second case because, as I mentioned, there are multiple federal actions that have been pending since 2018 that raise similar issues.

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021 02:42

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

66

Proceedings

1 One of those is a federal action against Governor Cuomo and 2 the Department of Financial Services that was already pending in the Northern District. We filed this case as a 3 related case to that one. 4 5 So, this was not arbitrary. This was consistent with the pattern that has emerged over the course of the 6 7 past few years as these same exact factual and legal issues have been contested in other forums before the AG brought 8 9 its case. 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. 11 I think I have everybody's argument well in hand. 12 I can't see if Mr. Conley is waving his arms at me, so I'll 13 assume he's not. I'd like to take a ten-minute break to look through 14 15 my notes and then I'll be back with you. 16 Is somebody on the -- I see a blue light flashing 17 on Ms. Rogers' screen. Are you trying to say something? 18 MS. ROGERS: No, your Honor. I must be some kind 19 of aberration as well. 20 THE COURT: You have some sort of a gremlin. 21 Anyway, I'll be back in about ten minutes, so why don't we assume 12:10. 22 23 Thank you very much. 24 (Brief recess is held.) 25 THE COURT: Look, I appreciate everybody's hard

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

work. Your briefs were exceptional. Your arguments were exceptional. I am ready to render a decision that I will describe for you now.

After a careful review of one of the larger records I've seen on motions to dismiss, the defendants' various motions to dismiss, transfer or stay this action, which involve a number of interrelated issues, are denied. I will file a written order, but in the meantime will provide my reasons on the record.

At the outset, I note that these motions relate only to whether the Attorney General can maintain this action in this court or some other court. They have nothing to do with the underlying merits of the case, which are not before me today.

I'd like to start with the statutory motion to either dismiss or transfer because of venue. Analytically, starting with the first point. Venue is appropriate in New York county unless another venue is prescribed by law.

Under the CPLR, the place of trial of an action shall be in the county designated by the plaintiff, that's CPLR 509, and then you turn to CPLR 503(a) which provides that the place of trial shall be in the county in which one of the parties resided when it was commenced, except where otherwise prescribed by law.

So, it's undisputed that the Attorney General is

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

Proceedings

deemed to be a resident of New York county as well as every other county, so venue here is proper under CPLR 509 and 503, unless another venue is "prescribed by law".

So, the question here is whether the New York

Not-for-Profit Corporation Law prescribes a different venue

with respect to the claims for dissolution of the NRA. I

find it does not.

Under Section 1110 of the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law:

"An action or special proceeding for dissolution shall be brought in the Supreme Court in the judicial district in which the office of the corporation is located at the time of the service on the corporation."

And, as counsel had pointed out during the argument:

The "office of the corporation" is further defined as the office, the office location of which is stated in the Certificate of Incorporation.

And continuing down the line of definitions:

The Certificate of Incorporation is defined to include the original Certificate of Incorporation or any other instrument filed or issued under any statute to form a domestic or foreign corporation as amended, supplemented or restated by Certificate of amendment, merger or consolidation, or other certificate or instruments filed or

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 issued under any statute.

That's enough of the quoting.

For these purposes, the parties agree that the NRA's actual headquarters, at least currently, are in Virginia, but that that's irrelevant. Only its statutorily designated New York office, if it has one, is relevant to which court can hear this case.

Now, both sides, exhaustively and very impressively, combed the historical records from 1871 to present to find any shred of evidence as to the location of the NRA's corporate office in New York.

While interesting, ultimately I find that all of that is beside the point. The definition of the "office of the corporation" is statutory and very specific. It has to be the location designated in the Certificate of Incorporation as amended.

The quirk here, as I mentioned earlier, is that the NRA was formed under an 1865 statute that didn't require designation of a specific office, so the original corporation didn't do so. And it has not been amended to do so, based on my review of the record in the 150 years since.

Under the plain language of the statute, then, the NRA does not have an "office of the corporation", and was not required to have one, let alone that mandates venue in Albany.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

The NRA relies heavily on a 2002 filing which we discussed during the argument which is NYSCEF Document 109, in which it specifically changed the address to which the Secretary of State shall forward copies of process accepted on behalf of the corporation to an address in Albany, and also named CSC as its designated agent to receive process.

But in that very same form, immediately above the boxes that were checked by the NRA, includes the option to change the "county location within this state in which the office of the corporation is located."

In other words, the exact statutory language that is set forth in the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law venue provision. The NRA left that space blank.

In my judgment, that disposes of the argument that, you know, in the remainder of the form designating an agent for service of process was intended or had the effect of designating for the first time an "office of the corporation" in any county.

So, while the defendants cite to cases that appear to equate the location of the registered agent with the residence of a party under CPLR 503, those cases are not in the context of the statutory language at issue here, which I am bound to follow.

That is especially true, given that the same form permitted the NRA to change its agent for service of

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

process, gave it an easy means of changing the location of the office of the corporation.

So, they clearly are not the same for statutory purposes. Service of process and agent is a different piece on the amendment of the corporate documents. So, to argue now that they're the same, I think, just conflicts the plain language of the amendment itself.

I note, as the parties have gone back and forth, that the New York Department of State Division of Corporation lists the NRA's "county" to be New York. You know, the NRA presumably could have changed it if it felt it wasn't accurate, but it didn't. I don't give tremendous weight to that. It's just an indicia that because no changes had been made, certainly not checking the boxes I described, then there was no change in the State's records.

By contrast, as the defendants point out, there is the reference to the Albany address with respect to service of process which is, again, consistent with the 2002 form that it changed.

The bottom line, in my view, is that there is no statutory basis to conclude that the NRA's "office of the corporation" is in Albany. In fact, as far as I can tell, the NRA has never designated an office of corporation and wasn't required to.

As discussed with both counsel during the argument,

cb

71 of 102

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

in the absence of any office of incorporation in any particular county, the default provisions of the CPLR control and venue in New York county is permissible.

Now, even if I were inclined to consider the historical evidence, which I, again, don't think is necessary because there is no office of the corporation, I would deny the motion to change venue anyway.

The 1865 Act under which the NRA was launched required the Certificate of Incorporation to be filed "in the office of the clerk of the county in which the office of the corporation shall be situated."

So, similar language to what ended up being in the subsequent statute. By that measure, the NRA chose New York county as its office location by filing its certificate at the very beginning with the clerk in New York county.

There is also no evidence that the NRA chose -there was also some evidence, at least, that the NRA chose
New York county as the location of its office by seeking and
obtaining approval for certain corporate changes by justices
in this county when the law required the approval of "a
justice of the Supreme Court in the judicial district in
which the office of the corporation is located."

So, again, just inferring from that language which ends up in the currently applicable statute, the NRA took certain steps long ago which indicated that if there is an

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

office of the corporation, the weight of the evidence is that it is New York county.

In 1956, for example, when the NRA first amended its corporate purposes, it sought approval of the amendment certificate from a justice in this judicial district.

The NRA did something similar in 1977 when it sought and received approval by a justice in this district as well.

The NRA argues that the probative value of these filings is limited because they were required under the 1865 statute to continue making filings where they made their first one. And, frankly, that's a fair point. But if we're in the business of trying to define the location of the corporate office by historical precedent, these filings that I just went through tip in favor of New York county.

And, again, the main argument the NRA really raises here and relies on is the 2002 filing where they created an Albany address for service of process. And I've already gone through why I think that is not persuasive. And, in fact, I think it cuts the other way, the fact that they chose an Albany address for one purpose and did not choose it for purposes of designating an office of corporation, to me, cuts against them.

So, all things considered, I believe the Attorney General has the better of the argument that if we go to

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

historical precedent, the NRA has an office of the corporation, and if the NRA has an office of the corporation, then it would be New York county, unless and until the NRA amends their Certificate of Incorporation or otherwise.

So, the bottom line is that even using the historical evidence here, I don't see a mandatory venue in Albany county. Given that ruling, I need not, and do not, reach the alternative argument that the Attorney General has made, that even if the statute mandated venue in Albany for the dissolution claims, that I could still retain all of her claims, including that one as a matter of discretion, I'm just not going to reach that, which I think is unnecessary since I'm keeping the NRA claim here anyway.

All right. So that's the statutory venue motion.

Moving on to the motion to dismiss on grounds of forum non conveniens, the doctrine which has now been codified in CPLR 327 (a) permits a court to dismiss an action when, although it may have jurisdiction over a claim, the court determines that in the interest of substantial justice the action should be heard in another forum.

And the factors that courts consider are well established. They include the residence of the parties; the situs of the underlying transaction; the existence of an adequate alternative forum; the location of potential

cb

74 of 102

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

witnesses and relevant evidence; potential hardship to the defendant, and the burden on the New York courts.

In this setting, the plaintiff's choice of forum is entitled to strong deference. The cases make clear that the defendants bear a heavy burden of demonstrating that the plaintiff's selection of New York was not in the interest of substantial justice, and unless the balance tips strongly in favor of the defendants, then the plaintiff's choice of forum will not be disturbed.

And here's why I don't think that the defendants meet that burden:

First, this is an action by New York's Chief Law
Enforcement Officer pursuant to her supervisory authority
over a New York not-for-profit corporation for violating New
York law.

To be sure, some witnesses and evidence may be located outside of New York. Albany is a great, great city. It's hard to argue that it is easier to get to Albany from out of state than it is to get to New York City.

To this extent that defendants must bear the burden, or at least the NRA must bear the burden of litigating in two New York courts at the same time, this one, and the federal court in Albany, that is something that the NRA could have chosen to do otherwise by bringing its action here.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

I'm not saying it had to, but if it's going to say that it's inconvenient to litigate in two places at the same time, it could have avoided that.

In many ways, the defendants are really arguing for removal of this case to federal court. I'm not aware and the parties have not cited any case applying forum non conveniens to move a case from a state court to a federal court in the same state. And that is not what forum non conveniens is about.

And what the defendants are really doing are moving for removal and forum non conveniens is not a removal statute. The doctrine is concerned with geographic convenience largely, not choosing between state and federal courts within the same state.

In any event, I'm confident I'll be able to work with the parties and whatever other courts have cases that are in any way related to coordinate discovery to minimize inefficiencies and duplication of effort. This Court does that in many, many cases and I have no doubt we can do that here.

Turning next to the motion to dismiss based on CPLR 3211 (a)(4) which provides for a dismissal of a cause of action when "there is another action pending between the same parties for the same cause of action in a court of any state or the United States, the court need not dismiss upon

cb

76 of 102

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

77

Proceedings

1 this ground, but may make such order as justice requires".

> So, here, the defendant places enormous weight on the fact that the Attorney General's initial complaint omitted or garbled certain words from its verification statement. This is, in my judgment, placing far too much weight on what was obviously a nonsubstantive error that was quickly fixed.

> The original verification, which was signed, includes a sentence that sort of ends before completion. says, in part:

"To my knowledge, based on such acquaintance with the facts, the complaint is true, except as to those allegations made upon information and belief, and as to those allegations", and then it trails off and the rest of the words are missing.

In the defendants' view, this typo, which was promptly corrected, requires the dismissal of this action because the federal case was already pending by the time the OAG corrected it. I just flatly disagree with that.

The Attorney General filed first. One cannot say that the other action was pending at that time. that the verification was later amended doesn't change the priority of the filings. The federal action was not pending when this case began.

In any event, even if one assumes contrary to those

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

facts that the federal case was pending, dismissal would not be appropriate anyway. The first-filed rule is not a rule at all, especially when the timing of the two cases is very close in time, it's a matter of discretion. And, here, for a variety of reasons, I don't think discretion favors dismissing or staying the case.

And some of these are similar to the forum non conveniens. In fact, the First Department, in White Light Productions, 231 AD2d 90 {First Dept. 1997} says explicitly that the inquiry under this pending action statute is similar to that undertaking in applying the doctrine of forum non conveniens, that is, whether the litigations and the parties have sufficient contact with the State to justify burdens imposed on our system.

And, again, the first-filed factor is particularly weak when they're essentially contemporaneous.

So, here are factors I think warrant denial of this motion:

First, there are, in my opinion, basic questions of federal literature. The Attorney General is the Chief Law Enforcement of the State of New York. She's enforcing a New York State statute against a not-for-profit company and its officer organized under the laws of the State of New York.

Indeed, as the NRA argued, the statute under which the Attorney General sues specifically envisions filing in a

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

1 state court.

And I think it would be inappropriate, in these circumstances, to find that the Attorney General cannot pursue her claims in state court just because one of the defendants would prefer to proceed in federal court.

You know, again, to the point about, you know, state and federal courts, you know, I don't take any umbrage in any of those statements, but whatever one's views may be, we're all part of a federal system and the state courts have their role to play, particularly when enforcing state law. And to the extent that any constitutional arguments need to be raised or will be raised here, you know, that's something that this Court and others do on a regular basis and there's no, you know, legal requirement that that be done in federal court.

Beyond that, the federal cases that exist don't address many of the claims in this case and the individuals here are not parties in the federal case that's in Albany at least. In light of these factors, dismissing this action as second in time would elate form over substance and would, in my view, not be appropriate.

Again, I would work with the parties to coordinate discovery and other matters and minimize inefficiency and avoid duplication of effort.

Last, and we didn't address this too much in the

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

argument, but it's in the papers, the motion to stay this case based on the pending Ackerman action in Texas, under Section CPLR 2201 is also denied.

CPLR 2201 permits me to grant a stay in a proper case upon such terms as may be just. Obviously, it's a discretionary call. And, as a general matter, this will be done in one action -- I'm sorry.

"In general, only where the decision in one action will determine all of the questions in the other action, and the judgment on one trial will dispose of the controversy in both, is a stay justified. This requires the complete identity of the parties, the causes of action, and the judgment sought."

That is a quote from the 952 Associates case, 52 AD3d 236 {First Dept. 2008}.

That is not an ironclad rule, but it certainly is important guidance. Here, the AG and the individual defendants are not parties to the NRA's action against Ackerman, and the defendants failed to identify how resolution of that action will dispose of, you know, any of these issues in the complaint, let alone the entirety of the complaint. Therefore, defendants are not entitled to a stay under CPLR 2201.

I'll file a written order confirming the result on these motions.

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021 02:42

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

81

Proceedings

I'll ask the parties to upload the transcript upon receipt from the court reporter. I'll ask you to stay on after we're done to get Carolyn's information to do so.

So, with the resolution of those motions, we now have to talk about next steps in the litigation. understood from one of the letters that the parties were planning to Meet and Confer, maybe as early as tomorrow, with respect to proceeding with the action. So, why don't I hear from the parties as to what the plan would be, in light of this decision.

Let me start with the Attorney General.

MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, this is Jim Sheehan, the Charities Bureau Chief.

I think what we would like to see happen, based upon the Court's decision today, is, number 1, we would like to proceed with the Meet and Confer, which is planned for There are a number of issues that we addressed tomorrow. during that meeting and we are planning to have the parties (inaudible) --

THE COURT: You just went on mute. And I'm sorry, I was the culprit. I was trying to get your picture to appear.

So, Mr. Sheehan, you're going to have to unmute yourself.

MR. SHEEHAN: I just did, your Honor. Thank you.

COUNTY CLERK 02/03/2021

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021 NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

82

Proceedings

Your Honor, what we would like to see, at this point, based upon the Court's decision here, is first we would like to proceed with the Meet and Confer which is scheduled for tomorrow, that the parties could proceed in good faith with the guidance we obtained from this decision today and plan out a schedule for discovery in this case that will bring the case to a trial in early 2022.

The second thing we would like to see is that an order be entered, and we would like to discuss this with the Court and the parties, if there are any additional motions to dismiss, that they be consolidated into one proceeding as opposed to seriatim.

And I think the third is that they will keep the Bankruptcy Court advised as to the current status of this litigation because it may affect other events that are going on in that court.

> THE COURT: Okay.

And for the defendants.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor.

I don't know if you can see me, but I hope you can hear me.

The NRA has no objection to proceeding with the Meet and Confer tomorrow. I leave it to Mr. Fleming as to whether Mr. Frazer is in a position to discuss long term discovery and case schedules and things like that until he

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

Proceedings

obtains replacement counsel, but that's not an issue for the NRA, per se.

We also have no objection to informing the Bankruptcy Court of developments as appropriate.

As to whether future motions will be consolidated, we obviously think that depends upon who is bringing them and the substance of them and we would, you know, reserve our rights on that.

THE COURT: I mean, the CPLR does not envision any sort of an endless series of motions under 3211, so I don't know what motions people are talking about, but I certainly would like to, you know, coordinate and organize so that we don't have another wave. I would like to get moving on the case.

So, are you aware, as you sit here now, of motions to dismiss? I mean, the complaint hasn't changed. What are you talking about?

MS. ROGERS: Your Honor, that's just it. Sitting here, I don't have a discrete intention to bring a specific motion, but Mr. Sheehan has proposed that any future motions be consolidated, and I'm simply saying that I don't know what the other defendants are doing, but we would approach that on a case by case basis.

THE COURT: Well, let me take it one step at a time.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020
RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

84

Proceedings

1 And has there been an answer? 2 MS. ROGERS: My understanding is one defendant or maybe two defendants have answered. 3 THE COURT: I should set a schedule for answers now 4 5 that the motions to dismiss have been denied. I know it's a 6 long complaint, but you've had it for quite a while. 7 would normally say 20 days. Let me know if that works. MS. ROGERS: Given the volume of the complaint and 8 9 the fact that we anticipate coordination among the defendants, and one of the defendants is currently searching 10 11 for substitute counsel, we would request 30 days rather than 12 20, if that's agreeable to the Court. 13 THE COURT: 30 days is fine. MS. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: And then we should also set a 16 preliminary conference for this case. That should not get 17 in the way of you all meeting and conferring and working on 18 a schedule, because that's going to be an important part of 19 the preliminary conference anyway. How about March 9th? March 9th at 11:30? 20 21 MR. SHEEHAN: That's satisfactory to the plaintiffs, your Honor. 22 23 MS. ROGERS: That works for the NRA, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 Thank you very much.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020 RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

85

Proceedings

1	Again, I will issue an order on today's decision.
2	And I do appreciate all of your hard work and patience
3	through the technical and other pitfalls.
4	Is there anything else I need to address for today
5	for anyone?
6	MS. ROGERS: Not for the NRA, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	Thank you, all.
9	(Record is closed.)
10	
11	** ** **
12	This is certified to be a true and accurate
13	transcription of my stenographic notes.
14	
15	
16	CAROLYN BARNA
17	SENIOR COURT REPORTER
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	ch

