# IN THE OFFICE OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS STATE OF GEORGIA

DAVID ROWAN, : DOCKET NUMBER: 2222582

DONALD GUYATT, : 2222582-OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-57-Beaudrot

ROBERT RASBURY

RUTH DEMETER, : Agency Reference No.: 2222582

DANIEL COOPER, :

Petitioners,

V.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE,

:

Respondent.

POST-HEARING MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS' CANDIDACY CHALLENGE TO RESPONDENT MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

				PAGE NO.		
PRELIMIN	JARY ST	[ATEM]	ENT			
I.	FAC	FACTUAL SUMMARY				
	A.	Violent Insurrectionists Storm the Capitol and Prevent Congress from Counting Electoral Votes				
		1.	Histor	ry of Insurrections in the United States		
		2.	January 6, 2021 Insurrection			
			a.	Congress' Constitutional Duty to Count and Certify the Electoral College Votes		
			b.	Setting the Stage for the Insurrection		
			c.	Insurrectionists Breach the Capitol While Congress Attempts to Count and Certify the Electoral College Votes		
			d.	Military and Other Reinforcements Are Needed to Quell the Insurrection		
			e.	The Insurrection Causes Injuries, Damage, and Death		
			f.	A Seditious Conspiracy9		
			g.	Calling January 6 What It Was: An Insurrection 10		
	B.	Marjo	Marjorie Taylor Greene Engages in Insurrection			
		1.		e the 2020 Election: Greene Advocates Political nce		
		2.	False	mber 3, 2020 to January 3, 2021: Greene Advances Claims Election Was Stolen and Lays the adwork for Insurrection		
		3.	to Use	ry 3 to January 6, 2021: Greene Calls on Her Supports e Political Violence to Stop the Counting of Electoral		
		4.		anuary 6, 2021: Greene Continues to Call for Violent lion		

II.	ARG	ARGUMENT17					
	A.	Gree	Greene Is Disqualified from Serving in Congress				
		1.	Greene Takes the Oath of Office	. 18			
		2.	The Violent Attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021 Was an Insurrection Under the Disqualification Clause	. 18			
		3.	Greene Engaged in the January 6 Insurrection	. 21			
		4.	Greene Fails to Rebut Petitioners' Proof that She Engaged in Insurrection	. 25			
	В.	Gree	ne's Defenses Are Meritless	. 27			
		1.	First and Fourteenth Amendments	. 27			
		2.	Due Process	. 28			
		3.	Article I, Section 5, Clause 1	. 28			
		4.	The Amnesty Act of 1872	. 30			
		5.	State law administrative proceedings do not require a federal cause of action.				
		6.	The First Amendment and Hearsay	. 35			
		7.	The Speech and Debate Clause	. 38			
CONCLU	SION			. 38			

Petitioners DAVID ROWAN, DONALD GUYATT, ROBERT RASBURY, RUTH
DEMETER, and DANIEL COOPER ("Petitioners") respectfully submit this post-hearing
memorandum in support of their candidacy challenge to Respondent Marjorie Taylor Greene.

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The oath to support and defend the United States Constitution against all enemies imposes great responsibility. The architects of the Fourteenth Amendment understood this well. They witnessed the carnage that results when the People's representatives abdicate their responsibilities, abandon their oaths, and try to abolish the system of government they swore to defend. They enacted Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment to prevent those who betray their oaths of office in this manner from holding positions of power ever again. Like other constitutional qualifications for federal office—citizenship or age—Section Three limits who may attain power and whom voters may choose to represent them. In the wake of the greatest insurrection our country has ever seen, the nation determined that voters should choose their representatives from among only those who have never betrayed their oaths to support and defend the Constitution.

Respondent Marjorie Taylor Greene does not meet that qualification. Even before she swore the oath, she advocated violence against the government. She accused the Speaker of the House of treason and condoned the suggestion that she should be shot in the head. She sought to instill "fear" in the hearts of political officials. And she told people that the government was trying to take away their freedoms and that they would have to defend those freedoms with "the price of blood."

After she was elected to Congress in November 2020, Greene became fixated on false claims of election fraud, railing against what she claimed was a stolen election. To be sure, she had the right to those beliefs and to lawfully advocate for them. But as the new year

approached and allegations of voter fraud were being disproved across the country, Greene became more desperate, and she turned back to her preferred method for stopping governmental action with which she disagrees: violence. In tweet after tweet, video after video, she told her supporters that their government was being taken from them and implored them to "fight"—a term that Greene's audience did not understand purely figuratively—to win it back. In one stark example, she told her supporters, "You can't allow it to just transfer power 'peacefully' like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our president because he did not win this election." She framed the rapidly approaching, Constitutionally mandated, peaceful transition of power as an existential battle, a new independence day from the "oppression" of our constitutional system, a new July 4<sup>th</sup>, 1776. She rallied her supporters, promising them: "We will not go quietly into the night."

Greene's words and actions—her efforts to delegitimatize the very government she was about to join, her violent imagery—were the kindling from which the January 6 insurrection exploded. When Greene took the oath on January 3, she swore to protect the government, not destroy it; she swore to let all that kindling rot. But she broke her oath. She dropped a match on the kindling she had amassed. Invoking a phrase that had been used repeatedly among her supporters and friends, she told her followers that January 6 was their "1776 moment"—the time to stop the government from carrying out its functions, to flood the Capitol, and to use violence if necessary. In the context of Greene's prior violent rhetoric, Greene's supporters understood her reference to "1776" for what it was: a call for revolution.

The resulting fire was catastrophic. January 6 was the most significant breach of our Capitol in more than 200 years. It was, unquestionably, an insurrection: Thousands of people stormed the seat of our national legislature in an effort to stop it from performing its duties; they used violence to achieve their means; and they were so numerous and persistent that

they could not be stopped by ordinary law enforcement. People died; hundreds of law enforcement officers were injured; the Capitol was severely damaged; and the peaceful transfer of power that Greene was so committed to preventing was temporarily suspended.

Greene now stands among the ashes claiming ignorance and innocence. She purports not to recall any of her incendiary words, even though they are preserved and are part of the record. She hides behind the First Amendment, without acknowledging that she is no longer a private citizen, that Section Three appropriately limits the rights of Congressmembers to engage in insurrection, or that she accepted a solemn duty when she "freely" took the oath of office. Her defenses demonstrate her unwillingness and inability to accept the responsibility that comes with being a member of the federal government.

The Court should find that Greene is disqualified from federal office under Section

Three of the Fourteenth Amendment and is therefore not "qualified to seek and hold the

public office for which [she] is offering" under O.C.G.A. § 21-2-5(c).

### I. FACTUAL SUMMARY

The following facts are derived from the testimony and evidence presented at the April 22, 2022 hearing.

# A. Violent Insurrectionists Storm the Capitol and Prevent Congress from Counting Electoral Votes

## 1. History of Insurrections in the United States

The Civil War, which lasted from 1861 to 1865, is the most well-known insurrection in American history. The Fourteenth Amendment was ratified in the wake of the Civil War and Section Three was designed in large part to prevent the leaders of that insurrection from holding federal office. *See* Tr. of Apr. 22, 2022 Hr'g, (attached as Ex. A, and hereinafter referred to as "Tr.") 47:7-48:15. But the Civil War is not the only insurrection the United

States has endured. At the time the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified, two other insurrections of relatively recent vintage were well known to Americans: Shays' Insurrection and the Whiskey Insurrection. *See id.* at 49:1-49:8.

Shays' Insurrection occurred in Massachusetts at the end of 1786 and early 1787. *Id.* at 49:12-14. Groups of farmers who were upset about high land taxes armed themselves and went to local courts to stop them from holding foreclosure sales. *Id.* at 49:16-20. Eventually, the state militia was called in to quell the uprising and to restore the operations of the courts. *Id.* at 49:20-24. State militia clashed with the armed farmers at an armory, resulting in four deaths. *Id.* at 49:24-50:3.

The Whiskey Insurrection was another tax protest by farmers. *Id.* at 51:17-20. This time, farmers in Pennsylvania rebelled against a federal tax on whiskey and other spirits. *Id.* The farmers were "loosely organized" with no single leader. *Id.* at 52:19-22. The farmers armed themselves and tried to prevent tax collection by attacking places where tax collectors worked and trying to shut down the courts. *Id.* at 51:25-52:6. George Washington eventually called in more than 10,000 troops to end the insurrection, but not before four or five people were killed. *Id.* at 52:7-16.

### 2. January 6, 2021 Insurrection

a. Congress' Constitutional Duty to Count and Certify the Electoral College Votes

On "the sixth day of January succeeding every meeting of the electors" of the Electoral College, Congress meets for the purposes of opening, counting, and resolving any objections to the Electoral College vote and certifying the results. 3 U.S.C § 15; Apr. 19, 2022 Stipulated Facts ("Stipulated Facts") ¶ 6. These congressional duties are prescribed by the Twelfth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. *See* U.S. Const., amend. XII ("The

President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted."). On January 6, 2021, this constitutionally mandated joint session of Congress was convened at approximately 1:00 p.m. in the House chamber. *See* Stipulated Facts ¶ 6; P-36 (Congressional Record, Jan. 6, 2021) at H76.

In the hours that followed, the "most significant breach of the Capitol in over 200 years" took place, P-19 (Congressional Report) at 21, forcing Congress to suspend its counting and certification of the Electoral College votes.

## b. Setting the Stage for the Insurrection

For weeks before January 6, 2021, certain supporters of then-President Trump developed various plans to try to prevent Congress from certifying the results of the 2020 election. Some of those plans turned entirely on lawsuits, or on lawful parliamentary maneuvers within the House floor; they are not at issue here. Other plans involved fraudulent "alternate" slates of electors, 1 or envisioned unconstitutional action by Vice President Pence to unilaterally reject electoral votes. P-18.

As January 6 approached, these options narrowed. *See, e.g.*, P-83 (letter from Pence stating refusal to unilaterally reject votes). By January 5, when it was publicly revealed that Pence would not unilaterally reject votes,<sup>2</sup> it was evident that no lawful parliamentary maneuvers could prevent certification of the 2020 election.

On the morning of January 6, 2021, long before the joint session of Congress began, thousands of people began gathering around Washington, D.C. Many of these people headed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Katie Benner, Justice Dept. Is Reviewing Role of Fake Trump Electors, Top Official Says, N.Y. Times, Jan. 25, 2022, available at https://nytims/3EZ3mfK.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Jeff Mason, Despite Trump pressure, Pence will not block Biden's election certification: advisers, Reuters, Jan 5, 2021, available at https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-pence/despite-trump-pressure-pence-will-not-block-bidens-election-certification-advisers-idUSKBN29A2J0.

to the Ellipse, near the White House, where then-President Trump and others were scheduled to speak. P-19 at 22. Others headed directly to the Capitol building. By 11:00 a.m. the United States Capitol Police ("USCP") reported "large crowds around the Capitol building." P-19 at 22 (cleaned up). Some of the people gathering in Washington were "equipped with communication devices and donning reinforced vests, helmets, and goggles." P-44 at 4.

Mr. Trump began his address just before noon. *Id.* In his remarks, he perpetuated false claims of voter fraud and encouraged his supporters to march on the Capitol. *See* P-54 (Transcript of Trump speech) at 8-9. Before he finished his address, "crowds began leaving the Ellipse for the Capitol." *See* P-19 at 22.

# c. Insurrectionists Breach the Capitol While Congress Attempts to Count and Certify the Electoral College Votes

By 12:45 p.m., significant and increasingly violent crowds were forming around the Capitol. P-19 at 22. At 12:53 p.m., the mob breached the outer security perimeter the USCP had established around the Capitol. *Id.* at 23. Individuals "picked up one of the metal bike racks that demarcated USCP's security perimeter and shoved it into the USCP officers standing guard." *Id.* Following this initial breach, crowds flooded into the Capitol's West Front grounds. *Id.* People "pressed towards the Capitol building—climbing the inaugural platform and scaling walls. The only remaining security perimeter consisted of the USCP officers positioned around the grounds, who were overwhelmed and outnumbered." *Id.* 

While violence and chaos raged outside the Capitol, inside the building, most Members of Congress were trying to perform their duties under the Twelfth Amendment. At approximately 1:15 p.m., the House and the Senate separated to debate objections to the certification of Arizona's Electoral College votes. *See* P-36 at H77.

By 2:06 p.m., insurrectionists had reached the Rotunda steps, and by 2:08 p.m., they were at the House Plaza. P-19 at 24. At 2:10 p.m. the final barricades on the West Front and northwest side of the Capitol were breached. *Id.* People smashed through first-floor windows on the Capitol's south side, making a hole big enough to climb through, and a stream of people entered, with two individuals kicking open a nearby door to let others into the Capitol. *Id.* at 24-25. On the east side of the Capitol, individuals "weaved through the restricted area in a military 'stack' formation with hands on shoulders and gear," and ultimately ascended the stairs on the Capitol's east side. P-16 ¶ 30-32. Some of these individuals were armed with bear spray and tactical gear and accompanied by an 82-pound German Shepherd. P-44 at 5.

At 2:13 p.m., the Senate was forced to go into recess. *See* P-36 at S18. At 2:29 p.m., the House was forced to follow suit. *See id.* at H85. One floor below the Senate chamber, just as the Senate was beginning its recess, insurrectionists chased a USCP officer up the stairs to the second floor, passing within 100 feet of Vice President Pence and his family. *See* P-73 at 3:08-3:50. Outside the Capitol, someone announced that Senators "just ran out of the session," and the sea of people who were unlawfully on the Capitol grounds cheered. *Id.* at 4:15-4:31.

At 2:25 p.m., a mob of people overran USCP officers in the crypt just below the Rotunda. *Id.* at 6:35-6:45. At the same time, another mob entered the Rotunda above from doors on the east side of the building. *Id.* at 6:45-7:10. At 2:43 p.m., insurrectionists "broke the glass of a door to the Speaker's Lobby," a hallway that would have given them direct access to the House chamber. P-19 at 25. When they tried to lift Ashli Babbitt through the opening, "a USCP officer fatally shot her." *Id.* Less than ten minutes later, insurrectionists breached the Senate chamber. *Id.* at 26. "In the House chamber, USCP officers barricaded the

door with furniture and drew their weapons," trying to fend off people who were trying to enter the chamber. *Id*.

Inside and outside of the Capitol, insurrectionists announced their desire to find and kill lawmakers and to stop Congress from certifying the Electoral College votes. Statements captured on video include: "We're here for you, Nancy," P-73 at 1:46; "Drag 'em out. Hang 'em out," P-73 at 8:07-8:10; "Can I speak to Pelosi? Yeah, we're coming bitch. Oh, Mike Pence? Yeah, we're coming for you, too, you fucking traitor," P-72 at 4:27-4:32; "Hang Mike Pence! Hang Mike Pence!" P-72 at 4:32-4:36; "Start making a list and put all the names down and we start hunting them down one-by-one," P-72 at 4:47-4:55. The insurrectionists also set up gallows outside the Capitol building. *See* P-72 at 4:40-4:45.

Insurrectionists attacked police officers as they made their way through the Capitol. In one police radio transmission, an officer desperately sought help as he announced that he was "taking metal, sharpened objects, missiles, to include bottles and rocks and hand-thrown chemical grade fireworks." P-72 at 0:58-1:05. Video shows a mob trying to force their way into the Capitol through a barrage of police officers in riot gear. P-72 at 3:50-4:14. At one point, a member of the mob forcibly tries to remove a police officer's gas mask. *Id*.

# d. Military and Other Reinforcements Are Needed to Quell the Insurrection

The insurrectionists proved too numerous and violent for the USCP to control. The Mayor of Washington, D.C. was forced to call the Secretary of the Army to seek National Guard support. P-19 at 24. The USCP called the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard as well. *Id.* An announcement also went out over police radio asking for "all military and sworn officers" to come to the Capitol. P-73 at 9:18-9:39. Ultimately, a number of agencies and entities were needed to repel the insurrectionists, "including DHS; the FBI; the

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; the Montgomery County Police Department; the Arlington County Police Department; the Fairfax Police Department; and Virginia State Troopers." P-19 at 26. Members of the House were held in a secret location, guarded by the military. Tr. 231:12-15.

The Senate did not reconvene until 8:06 p.m. *See* P-36 at S18. The House reconvened at 9:02 p.m. *See id.* at H85. Congress did not certify the Electoral College votes until 3:40 a.m. on January 7, 2021. *See* Stipulated Facts ¶ 9.

# e. The Insurrection Causes Injuries, Damage, and Death

Around 140 law enforcement officers reported injuries suffered during the attack. P-19 at 29. Some of the more serious injuries included brain injuries, cracked ribs, and smashed spinal discs. *Id.* One officer was stabbed with a metal fence stake; another officer lost an eye. *Id.* Another officer suffered a heart attack after being attacked several times with a stun gun. *Id.* Three officers lost their lives following the attack. USCP Officer Brian Sicknick was attacked with bear spray and passed away on January 7, 2021; Officer Howard Liebengood died on January 9; Officer Jeffrey Smith died on January 15. *Id.* 

Besides the injuries and loss of life, the insurrection causes substantial property damage, "requiring the expenditure of more than \$1.4 million dollars for repairs." Ex. 16  $\P$  40.

## f. A Seditious Conspiracy

Hundreds of people have been arrested in connection with the January 6, 2021 insurrection. Immediately after the attack, the U.S. Department of Justice characterized January 6 as an insurrection. *United States v. Chansley*, No. 21-cr-00003 (D. Ariz. filed Jan. 14, 2021), ECF No. 5, at 1, <a href="https://bit.ly/3FJ1LdM">https://bit.ly/3FJ1LdM</a> (describing "a violent insurrection that attempted to overthrow the United States Government on January 6, 2021").

More recently, over ten people—including some who never entered the Capitol—have been charged with seditious conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 2384, the elements of which track almost exactly the federal criminal offense of insurrection under 18 U.S.C. § 2383. *See* P-16; U.S. Dep't of Justice, Capitol Breach Cases, *available at* https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/capitol-breach-cases. While many of those cases are still proceeding to trial, some individuals have pleaded guilty to committing crimes and signed Statements of Offense, in which they have stipulated to facts they conceded the United States would be able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Joshua James, for example, stipulated that he "entered the Capitol in part to hinder or delay the certification of President-Elect Joseph R. Biden as President of the United States." P-36 ¶ 32. He further stipulated that he "intended to use force and did, in fact, use force in the Capitol and when engaging in physical altercations with law enforcement, in order to prevent, hinder, and delay the execution of the laws governing the transfer of power." *Id.* ¶ 36. Similarly, Charles Donohoe stipulated that he "intended to use force and did, in fact, use force to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the certification of the Electoral College vote, and did forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with, officers or employees of the United States." P-17 ¶ 42.

## g. Calling January 6 What It Was: An Insurrection

In the wake of January 6, lawmakers and Congress itself have labeled the events of that day an insurrection. For example, in Public Law 117-32—which the House passed by an overwhelming 406-21 majority, and the Senate passed unanimously<sup>3</sup>—Congress declared, "On January 6, 2021, a mob of *insurrectionists* forced its way into the U.S. Capitol building

10

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 167 Cong. Rec. H2800 (daily ed. June 15, 2021), S5685 (daily ed. Aug. 3, 2021).

and congressional office buildings and engaged in acts of vandalism, looting, and violently attacked Capitol Police officers." P-22 § 1(2) (emphasis added).

On February 13, 2021, Senator McConnell stated on the floor of the Senate that the people who entered the capitol on January 6 had "attacked their own government." P-55 at S735. "They used terrorism to try to stop a specific piece of domestic business they did not like," he continued. *Id.* "Fellow Americans beat and bloodied our own police. They stormed the Senate floor. They tried to hunt down the Speaker of the House. They built a gallows and chanted about murdering the Vice President." *Id.* None of these statements was or could be disputed.

## B. Marjorie Taylor Greene Engages in Insurrection

Respondent Marjorie Taylor Greene spent the years and months before she was sworn in as a Member of Congress developing a common vernacular with her national supporters and acclimating them to the idea that they would one day be called upon to storm the Capitol and attack their own government. She normalized political violence and pushed a false narrative of stolen elections, so that when it came time to call for a "1776 moment" on January 5, 2021, her supporters knew exactly what to do.

### 1. Before the 2020 Election: Greene Advocates Political Violence

In the run-up to her election to Congress in 2020, Greene advocated for and celebrated violence as a means for her and her supporters to accomplish their political goals.

In early 2019, Greene recruited her supporters to join her in doing exactly what the insurrectionists did on January 6, 2021. She implored them to come with her to Washington, D.C. because "[i]f we have a sea of people, if we shut down the streets, if we shut down everything, if we *flood the Capitol Building*," then they could go *inside* the U.S. Capitol building and demand that the federal government employees address their grievances. P-84.

Although only a portion of her self-made video is publicly available—and Greene refused to produce any documents in discovery—Greene also stated in the video that she wanted to make federal officials "cower[] in fear," and that if her supporters showed up with "big numbers on Feb. 23, oh I promise you, I promise you, they'll be struck with fear on the inside."

Nor did Greene deny that she referred to Speaker of the House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi as a "traitor." Tr. 109:9-110:24. Greene admitted she believes Pelosi violated her oath of office and could not deny that she said Pelosi committed treason and that treason is a "crime punishable by death." *Id*; *see also id.* at 105:5-21.<sup>5</sup> News reports indicated that Greene "Liked" a January 2019 Facebook post suggesting that a "bullet to the head would be quicker" to remove Speaker Pelosi from office. Once again, Greene could not deny that she personally liked that post. Tr. 113:18-114:5.

In October 2020, Greene made clear how far she was willing to go if she felt slighted by the political system. Just before she was elected to be a member of the United States Congress, Greene told a gun rights activist—who was wearing a t-shirt referencing "1776" during the recorded interview—that if anyone takes away your "freedoms," the only way to get them back is "with the price of blood." P-6. Remarkably, Greene denied in her testimony that suggesting freedoms should be obtained "with the price of blood" was a call for violence. Tr. 162:3-16.

<sup>4</sup> See also Roger Sollenberger, In 2019, Marjorie Taylor Greene told protesters to "flood the Capitol," feel free to use violence, Salon, Feb. 2, 2021, available at <a href="https://www.salon.com/2021/02/02/in-2019-marjorie-taylor-greene-told-protesters-to-flood-the-capitol-feel-free-to-use-violence/">https://www.salon.com/2021/02/02/in-2019-marjorie-taylor-greene-told-protesters-to-flood-the-capitol-feel-free-to-use-violence/</a> (marked as Exhibit P-23).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See also Em Steck and Andrew Kaczynski, Marjorie Taylor Greene indicated support for executing prominent Democrats in 2018 and 2019 before running for Congress, CNN, Jan. 26, 2021, available at <a href="https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/26/politics/marjorie-taylor-greene-democrats-violence/index html">https://www.cnn.com/2021/01/26/politics/marjorie-taylor-greene-democrats-violence/index html</a> (marked as Exhibit P-5).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> *Id*.

# 2. November 3, 2020 to January 3, 2021: Greene Advances False Claims Election Was Stolen and Lays the Groundwork for Insurrection

After she was elected to Congress in November 2020, Greene inflamed the passions of her supporters by attacking the results of the Presidential election. Her efforts were not confined to merely making baseless allegations of "widespread voter fraud." P-2B. Rather, during this period, Greene amplified her violent rhetoric, increasingly borrowing terms used in battle and war, *see* P-1C (using word "battle"); P-1E (vowing to "hold the line"), and setting the foundation for her ultimate call to invade the Capitol through a code word, "1776," an obvious reference to the Revolutionary War, the armed rebellion to overthrow British rule in the colonies. But Greene used "1776" not with reference to any foreign state, but to the United States government, effectively calling for a rebellion against our own government—in other words, an insurrection.

Greene also began rallying her supporters for a "wild" day on January 6. On Twitter, she circulated a Fox News article with the headline, "Trump promises 'wild' protest in Washington DC on Jan. 6," and commented that she was "planning a little something on January 6th as well." P-2K. She retweeted a promise from Ellipse Rally organizer Kylie Kremer to Mr. Trump that "[the] calvary [sic] is coming, Mr. President," while circulating promotional material for the January 6 protest. P-2D. She told her supporters, "I will #FightForTrump on Jan. 6" because "This #FightForAmerica is exploding!" P-2F.

In her most explosive pronouncement of all, Greene stated: "You can't allow it to just transfer power 'peacefully' like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our president." P-12; P-66. She used her fingers to make "air quotes" around the word "peacefully." Greene told her hundreds of thousands of Facebook followers—and the millions of others who would have access to her Facebook page—that she intended to disrupt

the peaceful transfer of power on January 6. She invited anyone who was "able" to join her on January 6 because it was "critical for everyone to show up and show the nation who we are. We are not a people that are going to go quietly into the night. We are not a people who are going to be thrust into socialism without stopping it." *Id*.

# 3. January 3 to January 6, 2021: Greene Calls on Her Supports to Use Political Violence to Stop the Counting of Electoral Votes

On January 5, 2021—the day before the insurrection—Greene called on her supporters to commit violent rebellion. When a broadcaster asked her, "What is your plan tomorrow? . . . . What are you prepared for," Greene answered, "This is our 1776 moment." P-27. This unambiguous reference to the armed rebellion by which the United States forged its freedom from the British Empire had a particular meaning to Greene's followers who were familiar with the modern usage of the term as a reference to violent resistance against perceived government tyranny. It was a statement designed to ignite Greene's supporters, to invite them to flood the Capitol, to block the certification at all costs, and to use violence if necessary. Greene proudly posted the video of that exchange to her Facebook page, where it remains today. Tr. 212:5-213:9. In tweets on January 4 and 5, Greene again invoked the concepts of rebellion, war, and revolution. She told her supporters that "the people will remember the Patriots who stood for election integrity" and implored them to "#FightForTrump," P-2H; see also P-1K (using the term "Surrender").

