Mary Igo - 5/21/12

	Dama 1		Demo
	Page 1		Page 3
	BEFORE THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE	1	INDEX
	AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BOARD	2	WITNESS PAGE
	OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA	3	Examination by Mr. Goldsmith 4
		4	Examination by Mr. Sigurdson 60
	In the Matter of the Republican	5	
	Party of Minnesota		
		8	
		9	
	Statement of MARY IGO, taken in the	10	
	above-entitled matter, pursuant to Notice, before Julie	11	
	A. Rixe, court reporter and notary public, at	12	
	Suite 190, 658 Cedar Street, in the City of St. Paul,	13	
	County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota, on the 21st day	14	
	of May, 2012, commencing at approximately 10:15 a.m.	15	
		16	
		17	
		18	
		19	
		20	
	* * *	21	
		22	
		23	
		24 25	
	Page 2	2.5	Page 4
-			
1	APPEARANCES:	1	MARY IGO,
2 3	GARY GOLDSMITH, Executive Director, and JEFFREY SIGURDSON, Assistant Executive Director,	2	after having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified on her oath as follows:
4	and JODY POPE, Management Analyst, Minnesota	4	MR. GOLDSMITH: My name is Gary
5	Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board,	5	Goldsmith. I'm with the Campaign Finance Board.
6	Centennial Office Building, Suite 190, 658 Cedar	6	And I'll also have the record reflect that Jeff
7	Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-1603, appeared	7	Sigurdson and Jody Pope from the Board are here
8	for and on behalf of the Minnesota Campaign	8	with us as well.
9	Finance and Public Disclosure Board.	9	EXAMINATION
10	JOHN H. GILMORE, Attorney at Law,	10	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
11	64 West Delos Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55107,	11	Q Thank you for being here. Good morning.
12	appeared for and on behalf of the Deponent.	12	As you know from receiving the
13		13	complaint, we did receive a complaint regarding
14		14	the relationships and transactions between the
15 16		15	Republican Party of Minnesota and a corporation
16 17		16	called Count Them All Properly, Inc., which we
17 18		17 18	from refer to sometimes for short as CTAP,
18 19		19	C-T-A-P. So if I say CTAP, that's what I'm talking about.
20		20	Will you provide your mailing address
20 21		21	and telephone number, please?
22	WHEREUPON, the following proceedings	22	A Sure. 165 Western Avenue North, St. Paul 55102.
23	were duly had and entered of record, to wit:	23	And phone number is 651-298-0000.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	24	Q Do you have any formal or informal role with the
24			Q Do you have any format or informat fore with the

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

		Page 5			Page 7
1	А	Just an activist.	1	ł	have a lot of eyes on the ballots and so on?
2	Q	No office or director or committee person or	2		(Indicating.)
3		anything like that?	3		MR. GILMORE: An observer?
4		MR. GILMORE: Do you mean now or	4		THE WITNESS: An observer, yes.
5		throughout	5	BY	MR. GOLDSMITH:
6	B	Y MR. GOLDSMITH:	6	Q	And you need to answer yes or no rather than nod,
7	Q	Well, let's start with now.	7		for the court reporter.
8	А	No.	8	А	Got it.
9	Q	I'll expand that, then. Have you in the past had	9	Q	When is the first time you heard about the concept
10		any formal role with the Republican Party of	10	(of some organization other than the Republican
11		Minnesota?	11	I	Party paying for the recount?
12	А	Officer and a BPOU.	12	Α	I think it was maybe Let's see. The election
13	Q	Nothing at the state party level?	13	V	was in 2010. It was probably the first part of
14	А	State credentials chair.	14	2	2011.
15	Q	Okay. How long have you been active in Republican	15	Q	And tell me how you heard about that concept.
16		politics in Minnesota?	16	А	I had a voicemail message that asked if my husband
17	А	Twenty years.	17	(or I would sit on the board.
18	Q	In connection with your activism, I presume you've	18	Q	And who was that message from?
19		come to know who Tony Sutton is?	19	А	Dan Puhl.
20	А	Yes.	20	Q	Did you call him back as a result of that
21	Q	How long have you known Tony Sutton?	21	v	voicemail message?
22	А	Ten years maybe. Time escapes me.	22	Α	Pat did.
23	Q	Sure. I'm just trying to get some general	23	Q	And Pat is your husband?
24		background, so we're not asking for specific dates	24	А	Yes.
25		or anything.	25	Q	Had you and Pat discussed the message before Pat
		Page 6			Page 8
		rage o			raye o
1	А		1	1	made the return call?
1 2	A Q	Awhile, yes.	1 2		
	Q	Awhile, yes.		А	made the return call?
2	Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes.	2	A Q	made the return call? Yes.
2 3	Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him?	2 3	A Q A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion.
2 3 4	Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes.	2 3 4	A Q A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national
2 3 4 5	Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was	2 3 4 5	A Q A t	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided
2 3 4 5 6	Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota.	2 3 4 5 6	A Q A t	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota.	2 3 4 5 6 7	A Q A t Q	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Q A t Q	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Q A U Q V	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Q A t Q V A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Q A Q V A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Q A Q V A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Q A Q V A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Q A Q V A Q V C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Q A Q V t A Q V t A V Q V t	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any discussions. Only I When asked to volunteer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the board?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any discussions. Only I When asked to volunteer. You volunteered in some way for the recount?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the board? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any discussions. Only I When asked to volunteer. You volunteered in some way for the recount? Yes. What were your duties going to be as a volunteer?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the board? Yes. Okay. What is the next contact you had from anyone about becoming a board member? The request to meet at Meritage for a board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any discussions. Only I When asked to volunteer. You volunteered in some way for the recount? Yes. What were your duties going to be as a volunteer? I was going to go to the recount area and witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A Q A Q C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the board? Yes. Okay. What is the next contact you had from anyone about becoming a board member? The request to meet at Meritage for a board meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q	Awhile, yes. Do you know Dan Puhl? Yes. How do you know him? Dan, first of all, was a neighbor and then was involved in the national convention, when it was here in Minnesota. Are you still neighbors? No. He moved to Washington, Virginia. As I said, we're going to be talking about this corporation that we call CTAP. When is the first timed you heard Well, let me back up one step. When is the first time you had a discussion with anybody about the fact that there might be a recount of the 2010 gubernatorial election? I read it in the paper before I had any discussions. Only I When asked to volunteer. You volunteered in some way for the recount? Yes. What were your duties going to be as a volunteer?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A Q A Q Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A	made the return call? Yes. Tell me about that discussion. At the time I was going to run for national committeewoman, so we talked about it and decided that I would sit on the board so I could put it on my resume. In the voicemail was there any more detail about what this corporation was or any more information than that they were looking for directors? I did not hear the voicemail. The report that I was given is they needed somebody to sit on this company that was going to be responsible for raising money for the recount debt. So did you make the call to Dan Puhl, then? Pat did. Pat did. To tell Dan that you would sit on the board? Yes. Okay. What is the next contact you had from anyone about becoming a board member? The request to meet at Meritage for a board

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 11
1	MR. GILMORE: M-E-R-I-T-A-G-E. It's on	1	the minutes. Was anyone else in attendance at
2	St. Peter. It's quite good.	2	that first meeting?
3	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	3	A Dan Puhl, Tom, myself and Fred Meyer.
4	Q Who made that request and how did you receive that	4	Q Fred?
5	request?	5	A Meyer, M-E-Y-E-R.
б	A I don't remember. I think somebody called, but	6	Q And who is Fred Meyer?
7	I'm not I think Dan probably called.	7	A He's another party activist, a long time.
8	Q Okay. And then the next event surrounding your	8	Q And so the four of you, then, who were at that
9	involvement with CTAP would have been attending	9	meeting consisted of the complete board of
10	that meeting or	10	directors at that time?
11	A Yes.	11	A Yes.
12	Q Do you know what the date of that meeting was or	12	Q There was a suggestion at that meeting that Tom
13	the approximate date?	13	Emmer be made the majority shareholder of Count
14	A I want to say it was February 11th, but I don't	14	Them All Properly, Inc. Did that ever occur?
15	know exactly. There should be minutes.	15	A No.
16	Q I have minutes from February 17th of 2011. Was	16	Q Who was in fact at that time, at this first
17	that	17	meeting, the shareholder?
18	A Does it say it's at Meritage?	18	A No one.
19	Q Yes, it does say it's at Meritage.	19	Q No one. Is there anyone a shareholder at this
20	A That was it.	20	time?
21	Q So up until this meeting, you didn't know very	21	A I understand I am.
22	much about Count Them All Properly. Tell me what	22	Q Okay. And do you understand how that came about?
23	you learned about the corporation at the first	23	A Yes. At the time that the taxes were to be filed,
24	board meeting.	24	they needed an owner. Since everything else was
25	A It was being set up to raise money to pay off the	25	under my name, I said I'm fine with that.
	Page 10		Page 12
1	recount debt, because it was after-election	1	Q Okay. Now, I notice I presume you're familiar
2	expense that the Party couldn't be responsible for	2	with these minutes. You might need to look at
3	or raise money for. I'm not sure exactly how it	2	88
		3	them. If you do want to look at them, let me
4	was worded.	3 4	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know.
4 5	was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party	4 5	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the
5 6	was worded.Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is	4 5 6	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one
5 6 7	was worded.Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying?	4 5 6 7	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means
5 6 7 8	was worded.Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying?A I didn't understand it, never asked.	4 5 6 7 8	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties
5 6 7 8 9	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and 	4 5 7 8 9	them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do?
5 6 7 8 9 10	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually 	4 5 7 8 9 10	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked about, and Tom Datwyler. Who is Tom Datwyler? 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder. THE WITNESS: They were presented to Tom
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked about, and Tom Datwyler. Who is Tom Datwyler? A Tom works for Dan Puhl at Cardinal FEC. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder. THE WITNESS: They were presented to Tom Emmer.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked about, and Tom Datwyler. Who is Tom Datwyler? A Tom works for Dan Puhl at Cardinal FEC. Q And does Tom work at the Minnesota office? 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder. THE WITNESS: They were presented to Tom Emmer. BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked about, and Tom Datwyler. Who is Tom Datwyler? A Tom works for Dan Puhl at Cardinal FEC. Q And does Tom work at the Minnesota office? A Yes. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder. THE WITNESS: They were presented to Tom Emmer. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q And next in line under payment was Bryan Cave. I
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 was worded. Q Okay. So you didn't understand why the Party itself couldn't undertake to pay this debt; is that what you're saying? A I didn't understand it, never asked. Q Okay. The minutes reflect election results and say, Mary Higle, board chair. Is that actually Mary Igo, board chair? A Yeah. I didn't catch that. Q There is no Mary Higle, H-I-G-L-E? A No. I'm sure Tom did not know how to spell my last name. Q So you were and have been the board chair since this first meeting? A Yes. Q Also at the meeting was Dan Puhl, who we've talked about, and Tom Datwyler. Who is Tom Datwyler? A Tom works for Dan Puhl at Cardinal FEC. Q And does Tom work at the Minnesota office? 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 them. If you do want to look at them, let me know. Apparently there was a discussion of the order in which bills would be paid, and number one was counties for copying. I presume this means the various photocopying of ballots that counties were asked to do? A Yes. Q And were any of the counties paid from CTAP funds? A No. Q Okay. Do you have anything more to add on that as to why not or how that came about, that they were paid first? A The bills were not presented, to my knowledge. They were presented to Tom Emmer. MR. GILMORE: You have to speak up a little bit louder. THE WITNESS: They were presented to Tom Emmer. BY MR. GOLDSMITH:

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13		Page 15
1	A I do not know the attorney's name that was from	1	come about giving CTAP this check for \$30,000?
2	Bryan Cave.	2	A No.
3	Q And then we have Trimble & Associates, which would	3	Q You just knew it was there; you didn't know how it
4	be Tony Trimble. I see that Eric Magnuson and his	4	got there?
5	law firm are not listed on this list.	5	A Initially I did not know it came from Cummins.
б	Were you aware that there were also	б	Q Okay.
7	attorney's fees from a third law firm?	7	A The account had \$30,000. I was trusting that it
8	A I was told there were three attorney's bills, and	8	was I had no idea where it came from.
9	I did not relate to who was with which company.	9	Q Up to this point, and I mean February 17th, was
10	Q Okay. And the last thing indicates that the	10	Dan Puhl essentially the person running CTAP, to
11	Well, the statement says, take recommendation from	11	the extent that anybody was running it?
12	RPM, parenthesis, and Tony Sutton on what to pay	12	A Yes.
13	with the cash on hand.	13	Q And maybe Tom Datwyler, since he worked for
14	At this first meeting, what was your	14	Mr. Puhl; do you know?
15	understanding of the relationship between CTAP and	15	A I think your comment about in the sense that
16	Tony Sutton or the Republican Party?	16	anybody was running it, it was Dan.
17	A My understanding was that the Party had nothing to	17	Q Do you know if this first meeting was Fred Meyer's
18	do with this and that the attorneys had made this	18	first exposure to CTAP, like your own?
19	recommendation.	19 20	A I think
20	Q The attorneys had made what recommendation?	20	MR. GILMORE: Do you mean does she know
21 22	A To open this company.	21	if he was aware of CTAP before this meeting?
22	Q Oh, okay. Do you know what attorneys specifically	22 23	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
23 24	might have made this recommendation?	23 24	Q Yeah. Let me rephrase that. Do you know if
24 25	A No. Only what I read in the paper.Q Okay. So we've covered, really, up through	24 25	Mr. Meyer came into this first meeting the same as
20		20	you did, having simply been asked to be a
	Page 14		Page 16
1	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of	1	director?
2	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat	2	director? A I don't know. He just showed up.
2 3	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no	2 3	director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are
2 3 4	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to	2 3 4	director?A I don't know. He just showed up.Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill
2 3 4 5	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with	2 3 4 5	director?A I don't know. He just showed up.Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury?
2 3 4 5 6	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6	director?A I don't know. He just showed up.Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury?A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct?A Right. I have to say it was one of the few	2 3 4 5 6 7	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct?A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct?A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct?A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have 	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000 that was in the account, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000 that was in the account, approximately 30,000? A Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Okay. BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000 that was in the account, approximately 30,000? A Yes. Q And that was the result of a single contribution 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Okay. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Even if you know what I'm going to say, you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000 that was in the account, approximately 30,000? A Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Okay. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Even if you know what I'm going to say, you have to wait until I finish.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 February 17, 2011, which was the first meeting of the corporation. You had a voicemail and Pat returned a phone call to Dan, but there were no e-mails or other communications prior to February 17th about CTAP or your relationship with CTAP; is that correct? A Right. I have to say it was one of the few meetings that I went to having no idea what the meeting was going to be about or what was going on with it. Q The minutes are fairly sparse. Did you have discussions at this first meeting about what was going to be expected of you personally, as far as what you were going to need to do? A We talked only about fund-raising and disbursing the existing funds. No, there was no other directives. Q Okay. Now, disbursing the existing funds, that would be the \$30,000 that was in the account, approximately 30,000? A Yes. Q And that was the result of a single contribution from Robert Cummins; is that correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 director? A I don't know. He just showed up. Q Now, the next minutes that you've provided are from a meeting on September 9, 2011 at Green Mill in Woodbury? A Yes. Q Was that the very next meeting of the corporation? A Yes, to my knowledge. Q None in between? A No. Q And the minutes show the four directors present, including Dan Puhl. Do you know if all four of the directors were physically present at that meeting at the Green Mill? A At the Green Mill, yes. Dan was in town. Q Was he living in the DC area by that A Yes, but he was here for a wedding. MR. GILMORE: You have to let him ask the question first. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Okay. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Even if you know what I'm going to say, you have to wait until I finish.

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

	Page 17		Page 19
1	September 9th meeting. I see this is where	1	Washington and would like to be replaced, the
2	apparently whoever had suggested that I'm	2	minutes say, as the legal officer. Was there more
3	sorry. Strike that.	3	to it than that? Was it just as the legal
4	This is where whoever had suggested that	4	officer, or what was the discussion about Dan Puhl
5	Tom Emmer be made the sole shareholder removed	5	moving?
6	that suggestion or withdrew that motion. Do you	6	A I'm not sure why they termed it legal officer
7	know who had suggested that?	7	because Dan was the contact person listed on the
8	A Dan Puhl.	8	document. Dan moved to Virginia because he took a
9	Q And there was a discussion about the payment and	9	position with the RNC as their CFO. So he felt
10	apparently how that should be treated. The	10	since he wasn't here, he should be off of it.
11	question is stated as, is this a capital	11	Q Okay. Does he still have that position?
12	contribution. The notation is that you will check	12	A He My understanding is he does not, but that's
13	with volunteer counsel about the treatment of this	13	rumor.
14	Bob Cummins payment. Who was the volunteer	14	Q And he still live in the DC area or has he
15	counsel that you might have checked with?	15	A Yes.
16	A Ed Matthews. Or did I ask him?	16	Q He has not returned
17	Q And did you check with volunteer counsel about how	17	A No.
18	that contribution might be handled?	18	Q You have to wait. He has not returned to
19	A No, I don't think so, because the same thing as	19	Minnesota?
20	with making Emmer shareholder. I knew enough that	20	A No.
21	you cannot assign a company ownership to someone	21	Q You were going to contact Mr. Matthews regarding
22	who knows nothing about it, nor could that	22	replacing Mr. Puhl. Was that Ed Matthews?
23	ownership be assigned to Bob Cummins without his	23	A Yes.
24	knowledge. So I think I maybe blew it off.	24	Q And I don't think I asked you this: Is he another
25	Q Because a capital contribution would be something	25	Republican activist, or how did you know him?
	Page 18		Page 20
1	like a shareholder putting money into the	1	A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress,
2	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?	2	A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney.
2 3	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It	2 3	A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney.Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue
2 3 4	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation.	2 3 4	A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney.Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that
2 3 4 5	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation.Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been	2 3 4 5	A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney.Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion?
2 3 4 5 6	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation.Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has	2 3 4 5 6	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting
2 3 4 5 6 7	like a shareholder putting money into the corporation?A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation.Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl A Dan Puhl. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican Party or with Tony Sutton on ways to get money
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl A Dan Puhl. Q who made the decision? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican Party or with Tony Sutton on ways to get money into CTAP?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl A Dan Puhl. Q who made the decision? A We had just directed that the money be paid or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican Party or with Tony Sutton on ways to get money into CTAP? MR. GILMORE: What do you mean, Gary, by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl A Dan Puhl. Q who made the decision? A We had just directed that the money be paid or could be paid after the copying. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican Party or with Tony Sutton on ways to get money into CTAP? MR. GILMORE: What do you mean, Gary, by working with?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 like a shareholder putting money into the corporation? A Yes. And it was not a capital contribution. It was, essentially, a donation. Q Okay. Now, by this time some payments have been made to the three law firms. In fact, \$9,000 has been paid to each of the three law firms. Do you know any of the details of what occurred between the February meeting and September meeting that caused those payments to be made to the law firms? A That was directed at the February meeting, to make to pay them what we could. Q Okay. A The fact that it was \$9,000 that was made to each one, I'm not sure who made that decision. Q Okay. Who would have authority to make that decision? A Probably the treasurer. Q So it could have been Dan Puhl A Dan Puhl. Q who made the decision? A We had just directed that the money be paid or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A He's our Republican activist, ran for Congress, and is an attorney. Q The minutes say you also discussed revenue generation ideas. Can you tell me about that discussion? A We talked about having a fund-raiser and inviting some of the large donors from that we were in contact with or had relationships with to try to resolve this debt. Q Was any decision made? A No. Q Did you ever have such a fund-raiser? A No. Q When you mentioned large donors that you were in contact with, do you mean large donors that the four on the board of directors knew about who might donate to a Republican cause or A Yes. Q Were you working in any way with the Republican Party or with Tony Sutton on ways to get money into CTAP? MR. GILMORE: What do you mean, Gary, by