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

1

<u> </u>	1	 		1
4	2021 [1] - 1:11	7	acknowledge [2] -	12:1, 14:25, 15:12,
1	2022 [1] - 82:7	7	9:4, 65:13	15:14, 15:15, 15:18,
				16:12, 16:17, 17:12,
1 [1] - 81:15	21 [1] - 1:11	7 [1] - 30:22	acknowledging [1] - 32:12	18:5, 18:6, 19:5, 19:8,
10005 [1] - 1:18	2201 [3] - 80:3, 80:4,	750 [1] - 1:22		21:23, 21:24, 22:7,
10022 [2] - 1:22, 2:6	80:23	767 [1] - 45:25	ACLU [1] - 35:22	
10022 [2] - 1.22, 2.0 101 [3] - 32:22, 33:3,	231 [1] - 78:9		Acme [1] - 45:24	22:9, 22:11, 29:10,
33:8	236 [1] - 80:15	7th [1] - 2:3	acquaintance [2] -	29:19, 32:3, 41:22,
	250 [1] - 2:3		59:25, 77:11	42:16, 47:8, 47:21,
10166 [1] - 2:10	26 [2] - 9:6, 45:23	8	act [1] - 25:24	48:13, 49:4, 49:5,
10177 [1] - 2:3	28 [1] - 1:17		Act [2] - 26:5, 72:8	49:10, 61:4, 62:2,
105 [2] - 61:6, 61:7	29 [1] - 16:2	80 [10] - 8:24, 15:12,	acted [2] - 10:12,	70:3, 70:5, 71:17,
109 [2] - 15:21, 70:2		16:10, 19:8, 20:22,	10:25	73:18, 73:21, 79:17,
1110 [12] - 8:8, 9:18,	3	22:9, 22:11, 47:3,	action [87] - 6:1,	79:25, 85:4
19:22, 23:24, 23:25,		47:8, 49:7	8:12, 12:6, 23:20,	addressed [2] -
26:24, 28:6, 31:17,		•	23:22, 24:1, 26:5,	16:13, 81:17
44:19, 46:21, 48:20,	3 [3] - 1:1, 36:8, 65:9	810 [1] - 2:6	27:8, 28:5, 28:19,	adequate [1] - 74:25
68:8	30 [2] - 84:11, 84:13		30:4, 30:5, 33:24,	adhered [1] - 27:10
11:30 [2] - 45:3,	3026 [3] - 55:4,	9	34:12, 34:13, 35:14,	adjudicate [2] -
84:20	55:12, 55:15		37:9, 37:25, 38:1,	43:10, 50:9
12:10 [1] - 66:22	31509 [1] - 59:3	90 [1] - 78:9	40:23, 41:10, 42:5,	adjudicates [1] -
13 [1] - 43:16	3211 [2] - 76:22,	952 [1] - 80:14	43:8, 43:23, 44:9,	53:12
14th [1] - 1:22	83:10	9th [2] - 84:20	48:24, 50:7, 50:14,	adjudicating [2] -
150 [4] - 14:20,	3211(a)(4 [2] - 54:4,	Jul [2] - 04.20	50:15, 50:20, 50:25,	50:20, 53:9
47:19, 49:2, 69:21	54:17	Λ	51:6, 51:14, 52:9,	adjudication [1] -
16 [4] - 23:20, 28:17,	327 [1] - 74:18	Α	53:9, 53:11, 53:14,	64:22
35:24, 43:21	37 [1] - 62:16		53:15, 53:21, 54:7,	admitted [1] - 60:25
168 [2] - 37:18, 61:16	38 [2] - 29:10, 29:24	a)(4 [1] - 76:22	54:9, 54:10, 54:15,	admitted[y] - 9:22
17 [1] - 23:1	3d [1] - 45:24	aberration [2] -	54:17, 54:22, 55:7,	adminished [1] -
	30 [1] - 43.24	23:13, 66:19	55:23, 56:5, 56:6,	55:15
18 [2] - 23:20, 28:17	4	ability [3] - 28:19,	56:7, 56:10, 56:14,	
1865 [3] - 69:18,	4	40:14, 41:22		adopting [1] - 60:13
72:8, 73:10		•	56:19, 57:1, 57:6,	advanced [1] - 39:1
1871 [8] - 10:15,	401 [1] - 62:16	able [5] - 4:14, 27:5,	57:8, 57:16, 61:9,	adversarial [1] - 30:6
11:25, 13:7, 22:23,	410 [1] - 2:6	40:23, 48:6, 76:15	62:8, 63:11, 64:7,	advised [1] - 82:14
23:2, 26:5, 47:20,	45 [1] - 62:17	absence [1] - 72:1	66:1, 67:6, 67:12,	affect [1] - 82:15
69:9	451625/2020 [1] - 1:5	absent [1] - 55:5	67:19, 68:10, 74:19,	affects [3] - 55:10,
1956 [1] - 73:3	46 [1] - 62:17	abstain [2] - 62:13,	74:21, 75:12, 75:25,	59:5, 59:12
1977 [1] - 73:6		62:18	76:23, 76:24, 77:17,	afforded [1] - 31:7
1983 [2] - 43:22, 65:9	49 [1] - 30:24	abstention [8] -	77:21, 77:23, 78:10,	AG [12] - 19:11,
1985 [3] - 15:12,	_	51:21, 51:22, 57:3,	79:19, 80:2, 80:7,	19:19, 30:14, 34:14,
17:24, 47:1	5	57:8, 57:9, 62:9,	80:8, 80:9, 80:12,	35:25, 36:7, 37:12,
1997 [1] - 78:9		62:15, 63:23	80:18, 80:20, 81:8	59:17, 60:18, 61:3,
	5 [3] - 27:21, 32:14,	abused [1] - 50:24	Action [1] - 61:7	66:8, 80:17
2	32:18	accepted [1] - 70:4	actions [5] - 28:18,	AG's [3] - 37:1, 40:7,
	502 [2] - 32:11, 32:16	accordance [2] -	40:3, 43:4, 54:24,	43:5
	503 [8] - 12:9, 14:7,	24:13, 60:15	65:24	against [24] - 5:25,
2 [1] - 18:1	14:9, 14:13, 19:24,	accorded [1] - 54:2	active [1] - 10:20	7:22, 12:7, 12:23,
20 [3] - 22:23, 84:7,	32:8, 68:3, 70:21	according [1] - 8:14	activity [2] - 41:18,	33:3, 34:14, 35:10,
84:12	503(a [1] - 67:21	accounting [1] -	64:7	40:18, 41:17, 42:19,
200 [1] - 2:9	`	56:12	actual [4] - 11:1,	43:1, 43:25, 50:22,
2001 [1] - 55:15	508 [1] - 30:24	accuracy [2] - 24:22,	18:23, 31:10, 69:4	54:7, 54:14, 55:15,
2002 [9] - 15:13,	509 [2] - 67:21, 68:2	60:8	actually [8] - 21:23,	56:8, 57:7, 63:6,
16:5, 17:22, 27:2,	51394 [1] - 59:1	accurate [4] - 42:8,	22:16, 29:25, 36:24,	63:14, 66:1, 73:23,
47:1, 49:5, 70:1,	52 [1] - 80:14	47:11, 71:12, 85:12	41:3, 45:22, 46:7,	78:22, 80:18
71:18, 73:17		accusations [3] -	47:12	agencies [1] - 63:7
2008 [1] - 59:3	6	37:19, 59:16, 59:18	AD2d [1] - 78:9	agenda [2] - 5:18,
2008 } [1] - 80:15		Ackerman [11] -	AD3d [1] - 80:15	6:21
2016 [1] - 59:1	6 m 10.1 25.10		add [2] - 21:15, 29:6	
2018 [2] - 64:18,	6 [2] - 18:1, 35:19	34:21, 34:24, 35:1,	additional [3] - 13:1,	agent [24] - 9:25,
65:25	6th [3] - 34:15, 38:1,	35:6, 35:7, 35:9,		14:1, 15:15, 16:2,
2020 [1] - 35:19	38:4	64:15, 64:18, 80:2,	21:18, 82:10	16:4, 16:8, 16:10,
2020 [1] - 33. 18		80:19	address [41] - 5:19,	16:12, 16:19, 17:17,
		cb		
·		CD	<u>-</u>	

applicable [3] -

47:15, 52:5, 72:24

application [3] -

21:9, 32:13, 50:21

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

2

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

18:2, 18:3, 18:9,
18:12, 18:19, 25:13,
26:20, 26:22, 27:1,
70:6, 70:15, 70:20,
70:25, 71:4
ago [3] - 4:6, 49:2,
72:25
agree [3] - 7:16,
20:10, 69:3
agreeable [1] - 84:12
ahead [2] - 50:2,
58:22
Albany [46] - 7:1,
7:6, 8:25, 10:5, 12:6,
12:17, 15:3, 15:12,
17:12, 18:4, 18:5,
19:8, 19:20, 20:23,
21:11, 22:9, 22:12,
25:7, 25:14, 27:2,
39:3, 39:7, 39:10,
39:14, 40:17, 42:25,
43:4, 44:14, 44:15,
44:18, 47:4, 47:9,
49:7, 52:8, 69:25,
70:5, 71:17, 71:22,
73:18, 73:21, 74:8,
74:10, 75:17, 75:18,
75:23, 79:18
albeit [1] - 41:2
Alden [2] - 59:1, 59:4
allegation [5] - 9:14,
60:12, 60:21, 61:16
allegations [8] -
36:3, 37:20, 40:7,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5,
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7 ambiguity [1] - 19:15
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7 ambiguity [1] - 19:15
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7 ambiguity [1] - 19:15 amend [2] - 46:10, 46:13
60:2, 60:3, 60:19, 77:13, 77:14 allege [4] - 9:7, 11:11, 41:18, 63:18 alleged [3] - 11:14, 34:20, 41:13 alleges [1] - 11:4 allowance [1] - 31:19 almost [2] - 28:22, 64:24 alone [3] - 26:22, 69:24, 80:21 along [3] - 27:9, 39:16, 58:18 alter [1] - 53:24 altered [1] - 58:7 alternative [4] - 51:5, 52:25, 74:9, 74:25 although [4] - 5:24, 10:8, 43:8, 74:19 always [1] - 24:7 ambiguity [1] - 19:15 amend [2] - 46:10,

	_
69:20, 73:3, 77:22	ар
amendment [6] -	33:1
36:23, 48:1, 68:24,	ар
71:5, 71:7, 73:4	18:1
Amendment [5] -	ар
17:24, 18:1, 39:6,	31:5
64:4	ар
amendments [10] -	ар
8:21, 10:24, 15:19,	23:7
19:2, 24:17, 26:13,	ар
26:15, 26:18, 46:19,	18:2
47:1	ap
amends [1] - 74:4	7:17
AMERICA [1] - 1:7 amici [1] - 35:24	37:2
amounts [2] - 11:4,	78:2
11:10	26:1
analog [1] - 13:19	73:4
analogized [1] -	ap
63:20	ap
analysis [7] - 8:18,	art
8:19, 32:21, 38:17,	arg
46:7, 52:6, 54:6	arg
analytically [3] -	25:1
14:20, 14:23, 67:16	34:4
analyze [1] - 34:6	61:2
ancillary [1] - 35:5	71:5
AND [1] - 1:21	arç
announced [1] -	78:2
42:21	arç
announcing [1] -	10:2
38:5	58:1
anomaly [2] - 17:6,	arç
19:19	arg
answer [1] - 84:1	6:10
answered [1] - 84:3	12:3
answers [1] - 84:4	20:7 28:1
anticipate [1] - 84:9	39:1
anyway [7] - 23:14, 48:9, 66:21, 72:7,	40:2
74:14, 78:2, 84:19	42:1
apart [1] - 16:11	51:8
apologize [3] - 15:6,	65:4
38:21, 59:10	68:1
Appeals [5] - 14:8,	71:2
30:22, 31:4, 31:6,	74:9
31:9	arç
appear [2] - 70:19,	19:2
81:22	42:1
appearance [1] -	55:2
4:18	79:1
appearances [2] -	ari:
3:2, 4:8	ari
appearing [1] - 4:11	ari
applicability [1] -	arr
6:17	22:1

applies [2] - 32:22, 33:16
apply [5] - 14:17, 18:18, 47:15, 54:6
applying [4] - 19:3,
31:5, 76:6, 78:11 apposite [1] - 29:22
appreciate [4] - 7:7, 23:7, 66:25, 85:2
approach [3] - 14:25, 18:23, 83:22
appropriate [9] - 7:17, 13:9, 13:12,
37:23, 51:22, 67:17, 78:2, 79:21, 83:4
approval [6] - 26:16,
26:17, 72:19, 72:20, 73:4, 73:7
approvals [1] - 26:14 approved [1] - 24:18
arbitrary [1] - 66:5
arguably [1] - 17:2 argue [12] - 19:12,
25:11, 33:21, 33:25,
34:4, 51:3, 54:20, 61:23, 63:24, 64:5,
71:5, 75:18 argued [2] - 36:7,
78:24
argues [7] - 10:20, 10:22, 16:24, 43:19,
58:16, 58:23, 73:9 arguing [1] - 76:4
argument [36] - 3:23,
6:10, 6:25, 10:12, 12:3, 12:12, 12:25
12:3, 12:12, 12:25, 20:7, 25:14, 25:21,
28:10, 38:19, 39:10, 39:12, 39:23, 39:25,
40:25, 41:3, 42:6,
42:17, 42:18, 44:4, 51:8, 62:2, 62:14,
65:4, 65:5, 66:11,
68:15, 70:2, 70:14, 71:25, 73:16, 73:25,
74:9, 80:1 arguments [10] -
19:25, 38:16, 42:8,
42:13, 44:6, 50:4, 55:22, 62:9, 67:1,
79:11
arise [1] - 43:16 arises [1] - 56:6
arising [1] - 65:6
arms [1] - 66:12 Article [5] - 27:21,
32:14, 32:18, 36:8,
65:9 aside [1] - 65:12
aspect [1] - 39:25

asserted [1] - 23:20 assess [1] - 57:6 assets [1] - 50:24 Assistant [4] - 3:5, 3:8, 3:13, 3:17 Associates [2] -59:2, 80:14 ASSOCIATION[1] -Association [3] -4:12, 22:8, 38:6 assume [6] - 13:6, 27:16, 57:22, 65:14, 66:13, 66:22 assumes [1] - 77:25 Astarita [1] - 45:24 attach [1] - 40:6 attempted [1] - 38:1 Attorney [57] - 3:5, 3:8, 3:13, 3:14, 3:17, 5:23, 7:23, 8:5, 9:1, 9:12, 10:10, 10:19, 10:22, 11:3, 11:10, 11:13, 12:3, 12:10, 12:13, 12:19, 12:21, 13:22, 16:24, 21:14, 21:20, 22:4, 22:14, 22:20, 27:8, 27:10, 27:23, 33:1, 35:17, 36:20, 37:17, 41:6, 41:12, 45:1, 45:23, 47:6, 50:15, 51:15, 54:14, 56:24, 57:1, 57:7, 62:9, 67:11, 67:25, 73:24, 74:9, 77:3, 77:20, 78:20, 78:25, 79:3, 81:11 **ATTORNEY** [2] - 1:3, 1:16 ATTORNEYS[1] -1.21 Attorneys [5] - 1:17, 1:21, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8 August [4] - 34:15, 35:19, 38:1, 38:4 authority [11] - 6:16, 12:13, 14:8, 26:21, 28:19, 30:23, 31:4, 33:9, 45:12, 50:17, 75:13 available [1] - 57:20 availment [1] - 38:19 Avenue [4] - 1:22, 2:3, 2:6, 2:9 avoid [3] - 51:23, 65:16, 79:24 avoided [1] - 76:3 aware [5] - 28:13, 45:8, 53:13, 76:5, 83:15

В

backing [1] - 60:7 backyard [1] - 9:20 bad [1] - 62:21 balance [1] - 75:7 ball [1] - 61:24 bank [1] - 31:10 Bankruptcy [5] -5:19, 6:7, 6:19, 82:14, 83:4 bankruptcy [4] -5:21, 5:24, 6:6, 6:17 **banks** [1] - 31:5 **bar** [1] - 33:3 **BARNA**[2] - 2:15, 85:16 based [14] - 6:12, 33:24, 38:18, 40:6, 42:7, 42:20, 59:25, 63:14, 69:21, 76:21, 77:11, 80:2, 81:14, 82:2 **basic** [1] - 78:19 basis [8] - 33:6, 50:6, 52:12, 54:8, 58:5, 71:21, 79:13, 83:23 bear [3] - 75:5, 75:20, 75:21 bearing [1] - 25:19 began [1] - 77:24 beginning [2] - 3:3, 72:15 behalf [4] - 4:12, 5:4, 50:16, 70:5 behaved [1] - 41:18 behind [2] - 16:25, 60.18 being [13] - 22:8, 29:22, 31:8, 31:14, 39:7, 39:16, 40:14, 41:9, 41:12, 44:8, 64:17, 64:19, 72:12 belabor [1] - 35:20 belief [2] - 60:2, 77:13 believe [8] - 7:13, 15:22, 22:22, 29:1, 32:11, 43:24, 53:15, 73:24 believed [1] - 59:17 believes [1] - 37:20 belongs [1] - 12:24 below [1] - 22:24 beside [1] - 69:13 best [3] - 29:16, 44:7, 44:17 better [3] - 5:8, 41:14, 73:25

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

3

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

between [6] - 32:17, 35:1, 35:16, 42:17, 76:13, 76:23 beyond [1] - 79:16 big [1] - 41:5 **binary** [1] - 20:5 bit [3] - 5:7, 9:22, 31:1 black [4] - 8:17, 9:4, 11:9, 46:16 blacklisting [1] -63:15

blank [2] - 16:19, 70:13 **BLECHER** [2] - 1:23, 4:15

Blecher [1] - 4:14 **blue** [1] - 66:16 blunted [1] - 31:15 **boil** [1] - 50:4 books [1] - 31:14 both [10] - 6:15,

9:25, 25:8, 27:17, 47:25, 55:20, 64:12, 69:8, 71:25, 80:11 bottom [3] - 16:9,

71:20, 74:6 bound [1] - 70:23

box [2] - 16:18, 16:19 boxes [3] - 16:17,

70:8, 71:14 branches [3] - 29:7, 31:25, 65:15

breadth [1] - 44:20 break [4] - 6:23, 45:18, 58:12, 66:14

BREWER [1] - 1:21 brewing [1] - 35:18

brief [4] - 17:25, 36:2, 45:5, 66:24

briefing [2] - 62:6, 63:24

briefly [4] - 5:19,

44:5, 54:4, 57:18 briefs [1] - 67:1 bring [12] - 11:17, 12:22, 13:2, 27:12,

27:17, 30:17, 38:8, 41:6, 61:18, 65:17, 82:7, 83:19

bringing [5] - 27:11, 56:25, 63:5, 75:24,

brings [1] - 50:15 broad [1] - 8:5 broadened [1] -

40:20 broader [1] - 39:6

brought [18] - 12:15,

12:16, 12:17, 12:22, 20:15, 20:19, 27:8, 30:9, 36:8, 38:9, 51:14, 56:7, 62:19, 62:21, 64:4, 66:8, 68:11

Building [1] - 2:9 bunch [1] - 55:22 burden [8] - 25:2, 50:12, 53:16, 75:2, 75:5, 75:11, 75:21 burdens [2] - 53:11,

78:14 Bureau [3] - 3:5, 3:10, 81:13 Burford [1] - 57:9

Bus [1] - 45:24 business [6] - 8:19, 25:18, 31:13, 34:18, 52:1, 73:13

Business [2] - 19:24, 46:13

but [108] - 6:5, 7:24, 9:3, 9:10, 9:14, 10:1, 11:3, 13:2, 14:2, 14:11, 14:20, 15:7, 15:17, 15:23, 16:19, 17:9, 17:10, 17:19, 18:4, 18:10, 18:17, 19:12, 20:1, 21:8, 21:19, 21:23, 22:3, 22:15, 22:21, 23:2, 23:10, 24:25, 25:14, 26:10, 27:3, 27:6,

31:5, 31:19, 32:8, 32:18, 33:1, 33:23, 34:1, 35:20, 36:7, 36:11, 36:23, 37:1,

29:13, 30:11, 30:16,

37:8, 37:14, 37:24, 38:16, 38:23, 39:23, 40:2, 40:7, 40:10, 42:1, 42:6, 42:9, 44:5,

44:12, 44:17, 48:3, 49:9, 49:14, 49:24,

50:5, 51:6, 52:12, 54:13, 54:16, 54:22, 56:1, 56:3, 57:10,

58:2, 59:22, 60:10, 60:19, 61:16, 61:25, 62:12, 62:24, 63:8,

63:15, 64:6, 65:3, 65:16, 67:8, 69:5, 70:7, 71:12, 73:12,

76:1, 77:1, 79:8, 80:1, 80:16, 82:20, 83:1, 83:11, 83:20, 83:22, 84:6

BY [6] - 1:3, 1:18, 1:23, 2:4, 2:7, 2:10

by [62] - 4:6, 4:13, 4:17, 5:3, 5:22, 6:1, 6:2, 7:1, 8:2, 10:16, 11:4, 11:24, 12:1, 13:11, 13:14, 14:7, 14:14, 19:3, 20:3,