Greene's public calls for violence during the three days after she took the oath of office on January 3 stand in stark contrast to her post hoc testimony claiming her primary focus was on preparing objections to the count of electoral votes. *See e.g.*, Tr. 120:4-7; 191:13-15. She and her colleagues had a backup plan in the event that their objections were unsuccessful—which by January 5, she knew they would be. In the event that Vice President

Pence ignored their calls to overturn the results of a free and fair election, Greene would call on her supporters to illegally enter the Capitol Building and use threats and intimidation to stop the House and Senate from certifying the results of the 2020 presidential election. And that backup plan had a name: "1776."

Greene knew exactly what she was saying when she said, "This is our 1776 moment." She knew that her supporters and political allies saw themselves as "Patriots" who were trying to free the country from a tyrannical government and used "1776" as a call for violent insurrection. For example, in response to a Tweet from Greene that the leaders of the House and Senate may work out a rules change to block the electoral certification objections, Ali Alexander, a leader in the "Stop the Steal" organization, stated that, if such a tactic were employed, "1776 is \*always\* an option." He not-so-subtly hinted that he "and 500,000 others" would invade the Capitol building. Greene never responded to Mr. Alexander as though she were confused by his reference to "1776" or to ask him and his 500,000 supporters *not* to do anything to the Capitol building. In another example, the term was even used as a title for a written plan to surveil and storm the Capitol on January 6: "1776 Returns."

Finally, and most obviously, Greene knew that the Declaration of Independence, signed in 1776, was a document that ignited a revolution that seized political power through violence and force. Tr. 149:17-153:14. She even invoked the Declaration of Independence when she later apologized for the insurrectionists and attempted to justify their conduct,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Jan. 7, 2021 1:12PM tweet from @RighteousBabe4 capturing tweets from Ali Alexander, available at https://twitter.com/RighteousBabe4/status/1347244659446321156 (marked as Exhibit P-3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Alan Feuer, *Document in Jan. 6 Case Shows Plan to Storm Government Buildings*, N.Y. Times, Mar. 14, 2022, *available at*, <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/14/us/politics/enrique-tarrio-jan-6-document html">https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/14/us/politics/enrique-tarrio-jan-6-document html</a> (marked as Exhibit P-39).

stating: "January 6th was just a riot at the Capitol. And if you think about our Declaration of Independence says, it says to overthrow tyrants." P-15.

# 4. Post-January 6, 2021: Greene Continues to Call for Violent Rebellion

In the weeks and months after Greene's supporters heeded her call to invade the Capitol, she belatedly and insincerely attempted to cast herself as an advocate for peace. But the record includes no evidence of her calling for peaceful protest prior to the insurrection on January 6, 2021—and, under oath, Greene could not identify a single instance in which Greene urged her supporters to be peaceful *before* the insurrection. Tr. 233:7-15, 233:24-234:8. And Greene has never offered an unequivocal condemnation of the people who violently invaded the Capitol on January 6. Instead, she has advanced false claims that the federal government *invited* the insurrectionists in, *see* P-75 (referring to the insurrection as a "fedsurrection"), and she visited those who have been arrested for their role in the insurrection in what she has called the "patriot wing" of the jail where they are held. Tr. 227:18-22. Indeed, even during her hearing testimony, she continued to defend the insurrectionists as "patriots." *Id.* at 217:15-25.

Conspicuously, during the hearing, Greene's counsel asked her no questions about providing support to people who were planning the demonstrations; he asked her no questions about her conversations with the people who broke into the Capitol; he asked her no questions about her activities between January 3 and January 6. In response to Petitioners' questions on these topics, Greene could not *deny* offering support to those who planned to invade the Capitol, *id.* at 143:6-11, she could not *deny* speaking with White House staff about

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See also Alia Shoaib, Marjorie Taylor Greene visited accused Jan. 6 rioters in jail and told Steve Bannon the prisoners cry while singing the national anthem every night, Business Insider, Nov. 6, 2021, available at <a href="https://www.businessinsider.com/marjorie-taylor-greene-visited-jan-6-rioters-jailed-patriot-wing-2021-11">https://www.businessinsider.com/marjorie-taylor-greene-visited-jan-6-rioters-jailed-patriot-wing-2021-11</a> (marked as Exhibit P-25).

plans for demonstrations on January 6, *id.* at 126:22-127:1, she could not *deny* liking a Facebook post about murdering a political leader. *Id.* at 143:6-11, 126:22-127:1, 113:19-25. Instead, she hid behind her purported lack of memory, incredibly claiming during her testimony she could not answer at least 80 of Petitioners' questions because she did not "recall" or could not "remember." *See, e.g.*, Tr. 100:10-16, 113:18-25, 127:15-20, 129:13-23, 132:11-24, 155:3-8, 183:23-184:2, 200:20-201:3.

There is another effort to prevent the peaceful transfer of power that Greene ostensibly does not remember: asking the White House Chief of Staff to convey to the President her colleagues' suggestion to declare martial law to prevent the inauguration of President-elect Biden. On January 17, 2021, she reportedly sent a text message to then President Trump's Chief of Staff: "In our private chat with only Members, several are saying the only way to save our Republic is for Trump to call for Marshall [sic] law. I don't know on those things. I just wanted you to tell him." Pet. Mot. to Supp. Record (Apr. 26, 2022). Whatever Greene may have meant by "I don't know on those things," she made clear that she "wanted [the Chief of Staff] to tell [the President]" this idea. At the hearing, she claimed not to remember any such requests. See Tr. 200:20-201:3; 216:19-217:14. But her failure to recall this last gasp of insurrection is no more credible than her other lost memories.

### II. ARGUMENT

Respondent Marjorie Taylor Greene is disqualified to serve as a Member of Congress because she engaged in insurrection after taking the oath of office. The arguments she advances to mischaracterize the evidence and evade the inevitable legal conclusion it commands are without merit.

## A. Greene Is Disqualified from Serving in Congress

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any person "who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress . . . shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the [Constitution]" from serving as a United States Representative in Congress. The evidence in this case shows: (i) Respondent Marjorie Taylor Greene took the oath of Congressional office on January 3, 2021; (ii) an insurrection occurred on January 6, 2021; and (iii) Marjorie Taylor Greene engaged in that insurrection by promoting, supporting, and assisting it.

### 1. Greene Takes the Oath of Office

The parties stipulated that, "[o]n January 3, 2021, Respondent [Greene] took the oath of office to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time." *See*Stipulated Facts ¶ 5.

# 2. The Violent Attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021 Was an Insurrection Under the Disqualification Clause

The January 6, 2021 attack on the U.S. Capitol was an "insurrection" under all conceivably applicable definitions of the word.

An "insurrection" is a "combined resistance" to "lawful authority," with the intent to deny the exercise of that authority. *See* P-80 (Webster's Dictionary, 1830) ("combined resistance to . . . lawful authority . . ., with intent to the denial thereof"); P-81 (Georgia insurrection statute, 1866) ("[a] rising against civil or political authority"); *Allegheny Cty. v. Gibson*, 90 Pa. 397, 417 (1879) (nearly identical definition). To qualify as an insurrection, the resistance must be formidable enough to temporarily defy the authority of the government. *See In re Charge to Grand Jury*, 62 F. 828, 830 (N.D. III. 1894) (an uprising "so formidable as *for the time being* to defy the authority of the United States") (emphasis

added). It must be so significant that it cannot be addressed by ordinary law enforcement, *cf. Luther v. Borden*, 48 U.S. (7 How.) 1, 2 (1849); *In re Charge to Grand Jury*, 62 F. at 830, but no minimum threshold of violence is required, *id.* at 830 ("It is not necessary that there should be bloodshed").

The January 6 insurrection satisfies all these criteria. It was an uprising against the United States that sought to stop the peaceful transfer of power and thereby prevent the government from functioning. See supra §§ I.B.2.c, I.B.2.f. It succeeded, temporarily, in defying the authority of the United States by seizing a protected federal building to prevent Congress from fulfilling its constitutional duty to certify the results of a presidential election. The success of the attack may have been short-lived, but even a failed attack with no chance of success can qualify as an insurrection. See Home Ins. Co. of N.Y. v. Davila, 212 F.2d 731, 736 (1st Cir. 1954) (an insurrection "is no less an insurrection because the chances of success are forlorn."); In re Charge to Grand Jury, 62 F. at 830 ("It is not necessary that its dimensions should be so portentous as to insure probable success."). In fact, the January 6 insurrection can claim something many past insurrections could not: their violent seizure of the Capitol did, in fact, obstruct and delay an essential constitutional procedure. See supra § I.B.2.c. And it can claim a victory the Confederates never enjoyed: they never attacked the heart of the nation's capital, prevented a peaceful and orderly presidential transition of power, or took the U.S. Capitol. Tr. 65:20-66:17.

The attack was also violent. Multiple people died and 140 law enforcement officers were injured, some severely. *See supra* § I.B.2.e. The January 6 attack was as violent as at least two previous insurrections against the United States to which the Disqualification Clause was understood to apply: the Whiskey and Shays' Insurrections. *See* Tr. 53:11-25; 69 Cong. Globe, 39 Cong. 1st Sess. 2534 (Rep. Eckley) (during debates over clause, arguing

that "[b]y following the precedents of our past history will we find the path of safety," then discussing approvingly the expulsions and investigations of representatives who supported the "small in comparison" Whiskey Rebellion); see also P-48 (12 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 141, 160 (1867)) (opining that, in similarly-worded statute, "[t]he language here comprehends not only the late rebellion, but every past rebellion or insurrection which has happened in the United States"). The violence was so significant that civil authorities were unable to resist the attack and military and other federal agencies had to be called in. See supra § I.B.2.d.

Finally, Congress itself has characterized the January 6 attack as an insurrection. *See supra* § I.B.2.g. The Senate unanimously characterized the January 6 attackers as "insurrectionists" in awarding a Congressional Gold Medal for Capitol Police Officer Eugene Goodman. P-10. Congress separately voted to award Congressional Gold Medals to other Capitol Police for their conduct in the face of "insurrectionists" on January 6, 2021. P-11. Obviously, "insurrectionists" presuppose an "insurrection." Similarly, bipartisan majorities of the House and Senate voted for articles of impeachment describing the attack as an "insurrection." 167 Cong. Rec. H191 (daily ed. Jan. 13, 2021); 167 Cong. Rec. S733 (daily ed. Feb. 13, 2021). During the impeachment trial, former President Trump's defense lawyer stated that "the question before us is not whether there was a violent insurrection of [*sic*] the Capitol. *On that point, everyone agrees.*" 167 Cong. Rec. S729 (daily ed. Feb. 13, 2021) (emphasis added).

The January 6 attack is no less an insurrection just because some participants envisioned slightly different versions of the day's events. Plans were fluid and overlapped substantially with what a federal court has found to be a conspiracy to obstruct the Joint Session of Congress on January 6, 2021. *See* P-18. Like the Whiskey and Shays' Insurrections, the January 6 insurrection was loosely organized. Tr. 52:19-22. Whether some

participants may have gone further than others would have preferred or other participants were dismayed by some of the particular consequences is irrelevant; the events that actually unfolded constituted an insurrection. Greene offered no evidence otherwise.

## 3. Greene Engaged in the January 6 Insurrection

Two judicial opinions have considered the meaning of the word "engage" as used in the Disqualification Clause. *See United States v. Powell*, 65 N.C. 709 (C.C.D.N.C. 1871) (defining "engage" as "a voluntary effort to assist the Insurrection . . . and to bring it to a successful [from insurrectionists' perspective] termination"); *Worthy v. Barrett*, 63 N.C. 199, 203 (1869) (defining "engage" as "[v]oluntarily aiding the rebellion, by personal service, or by contributions, other than charitable, of any thing that was useful or necessary"). <sup>11</sup>

An individual need not personally commit an act of violence to have "engaged" in insurrection. *See Powell*, 65 N.C. at 709 (defendant paid to *avoid* serving in Confederate Army); *Worthy*, 63 N.C. at 203 (defendant simply served as county sheriff). Nor does "engagement" require previous conviction of a criminal offense. *See*, *e.g.*, *Powell*, 65 N.C. at 709 (defendant not charged with any prior crime); *Worthy*, 63 N.C. at 203 (defendant not charged with any crime); *In re Tate*, 63 N.C. 308 (1869) (defendant not charged with any crime); Gerard N. Magliocca, Amnesty and Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment, 36 Const. Comment. 87, 98-99 (2021) (in special congressional action in 1868 to enforce Section Three and remove Georgia legislators, none of whom had been charged criminally).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The *Worthy-Powell* standard provides the only judicial construction of "engage" under the Disqualification Clause. *See also In re Tate*, 63 N.C. 308 (1869) (applying *Worthy*). In a similarly-worded 1867 statute with more severe consequences (disenfranchisement) than the Disqualification Clause, the Attorney General construed the statute to require "some direct overt act, done with the intent to further the rebellion." Ex. 48, col. 4 (12 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 141, 164 (1867)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Rather than require a criminal conviction as a prerequisite to a civil action to disqualify an officeholder, Congress did the reverse and imposed criminal penalties for those who held office in defiance of the Disqualification Clause. *See* Act of May 31, 1870, ch. 114, § 15, 16 Stat. 140, 143.

No evidence or authority suggests that a prior criminal conviction was *ever* considered necessary to trigger the Disqualification Clause.

"Engage" includes both words and actions. Confederate leaders (from Jefferson Davis down) used words to tell subordinates what to do. Although "merely disloyal *sentiments or expressions*" may not be sufficient, P-48, col. 4 (12 U.S. Op. Atty. Gen. 141, 164 (1867)) (emphasis added), marching orders or instructions to capture a particular objective, or to disrupt or obstruct a particular government proceeding, constitute "engagement" under the *Worthy-Powell* standard. <sup>13</sup>

Greene acted as a leader of the loosely organized insurrection. As a Member-elect of Congress, known to have close ties to then-President Trump, Greene instructed her followers to converge on the Capitol on January 6, 2021. P-2C, P-2D. She told them, "You can't allow it to just transfer power 'peacefully' like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our president." P-12 (emphasis added); P-66; see also supra § I.C.2. It was her followers—not parliamentary procedure—that would prevent the certification of the Electoral College votes.

After taking the oath of office, she told her followers on January 5, 2021 that "this is our 1776 moment." P-27. While "1776" refers to one of our nation's proudest and defining historical moments, it unambiguously refers to an armed and violent rebellion. *See supra* § I.C.3. The American Revolution was fought against a foreign empire, but Greene used the phrase in reference to our own nation, and an armed rebellion against our own nation is, by definition, an insurrection. Indeed, "1776" accrued a particular and violent meaning among

"constitutionally protected speech may nevertheless be an overt act in a conspiracy charge").

22

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> To the extent (if any) that an "overt act" may be needed, *see* Ex. 48 (col. 4), words can constitute an "overt act," just as words may constitute an "overt act" under the Treason Clause, *e.g.*, *Chandler v. United States*, 171 F.2d 921, 938 (1st Cir. 1948) (enumerating examples, such as conveying military intelligence to the enemy), or for purposes of conspiracy law, *e.g.*, *United States v. Donner*, 497 F.2d 184, 192 (7th Cir. 1974) (even

Greene's allies and contemporaries. To them, her "1776" reference signaled violent resistance to perceived government tyranny.<sup>14</sup>

Greene's long and unbroken history of advocating that her followers should "flood the Capitol" (P-84) and commit political violence (including executing Speaker Pelosi) sets critical context for her remarks. No matter how a hypothetical "average" American may have understood superficially ambiguous statements such as "this is our 1776 moment," Greene's associates such as Anthony Aguero, Ali Alexander, and others in the violent vanguard understood them as signals to storm the Capitol. In this way, her communications resemble a Cold War "number station" broadcasting coded messages on open radio waves. The message was to flood the Capitol to prevent the certification of votes (whether by intimidating the Vice President into illegally rejecting electoral votes, by preventing Congress from functioning, or other means) because, as she had already told them, "[y]ou can't allow it to just transfer power 'peacefully." To deny the obvious meaning of her communications to her intended audience would allow political leaders to evade accountability by sheathing their messages in wink-and-nod layers of implausible deniability.

Greene's actions—all of which were voluntary—substantially aided the insurrection toward its goals through personal service and by useful contributions, satisfying the *Worthy-Powell* standard. As a Member of Congress, she signaled to supporters to initiate a mass uprising on a specific day, in a specific place, to defy the lawful authority of the United States and prevent the peaceful transfer of power. Greene's actions were far more concrete than, for example, the communications upon which the House relied in 1868 to exclude John

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> See, e.g., P-6; see also See Jan. 7, 2021 1:12PM tweet from @RighteousBabe4 capturing tweets from Ali Alexander, available at <a href="https://twitter.com/RighteousBabe4/status/1347244659446321156">https://twitter.com/RighteousBabe4/status/1347244659446321156</a> (marked as Exhibit P-3);; Alan Feuer, Document in Jan. 6 Case Shows Plan to Storm Government Buildings, N.Y. Times, Mar. 14, 2022, available at, <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/14/us/politics/enrique-tarrio-jan-6-document html">https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/14/us/politics/enrique-tarrio-jan-6-document html</a> (marked as Exhibit P-39).

Young Brown for disloyalty. 1 Asher C. Hinds, *Precedents of the United States House of Representatives*, ch. 14, § 449, at 445, <a href="https://bit.ly/JohnYBrown">https://bit.ly/JohnYBrown</a> (excluding Member for urging, in a general manner, attacks on Union Army volunteers). Her marching orders not only specified a time and place, but also gave the insurrection a veneer of false legitimacy and the understanding that those in power would help carry the plan to its fruition.

The question is not whether Greene *subjectively* envisioned or specifically desired that the storming of the Capitol unfold as violently as it did. Whatever her subjective desires for January 6 may have been, in the context of her well-known history of advocating political violence (including the execution of Speaker Pelosi), and amidst widespread reports of planned violence on the Capitol, her communiques had a reasonably foreseeable effect: a violent assault on the Capitol to prevent a peaceful transfer of power to the president-elect, in defiance of the Constitution. 16

Greene relies on the fact that, *after* people heeded her calls to prevent the peaceful transfer of power and execute Speaker Pelosi overran the Capitol, she released a video asking them to stand down. Ex. R-1. But having urged her followers to burn down the house, it is no defense that as the nation watched the fire in horror and the flames got too close to her, she half-heartedly asked them to back off. Her single, belated message does not negate her responsibility for urging the rebellion in the first place.<sup>17</sup>

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> See P-40, P-60 (marked but not admitted into evidence).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> The only "intent" requirement in the *Worthy-Powell* standard is voluntariness, but to the extent that "intent" may be relevant, "a person of sound mind and discretion is presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of his acts." *Adams v. State*, 246 Ga. 119, 121 (1980). Greene's instructions had the natural and probable consequence of causing her followers to flood the Capitol and prevent the peaceful transfer of power.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> She did not release a stand-down video during the window of time when she purportedly believed that "antifa" or "BLM" had stormed the building. Presumably she understood who might follow her instructions and who would not.

# 4. Greene Fails to Rebut Petitioners' Proof that She Engaged in Insurrection

Greene did not present any evidence or testimony at the hearing to rebut Petitioners' proof that she engaged in insurrection. She never explained what she meant when she told her followers that January 6 would be their "1776 moment," she never denied providing support to the people who violently invaded the Capitol, and she never denied coordinating with White House staff to plan the demonstrations. *See supra* § I.B.3. In this action, where the Court departed from the presumption that Greene bore the burden of proof and denied Petitioners the opportunity to obtain documents from Greene and to probe her knowledge through deposition testimony, only Greene is in possession of the documents and information necessary to rebut Petitioners' proof. But she never provided it to the Court.

Any purportedly innocent interpretations that Greene propounded as a cover story after the insurrection (e.g., that she was referring solely to parliamentary maneuvers on the House floor) are not credible. By January 5, it was publicly evident that there were no viable options for using only lawful means (such as objections by Members combined with peaceful nonviolent protest *outside* the Capitol) to block certification. The only possible options for preventing certification required either intimidating the Vice President into illegal action, *cf.* P-18, or obstructing Congress from voting, creating time and space for other unlawful maneuvers such as presentation of "alternate" electors, or the declaration of martial law, *see* Pet. Mot. to Supp. Record (Apr. 26, 2022). She also testified, after the fact, that she had only ever desired "peaceful" actions. *See*, *e.g.*, Tr. 91:16-17, 101:7-8. But she didn't use the word "peaceful" *before* January 6, 2021. *See* Tr. 101:21-102:4. Rather, during the long lead-up to January 6, 2021, the *only* time that Greene ever used the word "peaceful" in her

communiques was when she told her troops that they could *not* allow the government to "just transfer power 'peacefully."

The Court can, and should, reject Greene's attempts to justify her words and actions based on her demonstrably false testimony and her repeated and incredible feigned lack of memory. It is bedrock law that "[i]f a witness is impeached or discredited in some legal manner . . . a trial judge in [a] nonjury case may disbelieve [her] altogether." *Mustang Transp., Inc. v. W. W. Lowe & Sons, Inc.*, 123 Ga. App. 350, 352 (1971). When Petitioners' counsel asked if Greene ever said that Speaker Pelosi was "a traitor to the country," she responded, "No, I haven't said that." Tr. 105:11-15. That was a lie. When Petitioners' counsel began to put up an exhibit to rebut Greene's lie, she quickly backtracked: "Oh, no, wait, hold on now." *Id.* at 105:16-19. Moreover, under Georgia's "self-contradictory testimony rule," which "has been firmly entrenched in Georgia law for well over a century," Greene's equivocation and vague answers to Petitioners' questions counsel against giving any weight to her testimony at all. *See Thompson v. Ezor*, 272 Ga. 849, 851 (2000) (under the rule, "the testimony of a party who testifies on their own behalf at trial is construed against them whenever it is self-contradictory, vague, or equivocal").

Finally, Greene's defense rests almost entirely on her claimed lack of memory. She answered "I don't recall" or some version thereof more than 80 times during the hearing. Where, as here, Petitioners have proven the statements and events Greene claimed not to recall, her testimony that she did not "recall" those statements or events can be—and should be—deemed not credible. *Wyckoff v. State*, 309 Ga. App. 627, 629 (2011) (affirming trial court determination that criminal defendant's testimony that he did not remember plea hearing was not credible).

Greene's half-hearted post-hoc attempts to distance herself from the violence that resulted from her actions are too little, too late. Those who sow the wind can hardly profess surprise when America reaps the whirlwind.

### **B.** Greene's Defenses Are Meritless

In Greene's motion to dismiss, she raised four "General Objections" based on federal law: (1) that Georgia's challenge statute puts an unjustified burden on her First Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment right to run for office; (2) that Georgia's challenge procedures violate due process; (3) that Georgia's challenge statute violates Article I, Section 5, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which empowers the House to judge the qualifications of its own members; and (4) that the Amnesty Act of 1872 granted her prospective amnesty under the Disqualification Clause for the insurrection of January 6, 2021. Greene may also argue that the Disqualification Clause requires congressional action, e.g., a federal cause of action, to be enforceable in this proceeding.

Greene's motion also raised two "Privilege Objections," also based on federal law:

(1) that protected First Amendment activity and hearsay cannot be used to establish that she engaged in an insurrection, and (2) that her alleged involvement in the insurrection is privileged under the Speech and Debate Clause of the United States Constitution.

None of Greene's defenses has any merit.

### 1. First and Fourteenth Amendments

Petitioners' opposition to Greene's Motion to Dismiss fully briefed the question of whether Georgia's challenge statute violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; that argument is incorporated in full by reference here. Furthermore, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia held that the statute likely does not violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments and denied

Greene's request to enjoin this proceeding. *Greene v. Raffensperger*, No. 22 Civ. 1294, 2022 WL 1136729, at \*15–\*22 (N.D. Ga. Apr. 18, 2022).

### 2. Due Process

Any argument that the challenge statute provides constitutionally inadequate process because it requires Greene to affirmatively establish her eligibility for office is moot because this Court has already exercised its authority under OSAH Rule 616-1-2-.07(2) to shift the burden of proof to the petitioners. (Corrected Prehearing Order at 4-5.) The federal court so held, noting that very fact. *Greene v. Raffensperger*, No. 22 Civ. 1294, 2022 WL 1136729, at \*15–\*22 (N.D. Ga. Apr. 18, 2022).

### 3. Article I, Section 5, Clause 1

Greene's third argument involves Article I, Section 5, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which provides that "Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members." Greene argues that this clause gives Congress "an exclusive role" in judging the qualifications of its own members and that states may not scrutinize the qualifications of House or Senate candidates. (Mot. Dismiss at 12.) But that is not the law.

The Constitution's Elections Clause gives the states broad authority to regulate congressional elections:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1; see also Roudebush v. Hartke, 405 U.S. 15, 25 (1972) (holding that Indiana's recount procedure was a valid exercise of state authority and did not usurp the

28

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> The petitioners reserve the right to appeal this Court's ruling on the burden of proof.