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21		Page 23
1	Sutton or anybody at the Republican Party about	1	A Yes, when I saw the documents from Tom in
2	how to get money into CTAP?	2	preparation to get them to you.
3	A At that time? No.	3	Q Okay.
4	Q Up to and including September 9th.	4	A That was the first time I ever saw the bills.
5	A No.	5	Q So the whole process between the last meeting that
б	Q Okay.	б	you were at on I'm sorry, not the last the
7	A Can I tell you why we didn't have any?	7	meeting that you were at on February 17th, between
8	MR. GILMORE: No, the question is not	8	then and September 9th, when the bills by that
9	pending.	9	time had been paid, you were not involved with
10	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	10	that process; is that correct?
11	Q Well, it will be. Can you tell us why you didn't	11	A I'm not sure I would have to say no, I was not
12	have any discussions with Tony Sutton or anyone at	12	involved in that process. I did not see the
13	the RPM about how you might raise money for CTAP?	13	bills, had no contact with the attorneys. I know
14	A My understanding was the Party had no knowledge	14	Dan talked to the attorneys and I knew the
15	or of this company, of what was, you know,	15	payments were made.
16	going on within this company.	16	Q Okay. Now, there was at least an intention to
17	Q Okay. Do you know the date that CTAP was actually	17	have another meeting in November of 2011. That's
18	incorporated?	18	noted at the bottom of or near the end of the
19	A I believe, in looking at the documents, it was	19	September 9, 2011 minutes, that you would meet on
20	December 3rd. It's actually in that thick packet.	20	November 16th. Did that meeting occur?
21	Q That's correct.	21	A No.
22	MR. GILMORE: You mean the complaint?	22	Q Are we okay?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.	23	A Yeah, we're good, except my paper is stuck to my
24 25	BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q And the election was November 2nd?	24 25	cough drop. Q Let's move on to what I'll ask you if this was,
20	Page 22	2.5	Page 24
1	A It could have been.	1	then, the next meeting in chronological order,
1		Ŧ	
.,	() ()kay What I'm struck with with respect to your	2	
2	Q Okay. What I'm struck with with respect to your	2 3	which would be February 10, 2012?
3	comment about the Republican Party having no	3	which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the
3 4	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount	3 4	which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again?
3 4 5	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest,	3 4 5	which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
3 4 5 6	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when	3 4	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012.
3 4 5 6 7	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being	3 4 5 6	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would 	3 4 5 6 7 8	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the
3 4 5 6 7	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being	3 4 5 6 7	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time,
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill 	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were you aware that they were advised 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think that was early December. I'd have to look at
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were you aware that they were advised THE WITNESS: No. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think that was early December. I'd have to look at those papers that I filed. I filed them from
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were you aware that they were advised THE WITNESS: No. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think that was early December. I'd have to look at those papers that I filed. I filed them from Boulder. And so he was no longer part of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were you aware that they were advised THE WITNESS: No. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q You know that CTAP, at some point, received bills 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think that was early December. I'd have to look at those papers that I filed. I filed them from Boulder. And so he was no longer part of the board, but had not his resignation had not been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 comment about the Republican Party having no knowledge of CTAP is that from the day the recount activities started, which were, at the latest, November 3rd, at least through December 3rd, when CTAP was incorporated, attorney's fees were being accrued and CTAP didn't even exist. So it would seem that the Republican Party would have known about those attorney's fees, at least. MR. GILMORE: There's no question. There's no question. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Are you aware of the fact that the Republican Party actually advised the three law firms at a later point to reissue invoices in the name of CTAP? A I know that the bill MR. GILMORE: Answer the question. Were you aware that they were advised THE WITNESS: No. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 which would be February 10, 2012? MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. What was the date again? BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q February 10, 2012. A Yes. Q So that would be the third meeting of the corporation. The corporation, up to that time, had only those three meetings? A Formal meetings, yes. Q Were there informal meetings? A No. There are e-mails. Q Right, okay. And I see that the minutes say Dan Puhl is attending as a guest of the chairwoman. Can you explain why it's written that way, what that meant? A Dan was on Skype. Dan had been removed from the legal representative or whatever it was. I think that was early December. I'd have to look at those papers that I filed. I filed them from Boulder. And so he was no longer part of the

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

	Page 25		Page 27
1	Q His formal resignation as a board member had not	1	refreshed why it was here.
2	been received?	2	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
3	A Yes.	3	Q Okay.
4	Q So he had been removed as the agent and as an	4	A I need to go back and clarify something, because I
5	officer of the corporation, but technically was	5	think September 17th you asked me if I had talked
6	still a board member?	б	to Tony. I do not remember when the Midwest
7	A He was removed is the agent. He was no longer on	7	Leadership Conference was, and right before the
8	the board. Yeah, I guess so.	8	Midwest Leadership Conference I did ask Tony if
9	Q It's more of a legal question, so I won't ask you	9	the Party was going to be able to pay any of this
10	to try to get to the details of that.	10	debt or pay CTAP money. And Tony told me that he
11	There were about 15 minutes of	11	anticipated that there would be money from the
12	discussion, according to the minutes, going from	12	Midwest Leadership meeting that could be given to
13	about 1:05 to 1:20. I'd like to ask you to recall	13	CTAP to pay this debt.
14	the discussion. This is back just February of	14	MR. GILMORE: We should probably use
15	this year.	15	Sutton and Trimble, since both of them are named
16	The first point of discussion was the	16	Tony. I have a feeling both of those names will
17	purpose of the committee to finance Tom Emmer's	17	come up frequently.
18	2000 (sic) recount election. It seems that that	18	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
19	had been discussed at the very first meeting as	19	Q Staff will understand, but, for the record, it
20	well. Can you tell me what the discussion was at	20	might be better to talk about Tony Sutton and Tony
21	the February 2012 meeting?	21	Trimble.
22	A Could you read that to me again?	22	A Okay. I've never met Tony Trimble.
23	Q Sure. I'll be asking about the three items I've	23 24	Q Do you remember, was there any conclusion reached
24	marked.	∠4 25	about whether the corporation should be shut down in some way at this masting of Fahrwary 10th 2
25	MR. GILMORE: Thank you.	25	in some way at this meeting of February 10th?
	Page 26		Page 28
1	THE WITNESS: This was in February. It	1	MR. GILMORE: He means by the board.
2	was after the state central meeting in December.	2	THE WITNESS: By our board?
3	It was after Tony's resignation.	3	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
4	And I think I had been bombarded with	4	Q Yes.
5	questions at state central meeting. And so I	5	A No, there was not.
6	wanted to go back again and just reiterate why we	6	Q And I also see there was some discussion or at
7	were doing this or of, based on the discussion	7	least a mention of possible ways of settling the
8	that had occurred in December in the paper, had	8	debt with the three law firms. Do you remember
9	sort of negated the purpose of this company, which	9	any conversation about that topic?
10	gets to the possible guarantees that Tony made.	10	A That was a question of mine, of should we contact
11	And apparently there was a letter that	11 12	the attorneys and see if there was a settlement
12 13	was signed by Tony that Tony Trimble had put	12 13	amount that could be made. Because it was
13	together. And, no, I didn't see that, nor had any knowledge of it. So that was sort of it. It was	13	certainly far after the election, and no one was going to donate at this time to something like
$14 \\ 15$	like, is there any purpose to this anymore or	$14 \\ 15$	that. That was the discussion.
16	should we just close the company, et cetera.	16	Q Did any of the other board members have comments
17	And the discussion that occurred, and	17	on that question?
18	I'm sure that this statement was made by Dan, no	18	A No, not that I can remember.
19	jurisdiction over non-federal debt. And to tell	19	Q Do you know who drafted the bylaws for the
20	you the truth, the way that's worded, I have no	20	corporation?
21	idea what that means. But the further discussion	21	A Dan Puhl.
22	was this post-election non-federal recount. It	22	Q Now I'm going to turn to the group of e-mails that
23	was a state election. It was post-election I	23	your attorney has provided to me. And first I
24	mean, yeah, post-election. It was not campaign	24	just wanted to ask a general question so that I
25	and election related. And so that, again, sort of	25	can understand them better. I've noticed
			7 (Dagog 25 to 28)

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29		Page 31
1	throughout the e-mails that there will be places	1	it existed.
2	where in brackets it says, quoted text hidden. Is	2	Q Okay. I've marked the e-mails in I think
3	that something that you trigger in the e-mail, or	3	chronological order, at least by the first date
4	what does that mean?	4	that's on each one, which I realize a lot of them
5	MR. GILMORE: If I could jump in for a	5	are a trail-out over several days, but there were
6	minute, Mr. Goldsmith. That's a function of	6	a few things that I wanted to ask you to clarify.
7	G-mail and is part of that nesting properties that	7	And let me just start with something you
8	I referenced. And when you expand, it either has	8	just said. You said you were instructed to talk
9	additional data of the e-mail itself or it	9	to Pat Shortridge about the complaint. Was that
10	replicates what already is shown just below.	10	an instruction of your board of directors, or who
11	And so on a couple of the e-mails We	11	instructed you to do that?
12	expanded one to I think nine pages to show that.	12	A The board. It might have been Dan Puhl. I thin
13	If there's anything that you want expanded, we'll	13	there's an e-mail where Dan says he had talked to
14	be happy to go back and do that, but I checked	14	an attorney and that I should be in contact with
15	myself for that. It looks like it's occluding the	15	Pat Shortridge.
16	information, when in fact it's not. The text of	16	Q Now, you've given me a lot of e-mails, the oldes
17	each of those e-mails is subsequently laid out.	17	of which is September 14th of 2011. Does that
18	MR. GOLDSMITH: All right. That's what	18	mean that there were no e-mails prior to that time
19	I thought. There may be a couple that I will ask	19	relating in any way to CTAP or just that you don'
20	you later to expand just to make sure we have	20	have them anymore?
21	everything.	21	A That's an interesting question. I don't have
22	MR. GILMORE: Sure, happy to do so.	22	any. Those are the only ones I have. I have
23	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	23	searched in every which way.
24	Q I can see in the group of these e-mails that it	24	Q I don't mean to suggest that there are more.
25	looks like towards the very end there's an	25	Actually, the first one is sending you the minutes
			Terrainity, are more to be thank you are minutes
	Page 30		Page 32
1	Page 30	1	Page 32
1	indication that you forwarded them to your	1	from September 9th, which was only your second
2	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?	2	from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between
2 3	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.	2 3	from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there.
2 3 4	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms	2 3 4	from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there.A There wasn't.
2 3 4 5	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it	2 3 4 5	from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there.A There wasn't.Q There wasn't?
2 3 4 5 6	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near	2 3 4 5 6	from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there.A There wasn't.Q There wasn't?A (Indicating.)
2 3 4 5 6 7	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that?	2 3 4 5 6 7	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct?A Yes.Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that?A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was not string to the provide the string to help the board.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was not willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed said he did not want to be part of the board, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, then, of both you and the Party responding to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was no willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed said he did not want to be part of the board, but he would come and talk with us if there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, then, of both you and the Party responding to the Board's complaint or the complaint that the Board 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was now willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed said he did not want to be part of the board, but he would come and talk with us if there were issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, then, of both you and the Party responding to the Board's complaint or the complaint that the Board was investigating. Mike Vekich was not involved 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was now willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed said he did not want to be part of the board, but he would come and talk with us if there were issues. Q Sure, okay. It also notes that you're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 indication that you forwarded them to your attorney as part of this process; is that correct? A Yes. Q I also notice, and I'll cover it in general terms rather than individually, that on many of them it looks like they were forwarded to Mike Vekich near the end of February. Can you explain that? A Mike Vekich was researching the Party debt, and I was instructed to talk to Pat Shortridge about where the Party was at with the letter by the Board. And when I talked to Pat Shortridge, he suggested that I talk to Mike Vekich. And Mike called me and we went over sort of this superficial history. And the ones that were relevant with some stuff in it, part of the conversation that he and I had, like the e-mails from Tony Trimble, I forwarded to him by his request. Q So just so I'm clear, this was in the context, then, of both you and the Party responding to the Board's complaint or the complaint that the Board was investigating. Mike Vekich was not involved in the operation of CTAP or recommending how CTAP 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 from September 9th, which was only your second meeting, so there may not have been in between there. A There wasn't. Q There wasn't? A (Indicating.) Q In this string of e-mails, starting with the one, September 14th at 8:37 a.m., a little ways down in the string is one from you to Thomas Datwyler in which you indicate that you had talked to Ed Matthews and he's willing to be on the board. Did Ed Matthews ever join the board? A No. He was willing to help the board. He was not willing to be on the board. Q Okay. So this statement here, I've highlighted it in green. On the previous page you can see it's from you to, I think, Dan. A Yeah. It was inappropriate wording, because Ed said he did not want to be part of the board, but he would come and talk with us if there were issues. Q Sure, okay. It also notes that you're going to meet him on a subsequent Monday evening, and he