20:5, 20:12, 23:23, 24:4. 24:18. 26:15. 27:1, 27:11, 28:14, 30:4, 30:6, 31:15, 32:23, 34:24, 35:18, 36:19, 46:17, 47:16, 50:22, 51:14, 54:24,

55:16, 60:12, 61:17, 67:18, 67:20, 67:24, 68:3, 68:24, 70:8, 71:16, 72:13, 72:14, 72:18, 72:19, 73:7, 73:14, 75:12, 75:24,

С

77:18, 83:23

C [2] - 1:15, 2:1 call [2] - 8:18, 80:6 cameras [1] - 45:4 can [52] - 4:4, 7:7, 7:10, 7:13, 7:14, 9:3, 16:7, 19:19, 20:15, 20:19, 21:22, 23:10, 23:12, 23:14, 23:15, 28:1, 29:7, 29:13, 29:15, 29:16, 30:9, 33:21, 33:22, 43:9, 43:10, 45:3, 46:3, 46:4, 49:19, 49:21, 49:22, 49:25, 51:16, 57:11, 57:12, 58:17, 58:18, 58:20, 58:22, 60:4, 60:10, 61:6, 61:19, 61:21, 65:7, 65:14, 67:11, 69:7, 71:22, 76:19, 82:20 can't [7] - 14:6, 20:8,

30:17, 38:17, 45:1, 49:13, 66:12

cannot [8] - 11:10, 41:6, 49:23, 55:24, 59:7, 62:24, 77:20, 79:3

capable [1] - 53:8 capital [1] - 7:22 careful [4] - 18:15, 47:10, 48:5, 67:4 CAROLYN [2] - 2:15,

Carolyn [4] - 23:14,

49:22, 49:24, 51:17 Carolyn's [2] - 44:23, 81:3

65:17, 65:20, 65:23, 66:3, 66:4, 66:9, 67:13, 69:7, 76:5, 76:6, 76:7, 77:18, 77:24, 78:1, 78:6, 79:17, 79:18, 80:2, 80:5, 80:14, 82:6,

82:7, 82:25, 83:14,

83:23, 84:16

carve [1] - 62:15

case [97] - 5:25, 7:4,

7:18, 7:20, 7:22, 8:6,

8:7, 9:13, 9:22, 12:5,

12:15, 13:24, 18:11,

19:12, 20:19, 28:9,

29:3, 29:10, 29:20,

30:2, 30:7, 30:11,

39:7, 40:5, 40:13,

41:4, 42:25, 43:2,

43:5, 43:13, 43:14,

43:18, 43:20, 44:2,

44:3, 44:16, 45:22,

45:23, 47:22, 50:9,

51:7, 51:10, 52:13,

52:25, 53:4, 55:12,

55:22, 55:25, 57:8,

58:7, 59:4, 59:15,

62:7, 62:10, 63:1,

63:24, 64:18, 65:6,

57:11, 57:14, 57:24,

30:21, 31:3, 35:21,

37:1, 38:3, 39:2, 39:3,

cases [28] - 6:17, 12:14, 18:20, 28:21, 33:6, 35:3, 36:13, 38:2, 38:24, 39:10, 40:10, 41:15, 45:8, 55:20, 56:6, 58:25, 59:14, 62:10, 64:24, 65:7, 65:8, 70:19, 70:21, 75:4, 76:16, 76:19, 78:3, 79:16 Castle [1] - 30:23

categories [1] -15:16 cause [5] - 34:8, 42:3, 62:8, 76:22, 76:24

causes [4] - 23:20, 23:22, 28:17, 80:12 center [1] - 39:19 central [1] - 63:15 century [1] - 51:11

certain [6] - 12:7, 17:19, 21:22, 72:19, 72:25, 77:4

Certainly [1] - 15:5 certainly [11] - 10:6, 11:20, 13:3, 16:24, 32:2, 41:15, 42:11,

57:13, 71:14, 80:16, 83:11

Certificate [46] -8:16, 8:20, 8:23, 9:9, 9:11, 9:24, 10:4, 11:20, 13:13, 14:24, 15:18. 16:5. 17:22. 17:24, 18:1, 18:24, 19:1, 19:4, 19:7, 20:17, 20:20, 20:22, 21:10, 22:1, 22:22, 22:25, 24:5, 24:10,

24:14, 26:13, 26:15, 30:19, 31:23, 44:14, 46:17, 46:23, 46:25, 47:12, 48:17, 68:18,

68:20, 68:21, 68:24, 69:15, 72:9, 74:4 certificate [5] -10:14, 25:24, 68:25,

72:14, 73:5 Certificates [1] -24:17

certified [1] - 85:12 challenge [4] - 8:25, 56:21, 56:23, 57:15 **challenged** [1] - 59:7

challenging [2] -23:22, 54:9

Change [2] - 16:5, 17:23

change [16] - 16:17, 16:20, 21:4, 25:2, 27:1, 27:4, 27:6, 36:23, 38:17, 48:8,

55:1, 70:9, 70:25, 71:15, 72:7, 77:22 changed [5] - 17:8, 70:3, 71:11, 71:19,

83:16 changes [4] - 21:8, 26:15, 71:14, 72:19

changing [3] - 27:3, 48:1, 71:1

character [1] - 31:15 characterization [1] - 22:20 characterize [1] -

10:11 characterizes [1] -37:13

Charities [3] - 3:5, 3:9, 81:13

charities [2] - 50:18, 50:23 chart [1] - 63:19

checked [5] - 16:17, 16:18, 16:23, 47:11, 70:8

checking [1] - 71:14

cb.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 220

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

4

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

Chief [6] - 3:4, 3:9, 40:22, 75:12, 78:20,
81:13 Chofetz [1] - 43:20
choice [15] - 7:21, 7:24, 8:1, 8:2, 19:10,
24:16, 25:1, 25:3, 25:4, 27:11, 50:10,
50:12, 52:22, 75:3, 75:8
choose [1] - 73:21 choosing [1] - 76:13
chose [10] - 9:16, 9:20, 11:6, 19:16,
27:23, 60:18, 72:13, 72:16, 72:17, 73:21
chosen [2] - 62:13, 75:24
Circuit [2] - 51:20, 62:7
circumstances [4] - 41:9, 43:17, 79:3
cite [13] - 13:25, 18:11, 26:21, 28:21,
30:21, 32:8, 33:8, 36:2, 43:18, 45:22,
45:25, 62:6, 70:19 cited [6] - 19:2,
32:11, 43:20, 58:25, 59:15, 76:6 cites [2] - 45:23, 59:2
citing [2] - 17:23, 27:20
city [2] - 39:19, 75:17 City [5] - 10:20,
10:21, 18:7, 38:11, 75:19
CIVIL [1] - 1:1 claim [13] - 12:24,
29:3, 29:4, 43:5, 51:20, 53:10, 55:9,
58:6, 63:12, 63:13, 64:5, 74:14, 74:19
claimants [1] - 41:17 claiming [1] - 43:6
claims [42] - 12:4, 12:7, 12:15, 12:22,
12:23, 13:2, 27:12, 28:4, 28:7, 28:12,
28:16, 36:8, 36:10, 36:14, 36:15, 41:23,
43:9, 43:13, 43:17, 43:22, 44:1, 44:2,
44:7, 53:7, 56:21, 56:25, 57:3, 57:7, 50:7, 62:3, 62:12
59:7, 62:3, 62:12, 63:5, 63:9, 64:9, 65:3, 65:9, 68:6, 74:11,
74:12, 79:4, 79:17 clarity [1] - 47:17
οιατι τy [1] = π1.11

clear [4] - 36:4, 43:10, 48:1, 75:4 clearly [5] - 19:20,
19:21, 20:12, 50:8, 71:3 clerk [3] - 24:11,
72:10, 72:15 close [2] - 45:1, 78:4
closed [1] - 85:9 closely [1] - 31:18 closest [1] - 13:19
cluster [1] - 12:3 Co [1] - 3:9 co [1] - 21:24
co-defendant [1] - 21:24 Co-Section [1] - 3:9
codified [1] - 74:18 COHEN [1] - 1:14 collateral [3] - 54:8,
57:15, 64:23 collaterally [1] - 56:21
colleague [3] - 4:13, 5:3, 5:12 colon [1] - 60:24
color [1] - 22:3 Color [1] - 59:2
combed [1] - 69:9 come [4] - 20:1, 35:6, 36:3, 63:4
comes [1] - 39:23 comfortable [1] - 6:12
comity [1] - 54:1 commence [1] - 7:21 commenced [10] -
34:13, 34:14, 35:18, 37:1, 38:4, 38:5, 54:15, 54:24, 58:8,
67:23 commencement [2] - 54:21, 55:6
Commercial [3] - 40:9, 44:20, 53:12 companies [1] - 21:3
company [5] - 16:10, 16:16, 16:20, 48:6, 78:22
comparators [1] - 63:18
competence [2] - 62:24, 65:13 competent [1] - 65:2
complaint [26] - 9:5, 11:15, 23:20, 34:20, 37:10, 50:19, 54:23, 54:25, 57:23, 57:24

54:25, 57:23, 57:24, 58:1, 59:5, 59:12,

60:1, 60:17, 61:5,

61:12, 61:16, 61:20,
77:3, 77:12, 80:21,
80:22, 83:16, 84:6, 84:8
complete [1] - 80:11
completion [1] - 77:9
complex [3] - 40:10, 52:17, 53:12
complexity [2] -
44:21, 52:19
component [1] - 48:25
comprehensive [1] -
33:10 comprise [1] - 19:7
compulsory [6] -
43:6, 43:7, 43:13,
43:23, 44:1, 44:3 concedes [1] - 12:19
concepts [2] - 18:9,
34:2
concern [1] - 65:12 concerned [1] -
76:12
conclude [1] - 71:21
conclusive [1] - 26:23
condition [2] - 9:12,
26:1
conduct [2] - 42:20, 62:20
conducts [1] - 11:3
Confer [4] - 81:7,
81:16, 82:3, 82:23 confer [1] - 9:17
conference [3] -
38:5, 84:16, 84:19
conferring [1] - 84:17
confident [1] - 76:15
confirming [1] - 80:24
conflict [5] - 12:14,
12:18, 32:14, 33:2,
33:4 conflicting [2] -
12:10, 13:1
conflicts [2] - 32:17,
71:6 confronted [1] -
51:19
confusing [1] - 22:14
congress [1] - 41:23 Conley [9] - 3:13,
3:22, 4:2, 23:8, 23:14,
49:21, 50:2, 51:16, 62:3
CONLEY [17] - 1:19,
3:12, 3:22, 23:18,
26:12, 27:20, 28:1,
cb

28:15, 29:1, 49:17,
60:3, 51:18, 56:5,
66:17, 56:19, 56:23,
57:18
conley [7] - 48:11, 9:13, 58:10, 58:15,
8:16, 58:23, 66:12
conley's [1] - 63:10
connect [1] - 17:15
connected [1] - 23:4
connection [1] - 15:8
Connell [2] - 3:17,
l:5
CONNELL [3] - 1:20,
3:16, 4:5
consider [4] - 37:25,
8:12, 72:4, 74:22
considered [1] -
3:24
consistent [7] -
32:21, 33:1, 44:10,
4:12, 44:19, 66:5,
' 1:18
consolidate [2] -
35:4, 38:24
consolidated [5] -
2:4, 65:8, 82:11,
33:5, 83:21
consolidation [1] -
8:25
constitutional [16] -
35:16, 35:22, 36:1,
86:8, 36:15, 39:2,
0:18, 41:23, 42:8,
2:13, 43:9, 56:21,
57:3, 63:5, 63:9,
'9:11
constitutionally [2] -
52:20, 64:6
construction [1] -
34:6
constructive [1] -
1:1
constructively [1] -
9:17
constructs [1] -
9:23
construe [1] - 29:22 construed [1] -
9:17
construes [1] - 31:4
construing [1] -
80:24
contact [1] - 78:13
contacts [1] - 8:18
contain [1] - 14:24
contained [1] - 46:8
contemporaneous
11 - 78:16

contend [1] - 42:12

contending [1] -
61:2
contest [1] - 24:24
contested [1] - 66:8
context [3] - 18:16, 38:15, 70:22
continue [1] - 73:11
continue [1] - 73.11
Continued [1] - 2:1
Continues [1] - 1:24
continuing [1] -
68:19
contradictory [1] -
42:17
contrary [2] - 25:8,
77:25
contrast [1] - 71:16
control [1] - 72:3
controlling [3] -
14:7, 30:22, 31:3 controversy [1] -
80:10
convenience [2] -
31:12, 76:13
conveniens [20] -
33:23, 34:9, 38:15,
39:16, 39:22, 39:25,
45:8, 50:4, 52:6,
52:14, 52:21, 53:17,
53:25, 54:6, 74:17,
76:7, 76:9, 76:11,
78:8, 78:12 convenient [5] -
34:10, 40:1, 40:17,
42:15, 45:10
conveyed [1] - 6:8
cool [1] - 44:24
coordinate [3] -
76:17, 79:22, 83:12
coordination [1] -
84:9
copies [4] - 10:23,
15:8, 16:17, 70:4
copy [1] - 15:22
core [1] - 26:3 corners [1] - 47:2
Corp.,55 [1] - 45:24
Corporate [1] - 10:2
corporate [8] - 26:2,
31:21, 43:11, 69:11,
71:5, 72:19, 73:4,
73:14
Corporation [11] -
8:4, 19:10, 19:24,
30:17, 31:19, 32:24,
33:5, 68:5, 68:9,
70:12, 71:10 corporation [60] -
8:13, 10:13, 10:20,
10:21 10:25 13:18

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

5

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

14:4, 14:12, 14:16, 14:21, 16:10, 16:22, 17:1, 17:14, 17:16, 18:20, 21:1, 21:4, 22:17, 24:2, 24:4, 24:7, 24:16, 25:7, 25:9, 25:17, 25:23, 26:7, 26:24, 27:15, 27:18, 27:22, 28:3, 30:16, 33:11, 48:19, 48:22, 48:23, 49:11, 68:12, 68:13, 68:16, 68:23, 69:14, 69:20, 69:23, 70:5, 70:10, 70:18, 71:2, 71:22, 71:23, 72:6, 72:11, 72:22, 73:1, 73:22, 74:2, 74:3, 75:14 corporation's [1] -
corporation's [1] -
•
26:22 corporations [4] -
9:17, 30:15, 46:10,
51:24
correct [9] - 7:19,
13:23, 14:5, 15:21,
15:22, 15:24, 16:3,
21:2, 22:15
corrected [6] - 58:1,
58:4, 58:7, 60:18,
77:17, 77:19
CORRELL [10] - 2:2,
2:4, 4:19, 22:1, 22:19,
32:3, 33:18, 45:16,
47:5, 48:12
Correll [1] - 4:19
corruption [1] -
37:18
cost [1] - 39:18
costly [1] - 40:13
could [19] - 12:16,
12:17, 12:21, 12:22, 13:22, 14:25, 17:1,
13:22, 14:25, 17:1,
27:2, 29:21, 31:20,
47:16, 48:5, 51:9,
65:11, 71:11, 74:11,
75:24, 76:3, 82:4
couldn't [2] - 30:2,
42:12
counsel [9] - 3:2,
4:18, 21:24, 45:14,
57:19, 68:14, 71:25,
83:1, 84:11
Counsel [1] - 3:18
COUNSELORS [1] -
1:21
counter [1] - 55:11
counterclaim [2] -
43:6, 43:13
43:6, 43:13
43:6, 43:13 counterclaims [4] -
43:6, 43:13

44:3 countersuit [2] -51:3, 54:13 counties [1] - 31:14 countries [1] - 40:8 County [1] - 12:18 county [68] - 9:2, 9:8, 9:11, 10:13, 10:24, 10:25, 11:12, 11:16, 11:19, 12:1, 12:2, 12:17, 12:20, 13:2, 13:22, 16:21, 19:21, 21:23, 22:17, 22:24, 23:1, 23:3, 24:8, 24:11, 24:14, 24:15, 24:18, 24:20, 25:7, 25:10, 25:14, 25:22, 25:24, 25:25, 27:1, 27:3, 27:6, 27:7, 27:9, 27:23, 28:18, 30:17, 31:11, 48:7, 48:16, 48:18, 49:2, 49:8, 67:18, 67:20, 67:22, 68:1, 68:2, 70:9, 70:18, 71:10, 72:2, 72:3, 72:10, 72:14, 72:15, 72:18, 72:20, 73:2, 73:15, 74:3, 74:8 **COUNTY** [1] - 1:1 couple [3] - 24:24, 38:12, 65:22 course [4] - 5:16, 10:2, 51:18, 66:6 Court [61] - 6:7, 6:19, 11:22, 13:3, 13:11, 14:8, 18:8, 19:22, 22:2, 22:3, 24:1, 28:1, 28:5, 28:6, 28:15, 28:16, 28:18, 28:24, 30:3, 30:22, 31:3, 31:6, 31:9, 32:7, 32:8, 32:17, 33:9, 33:12, 34:7, 36:10, 37:12, 42:12, 45:18, 45:19, 47:16, 48:21, 50:8, 50:13, 51:2, 52:9, 53:3, 53:5, 53:8, 53:11, 53:16, 53:23, 53:25, 57:4, 61:25, 62:24, 62:25, 63:8, 65:4, 68:11, 72:21, 76:18, 79:13, 82:10, 82:14, 83:4, 84:12 court [69] - 4:1, 7:18, 7:19, 7:20, 23:21, 32:19, 34:16, 34:17, 35:11, 35:14, 36:21, 40:2, 40:11, 40:19, 40:24, 41:2, 41:4,

41:7, 41:14, 41:17, 41:24, 41:25, 42:2, 42:14, 42:21, 43:4, 43:9, 43:10, 43:19, 44:11, 44:16, 44:18, 44:19, 50:5, 51:6, 51:9, 51:13, 51:19, 52:13, 52:25, 53:3, 53:5, 53:21, 57:5, 57:6, 61:22, 61:24, 62:4, 65:2, 65:3, 67:12, 69:7, 74:18, 74:20, 75:23, 76:5, 76:7, 76:8, 76:24, 76:25, 79:1, 79:4, 79:5, 79:15, 81:2, 82:16 **COURT** [96] - 1:1, 2:15, 3:2, 3:11, 3:15, 3:19, 3:24, 4:3, 4:8, 4:16, 4:21, 4:24, 5:6, 5:9, 5:14, 7:14, 13:5, 13:14, 13:21, 14:3, 14:11, 15:1, 15:21, 15:25, 16:15, 17:10, 18:14, 19:25, 20:24, 21:3, 21:12, 22:13, 23:7, 23:12, 23:15, 23:16, 26:4, 27:13, 27:24, 28:10, 28:21, 29:5, 29:13, 29:16, 29:18, 30:25, 31:1, 31:24, 33:17, 33:19, 36:17, 37:3, 38:7, 38:20, 39:8, 39:15, 40:19, 41:21, 43:12, 44:22, 45:6, 45:13, 45:20, 46:2, 47:22, 49:9, 49:19, 49:22, 49:23, 49:24, 51:16, 55:19, 56:16, 56:18, 56:22, 57:17, 58:10, 58:17, 58:21, 59:8, 59:19, 61:21, 65:11, 66:10, 66:20, 66:25, 81:20, 82:17, 83:9, 83:24, 84:4, 84:13, 84:15, 84:24, 85:7, 85:17 Court's [3] - 19:12, 81:15, 82:2 courts [19] - 6:15, 6:16, 7:17, 18:10, 41:21, 51:10, 52:15, 54:2, 56:2, 58:25, 62:11, 63:2, 74:22, 75:2, 75:22, 76:14,