Senate's power to judge elections). With this authority, states may enact "numerous requirements as to procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved." *U.S. Term Limits v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 834 (1995) (quoting *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932)); *see also Storer v. Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730 (1974) ("[A]s a practical matter, there must be a substantial regulation of elections if they are to be fair and honest and if some sort of order, rather than chaos is to accompany the democratic processes."); *United States v. Classic*, 313 U.S. 299, 311 (1941) ("[T]he states are given, and in fact exercise, a wide discretion in the formulation of a system for the choice by the people of representatives in Congress.").

In *Roudebush*, the Supreme Court upheld an Indiana recount procedure in a close Senate election as a valid exercise of the State's broad powers under the Elections Clause and rejected a claim that the process usurped a power that only the Senate could exercise. 405 U.S. at 24-26. The Court reasoned that "a recount can be said to 'usurp' the Senate's function only if it frustrates the Senate's ability to make an independent final judgment." *Id.* at 25. Indiana's procedure did not frustrate the Senate's function, the Court explained, because the Senate remained "free to accept or reject the apparent winner in either count, and, if it so chooses, to conduct its own recount." *Id.* at 25-26 (footnotes omitted). As a result, the recount process did not violate Article 1, Section 5, Clause 1. *See id.* at 26.

So too here. The House remains free to accept or reject Georgia's determination of Greene's qualifications and can, if it so chooses, void the election and require a new one if it disagrees with a determination that Greene is disqualified. Georgia's challenge process therefore does not usurp the House's power any more than Indiana's recount process usurped the Senate's.

Greene nonetheless argues that Georgia violates the Constitution simply by making an "independent evaluation" of her qualifications. (Mot. Dismiss at 13.) But such a rule would be absurd. Georgia would not, for example, violate the Constitution if it made an independent evaluation of a non-citizen or underage candidate's qualifications. Congress also has the final say in a similar setting—the counting of votes from the Electoral College, *see* 3 U.S.C. § 15—and yet courts have held that states retain the ability to disqualify constitutionally ineligible presidential candidates under these circumstances. *See, e.g.*, *Hassan*, 495 F. App'x at 948-49 (candidate not a natural-born citizen); *Lindsay*, 750 F.3d at 1065 (underage candidate). Indeed, the federal court held as much in denying Greene's request to enjoin this proceeding. *Greene*, 2022 WL 1136729, at \*26–\*28.

Greene therefore has not established that this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear challenges to federal candidates.

## 4. The Amnesty Act of 1872

Greene next argues that, because the Amnesty Act of 1872 granted prospective amnesty to all future insurrectionists, the Disqualification Clause simply does not apply to her. (Mot. Dismiss at 14-16.) But Greene's reading of both provisions is at odds with their text and history.

The Disqualification Clause provides in full as follows:

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 3. Congress does not have the power to repeal the Disqualifications Clause by statute, but it does have the power to "remove" a disqualification under this Clause.

Congress did just that by private legislation in the years immediately following the 1868 ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See, e.g.*, Private Act of December 14, 1869, Ch. 1, 16 Stat. 607, 607-13. Then, in 1872, Congress adopted the Amnesty Act, which provides in part that

all political disabilities imposed by the third section of the fourteenth article of amendments of the Constitution of the United States are hereby removed from all persons whomsoever, except Senators and Representatives of the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh Congresses, officers in the judicial, military, and naval service of the United States, heads of departments, and foreign ministers of the United States.

Act of May 22, 1872, ch. 193, 17 Stat. 142 (1872) (the "Amnesty Act of 1872"). The issues here are whether Congress could, and did, remove disqualifications prospectively.

The word "remove" means to "take away or off"; "to get rid of"; or to "eliminate." *ACLU of Fla. v. Miami-Dade Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 557 F.3d 1177, 1219 (11th Cir. 2009); *Vurv Techn. LLC v. Kenexa Corp.*, 2009 WL 2171042, at \* 5 (N.D. Ga. Jul. 20, 2009). It means to take away something already present. The plain meaning of the text of the Disqualification Clause therefore suggests that it does not empower Congress to grant prospective amnesty.

Congress confirmed this understanding of its power under the Disqualification Clause in 1919 when it rejected a similar argument, based on the Amnesty Act of 1898, from a Representative-elect who had been convicted of espionage. After acknowledging that the Clause authorizes Congress to remove disqualifications, the House concluded that "manifestly it could only remove disabilities incurred previously to the passage of the [1898 Amnesty] act, and Congress in the very nature of things would not have the power to remove

any future disabilities." 6 Clarence Cannon, Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States, ch. 157, § 56-59 (1936). 19 Thus, the history of the Clause also suggests that it does not give Congress the power to grant prospective amnesty. Greene's interpretation, moreover, would mean that Congress effectively repealed the Disqualification Clause without the constitutionally required ratification by three fourths of the states. If the drafters of the Fourteenth Amendment had meant the Disqualification Clause to amend Article V, the process by which the Constitution is amended, they would have said so explicitly.

But even if Congress had the *power* to grant prospective amnesty, the text and history of the Amnesty Act of 1872 suggest that Congress did *not* intend to grant prospective amnesty. The Act uses the past tense "imposed" rather than "which may be imposed," suggesting that it only applies to disqualifications that have already been imposed. *See Gundy v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 2116, 2127 (2019) (noting that the use of past tense indicates that a statute applies to pre-enactment conduct); *Carr v. United States*, 560 U.S. 438, 448 (2010) (observing that the Supreme Court has "frequently looked to Congress' choice of verb tense to ascertain a statute's temporal reach").

And the history of the statute confirms the plain meaning of the text. *See generally*, Magliocca, *supra*, at 111-20. Before the Act, Congress had been passing private bills to remove disqualifications from former Confederates. *See id.* at 112. That soon became cumbersome, with thousands of names in each bill. *Id.* 

One of the last private bills that the House considered originally contained some "sixteen or seventeen thousand names," and was then amended to include "some twenty-five

 $<sup>{\</sup>it ^{19}\,Available\,at\,\,} \underline{\rm https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-HPREC-CANNONS-V6/pdf/GPO-HPREC-CANNONS-V6.pdf/gpo-$ 

more pages of additional names." Cong. Globe, 42nd Cong., 2nd Sess. 3381-82 (1872) (Rep. Butler). As members kept adding names to the list, one member proposed adding the words "and all other persons" to the bill. *Id.* at 3382 (Rep. Perry). The sponsor of the bill rejected that proposal out-of-hand precisely because it suggested that amnesty would be extended to those who had not yet incurred disqualification under the Fourteenth Amendment, joking that he "did not want to be amnestied" himself. *Id.* at 3382 (Rep. Butler). That remark elicited laughter on the House floor, *see id.*, underscoring the fact that Greene's preferred interpretation—that Congress could grant Section Three amnesty prospectively—was the punchline of a joke at the time of the 1872 Act's passage.

Still, rather than pass another statute with a long list of names, Congress chose to use a general phrase to identify those former Confederates it was relieving of disqualification, with a few exceptions for some of the most prominent Confederate leaders. Magliocca, supra, at 116-20. Crucially, all of the discussion leading to the Amnesty Act of 1872 centered on ex-Confederates, rather than any other insurrectionists to whom the Disqualification Clause might apply. Tr. 65:13-19. It was not designed to grant amnesty to potential future insurrectionists.

Greene's argument to the contrary is exceedingly simple: "By the plain language of this Act, the political disability was removed from any Representative other than those of the two enumerated Congresses." (Mot. Dismiss at 15.) But this merely assumes that one can "remove" something which does not already exist. And it ignores the plain meaning and history of the provisions at issue. As authority, Greene cites only a district court case from North Carolina which recently adopted this textual argument (Mot. Dismiss at 16), but that case is neither binding nor persuasive, and it remains pending on appeal. To the contrary, the federal court considering Greene's arguments to enjoin *this* proceeding carefully evaluated

both her arguments and the North Carolina decision, and concluded that the Amnesty Act of 1872 does *not* apply to future insurrections. *See Greene v. Raffensperger*, 2022 WL 1136729 at \*23-\*25 (N.D. Ga. Apr. 18, 2022),

Greene therefore has not established that the Amnesty Act of 1872 granted her prospective amnesty for engaging in the insurrection of January 6, 2021.

## 5. State law administrative proceedings do not require a federal cause of action.

Greene may argue that this Court cannot decide whether she has engaged in insurrection within the meaning of the Disqualification Clause because Congress has not enacted a federal cause of action to enforce the Disqualification Clause. If so, that argument would be a non sequitur. Challengers did not file a federal lawsuit, and do not require a federal cause of action. In the context of a state administrative proceeding, it makes no more sense to inquire whether Congress has conferred a private right of action to enforce the U.S. Constitution than for any other state or local proceeding (e.g., a zoning appeal) that might turn on an embedded federal ingredient.

In re Griffin is not to the contrary. That case noted in dicta that procedures for enforcing the Disqualification Clause "can only be provided for by congress." 11 F. Cas. 7, 26 (C.C.D. Va. 1869). But *Griffin* was decided when Virginia had no state government, and was under direct federal rule; much like Washington, D.C. today, all its laws could "only be provided for by congress." See Magliocca, supra at 130 & n.91 (noting Griffin "was not denying states the power to enforce Section Three on their own").<sup>20</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> The contrary decision of an Arizona state trial court fails to identify this critical fact. *Hansen v. Finchem*, No. CV 2022-004321, slip. op. (Ariz. Maricopa Cty. Superior Ct. Apr. 21, 2022), appeal filed, No. CV-22-0099-AP/EL (Ariz. Sup. Ct. filed Apr. 22, 2022).

Finally, Congress did pass legislation requiring Georgia to apply the Disqualification Clause. 40 Cong. Ch. 70, 15 Stat. 73 (1868) ("no person prohibited from holding office under the United States . . . by section three of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, known as article fourteen, shall be deemed eligible to any office in [any] of said States, unless relieved from disability as provided by said amendment"). That provision has never been repealed.

#### 6. The First Amendment and Hearsay

Greene's first "Privilege Objection" is that First Amendment activity and hearsay cannot be used to support insurrection claims. (Mot. Dismiss at 29-33.) This argument misses its mark for at least two reasons.

First, hearsay is not a bar to admissibility in this Court. Under OSAH rules, an ALJ may consider certain hearsay evidence when "it is of a type commonly relied upon by reasonably prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs." OSAH Rule 616-1-2-.18(1). This Court excluded proposed evidence that it deemed inadmissible hearsay, and the central evidence in the record (admitted exhibits and Greene's testimony) is not hearsay.

Second, the First Amendment does not preclude disqualifying someone from Congress based on what might otherwise be First Amendment-protected speech. The Disqualification Clause is not a mere statute, subject to First Amendment review; it is a coequal provision of the Constitution. For example, while all Americans have a First Amendment right to refuse to swear an oath to protect the Constitution, the Constitution itself requires federal and state legislators and officers to take an oath to protect the Constitution before they can serve—a requirement the Supreme Court has had no difficulty upholding. See U.S. Const. art. VI; Bond v. Floyd, 385 U.S. 116, 132 (1966). First Amendment "compelled speech" analysis, which protects private citizens from compelled oaths, simply

does not apply to an incoming member who refuses the oath. By the same token, there is no First Amendment right to serve in Congress for someone who, after taking the oath, engages in insurrection, even if the engagement included speech that would be protected under the First Amendment if made by a private citizen.

Greene nonetheless argues that speech cannot constitute engagement in an insurrection unless the speech meets the two-part test set out in *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444 (1969). In that case, the Supreme Court held that the First Amendment prohibits the government from imposing penalties via legislation, regulation, or common law on private citizens for advocating violence to achieve political ends, unless the advocacy was (i) intended to and (ii) likely to incite "imminent lawless action." Id. at 447. Greene cites no authority as to why *Brandenburg* should apply to a separate constitutional provision; her argument would gut the Disqualification Clause and defeat its intended purpose. If distributing open or veiled signals, marching orders, and other instructions in support of an insurrection cannot count as engaging in insurrection, then only the foot soldiers would face possible disqualification. But the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment were not primarily concerned with disqualifying Confederate soldiers; rather, they were primarily concerned with disqualifying Confederate *leaders*. Magliocca, *supra* at 91-93. The primary way that leaders engage in insurrection is through their speech—their commands and their advocacy. Under Greene's theory, the vast majority of Confederate political leaders (including Jefferson Davis) were not disqualified by Section Three—most never fired a shot or gave a speech that met the Brandenburg definition of inciting "imminent lawless action." That Greene's engagement in the insurrection included oral advocacy does not immunize her from disqualification; to the contrary, it makes her exactly the sort of insurrectionist that the Disqualification Clause was intended for.

Moreover, even if the First Amendment did serve as a limitation on the Disqualification Clause, Brandenburg still would not apply. Government actors like Greene are not subject to precisely the same First Amendment analysis as private citizens. See, e.g., Garcetti v. Ceballos, 547 U.S. 410, 419 (2006) (Public employees "often occupy trusted positions in society. When they speak out, they can express views that contravene governmental policies or impair the proper performance of governmental functions."); Snepp v. United States, 444 U.S. 507 (1980) (requiring CIA employees not to divulge classified information, or to publish information about agency without prior agency approval, does not violate First Amendment); U.S. Civ. Serv. Comm'n v. Nat'l Ass'n of Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 564 (1973) (holding Hatch Act constitutional). And the Supreme Court has held that restrictions on elected officials, even ones that may force them to resign, should be viewed with less skepticism than restrictions on civil servants. Clements v. Fashing, 457 U.S. 957, 972 (1982). Having sworn an oath to support the Constitution, they are held to a higher standard than individual private citizens who may, e.g., advocate to forcefully prevent a peaceful transfer of power.

But even if *Brandenburg* did somehow apply as a limit on the Disqualification

Clause, the record here establishes Greene's marching orders would satisfy the *Brandenburg* standard. Greene's statements urging supporters to reject a peaceful transition of power and to come to the Capitol on January 6 for "our 1776 moment" were not an abstract advocacy of violence—a declaration in the woods that, at some undetermined point, "there might have to be some revengeance taken." *Brandenburg*, 395 U.S. at 446. They were a call to reject the peaceful transition of power *at a particular time and place*. Furthermore (and unlike in *Brandenburg*), her instructions *in fact* led to lawless action at that very time and place. "It remains fundamental that while the state may not criminalize the expression of views—even

including the view that violent overthrow of the government is desirable—it may nonetheless outlaw encouragement, inducement, or conspiracy to take violent action." *United States v. Rahman*, 189 F.3d 88, 115 (2d Cir. 1999).

### 7. The Speech and Debate Clause

Greene's second "Privilege Objection" is that the Petitioners' claims are based on activity that is protected under the Speech and Debate Clause in Article 1, Section 6 of the United States Constitution. (Mot. Dismiss at 33-36.) This argument also lacks merit.

The Speech and Debate Clause "prohibits inquiry only into those things generally said or done in the House or the Senate in the performance of official duties and into the motivation for those acts." *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501, 512 (1972). It "enures only to legislators engaging in actions considered an integral part of the deliberative and communicative processes by which legislators participate in proceedings with respect to the consideration and passage or rejection of proposed legislation." *Bryant v. Jones*, 575 F.3d 1281, 1304–05 (11th Cir. 2009) (cleaned up).

Neither the allegations of the Complaint nor the evidence presented at the hearing pertain to legislative activity protected by the Speech and Debate Clause.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth herein, the Court should find that Respondent Greene is disqualified under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment and is not "qualified to seek and hold the public office for which [she] is offering" under O.C.G.A. § 21-2-5(c).

This 29th day of April, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bryan L. Sells
Bryan L. Sells
Georgia Bar No. 635562
The Law Office of Bryan L. Sells, LLC
Post Office Box 5493
Atlanta, Georgia 31107-0493
Telephone: (404) 480-4212

Email: bryan@bryansellslaw.com

Ronald Fein\*
John C. Bonifaz\*
Ben Clements\*
Courtney Hostetler\*
Benjamin Horton\*
FREE SPEECH FOR PEOPLE
1320 Centre St. #405
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 244-0234
rfein@freespeechforpeople.org

Jonathan S. Abady\*
Andrew G. Celli, Jr.\*
Samuel Shapiro\*
Andrew K. Jondahl\*
EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF ABADY WARD & MAAZEL LLP
600 Fifth Avenue, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor
New York, NY 10020
(212) 763-5000
jabady@ecbawm.com
acelli@ecbawm.com

Attorney for the Petitioners

<sup>\*</sup> Admitted pro hac vice

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 29, 2022, I served the foregoing document on the respondent by electronic mail at the following addresses: <a href="mailto:dfg@guldenschuhlaw.com">dfg@guldenschuhlaw.com</a>, <a href="mailto:khilbert@hilbertlaw.com">khilbert@hilbertlaw.com</a>, <a href="mailto:cgardner@hilbertlaw.com">cgardner@hilbertlaw.com</a>, <a href="mailto:msiebert@bopplaw.com">msiebert@bopplaw.com</a>, and <a href="mailto:jboppir@aol.com">jboppir@aol.com</a>.

/s/ Bryan L. Sells
Bryan L. Sells
Georgia Bar No. 635562
The Law Office of Bryan L. Sells, LLC
Post Office Box 5493
Atlanta, Georgia 31107-0493
Telephone: (404) 480-4212

Email: bryan@bryansellslaw.com

Attorneys for Petitioners

# Exhibit A

```
1
     BEFORE THE OFFICE OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
 2
                      STATE OF GEORGIA
 3
   DAVID ROWAN, DONALD ) Docket No.: 2222582
   GUYATT, ROBERT RASBURY, ) 2222582-OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-
 5
 6
   RUTH DEMETER, and DANIEL ) 57-Beaudrot
7
   COOPER,
 8
       Petitioners,
   V.
   MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE,
10
       Respondents.
11
12
13
                       April 22, 2022
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
2.3
24
25
                Transcript by TransPerfect
```

Legal Solutions

[00:35:30]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: All right. We don't normally have many people in this courtroom. Okay, let's see here. Some obvious things that may bear repeating. This is an important hearing. These are important things. We need to ask everybody to respect the proceeding. This is our big courtroom, but it's quite full. So, please be, you know, quiet, and again, you know have phones and computers and the like. Just be very careful with them. Please turn off your, any alarms or anything, that, you This is not federal court, where I would, know. of course, you wouldn't have it in federal court. I would lock you up if you did. Computers and phones, noise to minimum, moving around to minimum, just don't be disruptive. No comments. This is not a public forum. No comments. Let's talk about the schedule for the day, so everybody will be sort of prepared. I plan to go until The first break, we'll take 15 minutes. 10:45. Then we plan to go from 11:00 to 12:30 with a 30minute lunch break. We'll resume at 1:00 o'clock, and a structured break at 2:30, and then reconvene at 2:45. Obviously, if something needs

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

whatever reason, just let me know, and we will consider that. Yesterday, we had, you know, this case been proceeding at a very rapid rate. It has to. It's an election case, and we had a conference on evidentiary matters, and I have reached a number of preliminary conclusions about documents that have been proffered, and I'm going to, it's going to be rather tedious, but I need to read these into the record, and so, and then, I want to hear from counsel to let you ask any of questions that you want to discuss in particular, and I'm only going to read the documents, which I'm admitting at this point.

JAMES BOPP: Your honor?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes.

JAMES BOPP: Sorry, I had a preliminary matter. I'd like to vote separation of witnesses, please.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Oh, we only have, who do we have? There's Representative Greenee and professor....

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I think Mr. [PH 00:37:50] Magliocca, Dr. Magliocca is here.

2.1

2.3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: The professor can step out. That will be fine, thank you.

JAMES BOPP: All right, thank you, your honor.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Certainly, thank you, Mr. Bopp. Okay. All right. So, here's what's in at this point: exhibit P2G, as in George, the video, P21, the video only, P2N, as in Nancy, the video, P6, the video, P10 from the congressional record is in, P11 is in, P12, which is a video, P13A is in, P14, the video only, P16, P17, P18, P19, P21, P22, P24, P27, P29, P36, P41, P44, P45, P48, P49, P51, P52, P53, P54, P55, P57, P59, P61. On P62, we had a discussion about this yesterday, there's a reference to a Senate report. The Senate report was not tendered. Ιf somebody wants to tender it, I will admit that, but I'm not, P62 itself is not coming in. P63, P64, P65, P66, P68, 69, P72, P73, P74 and P75, P76, P80, and P81. Now, and then on respondent's list, the following are admitted: R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, and R14. Those are all I have. I will, if council want to [PH 00:41:13] perfect objections at this point and raise it for the record, I'll start with Mr. Celli, if you all

1	have any objections that you want to raise at
2	this time.
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, I don't
4	have my list handy, but are these the preliminary
5	rulings that you gave yesterday?
6	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yeah, I mean, I
7	believe. I mean, I believe this is what I went
8	through yesterday. There were a couple of items
9	that I did not have chance to review until today.
10	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: One second, your
11	honor.
12	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sure, take a
13	second.
14	SAM SHAPIRO: Your honor, if actually
15	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, I'll
16	[INDISCERNIBLE 00:41:41], Judge [INDISCERNIBLE
17	00:41:43], can you all hear me?
18	SAM SHAPIRO: Not well.
19	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.
20	SAM SHAPIRO: Not well.
21	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. Okay.
22	I'll try to speak to it more directly. Thank
23	you. Thank you, officer. Go ahead.
24	

Oh,

Yes, I'm sorry.

1 SAM SHAPIRO: Sorry, your honor. I thought 2 yesterday you admitted P15 as well. I didn't 3 [INDISCERNIBLE 00:41:57]. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let me look 4 5 again. Hold on. Oh, I couldn't find it. I mean, [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:18] wouldn't work, 6 7 that was my problem. If you want to submit it, I mean, if I could review it, I would be happy to 8 oblige. That was the only, I went looking for 9 10 it, and I couldn't find it. SAM SHAPIRO: And then P50, I thought your 11 honor [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:34] as well. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's see, P55. 13 SAM SHAPIRO: 50, sorry. 14 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 50, well, I 15 thought so too. I'm sorry. Yes, that was my 16 other [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:44], yes. 17 SAM SHAPIRO: And then we had submitted to 18 your honor three additional exhibits: P82, 83, 19 and 84 yesterday afternoon. 20 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Oh, I'm sorry, 2.1 yes. Wait a minute. Let me see. Hold on. 22

yes. Let me look at these.

2.3

24

25

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Yes, those are, what was 80, 81, and 83?

SAM SHAPIRO: 82, 83, and 84.

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: What was 82?
2	SAM SHAPIRO: 82 is a video, the House
3	impeachment video.
4	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes, yes. Yeah,
5	I did not Yeah, the House impeachment videos
6	[INDISCERNIBLE 00:43:27], yes.
7	SAM SHAPIRO: 83 was the January 6th letter
8	from Vice President Pence.
9	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes. Yes,
10	that's in this, yes.
11	SAM SHAPIRO: And then 84 was a video of the
12	Congresswoman.
13	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Video? Oh, of
14	Representative Greenee, yes. Yes, yes, that
15	one's in this.
16	SAM SHAPIRO: And then just one more, your
17	honor, I think, on the respondent's exhibits, I
18	thought you had admitted R7, which is a statute.
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I did. That's
20	right.
21	SAM SHAPIRO: I believe you had said you
22	admitted R6, but that was an article, and I
23	thought

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You are correct. 2 Thank you for the correction. You're absolutely 3 correct. [INDISCERNIBLE 00:44:04]. Mr. Bopp? JAMES BOPP: Nothing, your honor. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You're good? 6 Thank you so much. Okay. Appreciate everybody's 7 indulgence on that. Now, the lawyers in this case are doing an excellent job, and they're under great pressure. So, I appreciate everybody 10 staying on task. So, with that said, you know, it's a black hole sometimes, [INDISCERNIBLE 11 00:44:38]. Okay. We're ready to begin then. 12 13

So, as we've discussed, we're going to proceed. I'd like begin with opening statements. Well, before we begin anything, Mr. Bopp,, anything that you discuss before we start with opening

statements? 17

1

4

5

8

9

14

15

16

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JAMES BOPP: No, your honor, I'm prepared for argument.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Right. Celli?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We're ready, your honor.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: All right, good. So, what we're going to do is we'll start with

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

opening statements. I'd like to get both of them at the same time. Rhe burden in this case is on the petitioners by preponderance of the evidence. So, they will get to go first, and then we'll proceed with their case [INDISCERNIBLE 00:45:18]. Who's going to present, Mr. Fein?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

RON FEIN: Thank you, your honor. May it please the court?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes, sir.