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

	Page 33			Page 35
1	A Yes, it did. And that's why that says that,	1		tell him what the future of CTAP might be?
2	because when I called Ed and asked him if he would	2	А	
3	be interested to be on the board, he said yes.	3		was going to be very difficult to raise money. I
4	Then when we met on Monday night, he was having	4		may have told them told him Timing-wise I
5	some personal issues and didn't want to get	5		don't remember if I told him about the
6	involved in anything, but he said he would help if	6		fund-raising that we were talking about before, in
7	he could.	7		the minutes, that we were going to hold a coffee,
8	Q And you mention you have a list of questions that	8		\$10,000 apiece, to try to get this paid off. I'm
9	he had and you were going to get answers. Did you	9		not sure if I told him that that was the
10	write out answers to those questions?	10		discussion. I said I did not know how we were
11	A No. My questions were primarily about me, what	11		going to raise the funds to get this paid off.
12	was my personal risk with getting involved in	12	Q	We talked to Mr. Emmer, of course, and he relates
13	this. The other had to do with clarification of	13		to us your conversation at the Midwest Leadership
14	that question you asked before, of whether Tom	14		Conference. He says that when you referred to
15	Emmer or Bob Cummins could be owners of the	15		CTAP, you referred to it as the company Tony set
16	company.	16		up for the recount. Does that sound like how you
17	Q In preparing Or in considering the question	17		would have referred to CTAP?
18	about whether Bob Cummins could be an owner of the	18	A	I would have said the company Dan set up, I don't
19	company, did you then, at that time, go and talk	19		think Tony, although my understanding was I
20	to anybody else about the Cummins contribution?	20		that Tony and Dan and the attorneys had discussed
21	A No.	21		this. You know, I can remember that day. I can
22	Q It's my understanding that during 2011, you made	22		remember where I was when I was talking to him,
23	efforts to reach Tom Emmer to talk to him about	23		and it was a little bit chaotic. He was not
24	the corporation. Can you describe those efforts	24 25		anxious to talk to me. I may have been nervous
25	to reach Mr. Emmer?	25		and said that. I don't remember.
	Page 34			Page 36
1	MR. GILMORE: First of all, is that	1	Q	
2	true?	2		that conversation, just to be clear, the Tony
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.	3		we're talking about is Tony Sutton?
4	MR. GILMORE: Okay.	4		Yes.
5	THE WITNESS: I e-mailed him. No, I didn't e-mail him. I called him and I e-mailed	5 6	Q	
6 7	his wife through Facebook and said, Jackie, can	7		Leadership Conference, he also relates that you told him that you were considering filing
8	you get him to call me back. And he didn't call	8		bankruptcy for CTAP and that you wanted him to
9	and didn't call.	9		know about that. Do you recall telling him that?
10	Then I ran into him at the Midwest	10	۸	
11	Then I fan into inn at the windwest			I fold him I don't remember I may have I
	Leadership Conference and said I need to talk		A	······································
	Leadership Conference and said, I need to talk with you about this company. And he said he knew	11	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that
12	with you about this company. And he said he knew	11 12	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and
12 13	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he	11 12 13	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And
12 13 14	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay	11 12 13 14	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there,
12 13 14 15	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that	11 12 13	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay
12 13 14	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay	11 12 13 14 15	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare
12 13 14 15 16	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located.	11 12 13 14 15 16	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that.
12 13 14 15 16 17	 with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Did that surprise you, that he said he raised 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that. All of that was a little bit strange to me. I
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Did that surprise you, that he said he raised significant money to pay off the debt? 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that. All of that was a little bit strange to me. I mean, you know, how you do that or how it
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Did that surprise you, that he said he raised significant money to pay off the debt? A Yes. 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q	may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that. All of that was a little bit strange to me. I mean, you know, how you do that or how it processes was a little bit weird to me. So I may have said that.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Did that surprise you, that he said he raised significant money to pay off the debt? A Yes. Q Did he ask you if CTAP had received any of that money? A No. He really did not want to talk to me. 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that. All of that was a little bit strange to me. I mean, you know, how you do that or how it processes was a little bit weird to me. So I may have said that. Okay. As long as we're talking about your conversations with Mr. Emmer, we might as well
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 with you about this company. And he said he knew nothing about it at that time and that he really he had raised significant money to pay off the debt, and that he didn't know where that money had been located or was located. BY MR. GOLDSMITH: Q Did that surprise you, that he said he raised significant money to pay off the debt? A Yes. Q Did he ask you if CTAP had received any of that money? 	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		may have said that It went back, again, to that fact of him being the owner of the company and then trying to assign that ownership to him. And I may have said that if bankruptcy was there, because I did not know how we were going to pay off that. If we closed company, did that declare bankruptcy. I may have said something like that. All of that was a little bit strange to me. I mean, you know, how you do that or how it processes was a little bit weird to me. So I may have said that. Okay. As long as we're talking about your

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37		Page 39
1	the Midwest Leadership Conference was the State	1	going to ask you some questions about the next one
2	central committee meeting and that you saw him	2	down, which was a little later, 10:42. And I'll
3	again at the state central committee meeting. He	3	give you a little or what time you need to read
4	was there in the morning helping with his	4	through that first.
5	congressional district registration, is what he	5	A Okay.
6	terms us, at least.	6	Q The second sentence of that e-mail says, when all
7	A He was. He was sitting at the table.	7	this broke I had been asked to hold until the
8	Q Okay. Did you have a conversation with him?	8	Party clears up Tony Trimble's breach of
9	A I said, Tom, you haven't called me back. I said,	9	attorney-client.
10	specifically, should I call you on Wednesday	10	Who asked you to hold any action at that
11	morning, when you're on the way home, in order to	11	point?
12	get your attention.	12	A Dan. No. Wait a minute. December 8th I was
13	Q What	13	asked by Kelly Fenton.
14	MR. GILMORE: Can I ask a question?	14	Q That name is familiar to me, but refresh my
15	Mary, when you're saying this, are you	15	A She was elected deputy chair on December 3rd and
16	referring There were two state central meetings	16	then subsequently had taken over as Party chair
17	in December. One was on December 3rd What	17	MR. GILMORE: Temporary.
18	didn't happen to the Republican Party in December	18	THE WITNESS: temporary, but was in
19	of 2011? December 3rd and December 31st.	19	chaos and just said, please don't do anything, I
20	THE WITNESS: It would have been the	20	don't know what's happening sort of thing.
21	December 3rd meeting.	21	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
22	MR. GILMORE: Okay.	22 23	Q This was right after Tony Sutton had resigned,
23 24	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	23 24	then? A Yes.
24 25	Q I didn't know there were two meetings.A December 31st I quickly left.	24 25	Q It sounds like you were already regretting or
J		2.5	
	Page 38		Page 40
1	Q So you mentioned he hadn't called you. What was	1	maybe had been for some time regretting getting
2	his response to that?	2	involved in CTAP; is that a fair statement?
3	A He told me he had nothing to talk about with this	3	A Yes. I was
4 5	company. He didn't know anything about it. It had been set up without his knowledge.	4 5	MR. GILMORE: There's no question. THE WITNESS: bombarded.
6	Q Did you, again, talk about the potential for	6	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
7	either bankruptcy or shutting down the company or	7	Q She can comment if she'd like to.
8	anything like that?	8	A I was just bombarded with questions about this.
9	A I told him we may have to shut the company down,	9	MR. GILMORE: You mean at state
10	because, again, I would have reiterated that I	10	central?
11	don't know where the money is coming from.	11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	Q Sure. Now I'm looking at a Thursday, November 10,	12	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
13	2011 e-mail from yourself to the other directors.	13	Q I think there's an e-mail about that as well.
14	You mention you have not gotten any return calls	14	Let's just move on a bit. I'm going to
15	from Tom. Would that be Tom Emmer that you're	15	ask Actually, I'm looking at one. I don't have
16	talking about?	16	specific questions about it, except I had a note
17	A Yes.	17	on another December 8th one where there's an
18	MR. GOLDSMITH: John, do you have some	18	indication that it's to Mike Vekich on
19	of these? Do you have the one that's Thursday,	19	February 27th. That was just part of the package
20	December 8, 2011?	20	where you sent him all the e-mails?
21	MR. GILMORE: This one (indicating)?	21	A Yeah. And I'm not sure if I did them all on the
22	MR. GOLDSMITH: Yes.	22	same day. I know when I was on the phone with
23	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	23	him, I couldn't find everything I was looking
24 25	Q Giving you an e-mail series that starts on	24 25	for. So I may have done it the next day or
25	Thursday, December 8, 2011 at 10:09, I'm actually	25	something. I don't know. I was anxious to let