COVID [1] - 43:3 CPL [2] - 8:8 CPLR [38] - 12:9, 14:7, 27:21, 32:8, 32:11, 32:15, 32:16, 32:18, 32:21, 32:22, 32:25, 33:3, 33:5, 33:8, 37:10, 37:11, 54:24, 55:4, 55:11, 55:14, 60:15, 61:6, 61:7, 61:17, 67:19, 67:21, 68:2, 70:21, 72:2, 74:18, 76:21, 80:3, 80:4, 80:23, 83:9 create [3] - 47:14, 47:16, 47:17 created [5] - 31:16, 47:24, 47:25, 52:3, 73:17 creation [1] - 26:2 creative [1] - 9:2 creatures [1] - 52:2 credible [1] - 25:6 credibly [1] - 41:12 critical [1] - 51:1 crucial [1] - 11:4 cryptic [1] - 32:6 CSC [1] - 70:6 culpability [1] - 64:3 culpable [1] - 63:25 culprit [1] - 81:21 Cuomo [3] - 43:1, 63:21, 66:1 current [4] - 12:8, 24:21, 48:18, 82:14 currently [4] - 49:5, 69:4, 72:24, 84:10 cursory [2] - 29:10, 29:24 cut [1] - 5:7 cuts [3] - 17:2, 73:20, 73:23

D

Danan [1] - 62:7
database [2] - 24:25,
49:7
date [4] - 6:8, 22:21,
22:22, 23:2
day [2] - 36:21, 52:16
days [3] - 84:7,
84:11, 84:13
de [1] - 52:23
deal [2] - 26:19,
52:16
dealing [3] - 26:6,
30:11, 34:20

dealt [2] - 57:11, 57:12 death [1] - 31:21 debtor [1] - 5:25 decided [2] - 5:21, deciding [1] - 20:4 decision [9] - 29:1, 30:13, 67:2, 80:8, 81:10, 81:15, 82:2, 82:5. 85:1 declined [2] - 27:4, deemed [2] - 52:20, 68:1 default [2] - 25:13, 72:2 defect [1] - 55:17 **defective** [5] - 55:10, 57:21, 58:1, 58:24, 61:19 defectively [1] -60:16 defendant [16] - 4:9, 4:12, 4:23, 5:5, 5:13, 21:24, 29:20, 41:13, 52:24, 53:22, 59:6, 59:13, 61:10, 75:2, 77:2, 84:2 **Defendant** [4] - 1:21, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8 defendant's [3] -25:2, 25:4, 25:21 **Defendants** [1] - 1:9 defendants [54] -6:8, 12:8, 12:23, 21:14, 23:19, 23:21, 24:22, 25:5, 25:11, 26:19, 28:20, 41:17, 44:25, 45:7, 50:11, 51:3, 51:12, 52:10, 52:11, 53:2, 53:13, 53:18, 54:20, 54:22, 55:2, 55:8, 55:17, 55:21, 56:12, 56:15, 56:20, 57:19, 57:22, 57:25, 58:3, 58:6, 64:13, 70:19, 71:16, 75:5, 75:8, 75:10, 75:20, 76:4, 76:10, 79:5, 80:18, 80:19, 80:22, 82:18, 83:22, 84:3, 84:10 defendants' [12] -7:9, 50:4, 51:8, 52:6, 53:6, 53:7, 53:10, 53:23, 54:18, 55:13, 67:5, 77:16

defending [1] - 27:11

defense [2] - 45:14,

-cb-

76:16, 79:7, 79:9

cover [1] - 38:22

covered [1] - 5:25

6

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

58:11	70:17, 73:22	19:11, 28:14, 30:14,	distinguish [1] -	6:22, 32:7, 35:25,
defenses [2] - 9:2,	designation [3] -	32:17, 32:19, 34:7,	63:22	65:20, 76:10, 83:22
56:1	10:9, 24:20, 69:19	37:13, 42:3, 61:25,	distinguishable [2] -	domestic [1] - 68:23
deference [2] -	designations [1] -	74:12, 78:4, 78:5	29:12, 33:7	don't [41] - 4:3, 7:10
14:10, 75:4	16:7	discretionary [7] -	district [15] - 8:13,	15:3, 15:6, 17:15,
deficit [1] - 37:15	designed [2] - 40:12,	7:4, 19:25, 20:1, 20:7,	11:6, 20:15, 20:20,	18:20, 21:8, 21:19,
define [1] - 73:13	65:10	42:6, 48:11, 80:6	24:2, 26:16, 30:9,	27:17, 28:10, 29:6,
defined [7] - 8:21,	destination [1] - 16:9	discuss [5] - 13:3,	31:11, 31:21, 46:22,	31:25, 32:24, 35:20,
15:19, 19:1, 19:7,	destroy [1] - 38:6	45:7, 45:17, 82:9,	48:22, 68:12, 72:21,	41:5, 42:8, 44:24,
46:25, 68:16, 68:20	deter [1] - 62:20	82:24	73:5, 73:7	45:3, 49:14, 49:19,
definition [10] - 8:10,	determine [5] - 6:16,	discussed [2] - 70:2,	District [11] - 12:7,	60:4, 60:10, 61:17,
8:14, 13:14, 16:23,	7:18, 34:7, 57:6, 80:9	71:25	12:24, 35:2, 35:13,	62:11, 63:8, 63:11,
20:25, 21:5, 26:8,		dismiss [17] - 43:21,	35:19, 40:2, 43:22,	66:22, 71:12, 72:5,
46:23, 61:7, 69:13	determined [2] -	45:15, 48:10, 57:2,	44:9, 51:4, 54:14,	74:7, 75:10, 78:5,
	24:4, 43:22	57:5, 58:2, 61:19,	66:3	79:7, 79:16, 81:8,
definitions [1] -	determines [3] -			82:20, 83:10, 83:13,
68:19	43:20, 52:4, 74:20	67:5, 67:6, 67:16,	disturbed [2] -	83:19, 83:21
Delatil [2] - 35:12,	determining [1] -	74:16, 74:18, 76:21,	50:11, 75:9	
64:19	28:2	76:25, 82:11, 83:16,	Division [4] - 40:9,	done [7] - 17:2, 27:
deliberate [3] - 8:2,	developments [1] -	84:5	44:20, 53:12, 71:9	47:13, 51:10, 79:14
19:10, 62:15	83:4	dismissal [10] - 7:1,	do [35] - 5:16, 7:7,	80:7, 81:3
demonstrating [1] -	device [1] - 53:19	33:24, 38:15, 52:20,	11:17, 11:18, 21:5,	doors [1] - 42:10
75:5	did [20] - 5:22, 10:5,	53:19, 54:16, 58:5,	21:14, 23:19, 24:24,	doubt [2] - 36:10,
denial [1] - 78:17	10:6, 24:22, 28:23,	76:22, 77:17, 78:1	27:18, 28:12, 29:16,	76:19
denied [4] - 62:25,	29:2, 32:8, 33:7, 33:8,	dismissed [1] - 53:4	41:24, 43:18, 49:16,	down [5] - 30:1,
67:7, 80:3, 84:5	37:24, 39:5, 42:24,	dismissing [7] - 7:4,	49:18, 53:1, 56:2,	44:24, 50:5, 59:9,
deny [3] - 40:11,	45:17, 55:1, 58:4,	50:6, 52:13, 54:7,	56:3, 56:4, 60:14,	68:19
63:10, 72:7	59:16, 61:20, 73:6,	57:14, 78:6, 79:19	63:17, 63:23, 64:8,	dozens [1] - 40:7
depart [4] - 8:3,	73:21, 81:25	dispatches [1] -	64:11, 65:14, 67:13,	drafted [2] - 9:17,
19:10, 34:5, 53:25	didn't [15] - 10:13,	12:25	69:20, 74:8, 75:24,	30:13
Department [12] -	17:2, 21:6, 26:6, 26:7,	dispose [2] - 80:10,	76:19, 79:13, 81:3,	draw [1] - 23:3
22:6, 22:10, 24:19,	27:15, 38:10, 38:25,	80:20	85:2	duplication [2] -
24:21, 26:18, 29:2,	48:8, 61:18, 65:17,	disposes [1] - 70:14	doctrine [11] - 34:9,	76:18, 79:24
43:1, 49:6, 52:1, 66:2,	69:18, 69:20, 71:12,	dispositive [3] -	39:24, 52:21, 52:23,	duplicativeness [1
71:9, 78:8	79:25	21:19, 46:9, 57:2	53:1, 53:17, 53:25,	65:19
department [3] -	difference [1] - 37:2	dispute [6] - 22:19,	62:16, 74:17, 76:12,	during [5] - 45:17,
29:11, 29:25, 43:24	different [11] - 31:4,	23:19, 24:22, 35:16,	78:11	68:14, 70:2, 71:25,
depends [1] - 83:6	36:7, 38:23, 40:20,	39:4, 39:5	doctrines [2] - 57:9,	81:18
deprive [1] - 28:6	41:2, 42:7, 61:5,	disputed [1] - 22:16	57:12	
-	63:25, 65:20, 68:5,	disputes [2] - 52:18,	Document [1] - 70:2	E
deprived [1] - 61:25	71:4	53:13	document [7] - 11:7,	<u> </u>
Dept [2] - 78:9, 80:15			15:20, 16:1, 16:6,	
derived [1] - 31:17	differently [1] -	disregard [1] - 37:13	16:8, 22:2, 22:21	E [6] - 1:13, 1:15, 2
describe [1] - 67:3	63:22	dissolution [27] -	documents [14] -	earlier [2] - 37:4,
described [1] - 71:15	difficult [3] - 4:1,	8:6, 8:7, 11:5, 11:17,	9:21, 11:23, 15:9,	69:17
deserve [1] - 36:9	40:10, 64:21	12:6, 12:24, 13:2,		early [4] - 10:1, 81:
designate [16] -	difficulty [2] - 26:4	20:15, 20:19, 23:22,	15:15, 15:20, 16:13,	82:7
9:25, 10:6, 10:7,	diminish [1] - 63:10	24:1, 27:12, 28:4,	18:5, 18:6, 19:6, 40:8,	easier [2] - 39:20,
10:13, 16:8, 16:12,	directed [1] - 64:16	28:7, 28:16, 29:2,	47:1, 47:11, 47:20,	75:18
16:18, 17:1, 17:5,	direction [1] - 48:3	30:5, 43:12, 51:20,	71:5	easily [3] - 17:2,
17:7, 17:14, 18:2,	directly [1] - 16:20	56:13, 56:25, 62:3,	does [17] - 8:18,	•
18:5, 18:6, 25:22,	director [4] - 30:4,	62:8, 62:12, 68:6,	13:18, 17:14, 17:17,	27:2, 47:15
42:14	30:8, 30:10, 39:5	68:10, 74:11	20:14, 28:18, 28:25,	easy [2] - 47:15, 7
	disagree [1] - 77:19	dissolve [2] - 10:17,	33:11, 48:7, 55:6,	echos [1] - 5:15
designated [10] -	discern [1] - 47:20	36:4	56:4, 57:11, 58:24,	economy [1] - 28:8
designated [10] - 11:20, 12:1, 15:3,	discernini - 47.20	distance w 60:11	68:7, 69:23, 76:18,	Edge [1] - 59:2
11:20, 12:1, 15:3,		distance [1] - 60:11		-444 20-42
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20,	discovery [9] -	distant [2] - 31:14,	83:9	effect [4] - 20:13,
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20, 69:6, 69:15, 70:6,	discovery [9] - 35:15, 52:12, 52:17,		83:9 doesn't [9] - 3:25,	24:9, 25:23, 70:16
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20, 69:6, 69:15, 70:6, 71:23	discovery [9] - 35:15, 52:12, 52:17, 52:18, 63:15, 76:17,	distant [2] - 31:14, 39:17		
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20, 69:6, 69:15, 70:6, 71:23 designates [2] -	discovery [9] - 35:15, 52:12, 52:17, 52:18, 63:15, 76:17, 79:23, 82:6, 82:25	distant [2] - 31:14, 39:17 distinct [4] - 18:9,	doesn't [9] - 3:25,	24:9, 25:23, 70:16
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20, 69:6, 69:15, 70:6, 71:23 designates [2] - 15:12, 17:17	discovery [9] - 35:15, 52:12, 52:17, 52:18, 63:15, 76:17, 79:23, 82:6, 82:25 discrete [2] - 8:9,	distant [2] - 31:14, 39:17 distinct [4] - 18:9, 25:17, 35:10, 56:20	doesn't [9] - 3:25, 14:16, 15:23, 22:13,	24:9, 25:23, 70:16 efficiencies [3] - 36:12, 40:4, 40:12
11:20, 12:1, 15:3, 15:13, 18:13, 67:20, 69:6, 69:15, 70:6, 71:23 designates [2] -	discovery [9] - 35:15, 52:12, 52:17, 52:18, 63:15, 76:17, 79:23, 82:6, 82:25	distant [2] - 31:14, 39:17 distinct [4] - 18:9,	doesn't [9] - 3:25, 14:16, 15:23, 22:13, 28:6, 32:18, 57:13,	24:9, 25:23, 70:16 efficiencies [3] -

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

efficiently [1] - 65:8
effort [4] - 36:4,
63:10, 76:18, 79:24
either [6] - 20:4,
25:5, 38:25, 48:8,
51:20, 67:16
elate [1] - 79:20
elect [2] - 61:19,
61:21
electing [1] - 27:7
election [3] - 60:16,
61:23, 62:1
elevation [1] - 55:13
embedded [1] - 21:5
emerged [1] - 66:6
Emily [1] - 3:8
EMILY [1] - 1:19
emphasize [1] -
59:11
employee [1] - 35:6
enable [1] - 59:9
enacted [1] - 50:22
encourage [1] -
47:18
ended [1] - 72:12
endless [1] - 83:10
ends [3] - 60:3,
72:24, 77:9
enemies [1] - 63:21
enforce [2] - 6:2,
56:8
Enforcement [4] -
3:9, 40:22, 75:13,
78:21
enforcement [14] -
41:15, 41:18, 43:23,
50:7, 50:14, 51:6,
51:14, 54:9, 54:10,
56:10, 57:15, 63:12,
63:13, 64:7
enforcing [2] -
78:21, 79:10
engages [1] - 25:18
enormous [1] - 77:2
enough [1] - 69:2
ensued [1] - 63:7
ensure [1] - 50:23
entered [1] - 82:9
entertaining [1] -
62:8
entire [3] - 28:5,
28:9, 28:19
*
entirely [1] - 50:19
entirety [1] - 80:21
entities [3] - 46:13,
52:2, 63:20
entitled [8] - 37:10,
37:22, 54:23, 57:25,
58:3, 61:4, 75:4,

entity [11] - 6:2,
16:19, 22:7, 22:8,
25:18, 31:8, 47:8,
47:21, 47:23, 52:3, 56:8
entity's [2] - 25:16,
26:23
envision [1] - 83:9
envisions [1] - 78:25
equate [1] - 70:20
equipped [1] - 42:12
equitable [2] - 54:5,
54:8 Eric [1] - 63:3
error [6] - 37:14,
54:20, 54:25, 55:3,
55:5, 77:6
especially [4] -
36:13, 61:1, 70:24,
78:3
ESQ [10] - 1:18, 1:19,
1:19, 1:20, 1:23, 1:23,
2:4, 2:7, 2:10, 2:11 essence [1] - 30:6
essential [1] - 26:2
essentially [5] -
12:4, 30:6, 35:7, 42:3,
78:16
establish [3] - 25:3,
25:6, 27:18
established [5] -
11:11, 24:6, 25:5, 31:11, 74:23
estoppel [1] - 64:23
even [20] - 10:13,
11:1, 12:5, 13:1, 21:7,
28:3, 36:3, 41:14,
44:10, 46:13, 46:18,
47:24, 54:23, 60:22,
64:6, 65:23, 72:4, 74:6, 74:10, 77:25
event [4] - 25:1,
57:21, 76:15, 77:25
events [2] - 34:19,
82:15
ever [1] - 53:3
every [4] - 12:12,
51:19, 52:16, 68:1
everybody's [2] -
66:11, 66:25 everyone [2] - 5:17,
7:13
evidence [17] - 15:1,
15:4, 17:11, 17:23,
25:6, 26:11, 26:23,
27:17, 52:8, 69:10,
72:5, 72:16, 72:17,
73:1, 74:7, 75:1, 75:16
75:16 evolved [1] - 10:8
5.5

aveatrs: 16:00
exact [5] - 16:22,
35:13, 41:11, 66:7,
70:11
exactly [1] - 32:7
example [4] - 10:15,
12:15, 34:21, 73:3
except [4] - 32:22,
60:1, 67:23, 77:12
exception [2] - 6:1,
32:9
exceptional [2] -
67:1, 67:2
exceptions [1] -
31:16
exclusive [2] - 6:18,
41:24
excuse [1] - 30:25
executive [2] - 64:2,
65:15
executives [3] -
12:8, 63:25, 64:14
exercise [3] - 37:13,
42:3, 51:9
exercised [1] - 51:13
exhaustive [1] -
11:23
exhaustively [1] -
69:8
exhibit [2] - 15:7,
17:25
exhibits [1] - 11:22
exist [7] - 19:23,
26:6, 26:8, 38:25,
63:2, 64:11, 79:16
existed [2] - 47:24,
51:22
existence [8] - 9:19,
19:14, 19:16, 26:2,
41:10, 52:4, 65:19,
74:24
exists [2] - 19:24,
34:8
expand [1] - 53:24
expect [1] - 57:5
expecting [1] - 16:16
expenditures [2] -
34:18, 35:8
expenses [2] -
34:21, 34:22
experience [1] -
63:16
experienced [1] -
•
63:16
explicit [1] - 21:8
explicitly [1] - 78:9
expressly [1] - 25:16
extension [1] - 33:14
extent [7] - 19:15,
34:23, 42:7, 57:10,

F **F**[1] - 1:13 face [2] - 11:5, 31:20 fact [16] - 7:24, 17:2, 22:25, 37:15, 38:9, 57:23, 58:4, 60:1, 63:22, 71:22, 73:20, 77:3, 77:21, 78:8, 84:9 facto [1] - 52:23 factor [2] - 54:16, 78:15 factors [5] - 52:5, 54:5, 74:22, 78:17, 79:19 facts [6] - 41:11, 43:16, 44:8, 65:7, 77:12, 78:1 factual [6] - 34:17, 57:10, 63:10, 64:2, 64:12, 66:7 faded [1] - 31:1 fail [5] - 26:20, 46:18, 46:20, 54:11, 54:19 failed [5] - 46:10, 46:13, 51:12, 55:2, 80:19 failure [3] - 59:5, 59:12, 60:22 fair [2] - 48:15, 73:12 fairly [1] - 53:9 **fairness** [1] - 62:24 faith [2] - 62:22, 82:5 false [2] - 53:10, 59:7 fanfare [1] - 59:16 far [3] - 5:16, 71:22, 77:5 **FARBER** [4] - 2:10, 5:1, 5:8, 5:10 Farber [2] - 5:1, 5:10 farber [1] - 5:7 favor [7] - 28:9, 47:16, 52:6, 53:4, 65:6, 73:15, 75:8 favors [2] - 34:8, 78:5 federal [80] - 6:14, 6:15, 33:24, 34:16, 34:25, 35:3, 35:11, 35:14, 36:8, 36:13, 36:15, 36:21, 37:25, 38:3, 38:24, 39:2, 40:2, 40:11, 40:16, 40:19, 41:4, 41:10, 41:14, 41:16, 41:22, 41:23, 41:24, 42:2, 42:5, 42:13, 42:14,