RON FEIN: Ron Fein on behalf of the voters in Georgia's 14th congressional district who filed this challenge, with me, of course, are Andrew Celli, Sam Shapiro, Dymond Wells, [PH 00:45:39] Ryan Sells, and of course, our cocounsel watching remotely. Your honor, this is a solemn occasion. This is not politics. This is not theater. This is a serious case that the voters who we represent have brought in order to offer proof that their United States representative seeking reelection, Marjorie Taylor Greene, having taken the oath to support the Constitution, then broke that oath and engaged in insurrection, and in order to understand that case, it's important to set the stage with some history. There have been past

1 insurrections in this country, and we're going to 2 hear about some of them, the most important of 3 which was the Civil War, or as it was called at 4 the time, The Insurrection. and Professor Gerard 5 Magliocca, who is one of the nation's foremost 6 Constitutional historians of that era, specializing in reconstruction in the 14th 7 Amendment, will talk about some of that history. 8 9 What was interesting about some of the 10 differences between these past interactions is that the Civil War involved states raising 11 armies. They equipped them with uniforms, 12 insignia, and state-of-the-art military 13 equipment. They marched the columns. 14 occupied huge tracks of land. That is not the 15 only type of insurrection that this country has 16 Professor Magliocca will also talk about 17 some of the previous insurrections that were on 18 the minds of 19th century Americans. 19 include Shays' Rebellion, also known as Shays' 20 insurrections, and the Whiskey Rebellion. These 21 insurrections were of a different character. 22 They were not quite as organized as the Civil 2.3 The foot soldiers of those insurrections 2.4

25

didn't march in armies. They didn't conquer vast

1 swaths of territory, and they certainly didn't 2 wear uniforms. That is the kind of insurrection 3 that occurred on January 6th. The evidence will 4 show a violent assault on the United States Capital that the law enforcement and ordinary 5 6 authorities were unable to control, that this violent assault had multiple purposes. 7 8 included capturing and executing the Speaker of the House of the United States representatives, 9 10 the Vice President of the United States, other 11 members of Congress. Those purposes also included, and for a time, achieved preventing the 12 certification of the electoral votes for the 13 President incoming: Joseph R. Biden, and the 14 disruption of the peaceful transfer of power. 15 This attack on the sacred temple of our 16 democracy, the United States Capital, was 17 unprecedented, and to be sure, it was less 18 organized than some of those past interactions. 19 This was not a case where the leaders were on 20 horseback, leading the charge. This was not the 2.1 type of insurrection where the leaders were 22 standing in Richmond, Virginia, giving long-2.3 winded speeches to justify the man. Rather, the 24

25

leaders of this insurrection, of whom there were

24

25

a number, were among us on Facebook, on Twitter, on corners of social media that would make your stomach curdle. The evidence will show that Marjorie Taylor Greene was one of them. In order to understand that, January 6th has to be set in It didn't arise out of nowhere. before January 6th, as December 2020 turned into January of 2021, there were multiple shifting tactics used by different groups, some violent extremist groups, some nonviolent groups, all loosely coordinating, all with a shared central aim of preventing the certification of Joseph Biden as president. The tactics shifted. The different leaders jockeyed for position. were in violent extremist groups. Some were elected officials. Some were influencers of various types. You'll hear about them. You'll hear about these different figures, some of whom isolated themselves from some of the action with layers of deniability, some more plausible than There'll be direct evidence. There'll also be inferential evidence, and that inferential evidence includes coded language. Let me explain what I mean by that. The evidence today does not include surveillance tapes

1 purporting to show that Marjorie Taylor Greene was directing the plotting of the attack. 2 3 not going to happen today. The witness list 4 today does not include a turncoat witness, who's 5 going to come and risk their own exposure by 6 testifying that he or she was ordered by Marjorie Taylor Greene to take certain actions in secret. 7 That's not the type of evidence that we are going 8 to present today. Rather, the way that 9 10 insurrections are organized nowadays is less in uniforms with military hierarchies and chains of 11 command, less with detailed military plans of 12 battle, and more through social media and the 13 mass media. That's the era that we're living in. 14 In many cases, the communications have multiple 15 layers, and anyone who knows a teenager, is a 16 teenager, or knows anyone in their 20's knows 17 that hashtags and memes and ways of communicating 18 among internet subcultures can mean that words 19 that could have one meaning, a benign meaning or 20 even a baffling meaning to large portion of the 21 American public, can carry a very different 22 significance to the people swimming in that 2.3 particular subculture. So, the most important 24

witness today, after Professor Magliocca

1 testifies, the most powerful witness against 2 Marjorie Taylor Greene's candidacy, the most 3 powerful witness in establishing that she crossed 4 the line into engagement of insurrection is Marjorie Taylor Greene herself. You'll hear her 5 6 words, of course, on the stand, what she says and 7 what she doesn't say. You'll also hear what she 8 said in the past. Again, some of that will be in somewhat coded or veiled language, but you'll 9 10 also hear, in some cases, the mask falls, and she 11 shows us exactly what she intended. Now, she was not on the Capital steps, urging the attackers to 12 breach police lines and smash through the doors 13 on January 6th. That was no not the role that 14 she played. Different figures within this larger 15 effort had different roles, but what became 16 clear, as December turned into January, as lawful 17 means of preventing the certification of Joe 18 Biden were exhausted, as nonviolent, even if 19 unlawful, means were exhausted, is that Marjorie 20 Taylor Greene nonetheless played an important 21 role, and her role, even after she took the oath 22 on January 3rd to uphold the Constitution and 2.3 defend it against all enemies, foreign and 24

domestic, was several-fold: to bring people to

DC, again, not by providing trains and buses that would transport them directly, but rather, through other means, to contribute in the planning, and to signal that January 6th would be, as she said, herself, on January 5th, our 1776 moment, a coded phrase with great significance. In fact, it turned out to be an 1861 moment. Instead of violence against a foreign empire, as we saw in 1776, she urged and encouraged and helped facilitate violent resistance to our own government, our democracy, and our Constitution, and in doing so, she engaged in exactly the type of conduct that triggers disqualification under section three of the 14th Amendment, which is to say, she engaged in insurrection. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you. Mr. Bopp?

JAMES BOPP: Thank you, your honor. May it please the court, represent Mark Taylor Greene, member Congress of the United States, in this hearing, and your honor, this is a court of law. This is not a political candidate debate. This is not a place for political hyperbole. It is not a place for political smears. It's a court

1 of law. In what we just heard, there was not a 2 word about the law. What does the section three 3 of the 14th Amendment mean? What does the word 4 'insurrection' mean? What does the word 'engage' Not a word. There was not a word about 5 mean? 6 the 1st Amendment that prevents normal political 7 speech and a hyperbole from being used against someone, not a word. They think they're in the 8 wrong place. Well, I plan to talk about the law. 9 10 What does this mean, this very serious charge 11 that has very broad ramifications to the rights of Representative Greenee, the voters in her 12 district, and our democracy? First, the right to 13 14 vote is at stake, right here, right now, because they want to deny the right to vote to the 15 thousands of people in the 14th district of 16 Georgia by having Greene removed from the ballot. 17 Those voters have a right to vote for the 18 candidate of their choosing, and they have right 19 to have their vote counted. Now, the primary is 20 May 24. Absentee ballots have already been 21 They'll be mailed on May the second, printed. 22 and early voting starts on May the seventh, and 2.3 what is their hope is that there'll be a decision 24 by the Secretary of State, right before the 25

1 primary, where she is immediately struck from the 2 ballot, and those people that go into the polling 3 place cannot vote for their candidate of their 4 choice, because by utilizing this procedure, the substantial Constitutional and federal law 5 violations that this candidacy challenge presents 6 7 cannot be decided by this court, unlike civil court or criminal court, which will always 8 prioritize deciding issues of that magnitude 9 10 before being subject to a trial, before being penalized by disqualification, and before the 11 irreparable harm that will occur, if that occurs, 12 but that's the nature of the procedure. When can 13 Representative Greenee raise her Constitutional 14 defenses, like the evidence you are presenting 15 violates the 1st Amendment to the Constitution? 16 When are we going to be able to litigate that 17 question? In state court, after she's 18 disqualified, after she's stripped from the 19 ballot, maybe after the primary occurs, and she 20 loses, well, nobody can vote for her, and 2.1 obviously, loses it. Well, whoopty-dee, okay? 22 How do we recover from that? How do we go back 2.3 These are irrevocable harm to voters from that? 24 and to the candidate. Now, second, our democracy 25

1 is at stake. It should be the voters, not 2 government employees, public officials, judges, 3 and lawyers who decide our elections. Voters 4 have a right to vote for the candidate of their choice, unless there's very compelling, legal, 5 not rhetorical, justification for that, and which 6 7 is not present here. Third, fundamentally, 1st 8 Amendment rights are at stake, not only the right to vote, as I've mentioned, or the right to run 9 10 for office, but also, the challengers will try to 11 use the 1st Amendment protected political speech of Representative Greenee as evidence of, quote, 12 'engaging in an insurrection or rebellion'. 13 That's unConstitutional and should not be 14 allowed, and finally, the charge not only 15 triggers disqualification, but is a serious 16 federal criminal offense that she is being 17 charged with. Now, this is a very serious 18 matter, and the decision should be based on 19 admissible evidence under the rules. 20 recognize that you have greater latitude than 2.1 that, but the charges, the seriousness of the 22 charges, we think, warrant that adherence and 2.3 faithful application of the law, and we expect 24

25

that you will do that. Now, procedure, Georgia

1 law, and here, I am talking about the law. 2 Georgia law 21-2-5 permits a candidate challenge 3 under two circumstances: one, a candidate is not 4 qualified to be a candidate, all right, and 5 number two is a candidate is not qualified to take office. Of course, these are different, 6 different conceptually and different in their 7 application. So, a claim under section three of 8 the 14th Amendment has to do with your ability to 9 10 take office, because it doesn't address candidacy in any way. It's the ability of a 11 representative, in this case, to take office, 12 because she has sworn the oath of office, engaged 13 in insurrection or rebellion, Congress has not 14 given her amnesty, and finally, when she presents 15 herself to take the oath of office, she could be 16 challenged, which we think is the exclusive 17 Constitutional right of Congress, not state 18 officials, to decide whether or not she is 19 eligible, at that time, to take office. 20 we're not dealing with a candidacy 2.1 disqualification. We're dealing with an alleged 22 take office qualification. Now, unfortunately, 2.3 as I've mentioned, many of these issues cannot be 24

25

decided by this court, even though you might make

1 recommendations to the Secretary of State on the 2 matter, and we have fully briefed this already in 3 our motion to dismiss and to stay the 4 proceedings, the Constitutional claims, the 5 federal law claims, the protections of the 1st Amendment, speech and debate, and what these 6 7 words in section three mean. So, let's look at We have our, admitted evidence is R2, 8 that. which is the 14th Amendment, and it includes, of 9 10 course, section three, and section three provides 11 that no person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, etc., etc., etc., 12 who, having previously taken an oath and as a 13 member of Congress or an officer of the United 14 States, etc., to support the Constitution, shall 15 have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against 16 the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies 17 thereof. So, there's a sequence. You have to 18 have originally taken the oath. You have to then 19 engage, and then you are disqualified, and 20 Congress can determine that you're disqualified 2.1 for having done that, from taking a subsequent 22 oath, and therefore, cannot assume your position 2.3 as a member of Congress, and then furthermore, 24

that Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of

1 each house remove such disability, and of course, 2 that's the various Amnesty Acts that have been 3 adopted, or could be adopted by Congress. 4 this provision, as I mentioned, makes it clear, this is about eligibility on January 3rd, 2023, 5 6 not today, not tomorrow, but eligibility when she 7 presents herself as a reelected member of She could be excluded under the 8 Congress. exclusive power of Congress to judge the 9 10 qualifications of its members. That's where these people should be: in Congress, explaining 11 why she, once she is reelected, is disqualified 12 from taking her seat. Now, the second thing that 13 this sequence makes clear is that, in her case, 14 she took the office first, for first time, and 15 these are in our stipulated facts, right, on 16 January the third. Right? So, that's the first 17 time, and so, she would have had to engage in 18 insurrection or rebellion after January 3rd. 19 other words, under the Constitution, prior to 20 January 3rd, she could have done it under the 2.1 Now, it's preposterous that she would even 22 consider it. She reveres the United States 2.3 Constitution, but the way the Constitutional 24

provision is set up, she would have to have

This

1 engaged after. So, evidence of anything she did 2 prior to January 3rd is just completely 3 irrelevant to the section three, unless it is a 4 direct admission of her intention to engage in 5 insurrection or rebellion after January 3rd. 6 Anything else she says is, not only, it should be 7 excluded, because it doesn't fit the charge, right, but as I will soon demonstrate, it is 8 protected by the 1st Amendment. Now, here, words 9 10 matter, and at every turn, the challengers mistake what the law is in their complaint. 11 Obviously, they didn't discuss it here, but in 12 their complaint, and calling something, 13 something, doesn't make it something. Calling an 14 orange an apple does not make the orange an 15 An orange has characteristics that are 16 preestablished and are applied to determine 17 whether the word 'apple' applies. Here, the key 18 phrases in section three are themselves defined 19 by the law. Now, they start off in misstating 20 the law by saying that Representative Greenee 21 should be disqualified under section three. 22 is also called, by the way, the disqualification 2.3 clause, because she is someone who, quote, 'aided 24

and engaged in an insurrection', end of quote,

1 complaint page one, aided and engaged. 2 that in section three? It says engaged in 3 insurrection or rebellion or gave aid or comfort 4 to the enemies thereof. There's no aided and 5 engaged in this statute. Now, each of those 6 phrases, 'engaged in insurrection or rebellion', 7 that phrase, or the accompanying phrase, 'gives aid or comfort to the enemies thereof', each of 8 those have special meaning. Engage is an act. 9 10 It is a direct and overt act of insurrection. is about, as one commentator said, domestic war. 11 That's what 'engaged in insurrection or 12 rebellion' is about. The, or 'giving aid or 13 comfort to the enemies thereof', as the same 14 commentator, said is about foreign wars. 15 these phrases have been used several times in 16 federal law and have come to gain particular 17 meaning. They're words [PH 01:09:34] of art. 18 So, you can't take 'aid' out of the second part 19 about foreign wars and add it to the first part 20 that is about domestic wars. That defies the 2.1 rules of construction. It flaunts the technical 22 and meaning of those phrases, of those words. 2.3 So, what is engaged, and what does it mean? 24

Well, engage connotes conduct, a direct, overt

1 act of insurrection to overthrow the United 2 States government. It is about things like, 3 which the people who drafted this well 4 understood. many of them were part of the victorious, thank the Lord, Union army, and they 5 knew what an insurrection or rebellion was. 6 7 it was taking up arms, you know, voluntarily 8 joining the Confederate army. It was about working in the war department for the Confederate 9 10 government. It was about providing supplies and 11 equipment and material for the people who were conducting the war. So, these were direct, overt 12 acts of insurrection. Now, instead of looking to 13 that, what we have already heard, described as 14 their evidence, and of course, is well revealed 15 in their complaint, they want to hold against her 16 1st Amendment-protected speech, and here's a few 17 examples. On page 19, quote, "The people will 18 remember the patriots who stood for election 19 integrity", end of quote. That is supposed to be 20 about an insurrection or engaging in an 2.1 insurrection, or they said she said, she's 22 alleged to have said, quote, "Congress is the 2.3 last line of defense from a stolen election", end 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

25

of quote, on page 21. Isn't that quintessential

1 political speech? Isn't that recognizing in the 2 role of Congress in certifying the electors? 3 could that be interpreted as an overt act to 4 engage in insurrection or rebellion? Well, it 5 can't be, and now, the question of voter fraud in 6 the 2020 election was is a quintessential example 7 of political speech: legitimate political 8 disagreements about what happened. Yet, you 9 know, the Supreme Court in Republican Party of 10 Minnesota versus White, actually the first one I argued in the court, said that announcing views 11 on disputed legal or political issues is at the 12 core of the 1st Amendment, at the core. 13 this is disputed, no question, but to say they is 14 an act of insurrection, it is direct, overt act 15 of insurrection against the United States, when 16 Representative Greenee was an elected member of 17 Congress, who on January 6th, had a 18 constitutional duty and responsibility to be on 19 the floor where she was, to determine whether or 20 not electoral votes from the states would be 21 certified. Now 1st Amendment demands a very 22 I've already said and argued that narrow test. 2.3 'engage' connotes conduct, right, but we can look 2.4 to a much broader term that actually allows 25

1 speech to be considered, and that is the 2 Brandenburg case and the NAACP case, which we 3 saw, and that is the word 'incitement'. Now, 4 'incitement' and 'engage' are different words with different meanings, and in fact, you know, 5 6 that for sure, because there are federal statutes 7 that say 'incite' and then say 'engage in certain conduct'. I mean, they're used as different 8 words, right? Incitement, the Supreme Court has 9 10 said, is speech, but the Supreme Court, because 11 of 1st Amendment concerns, so that normal, everyday political speech will not be punished, 12 as they want to do, says that that speech must 13 be. quote, "Directed to inciting or producing 14 imminent lawless action, and that it is likely to 15 incite or produce such action", end of quote. 16 That's on page 30 of our motion to dismiss. That 17 is very restrictive, right, but we know how 18 restrictive it is, when we point out the 19 statements that are made, where people are 20 claiming that is incitement, and the Supreme 21 Court says, no, that's protected by the 1st 22 Amendment. For instance, A Klu Klux Klan leader, 2.3 quote, Advocated the duty, necessity, and 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

25

propriety of crime, sabotage, violence, or other

1 unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of 2 accomplishing industrial or political reform", 3 end of quote, and the Supreme Court said that is 4 protected 1st Amendment speech. That is not site 5 incitement. There was also a statement by an 6 NAACP official, where he said, quote, "If we 7 catch any of you going in any of them racist stores, we're going to break your damn neck", end 8 of quote. That was not incitement under the 9 10 Brandenburg test, and we also have seen where a Vietnam War protestor said, "OWe are taking the 11 F\*\*\* street again", end of quote, and that was 12 not incitement under the Brandenburg test. 13 14 15 incitement, and she can't even be held into 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 the January 6th rally away from the Capital, 2.3 24

25

There is absolutely nothing that Representative Greenee ever said that passes the Brandenburg test of account for incitement, because this is 'engage', which requires conduct. Look, they knew what the words meant, and they chose the words that they were going to use. This was going to be a very narrow disqualification. Now, then they claim that Representative Greenee promoted or organized right, near the White House, and where some of the people at that rally went to the Capital, and Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 some of those attacked the Capital, and I call it 2 an attack. It was despicable for these people to 3 do this, to attack the Capital of the United 4 States. So, over 700 have been charged with 5 crimes. If they're quilty, they should be 6 convicted of those crimes, but, you know, not a 7 single one of them has been charged with engaging in insurrection or rebelling, which is a federal 8 criminal offense, not one, not a one of the 9 10 people that actually attacked the Capital, assaulted police officers, broke in, and were 11 there unlawfully. Well, the 1st Amendment right 12 to assemble means that the right to assemble does 13 not lose all Constitutional protections merely 14 because some members of that group may have 15 participated in conduct or advocated doctrine 16 that itself is not protected. So, this was a 17 quintessentially protected 1st Amendment right of 18 assembly, and that some people left and went to 19 the Capital. Some people attacked the Capital. 20 You can't hold the people who organized a 21 peaceful and constitutionally protected rally, 22 you cannot hold that against them, because that's 2.3 what they did. Now, second, the challengers 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

misstate the law regarding what is an

1 insurrection or rebellion. They say it is, 2 quote, "To overthrow the government or obstruct 3 its core functions", period, end of quote. 4 That's on page 32. Nowhere, in any case, does it 5 say that insurrection includes 'obstruct its core functions'. It certainly says 'overthrow the 6 7 government', and, you know, certainly, you know, if that would occur, all of the functions would 8 transfer to someone else, right, but they want to 9 10 expand this, so that, for instance, when a 11 heckler in the House gallery stands up and heckles the Congress, you know, the House, and 12 they have to suspend, that that person is quilty 13 of insurrection or rebellion, because a core 14 function has been obstructed. Look, this word is 15 way more serious and narrow than what they say. 16 Let me give you examples of what the, either 17 statutes the courts, etc., have said. A domestic 18 war, that is on page 20 of our submission motion 19 to dismiss, a domestic war. Second, and that was 20 the attorney general in 1867, two, "Combinations 2.1 too powerful to be suppressed by ordinary course 22 of judicial proceedings or by the marshalls". 2.3 That was temporarily so, apparently. I don't 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

25

know, but even if it were, it wasn't, you know,

1 it was temporary, and short-lived. Third, "A 2 rising so formidable as, for the time being, to 3 defy the authority of the United States in such 4 force that civil authorities are inadequate to 5 put them down, and a considerable military force 6 is needed to accomplish the result", Shays' 7 Rebellion collapsed when the U.S. military showed up, and the military wasn't required here, even 8 for the temporary attack, and "Armed insurrection 9 10 too strong to be controlled by civil authorities", and then, finally, the court in 11 Allegheny City juxtaposed what an insurrection is 12 and what an insurrection isn't. It says, "An 13 insurrection is an organized and armed uprising 14 against authority or operation of government. It 15 is not, while crimes growing out of mob 16 violence", which we certainly had on January 6th, 17 "However serious they may be, or however numerous 18 the participants, are simply unlawful acts in 19 disturbance of the peace, which do not threaten 20 the stability of the government or the existence 21 of political society". They're different, 22 dramatically different. Now, we have stipulated 2.3 that a group of people that did not include 24

Representative Greenee unlawfully entered the

1 United States Capital on January 6th, and they 2 I mean, I say more than that about what 3 happened, as I just have before your court, your 4 honor, on behalf of Representative Greenee. 5 Excuse me, Judge. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yeah, I 6 7 apologize, Mr. Bopp. 8 JAMES BOPP: Sorry? 9 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: My guy needs to 10

help with the sound. Give me just a second.

JAMES BOPP: Hope he helps with the

temperature. [INDISCERNIBLE 01:24:05].

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 01:24:08], thank you very much. I apologize. I didn't mean to interrupt.

JAMES BOPP: No, that's, you know...

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You know, if you're not under, we're far too old to be dealing with these issues, far too old.

JAMES BOPP: Anyway, yeah, and so, we have willingly stipulated that people entered the Capital unlawfully, and I say more than that, more than just unlawfully, but significantly, they are willing to that those people that entered unlawfully did not include Representative

1 Greenee. So, she did not engage on the attack on 2 the Capital. If there is conduct that meets the 3 term 'engage', I mean that, if there is conduct 4 that would ever meet the term 'engage', it would 5 be breaking into the Capital. That would be an 6 engagement, certainly, a direct, overt act, and, 7 however, I think describing that as insurrection or rebellion is just political hyperbole and not 8 under the Constitution, and that's what you have 9 10 to engage. Now, what you see is pertinent evidence about what she did, from us, from 11 January 3rd until the end of the day on January 12 6th, and, you know, you will see that, on January 13 3rd, and we stipulate was sworn in, she met with 14 President Trump about making objections to 15 certain states' electoral votes, based upon 16 evidence that she believed, and others believed, 17 constituted sufficient voter fraud to overturn 18 the election. In those particular states, you 19 will see that, on January 6th, and of all the 20 tweets and all the videos, we are presenting this 21 This is during the moment when the attack video. 22 on the Capital was occurring, and she is in the 2.3 Capital, in a dark hallway, and she says, first, 24 in the tweet accompanying the video, which they 25

1 do quote in their complaint, "Be safe, be smart, 2 stay peaceful, obey the laws. This is not a time 3 for violence. This is a time to support 4 President Trump and support election integrity", 5 which they believed they were doing on the floor 6 of the United States Congress, and then the vide, 7 "So, I urge you to remain calm. I urge you to 8 have a peace peaceful protest. Make sure that everyone is safe and protected, and let's do this 9 10 in a peaceful manner. This is not a time for This is a time to support President 11 violence. Trump, support election integrity, and support 12 this important process that we're going through 13 in Congress, where we're allowed to object." So, 14 this is very important. "So, I urge you to stay 15 calm, be the great American people that I know 16 you are, and just know that we're in the fight 17 for you. God bless everyone. Be careful, be 18 safe, be smart, and obey the laws." A few days 19 later, after the attack occurred, she said "We", 20 meaning members of Congress, "Did not plan, 2.1 cause, and denounce the January 6th attack", and 22 then FBI director, Ray, testifies before a 2.3 committee of Congress, this is R5, "I was 24

25

appalled, like you", he's addressing members of

1 Congress, "At the violence and destruction we saw 2 that day. I was appalled that you, members of 3 Congress, our country's elected leaders were 4 victimized right here in the very halls of 5 Congress." Representative Greenee was a victim 6 of this attack. Her life was in danger, she 7 thought. She was scared and confused. Her children were frantic about what was going on and 8 9 feared for her safety. That is not what a person 10 who planned the attack would react, and you will 11 see her reaction, and you will then hear her testimony. So, the attack on the U.S. Capital, 12 as despicable as it was, was not insurrection or 13 rebellion, and she certainly did not engage in it 14 as understood under the law. That is what the 15 evidence will prove and why she should remain, 16 among multiple other reasons, remain on the 17 ballot. Thank you, your honor. 18

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you, Mr. Bopp. Let's start with Mr. Magliocca.

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:29:54] your honor sorry, Magliocca, Magliocca. [CROSSTALK 01:29:58]

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [CROSSTALK 01:29:58] I struggle

1 | [INDISCERNIBLE 01:30:00].

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, we wanted to start just by reading into the record the stipulated facts. It will take a moment.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: If you want to read them, that's fine. They're in [INDISCERNIBLE 01:30:10], but you can read them.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The parties to the above [PH 01:30:15] captured proceedings, through their undersigned counsel, stipulates that the following facts are true: that the respondent is over the age of 25, the respondent has been a United States citizen for more than seven years, the respondent is inhabitant of Georgia. Petitioners are all registered voters in Georgia's 14th congressional district. On January 3, 2021, the respondent took the oath of office to be a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for the first time. A joint session of Congress was called to order at or around 1:00 PM on January 6th, 2021, for the purposes of opening, counting, and resolving any objections to the electoral college vote of the 2020 U.S. presidential election and certifying the results of the electoral college vote.

1 group of people that did not include the 2 respondent unlawfully entered the United States 3 Capital on January 6th, 2021. On January 26th, 4 2021, a joint session of Congress was suspended 5 while people were unlawfully inside the U.S. 6 Capital. Congress certified the results of the 7 electoral college vote at or about 3:40 AM on January 7th, 2021, and the respondent filed her 8 9 candidacy for the upcoming midterm elections for 10 Georgia's 14th congressional district on March 7th, 2022, and filed an amended notice of 11 candidacy on March 10th, 2022. We'd like to call 12 professor Magliocca. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 14

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay.