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

		Page 41			Page 43
1		Mike Vekich know because I didn't want to be the	1		the extent of my discussion. I did not talk to
2		only one that knew anything.	2		Dan anything other than e-mail. Didn't talk to
3	Q	Knew anything about what?	3		him on the phone, except I called him. Saturday
4		Count Them All Properly. I felt like I was	4		morning I found Tony Sutton had resigned and asked
5		sitting in a vacuum.	5		him if he was aware of that.
6	Q	•		Q	Okay. I see an e-mail in February of 2012 about
7		Tony Sutton or others at the RPM to keep them up	7		changing you to the owner of the corporation. Is
8		to date about CTAP?	8		that the change that you mentioned that was
9	Α	I don't know that. Not to my knowledge.	9		required for tax filing purposes?
10	Q	Move forward a little bit now to February 3rd.	10	А	Yes.
11		This is after the complaint had been received by	11	Q	And did Tom Datwyler take care of that or was it
12		the Board and was accepted by the Board. And we	12		just something you did on the tax form, or how was
13		had sent letters out to at that point, I think,	13		that accomplished?
14		Dan and the Republican Party. I don't think you	14	А	It was done on the tax form and nothing was filed
15		were involved at that point.	15		with the Secretary of State. It was just I had to
16		No.	16		sign the tax return.
17	Q		17	Q	
18		other board members, indicating that he is going	18		discussion, an e-mail discussion about whether you
19		to give the Republican Party's lawyer as much	19		should actually file something with the Secretary
20		information as he can. And he suggests that you	20		of State's office to indicate that you were the
21		keep in contact with Pat Shortridge to get	21		sole shareholder. And apparently the conclusion
22		updates. Do you remember that e-mail?	22		was made at least at that time not to file
23	A		23		anything. Do you recall that?
24	Q		24	A	Yes. And that was 'cuz we didn't know what we
25		the CTAP group and the Republican Party group	25		were going to do with the company.
		Page 42			Page 44
1		around that time?	1	Q	
2	Α	It had to do with the letter that Tony Sutton had	2		send out to the other board members and at this
3		signed from Tony Trimble and where this company	3		point it's still going to Dan Puhl that, let's
4		fit with the Republican Party.	4		just sit on it; I talked with Jeff Johnson and
5	Q		5		we'll meet with Mike Vekich this Friday.
6		this company fit with the Republican Party as a	6		So what prompted the discussion or the
7		result of these discussions, if there were any	7		telephone call to Jeff Johnson? Was it a
8		discussions?	8		telephone call?
9	Α	Well, the only discussion I had with Pat	9	A	No. It was I ran into him at an Elephant Club
10		Shortridge was to call him and say did we need to	10		breakfast. And Dan said we probably need to He
11		meet. And he said he wanted me to talk to Mike	11		said, you probably I said I had talked to Pat
12		Vekich. So then I contacted Mike Vekich and we	12		Shortridge and Pat had directed me to Mike Vekich,
13		scheduled a phone call. But, no, I did not. This	13	0	and Jeff confirmed that.
14 15	0	company just seemed to be out there.	14 15	Q	5
	Q	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	15 16	٨	should go ahead Yeah.
16 17		has been filed, the Board is investigating. Up to	10	A Q	and meet with Mike?
18		that point in time, at any time did you have any further discussions with Dan Puhl about just how	18	Q A	Yeah.
10 19		this company came into existence and who might	19	А 0	And I know you said you had a phone call. Did you
20		have thought to do this?	20	Y	actually meet with Mike Vekich?
20	Δ	No, I didn't, not about No, not about that.	21	А	
22	17	I Over whatever the year and however many	22	Q	
23		months, I really just that's why I asked those	23	X	phone call?
24		questions again at the board meeting, because it	24	А	When the company was opened, what my involvement
25		seemed like it had no purpose. And, no, that was	25		was, what I understood the company was there for,
			-		,, with a second and company was alore 101,