42:19, 43:4, 43:7,

13.0 13.10 13.11
43:9, 43:10, 43:14, 44:11, 45:9, 50:5,
51:3, 51:6, 51:8,
51:10, 51:13, 51:19,
52:24, 52:25, 53:4,
53:21, 54:13, 54:17,
55:22, 56:19, 57:5,
57:8, 62:4, 62:11,
63:2, 63:24, 64:17,
65:2, 65:12, 65:24,
66:1, 75:23, 76:5,
76:7, 76:13, 77:18,
77:23, 78:1, 78:20,
79:5, 79:7, 79:9,
79:14, 79:16, 79:18
Federal [1] - 43:16
federalism [1] -
40:21
feedback [1] - 46:4
Feldman [1] - 36:2
felt [1] - 71:11
few [4] - 38:4, 44:23,
58:15, 66:7
fiduciaries [1] -
50:18
fight [3] - 9:19, 11:5,
19:15
fighting [2] - 9:18,
19:14
figure [3] - 18:17,
37:4, 50:1
file [5] - 24:10, 46:19,
48:21, 67:8, 80:24
filed [43] - 9:24,
10:23, 11:22, 13:8,
15:8, 17:24, 23:1,
24:13, 24:18, 35:9,
25:14 26:11 26:10
35:14, 36:11, 36:18, 36:19, 36:21, 36:24,
30.19, 30.21, 30.24,
37:1, 37:3, 37:5, 37:8,
37:9, 38:2, 38:3, 39:3,
41:2, 41:10, 43:17,
44:2, 44:3, 48:17,
54:13, 54:15, 59:20,
63:9, 64:17, 64:18,
66:3, 68:22, 68:25,
72:9, 77:20, 78:2,
78:15
files [1] - 37:18
filing [15] - 5:21,
22:22, 23:2, 25:23,
25:24, 37:21, 37:24,
38:1, 54:25, 57:22,
58:7, 70:1, 72:14,
73:17, 78:25
filings [5] - 5:24,
73:10, 73:11, 73:14,
77:23
Financial [2] - 43:1,
66:2

8

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

financial to 62:44
financial [1] - 63:14
find [8] - 28:15,
28:17, 41:16, 43:18,
68:7, 69:10, 69:12,
79:3
finds [2] - 55:14,
58:8
fine [1] - 84:13
fingers [1] - 44:23
finished [1] - 59:23
finishing [1] - 45:1
Fire [1] - 23:17
first [31] - 6:24, 7:10,
10:11, 17:22, 19:4,
25:16, 27:16, 36:11,
36:18, 36:20, 36:24,
37:1, 38:2, 40:25,
44:2, 44:3, 53:6, 58:8,
59:17, 65:23, 67:17,
70:17, 73:3, 73:12,
75:12, 77:20, 78:2,
78:15, 78:19, 82:2
First [7] - 24:19,
26:18, 39:6, 64:4,
78:8, 78:9, 80:15
first-filed [3] - 44:3,
78:2, 78:15
fit [1] - 44:15
five [3] - 17:6, 44:24,
63:19
fixed [2] - 27:7, 77:7
flag [1] - 35:25
flashing [1] - 66:16
flatly [1] - 77:19
flawed [1] - 25:14
flaws [1] - 29:23
Fleming [3] - 4:22,
4:24, 82:23
· ·
FLEMING [4] - 2:5, 2:7, 4:22, 4:25
flexible [1] - 12:9
Floor [2] - 1:22, 2:3
fly [1] - 39:13
focus [2] - 26:19,
52:11
fold [1] - 10:11
folks [1] - 46:3
follow [3] - 6:21,
58:18, 70:23
followed [1] - 37:23
footprint [1] - 40:5
for [133] - 1:17, 1:21,
2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 3:6,
3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:9,
4:18, 4:19, 4:22, 5:13,
5:15, 6:13, 6:22, 7:4,
8:7, 8:18, 9:12, 9:17,
0.1, 0.10, 3.12, 3.17,
9:18, 10:15, 11:13, 12:6, 12:15, 14:19,
12.0, 12.10, 14:19,
15:9, 15:14, 15:15,

41:14, 41:25, 42:7, 42:9, 42:15, 44:6, 45:8, 45:9, 45:10, 50:4, 50:8, 50:10, 51:5, 52:5, 52:13, 52:20, 52:23, 53:4, 53:17, 53:24, 54:5, 62:5, 65:7, 65:9, 74:17, 74:21, 74:25, 75:3, 75:9, 76:6, 76:8, 76:11, 78:7, 78:12 forums [1] - 66:8 forward [5] - 16:13, 16:17, 35:6, 55:24, 70:4 **found** [1] - 6:16 founders [1] - 10:15 four [2] - 32:5, 47:2 Fourteenth [1] - 39:6 framework [1] - 19:9 frankly [1] - 73:12 fraud [1] - 50:23 **FRAZER** [1] - 1:8 Frazer [4] - 2:5, 4:23, 56:12, 82:24 frequently [1] -52:18 Friday [1] - 5:20 from [45] - 5:2, 5:4, 5:10, 5:13, 6:7, 8:3, 10:10, 10:19, 13:8, 16:11, 18:22, 19:10, 20:24, 23:3, 25:17, 26:16, 26:18, 31:14, 31:18, 36:12, 39:20, 40:11, 43:16, 47:20, 53:25, 55:9, 56:3, 56:6, 58:11, 59:4, 60:7, 60:11, 60:19, 63:6, 69:9, 72:23, 73:5, 75:18, 76:7, 77:4, 80:14, 81:2, 81:6, 81:9, 82:5 front [4] - 38:8, 38:10, 39:4, 47:14 frustration [1] - 47:5 **fully** [2] - 54:12, 57:5 fundamentally [3] -53:24, 57:20, 65:10 further [5] - 6:7, 10:22, 13:3, 58:11, 68:16 future [2] - 83:5, 83:20 G

Gambino [2] - 59:1, garbled [2] - 59:21, 77.4 garnered [1] - 34:22 gave [2] - 37:23, 71:1 General [57] - 3:5, 3:8, 3:14, 3:17, 5:23, 7:23, 8:4, 8:5, 9:1, 9:12, 10:11, 10:19, 10:22, 11:3, 11:10, 11:14, 12:3, 12:10, 12:13, 12:19, 12:21, 13:22, 16:24, 19:10, 21:14, 21:20, 22:4, 22:15, 22:20, 27:8, 27:10, 27:23, 30:17, 31:18, 33:1, 35:17, 36:20, 37:17, 41:6, 41:12, 45:1, 45:23, 47:7, 50:15, 51:15, 54:14, 57:1, 62:9, 67:11, 67:25, 73:25, 74:9, 77:20, 78:20, 78:25, 79:3, 81:11 GENERAL [2] - 1:3, 1:16 general [4] - 33:15, 33:16, 80:6, 80:8 General's [4] - 3:14, 56:24, 57:7, 77:3 genuine [1] - 12:14 geographic [1] -76:12 Gestalt [1] - 8:18 get [22] - 9:3, 12:15, 14:18, 20:1, 20:8, 24:25, 26:9, 26:14, 39:17, 42:1, 44:5, 45:1, 47:18, 48:3, 49:15, 59:9, 75:18, 75:19, 81:3, 81:21, 83:13, 84:16 gets [1] - 12:11 getting [3] - 14:15, 26:16, 46:4 giant [1] - 62:15 Gilinsky [2] - 13:24, 18:11 give [6] - 32:16, 32:18, 33:12, 44:23, 53:18, 71:12 given [10] - 7:9, 7:21, 7:24, 14:9, 44:20, 53:13, 60:20, 70:24, 74:8, 84:8 gives [2] - 19:11, 21:3 giving [1] - 57:14 go [15] - 7:10, 7:19,

21:21, 29:18, 39:17, 42:2, 42:22, 45:6, 46:3, 47:19, 50:2, 55:24, 56:22, 58:22, 73:25 going [26] - 3:20, 14:18, 21:23, 32:4, 36:6, 38:6, 39:18, 40:17, 42:22, 44:16, 48:2, 55:20, 56:1, 63:4, 63:17, 63:18, 64:3, 64:10, 64:12, 74:13, 76:1, 81:23, 82:15, 84:18 **gone** [3] - 60:6, 71:8, 73:19 **good** [14] - 3:7, 3:11, 3:19, 4:10, 4:15, 4:21, 4:24, 4:25, 5:1, 5:17, 34:8, 47:10, 52:21, 82:5 Good [4] - 3:12, 3:15, 3:16, 4:16 got [3] - 26:17, 42:21, 63:13 governed [1] - 23:23 governing [1] - 11:6 government [2] -10:17, 63:4 governmental [1] -6:2 Governor [3] - 43:1, 63:21, 66:1 grant [1] - 80:4 granted [2] - 41:23, 45:9 grants [1] - 8:4 great [3] - 26:19, 75:17 gremlin [1] - 66:20 ground [4] - 45:9, 52:20, 58:5, 77:1 grounds [10] - 6:13, 7:3, 7:4, 29:12, 48:11, 51:21, 52:14, 53:4, 57:2, 74:16 **GROUP** [1] - 2:2 group [2] - 33:22, 33:23 guess [2] - 38:7, guidance [2] - 80:17, 82:5 guide [1] - 19:12 **gun** [1] - 43:2

Н

hailed [1] - 53:18

cb

GAGE [1] - 2:5

gained [1] - 36:12

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

9

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

-				
hand [1] - 66:11	29:2, 29:9, 29:19,	importance [3] -	incorrect [1] - 23:2	intentionally [1] -
handling [1] - 3:23	32:2, 32:3, 33:18,	35:22, 51:1, 61:1	incredible [1] - 40:5	31:19
hands [1] - 19:18	34:2, 36:25, 37:8,	important [5] - 9:16,	incurred [3] - 34:23,	interest [12] - 28:8,
handwritten [1] -	38:12, 38:21, 39:4,	23:11, 30:3, 80:17,	34:24	34:7, 34:11, 42:13,
47:20	39:13, 39:21, 41:8,	84:18	indeed [2] - 34:23,	50:13, 50:25, 51:7,
hang [2] - 46:2,	42:11, 45:11, 45:16,	impose [1] - 52:10	78:24	51:24, 53:19, 65:5,
59:19	46:6, 47:2, 47:5,	imposed [1] - 78:14	indemnity [1] - 39:5	74:20, 75:6
happen [1] - 81:14	48:12, 49:17, 50:3,	impressively [1] -	independent [2] -	interesting [2] -
happened [4] -	51:18, 52:15, 56:5,	69:9	54:11, 65:16	13:10, 69:12
10:18, 14:19, 17:9,	58:14, 58:23, 60:14,	improper [4] - 12:2,	INDEX [1] - 1:4	interference [1] -
49:2	65:22, 66:18, 81:12,	25:3, 28:4, 51:23	indicated [2] - 62:11,	51:23
happens [2] - 13:15,	81:25, 82:1, 82:19,	improperly [2] -	72:25	interpretation [2] -
56:3	83:18, 84:14, 84:22,	28:16, 37:11	indicia [1] - 71:13	19:13, 50:21
happy [2] - 13:3,	84:23, 85:6	impugn [1] - 63:8	individual [7] - 12:8,	interrelated [3] -
15:7	hope [1] - 82:20	inaccurate [1] - 9:14	12:23, 56:14, 56:20,	36:13, 40:3, 67:7
harass [1] - 62:22	hopefully [1] - 49:25	inapposite [1] -	64:13, 64:14, 80:17	interruption [1] -
hard [6] - 32:7,	hostilities [1] - 63:6	30:20	individuals [2] -	31:13
33:22, 39:17, 66:25,	hypothesizing [1] -	inappropriate [2] -	56:8. 79:17	introduction [1] -
75:18, 85:2	14:11	62:5. 79:2	inefficiencies [1] -	6:20
harder [1] - 39:13	hypothetical [3] -	inaudible [1] - 81:19	76:18	investigation [1] -
hardship [2] - 52:10,	13:10, 13:20, 14:2	INC [1] - 1:7	inefficiency [1] -	56:24
75:1	hypothetically [1] -	inclined [1] - 72:4	79:23	investors [1] - 42:23
headquarters [1] -	13:6	include [6] - 8:21,	inference [1] - 23:3	invitation [2] - 53:6.
69:4		19:2, 47:1, 61:10,	inferring [1] - 72:23	53:23
health [1] - 43:24	1	68:21, 74:23	inform [1] - 45:18	invoked [1] - 52:24
hear [10] - 5:15, 7:13,	-	includes [4] - 61:9,	information [5] -	involve [3] - 29:2,
36:10, 42:12, 43:9,		61:12, 70:8, 77:9	23:5, 49:7, 60:2,	52:18, 67:7
46:5, 65:2, 69:7, 81:9,	idea [3] - 42:16, 44:5,	including [3] - 56:11,	77:13, 81:3	involved [2] - 43:24,
82:21	61:14	57:2, 74:12	informing [1] - 83:3	47:18
heard [6] - 34:12,	ideally [1] - 18:10	inclusive [1] - 15:19	inherent [1] - 40:12	involves [3] - 12:14,
36:9, 45:15, 62:3,	identical [1] - 64:25	incompetent [1] -	inherently [1] - 39:9	56:14, 56:19
65:10, 74:21	identified [4] - 44:13,	65:4	initial [5] - 11:25,	ironclad [1] - 80:16
hearing [3] - 3:6,	45:11, 45:12, 55:8	incomplete [1] -	26:10, 37:21, 60:19,	irrelevant [3] - 49:1,
5:22, 6:5	identifies [1] - 31:22	59:21	77:3	49:3, 69:5
heavily [1] - 70:1	identify [3] - 8:21,	inconsistency [1] -	ink [1] - 34:22	issue [7] - 21:13,
heavy [2] - 50:12,	51:12, 80:19	42:17	inquiry [1] - 78:10	40:20, 47:17, 64:17,
75:5	identity [1] - 80:12	inconsistent [4] -	inscribed [2] - 9:20.	70:22, 83:1, 85:1
held [5] - 7:17, 29:3,	ignore [3] - 28:12,	32:23, 32:25, 44:6,	11:6	issued [2] - 68:22,
45:5, 58:25, 66:24	28:14, 32:19	64:22	insider [1] - 30:5	69:1
helm [1] - 64:1	ignored [2] - 55:4,	inconvenient [3] -	insight [1] - 31:6	issues [19] - 5:21,
highest [1] - 63:3	55:5	38:10, 39:9, 76:2	insinuate [1] - 28:20	7:19, 33:8, 34:18,
highly [2] - 42:20,	ignores [2] - 25:23,	Incorporation [42] -	instance [3] - 51:13,	35:1, 35:13, 39:6,
64:5	51:10	8:16, 8:20, 8:24, 9:9,	59:17, 62:6	43:10, 44:8, 45:19,
historical [9] - 17:6,	illusory [1] - 11:12	9:11, 9:24, 10:5,	instant [1] - 28:2	56:2, 57:11, 64:12,
19:18, 25:8, 35:21,	image [1] - 23:9	11:21, 13:13, 14:24,	instead [4] - 6:6, 8:7,	65:1, 65:25, 66:7,
69:9, 72:5, 73:14,	imagine [1] - 29:16	15:18, 18:25, 19:1,	27:7, 57:24	67:7, 80:21, 81:17
74:1, 74:7	Imaging [1] - 62:7	19:4, 19:7, 20:17,	institutions [1] -	items [1] - 10:23
hold [1] - 29:15	immediate [2] - 6:5,	20:21, 20:22, 21:10,	31:12	iterations [1] - 11:21
holding [1] - 59:14	37:23	22:2, 22:23, 23:1,	instrument [1] -	itself [4] - 54:10,
home [1] - 55:14	immediately [1] -	24:5, 24:11, 24:14,	68:22	55:10, 57:16, 71:7
hON [1] - 1:14	70:7	24:17, 26:14, 26:15,	instruments [1] -	
Honor [68] - 3:7,	impact [1] - 5:21	30:20, 31:23, 44:14,	68:25	J
3:12, 3:16, 3:22, 4:5,	imperfect [1] - 18:10	46:17, 46:23, 46:25,	intended [5] - 16:25,	
4:15, 4:19, 4:22, 5:1,	implicate [2] - 39:5,	47:13, 48:17, 68:18,	47:14, 53:1, 53:17,	100
7:12, 13:17, 15:6,	64:13	68:20, 68:21, 69:16,	70:16	J.S.C [1] - 1:14
15:13, 15:20, 17:4,	implicated [1] - 34:3	72:9, 74:4	intent [2] - 19:22,	Jack [1] - 59:2
17:21, 18:22, 20:10,	implicates [1] -	incorporation [3] -	64:13	James [1] - 38:5
21:16, 21:18, 22:1,	50:25	25:25, 48:2, 72:1	intention [1] - 83:19	JAMES [2] - 1:3, 1:18
22:19, 23:11, 23:18,	implication [1] -	incorporations [1] -	intentional [1] - 05.19	January [1] - 1:11
26:12, 26:25, 27:20,	46:15	25:8	46:17	Jennifer [1] - 4:14
		,	10.17	

10

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

JENNIFER [1] - 1:23 Jewish [1] - 43:25 Jim [2] - 3:4, 81:12 **JOEL** [1] - 1:14 John [1] - 4:23 JOHN [1] - 1:7 joined [3] - 4:13, 4:17, 5:3 JONATHAN[1] -1:19 Jonathan [3] - 3:13, 3:22, 36:2 JOSHUA [1] - 1:8 judge [2] - 10:19, 20:3 **Judge** [1] - 4:3 judgment [4] - 70:14, 77:5, 80:10, 80:13 judicata [2] - 57:13, 64:24 Judicial [2] - 12:6, 12:24 judicial [16] - 8:12, 11:6, 20:15, 20:19, 24:1, 26:16, 28:8, 29:11, 29:25, 31:21, 46:21, 48:22, 56:13, 68:11, 72:21, 73:5 judicially [1] - 31:16 judiciary [1] - 65:15 jurisdiction [13] -28:7, 28:20, 32:20, 41:24, 42:18, 51:7, 51:9, 51:14, 51:21, 51:22, 53:18, 62:12, 74:19 justice [11] - 34:8, 34:11, 42:14, 53:20, 65:5, 72:21, 73:5, 73:7, 74:21, 75:7, 77:1 justices [4] - 24:18, 26:16, 26:18, 72:19 justified [2] - 62:18, 80:11 justify [1] - 78:14 K

keep [4] - 6:21, 27:7, 28:19, 82:13 keeping [1] - 74:14 KENT [1] - 2:4 Kent [1] - 4:19 kind [5] - 33:14, 38:18, 47:23, 63:1, 66:18 knowing [1] - 46:18 knowledge [2] - 59:25, 77:11 **known** [1] - 11:8

lacks [1] - 55:12

land [1] - 34:5

9:4, 18:23, 32:9,

32:12, 43:15, 46:12,

55:11, 59:4, 59:11,

60:25, 61:24, 69:22,

70:11, 70:22, 71:7,

LAPIERRE [1] - 1:7

LaPierre [4] - 2:2,

largely [2] - 34:16,

4:18, 4:20, 56:12

larger [1] - 67:4

72:12, 72:23

76:13

L

language [18] - 8:18,

79:19

last [4] - 38:9, 48:13, 51:11, 79:25 latest [3] - 34:15, 43:5, 65:6 launched [1] - 72:8 Law [14] - 8:4, 10:2, 19:10, 19:24, 30:17, 31:19, 32:24, 33:5, 40:22, 68:5, 68:9, 70:12, 75:12, 78:20 **LAW** [1] - 2:2 law [33] - 6:14, 11:9, 14:14, 20:3, 20:5, 20:12, 24:9, 24:13, 28:14, 41:15, 41:18, 43:11, 50:10, 50:19, 50:21, 51:1, 51:20, 52:2, 52:3, 54:22, 55:12, 55:16, 56:7, 56:8, 56:10, 58:9, 62:12, 64:11, 67:18, 67:24, 72:20, 75:15, 79:10 law" [1] - 68:3 laws [3] - 51:25, 54:3, 78:23 lawsuit [5] - 7:25, 34:14, 35:10, 38:9, 54:9 lawsuits [3] - 5:25, 40:18, 42:19 lawyer [1] - 18:15 lawyers [2] - 47:10, 48:6 Lazarow [3] - 30:23, 31:3, 31:9 least [8] - 28:22, 37:19, 40:11, 40:13, 69:4, 72:17, 75:21,

leave [2] - 45:6, 82:23 led [1] - 30:1 leeway [1] - 12:11 left [4] - 4:14, 16:19, 37:20, 70:13 legal [8] - 25:23, 26:21, 34:17, 44:8, 54:8, 57:11, 66:7, 79:14 legislature [4] - 9:16, 30:13, 47:14, 50:22 Legislature [1] - 8:3 legislature's [1] -19:9 legitimate [3] - 50:6, 52:12, 52:20 less [1] - 39:1 **LETITIA**[1] - 1:3 **Letitia** [1] - 38:5 letter [2] - 5:22, 11:9 letters [1] - 81:6 level [2] - 63:3, 64:13 Lexington [1] - 1:22 liberal [1] - 55:14 Liberty [1] - 1:17 Life [1] - 2:9 lift [1] - 41:6 Light [1] - 78:8 light [3] - 66:16, 79:19, 81:9 likely [1] - 64:5 likewise [1] - 9:3 limited [1] - 73:10 limiting [1] - 32:12 limits [1] - 32:13 line [5] - 22:21, 47:14, 68:19, 71:20, 74:6 lines [3] - 39:16, 40:15, 49:1 list [2] - 40:6, 48:7 listed [2] - 22:23, 49:6 lists [2] - 22:16, 71:10 **literally** [1] - 11:19 literature [1] - 78:20 litigate [5] - 38:11, 51:5, 64:10, 64:12, 76:2 litigated [6] - 44:9, 44:15, 64:3, 64:4, 64:17, 64:19 litigating [6] - 41:11, 41:16, 52:9, 65:6, 65:16, 75:22 litigation [13] - 7:6,