Professor, you [INDISCERNIBLE 01:31:47].

[INDISCERNIBLE 01:31:49] raise your right hand?

RON FEIN: Yes.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony given at this hearing is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I do.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, please proceed. Proceed, Mr. Fein.

25

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

1 RON FEIN: Good morning, Professor 2 Magliocca. Could you just repeat your full name 3 for the record? 4 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Gerard Magliocca. 5 RON FEIN: And what's your profession? 6 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I am the Samuel R. Rosen professor at the Indiana University, Robert 7 H. McKinney School of Law. 8 9 RON FEIN: What's your educational 10 background? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I received my college 11 degree at Stanford and my law degree from Yale. 12 RON FEIN: And could you summarize your 13 professional experience since then? 14 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I was a law clerk 15 for one year, and then I was an associate at a 16 law firm for two years, and I've been a teacher 17 for the past 21 years. 18 RON FEIN: And, your honor, I believe 19 exhibit P61, his resume, has already been 20 admitted to evidence. 21 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: That's correct. 22 RON FEIN: So, we don't need to retread it. 2.3 Professor Magliocca, what are your areas of 2.4 research? 25

1 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: My main area of 2 research is American Constitutional history. 3 RON FEIN: And you don't have a PhD in 4 history though, do you? 5 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I do not. RON FEIN: So, what is your experience 6 7 working with historical materials? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, I do work at 8 archives around the United States on books that T 9 10 write. So, for example, I've worked at the 11 Library of Congress, Mount Vernon, the Chicago History Museum, the National Archives, as well 12 other facilities that hold documents. 13 RON FEIN: And how much of your work has 14 been original historical research using original 15 historical materials? 16 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, more than half. 17 I mean, obviously, I use secondary sources, read 18 other books and articles to do my research. 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Excuse me just a 20 second. I think they're have difficulty hearing. 2.1 [INDISCERNIBLE 01:33:23]. 22 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Oh, okay, sorry. 2.3

24

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes,

[INDISCERNIBLE 01:33:28] you unfortunately have

to talk to the stupid thing.

RON FEIN: Did you need to finish that question?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Would you like me to repeat my answer?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Please.

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I would say I do more than half of my work on primary sources, and then the remainder consists of reading the other books or articles written about the subjects that I'm studying.

RON FEIN: And what methods do you use when you're conducting this original historical research?

methods that a historian would use. So, for example, I try to identify documents and make sure they are authentic. I try to understand the documents, based on what was going on at the time, and also, to make sure that I'm quoting them in context rather than out of context, for example,

2.4

2.3

1 RON FEIN: Have you ever heard the phrase 2 'law office history'? 3 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I have. 4 RON FEIN: What do you understand that 5 phrase to mean? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: It means reaching a 6 7 conclusion and then trying to find historical materials to justify the conclusion that you've 8 already reached. 9 10 RON FEIN: And how is your research the same or different from law office history? 11 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, I don't have any 12 particular conclusion when I begin a project. 13 do the research with the materials, and then I 14 gradually reach a conclusion based on what I read 15 and what I see. 16 RON FEIN: Now, I'm not going to ask you to 17 repeat your entire bibliography, but specifically 18 with respect to your historical research on the 19 19th century, how many, if any. books have you 20 published? 21 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Five. 22 RON FEIN: And what subjects were they 2.3 about? 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, the first one was about Andrew Jackson and the period in which he was president. The second was the period at the end of the 19th century, when William Jennings Brian was running for president multiple The third was a biography of Congressman John Bingham, who was one of the principal framers of the 14th Amendment. The fourth is a book on the Bill of Rights, that covers the entire history of the bill of rights, including the 19th century portion, and the one that I've just written is about George Washington's nephew, who was Bushrod Washington, who was a justice of the Supreme Court for 30 years in the early 19th century.

RON FEIN: In addition to these books, have you published academic articles and academic journals about 19th century Constitutional history?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I've published about ten articles that relate to 19th century Constitutional history in various journals.

RON FEIN: And in the past, let's say, three years, have you been asked to give any academic

25

1 lectures or speeches outside your university on 2 19th century Constitutional history? 3 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, of course, they 4 were virtual cause of the pandemic, but yes. just gave a talk at Mount Vernon in 2021 about 5 6 the, well, the Bushrod Washington book, and I've been doing some other things related to that. 7 That's been the main source of lectures that I've 8 done. 9 10 RON FEIN: And have you received any 11 fellowships or professional recognition for this work? 12 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I was a fellow at 13 Mount Vernon from 2019 to 2021, where I worked in 14 the archives there on the Bushrod Washington 15 project, looking at his letters and other 16 correspondence that was related to my research. 17 RON FEIN: And then turning to the 14th 18 Amendment, and section three in particular, have 19 you conducted any search on this? 20 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I have. 2.1 RON FEIN: And can you describe in broad 22 terms that research? 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

2020, I researched and wrote a paper on section

In the fall of

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes.

24

three of the 14th Amendment. The paper was completed in December and made available to researchers and anyone to see on the Social Science Research Network. That happened around

December 10th, 2020.

RON FEIN: And what perspectives do you use to address questions about the 14th Amendment?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, primarily, I look to what was said in Congress about the Amendment proposal, because that's sort of, well, the most important initial source. Then I also look to secondary sources outside of Congress, for example, what did newspapers have to say about the pending proposal, what was said in the states to the, extent that we can find out about the ratification of the 14th Amendment. So, it's primarily looking to the discussion or conversation that Americans had about the 14th Amendment when it was proposed and under discussion for ratification.

RON FEIN: And how are these approaches similar or different from the types of ordinary legal analysis that lawyers and judges ordinarily do?

2.4

2.3

2 | 3 | 4 |

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, I mean, there's some overlap, of course, but I focus much more, in my work, on the surrounding politics or social aspects of what's going on at these particular times, with these particular Constitutional issues, rather than focusing more on the text or the cases. So, obviously, you have to do some of both, but I'm more of a, you know, more of a historian than a lawyer in that respect.

RON FEIN: Your honor, at this time, I move to tender Professor Magliocca as an expert witness in 19th century American Constitutional history.

JAMES BOPP: I object, your honor. Number one, he was not tendered as an expert in in the specification of witnesses. Number two, they have provided us no expert report, which is required for such an expert, so that we can prepare for his testimony. Number three, he has not produced, to us, the documents that he relied upon in order to reach whatever conclusion the expert report reveals. So, we, under civil rules in Georgia, that's all required. None of that occurred here, and it is fundamentally unfair for us to show up at a hearing with no preparation

other than his resume, which we got a couple days ago, and cross-examine him without adequate opportunity to prepare that is always provided for an expert witness.

2.1

2.3

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: As I have said before, it's unclear what the role is of the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:39:44]. He's indicated it's a... Is he going to testify, essentially, the contents of his article that he's wrote?

RON FEIN: No, your honor. The subject matter of the questioning would address matters that were not entirely embraced within the context of his law review article.

JAMES BOPP: Your honor, I apologize. I have one other comment, and I was going back and forth, whether or not this is proper, when he starts asking questions right now, but I want to raise it. [INDISCERNIBLE 01:40:19] is described is his expertise, his expertise, and what he has, they said he will testify about are quintessential legal questions. If a statute is there, you look to the legislative history. That's what he wants to testify about. That that's a legal question, what the legislative history is, and what it provides. It is not for

a person to testify about. These are about facts, about what happened on January 6th, before, and not on legal matters. This is quintessential, legislative [INDISCERNIBLE 01:41:04] is quintessentially what us lawyers do and judges decide. So, I would object generally on that ground.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm struggling, because I'm trying to, you know, I don't know what the testimony's going to be. I mean, it's a circular question, but the issue of the history of the 14th Amendment, if the petitioners want to spend their time with a history of the enactment of 14th Amendment, I will listen, but I concur with you, that I will not permit and will not entertain testimony regarding the meaning of statutes or anything that would be properly the subject of briefing. So, what I, I will let you start, but, and I would also suggest, I mean, to me, this all sounds like the sort of stuff that would be coming in appropriately, in the briefing, and if you have articles and authorities and original documents that you wish to cite, I'm happy to read them, but I don't know that it makes sense for us to be dealing with a

series of objections on things which are historical in nature. So, I will let you start, but I may stop you. Okay? I will entertain objections when, and as appropriate. Go ahead, Mr. Fein.

2.1

2.3

RON FEIN: Thank you, your honor.

Professor, can you just briefly summarize the historical context for section three of the 14th Amendment?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes. So, after the Civil War, elections were held across the south for Congress and for the Senate, and some of the people who won had been leaders in the Confederacy. They arrived in Washington, seeking to take their seats. Northern public opinion was outraged at this, because these were some of the same people who had led secession. So, those members were excluded from Congress, and then consideration was given to some formal proposal that would exclude them for some period of time afterwards.

RON FEIN: And who were the primary framers of this, of the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:43:26]?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: So, section three of the 14th Amendment was drafted by Senator Jacob

Howard of Michigan, and it was narrower than the original proposal that had been put forward in the house of representatives. So, the house proposal for section three would have prohibited all former Confederates from voting in federal elections until 1870. So, the senators considered that too broad and unfair. So, the substitute drafted by Senator Howard focused instead on office holding, rather than voting, and did not apply to anyone who had been engaged in insurrection. Instead, it applied only to officials, either current or former and civil or military, on the thought that it was the leaders of the insurrection who should be held accountable, rather than ordinary followers.

RON FEIN: And in developing section three of the 14th Amendment, did the framers look to any historical examples of insurrections other than the Civil War?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: There were other examples, but there was nothing cited specifically in the debates in Congress about that provision.

2.3

2.1

RON FEIN: What, if any, historical insurrections were well known to reasonably educated mid-19th century Americans?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, there were two.

One was Shays' Rebellion, which was also referred to as Shays' Insurrection, and the other was the Whiskey Rebellion, which was also referred to as the Whiskey Insurrection,.

RON FEIN: So, let's start with Shays'
Insurrection, or Shays' Rebellion. When and where
did that occur?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: So, Shays' Rebellion occurred in Massachusetts at the end of 1786 and early 1787. It was a tax protest by farmers who were upset about high land taxes, and that had led to many closures of farms. So, what started happening was that groups of farmers would arm themselves and go to local courts to basically stop the courts from operating, so that foreclosure sales would not happen. This built up to a point where the state militia was called in to sort of deal with this suspension of the normal operation of the courts by the armed people, and that led to a clash at an armory when some of the sort of insurrections decided to try

to take some weapons. Four people were killed, and after that, the rebellion or insurrection ended.

RON FEIN: And you said that their goal was to stop the courts from operating. Is that correct?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: That's correct, to prevent foreclosure sales on farms.

RON FEIN: And from a historical perspective, what were the key features of Shays' Rebellion that would be remembered in the mid-19th century by reasonably educated Americans?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, that it was an effort by armed people to suspend the civil authority of government for a period of time, and it was considered a significant event, because it seemed to have an influence on the framers when they gathered in Philadelphia for the Constitutional convention, because they saw it as an example of why we needed to replace the Articles of Confederation with a new Constitution.

RON FEIN: And was it considered an insurrection or rebellion, or both?

2.3

2.4

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, so, in

Federalist Number Ten, James Madison, the
subtitle of Federalist Number Ten was, The Union
as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and
Insurrection. So, and he was referring to Shays'
Insurrection as well as some other upheavals that
had happened in the states, prior to that, and
then in the 19th century, a well-known book by
Justice Joseph Story referred to the insurrection
in Massachusetts. Story was from Massachusetts.
So, it probably explains why he emphasized that
point in his book.

RON FEIN: All right. Thank you. Let's talk about the other one you mentioned, the Whiskey Rebellion, or Whiskey Insurrection. What was that?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: So, the Whiskey
Insurrection was another tax protest by farmers,
this time on a federal tax on whiskey and other
spirits. So, farmers in Pennsylvania were upset
about this, and they decided to start getting
armed and trying to prevent tax collection. They
did this in various ways. Sometimes, they would,
well, in one case they tarred and feathered a tax
collector. Also, they would basically attack

places where the tax collectors were known to be, and they also shut down courts, because again, to some degree, the courts were necessary to further the collection of the taxes, because, sometimes, there were foreclosures that were required to, you know, pay the taxes that were owed.

2.1

2.3

RON FEIN: How many casualties were there in the Whiskey Rebellion?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: There were four or five. People were killed in some skirmishes. Eventually, George Washington called in a large force, more than 10,000 troops, to go into that portion of Pennsylvania, ad basically, for the most part, the insurrection just ended, because of the sight of this large force led by George Washington, but four or five people were killed.

RON FEIN: How well organized was the Whiskey Rebellion?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, it was a loosely organized thing. There were mostly local groups doing different things. So, there wasn't really a single leader at all, that we know of.

RON FEIN: And by the time of the 1860's, how well known was the Whiskey Rebellion to ordinary, educated 19th century Americans?

1 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: It would've been very... 2 JAMES BOPP: I object. We're now beyond 3 even legislative history. He's already conceded 4 that, in the debates, they were talking about the 5 Civil War, not what these were colloquially called insurrections, not the legal definition 6 7 under... JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained. 8 JAMES BOPP: ...Section two. 9 10 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Next question. 11 RON FEIN: Your honor. I recall your earlier testimony correctly, you said that four 12 people died in Shays' Rebellion and four or five 13

in the Whiskey Rebellion. Am I correct?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

JAMES BOPP: Your honor, I object. I mean, he's going on with this is to talk about something that was irrelevant as [PH 01:49:45] what, even legislative district, regarding title three. These were never signed.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Overruled, go ahead.

RON FEIN: Did I have those numbers, right, that you said four or five people died in each of those insurrections?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Correct.

RON FEIN: So, to the extent

2.3

that 19th century Americans thought of these as insurrections, in addition to, of course, the Civil War, how would 19th century Americans have understood what level of violence or bloodshed was needed before the word insurrection would be used?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, some violence was required, because there was no thought, really, that you could have a peaceful protest, and that would be considered an insurrection, but there was no particular thought about how much violence was required.

RON FEIN: And how would they distinguish between, or would they distinguish between a riot versus an insurrection?

JAMES BOPP: I object. He's going into mind reading.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained. Sustained. Next.

RON FEIN: All right. What sources did 19th century Americans use to understand the meanings of the words?

JAMES BOPP: I object. Again, no foundations related to that point.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained. 1 2 RON FEIN: All right. Let me rephrase. 3 Your honor, I'd like to display an exhibit that's 4 already been admitted into evidence, which is P81. 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: P81. 6 7 RON FEIN: Look at the, yeah, one more page after that. After that one. Can you see that, 8 Professor Magliocca? 9 10 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I can. 11 RON FEIN: What are we looking at? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: You are looking at an 12 1830 edition of Webster's Dictionary. 13 RON FEIN: How was that dictionary used in 14 1830 and afterwards? 15 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, it was the 16 leading dictionary in the United States during 17 this period. 18 RON FEIN: And... 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Excuse me, what 20 period are we talking about? 21 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: 1830. 22 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, 1830. 2.3 Okay. 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1	RON FEIN: Was the dictionary updated on a
2	semi-regular or regular basis after that?
3	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, much like modern
4	dictionaries, they would do a new edition every
5	so many years.
6	RON FEIN: Okay, but this is the 1830
7	edition.
8	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes.
9	RON FEIN: And you're familiar with this
10	dictionary, you've seen it before?
11	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I am.
12	RON FEIN: To what extent does it inform, if
13	at all, your understanding of how words were used
14	in the mid-19th century?
15	JAMES BOPP: I object, because I
16	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained.
17	RON FEIN: Let's turn to page, the next
18	page, and if we could zoom in on the left column,
19	in the top. Can you read that, Professor
20	Magliocca? That's a little dicey?
21	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Oh boy, okay.
22	RON FEIN: Can you zoom in even more then?
23	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I will do my best.
24	RON FEIN: Okay. Can you?
25	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I think I can.

RON FEIN: Can you read a couple entries
down, and I'm not going to ask you to read it
aloud, but do you see there, can you read the
definitions there?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, I can.

understanding of the word 'insurrection'?

RON FEIN: Are you familiar with if this dictionary has a definition for insurrection?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes, it does.

RON FEIN: And what can you, without reading from that definition, is that, in your experience as a historian, is that typical of a 19th century

JAMES BOPP: Objection.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained. You don't even need to stand up. The document speaks for itself, counsel. Next.

RON FEIN: Fair enough, your honor. How do you use these dictionaries in your own work?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, they're helpful in putting terms into context. For example, if I'm reading a letter, and I'm trying to understand what somebody meant, you know, sometimes the definition that people used back then isn't the same as the definition that we used now. So, it's, you have to check.

1	RON FEIN: Right. Let's go to exhibit P80,
2	if we may. This has also been into evidence.
3	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: P80?
4	RON FEIN: Yes. And what are we looking at
5	here?
6	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: This is a statute, a
7	Georgia statute enacted in 1866.
8	RON FEIN: And why did, what is this statute
9	about?
10	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Insurrection.
11	RON FEIN: And do you know why Georgia
12	enacted this statute?
13	GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I believe it was
14	because of the, it was in response, basically, to
15	what had occurred during the Civil War.
16	RON FEIN: And, your honor, I haven't asked
17	the question yet.
18	JAMES BOPP: I haven't objected yet.
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You may answer
20	the question.
21	SAM SHAPIRO: But maybe I should just stand.
22	RON FEIN: All right.
23	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm sorry. This
24	is very serious stuff, but what concerns me, Mr.
25	Fein, is this is what I would expect to be

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 reading in the briefs. This is not what I 2 expected your testimony on. This is historical 3 data that can be reviewed and commented on and 4 proffered and [INDISCERNIBLE 01:55:43]. I've 5 indulged you because of the importance of this 6 hearing, but, you may ask the question. Now, if 7 I hear an objection, I will rule. 8 RON FEIN: Thank you, your honor. When, your honor, may I have briefly confer? 9 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 10 Sure. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We're back. 11 We

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We're back. We are actually past my 10:45 five break. So, let's take our break. We'll reconvene in...

[INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:15]. This is not a show.

Do not do that. We will stop now. We'll reconvene at 11:00 o'clock. [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:24]

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:28].

SAM SHAPIRO: Yes, how you doing? Is it something that [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:30] helpful or historically [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:31]?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I thought it, actually, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:33], but I guess they [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:34].

1 SAM SHAPIRO: [INDISCERNIBLE 01:56:36] it's 2 okay now. 3 [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION] 4 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: All right, 5 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:07:00] you had to wait five 6 minutes. 7 RON FEIN: We're good. I just needed to talk him. 8 9 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 10 02:07:031 [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION] 11 RON FEIN: Is that going to go louder? 12 Is that going to pick up the speakers more? 13 MALE 5: This is just for the Zoom meeting. 14 RON FEIN: Oh, I got you, okay. 15 [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK/OFF-MIC 16 CONVERSATION 02:07:24-17 02:11:201 18 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. I think 19 Mr. [INDISCERNIBLE 02:11:22] had something to 20 say. 2.1 MALE 5: Yeah, I just wanted to give a 22 gentle reminder about photography. All the 2.3 individual media equipment today [INDISCERNIBLE 24 02:11:31] special permission, [INDISCERNIBLE 25

02:11:34] take pictures and video. So, if you weren't granted that permission, please ask. If not, please take pictures, and secondly, please try to refrain the [PH 02:11:41] clapping each time. Thank you so much.

2.1

2.3

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And that second, I will not, that will not happen again. If that happens again, you will be escorted out. This is not a performance. This is a deadly, deadly serious trial. So, I appreciate everybody treating it appropriately. So, all right, Mr. Fein, we're back on the record now.

RON FEIN: Thank you, your honor. Just a few more minutes, with Professor Magliocca.

Professor Magliocca, how were the southern states governed after the surrender?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, there were temporary civil governments put in place by President Johnson, but then, in 1867, Congress passed the Military Reconstruction Act to impose, essentially, marital law on almost the entire former Confederacy.

RON FEIN: So, for example, who was governing Virginia during that period?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: A union army general.

2.4

RON FEIN: And when was 14th Amendment section three first implemented.

implemented in the Military Reconstruction Acts, because those acts said that there had to be new elections throughout the South to elect conventions that could ratify the 14th Amendment and write new state Constitutions, and so, the acts provided that people who were covered by what it described as section three of the pending Amendment were not going to be able to vote in the elections for those conventions, and then there had to be some means of determining whether people could or could not vote under that standard.

RON FEIN: Okay. Can we please put up exhibit P48, which has been admitted into evidence already, and Dymond, if you can zoom into the, like, upper left? So, we can see it. Professor Magliocca. I know this is a small print, but can you see what that is?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Yes. This is an opinion of the Attorney General Stanbury interpreting the first and second Military Reconstruction Acts.

1 RON FEIN: And when was that issued? 2 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: This opinion is May 1867. 3 4 RON FEIN: When was the 14th Amendment ratified? 5 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Tn 1868. 6 7 RON FEIN: And where was this printed? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: This was in the New 8 9 York Times. It would've been widely reprinted in 10 newspapers across the country. 11 RON FEIN: Okay, great. We can put that down. How widely was section three applied in 12 the years after the ratification of the 14th 13 Amendment? 14 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, between 1868 and 15 1872, it was implemented many times, mostly to 16 remove state and local officials who had been 17 part of the Confederacy, but also, in a couple 18 instances, to exclude people from office. 19 RON FEIN: And what led to it not being 20 implemented as much? 2.1 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: So, in 1872, Congress 22 exercised its power under section three to grant 2.3 an amnesty to many of the former Confederates. 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Basically, in part, that was because there had

1 been private bills that had been giving amnesty 2 to individuals, but largely, that was simply, did 3 you know a member of Congress, and then if you did, they would pass a bill for you. 4 5 JAMES BOPP: Your honor, I move to strike 6 his first statement. It was a legal opinion, and 7 that is whether the amnesty act of 1872 8 removed, gave amnesty to former, only, to former officers. It's a legal question that we... 9 10 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I understand you 11 raised the issue. I'm going to let it stand but thank you. I mean, I understand the point. 12 Believe me, your point. 13 RON FEIN: What did the debates around 14 amnesty in public and the streets or in Congress 15

center on?

GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, I'll answer the question with what...

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Actually, wait a minute. Wait a minute. There's a lack of foundation [CROSSTALK 02:15:32].

RON FEIN: Fair enough. I understand.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We've got to have a little foundation.

2.4 25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

1 RON FEIN: All right. How familiar are you 2 with the debates that led to the 1872 3 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:15:37]? 4 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: I'm quite familiar with them. I read all of them. 5 RON FEIN: And what did they focus on? 6 7 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, they focused on whether people deserved amnesty, first of all, 8 and second, if so, who should be excluded from 9 10 that, and basically, would it be good for sectional reconciliation or not. So those are 11 the big questions. 12 RON FEIN: And how much of those debates 13 centered around ex-Confederates as compared to 14 anyone else who might become subject to section 15 three? 16 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, it was basically 17 about ex-Confederates, because those were the 18 people who were petitioning Congress for amnesty. 19 RON FEIN: Great. Just a few more 20 questions. During the Civil War itself, how did 2.1 Washington D.C. fare? 22 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Well, it was a 2.3 fortified city, and for good reason, because 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

25

there was a Confederate attack by Jubal Early on

1 the Capital in 1864, that was repulsed at Fort 2 Monroe. 3 RON FEIN: And were there, or how many, if 4 any, presidential elections occurred during the Civil War? 5 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: One in 1864. 6 RON FEIN: How orderly was that, if you 7 know? 8 9 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: It was very orderly. 10 RON FEIN: And how did the counting of the 11 electoral votes proceed? GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: There was no problem 12 with it at all. 13 RON FEIN: When, if ever, did the 14 Confederate insurrectionists seize controlled the 15 United States Capital? 16 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: They did not. 17 RON FEIN: And in your opinion, if in 1864 18 or 1868, a violent mass of people had seized 19 controlled the us Capital during certification of 20 presidential electoral votes and disrupted the 2.1 peaceful transfer of power, wouldn't 22 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:17:10] Americans... 2.3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained. 24 Sustained. You stop that question. Next 25

1 RON FEIN: Thank you, your honor. I have no 2 further question. 3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. Anything, 4 Mr. Bopp? 5 JAMES BOPP: No, your honor, not other than 6 [PH 02:17:27] do locally, a fellow Hoosier, and.... 7 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: The thought crossed my mind. 8 9 RON FEIN: Mine too. 10 JAMES BOPP: And I was a history major. So, 11 maybe I can sort of [INDISCERNIBLE 02:17:38] let myself in. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you very 13 much. 14 GERARD N. MAGLIOCCA: Thank you. 15 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You may step 16 down. 17 RON FEIN: Your honor, the petitioners call 18 Marjorie Taylor Greene to the stand. 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Representative 20 Greenee, if you could come take the stand. 2.1 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:18:00]. Do you swear or affirm 22 that the testimony you'll give in this hearing is 2.3 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the 24 truth, so help you God? 25

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I swear. 2 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Please be 3 seated. Mr. Celli, [PH 02:18:10] your witness. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: May I proceed? 5 you. Good morning, Representative Greenee. 6 Andy Celli. I represent the plaintiffs in this 7 matter. Ms. Green, you were elected to Congress in November of 2020, right? 8 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you became a 11 member of Congress on January 3rd, 2021, is that correct? 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you became a 14 member of Congress, you became a member of 15 Congress by virtue of having taken an oath of 16 office, right? 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I became a member 18 of Congress by being elected by the people of the 19 14th district. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, but you actually 2.1 were permitted to take your seat in the House of 22 Representatives because you took an oath of 2.3 office, isn't that correct? 2.4

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I swore an oath on January 3rd.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that oath required you to swear that you would support and defend the Constitution of the United States, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And it required you to swear an oath that you would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And part of the oath that you took says that you were going to undertake that obligation: to defend the Constitution against all enemies, freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. Do you recall that part?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I think so.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, well, let's have a look at it. This will be plaintiff's exhibit 63. I just want to make sure you get a chance to see it.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And this is the [INDISCERNIBLE 02:19:46] congressional record, is it?