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

1 what we had paid. He would be a great poker 1 Mr. Schroeder's being listed as CEO. 2 partner because he didn't - he acted like he 2 A I don't know anything about Mr. Schroeder. And, 4 didn't know and all adout he complaint mat ba 2 A I don't know anything about Mr. Schroeder. And, 4 didn't he was tagging interest on it. That was 6 7 Forwarded me the article from Blue Stream or 5 pretry much. I. Theme. I told kin Dun had 7 7 7 7 10 some of that suff too. 10 7 7 7 7 7 11 Q Qoxy. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 10 10 7 11 10 11		Page 45			Page 47
2 partner because he didnt - he acted like he 2 A I don't know ani dut, may thing about the complaint that Dan 4 Puhl had responded to. We had some superficial 3 actually, the first time 1 became aware of it was 5 discussion about Tony Trimble's bill and the fact 5 THE WITNESS: John, I think you 6 for that he was tagging interst on it. That was 6 Three WITNESS: Blue Stem Prairie. 7 pretry much it. I mean, I told him Dan had 7 7 9 nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded me he article from Blue Stream or something in Southern Minnesota that listed those 7 11 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 10 7 12 what the Party would like CTAP's position or 11 14 A He said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 14 A fe said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 14 14 14 A fe said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 <td>1</td> <td>what we had paid. He would be a great poker</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>Mr. Schroeder's being listed as CEO.</td>	1	what we had paid. He would be a great poker	1		Mr. Schroeder's being listed as CEO.
3 didn't know at all about the complaint that Dan 3 actually, the first time 1 became aware of it was 4 Publ had responded to. We had some superficial 4 5 discussion about Tony Trimble's bill and the fact 5 6 pretty much it. Imaan, Itodb lim Dan had 7 7 protty much it. Imaan, Itodb lim Dan had 7 8 responded to that complaint and we had heard 7 9 nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded him 9 10 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 11 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 12 what the Party would like CTAPs position or 12 13 approach to he? 13 14 A He said it dossn't cally make any difference, you 14 15 can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at 15 16 one opin there was some concern about the 15 17 waidi (in than the finage any 16 18 stay - the validity of the letter that Tony 18 18 stay - the validity of the letter that Tony 18 18 stay in play. An				А	
4Publ had responded to. We had some superficial4when $\frac{1}{2}$ 5discussion about Tony Trimble's bill and the fact5THE WITNESS: John, I think you6that he was tagging interest on it. That was6forwarded me the article from Blue Stream or7pretty much it. I mean, I told him Dan had7forwarded me the article from Blue Stream or9some of that suff too.10711Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to11712what the Party would like CTAP's position or121413approach to be?131414A He said it doesn't really make any difference, you141415can do whar you want do. And I said, well, at1416one point there was some concern about the1617validity of the letter that Tony1818email steam vers off in chow, logical order to1421id din't hant or it didn't make things any2122better.2223Q Okay. If m going to ver off now, just because the214email steam vers off in chronological order to244This is he fact that a couple of other262Carify what details we can figure out about it.233And I know you've been trying to figure it out354the dave right here. As of December 20th, 2011.355records as the CEO of Court Them All Properly.366people became named in the Secretary				••	
5discussion about Tony Trimble's hill and the fact that he was tagging interest on it. That was responded to that complaint and we had heard nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded him some of that stuff too.5THE WITNESS: Idon, I think you forwarded me the article from Blue Stream or something in Southern Minnesota that listed those two.10orkay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to approach to be?11Ithick we have and be didn't.13approach to be?12I had changed the legal representative, I had changed the legal representative, I had changed the legal representative, I believe it was like December something. And at that that time the Secretary of State's website thad notation on there of, how do you like our new format; you can now see the CEO and other people to point ther was some concern about the 1617validity of the letter and whether we should 1 it didn't hurt or it didn't make things any 201721to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 232024Co Kay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 34335And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, 920Fraley was on thre. 2536Gorege Fraley was on thre. 262047This is the fact that a couple of other 45548And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, 9344Too.Fraley		1			-
6 that he was tagging interest on it. That was 6 forwarded me the article from Blue Stream or 8 responded to that complaint and we had heard 7 some of that suff too. 9 nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded him 9 8 meson, It dol him Stope optiming more. And so that's when I forwarded me the articles. Blue Steem Prairie. And the Party would like CTAP's position or 10 11 Q Okay. Did Mr, Vekich give you any advice as to 10 10 12 what the Party would like CTAP's position or 12 he knew those names. I asked Dan if he knew those names. I asked Dan if he scretary of State's website had a notation on there of, how do you like our new format; you couldn't see 11 he knew those names. I asked Dan if he scretary of State's website had a notation on there of, how do you like our new format; you couldn't see 1 he knew those website had a notation on there of, how do you like our new format; you couldn't see 1 he staid it didn't mater, but 20 ever listed. And so then I went back and saw that Gorage called me maybe about a week after he received Tony Timble bad sort of scems 23 Q Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the people in the sceretary of State's office her adding mater. 24 And George called me naybe about a week after he received Tony Timble bad sort of scems 25 So George told his atormey he would call me directly. And he sai					
7 pretty much iii Timean, I told him Dan had 7 something in Southern Minnesota that listed those 8 responded to that complaint and we had heard 9 9 nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded him 9 10 go Kay. Did MY. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 11 quextore in the was some concern about the 10 12 what the Party would like CTAP's position or 12 13 approach to be? 14 14 A He said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 15 can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at 15 16 one poin there was some concern about the 16 17 validity of the letter and whether we should 17 18 stay - het validity of the letter that Tony 18 19 Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should 19 10 Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 20 22 Q Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 20 23 Q Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 21 4 e-mail stream veers off in chronoligical order to 23					-
8 responded to that complaint and we had heard nothing more. And so that's when I forwarded him 9 10 some of that stuff too. 10 11 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 12 what the Party would like CTAP's position or 12 13 approach to be? 11 14 A He said i doesn't really make any difference, you 14 15 can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at 15 16 one point there was some concern about the 16 17 validity of the letter that Tony 18 18 stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but 10 19 Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should 17 19 mail stream vers off in chronological order to 22 24 e-mail stream vers off in chronological order to 24 4 e-mail stream vers off in chronological order to 24 4 to be unrelated, but my Board has aked me to 1 14 to be unrelated, but my Board has aked me to 1 14 to be unrelated, but my Board has aked that a couple of other 5 15 This is the f					
9nohing more. And so that's when I forwarded him some of that stuff too.9MR. CIL.MORE: Blue Stem Prairie. THE WITNESS: Blue Stem Prairie. And I didn't know either of those names. I asked Dan if he knew those names and he didn't.12Q. Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to what the Party would like CTAP's position or can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at it didn't hurt or it was some concern about the validity of the letter that Tony stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but it to be unrelated, but my Board has asked mot it to be unrelated, but my Board has asked mot it to be unrelated, but my Board has asked not it to be unrelated, but my Board has asked not it he fact that a couple of other mearcit. And we have a copy of a memo - on a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tomy I mible to a pople becarem named in the Secretary of State's office records as the CEO of CTAP as of it schroeder, S-C'H-R-O-E'D-E'R. I believe it's it was sent from, and had his own IT people intresses that it was sent from, and had his own IT people intresses that					-
10 some of that stuff too. 10 THE WITNESS: Blue Stem Prairie, And I 11 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to 11 12 what the Pary would like CTAP's position or 12 13 approach to be? 13 14 A He said it doesn't cally make any difference, you 14 15 can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at 15 16 one point there was some concern about the 16 17 validity of the letter and whether we should 17 18 stay - the validity of the letter and whether we should 17 19 Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should 17 20 okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 23 21 to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to 24 22 clarify what details we can figure out about it. 24 34 to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to 1 35 This is the fact that a couple of other 5 4 too. Fage 46 5 This is the fact that a couple of other 5 6 people became named in the Secretary of State's <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
11 Q Okay. Did Mr. Vekich give you any advice as to what the Party would like CTAP's position or apported to be? 11 didn't know either of those names. I asked Dan if he knew those names and he didn't. 12 approach to be? 13 14 A He said i doesn't really make any difference, you any awnt to do. And I said, well, at to one point there was some concern about the tast on down any own ant to do. And he said i didn't matter, but ti didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 24 Coky. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 25 And George called ne maybe about a week after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that the pay him S719,000. And George and I had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. 2 This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's office recervary of State's office the secretary of State's office the secretary of State's office the dates right here. As of December 20th, 201, 11, 16, 0.7.0-N. And Trimble is no Schroeder as 16, 10, 10, 0.7.0-N. And then subsequently - Let mg just get transpired. 10 13 December 20th. 201, 11, 16, 16, 12, 12, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14					
12what the Party would like CTAP's position or approach to be?12he knew those names and he didn't. I had changed the legal representative, I had then was some concembound the Secretary of State's office, had gout her was hore form on or a legal of And we have a copy of a mem o- or a lefter, 9 actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 10 Mr. Schroeder, is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 11 Lon, J-O-N. And Timble is indicating that 12 Cerember 20th.12 12 Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-Q, Lefter, I belivee it's 13 And then subsequently Let me just get 14 the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, 15 the Secretary of State is So Schroeder as 16 the Secretary of State is So Schroeder as 16 the Secret					
13 approach to be? 13 I had changed the legal representative. 14 A He said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 15 can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at 15 16 one point there was some concern about the 16 17 validity of the letter and whether we should 17 18 stay - the validity of the letter that Tony 18 19 Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should 19 20 stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but 20 21 it didn't hart or it didn't matter, but 20 22 Q. Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 23 24 e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to 24 24 e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to 24 25 mother problem that came up, which sort of seems 25 26 Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the 1 27 Page 46 1 28 Page 46 1 29 Page 46 1 30 This is the fact that a couple of other 5					
14 A He said it doesn't really make any difference, you 14 I believe it was like December something. And at that time the Secretary of State's website had a notation on there of, how do you like our new validity of the letter and whether we should 15 one point there was some concern about the 16 format; you can now see the CEO and other people on the forms. I didn't realize you couldn't see it before. I really didn't how that a CEO was stay in play. And he said it didn't make things any 21 21 it didn't make things any 21 George Fraley was on there. 22 better. 22 better. 23 24 e-mail stream vers off in chronological order to 2 another problem that came up, which sort of seems 25 And George called me maybe about a week after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that too. 25 nother problem that came up, which sort of seems 25 Worked together before we were both in 26 Clarify what details we can figure out about it. 2 Beage 46 Page 48 5 This is the fact that a couple of other 1 healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. 6 poople became named in the Secretary of State's 6 went to the Secretary of State's 6 changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he sas int COEN atothe the secretary of State's 10 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
15can do what you want to do. And I said, well, at15that time the Secretary of State's website had a notation on there of, how do you like our new17validity of the letter and whether we should16notation on there of, how do you like our new17validity of the letter and whether we should16notation on there of, how do you like our new18stay the validity of the letter that Tony18it didn' trealize you couldn't see19Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should19it didn't hater, but20stay in play. And he said i didn't matter, but20even listed. And so then I went back and saw that21it didn't hurt or it didn't make things any21George Fraley was on there.22better.21after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had25another problem that came up, which sort of seems25another before we were bot in26Page 461healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue2clarify what details we can figure out about it.3So George tol his attorney he would3And I know you've been trying to figure it out3So George tol his attorney he would4too.1healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue5This is the fact that a couple of other566people became named in the Secretary of State's office77records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.78And we have a copy of a memo - or a					
16 one point there was some concern about the 16 notation on there of, how do you like our new 17 validity of the letter and whether we should 17 format; you can now see the CEO and other people 18 stay - the validity of the letter that Tomy 18 it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but 20 20 stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but 20 it didn't hurt or it didn't make things any 21 21 it didn't hurt or it didn't make things any 22 better. 22 22 better. 22 better. 23 23 Q Okay. Tm going to veer off now, just because the 23 And George called me maybe about a week 24 e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to 25 another problem that came up, which sort of seems 25 25 mota moty ou've been trying to figure it out 20 Corss and Blue Shield contracts. 26 24 too. This is the fact that a couple of other 5 1 healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue 25 This is the fact that a couple of other 5 10 Nr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's 4 too.					
17validity of the letter and whether we should17format; you can now see the CEO and other people on the forms. I didn't natize you couldn't see18stay the validity of the letter that Tony18on the forms. I didn't natize you couldn't see19Trimble had Tony Sutto sign and whether we should19it before. I really didn't know that a CEO was20stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but20Corege Fraley was on there.21better.21Corege Fraley was on there.22better.23And George called me maybe about a week23QOkay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to 242425another problem that came up, which sort of seems25worked together before we were both in26Page 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it.13And I know you've been trying to figure it out too.3So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's for records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.6Mr. Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 13117Jon, Jo-N. And Trimble is indicating that 141118And we have a CEO of CTAP as of 15129bechney 20th,1111Jon, Jo-N. And Trimble is indicating that 1511612Schroeder is listed as CEO					
18 stay the validity of the letter that Tony 18 on the forms. I didn't realize you couldn't see it before. I really didn't know that a CEO was 19 Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should 19 it didn't nurve it didn't make things any 20 21 it didn't hurve it didn't make things any 21 it didn't hurve it didn't make things any 21 22 better. 22 And George called me maybe about a week 23 Q Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to another problem that came up, which sort of seems 23 24 e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to call rule interesting thing is in the form that came up, which sort of seems 24 1 to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to to call rule interest). 1 Page 48 1 to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to to coll figure out about it. 2 So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, di dy ou have anything to do with that e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 9 So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, di dy ou have anything to do with that e-mail that the said, the interesting thing is it came from the said, he said, the interesting thing is it came from the behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. 1 Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating t		-			
19Trimble had Tony Sutton sign and whether we should stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but 20 better. 21 22 22 22 23it defore. I really didn't know that a CEO was ever listed. And so then 1 went back and saw that George Fraley was on there. And George called me maybe about a week after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in240Okay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to another problem that came up, which sort of seems23 24 24250Natter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in26Page 461 102710Page 461 102810Nat I know you've been trying to figure out about it. too.2310Ken CEO of Count Them All Properly. actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 10310Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-F, R. I believe it's 111011Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 1211 1012Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 131213December 20th.1214And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, 151515the dates right here. As		•			
20stay in play. And he said it didn't matter, but it didn't hurt or it didn't matter, but to didn't matter, bet better.2020Qokay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to 25 another problem that came up, which sort of seems21And Gorge called me maybe about a week after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in20Lar be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to 2 clarify what details we can figure out about it. 21Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to 2 to. 411Secore were both in3And I know you've been trying to figure it out 4 too.33Secore of a mano - or a letter, 8 pact after be core of Cont Them All Properly. 8 And we have a copy of a memo - or a letter, 9 actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 9 actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 19He said, the interesting thing is i came from 9 913December 20th.11 1011 105So I kept trying to get George's name 10					
21it didn't hurt or it didn't make things any better.21George Fraley was on there.22Verter.22And George called me maybe about a week after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in24e-mail stream vers off in chronological order to another problem that came up, which sort of seems24after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in25Page 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 31healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. S o George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. a ctually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 99healthcare. cong of tate's office11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 1211Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 1311of State's office, had gotten the P address that 11 to make as ofp Octar Pa as of 1213December 20th.13So I kept trying to ggure out how ha transpired.So I kept trying to ggure out how it had transpired.14And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, 1615So I kept trying to ggure out how ha transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2012 it lists George <b< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td></b<>					•
22better.22And George called me maybe about a week23QOkay. I'm going to veer off now, just because the2324e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to2425another problem that came up, which sort of seems25Page 46Page 46Page 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to2clarify what details we can figure out about it.3And I know you've been trying to figure it out34too.44too.45This is the fact that a couple of other56records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.78And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,89actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a910Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's1011Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that1112Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of1213December 20th.1414And then subsequently Let me just get1415the dates right here. As of December 20th.1516the Secretary of State is try of State is thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent1718filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George1819Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1919Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-					
23 Q Okay. Tm going to veer off now, just because the e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to another problem that came up, which sort of seems 23 after he received Tony Trimble's letter requesting that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in 25 match is problem that came up, which sort of seems 23 4 be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to 1 Page 46 2 clarify what details we can figure out about it. 2 So George told his attorney he would 3 And I know you've been trying to figure it out 3 So George told his attorney he would 4 too. 4 So George told his attorney he would 5 This is the fact that a couple of other 5 George Fraley's firewall at his business. 6 people became named in the Secretary of State's office 6 changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he sa sind chaing that 11 Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 11 11 10 And then subsequently Let me just get 10 14 And then subsequently Let me just get 12 13 14 So I kept trying to get George's name 16 16 the Secretary of State' sting, was having 17 16		с .			
24e-mail stream veers off in chronological order to another problem that came up, which sort of seems24 25that he pay him \$719,000. And George and I had worked together before we were both in24Page 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 31Page 462clarify what details we can figure out about it. 4223And I know you've been trying to figure it out 4 too.3So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's 67records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. 97Changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from 99actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 99911Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 121012Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 131213December 20th.1314And then subsequently Let me just get 141415the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, 151616the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as 161617chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent 171718filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George 191819Fraley, F.RAL-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1919Fraley, F.RAL-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1019<					
25another problem that came up, which sort of seems25worked together before we were both inPage 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to12clarify what details we can figure out about it.23And I know you've been trying to figure it out34too.45This is the fact that a couple of other56people became named in the Secretary of State's67records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.78And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,89actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a99actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a911Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that1112Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's1013December 20th.1314And then subsequently Let me just get1415the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,1516the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as1617chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent1718filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George1819Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1919Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.2020And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he2021try and get paid.2223And you got involved. Somehow I guess2124they copied th					
Page 46Page 481to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. 31healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts.3And I know you've been trying to figure it out too.3So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that epople became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 127changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. 1010Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-R, I believe it's 11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 121112Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-R, I believe it's 11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 121113December 20th. 1312it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired.14And then subsequently Let me just get 1414So I kept trying to get George's name 1616the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as 1616So I kept trying to get George's name 1716the Secretary of State lists George 1718The Was confusion when we took it down there.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George 1718MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure o					
2clarify what details we can figure out about it.2Cross and Blue Shield contracts.3And I know you've been trying to figure it out3So George told his attorney he would4too.4call me directly. And he called me and he said,5This is the fact that a couple of other5George told his attorney he would6people became named in the Secretary of State's6went to the Secretary of State's office7records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.7changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,8he said, the interesting thing is it came from9actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a9behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State ist Jon Schroeder as16So I kept trying to get George's name17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17there was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE			-		wonnee together certaie we were courtin
2clarify what details we can figure out about it.2Cross and Blue Shield contracts.3And I know you've been trying to figure it out3So George told his attorney he would4too.45This is the fact that a couple of other56people became named in the Secretary of State's67records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.78And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,89actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a910Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's1011Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that1112Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of1213December 20th.1314And then subsequently Let me just get1415the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,1516the Secretary of State is lists Jon Schroeder as1617chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent1718filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George1819Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1919Fraley, so he's writing to these people to2021try and get paid.2223And you got involved. Somehow I guess24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24		Page 46			Page 48
3And I know you've been trying to figure it out too.3So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that beipe became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.3So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 109behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's 1110of State's office, had gotten the IP address that 1212Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 1212it was sent from, and had his own IT people 1313December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had transpired.14And then subsequently Let me just get 1415So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as 1616the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George 191818filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George 191819Fraley, F.R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1920And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he 212022try and get paid.2223And you got involved. Somehow I guess 242324<	1		1		
4too.4call me directly. And he called me and he said,5This is the fact that a couple of other5did you have anything to do with that e-mail that6people became named in the Secretary of State's6went to the Secretary of State's office7records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.7changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,8he said, the interesting thing is it came from9actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a9behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14so I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out h		to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to			healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue
5This is the fact that a couple of other5did you have anything to do with that e-mail that6people became named in the Secretary of State's6went to the Secretary of State's office7records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.7changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,8he said, the interesting thing is it came from9actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a9behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to fi	2	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it.	2		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts.
6people became named in the Secretary of State's6went to the Secretary of State's office7records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.7changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,8he said, the interesting thing is it came from9actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a9behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid.22 <t< td=""><td>2 3</td><td>to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out</td><td>2 3</td><td></td><td>healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would</td></t<>	2 3	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out	2 3		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would
7records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. 87changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from 98And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, 98he said, the interesting thing is it came from 99actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a 109behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's 1110And he was in contact with the Secretary 1211Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that 1211of State's office, had gotten the IP address that 1212Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of 1312it was sent from, and had his own IT people 1313December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had transpired.14And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, 1515So I kept trying to get George's name to ff the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as 1616the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George 1918There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer. 2019MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black? THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the 	2 3 4	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too.	2 3 4		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said,
8And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, 98he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24<	2 3 4 5	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other	2 3 4 5		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that
9actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a9behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of<	2 3 4 5 6	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's	2 3 4 5 6		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office
10Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's10And he was in contact with the Secretary11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.1314And then subsequently Let me just get1415the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,1516the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as1617chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent1718filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George1819Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.1920And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he2021could get paid, so he's writing to these people to2122try and get paid.2223And you got involved. Somehow I guess2324they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24	2 3 4 5 6 7	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly.	2 3 4 5 6 7		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And
11Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that11of State's office, had gotten the IP address that12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from
12Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of12it was sent from, and had his own IT people13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a	2 3 4 5 7 8 9		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business.
13December 20th.13investigating where it came from and how it had14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's	2 3 6 7 8 9 10		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary
14And then subsequently Let me just get14transpired.15the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that
15the dates right here.As of December 20th, 2011,15So I kept trying to get George's name16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people
16the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as16off the Secretary of State's thing, was having17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had
17chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent17trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired.
18filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George18There was confusion when we took it down there.19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name
19Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.19MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having
20And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he could get paid, so he's writing to these people to try and get paid.20THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me.
21could get paid, so he's writing to these people to21Secretary of State.22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there.
22try and get paid.22MR. GILMORE: Okay.23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there. MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black?
23And you got involved. Somehow I guess23THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there24they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl.24for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer. And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there. MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black? THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the
they copied this e-mail to you or to Dan Puhl. 24 for me. Because I do consulting so I'm out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer. And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he could get paid, so he's writing to these people to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there. MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black? THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the Secretary of State.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer. And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he could get paid, so he's writing to these people to try and get paid.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there. MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black? THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the Secretary of State. MR. GILMORE: Okay.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to be unrelated, but my Board has asked me to clarify what details we can figure out about it. And I know you've been trying to figure it out too. This is the fact that a couple of other people became named in the Secretary of State's records as the CEO of Count Them All Properly. And we have a copy of a memo or a letter, actually, an e-mail from Tony Trimble to a Mr. Schroeder, S-C-H-R-O-E-D-E-R, I believe it's Jon, J-O-N. And Trimble is indicating that Schroeder is listed as CEO of CTAP as of December 20th. And then subsequently Let me just get the dates right here. As of December 20th, 2011, the Secretary of State lists Jon Schroeder as chief executive officer. And then in a subsequent filing, on January 5th of 2012 it lists George Fraley, F-R-A-L-E-Y, as chief executive officer. And Mr. Trimble was trying to figure out how he could get paid, so he's writing to these people to try and get paid. And you got involved. Somehow I guess	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		healthcare. We had worked together on some Blue Cross and Blue Shield contracts. So George told his attorney he would call me directly. And he called me and he said, did you have anything to do with that e-mail that went to the Secretary of State's office changing adding me as CEO, and I said no. And he said, the interesting thing is it came from behind George Fraley's firewall at his business. And he was in contact with the Secretary of State's office, had gotten the IP address that it was sent from, and had his own IT people investigating where it came from and how it had transpired. So I kept trying to get George's name off the Secretary of State's thing, was having trouble doing it. Burt Black was helping me. There was confusion when we took it down there. MR. GILMORE: Who is Mr. Black? THE WITNESS: He's the attorney for the Secretary of State. MR. GILMORE: Okay. THE WITNESS: And Pat took it down there