35:9, 35:12, 38:25, 40:4, 63:16, 64:19, 64:20, 81:5, 82:15 litigations [1] - 78:12 **LLP** [1] - 2:8 located [16] - 8:13, 16:22, 18:4, 24:2, 24:7, 25:14, 26:1, 26:17, 26:24, 48:19, 48:23, 53:5, 68:12, 70:10, 72:22, 75:17 location [42] - 8:15, 9:20, 9:25, 10:6, 16:21, 18:24, 19:5, 19:6, 20:16, 20:20, 20:21, 21:10, 24:3, 24:15, 25:18, 25:19, 25:22, 26:20, 26:21, 27:1, 27:3, 27:6, 28:3, 30:18, 30:19, 31:22, 39:17, 44:13, 46:10, 46:20, 46:22, 47:3, 68:17, 69:10, 69:15, 70:9, 70:20, 71:1, 72:14, 72:18, 73:13, 74:25 locked [1] - 42:18 locus [1] - 39:10 lodge [1] - 10:23 lodged [6] - 10:4, 11:24, 12:7, 15:9, 15:11, 59:15 look [12] - 8:20, 8:23, 14:13, 18:12, 19:4, 19:25, 36:3, 42:1, 46:21, 47:2, 66:14, 66:25 looked [1] - 47:7 looking [1] - 22:3 lost [1] - 29:13 lurid [1] - 59:16 lying [1] - 35:7

М

mail [1] - 11:18
mailing [1] - 15:15
main [2] - 65:11,
73:16
maintain [2] - 40:23,
67:11
major [1] - 39:19
managed [1] - 65:8
mandated [4] - 7:1,
41:1, 42:2, 74:10
mandates [1] - 69:24
mandatory [12] - 8:7,
9:4, 9:12, 12:5, 28:11,
28:23, 30:12, 31:4,

31:15, 32:19, 44:12, 74:7 Manhattan [8] - 7:24, 10:7, 10:18, 10:19, 38:9, 39:8, 39:13, 40:10 March [2] - 84:20 Mark [2] - 5:3, 5:12 **MARK** [1] - 2:11 marshals [1] - 29:21 matter [9] - 20:13, 25:1, 44:21, 52:19, 54:22, 60:10, 74:12, 78:4, 80:6 matters [2] - 37:6, 79:23 McQueen [4] - 34:21, 34:24, 35:1, 64:16 MDL [1] - 35:4 mean [8] - 28:11, 38:14, 49:9, 59:21, 60:9, 63:12, 83:9, 83:16 meaning [1] - 17:19 means [4] - 8:15, 20:16, 36:18, 71:1 meant [1] - 37:4 meantime [2] - 4:8, measure [1] - 72:13 mechanisms [1] -40:4 media [1] - 61:2 meet [1] - 75:11 Meet [4] - 81:7, 81:16, 82:3, 82:23 Meeting [1] - 1:10 meeting [2] - 81:18, 84:17 memory [1] - 15:11 men [1] - 10:16 mention [1] - 35:20 mentioned [3] -57:19, 65:24, 69:17 menu [1] - 21:22 mere [2] - 9:15, 60:23 merger[1] - 68:24 merit [1] - 57:7 meritless [1] - 58:8 merits [4] - 50:20, 51:5, 51:7, 67:13 Met [1] - 2:9 met [1] - 50:11 microphones [1] -45:4

Middle [1] - 35:13

might [5] - 31:13,

42:4, 45:18, 46:18,

46:19

95 of 102

34:16, 34:25, 35:5,

11

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

military [1] - 10:16 militate [1] - 54:7 minimize [2] - 76:17, 79.23 minute [1] - 66:14 minutes [3] - 38:4, 44:23, 66:21 Misc [1] - 45:24 misconduct [1] -50:23 misreading [1] - 23:5 misremembering [1] - 22.18 missing [1] - 77:15 misunderstand [1] -57:20 misused [1] - 50:24 modern [1] - 25:9 moment [3] - 9:3, 21:16, 24:25 money [1] - 39:18 MONICA [1] - 1:20 Monica [2] - 3:17, 4:5 morning [16] - 3:7, 3:11, 3:12, 3:15, 3:16, 3:19, 3:21, 4:10, 4:15, 4:16, 4:21, 4:24, 4:25, 5:1, 5:17, 38:4 morph [1] - 52:23 Mosdos [1] - 43:20 most [5] - 19:3, 20:11, 36:14, 42:15, 44:18 motion [25] - 6:25, 7:11, 11:23, 15:8, 25:2, 27:25, 29:8, 32:1, 33:20, 40:6, 40:21, 43:21, 45:9, 47:18, 53:8, 58:2, 61:18, 67:15, 72:7, 74:15, 74:16, 76:21, 78:18, 80:1, 83:20 motions [24] - 5:18, 6:11, 6:22, 7:9, 28:2, 33:21, 34:3, 45:15, 48:10, 54:4, 54:11, 54:18, 67:5, 67:6, 67:10, 80:25, 81:4, 82:10, 83:5, 83:10, 83:11, 83:15, 83:20, 84:5 Motions [1] - 1:11 move [7] - 29:7, 31:25, 32:4, 48:12, 52:25, 53:19, 76:7 moved [1] - 57:2 moving [5] - 35:4, 54:16, 74:16, 76:10,

83:13

MR [34] - 3:4, 3:12, 3:22, 4:4, 4:19, 4:22, 4:25, 5:1, 5:8, 5:10, 22:1, 22:19, 23:18, 26:12, 27:20, 28:1, 28:15, 29:1, 32:3, 33:18. 45:16. 47:5. 48:12. 49:17. 50:3. 51:18, 56:5, 56:17, 56:19, 56:23, 57:18, 81:12, 81:25, 84:21 **MS** [60] - 3:7, 3:16, 4:5, 4:10, 4:15, 4:17, 7:12, 7:15, 13:10, 13:16, 13:24, 14:6, 14:23, 15:5, 15:22, 16:4, 17:4, 17:21, 18:22, 20:10, 21:2, 21:7, 21:16, 21:18, 23:10, 29:9, 29:15, 29:17, 29:19, 31:2, 32:2, 34:2, 36:25, 37:7, 38:12, 38:21, 39:12, 39:21, 41:8, 42:11, 43:15, 45:11, 45:21, 46:6, 49:21, 58:14, 58:19, 58:23, 59:10, 60:14, 61:23, 65:22, 66:18, 82:19, 83:18, 84:2, 84:8, 84:14, 84:23, 85:6 multi [1] - 63:6 multi-pronged [1] multidistrict [2] -38:25, 40:4 multiple [7] - 36:1, 42:19, 56:11, 57:2, 59:14, 63:6, 65:24 must [6] - 10:25, 33:12, 54:17, 66:18, 75:20, 75:21 mute [3] - 46:3, 46:4, 81:20 Ν

N-CPL [2] - 8:8 N-PCL [9] - 9:17, 15:19, 23:23, 23:25, 25:16, 26:24, 27:11, 28:6, 31:17 name [2] - 26:3, 50:16 named [3] - 16:3, 16:5, 70:6 narrow [2] - 32:4,

narrowed [1] - 31:20

narrower [2] - 12:20,

14:8 **NATIONAL**[1] - 1:7 National [3] - 4:12, 22.8 38.6 nature [4] - 35:8, 37:14, 55:5, 60:20 **NDNY** [4] - 56:5, 56:14, 56:16, 57:1 necessary [2] -54:15, 72:6 need [8] - 33:19, 35:20, 42:7, 52:11, 74:8, 76:25, 79:11, 85:4 needed [1] - 52:24 needs [1] - 44:14 nest [1] - 34:15 never [12] - 10:9, 11:25, 14:23, 25:11, 25:19, 25:22, 27:6, 42:12, 52:19, 58:1, 62:3, 71:23 **new** [2] - 2:6, 2:10 **NEW** [5] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:3, 1:3, 1:16 New [113] - 1:11, 1:18, 1:22, 2:3, 2:6, 2:10, 3:14, 6:15, 8:2, 9:2, 9:8, 9:10, 9:23, 10:2, 10:12, 10:13, 10:20, 10:21, 10:24, 10:25, 11:12, 11:15, 11:19, 12:1, 12:2, 12:17, 13:2, 18:6, 19:21, 21:20, 21:23, 22:6, 22:9, 22:10, 22:12, 22:17, 22:24, 23:1, 23:2, 24:7, 24:14, 24:18, 24:20, 25:9, 25:12, 25:19, 25:24, 27:7, 27:8, 28:18, 34:14, 35:17, 35:19, 37:18, 38:11, 40:22, 42:19, 42:20, 42:24, 43:19, 43:22, 44:9, 47:9, 48:7, 48:16, 49:6, 50:8, 50:10, 50:13, 50:15, 50:16, 50:17, 50:19, 50:21, 50:23, 51:4, 51:24, 52:13, 52:15, 53:3, 54:14, 63:4, 63:14, 63:17, 67:17, 68:1, 68:4, 69:6, 69:11, 71:9, 71:10, 72:3, 72:13, 72:15, 72:18, 73:2, 73:15, 74:3, 75:2, 75:6, 75:12, 75:14, 75:17, 75:19, 75:22, 78:21,

78:23 newly [1] - 9:24 next [3] - 14:18, 76:21, 81:5 nexus [2] - 50:7, 51:6 non [22] - 33:23, 34:9, 38:15, 39:15, 39:22, 39:25, 45:8, 50:4, 52:5, 52:13, 52:17, 52:20, 53:4, 53:17, 53:24, 54:5, 74:17, 76:6, 76:8, 76:11, 78:7, 78:12 non-party [1] - 52:17 none [6] - 11:3, 11:20, 52:5, 52:8, 56:14, 56:19 nonetheless [2] -46:21, 60:20 nonprofit [4] - 9:18, 9:23, 30:16, 31:20 nonresident [1] -13:18 nonsubstantive [1] -77:6 normal [1] - 20:2 normally [1] - 84:7 Northern [6] - 35:2, 35:19, 40:2, 51:4, 54:14, 66:3 not-for-profit [4] -9:17, 33:11, 75:14, 78:22 Not-for-Profit [5] -32:24, 33:4, 68:5, 68:8, 70:12 note [5] - 28:1, 38:7, 60:14, 67:10, 71:8 **noted** [3] - 26:25, 46:9, 51:21 **notes** [3] - 30:3, 66:15, 85:13 nothing [1] - 67:12 notice [4] - 37:24, 57:22, 60:16, 61:12 Notice [1] - 5:19 notion [1] - 64:23 notwithstanding [1] - 53:7 November [2] -22:23, 23:1 nowadays [1] - 9:23 NRA [83] - 1:21, 4:9, 6:4, 9:8, 9:10, 10:1, 10:4, 10:16, 10:23, 11:4, 11:15, 11:24, 13:17, 14:23, 16:25, 17:4, 17:6, 19:14,

22:11, 24:10, 24:13,

24:16, 24:22, 25:11, 25:18, 25:21, 26:14, 26:17, 26:25, 27:3, 27:5, 35:1, 35:8, 35:9, 35:16, 35:18, 36:4, 36:21, 38:3, 38:8, 42:22, 42:23, 47:7, 49:4, 49:6, 49:21, 54:13, 56:24, 57:7, 63:3, 63:5, 63:22, 65:16, 68:6, 69:18, 69:23, 70:1, 70:8, 70:13, 70:25, 71:11, 71:23, 72:8, 72:13, 72:16, 72:17, 72:24, 73:3, 73:6, 73:9, 73:16, 74:1, 74:2, 74:4, 74:14, 75:21, 75:24, 78:24, 82:22, 83:2, 84:23, 85:6 NRA's [22] - 5:19, 8:23, 11:25, 24:6, 25:8, 26:1, 26:20, 34:18, 34:20, 36:14, 37:25, 54:8, 54:17, 57:3, 64:6, 65:9, 65:20, 69:4, 69:11, 71:10, 71:21, 80:18 **nullify** [2] - 54:21, 55:6 nullity [9] - 37:9, 37:11, 37:22, 38:2, 57:19, 57:23, 57:24, 60:17, 61:20 **NUMBER**[1] - 1:5 **number** [6] - 9:1, 29:12, 34:6, 67:7, 81:15, 81:17 **Nutronics** [1] - 62:7 **NY**[1] - 59:1 **NY2D** [1] - 30:24 **NYSCEF** [2] - 15:21, 70:2

0

OAG [1] - 77:19 objection [3] - 6:4, 82:22, 83:3 objects [1] - 41:17 observed [1] - 52:15 obtained [1] - 82:5 obtaining [1] - 72:19 obtains [1] - 83:1 obvious [1] - 20:12 obviously [7] - 17:4, 38:16, 44:17, 60:18, 77:6, 80:5, 83:6 occurs [1] - 62:16

-cb-

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

12

oddly [1] - 35:10 **OF** [9] - 1:1, 1:1, 1:3, 1:3, 1:7, 1:16 office [93] - 8:13, 8:15, 8:22, 8:24, 9:8, 9:10, 9:25, 10:6, 10:14, 11:1, 11:2, 11:12, 11:15, 11:16, 11:19, 13:12, 13:19, 14:3, 14:12, 14:15, 14:20, 15:3, 16:21, 17:1, 17:5, 17:7, 17:8, 17:14, 17:15, 18:9, 18:13, 18:15, 18:18, 18:19, 18:24, 20:16, 20:25, 21:4, 22:17, 24:2, 24:4, 24:6, 24:11, 24:12, 24:15, 25:7, 25:9, 25:12, 25:17, 25:22, 25:25, 26:7, 26:17, 26:23, 27:14, 27:18, 28:3, 30:18, 31:22, 46:10, 46:22, 48:1, 48:18, 48:22, 49:10, 68:12, 68:16, 68:17, 69:6, 69:11, 69:13, 69:19, 69:23, 70:10, 70:17, 71:2, 71:21, 71:23, 72:1, 72:6, 72:10, 72:14, 72:18, 72:22, 73:1, 73:14, 73:22, 74:1, 74:2 Office [2] - 3:14, 35:17 OFFICE [1] - 1:16 Officer [2] - 40:22, 75:13 officer [4] - 30:5, 30:8, 30:10, 78:23 officers [1] - 41:16 **offices** [1] - 20:16 official [1] - 16:6 officials [1] - 42:20 often [3] - 39:15, 46:10, 46:13 old [4] - 29:10, 29:24, 30:2, 33:14 omitted [1] - 77:4 once [1] - 7:18 one [68] - 10:7, 12:16, 12:17, 13:11, 13:14, 15:11, 16:2, 17:12, 17:13, 19:2, 20:6, 20:9, 20:21, 21:16, 21:18, 27:15, 28:24, 29:4, 30:6, 30:20, 31:5, 32:3, 33:16, 35:3, 38:7, 39:12, 39:23, 41:2,

41:9, 43:3, 45:17, 45:18, 47:3, 47:22, 47:23, 49:25, 59:1, 61:21, 61:22, 62:6, 62:25, 63:1, 63:14, 64:25, 65:11, 66:1, 66:4, 67:4, 67:22, 69:6, 69:24, 73:12, 73:21, 74:12, 75:23, 77:20, 77:25, 79:4, 80:7, 80:8, 80:10, 81:6, 82:11, 83:24, 84:2, 84:10 one's [1] - 79:8 **Op** [2] - 59:1, 59:3 open [1] - 42:10 operates [1] - 32:16 operating [1] - 3:25 opinion [5] - 29:11, 29:24, 32:5, 46:8, 78:19 opportunity [1] -46:19 oppose [1] - 44:17 opposed [2] - 48:18, 82:12 opposing [2] - 45:12, 57:18 opposition [3] -24:6, 45:24, 54:12 optimal [2] - 42:14, 44:7 option [2] - 27:3, 70:8 options [1] - 21:22 order [6] - 51:23, 67:8, 77:1, 80:24, 82:9, 85:1 ordered [1] - 47:10 orders [1] - 6:7 Organization [1] -43:25 organization [4] -10:18, 13:7, 24:5, 42:24 organize [1] - 83:12 organized [2] - 6:21, original [10] - 22:22, 22:25. 25:24. 48:17. 54:20. 55:1. 55:9. 68:21, 69:19, 77:8 Orthodox [1] - 43:25 otherwise [7] - 20:3, 49:15, 58:25, 62:21, 67:24, 74:5, 75:24 ought [1] - 21:19 outright [1] - 55:23

outset [1] - 67:10

outside [2] - 18:16,

75:17 overlap [1] - 63:10 overlapping [5] -34:3, 34:17, 38:2, 57:10, 64:22 overlays [1] - 14:9 oversight [1] - 56:9 overt [1] - 64:21 own [3] - 6:12, 51:25, 54:3

Р

page [6] - 16:9,

61:16, 63:19

30:22, 43:21, 45:23,

pages [3] - 16:2, 37:18, 62:17 paper [1] - 13:8 papers [15] - 8:11, 11:17, 11:23, 17:11, 21:20, 24:6, 24:23, 25:25, 30:1, 36:19, 37:12, 53:8, 54:12, 55:3, 80:1 par [1] - 5:15 paragraph [3] - 9:6, parallel [3] - 8:3, 31:18, 41:10 Park [3] - 2:3, 2:6, PART[1] - 1:1 part [8] - 6:24, 23:11, 40:25, 47:1, 63:1, 77:10, 79:9, 84:18 partial [2] - 40:6, 60:22 particular [2] - 7:22, 72:2 particularly [2] -78:15, 79:10 parties [21] - 5:20, 6:22, 33:7, 67:23, 69:3, 71:8, 74:23, 76:6, 76:16, 76:24, 78:13, 79:18, 79:22, 80:12, 80:18, 81:1, 81:6, 81:9, 81:19, 82:4, 82:10 party [2] - 52:17, 70:21 past [1] - 66:7 patience [1] - 85:2 pattern [1] - 66:6 Pause [1] - 21:17 PCL [9] - 9:17, 15:19, 23:23, 23:25, 25:16, 26:24, 27:11, 28:6,

31:17 penalty [1] - 9:6 pendency [1] - 7:5 pending [20] - 6:11, 6:17, 33:24, 34:16, 34:25, 35:11, 35:12, 39:3, 40:3, 51:4, 54:18, 65:25, 66:3, 76:23, 77:18, 77:21, 77:23, 78:1, 78:10, 80.2 **PEOPLE** [1] - 1:3 People [1] - 50:16 people [4] - 46:18, 47:18, 47:19, 83:11 per [1] - 83:2 perfectly [1] - 53:8 perhaps [2] - 41:14, 65:3 perjury [1] - 9:6 permissible [1] -72:3 permits [2] - 74:18, 80:4 permitted [2] -16:20, 70:25 persnickety [1] -49.9 perspective[1] -40:11 persuasive[1] -73:19 **petition** [3] - 61:5, 61:12, 61:13 petitioned [1] - 53:14 **petitioner** [1] - 61:10 **Phillips** [3] - 2:8, 5:5, **PHILLIPS** [1] - 1:7 phrase [4] - 17:16, 18:15, 20:25, 26:7 physical [3] - 25:12, 25:17, 25:19 **pick** [1] - 44:24 picture [4] - 4:7, 29:13, 49:13, 81:21 **piece** [5] - 13:8, 17:11, 17:23, 26:11, 71:4 pitfalls [1] - 85:3 place [17] - 7:17, 8:19, 13:25, 19:16, 19:17, 44:7, 52:3, 52:9, 52:16, 53:11, 53:15, 65:18, 65:20,

plain [6] - 12:1, 19:3, 38:17, 55:11, 69:22, 71:6 plainly [1] - 28:8 Plaintiff [2] - 1:5, plaintiff [6] - 3:3, 3:18, 29:21, 60:6, 61:10, 67:20 **plaintiff's** [9] - 25:1, 25:3, 29:23, 50:10, 52:22, 59:6, 75:3, 75:6, 75:8 plaintiffs [2] - 55:21, 84:22 plan [2] - 81:9, 82:6 planned [1] - 81:16 planning [2] - 81:7, 81:18 play [2] - 35:2, 79:10 plays [1] - 38:16 pleading [1] - 55:14 point [21] - 17:18, 26:10, 30:21, 32:4, 33:9, 38:11, 39:8, 42:1, 45:17, 48:4, 48:13, 57:19, 60:9, 60:11, 64:21, 67:17, 69:13, 71:16, 73:12, 79:6, 82:2 pointed [2] - 15:2, 68:14 points [4] - 24:24, 58:15, 62:9, 65:22 **police** [1] - 6:2 policy [1] - 46:7 political [2] - 7:22, 63:21 **position** [5] - 5:23, 6:5, 42:4, 43:12, 82:24 positions [1] - 6:9 possible [1] - 7:25 posture [1] - 38:23 potential [3] - 52:7, 74:25, 75:1 potentially [1] -40:23 **POWELL** [1] - 1:8 powers [1] - 6:3 practical [1] - 55:19 practice [2] - 47:18, 51:11 precedence [3] -33:5, 33:12, 57:15 precedent [8] - 26:1, 47:17. 48:3. 53:2. 54:1, 54:10, 73:14, 74:1 precise [2] - 48:20,

cb.