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, your honor. 2 is... Which one? This is exhibit DX 63. This is 3 a federal statute, 5USC3331, which sets forth the 4 oath of office for federal officers, including 5 members of Congress, and Ms. Wells, if you could 6 make that a little bit bigger. I want to make 7 sure the representative can see it, the 8 highlighted portion [INDISCERNIBLE 02:20:10]. So, if you see about a third of the way, two-9 10 thirds of the way down, it says that I will take 11 this obligation, I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of 12 evasion. See that? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mhm. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you now recall 15

that was part the oath, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And what did that mean to you, Congresswoman Greene?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: About taking it freely without reservation?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It means I'm swearing the oath, and I have no reservation.

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Great. Now, one part of the Constitution, Representative Greene, is 2 3 the 12th Amendment, right? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You're familiar with 6 the 12th Amendment? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 7 Yes. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's the one that 8 9 provides for the Constitutional process for 10 counting electoral votes in a presidential 11 election, right? JAMES BOPP: You honor, I object. Under the 12 speech and debate clause, she cannot be 13 questioned about what she does on the floor of 14 Congress pursuant to her legislative 15 responsibility. 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Responsibility. And I don't intend to ask any question of that sort, your honor. I just want to have her understanding of the Constitution. This is a case about Representative Greene's state of mind, including her understanding of the oath and the Constitution.

JAMES BOPP: Then I further object, because this case is not about her state of mind. It's

Τ

1 whether or not she engaged in insurrection of 2 rebellion, engaged in [INDISCERNIBLE 02:21:29] 3 conduct in a direct... JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I concur. concur. Sustained. Next question. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, if somebody tried to unlawfully interfere with the 7 process of counting the electoral votes, unlawfully, that person would be an enemy of the 10 Constitution. Wouldn't you agree? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Does it define that 11 way? Is it defined that way? 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, I'm asking for 13 14 15 16

4

5

8

9

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

25

your understanding. If somebody broke the law in a way designed to interfere with the process of counting the electoral count college folks, that person would be the enemy of the Constitution.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You mean interrupting Congress, is that what you're referring to?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Doing anything unlawfully to interfere with the process of counting the electoral votes.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Interrupting Congress, like when the Democrats interrupted

Congress and had a sit-in on the House floor and stopped Congress?

2.1

2.3

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Excuse me.

Excuse me for interrupting, Ms. Greene. Could
you rephrase your question, please?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm entitled to ask my questions in the way I'd like to ask them, your honor. I ask that she listen to my question and simply respond. May I proceed?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, if someone broke the law in an effort to interfere with the counting of the electoral votes, that person would be an enemy of the Constitution, am I right about that?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Breaking the law is unlawful. There's been over 700 people charged for what happened on January 6th.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, and those people were trying to interfere with the lawful process of counting the votes for the electoral college, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I would assume, yes, they did. They stopped the electoral count, yes.

2.4

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, and so, those people would be enemies of the Constitution. You would agree with that, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know if it...

I don't know. I don't know if it defines it that way.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, having taken the oath that we saw on the screen, if you were aware that someone was going to lawfully, unlawfully, excuse me, unlawfully interfere with the Constitutional process of counting the electoral votes, you'd be obliged by your oath to try to stop it. Right?

JAMES BOPP: Your honor, I object. The claim is not she violated her oath. The claim is under section three of the 14th Amendment, and so, her opinion on words like 'enemies' could, [PH 02:24:03] are words of art, often, in the law, is just irrelevant to the matter to whether or not she engaged, did a direct and overt act of insurrection.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, we had a one-hour presentation on the law from Mr. Bopp. We did not object to that.

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I will let you answer question. I've forgotten what it is. 2 3 Could you repeat it? 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can we ask that it be 5 read back? 6 DYMOND WELLS: Question: if you were aware 7 that somebody was going to unlawfully interfere with the Constitutional process of counting 8 9 electoral votes, you would be obliged to have 10 them arrested or stopped, right? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You may answer. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You may answer the 12 question to the best of your ability. 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I had no knowledge 14 of any attempt, and so, that's a question that I 15 can't answer. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm... 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't answer that 18 question. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I take your 20 representation that you have no knowledge for the 2.1 time being. I'm asking it as a hypothetical, 22 just to understand your... 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't answer a

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

hypothetical question.

24

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm permitted to 2 ask you one. So, I'm going to ask you again. 3 you had knowledge in advance that someone was 4 going to unlawfully interfere with the counting 5 of the electoral votes in a presidential 6 election, under your oath, you'd be obliged to do 7 something to stop that, right? JAMES BOPP: I object. She's not being 8 charged for violating her oath. There is no 9 10 foundation laid that she had any knowledge about

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We'll to that.

JAMES BOPP: And so, these, I consider...

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sustained.

Sustained.

anything like that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let me try it a different way on the screen. Remember the part of the oath where you talked about taking on the obligations of the oath freely and without mental reservation or purpose of evasion? You recall that from a few minutes ago, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. If you knew that people were planning to interfere with the Constitutional process of counting the electoral

votes, you knew that before you took the oath, and you took the oath anyway and decided not to do anything about those plans, that would be a mental reservation. Don't you agree?

JAMES BOPP: I object I object She is no

JAMES BOPP: I object. I object. She is not being charged with violating the oath. The question is, did she engage in insurrection or rebellion.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Her state of mind is relevant, your honor. We think it's very important to have her understanding.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: It's relevant to what, Mr. Celli?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's relevant to whether she engaged in insurrection during the time period from January 3rd to January 6th.

We're going to be talking about her state of mind all day.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well, you may come back to that question after you have laid a foundation for why it ties into her activities [INDISCERNIBLE 02:27:30] and after the [INDISCERNIBLE 02:27:32].

2.3

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough. Fair
2	enough, your honor. Ms. Green, you're familiar
3	with social media, right?
4	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
5	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that's a form of
6	communication, right?
7	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
8	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You know what Facebook
9	is and Twitter, right
10	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
11	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you use those as an
12	important form of communication in your work?
13	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
14	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You post messages on
15	Facebook, right?
16	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I post statements,
17	messages, yes.
18	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Videos also, right?
19	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
20	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you also respond
21	and react to other people's comments when they're
22	posted on Facebook or Twitter, right?
23	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
24	

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you do that as a 2 way to get your political views out into the 3 world. 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It's my freedom of 5 speech to do so. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I agree, and you've 7 been very successful at using social media to get your views out of the world, right? 8 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I would say that's 10 an opinion. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm asking your 11 opinion You've got hundreds of thousands of 12 people who follow you on Twitter and Facebook, 13 right? 14 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, not really, 15 because my Twitter, my personal Twitter account 16 doesn't exist anymore. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Before it was 18 suspended by Twitter, you had hundreds of 19 thousands of people following you on Facebook and 20 Twitter, right? 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And by the way, the 2.3 way Facebook and Twitter work is, to my 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 understanding, is they don't have to necessarily 2 follow you to read what you have to say, right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I quess so. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, it could be 5 millions of people who have read the things that 6 you have said on Facebook and Twitter over the 7 years. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know that. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But it could, you 10 would agree with that, right? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't know I don't know how many people read or see 12 what I post on social media. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But what you post on 14 social media is what you want people to know 15 about your political beliefs, correct? 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sure. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You're not 18 putting stuff up there as a joke, are you? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sometimes, yes. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, we'll come back 2.1 to that, and you used Facebook and Twitter to 22 communicate with your constituents in the 14th 2.3 congressional district here in Georgia, right? 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, immediately after 2 the 2020 election and through January 6th, even 3 beyond that, you issued a number of tweets and 4 made statements on Twitter and Facebook about the 5 election, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You tweeted a whole 7 lot of material about your views of what happened 8 in the 2020 election. 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: the thrust of those 11 tweets were that you felt that the election was 12 stolen from the sitting president. 13

JAMES BOPP: I object. That is...

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You can ask the question, what is your opinion?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: What, I also want to ask whether she communicated that opinion through...

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well...

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, let's do it that way, your honor. I take your point.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Where are you going with this, counsel?

25

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm going to show the 2 witness a number of tweets, and I wanted to make 3 sure that I understand the context of them. 4 That's all. 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well, she said 6 she posts on Twitter. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Rightm and my question 7 8 is whether she posts material that reflects the opinion that you have, strike that. Ms. Greene, 9 10 you had the opinion between November, 2020, when 11 the election happened, and January 6th, 2021, that the election was stolen from President 12 Trump. 13 I object. 14 JAMES BOPP: JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm going to 15 sustain it. Ask her, if you've got questions 16 about specific documents or specific things, go 17

ahead. Let's not, let's not bandy around.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Let let's, let's go to PX2A, Ms. Wells, please.

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sorry, which one is this?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 2A, your honor. you see that, Ms. Greene?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mhm.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And what we have here
in 2A a is a document, well, I'll ask you. Can
you tell us, is this a statement that you posted

on Twitter on December 3rd, 2020?

2.1

2.3

JAMES BOPP: Go ahead, Mr. Celli, I'm sorry.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Sure. Yes, ma'am?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah, and this is a statement where you talk about that you were looking for a Senator to join yourself and Representative Mo Brooks to reject the fraudulent votes for Joe Biden and to keep the real Donald Trump in the white house, right?

JAMES BOPP: I object, your honor, to the, you can hear my objection in [INDISCERNIBLE 02:32:34].

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm waiting. I'm waiting with bated breath, Jim.

JAMES BOPP: All right, is this violates her right of free speech. There's nothing in this statement that meets the Brandenburg test, even if speech could be considered, which, since it can't, when we're dealing with 'engages', which is conduct, not speech, and it does not provide, does not even meet the incitement test, which

1 requires directed to inciting or producing 2 imminent lawless action, [INDISCERNIBLE 02:33:10] 3 likely to... 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, we've 5 heard an hour of argument this morning on this. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Hold on. Hold 6 7 on. Go ahead, Mr. Bopp. Thank you, your honor, that is 8 JAMES BOPP: likely to incite or produce action in 9 10 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:33:20]. So, it's objectable, and to call her into account for her 1st 11 Amendment free speech is unconstitutional and 12 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:33:28]. 13 14 15

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Mr. Bopp, I appreciate your argument, but that's argument. I'm going to allow the question. Go ahead, Mr. Celli.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: When you sent out this, strike that. Did you send out this tweet,
Ms. Greene? Ms. Wells, could you put it back up?
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you sent out this tweet, you wanted the people who read the tweet to know that it was your view that the

25

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

votes for Mr. Biden for president were fraudulent, or some of them were, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That really wasn't the purpose of that tweet.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm just asking whether, when you sent this, you were communicating to your, the people who read your Twitter account, that you believe that there were fraudulent votes for Mr. Biden, and that your goal was to keep President Trump in the White House.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was communicating that we were looking for a senator to join our objection, which is very much part of the responsibilities and duties that I can do as a member of Congress.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I agree with that, but the purpose of that was because you believed that the votes for Mr. Biden were fraudulent, right, or at least some were?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: We had been spending a vast amount of time reading and researching and talking to people and had seen tremendous evidence of voter fraud. I don't know if you're aware, because I know you're not from

1 Georgia. We currently have, our secretary of 2 state has an investigation going on into election 3 fraud right now. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, I would 5 move to strike this. I'm entitled to get answers 6 to my questions, your honor. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 7 02:35:08], but thank you. Thank you, 8 9 Representative Greene. All right, let's back up. 10 What... 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: By the way, your honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. We missed 12 something very important. Can the representative 13 be sworn? 14 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Oh, thank you. 15 No, I sworn her in. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Oh, you did? Oh, 17 okay, I didn't see that. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 18 JAMES BOPP: She was sworn in. 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 20 02:35:23] thank you [INDISCERNIBLE 02:35:24]. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: All right, and can I 22 ask the court to acknowledge that this is an 2.3 adverse witness, a hostile witness? 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

She

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes, I 2 acknowledge that she's an adverse witness, and 3 you may therefore cross-examine her, even though she'd make some of your case in [INDISCERNIBLE 02:35:37] yes, I acknowledge that. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And I would ask the 7 court to remind the witness that, in this posture, she has to answer my questions. can't give speeches. Is that fair? 10 JAMES BOPP: Well, you're entitled to an 11 answer to the question that is asked. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: She's not 12 entitled to [INDISCERNIBLE 02:35:53] her answers. 13 14 15

1

4

5

6

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JAMES BOPP: You're not entitled to answers that require her to answer, when the question is objectionable, violates her 1st Amendment rights, is irrelevant to the charges that are being made. Now, just to, what fishing expedition, political What is this? theater?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: This is crossexamination.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: This is cross examining.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm entitled to a yes, no, or I can't answer response.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes. Let's go 1 2 ahead. 3 JAMES BOPP: Unless its objectionable. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You have a standing 5 objection, Mr. Bopp, to everything in the world. 6 I want to question your witness. Let me question 7 your witness. [CROSSTALK 02:36:28]. 8 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, gentlemen, 9 wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. 10 JAMES BOPP: [INDISCERNIBLE 02:36:32]. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's enough. Stop. 12 Mr. Bopp, please, sit down. Next question, Mr. 13 Celli. This is not theater. This is not an 14 argument from Supreme Court. This is an 15 evidentiary hearing. So, let's get going. Go 16 ahead, Mr. Celli. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Wells, can you 18 pull up the plaintiff's exhibit 2C, please? 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sorry, which 20 number? 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 2C. Ms. Greene, is 22 this a tweet that you sent out from your account 2.3 on December 19th, 2020? 2.4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And in this tweet... 1 2 Let me go back a second. Your honor. I would 3 just ask that the previous exhibit, which I think is 2D be admitted into evidence. 4 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: What was the number? 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 2D. 7 DYMOND WELLS: 2A. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm sorry, 2A. 10 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: All right. So, 2A is in. Yeah is that what it is? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And I'd ask that 2C be 12 admitted into evidence. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 2C, all right, 14 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:37:42] distracted. Go through 15 it. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Sure, I asked the 17 witness that this was her tweet, and she said it 18 was. 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: This is your 20 tweet? 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 22 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I ask that it be 24 admitted into evidence. 25

Ιt

1 JAMES BOPP: I object. If it's not 2 probative, then it violates her 1st Amendment 3 rights. It has nothing to do with engage it. 4 doesn't, it's before January 3rd. 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: It's in for what 6 it's worth, Mr. Bopp, which is, I mean, I don't 7 know it's worth anything, but it's in. 8 JAMES BOPP: And I apologize, your honor. I sincerely, I do think it's my responsibility to 9 10 make pertinent objections. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I respect 11 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:38:14] Mr. Bopp. 12 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:38:16]. Go ahead. Go ahead, 13 Mr. Celli. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. 15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

Representative Greene, in your tweet on December 19th, 2020, that we marked as plaintiff's exhibit 2C, one of the things you're communicating to the people who would read this tweet was that you want them to come to Washington on January 6th for a demonstration. Is that right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: For a March for Trump.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. March for, fight for Trump, the phrase that you use there is

#fight for Trump. Right? That's what the words say.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's what it says on my tweet.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, and you posted that because you, in fact, wanted people to show up on January 6th, 2021, in DC, in order to help you stop the theft of the 2020 election, from your point of view.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.

2.1

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Well, I'm not sure we got a clear answer on this. You did believe, at this time, that the 2020 election had been stolen by the Democrats from Mr. Trump, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was asking people to come for a peaceful March, which is what everyone is entitled to do under their 1st Amendment, but I was not asking them to actively engage in violence or any type of action.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question is really simple. It's about your opinion. When this tweet came out, in this period, it was your opinion that the election had been stolen from Mr. Trump, or was about to be stolen, right?

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Under my opinion, there was a tremendous amount of fraudulent things that happened in the election, and under my opinion, I want to do anything I can to protect election integrity and to protect the people of my district in Georgia, people's votes. They should count.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is it fair to say,
Representative Greene, that from election night
of 2020 until January 6th, 2021, your personal
opinion and your wish was that Congress not
certify Joe Biden as the winner of the 2020
election?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, that's not accurate.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You believed that Joe Biden had lost the election to Mr. Trump, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, yes. We saw a tremendous amount of voter fraud. We have investigations going on right now in the state of Georgia. There's investigations going on in multiple states. My own husband showed up to vote in the general election, and when he went in to vote in person, he was told that he had already voted by absentee ballot, when, in fact,

1	he had never even requested an absentee ballot.
2	There's many instances.
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, we could
4	do this now. I understand there's an IT issue
5	that requires a pause. Should we take?
6	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, well, how
7	long do we need? Two minutes? All right. Well,
8	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:41:34] everybody be patient
9	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:41:36]. I appreciate your
10	patience. Oh, I see what the problem is.
11	MALE 5: Representative Greene's
12	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:41:55] camera wasn't on.
13	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:41:55].
14	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Your camera was
15	off. That's why the recording stopped.
16	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Oh, okay.
17	MALE 5: Good?
18	[BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION]
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You want to, I
20	mean, I hate to make everybody just sit around,
21	but
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: [INDISCERNIBLE
23	02:43:18].
24	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's take ten.
25	Let's come back. I mean, Representative, you

1	step down. Let's take ten minutes. We don't
2	need to sit here while they [INDISCERNIBLE
3	02:43:24]. Let's just take ten minutes.
4	MALE 4: Everybody, remain seated, please.
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: No, I said they
6	could leave. I'm going to let them go.
7	MALE 4: [INDISCERNIBLE 02:43:31]?
8	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Huh?
9	MALE 4: We were looking at the
10	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:43:34].
11	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Oh, okay,
12	however you do it, thank you.
13	MALE 5: Yeah, just remain seated until the
14	parties exit the corridor [INDISCERNIBLE
15	02:43:39].
16	[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]
17	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We'll come back.
18	Let's take ten. No, let's come back 12:00.
19	[INDISCERNIBLE 02:44:01] time we get out of here
20	Let's come back at 12:00.
21	MALE 4: [INDISCERNIBLE 02:44:04] let the
22	parties out, and you can come back at 12:00.
23	[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]
24	MALE 4: You want us to let everybody else
25	out first?

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: No, no, you can 2 go. 3 [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION] 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 22 minutes? 5 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:44:43]. Sorry, I can't 6 reach down there. I apologize. [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yeah. You had me 8 wondering for a minute there, because it all 9 10 starts [INDISCERNIBLE 02:48:11]. I didn't hear 11 that. It just [INDISCERNIBLE 02:48:15]. [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes, I remember him. 13 He wasn't in the senior year. He was there like 14 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:53:10]. 15 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 16 FEMALE 3: He might have one over here. 17 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 18 FEMALE 3: Let me, I can take him to the 19 front desk and [INDISCERNIBLE 02:54:04]. 20 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 2.1 02:54:05], I'll be a minute [INDISCERNIBLE 22 02:54:091. 2.3 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Oh, that's great. 2 Well, at least I'm [INDISCERNIBLE 02:55:16]. 3 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah, I didn't know 5 her well or anything, but she, you know, but I 6 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:55:34]. [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 7 MALE 2: Can you do a quick interview with 8 the two of us right now [INDISCERNIBLE 02:56:53]? 9 10 Yeah, if that's all right with your people. 11 You've got to ask them. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I have to ask them. 12 MALE 2: That's right. Otherwise, we'll... 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I could do a Facebook 14 live with my phone. I have [PH 02:57:05] Our 15 Revolutions. 16 MALE 2: Yeah, you could it just in Our 17 Revolutions. That's fine. [INDISCERNIBLE 18 02:57:09]. You good? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yeah, thank you. 20 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 2.1 MALE 4: Here you go, [INDISCERNIBLE 22 02:59:24]. I may come back for it. 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

24

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Okay, let's see if 2 wee can find a purse for. This is always a good 3 place for it. 4 MALE 4: That's exactly where I 5 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:59:37]. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You never know when 6 7 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:59:38] is going to crying [INDISCERNIBLE 02:59:40] don't know. 8 9 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 10 MALE 4: Ladies and gentlemen, Judge 11 Beaudrot will be back in shortly. [INDISCERNIBLE 03:02:41], take your seat. 12 [BACKGROUND/OFF-MIC CONVERSATION/CROSSTALK] 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Representative 14 Greene, I think we're ready. Come on back, guys. 15 Everybody ready? Are we good? Okay. We're back 16 on the record. Representative Greene, appreciate 17 your patience [INDISCERNIBLE 03:07:54] 18 disruption. Appreciate everybody's cooperation 19 while they dealt with the technology. It's one 20 of the banes of human existence. All right. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: May I proceed, your 22 honor? 2.3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Go ahead, Mr. 24 Celli, thank you. 25

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, I would 2 just ask that Mr. Bopp not consult with this 3 client in the break period while I'm examining her. That's generally not permitted, in my 5 experience. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Go ahead. 6 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can we see plaintiff's exhibit 2C please. Ms. Wells 8 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: So, we're on 2C? 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 10 2C. 11 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, thank you. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, this is 12 the tweet that we talked about a little bit 13 earlier, just a quick question. You issued this 14 on December 19th, 2020, correct? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't see real 16 well, but I think that's the day. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Maybe we can make it a 18

SAM SHAPIRO: That's what it says.

little larger?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And what you were doing in this tweet was you were tweeting out a story from the Epic Times about president Trump saying that the protests that were planned for

25

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

1 January 6th were going to be, quote, "wild", 2 right? 3 JAMES BOPP: I object. We don't have the, 4 where is the article? 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right there, under the 6 picture of President Trump. 7 JAMES BOPP: Does it quote that? ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes, it says, "Trump: 8 9 supporters should join wild protest in DC on Jan 6th". 10 JAMES BOPP: Okay. I withdraw my objection. 11 I can't see that. I can't see what's on the 12 13 screen. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can you make it a 14 little larger, Ms. Well? You can answer the 15 question, Representative Greene. 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: What was your 17 question? 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question is, what 19 you were doing in the tweet is you were tweeting 20 out a story from the Epic Times about President 2.1 Trump making a statement that the protest on 22 January 6th would be wild. Right? 2.3

24

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I tweeted an 2 article that had the details of the dates and 3 times. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, and also, 5 included President Trump's statements that he 6 expected the demonstrations on January 6th to be 7 wild. Right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think 8 9 that's what my tweet was about. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Well, but you 11 see that the article says Trump: supporters should join, quote, wild protests in DC on Jan 12 6th. 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember 14 tweeting that specifically for what you're 15 saying. Those are your words. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, I'm reading... 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Those aren't mine. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm actually reading 19 from what's on the ... 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You're speculating 21 on why I tweeted that, but I don't remember 22 tweeting it for that specific reason. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, I'm just 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

asking questions.

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm just answering. 2 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And in your tweet, you 3 mentioned earlier that, your words, join hashtag March for Trump in DC, January 6th, fight for 5 Trump, that you were urging people to come to 6 Washington for a peaceful demonstration, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Peaceful 7 demonstration, absolutely. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, yeah. 10 word 'peaceful' is nowhere in this tweet, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Pardon me? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That word peaceful is 12 not in this tweet. 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't read it. 14 There's only half of it there. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's give the 16 representative a paper copy of that. I just want 17 to make sure I'm not missing anything. 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I can see it 19 now. It was scrolled up just a second ago. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. 'Peaceful' is 2.1 not in there, is it? 22 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, you know, 2.3 like... 2.4

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is the word 'peaceful' 2 in there, Ms. Greene? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It does not say 4 peaceful right there. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's my question. 6 Thank you. 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: But you're asking 8 me, and I said for peaceful demonstration, just 9 like people have the right to do in their 1st 10 Amendment. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm asking, you didn't 11 there's not a secret code in there, that's 12 supposed to be peaceful, right? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, I never mean 14 anything for violence. I don't support violence 15 of any kind, and I've said it over and over 16 again. So, I'm telling you. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You just didn't say it 18 on this occasion, did you? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I never mean 20 anything for violence, ever. All of my words 2.1 never ever mean anything for violence. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, we'll, examine 2.3 that question. Go to plaintiff's exhibit 2F, 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

please.

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 2F, F as in 2 Frank? 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes, and I'm looking 4 at the, yes, this top half of the exhibit. Ms. 5 Greene, this is a tweet that you sent out on January 2nd, 2021, correct? 6 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not sure. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, you don't recall 8 9 this? 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall 11 tweeting that, no. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You can set 12 that to one side. Well, let me ask this 13 question. Does anybody tweet things on your 14 Twitter account? Strike that. Did anybody in 15 January of 2021 tweet things on your Twitter 16 account without your permission? 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: On what day? 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: At any time from 19 November of 2020 to January 6th. 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 2.1 That's difficult to answer. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, which, you you'd 2.3 be surprised if somebody got into your Twitter 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 account and tweeted something without your 2 permission, wouldn't you? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, no one 4 tweeted anything without my permission. I just 5 don't remember who tweeted what. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough. Now, 6 would you agree, Ms. Greene, that this tweet from 7 January 2nd, 2021, is something that we can 8 9 fairly attribute to you, being that it was 10 tweeted on your Twitter account? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm sorry, I don't know. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. You can take 13 that down. Ms. Greene, you've had your 14 disagreements with Speaker Pelosi, isn't that 15 right? 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not sure what 17 you mean. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've had political 19 disagreements with her. You don't agree with 20 some of the things she's done in her career, 21 right? 22 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Politically 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

speaking, that would be correct.