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

	Page 49		Page 51
1	Black. It got confused, they sent him to another	1	sort of that, oh, my God, you know, why would
2	building, et cetera, et cetera, and it didn't get	2	somebody George has nothing to do with the
3	changed.	3	Republican Party in an activist sort of way. I
4	George's attorney, the kid's name is Bob	4	don't know what his involvement is, but his father
5	King, was involved and sort of gave me the form	5	was actively involved. How they got How they
6	or a form letter Excuse me a second. I may	6	selected his name just blew my mind.
7	have to step out for a minute.	7	So I did everything I could to get that
8	Can I be excused for a second?	8	off of there so he was not bothered with this. It
9	Q Sure.	9	was bad enough everybody else was being, you know,
10	(Break taken.).	10	worried about it.
11	THE WITNESS: Where was I?	11	Q Just before Mr. Fraley was listed as CEO, Jon
12	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	12	Schroeder had been listed, but that was for a
13	Q I think I can pick up with another question and	13	short time. Because it was so short, was there
14	we'll see if we cover everything.	14	any effort or anything done to find out who had
15	A Okay. So George said they had this information	15	made that change?
16	from behind their firewall, they were	16	MR. GILMORE: I can jump in here if I
17	investigating it and he would get to the bottom of	17	might, Gary.
18	it. He asked if I knew anybody that worked for	18	MR. GOLDSMITH: Sure.
19	him or if I had been in his offices. I said no.	19	MR. GILMORE: Independently of Mary I
20	Was trying to change that CEO.	20	asked Burt Black about that process. And as I
21	And then didn't contact George again	21	expected, it's a Data Practices request that would
22	until maybe last week or the week before. And I	22	have had to have been generated by Mr. Schroeder.
23	talked to him. The e-mail did come from behind	23	And he would be free to share or not whatever
24	their firewall to or the change was made from	24	information he would like. I have not contacted
25	behind their firewall by their employee at	25	Mr. Schroeder.
	Page 50		Page 52
1	11:07 a.m. and he had all the keystrokes.	1	I knew, based on my conversations with
2	And the person that did it went in	2	Mrs. Igo, that this would be of interest to you
3	directly to Count Them All Properly, typed in the	3	and the Board because it certainly struck me as
4	account number for the company, knew exactly where		not coincidental or very suspect.
5	the person was going, and he had subsequently	5	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I thought something
6	fired her, terminated her. She claimed that she	6	happened when they made that change in what they
7	had nothing to do with it. Someone should have	7	were showing, but I read someplace in one of the
8	Or someone got on her computer when she walked	8	articles that Burt said it's too coincidental and
9	away, which also violated some HIPAA policies in	9	highly unlikely that one error was made, much less
10	the healthcare world. So she was sort of between	10	two on the same company and in the same category.
11	the devil and the deep blue sea.	11	So to tell you the truth, I didn't investigate it
12	He had detail down to the keystrokes.	12	because I was just trying to get it resolved.
13	It was a little bit scary. And then George said,	13	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
14	the interesting thing is that you know this woman	14	Q In an e-mail subsequent to your learning about
15	and I know this woman; we both worked with her on	15	this, this is now February 28th, so the end of the
16	some issue at the Department of Surgery at the	16	month of February, again, from you to the other
17	University of Minnesota.	17	board members, still copying, by the way, Dan Puhl
18	I vaguely can remember a woman I	18	in on this e-mail, you mention you had a call from
			~
19	mean, this has to be 15 years ago, you know, but I	19	George and had a discussion, which I presume is
19 20		19 20	George and had a discussion, which I presume is the discussion we just talked about.
	mean, this has to be 15 years ago, you know, but I		
20	mean, this has to be 15 years ago, you know, but I can't remember her name. And I asked George her	20	the discussion we just talked about.
20 21	mean, this has to be 15 years ago, you know, but I can't remember her name. And I asked George her name and then I said, hold it, I don't want to	20 21	the discussion we just talked about. You say that he is sending you the info
20 21 22	mean, this has to be 15 years ago, you know, but I can't remember her name. And I asked George her name and then I said, hold it, I don't want to know her name.	20 21 22	the discussion we just talked about. You say that he is sending you the info he has secured so far. Did he actually send you