67:19, 67:22

76:2, 77:2

placed [1] - 42:20

places [3] - 65:17,

placing [1] - 77:5

28:12, 28:23, 30:12,

31:5, 31:18, 32:10,

32:12, 32:20, 38:18,

provisions [7] -

12:10, 27:21, 31:6,

32:14, 32:18, 34:6,

public [2] - 50:22,

publicly [1] - 60:13

purports [1] - 22:5

41:19, 62:22, 73:21

purposeful [1] -

purpose [4] - 20:13,

purposes [7] - 15:14,

24:3, 26:3, 69:3, 71:4,

pursuant [2] - 50:17,

put [6] - 22:4, 22:20,

Q

pursue [1] - 79:4

25:6, 42:4, 43:8,

puts [1] - 61:24

pull [1] - 15:7

44:13, 70:13

72:2

50:25

38:18

75:13

65:12

73:4, 73:22

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

13

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

49:12 precisely [1] - 55:15 preclusion [1] -57:13 preempts [1] - 33:5 prefer [3] - 7:23, 53:22, 79:5 preference [1] - 50:5 preferred [1] - 42:9 prejudice [3] - 55:6, 55:8, 55:16 preliminary [2] -84:16, 84:19 premised [1] - 50:19 prescribed [10] - 8:8, 14:14, 20:3, 20:5, 20:12, 28:14, 31:12, 67:18, 67:24, 68:3 prescribes [3] -20:13, 20:18, 68:5 prescription [2] -9:5, 12:21 prescriptive[1] -14:8 present [2] - 55:23, 69:10 press [3] - 34:22, 38:5, 42:21 presumably [1] -71.11 **pretty** [2] - 31:17, 39:4 prevent [1] - 31:13 previously [6] -34:25, 35:14, 41:10, 43:17, 44:19, 64:17 principal [7] - 3:20, 8:19, 17:12, 18:9, 18:13, 18:14, 18:18 printout [5] - 22:4, 22:5, 48:14, 48:15, priority [1] - 77:23 probative [1] - 73:9 problem [3] - 12:12, 62:14, 64:22 procedural [2] -33:11, 53:19 procedure [2] -32:22, 37:23 procedures [1] -52:16 proceed [8] - 6:10, 6:20, 55:21, 57:12, 79:5, 81:16, 82:3,

proceeding [12] -

6:4. 6:12. 35:4. 61:9.

61:11, 61:15, 62:19,

62:21, 68:10, 81:8,

82:11, 82:22 proceedings [1] -21:17 Proceedings [1] proceeds [1] - 55:25 process [15] - 16:3, 16:5, 16:18, 17:18, 18:3, 18:19, 35:4, 70:4, 70:6, 70:16, 71:1, 71:4, 71:18, 73:18 processed [1] -64:15 produce [1] - 21:22 produces [1] - 33:2 Productions [1] -78:9 profile [1] - 60:20 **profit** [5] - 9:17, 30:14, 33:11, 75:14, 78:22 Profit [5] - 32:24, 33:4, 68:5, 68:8, 70:12 progressing [1] -

64:24

promptly [3] - 60:15,

prosecution [2] -

prospect [1] - 31:20

protection [1] - 31:7

provide [2] - 35:6,

provides [5] - 31:5,

providing [1] - 55:16

province [1] - 6:18

17:17, 23:23, 27:11,

provision [14] -

54:24, 55:4, 67:21,

62:19, 62:21

62:20, 64:6

67.8

76:22

protected [2] -

63:9, 77:17 pronged [1] - 63:6 **proof** [1] - 55:16 questioned [1] proper [14] - 9:7, 36:15 19:20, 19:21, 23:25, questioning [1] -25:4, 27:9, 27:22, 62:23 28:18, 29:3, 29:4, questions [4] - 51:1, 50:8, 57:4, 68:2, 80:4 58:13, 78:19, 80:9 properly [4] - 23:21, quickly [2] - 52:23, 32:25, 54:2, 55:4 77:7 **proposed** [1] - 83:20 quirk [1] - 69:17 proposition [2] quirky [1] - 47:22 28:22, 45:25 **quite** [1] - 84:6 propriety [2] - 56:23, quote [3] - 59:4, 56:25 61:19, 80:14 prosecuting [1] **quoting** [3] - 32:9,

R

62:16, 69:2

raise [4] - 33:7, 42:7, 55:25, 65:25 raised [7] - 8:25, 34:17, 45:19, 57:4, 58:15, 79:12 raises [4] - 40:19, 56:20, 65:1, 73:16 raising [2] - 38:14, rarely [1] - 50:11 rather [4] - 6:21, -cb

39:20, 60:19, 84:11 rational [1] - 44:18 reach [2] - 74:9, 74:13 read [10] - 8:10, 17:10, 22:21, 32:25, 43:15, 48:15, 48:16, 59:8, 60:4, 61:7 reading [7] - 20:11, 20:24, 33:2, 47:20, 48:14, 55:16, 59:8 ready [1] - 67:2 reaffirmed [1] -24:16 real [4] - 46:20, 49:4, 63:9, 64:10 really [9] - 18:20, 27:18, 32:7, 48:3, 48:25, 65:23, 73:16, 76:4, 76:10 reason [6] - 14:6, 30:20, 40:16, 52:21, 53:15, 59:22 reasonable [1] - 6:13 reasons [3] - 54:12, 67:9, 78:5 rebut [1] - 55:2 receipt [1] - 81:2 receive [2] - 58:4, 70.6 received [1] - 73:7 recent [1] - 63:16 recess [2] - 45:5, 66:24 recognize [2] -14:18, 65:14 recognized [1] - 52:1 recollection [1] -28:22 recommendation [1] - 13:16 reconvene [1] - 45:3 record [7] - 11:23, 22:4, 22:14, 38:22, 57:4, 67:9, 69:21 Record [1] - 85:9 records [6] - 24:21, 24:25, 46:9, 67:4, 69:9, 71:15 red [1] - 35:25

refusal [1] - 62:18 regards [1] - 22:11 registered [14] -9:25, 14:1, 15:15, 16:8, 16:9, 16:11, 16:19, 18:9, 18:12, 25:13, 26:20, 26:22, 27:1, 70:20 regular [4] - 14:4, 14:17, 14:22, 79:13 regulated [1] - 32:23 regulating [1] -51:24 regulatory [2] - 6:2, 56:10 reject [2] - 53:6, 53:23 relate [2] - 34:20, 67:10 related [6] - 33:25, 39:3, 39:7, 56:6, 66:4, 76:17 relevance [1] - 18:16 relevant [6] - 18:21, 26:22, 52:7, 54:5, 69:6, 75:1 reliance [2] - 29:23, 46:16 relied [1] - 33:6 relief [3] - 30:7, 56:11, 57:20 relies [3] - 12:13, 70:1, 73:17 relinquishment [1] -11:9 relocating [1] - 46:14 reluctant [1] - 60:21 rely [2] - 17:11, 64:23 relying [1] - 26:5 remainder [1] -70:15 remaining [3] - 7:19, 33:21, 48:10 removal [5] - 52:24, 56:12, 76:5, 76:11 render [1] - 67:2 rendered [1] - 57:23 repeatedly [1] -24:16 replacement [1] reply [4] - 13:25, 24:23, 30:22, 55:2 REPORTER [6] -2:15. 4:3. 23:15. 30:25, 49:23, 85:17 reporter [2] - 59:9, 81:2 reporters [1] - 4:1 representing [1] -

reduce [1] - 60:21 reference [2] - 37:3, 71:17 references [2] -21:20, 26:6 referencing [1] -32:9 referring [1] - 48:16 reflected [2] - 24:21,

25:9

14

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

	<u> </u>	 	1	<u> </u>
48:6	retaliate [1] - 62:19	salient [2] - 35:21,	selection [1] - 75:6	shown [1] - 55:17
request [1] - 84:11	retaliation [2] - 64:4,	36:14	selective [2] - 63:12,	shows [1] - 22:8
requested [1] - 44:20	64:8	SARAH [1] - 1:23	63:13	shred [2] - 12:13,
require [4] - 5:24,	retroactive [1] - 10:9	Sarah [1] - 4:11	semi [1] - 60:24	69:10
10:8, 50:20, 69:18	Rettig [1] - 30:23	satisfactory [1] -	send [3] - 11:18,	shreds [1] - 27:17
required [11] - 17:5,	revert [3] - 13:25,	84:21	39:19	sic [2] - 35:12, 64:19
24:10, 25:22, 26:14,	14:4, 14:6	satisfy [1] - 60:22	SENIOR [2] - 2:15,	sides [2] - 27:17,
47:19, 50:12, 69:24, 71:24, 72:9, 72:20,	review [2] - 67:4,	saw [1] - 4:6	85:17	69:8
71.24, 72.9, 72.20,	69:21 riding [1] - 28:24	schedule [3] - 82:6, 84:4, 84:18	sense [5] - 20:4, 34:3, 43:8, 56:4,	sign [3] - 45:3, 59:5, 59:12
requirement [4] -	Rifle [3] - 4:12, 22:8,	scheduled [1] - 82:4	59:15	signatures [1] -
10:3, 10:9, 60:22,	38:6	schedules [1] - 02.4	sent [1] - 31:14	10:19
79:14	RIFLE [1] - 1:7	82:25	sentence [2] - 31:21,	signed [1] - 77:8
requires [6] - 9:24,	rights [1] - 83:8	scheme [5] - 7:25,	77:9	similar [7] - 6:8,
10:14, 34:10, 37:19,	rigid [1] - 55:16	8:4, 19:11, 33:11,	sentences [1] - 32:5	31:17, 65:25, 72:12,
77:17, 80:11	robbed [1] - 28:20	33:13	separate [5] - 15:14,	73:6, 78:7, 78:11
requires" [1] - 77:1	ROGERS [57] - 1:23,	Schneiderman [1] -	18:5, 23:23, 33:10,	similarly [2] - 54:6,
reread [1] - 59:11	4:10, 4:17, 7:12, 7:15,	63:3	65:15	62:10
res [2] - 57:13, 64:23	13:10, 13:16, 13:24,	scholars [1] - 36:1	separately [5] - 4:17,	simple [2] - 8:9, 8:17
research [1] - 6:13	14:6, 14:23, 15:5,	scope [2] - 52:19,	5:4, 5:12, 16:11, 62:2	simply [3] - 34:9,
reserve[1] - 83:7	15:22, 16:4, 17:4,	53:24	seriatim [1] - 82:12	53:21, 83:21
reserved [1] - 6:6	17:21, 18:22, 20:10,	screen [2] - 49:15,	series [2] - 6:22,	simultaneously [2] -
resided [1] - 67:23	21:2, 21:7, 21:16,	66:17	83:10	12:16, 34:4
residence [2] -	21:18, 23:10, 29:9,	scrutiny [1] - 63:11	serve [3] - 11:16,	single [3] - 12:12,
70:21, 74:23	29:15, 29:17, 29:19,	se [1] - 83:2	34:11, 40:14	13:8, 51:12
resident [2] - 12:19, 68:1	31:2, 32:2, 34:2, 36:25, 37:7, 38:12,	searching [1] - 84:10	served [1] - 60:16	sit [1] - 83:15
resides [1] - 30:10	38:21, 39:12, 39:21,	second [8] - 4:6, 7:3,	serves [1] - 15:11 service [14] - 16:3,	sitting [1] - 83:18
resolution [2] -	41:8, 42:11, 43:15,	25:21, 59:19, 65:19, 65:23, 79:20, 82:8	16:4, 16:10, 17:18,	situated [2] - 24:12, 72:11
80:20, 81:4	45:11, 45:21, 46:6,	Second [2] - 51:20,	18:2, 18:3, 18:18,	situation [2] - 62:25,
resolve [3] - 28:2,	49:21, 58:14, 58:19,	62:7	48:23, 68:13, 70:16,	63:2
32:17, 41:22	58:23, 59:10, 60:14,	Secretary [10] - 10:5,	70:25, 71:4, 71:17,	situations [3] -
resort [1] - 19:23	61:23, 65:22, 66:18,	11:24, 15:9, 16:12,	73:18	18:11, 32:13, 63:19
respect [6] - 6:6,	82:19, 83:18, 84:2,	18:2, 18:4, 21:21,	Services [2] - 43:2,	situs [1] - 74:24
54:2, 61:1, 68:6,	84:8, 84:14, 84:23,	45:25, 46:8, 70:4	66:2	Slip [2] - 59:1, 59:3
71:17, 81:8	85:6	section [2] - 8:14,	set [10] - 7:3, 8:10,	slower [1] - 56:22
respectfully [1] -	Rogers [8] - 4:11,	46:24	9:8, 9:11, 23:5, 41:8,	slowly [2] - 51:17,
61:11	7:10, 27:14, 29:6,	Section [11] - 3:9,	54:12, 70:12, 84:4,	59:9
respects [1] - 25:15	33:22, 45:6, 45:17, 46:5	32:8, 32:21, 33:8,	84:15	society [1] - 24:12
respond [2] - 48:9,	Rogers' [1] - 66:17	41:19, 43:22, 48:20,	SETH [1] - 2:10	some [18] - 5:15,
58:15	role [2] - 38:16,	65:9, 68:8, 80:3	Seth [2] - 5:1, 5:10	11:11, 16:25, 18:16,
responded [1] - 9:1	79:10	see [28] - 4:2, 4:3, 4:4, 4:6, 4:14, 5:16,	sets [2] - 33:10, 56:2 setting [3] - 26:3,	20:3, 26:11, 31:5,
61:11	rough [1] - 28:24	10:12, 16:7, 23:10,	48:3, 75:3	34:16, 36:3, 36:14,
response [3] - 10:10,	routinely [2] - 41:16,	23:14, 29:6, 29:15,	settled [2] - 54:1,	38:18, 58:25, 66:18, 66:20, 67:12, 72:17,
63:5, 64:8	53:12	45:1, 45:7, 48:7,	57:12	75:16, 78:7
responses [3] - 6:23,	rule [7] - 6:1, 31:10,	49:13, 49:15, 49:18,	several [4] - 25:15,	somebody [2] -
17:21, 38:13	33:14, 55:15, 78:2,	49:21, 58:12, 58:20,	38:23, 43:4, 54:11	60:11, 66:16
rest [2] - 44:25,	80:16	66:12, 66:16, 74:7,	severe [1] - 29:22	somehow [2] -
77:14	Rule [2] - 43:16, 54:4	81:14, 82:1, 82:8,	shall [6] - 24:12,	54:21, 63:23
restated [1] - 68:24	rules [1] - 14:17	82:20	67:20, 67:22, 68:11,	something [9] - 22:5,
restitution [1] -	ruling [3] - 30:2,	seek [2] - 6:7, 39:15	70:4, 72:11	22:15, 28:14, 37:14,
56:11	47:16, 74:8	seeking [2] - 38:24,	SHEEHAN [6] - 1:18,	60:5, 66:17, 73:6,
result [3] - 13:21,	run [1] - 33:3	72:18	3:4, 4:4, 81:12, 81:25,	75:23, 79:12
31:13, 80:24	runs [1] - 55:11	seeks [1] - 56:10	84:21	sometimes [1] - 60:9
resulted [1] - 55:9	C	seem [5] - 3:25,	Sheehan [4] - 3:4,	somewhat [2] -
retain [2] - 28:5,	S	14:16, 38:10, 49:14, 60:6	81:12, 81:23, 83:20	23:12, 33:25
74:11		selected [3] - 22:7,	short [1] - 58:12 shot [1] - 28:24	sophistication [1] - 36:10
retaining [2] - 28:9, 50:14	safeguard [1] - 50:22	47:8	shoving [1] - 55:5	sorry [6] - 15:13,
00.17			3.13.11.11g [1] 00.0	3011 y [0] 10.10,
L	1	cb	1	1

1	5
	レン

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

29:21, 31:2, 59:9,
80:7, 81:20
sort [20] - 9:4, 10:12,
13:17, 19:17, 19:22,
27:17, 28:24, 39:9,
40:19, 40:20, 46:7,
46:15, 49:2, 59:21,
60:3, 61:24, 62:23,
66:20, 77:9, 83:10
sorts [1] - 39:18
sought [4] - 30:7,
73:4, 73:7, 80:13
Southern [1] - 43:21
sovereign [1] - 54:2
space [1] - 70:13
special [3] - 61:9,
61:11, 68:10
Special [2] - 3:17,
61:7
specific [8] - 10:8,
33:15, 33:16, 62:6,
64:2, 69:14, 69:19,
83:19
specifically [6] -
16:16, 16:18, 17:13,
32:13, 70:3, 78:25
SPENCER [1] - 2:5
spent [2] - 21:24,
40:25
spokesperson [1] -
3:20
square [1] - 41:5
stamp [1] - 15:23
stand [3] - 60:12,
60:18, 63:11
standards [1] - 55:14
start [6] - 7:11, 7:16,
7:17, 49:14, 67:15,
81:11
started [2] - 15:2,
27:16
starting [2] - 4:9,
67:17
STATE [4] - 1:1, 1:3,
1:3, 1:16
state [55] - 6:16,
13:19, 16:21, 34:17,
40:15, 40:23, 41:2,
41:3, 41:7, 41:15,
41:21, 41:25, 43:8,
43:10, 43:23, 44:16,
44:18, 45:10, 46:18,
51:1, 51:2, 51:19,
52:2, 52:12, 52:17,
52:18, 53:20, 54:1,
54:3, 56:7, 56:8, 56:9,
57:15, 59:14, 62:3,
62:8, 62:12, 63:6,
65:3, 65:12, 70:9,
75:19, 76:7, 76:8,