24

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. You don't 2 agree with a lot of things she's done, right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Politically 4 speaking, that would be correct. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: In fact, you think 6 that speaker Pelosi is a traitor to the country, 7 right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not answering 8 9 that question. It's speculation and it's 10 hypothetical. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've said that, 11 haven't you, Ms. Greene, that she's a traitor to 12 the country? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I haven't said 14 that. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Put up 16 plaintiff's exhibit 5, please. 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Oh, no, wait, hold 18 I believe, by not upholding the, 19 securing the border, that that violates her oath 20 of office. 21 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough. I'm not 22 interested in her oath of office. I'm interested 2.3 in that you said that she's a traitor to our

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

country. Right?

2.4

JAMES BOPP: I object, your honor. She did not, this is [INDISCERNIBLE 03:14:45].

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 03:14:45] the relevance to that, Mr. Celli. Next.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor. Can we give Mr. Bopp standing objection on the 1st Amendment grounds?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: No.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: This is an effort to interrupt my examination of the witness. I am attempting to establish the witness's desire to engage in insurrection during the period of January 3rd to January 6th. Now, it's true that some of the things that she said are relevant, if they were, even though they occurred before January 3rd, but there's no 1st Amendment objection to evidence, your honor. She said what she said.

JAMES BOPP: There is 1st Amendment objections.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We don't agree.

JAMES BOPP: Fine, but I get to make my objection.

2.1

2.3

2.4

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You can make the 2 objection. You can have a standing objection. 3 JAMES BOPP: I don't want a standing 4 objection. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: [INDISCERNIBLE 6 03:15:30] Because he wants to interrupt my flow, 7 your honor. That's not appropriate. JAMES BOPP: I don't object to everything. 8 9 Okay? I have specific things that I think are I 10 object to, and I should be extended the courtesy to do that. 11 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You may. You 12 may object. Thank you. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: [INDISCERNIBLE 14 03:15:451. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Plaintiff's exhibit 16 five, please. 17 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We're on five 18 now? Okay. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, I'm placing before 20 you what we've pre-marked as plaintiff's exhibit 2.1 five, which is an article that appeared in CNN on 22 January 26th, 2021. 2.3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Do you have a 24 hard copy of this available? 25

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It should be in the 2 book. 3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Does she have a 4 hard copy, I mean? She can't read it off the 5 screen. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We have one for her. 6 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Good. Well, 7 let's start using hard copies. You can't read 8 9 stuff like this on the screen 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: May I approach the 11 witness, your honor. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes. You have a 13 14 standing permission to approach the witness to deliver copies of documents [PH 03:16:27] as to 15 which you're going to ask your questions. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. Ms. Wells, 17 if you could scroll down a bit. Ms. Greene, I 18 want to, direct your attention to the bottom of 19 the fourth page of the exhibit. 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mhm. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: This is a paragraph 22 that starts out, "She's a traitor to our 2.3 country". You see that? 2.4

JAMES BOPP: I object, your honor. What possible relevance could it be, that she had political disagreements that results in hyperbole that commonly used?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your honor, this is unreasonable.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [CROSSTALK 03:17:41] overruled. Next.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. I just want to ask a narrow question, representative Greene. Did you say, referring to speaker Pelosi, "She's a traitor to our country. She's guilty of treason. She took an oath to protect the American citizens. She gives aid and comfort to our enemies who would illegally invade our land. That's what treason is, and our law representatives and senators can be kicked out and no longer serve in our government, and it's a crime punishable by death, is what treason is.

Nancy Pelosi is guilty of treason." Did you say those words?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I said, this is what I was telling you is she doesn't uphold our laws. She allows illegal...

2.3

2.4

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's a simple yes or 2 no question, ma'am. 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I mean 4 [INDISCERNIBLE 03:18:29]. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you say those 6 words? 7 JAMES BOPP: [INDISCERNIBLE 03:18:32] answer without being instructed by him to say yes or no. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I don't agree, your 10 honor. This is cross examination. JAMES BOPP: [PH 03:18:39] So what? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm entitled to an 12 answer to my question, not a speech. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Representative 14 Greene, did you say these words that are quoted 15 on the bottom? Did you say that? 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: According to the 17 CNN article, I did. I don't remember. 18 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Do you recall 19 saying it? 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall 2.1 saying all of this, but I do recall having said 22 this about the, I totally disagree with the 2.3 border issues and I believe ... 2.4

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. It's been
2	answered. Next question.
3	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Okay.
4	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Representative Greene,
5	you have advocated the use of physical violence
6	against people you disagree with politically,
7	right?
8	JAMES BOPP: I object. Without context,
9	without anything
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Overruled, go
11	ahead. What's the question again, Mr. Celli?
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've advocated the
13	use of physical violence against people that you
14	disagree with politically.
15	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: That's a
16	question?
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes.
18	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Is that true?
19	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think so.
20	I don't know how to answer that.
21	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Next question.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, have a look at
23	what we've marked as plaintiff's exhibit 5.
24	DYMOND WELLS: P5.
25	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: P5, thanks.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: That's the same 1 2 one, is that correct? 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's the same one. 4 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, thank you. 5 You've got a copy of this, Representative? 6 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Oh, is it the same one? 7 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes, it's the 8 9 same one. 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Okay. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, let me ask a 11 foundational question. You understand that, on 12 social media posts like Facebook and Twitter, one 13 14 of the things, well, I guess on Facebook, one of the things you can do is you can like, someone's 15 post, right? 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You can like 17 people's post, right. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you like, 19 someone's post, that's a way of signifying that 20 you agree with or admire or think is it's 2.1 correct, that the post is correct. Right? 22 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

don't agree with your phrase of questioning.

24

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm asking you.

Isn't it true that, when you like, when you
personally, Ms. Greene, like someone's post
you're signifying your approval for what the post
says?

2.1

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't agree with this, how you're phrasing that question.

No, I don't agree with that.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, it's true, though, that you liked a post that suggested that, quote, "A bullet to the head of Nancy Pelosi would be a quicker way to remove her as speaker of the house than impeachment". Right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Now you're using a CNN article, which CNN has lied about me multiple times, and you're using a CNN article as your evidence.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm asking you to answer my question. Did you like a post that said it's quicker, that a bullet to the head would be a quicker way to remove Nancy Pelosi from the role of Speaker?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have had many people manage my social media account over the years. I have no idea who liked that.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Are you 2 testifying under oath it wasn't you? I just want 3 to be clear on that. 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I am testifying that I have no idea who liked that comment. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough. It could 6 7 have been you. Right? JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: She's answered 8 the question. 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm telling you I 11 do not know. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: She's answered 12 the question. Go ahead. Next question. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: By the way, you know, 14 Ms. Greene, that one of the places inside the 15 United States' Capital building that was invaded 16 by people who were doing violence was Ms. 17 Pelosi's office, right? 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was inside the 19 chamber during, on January 6th. So, I do not 20 know all the places that those people went. I 2.1 only know where I was. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Are you telling us 2.3 that, in the more than a year since these events 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

25

occurred, you have not become aware that one of

1	the offices that was invaded by people who were
2	illegally in the Capital was Nancy Pelosi's
3	office?
4	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've seen that on
5	the news, but I don't know for sure. I haven't
6	investigated all of that.
7	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now, you mentioned
8	earlier, in response to some of my questions,
9	that there was a demonstration that was being
10	planned for January 6th, 2021, called the March
11	for Trump, right?
12	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: We talked about it
13	on one of my Twitter posts.
14	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, and that
15	demonstration was being organized in part by an
16	organization called Women for America, right?
17	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember
18	who organized it.
19	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Ms. Wells, can
20	you pull up claimant's exhibit 2D?
21	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm sorry.
22	Which one did you say?
23	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm sorry, 2D, your
24	honor.
25	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: D or B?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 2 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: B as in boy? 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, no, D as in dog, 4 sorry. 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: D as in dog. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: [PH 03:23:53] I 6 7 printed this on paper, so [INDISCERNIBLE 03:23:56]. I placed in front of you what's a 8 document that's been pre-marked as plaintiff's 9 10 exhibit 2D. I'll begin by asking, one of the things that you can do on Twitter, Ms. Greene, is 11 you can retweet, or send out again, somebody 12 else's tweet, right? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, and on 15 plaintiff's 2D, which I placed in front of you, 16 you are retweeting a tweet sent by [PH 03:24:46] 17 Kylie Jane Kramer on December 19th, 2020. Right? 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know if I 19 retweeted it. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, if you look 2.1 carefully, it says, "Marjorie Taylor Greene green 22 is an American flag", and it says retweeted. 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

[INDISCERNIBLE 03:24:59]

24

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know if I 2 retweeted it. 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You don't recall one 4 way or the other? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And it's your testimony that, if this got retweeted from your 7 account, that would've been done with your 8 permission, right? 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall 11 retweeting it. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's not my 12 question. You don't deny that Kylie Jane 13 Kramer's message was retweeted from your account, 14 in the form set forth as plaintiff's 2D, on 15 December 20th, 2020, I'm sorry, December 19th. 16 You don't deny that, do you? 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: This is what your 18 picture has, this paper has. I don't have this 19 Twitter account anymore. So, I don't recall. I 20 don't remember retweeting this. 21 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, but you do 22 remember that there was this thing called the 2.3 March for Trump that was going to be on January 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

6th, right?

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 2 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that Women for 3 America were one of organizers, right? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I don't 5 remember, but that's what this says. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, and one of the other hashtags for the demonstrations that were 7 planned on January 6th, 2021, in Washington D.C. 8 9 was a hashtag 'stop the steal, #stopthesteal, 10 right? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Stop, yes. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes, and another 12 hashtag that got used at the time was, or I'm 13 sorry, a website that was being used to organize 14 people to come to Washington was something called 15 wildprotest.com, right? 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Have a look at PX 33, 19 please. 20 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Mr. Celli, P...? 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: PX33. 22 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: X, P-X? 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I called it PX, P33 24

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: P33, okay. Oh, I got it. Sorry.

2.1

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I've placed before you, Ms. Greene, the document that we marked as plaintiff's exhibit or petitioner's exhibit 33. I'm just ask a couple questions about it. Does this refresh your recollection that there was a website known as wildprotest.com, that was encouraging people to come to Washington for a protest on January 6th?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember the website, but I'm seeing it here on this, on your paper.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, and 'wild' was the term that President Trump used to describe what he thought was going to happen on January 6th, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Wild is also a term that high schoolers when they talk about spring break.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough, but whatever the title of the demonstration or the name or the hashtag that was used, you would agree that you were aware, after the election and before January 6th, that people being asked to

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1 come to D.C. for a large demonstration to object 2 the certification of Joe Biden as President of 3 the United States. Right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was aware people 4 5 were coming to support our objection in Congress, 6 and on January 6th, the only thing I was preparing for was objecting. 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: When did you first 8 become aware that there were going to be large 9 10 demonstrations in D.C. on the 6th? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you consider, at 12 any point, participating in any of those 13 demonstrations? 14 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It was put on my 15 calendar, but then I never went. We were too 16 busy. We were, you know, looking at all the 17 evidence and preparing for our debates and 18 preparing to object. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And who put it on your 20 calendar? 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Somebody on your 2.3 staff, I take it? 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

25

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, it wasn't a 2 complete stranger, right? It was somebody from 3 your congressional staff, right? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Probably so, but I 5 have no idea. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And as you sit here, 6 7 can you tell us why it is that an appearance for 8 you at that demonstration was placed on your 9 calendar? 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Can you rephrase that question? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: How did it come to 12 pass that it was put on your calendar that you 13 14 were going to appear at a demonstration? understand you said you were too busy. 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. 16 was so busy just preparing to object. I don't 17 know. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You were going to go 19 to one of these demonstrations as a speaker, 20 right? 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think so. 22 I was always preparing to object. We were 2.3 very busy. 24

1 2

2.3

2.4

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, have a look at what we've marked as, what number are we on, 33, and if you go about three pages in, at the bottom of that page, and then over to the next page, it says invited speakers and featured guests.

Right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm assuming it, I guess I was on there because I was invited, but I don't know who made this website. I'm sorry. I can't answer essentially anything about it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, you can answer that that's your name and face, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That is my name and face, but I, again, I don't run that website. I have no idea who does, so...

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question to you,
Representative Greene, is you or someone under
your authority at your congressional office
authorized you to be placed as a speaker or guest
of the Wild Protest demonstration.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I get many invitations as a member of Congress to many events and all kinds of speaking engagements, and most of the time, those go on my calendar, but

1	they have no relevance as to whether I attend or
2	not.
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, would it be fair
4	to say, Ms. Greene, that, through your office,
5	you authorized your name and your likeness to be
6	associated with the wild protest.com
7	demonstration?
8	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, you cannot say
9	that or assume that. That would be whoever
10	organized this.
11	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, let's talk about
12	that. Going back to 33. You know Ali Alexander
13	don't you?
14	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't really
15	know him, no.
16	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: When you say you don't
17	really know him, you've met him, right?
18	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've seen him
19	before, but I don't know him.
20	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah, how many times
21	have you been in his physical presence, to your
22	knowledge?
23	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I cannot even,
24	guess hardly any.
25	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ten? Twenty?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 2 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Have you shaken his 3 hand? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've shaken his 5 hand before, yes. I shake hands with pretty much 6 everyone I meet. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Lots of people, right, 7 8 and he's a friend of yours, right? 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. We'll come back 11 for that. Did you discuss, with Mr. Alexander, the idea of you coming to appear at a 12 demonstration on January 6th? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not recall 14 that, no. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You're not denying 16 that happened. You just don't recall one way or 17 the other. 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not recall 19 that, no. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, did you discuss, 2.1 with anybody, attending the Wild Protest 22 demonstration that was planned for January 6th? 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not recall 24 ever talking about attending. 25

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Other than people on 2 your congressional staff or your campaign staff, 3 list for me all the people who you spoke to about 4 the demonstrations on January 6th. 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That would... I'm 6 sorry, I have no idea. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You don't 7 8 remember any of them? 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not remember. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Not any of them? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 11 No. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay, and you spoke to 12 some people about those demonstrations prior to 13 being sworn in as a representative from the 14th 14 district, right? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you spoke to some 17 of those people after you took the oath on 18 January 3rd and before the sixth, right? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you speak to 2.1 anybody in government about the fact that there 22 were going to be demonstrations in Washington on 2.3

January 6th?

2.4

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 2 We were mostly reading information about election 3 fraud, and people signed affidavits about what 4 they'd witnessed with voter fraud and preparing 5 to object. That was pretty much all I remember 6 doing. 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right, pretty much, 8 but your testimony, as you sit here today under 9 oath, is that you didn't talk to anybody in 10 government about the fact that there were going 11 to be large protests in Washington on January

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You spoke to Representative Biggs or his staff about that fact, didn't you?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not remember.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: How about

Representative Gosar?

6th.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm sorry, I don't remember.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you talk to people at the White House about the fact there were going to be large demonstrations on January 6th in Washington?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 2 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Prior to January 6th, 3 Representative Greene, did anyone ever mention to 4 you the possibility that there might be violence 5 in Washington on January 6th, 2021? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 6 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, it's possible that 8 folks told you things could get violent in Washington on January 6th, right? 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was a brand-new member of Congress, if, I don't remember those 11 conversations, but I would hope Nancy Pelosi and 12 those in charge of the Capital were taking the 13 14 Capital security very seriously. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question was just 15 about whether anybody at all ever mentioned to 16 you the possibility of violence. 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, you're not denying 19 it. You're just saying you don't recall. 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 21 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you don't recall 22 that people said we're having these big 2.3 demonstrations in Washington and some of the

2.4

25

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

people who come to those demonstrations might become violent. That never happened?

2.1

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The only violence I ever seen was the Antifa and BLM riots and I've been to so many Trump rallies, have never once seen violence out of Trump people. I don't recall any talk of violence.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you knew that the people who were coming for the demonstrations on January 6 those were Trump people, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I knew there were many people coming to support President Trump and our objection on January 6.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And at least some of them were coming because you asked them to come, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I didn't per -- I don't recall personally asking people to come but evidently I Tweeted about January 6.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Anybody -- strike that. Did you have any conversations with anybody in Government, representatives, senators, White House staff, the President of the United States at the time, any government official or government employee about the fact -- this is now

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

prior to January 6 about the fact that there was 1 2 a risk of people coming to Washington for January 3 6 demonstrations might become violent? 4 JAMES BOPP: I object. That's the fourth 5 time he's asked the same questions. She's 6 repeatedly saying -- . ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's not the same 7 question. 8 9 JAMES BOPP: It really is the last question. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Why didn't you ask 11 questions the last time? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, did you 13 ever hear that from any source prior to January 6 14 that some folks were planning to come to 15 Washington on January 6 and the idea was that 16 they were going to flood the Capitol with people. 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I don't 18 remember ever hearing that. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you never 20 discussed that with anybody? 21 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I do not 22 remember that. 2.3

24

1 2

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But you supported the idea of people coming to Washington on January 6

and flooding the Capitol, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I support people's first amendment to have a peaceful protest, use their freedom of speech.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well previously you publicly said that one way for people to express their displeasure with their government would be to flood the Capitol building with people, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The Capitol belongs to the people. That's where you come and speak to your senators, your representatives. You come to express your views. You come to talk about how you want your tax dollars spent. You come to talk about how you want senators or representatives to vote.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question is a bit more narrow than that. You publicly expressed support for the idea that people should come to Washington to express their displeasure with their government by flooding the Capitol.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. JAMES BOPP: Your Honor -- .

24 25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Amend the
question actually and move on.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can we have the
exhibit 23, please? I placed in front of you
what was previously marked as Petitioner's
Exhibit 23 which is a CNN article entitled 2019

Marjorie Taylor Greene told protestors to flood the Capitol and feel free to use violence.

JAMES BOPP: Your Honor, I object. This is 2019. How many years back? High school? Do we have to be treated with statements that like flood the Capitol, flood the Capitol--.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

7

8

9

10

11

12

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, this is a speaking objection. It's not appropriate.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Go ahead. You may -- if you can figure out how you can lay the foundation for this you may proceed.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. I want to direct your attention to Representative Greene to the second page of this exhibit.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Could you please go through the top so she knows what she's looking for?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. I thought I did but--.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I didn't hear
it. I'm sorry.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Ms. Greene, this is an article that appeared we believe in CNN late January 6. Can I ask if you've seen this document before?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Nope I haven't seen it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah. I'm going to ask some questions about statements that are attributed to you in this article and tell me if you made them or not. Okay? Second page of the document has a quotation that reads, quote, "All of us together when we rise up we can end all of this. We can end it. We can do it peacefully. We can. I hope we don't have to do it the other way. I hope not. But we should feel like we will if we have to because we are the American people." Do you recall making that statement in 2019 in connection with a protest around Fund the Wall?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't recall.

JAMES BOPP: Asked and answered. I object.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 2

O

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Are you denying that 2 you made that statement? 3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Objection noted. 4 M : Do you deny that you made that 5 statement? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm saying I don't 6 7 recall. This is--. 8 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You're not denying it. You just don't recall. 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It said CNN article. 11 JAMES BOPP: She said she does not recall. 12 That is the answer. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Further out please. 14 Keep going. I'm sorry, Judge. I'm missing a 15 page in my copy of the exhibit. 16 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Go on. I'm sorry. 18 Bottom of the - yeah down a little bit. 19 you. You can stop right there. A little further 20 along in the article I'm just going to ask you 2.1 whether you made this comment. "If we have a sea 22 of people we will shut down the streets. 2.3 shut down everything, if we flood the Capitol 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

25

building, go inside, these are public buildings.

1 We own them. We own these buildings. Do you 2 understand that? We own the buildings and we pay 3 all the people that work in the buildings." Did 4 you say that in connection with the Fund the Wall 5 demonstration in February of 2019? JAMES BOPP: And because it's about the Fund 6 the Wall demonstration I'm not after she was 7 sworn in as a member of Congress and taken as--. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's irrelevant. 10 JAMES BOPP: Completely irrelevant to what 11 she--. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: [INDISCERNIBLE 12 03:43:23]. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you say that? 14 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 16 You're using CNN and they've chopped up my words 17 so many times. They've lied about me so many 18 I mean you sound like you have as many 19 conspiracy theories as QAnon at this point. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well you believe in 2.1 QAnon, right? 22 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I did not say 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

I believe in QAnon.

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You don't believe in
2	QAnon?
3	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: This is not
4	relevant. Let's move on.
5	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: She brought it up,
6	Your Honor. Can we go to PX 84 please as well?
7	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Which one?
8	
9	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 84.
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 84.
11	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is that your face, Ms.
12	Greene?
13	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It appears to be.
14	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, this is a video
15	but I'm going to ask that we play it and stop at
16	a minute and 50 seconds. And simply ask if
17	that's you making those statements.
18	JAMES BOPP: Your Honor, before he starts
19	running this, I want I object unless he
20	ensures us that this is the complete clip not
21	selected pieces. That it's the entire
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We haven't touched it,
23	Your Honor.
24	JAMES BOPP: Okay. I'm not saying you
25	touched it. This is on you're prepared to

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions play this I think your responsibility and I've asked the court to require this or object is to make sure that this is not taken out of context. You want to present it as evidence. I think you should be required to explain that this is the entire statement that was made not some selected piece out of context.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: May I have your ear on this, Your Honor?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sure of course. Go ahead.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, we've been denied the opportunity to conduct discovery in this case as Your Honor knows. Given the speed with which this proceeding had to go forward. We have been denied the opportunity to issue subpoenas to get records to do precisely what Mr. Bopp would like me to do. In fact, Mr. Bopp objected to all of those things and said we don't want them to do those things. So, the idea now that he is objecting to us playing a portion of his own client's words, she can defend herself quite ably. She will tell us if it's out of context or if it's QAnon or something else.

2.1

2.3

2.4

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's back up.
2	First of all, what is this again?
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: This is a video we
4	believe of the Congresswoman making a statement.
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And where did it
6	come from?
7	
8	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It came from the CNN
9	article linked to it from Facebook.
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: But this was
11	pulled off of what? The internet?
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, it was connected
13	through CNN I believe. No? From a Tweet.
14	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Next question.
15	This is the complete what was there? Is that
16	what was there?
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's what was there,
18	yes.
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. If you
20	made any alterations?
21	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, sir.
22	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Are you aware of
23	any alterations?
24	
25	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, sir.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. Do we know when it was made?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We believe it was made in February of 2019 but I think--.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Now I ask the witness this about it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can we play the video please?

In Washington D.C on February 23 and VIDEO: protest and march with me at 8 AM. Please. begging you. If we have -- okay, if we have a sea of people, if we shut down the streets, if we shut down everything, if we flood the Capitol building, flood all the government buildings, go inside, these are public buildings. We own them. We own these buildings. Do you understand that? We own the buildings and we pay all the people that work in the buildings. You know what? February 23 may be kind of cold. We're going to go inside. We're going to be warmer. And then we're going to demand that our Federal Government serve we the people. Because we're sick and tired of their ways. We're sick and tired of the crap show. See, here's the issue. Here's the issue, America. They think that we're stupid.

1 And they treat us like we're stupid. And we 2 allow it. We allow it. Well no more. We're not 3 going to allow it any more. We want solutions to 4 the problems. We want to take care of America. 5 America is first. Americans come first with Americans tax payer dollars. We're done. 6 7 done. And we have a massive list of grievances. Okay? We have a huge list of grievances. And 8 9 that's why on February 23 in Washington D.C. at 8 10 AM we're going to march and protest and I am 11 telling you to get your butt there. I'm begging all of you to be there. Be there. Let's make 12 this huge. There's a lot of really, really great 13 people organizing this. You don't even know. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, that's 15 you, right? 16 17

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's me.

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And in that clip you refer to people to come to Washington and flood the Capitol, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: What year was that? ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You tell me, Ms. Greene.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I believe it was for February 23, 2019.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. 2 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: There was no 3 violence that day. We peacefully protested. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough but my 5 point is ask you the question you were urging 6 people for that demonstration to flood the 7 Capitol. 8 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: To peacefully 9 protest with me. And enter the Capitol and ask 10 our lawmakers to serve the American people. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, now you remember giving that statement, right? 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Now that we've 13 watched the video I remember that. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now that your memory 15 has been jogged a little bit, do you remember 16 talking about that demonstration being done on a 17 peaceful basis? 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That demonstration 19 was peaceful. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you remember that 2.1 you said we can do it peacefully, right? 22 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Of course I only 2.3 believe in peaceful demonstration. I do not 24 support violence. 25

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: In fact, what you said 2 is we can do it peacefully. We can. I hope we 3 don't have to do it the other way. I hope not. But we should feel like we will if we have to. 4 5 Because we are the American people. That was 6 another statement that you made in the same 7 presentation, correct? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 8 That was in your 9 CNN article and I don't trust CNN as a source. 10 They've lied about me in it multiple times. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Are you denying that 12

under oath that you made that statement?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not. I just don't recall -- I'm not recalling saying specifically that. The demonstration was peaceful. History shows that.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: What year was this again?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 2019. It has nothing to do with January 6.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'll move on, Your Honor.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You're pushing the envelope.