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

	Page 53		Page 55
1	sent him sort of requesting the money, but I don't	1	company up, and he asked if Tony, this would be
2	even know if I ever got it. I figured it was the	2	Tony Sutton, did. And you asked what Tony said.
3	same one I got, so I didn't pay any attention to	3	And the reporter states that Tony said he was
4	it.	4	involved in it. Did that surprise you at all?
5	Q But he didn't send you any info about the	5	A Yes.
6	investigation that he had undertaken?	6	Q What was your understanding prior to hearing that
7	A Oh, no, no, no. He just told me that over the	7	Tony Sutton claimed involvement?
8	phone.	8	A That Dan Puhl had set it up. I knew there had
9	Q We're moving up toward close to the present time	9	been discussion with Tony and the attorneys, but
10	here. I've skipped over a lot of interchange	10	I it was my understanding they were out of it
11	about the CEO issue because I think you've	11	at that point.
12	clarified that to the extent that you have	12	The reason I asked what Tony said is
13	information.	13	because I was still sort of in shock about or in
14	I'm now moved up to Tuesday, April 10th,	14	awe that Tony was talking to them, yeah.
15	so six weeks ago or so. And this is an e-mail	15	Q Moving on, then, to April 19th, this is an e-mail
16	from you, again, to the other directors. I see	16	from Dan Puhl to you. Well, I won't read into
17	that you're still including Dan Puhl in the	17	it. Here's what it says, in order for me to
18	correspondence. By that point he had still not	18	answer truthfully (I expect to be deposed) that I
19	submitted a formal letter of resignation; is that	19	don't have anything to do with CTAP, I can't
20	correct?	20	participate in your meetings.
21	A No, but he verbally resigned at that meeting.	21	And then it goes on to say, FYI, the
22	Q And you did not have other than Mr. Puhl, you	22	bylaws say that four board members are required as
23	didn't have a fourth director, an additional	23	well.
24	director at that point?	24	Do you remember that e-mail?
25	A No.	25	A Yes.
	Page 54		Page 56
1	Q And still don't?	1	Q Did anything different happen as a result of that
2	A No. I did not want to bring another person into	2	e-mail than had happened previously with respect
3	it.	3	to Dan Puhl's participation in meetings?
4	Q Your reporting to the board and Mr. Puhl that the	4	A No. I had invited him to that meeting, and the
5	reporter from the Star Tribune had reached you and	5	only discussion that we had after that was about
б	asked you to comment. Did that reporter Your	6	securing a fourth member, and Fred had recommended
7	note to them says, they, meaning the Star Tribune,	7	Mike Boguszewski. Don't ask me how to spell
8	had talked to Tony, which I presume would be Tony	8	that.
9	Sutton, and he told them that he raised \$30,000	9	THE WITNESS: Do you know?
10	for this company.	10	MR. GILMORE: I can get it for the court
11	Do you remember them telling you that?	11	reporter during the break.
12	A Yeah, yeah. I was surprised. I was surprised on	12	THE WITNESS: And Fred gave me his phone
13	two parts: One, that Tony said he raised it; but	13	number. And I went out of town, came back in
14	the other one, that Tony was even talking to them	14	town, had your envelope and decided I wasn't going
15	about it. I mean, he I didn't know he had any	15	to add anybody else into the equation at this
16	knowledge of it.	16	point.
17	I must have a list on my e-mail that has	17	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
18	all the board members, and Dan is probably still	18	Q Okay. I think, according to this e-mail,
19	on that.	19	Boguszewski is B-O-G-U-S-Z-E-W-S-K-I.
20	MR. GILMORE: Are you talking about why	20	Now, this series of e-mails that we've
21	you're still continuing to include Dan Puhl in the	21	been talking about on Thursday, April 19th, 2012
22	e-mails?	22	is talking about another meeting. Did you
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.	23	actually have another meeting of the Board?
24	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:	24	A Yes. No. Yes. Can you check the minutes?
25	Q You also note that he asked you who set the	25	Q We don't have minutes for it, so that's why I'm

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

		Page 57		Page 59
1		asking.	1	Q What do you expect to happen to Count Them Al
2		MR. GILMORE: Does it reference	2	Properly, Inc., as you move forward through the
3		THE WITNESS: Yeah, there was a meeting	3	rest of this year?
4		right after that because we had further discussion	4	MR. GILMORE: I think you're asking her
5		about Mike Boguszewski, and that's when I said I	5	to speculate, Gary.
6		was going to call him.	6	THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
7	B	Y MR. GOLDSMITH:	7	BY MR. GOLDSMITH:
8	0		8	Q Okay.
9	Ċ	to two-sided copying yet. So let me look	9	A I actually did not read Jeff's report on the Party
10		MR. GILMORE: I had them copied as they	10	in its entirety. I don't know. I haven't really
11		were produced.	11	thought about it. I've been focused on this.
12		MR. GOLDSMITH: My staff did this, so	12	Q Is there anything that you think that you would
13		they were fine.	13	want to add that I haven't allowed you to cover
14	B	Y MR. GOLDSMITH:	14	that you would just want to make sure we know
15	Q		15	about before we end the deposition? I will ask my
16	Ċ	W.A. Frost?	16	colleagues if they have questions, but I'd like to
17	Α	Yes.	17	give you the opportunity if there's something you
18	0			want to clear up or something like that.
19	Ċ	at that meeting?	19	A No. I'm not sure if
20	Α		20	MR. GILMORE: You can go ahead.
21	Q		21	THE WITNESS: You know, I took this on
22	×	Mr. Puhl's resignation?	22	thinking it was no big deal, listened to I think
23	А	I realized that there was nothing in the minutes,	23	Dan and, you know, the hearsay about the attorney
24		yes.	24	comment that this was the right thing to do. I
25	0		25	had multiple discussions right before that state
	_			· · ·
		Page 58		Page 60
1		earlier?	1	central meeting with a couple Party activists that
2	А	Yes.	2	there was nothing going on here, it wasn't
3	Q		3	illegal, it wasn't unethical. If it was, it
4		problems, and then you had the new member	4	wouldn't be something that I would have been
5		discussion. Tell me about the new member	5	involved in. And I feel real bad that I wasn't
6		discussion that occurred.	6	more meticulous. I would not have gotten away
7	А	Fred described Mike's involvement, level headed,	7	with running the business that I was employed at
8		straightforward, reasonable person, and that he	8	the way this was run. So for that I apologize. I
9		had asked Mike in passing at the fourth	9	thought it was the right thing to do.
10		congressional district meeting. Mike said he	10	MR. GOLDSMITH: Jeff?
11		would be interested. He wanted me to call him and	11	EXAMINATION
12		invite him to the next board meeting, and that was	12	BY MR. SIGURDSON:
13		that.	13	Q I think I have three questions. And I'm sorry.
14	Q	J	14	They may jump around a little bit, but this was
15		Vekich about financial status updates. Can you	15	based on answers you provided to Mr. Goldsmith'
16		tell me what financial status updates you had	16	questions.
17		received from Mike Vekich?	17	At this point is Count Them All Properly
18	А	,	18	still receiving bills from the three law firms for
19		discussion with Mike Vekich I had received nothing	19	the recount?
20		back, didn't know how he felt about it. And this	20	A I don't know that.
21		was prior to Jeff Johnson's statement coming out	21	Q Okay.
22		about the Party finances.	22	A It would be whatever is in the file that we gave
23	Q	5 5 6	23	you is what we have.
24		of directors in the foreseeable future?	24	Q To your knowledge, there was never any
25	Α	No.	25	re-invoicing of activities unrelated to the

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

	Page 61		Page 63	3
1	recount that was	1	We're off the record.	
2	MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry. I can't hear	2	(Deposition concluded at 11:50 a.m.)	
3	you.	3		
4	BY MR. SIGURDSON:	4		
5	Q I'm sorry. Was there any indication or any	5		
6	information provided to you that there was	6		
7	anything other than recount billings that Count	7		
8	Them All Properly was responsible for?	8		
9	A No.	9		
10	Q Okay. When Mr. Emmer indicated to you at the	10		
11	Leadership Conference that he had raised	11		
12	substantial money for the recount, did you or	12		
13	anyone else contact the Republican Party to see if	13		
14	those funds were available?	14		
15	A No, because I had talked to Tony right before that	15		
16	and had asked him if there was money available to	16		
17	contribute to this company. And he said no, but	17		
18	he expected money out of the Leadership	18		
19 20	Conference. So when Tony told me that at the	19 20		
20	Leadership Conference, again, it just baffled me. I mean, I was concerned about it.	20 21		
22	Q I realize this contribution came in Or at least	22		
23	I believe this contribution came in prior to you	23		
24	actually joining the board, but the contribution	24		
25	from Mr. Cummins, do you know, was that made to	25		
	Page 62		Page 64	Ł
1	CTAP or was it made to the Republican Party and	1	STATE OF MINNESOTA)	
2	then forwarded to CTAP?	2) ss. COUNTY OF DAKOTA)	
3	A I don't know that.	3 4	Be it known that I took the statement of MARY IGO	
4	Q Okay. And then I guess one last question, and I		on the 21st day of May, 2012, at Suite 190, 658 Cedar	
5	realize that this is more an impression question.	5 6	Street, St. Paul, Minnesota; That I was then and there a notary public in and	
6	In your conversations with Mr. Puhl on CTAP and	-	for the County of Dakota, State of Minnesota, and that	
7	its origins and what it was going to try to	7 8	I was duly authorized to administer an oath; That the witness before testifying was first duly	
8	achieve, did he ever provide a motivation for	9	sworn to testify the truth and nothing but the truth;	
9	CTAP? And by that I mean why the bills would no		That the testimony was recorded by myself and	
10	longer be the responsibility of the Republican	10	transcribed into a computer-aided transcript and that the deposition is a true record of the testimony given	
11 12	Party.	11 12	by the witness to the best of my ability;	
13	A The only thing he said is that it was post-election expense that could not be filed on		That I am not related to any of the parties hereto nor interested in the outcome of the action;	
14	the FEC report. That's the only piece I remember	13	That the cost of the original transcript has been	
15	that relates to your question.	14	charged to the party noticing the deposition, unless	
16	Q Okay. On the FEC report. Did you mean the	15	otherwise agreed by Counsel, and that copies have been made available to all parties at the same cost, unless	
17	campaign finance report or did you actually mean		otherwise agreed upon by Counsel;	
18	at the federal election level?	16	That the reading and signing of the statement by	
19	A I don't know that. He said	17 18	the witness was waived. WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 30th day of May,	
20	Q He said FEC?		2012.	
21	A I think he said FEC report. That was back	19 20		
22	February of 2011.	21	JULIE A. RIXE	
23	Q Okay. All right. Thank you.	22	Court Reporter	
24	MR. GOLDSMITH: All right. That	23 24		
25	concludes the deposition. Thank you very much.	25		

16 (Pages 61 to 64)