76:13, 76:14, 76:25, 79:1, 79:4, 79:7, 79:9, 79:10 State [66] - 3:14, 3:21, 8:3, 8:24, 10:5, 11:24, 13:22, 15:9, 15:12, 15:13, 16:10, 16:13, 18:2, 18:4, 19:8, 20:22, 21:3, 21:21, 22:6, 22:9, 22:10, 22:11, 24:21, 25:12, 30:6, 35:17, 37:18, 38:1, 40:18, 41:6, 41:12, 42:19, 42:20, 42:24, 46:1, 46:9, 47:3, 47:9, 48:9, 49:6, 49:7, 50:6, 50:13, 50:14, 50:16, 51:5, 51:14, 51:15, 52:13, 53:3, 53:5, 54:10, 63:4, 63:14, 63:17, 64:5, 65:21, 70:4, 71:9, 78:13, 78:21, 78:22, 78:23 **State's** [1] - 71:15 **stated** [18] - 6:4, 8:16, 8:22, 8:24, 13:12, 18:24, 19:5, 19:6, 20:17, 20:20, 20:21, 21:10, 30:19, 31:23, 46:22, 47:3, 47:12, 68:17 **statement** [1] - 77:5 **statements** [1] - 79:8 states [3] - 25:16, 35:24, 40:8 States [1] - 76:25 stationed [1] - 10:16 **statue** [1] - 14:16 status [1] - 82:14 statute [49] - 7:1, 8:14, 9:23, 10:8, 10:14, 12:2, 13:12, 14:5, 14:9, 14:22, 15:17, 17:20, 18:17, 19:3, 19:8, 20:2, 20:14, 20:18, 21:9, 24:3, 26:5, 28:11, 31:15, 32:20, 32:23, 33:10, 33:15, 37:19, 39:24, 41:1, 46:24, 47:24, 48:20, 49:10, 52:24, 68:22, 69:1, 69:18, 69:22, 72:13, 72:24, 73:11, 74:10, 76:12, 78:10, 78:22, 78:24 **statutorily** [1] - 69:5 statutory [28] - 6:1, 6:24, 6:25, 7:11, 7:25,

8:3, 12:5, 12:20, 16:22, 17:16, 18:16, 19:9, 20:25, 26:7, 26:8, 27:10, 30:12, 31:4, 34:5, 38:16, 49:3, 67:15, 69:14, 70:11, 70:22, 71:3, 71:21, 74:15 **stay** [10] - 6:6, 6:17, 46:4, 48:10, 67:6, 80:1, 80:4, 80:11, 80:22, 81:2 **stayed** [1] - 5:25 **staying** [5] - 7:4, 50:6, 54:7, 57:14, 78.6 stenographic [1] -85:13 step [2] - 23:19, 83:24 steps [3] - 48:8, 72:25, 81:5 Stern [1] - 3:8 STERN [2] - 1:19, 3:7 still [4] - 28:17, 49:13, 63:25, 74:11 stockholder [3] -30:4, 30:8, 30:9 stores [1] - 43:2 **straddle** [1] - 20:8 straight [1] - 18:23 straightforward [3] -20:11, 21:9, 46:16 strand [1] - 39:12 STRAWN[1] - 2:8 Strawn [4] - 5:2, 5:4, 5:11, 5:13 Street [12] - 1:17, 8:25, 15:12, 15:13, 16:10, 19:8, 20:22, 22:9, 22:11, 47:4, 47:9, 49:7 stretch [1] - 60:10 strict [1] - 34:5 strictly [1] - 19:3 strip [1] - 30:13 strong [2] - 51:23, **strongly** [1] - 75:7 **struggle** [1] - 29:22 subject [1] - 56:9 submissions [1] -30:1 submit [1] - 5:20 subpoenas [1] -40:14 subsequent [2] -10:7, 72:13 substance [4] -55:13, 61:1, 79:20, -cb

83:7 substantial [13] -34:8, 34:11, 42:14, 50:7, 53:20, 55:6, 55:11, 58:24, 59:6, 59:13, 65:5, 74:20, 75.7 substantive [3] -7:19, 9:16, 11:5 **substitute** [1] - 84:11 successfully [1] -38:3 sue [2] - 13:22, 19:19 sued [2] - 31:8, 31:10 sues [1] - 78:25 sufficient [2] - 54:16, 78:13 suit [1] - 41:7 suitable [1] - 51:4 **Suite** [1] - 2:6 **summary** [1] - 61:14 summons [3] -48:24, 54:25, 61:12 Sundel [1] - 30:23 supersedes [1] -14:9 supervisory [2] -50:17, 75:13 supplemental [2] -51:9, 51:13 supplemented [1] -68:23 support [2] - 55:12, 58:8 supported [1] **suppose** [1] - 48:5 supposed [2] -16:13, 47:2 **SUPREME** [1] - 1:1 Supreme [5] - 24:1, 33:9, 48:21, 68:11, 72:21 **surprise** [1] - 7:23 susceptible [1] -58:2 swept [1] - 41:4 system [3] - 41:22, 78:14, 79:9 Т

talk [4] - 14:19, 15:1, 51:16, 81:5 **talking** [8] - 16:1, 46:3, 46:8, 47:23, 49:14, 49:25, 83:11, 83:17

tangled [1] - 34:15 target [2] - 7:22, 42:22 targeted [1] - 41:13 Tashenberg [8] -29:1, 29:10, 29:20, 29:24, 30:3, 30:20, 32:4, 32:5 task [1] - 47:15 Teams [1] - 1:10 technical [2] - 37:16, technicalities [1] -60:10 technicality [3] -9:15, 37:17, 60:23 technically [14] -15:16, 17:22, 34:13, 36:11, 36:18, 36:25, 37:3, 37:5, 37:8, 43:5, 43:6, 43:7, 44:11, 44:12 telling [1] - 41:1 temporal [1] - 48:25 ten [3] - 17:6, 66:14, 66:21 ten-minute [1] -66:14 tenable [1] - 64:25 Tennessee [1] -35.13 term [3] - 8:15, 37:9, 82:24 **TERM** [1] - 1:1 terminated [1] - 52:4 terms [5] - 12:1, 13:11, 14:7, 19:4, 80:5 terribly [1] - 38:10 terrorist [1] - 42:23 test [1] - 49:3 testified [1] - 35:9 testimony [1] - 35:7 **Texas** [2] - 35:2, 80:2 text [2] - 20:11, 38:17 textbook [1] - 57:8 textual [1] - 18:23 THE [98] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:3, 1:7, 1:16, 3:2, 3:11, 3:15, 3:19, 3:24, 4:3, 4:8, 4:16, 4:21, 4:24, 5:6, 5:9, 5:14, 7:14, 13:5, 13:14, 13:21, 14:3, 14:11. 15:1, 15:21, 15:25, 16:15, 17:10, 18:14, 19:25, 20:24, 21:3, 21:12, 22:13, 23:7,

23:12, 23:15, 23:16,

16

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

26:4, 27:13, 27:24, 28:10, 28:21, 29:5, 29:13, 29:16, 29:18, 30:25, 31:1, 31:24, 33:17, 33:19, 36:17, 37:3, 38:7, 38:20, 39:8, 39:15, 40:19, 41:21, 43:12, 44:22, 45:6, 45:13, 45:20, 46:2, 47:22, 49:9, 49:19, 49:22, 49:23, 49:24, 51:16, 55:19, 56:16, 56:18, 56:22, 57:17, 58:10, 58:17, 58:21, 59:8, 59:19, 61:21, 65:11, 66:10, 66:20, 66:25, 81:20, 82:17, 83:9, 83:24, 84:4, 84:13, 84:15, 84:24, 85:7 themselves [2] -41:16, 60:11 theory [1] - 51:9 thereby [1] - 24:14 therefore [4] - 14:16, 25:13, 30:8, 80:22 therein [2] - 8:22, 8:24 thereto [1] - 8:21 they've [1] - 22:21 third [1] - 82:13 Third [4] - 12:6, 12:23, 29:2, 44:9 thorny [1] - 65:1 three [1] - 10:11 three-fold [1] - 10:11 throw [1] - 19:18 throwing [1] - 13:1 time [19] - 15:17, 21:25, 24:9, 39:1, 46:11, 47:25, 48:23, 52:24, 56:3, 68:13, 70:17, 75:22, 76:3, 77:18, 77:21, 78:4, 79:20, 83:25 timeline [1] - 64:25 timing [1] - 78:3 tip [1] - 73:15 tips [1] - 75:7 title [1] - 16:6 today [10] - 3:6, 3:23, 4:11, 5:16, 5:18, 6:5, 67:14, 81:15, 82:6, today's [1] - 85:1 together [1] - 33:23 toggle [1] - 21:22 tomorrow [4] - 81:7, 81:17, 82:4, 82:23 took [5] - 6:5, 52:9,

52:22, 62:1, 72:24 tool [1] - 53:20 toward [1] - 39:19 towards [1] - 16:8 track [1] - 29:25 trails [1] - 77:14 transaction [2] -64:15, 74:24 transactions [2] -

34:19, 52:8 transcript [1] - 81:1 transcription [1] -85.13

transfer [6] - 7:1, 15:8, 45:15, 48:10, 67:6, 67:16

travel [2] - 34:21, 39:20

treat [10] - 13:17, 13:18, 31:7, 37:10, 37:22, 57:23, 60:16, 61:19, 61:21, 63:21 treated [1] - 27:21 treats [1] - 31:6 tremendous [1] -

71:12 trial [4] - 67:19, 67:22, 80:10, 82:7 tried [3] - 29:25, 39:7, 40:10

true [10] - 17:22, 18:10, 36:4, 37:20, 59:18, 60:1, 61:6, 70:24, 77:12, 85:12 **truth** [1] - 61:15 **try** [4] - 10:17, 47:20,

58:18, 58:20 trying [11] - 18:16, 23:3, 36:12, 37:4, 49:11, 51:17, 60:5, 60:11, 66:17, 73:13,

Turley [1] - 36:2 turn [9] - 7:3, 21:13, 23:8, 45:4, 57:18, 58:17, 59:2, 64:12, 67:21

81:21

turning [3] - 5:18, 54:4, 76:21 two [24] - 6:23, 12:15, 15:14, 16:7, 16:15, 17:15, 17:21, 18:5, 23:4, 23:22, 28:4, 28:15, 38:2,

40:18, 49:1, 55:20, 56:1, 56:6, 64:24, 65:17, 75:22, 76:2,

78:3, 84:3 type [2] - 55:3, 55:15 typed [1] - 47:7

types [1] - 30:7 typical [1] - 39:22 typically [2] - 39:19, 64.8 typo [1] - 77:16

typographical [1] -

37:14

U

ultimately [1] - 69:12 umbrage [1] - 79:7 umbrella [1] - 40:21 unavailing [1] -53:10 unconstitutional [1] unconstitutionally [2] - 41:13, 41:19 uncontested [1] -36:19 **Under** [1] - 23:25 under [49] - 6:14, 8:8, 9:6, 12:9, 15:16, 15:19, 19:7, 19:24, 22:7, 24:9, 26:24, 27:20, 30:16, 32:14, 37:11, 40:20, 41:4, 41:21, 43:10, 46:21, 46:23, 49:3, 50:10, 51:25, 52:2, 52:20, 54:16, 55:4, 56:7, 57:8, 61:6, 67:19, 68:2, 68:8, 68:22, 69:1, 69:18, 69:22, 70:21, 72:8, 73:10, 78:10, 78:23, 78:24, 80:2, 80:23, 83:10 undercut [1] - 55:23 underlying [4] -30:1, 52:8, 67:13, 74:24

undermine [2] -54:1, 55:23 understand [11] -14:2, 17:18, 18:20, 26:10, 28:10, 36:6, 36:22, 38:14, 39:21, 39:22, 60:9 understanding [2] -

60:7, 84:2 understatement [1] -

32:6 understood [1] -

81:6 undertaking [1] -

78:11 undisputed [2] -52:7, 67:25

undue [1] - 53:16 unfortunately [2] -15:23, 58:19 unintentionally [1] -60:25

unique [2] - 9:22, 41:8

United [1] - 76:25 unless [10] - 6:12, 12:20, 14:13, 17:8, 20:2, 41:23, 67:18, 68:3, 74:3, 75:7 unlike [1] - 30:16

unmute [1] - 81:23 unmuted [1] - 7:13 unnecessary [2] -53:11, 74:13

unprecedented [1] -59:16

unsupported [2] -51:8, 58:6 unsurprisingly [1] -

42:25 unusual [2] - 36:1, 46:11

up [11] - 15:7, 19:18, 27:17, 33:3, 40:17, 42:25, 44:24, 45:2, 47:10, 72:12, 72:24

upload [1] - 81:1 upset [2] - 50:12, 52:22

urge [1] - 19:21 urges [1] - 37:12 **US** [1] - 62:16

usually [1] - 5:24

value [2] - 26:9, 73:9 vanished [2] - 23:10, 49:14 variety [1] - 78:5

various [2] - 30:7, 67:5

vehicle [1] - 52:25 venue [71] - 6:24, 6:25, 7:11, 7:16, 8:5, 8:7, 9:2, 9:5, 9:7, 12:2, 12:6, 12:9, 12:10, 12:14, 13:1, 13:9, 13:12, 14:5, 14:13, 14:14, 14:17, 14:22, 18:17, 19:12,

19:20, 20:2, 20:7, 20:12, 20:13, 23:22,

23:23, 23:25, 25:1, 25:2, 25:3, 25:4, 25:12, 25:20, 27:9,

27:10, 27:20, 27:22, 27:25, 28:2, 28:3, 28:11, 28:23, 29:3, 30:12, 31:5, 32:17, 33:19, 38:17, 38:18, 42:17, 44:6, 44:12, 67:16, 67:17, 67:18, 68:2, 68:3, 68:5, 69:24, 70:12, 72:3, 72:7, 74:7, 74:10,

74:15 venued [3] - 8:12, 23:21, 28:16 venuing [1] - 9:13

verbatim [1] - 8:9 verification [22] -36:23, 37:15, 54:21, 55:1, 55:3, 55:9, 55:10, 57:21, 57:25, 58:3, 58:4, 58:7, 58:24, 59:20, 59:21, 59:22, 60:17, 60:21, 61:5, 77:4, 77:8,

verified [10] - 9:6, 9:13, 9:14, 11:14, 37:11, 54:23, 59:5, 59:12, 60:17, 61:20 verify [5] - 37:19, 59:17, 60:5, 60:7,

77:22

61:15 versus [1] - 65:12 vests [1] - 61:24

via [1] - 17:9 viable [1] - 14:25 video [4] - 3:25, 4:6, 58:17, 58:19

view [7] - 23:4, 32:16, 32:24, 36:7, 71:20, 77:16, 79:21

views [2] - 5:20, 79:8 vindicate [1] - 19:22 violate [1] - 58:24

violating [1] - 75:14 **violations** [2] - 54:3, 64:11

vis [2] - 63:11 vis-a-vis [1] - 63:11 vital [1] - 50:13 Vogel [1] - 59:2 volume [1] - 84:8

Virginia [1] - 69:5

W

waived [1] - 11:11 waiver [2] - 11:4, 11:8 walk [1] - 15:3

cb.

INDEX NO. 451625/2020

17

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 02/03/2021

wants [2] - 19:19,

warning [1] - 63:3 warrant [2] - 57:14,

78:17

watching [1] - 51:17 wave [2] - 35:24,

83:13

waving [1] - 66:12

Wayne [1] - 4:19 **WAYNE** [1] - 1:7

ways [1] - 76:4

weak [1] - 78:16

website [10] - 21:21,

21:25, 22:5, 22:13,

22:16, 23:6, 47:7, 48:7, 48:14, 49:7

weekend [1] - 61:2

weigh [2] - 35:24,

52:6 weighed [1] - 35:22

weighs [1] - 28:9

weight [4] - 71:13,

73:1, 77:2, 77:6 Werbner [2] - 5:3,

5:12

WERBNER [1] - 2:11 whatever [4] - 21:4,

59:22, 76:16, 79:8

whatsoever[1] -

63:8

wherever [1] - 27:6 whistleblower [1] -

White [1] - 78:8

white [3] - 8:17, 9:4,

46:16

WILLIAM [1] - 2:7

William [1] - 4:22

willing [1] - 61:2 **Wilson** [2] - 5:5, 5:13

WILSON [1] - 1:7

WINSTON [1] - 2:8 Winston [4] - 5:2,

5:4, 5:11, 5:13

within [4] - 16:21,

39:23, 70:9, 76:14

without [4] - 28:2,

32:8, 32:9, 32:11

witnesses [5] - 40:7,

52:7, 52:17, 75:1,

75:16

wonder [1] - 18:8

word [8] - 18:14, 18:18, 18:19, 49:10,

61:3, 61:9, 61:11,

65:13

words [7] - 14:3,

17:19, 36:17, 61:10,

70:11, 77:4, 77:15

worked [1] - 47:6 working [2] - 56:2,

84:17

works [2] - 84:7,

84:23

worse [1] - 63:23

would [78] - 6:11,

6:20, 6:24, 7:7, 7:23,

10:17, 11:8, 11:14,

13:4, 13:8, 13:12, 13:16, 13:17, 13:21,

14:17, 15:7, 17:7,

17:8, 19:12, 19:21, 21:7, 27:21, 27:22,

29:9, 30:14, 34:1,

34:11, 39:19, 40:1,

42:11, 43:13, 44:15,

44:17, 44:18, 44:19,

45:16, 47:8, 47:13,

47:17, 48:6, 51:22,

52:23, 53:11, 53:15,

53:22, 55:22, 56:4,

58:1, 58:14, 61:15, 61:23, 62:2, 62:4,

63:11, 63:21, 63:22,

64:7, 72:7, 74:3, 78:1,

79:2, 79:5, 79:20,

79:22, 81:9, 81:14,

81:15, 82:1, 82:3,

82:8, 82:9, 83:7,

83:12, 83:13, 83:22,

84:7, 84:11 written [2] - 67:8,

80:24

wrong [6] - 7:18,

7:20, 36:1, 54:22,

59:24, 60:6

Υ

year [3] - 29:10, 29:24, 38:9

years [10] - 10:7, 10:24, 14:20, 15:10,

17:7, 42:21, 47:19, 49:2, 66:7, 69:21

yesterday[1] - 5:22

YORK [5] - 1:1, 1:1,

1:3, 1:4, 1:16 York [114] - 1:11,

1:18, 1:22, 2:3, 2:6,

2:10, 3:14, 6:15, 8:2, 9:2, 9:8, 9:10, 9:23,

10:2, 10:13, 10:14,

10:20, 10:21, 10:24,

10:25, 11:12, 11:15, 11:19, 12:1, 12:2,

12:17, 13:2, 18:7,

19:21, 21:20, 21:23,

22:6, 22:9, 22:10,

22:12, 22:17, 22:24, 23:1, 23:2, 24:7, 24:14, 24:18, 24:20,

25:9, 25:12, 25:19, 25:24, 27:7, 27:9,

28:18, 34:14, 35:17,

35:19, 37:18, 38:11, 40:22, 42:19, 42:20,

42:24, 43:19, 43:22,

44:9, 47:9, 48:7,

48:16, 49:6, 50:8, 50:10, 50:13, 50:15,

50:17, 50:19, 50:21,

50:23, 51:4, 51:24, 52:13, 52:15, 53:3,

54:15, 63:4, 63:14,

63:17, 67:18, 68:1,

68:4, 69:6, 69:11, 71:9, 71:10, 72:3,

72:13, 72:15, 72:18,

73:2, 73:15, 74:3,

75:2, 75:6, 75:14, 75:15, 75:17, 75:19,

75:22, 78:21, 78:22,

78:23 **York's** [1] - 75:12

Younger [2] - 57:9,

62:15 yourself [1] - 81:24

Z

zero [1] - 18:6

cb-