24

2.3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

JAMES BOPP: I thought you already fall off the cliff.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: NO comments. I'd appreciate to keep his comments to himself at the moment. He can do that with the cameras outside when the time comes.

JAMES BOPP: I'm serious. We need to get back to task.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, did you or any member of your government or campaign staff communicate with Anthony Aguero about the events of January 6 prior to January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you or any member of your staff -- Congressional staff, campaign staff communicate with somebody named Dustin Stockton prior to January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think I know who that is.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. How about

Jennifer Lawrence, not the actress but a Jennifer

Lawrence involved in conservative politics with

you or any member of your congressional or

campaign staff communicate with Ms. Lawrence

2.1

2.3

2.4

prior to January 6 about the demonstrations that 1 2 were planned for that day? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 4 Τ don't think I know who that is. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you or any member 6 7 of your campaign or congressional staff, Ms. 8 Greene, provide any support for any demonstrations that occurred on January 6, 2021? 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea. don't think so. I don't recall. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you or any member 12 of your staff provide information, advice, funds, 13 printed material, promise of a public statement, 14 to withhold a public statement, anything along 15 those lines in connection with the demonstrations 16 that were planned for January 6? 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 18 I don't think so. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And if somebody were 20 to come in here and say, oh yeah, she gave us 2.1 support for our demonstrations you'd say I don't 22 remember that. That didn't happen.

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

2.3

24

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not sure what you're saying. I think you're speculating that 2 3 hypothetical. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Prior to January 6, 5 2021 you heard that people were planning to enter 6 the Capitol on January 6 and engage in violence, 7 right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. JAMES BOPP: I object that. I think that's 10 the fifth time you've said that. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: No, she answered 11 the question. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Never heard that from 13 14 anybody? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 15

> ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And prior to January 6, 2021, you were aware that people were going to make noise outside the Capitol as a means to disrupt the proceedings inside the Capitol. that fair?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I have no idea what you're talking about.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Prior to January 6, 2021, have you heard that people were planning to

25

1

4

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

1	enter the Capitol building illegally in order to
2	disrupt the electoral counting process?
3	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. Absolutely
4	not. I don't know anything about that.
5	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, I think
6	it's 12:45.
7	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well, let's talk
8	about that. How much longer do you think you
9	need?
10	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I don't know.
11	Probably an hour.
12	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well, why don't
13	we take an I'm going to change. Let's take an
14	hour and let's be back here at 40 minutes so
15	that's 1:45.
16	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can I respectfully ask
17	to make it 45 minutes.
18	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 1:45 minutes.
19	You want to make it 12:30? I mean 1:30. I'm
20	sorry. I'm challenged with the clock. 1:30, 45
21	minutes, Mr. Bopp?
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is that okay with you,
23	Congresswoman?
24	
25	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: To continue?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We got 45
2	minutes for lunch. Is that okay?
3	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Oh sure.
4	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: O kay. Well,
5	let's we'll reconvene in 45 minutes which will
6	be 1:30.
7	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you, sir.
8	JAMES BOPP: Your Honor, do we need to clear
9	the table off or?
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I believe it's
11	your right.
12	(OVERLAY)
13	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We'll see
14	everybody back at 1:30.
15	(LUNCH)
16	(OVERLAY)
17	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Please be
18	seated.
19	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you, sir.
20	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I was going to
21	bring it up.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I want to go back and
23	ask just a couple narrow questions and then we'll
24	move to another topic. The Twitter handle
25	

@mtgreene, that's your Twitter handle, right or it was before your account was suspended. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Before my account was permanently banned. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Got it. And during the period from January 3, to January 6 did you or anybody in your office, your congressional office provide tours either formally or informally people of the U.S. Capitol? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. The only people that were with me was my husband and my children.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That would be on the third. Is that right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: They were -- I don't recall the exact days. I believe they went back to Georgia on the 4th.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. I'm trying to capture the period January 3 when you were sworn in until January 6. At any time during that period did anybody in your office provide tours to anybody of the U.S. Capitol?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE:

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And during that 2 period, did anybody on your campaign staff or did 3 you authorize provision of funds, money to people 4 who were planning a demonstration on January 6? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think so. I don't recall that at all. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: If you wanted to know 7 8 the answer to that question, who would you ask? 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I would have to 11 talk to people on my campaign but I don't think we did any -- how would we have done that? 12 didn't do anything like that? 13 14 15 16

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: During that same period of January 3 to January 6, did you or anybody on your campaign or congressional staff provide any information, any sort to anyone in connection with January 6 demonstrations?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think so. I have no idea. I don't think so.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And did you have members of the public visit your congressional office between January 3 or January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE:

24 25

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And during that period 2 from January 3 to January 6 did anyone from your 3 congressional office or you campaign provide maps 4 for the location of offices within the Capitol --? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. We got our 6 keys to my office on January 3. I couldn't even 7 find where the bathroom was most of the time. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You know why I'm 8 asking these questions, don't you, Representative 9 Greene? 10 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea why you're asking these questions. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Representative Greene, 13 you're familiar with the significance of the year 14 1776 in U.S. history, right? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 1776 is the year that 17 the Declaration of Independence was signed, 18 right? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mm-hm. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that was a 2.1 statement by representatives of the 13 colonies 22 that they were no longer subject to the authority 2.3 of British crown, right?

2.4

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: They were -- there 2 was a declaration of independence from the 3 British crown. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And in fact, 5 you may recall this from your studies the 6 Declaration of Independence refers to King George 7 tyrant, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm sure it may say 8 9 that somewhere in the history. I don't have the 10 history books in front of me and I don't know which one you're referring to but. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm referring to 12 the Declaration of Independence. That's the one 13 that says that King George was a tyrant unfit to 14 be ruler of free people. 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Are you quoting the 16 Declaration --? 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. 18 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Okay. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You will accept that, 20 won't you? 21 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: If you're quoting 22 it. 2.3 24

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And you would 2 agree that when a government acts tyrannically 3 then it's unfit to be the ruler of a free people. 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Typically against 5 tyrannical governments here. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And the people who 7 wrote the Declaration of Independence they were working with other people in the colonies to 8 9 express their independence from Britain, right? 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I wasn't alive back then but there's the history. I'm not a history 11 expert but as you said. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, you've heard of 13 the American Revolution, haven't you? 14 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Of course I have, 15 16 yes. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and you know that 17 the American Revolution was a violent rebellion 18 against British rule in the colonies. 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And they were trying 2.1 to overthrow the government in Britain that was 22 ruling the colonies, right? 23 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: America was trying 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

to start our own government.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And to do that they had to get rid of the British colonial officials who were here in America and throw them out.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And they viewed the British officials here on the ground in Britain as a tyrannical government, right?

2.1

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. That was an insurrection. Wouldn't you agree? The American Revolution was an insurrection against the government?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't believe it -- I don't know where it said that.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm asking you whether or not you agree that the American Revolution was an insurrection against the British government.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I believe it was the American Revolution is part of our history where we separated from the crown and started our own government here.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And the 2 separation was brought about by violence, right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: There was a 4 revolutionary war, yes. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah. And the 6 violence of -- the colonists were justified in 7 using violence to get rid of the tyrannical government of Britain their officials in America. 8 9 Right? 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Is that your 11 opinion? I assume so. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm asking you. 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It was a 13 revolutionary war. It was violent. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Now, you've 15 actually talked publicly about the Declaration of 16 Independence calling for the overthrow of 17 tyrannical governments, right? That's something 18 you discussed publicly? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Are you referencing 20 something I've said somewhere? 21 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, do you recall 2.3 talking about that topic? 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've talked about 2 the Declaration of Independence but I don't know 3 what occasion you're referring to. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Well, one of the occasions where you talked about the 6 Declaration of Independence was in connection 7 with January 6, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Let's go to 10 Plaintiff's 15 please. Plaintiff's 15. Hang on one second as well. Ms. Greene, I'm going to 11 play the short clip and ask if that's you 12 speaking on video, okay? 13 14 15

JAMES BOPP: What's the date on this? can't read it from here.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Sorry. October 26, 2021. If you can play the clip please?

VIDEO: The riot at the Capitol and if you think about what our Declaration of Independence says, it says to overthrow tyrants.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's your statement, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't believe it was finished but that was me. I don't recall --

25

1

4

5

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

I don't know what the rest of what I was saying because it was cut off.

2.1

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But in that statement that we looked at, you're comparing the overthrow of the British crown in America 1776 to January 6.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know what my statement was because it was cut off.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now you've talked about the need for people to have guns in order to secure their rights against the tyrannical government, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, we have a second amendment for a good reason.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And the good reason is in case they need to overthrow their government they can use their guns to do that.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: We have -- well, you're twisting things around. Could you rephrase your question please?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, I'm reaching to your answer. You said that we have a second amendment and that's a good thing and I said that the reason from your point of view that there is a second amendment is so that people can

1 overthrow their government by violent means with 2 quns. 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's not the 4 exact purpose. We defend ourselves. Say if you 5 know if you're being attacked you know a gun is a 6 tool to defend yourself. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right and but one of 7 the things it could be used for -- strike that. 8 Let's go to PX6. I'm going to play a video here 9 10 and ask a couple questions about it. Well, first 11 let me just ask you do you recall giving an interview as reflected on PX6 in October of 2020 12 just about a week before the election at 13 14 something called the Relic Hunter Firearm Shop? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mm-hm, I vaquely 15 remember. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And that's you 17 on the left and the gentleman on the right is the 18 owner of the shop. Am I right about that? 19 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Who's that just 22 so I know? 2.3 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mr. Door.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Who's Mr. Door? 2 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: He's a gun rights 4 activist and just someone I know. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Got it. And it's 6 backwards because of the video but Mr. Door's t-7 shirt says I am 1776 Percent sure that no one is 8 taking my guns. You agree that that's what it 9 says? 10 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. So, let's play 12 the video. 13 JAMES BOPP: I object to playing this. 14 have watched this. Right in the middle there was 15 a section cut off right in the middle. So, it 16 has been edited and who's the source of this? 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The source of this is 18 Marjorie Taylor Greene, it's owned wth the price 19 of blood. That's what we're going to be talking 20 about. 2.1 JAMES BOPP: No. Who's the source of the 22 video? Who--. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Where did we get this 24 from? YouTube. 25

1 JAMES BOPP: YouTube. Okay. Well, I know 2 you'll need to see it but. 3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We'll see it and 4 then you can make -- obviously that's difficult to cross examine a video but it's certainly 5 6 possible to say what's--. 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm going to ask a lot 8 of questions about it, Judge, and she can tell us if it's--. 9 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yeah. 10 That she 11 can. Go ahead. VIDEO: But--. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Stop. We're not 13 14 watching the whole thing. Pick it up at 11 is that correct? 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's a minute and nine 16 seconds, Your Honor. 17 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: No, what I'm 18 asking is -- oh I see it's sure -- it looked like 19 we were halfway that's why I was saying --. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, no. 2.1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: It wasn't the 22 whole thing. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can you go back, Ms. 24 Wells, to just to the very beginning? 25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yeah let's start it over.

But here's the deal. VIDEO: If this generation doesn't stand up and defend freedom, it's gone. And once it's gone, freedom doesn't come back by itself. The only way you get your freedoms back is the price of blood. We can't [INDISCERNIBLE 04:19:50] too worried about offending someone anymore. This is it. November 3, freedom is on the ballot. You have a choice of either voting for freedom by voting for Donald J. Trump for President again four more years, voting Republican straight down your ballot or you're going to vote for socialism and vote to completely end America as we know it. This is no They do not want you to be able to defend joke. yourself. Because if you can defend yourself, guess what? Then you stop the tyrannical government. However, if they take away your guns and you can't -- not only can you never stop a tyrannical government you never even defend yourself if someone is breaking into your home. And that's the reality. Its' where we are today in 2020.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

JAMES BOPP: Let me start it off with the cut sentence which is a--.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Fill me in.

JAMES BOPP: Okay. So, whatever she said before is wiped out and then you saw three times when it was cut, okay, and mother Jones I'm sorry I am not going to rely upon them to give an accurate depiction of the [INDISCERNIBLE 04:21:08].

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well we can proceed with questioning. Witness can respond. I mean it is the witness and the statement she made. And she can respond. So--.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Look let's establish that. Representative Greene, this is a statement that you made in an interview with Mr. Door in October of 2020, right?

2.1

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That is a very partial cut off and pasted statement. That is me speaking but my sentences are cut off. My full message is not there.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And in that statement what you say is if you can defend yourself you can stop a tyrannical government.

1 However, if they take away your guns, you can 2 never stop tyrannical government. Right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Correct. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And you believe 5 that? 6 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Absolutely. 8 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And in fact, 9 what was done in 1776 was to stop a tyrannical 10 government with guns. Fair? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sure, yeah. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that was to use 13 violence against the tyrannical government 14 [INDISCERNIBLE 04:22:17]? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, they were 16 trying to get rid of a tyrannical government. 17 There was a lot of -- I mean there was a big 18 process. There was big build up there before the 19 revolutionary war. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: What--. 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The whole purpose 22 was not to use guns for violence. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: What did you mean --? 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: As the narrative that you're trying to push here.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: What did you mean when you said that once you lose your freedom it has to be earned with the price of blood?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, once -- I've always said I'm against violence and I've always said I never want to see a war in this country.

Never. I've said that over and over again in many speeches and the reason why I say that is because I don't want to see war here on American soil. I have three children that are young adults and I never want to see my children fighting a war, earning back our freedoms. And I've said that. That's what I'm talking about.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Earned with the price of blood is a reference to violence, isn't it?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The price of blood is the unfortunate and tragic cost of war. And that's what happened in the Revolutionary War. And that's what I'm talking about.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you know that the 2 term 1776 is actually a term that's sometimes 3 used in politics today. 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know if 5 you've noticed our state seal here in Georgia. 6 know you're not from Georgia. But as you can 7 see, we enjoy our history and we're proud of our freedoms. 1776 is on our state seal. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And it's also 10 a term that's used in political discourse in 11 America today. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't use it as a 12 term of violence. 13 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But you use it as a term, right? 15 16 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have used it as a 17 term but I do not use it as a term of violence as 18 you're trying to push. 19 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We're not up to that 2.1 yet. You'll have your chance to answer the 22 question you want to answer. 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I understand. 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But you have to start 2 by answering my question, okay? 3 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sure. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You acknowledge that 5 1776 is a term that's used in political discourse 6 7 today, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 8 Yes. 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And in fact, one of 10 the examples of 1776 being used in political discourse today is the t shirt that Mr. Door was 11 wearing in the interview that we just saw, right? 12 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: We saw a 1776 14 backwards on his t shirt on that cut up day, yes. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And you 16 understood that t shirt to mean that people need 17 to posses firearms in order to oppose a 18 tyrannical government? 19 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall even 2.1 -- I don't remember seeing his t shirt that day 22 when I saw him. The only time I'm paying 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

2.4

25

reference.

attention to it is now because you're drawing the

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay but as you sit 2 here today you understand that what that t shirt 3 is conveying it's a political message is that people needed to -- need to possess firearms in order to oppose the tyrannical government? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't necessarily 6 7 understand what you're trying to say. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm just asking whether you have that understanding or not. 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I think you're more 11 trying to push a narrative and push words in my mouth and I don't agree with what you're saying 12 necessarily. 13 14 15

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: As you sit here today, Representative Greene, you know that that term 1776 has been used in connection with the events of January 6, 2021.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I quess so. don't know.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, you yourself have used the term 1776 to describe the events of January 6, 2021.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall but if you say.

25

1

4

5

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's go to PX27 please Ms. [INDISCERNIBLE 04:26:04]. Alright. This video, Your Honor, has been admitted into evidence.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Right.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Wells, you can play that.

I know it wasn't actually planned VIDEO: but President Trump knows how much I support him. H e knows how much I support our district, Georgia's 14th District and so I was happy to go up there and encourage our voters to get out and vote. We can't allow our two Republican Senators to lose their seats to two radical socialist Democrats. So, I was excited to get out there and also cheer on Senator Kelly [INDISCERNIBLE 04:27:02] for announcing last night that she'll be objecting to this fraudulent stolen election tomorrow on January 6 and I'm very excited that both of us women representing Georgia will be fighting for President Trump and fighting for the integrity of our elections tomorrow. What is your plan tomorrow? How do you plan to handle what could possibly go down in the Joint Session of Congress tomorrow? What are you prepared for?

1 Well, you know, I'll echo the words of many of my 2 colleagues as we were just meeting together in 3 our GOP conference meeting this morning. This is our 1776 moment. 4 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's your statement on January 5, 2021. Correct? 6 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know the 8 9 date. Again, I don't recall but now that I've 10 seen it what was the date of the video? 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: January 5, 2021 but 12 you can't take my word for it we can play it back 13 and you'll see that you're talking about tomorrow 14 is the 6th. 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: O kay, yes. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And this is two 17 days after you took the oath of office to be a 18 representative from the 14th Congressional 19 District, correct? 20 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 22 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

24

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you used the term
2	1776 to describe in response to a question from
3	the Newsmax broadcast, right?
4	
5	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was speaking
6	about objecting.
7	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, he asked you
8	what is your plan, what are you prepared to have
9	go down tomorrow on January 6 and your response
10	was tomorrow is our 1776 moment. Right?
11	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was talking about
12	the courage to object.
13	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you said you were
14	echoing the words of your Republican colleagues.
15	Was the term 1776 used by your Republican
16	colleagues?
17	
18	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall that
19	was the video but I don't recall.
20	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: In fact,
21	Representative Bober has used the term 1776 to
22	describe the events of January 6, hasn't she?
23	
24	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. I
25	have no idea.

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: L et's go to PX9E
2	please.
3	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 9?
4	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: 9E.
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: 9E, thank you.
6	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you recall seeing a
7	Tweet from Representative Bobert from Colorado at
8	8:30 in the morning on January 6, 2001? Today is
9	1776.
10	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember
11	seeing this. I see it now. If that's her Tweet.
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: DO you have any doubt
13	that Representative Bobert used the term 1776 to
14	describe the events of January 6?
15	
16	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know.
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's go back to PX27
18	please. So, that was an interview that you gave
19	to News Max, right?
20	
21	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's what it said
22	on the screen News Max.
23	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You're not
24	denying that, right?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: NO, I'm just saying 1 2 I don't even remember the interview until we seen 3 it. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And that 5 interview was posted that day on your Facebook 6 page. 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We have that? Yeah. 8 9 Come back to that. Now when you said this is our 10 1776 moment, you knew that some of the people who felt that Donald Trump was the rightful winner of 11 the 2020 election used that term to refer to the 12 possibility of violence on January 6, 2021. 13 14 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I never heard 15 anyone talking about violence for January 6. 16 Absolutely not. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You never heard about 18 anyone using the term 1776 to refer to the 19 possibility--? 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I would never use--2.1 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let me finish my 2.3 question, Representative. 24 25

1	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Okay, excuse me.
2	Sorry.
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I don't mean to cut
4	you off.
5	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I apologize.
6	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've never heard
7	anybody say use the term 1776 as a code word for
8	violence to occur on January 6, 2021?
9	
10	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. Absolutely
11	not.
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You're familiar with
13	the group called The Proud Boys?
14	
15	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I 've heard of them.
16	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you know that The
17	Proud Boys it has developed at a written plan fo
18	conduct on January 6, 2021, right?
19	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I did not know
20	that.
21	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. The Proud Boys
22	are an extremist violent group, you would agree
23	with that?
21	

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know much 2 about The Proud Boys. 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Never heard that 4 they're a violent extremist group? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have heard about 6 7 them. I don't know what they do. I don't know 8 much about The Proud Boys. 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: you haven't heard that 10 the written plan attributed to The Proud Boys for January 6 was called 1776 returns? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I have no idea 12 anything about that. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Never heard that. 14 Okay. That's pull up PX39. This is an article 15 that appeared in the New York Times on March 14, 16 17 2020 entitled document [INDISCERNIBLE 04:33:03] case shows plan to storm government buildings. 18 Have you seen this document? 19 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've never seen it, 2.1 no. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let me get you a copy 2.3 so you can have a look. There you go. 2.4 Greene, did you see a story in the New York Times 25

1 or in any other publication or media outlet in March of '22, 2022 about The Proud Boys having a 2 3 written plan to storm government buildings on 4 January 6? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I've never -- I 6 don't recall never heard anything about it. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Never heard of that? 7 Never heard that that was called 1776 returns, 8 that plan that the government alleges Proud Boys 9 10 has to storm government buildings? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 11 No. I've never heard of it. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You were aware prior 13 to January 6 that 1776 referred to an idea or a 14

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You were aware prior to January 6 that 1776 referred to an idea or a plan for people who were opposed to the certification of the electoral college vote to infiltrate and occupy buildings in DC?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. Never.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Never heard of that?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you were aware prior to January 6, 2021 that 1776 was a term that people were using to describe a plan or an

25

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

2.3

2.4

1 idea to physically interfere and prevent the 2 electoral college vote. 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I don't know 4 anything about that. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You can put 6 that to one side. We talked a little bit about a person named Ali Alexander this morning. Do you 7 remember that testimony? 8 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mm-hm. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you said somebody you met on a number of occasions is that fair? 11 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've seen him a 13 couple times. I don't remember when and it's not 14 someone I know. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's pull up 67 16 please, PX67 as well. I'm going to ask you to 17 have a look at just the first ten seconds of the 18 video and just a person not even speaking and 19 tell me if you can identify that person, okay? 20 [VIDEO - MUSIC] 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you know that 22 person? 2.3 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Alexander. 11 minutes and 20 seconds.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's Ali

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. Let's go to minute 11:20. This is a rather long clip and I'm going to take you to the middle of it around

VIDEO: There is Congress on a committee. Congressman Steve King was the only one [INDISCERNIBLE 04:38:01] but so that's not true. So, avoided this information, avoid the division. We are here to continue pressing forward. Yet Congresswoman Marjorie Greene, my favorite, she's coming in, a friend of mine. She's coming in. she'll be whatever. Someone was trying to tell me--.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You can stop it there. You see that Mr. Alexander describes you as his favorite. Right? You heard him say that.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's what he said. I just saw it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Do you have any explanation for why he would feel that way?

2.3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

24

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Maybe he likes the 2 work I do. I don't know. I don't really know him 3 that well. I only met him a couple of times. 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Describes himself as -5 - you as a friend of his. Right? 6 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Those were his words. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. That's what he 10 said in the video. Is he lying when he describes himself as a friend of yours? 11 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't -- I 13 wouldn't call him a friend. I do not know him. 14 I've only met him a couple of times. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. So, if he says 16 he was a friend of yours he would be lying. 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sometimes people 18 say things on videos for their followers or to 19 maybe I don't know that's what he said. I don't 20 know him. I've only met him a couple of times. 21

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: IN fact, Mr. Alexander was very active on Twitter post election 2020 period up until January 6 isn't that right?

25

22

2.3

2.4

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. don't follow his account.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okav. Let's go to --I think we've established that during that post election period from November when you were elected until January 6 one of the things that you were doing was organizing people in Congress to file objections to the electoral college count. Right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, working very hard on objecting.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Let's go to PX3, please. If you could scroll it up so that we can see the bottom half first. Yeah. Further down please. I'll get you a paper copy. Greene, I want to focus your attention on the box in the middle of the page that says Marjorie Taylor G-R-E...E...123020. Do you see that?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that's a Twitter comment that you made on December 30, 2020, right?

2.4

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall making that Tweet. But that's what this piece of paper says.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Do you have any doubt that a Tweet from your account was issued on December 30, 2020 that said, quote, word on the Hill is that Mitch McConnell and Nancy Pelosi could be working together on a rules change deal to block our electoral college certification objection.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall this Tweet.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question is a little bit different. Do you have any doubt that this is a Tweet from your account?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you recall in late December of 2020 hearing rumor on Capitol Hill about a deal between Mitch McConnell and Nancy Pelosi to create a rules change so as to block the objections to the electoral college account?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't really remember. It's been 16 months or so ago.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That would be pretty 2 important wouldn't it if they changed the rules 3 so that you couldn't object to the electoral 4 college account, right? 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: It would have been 6 7 but there was no rule change. We were still able 8 to object or at least we tried anyways. 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But by this point in 10 December 2020 your focus was on objecting to the 11 electoral college account in Congress, right? 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. Finding 13 evidence of voter fraud and coming in to object, 14 yes. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And if there had been 16 rumors of a rule change, that would be something 17 that would be important for you to Tweet out and 18 talk about publicly. 19 IT possibly would MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 20 have been. I just don't remember this Tweet. I 21 don't remember it. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You know that Ali 2.3 Alexander has responded to Tweets that you've 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

sent out over the years, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. I don't always -- I have no idea who re Tweets and who responds. That's not something that I send much time at all looking at.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You spend some time looking at it though don't you, Representative Greene? Who responds to your Tweets.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Occasionally I have some time and I look at who responds but I do not know what he has responded, what he has Tweeted or re Tweeted.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and the reason that you look at responses to your Tweets is you want to see how what you've said is being taken on board by other people. Is that fair?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Actually I don't really look at comments on Twitter because they're filled with a lot of bots and a lot of hateful people and I don't like to read things like that so I really don't read many comments. Hardly ever.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, you read Mr. Alexander's response to your December 30 Tweet

that's shown in Exhibit 3, right? And just to read it out loud, when he writes this, if they do this, everyone can guess what me and 500,000 other will do to that building. 1776 is always an option. You read that, didn't you?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: If this is his
Twitter I see it on the screen I have no idea
those are his words I guess. I have no idea.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well as you sit here today, you understand that Mr. Alexander was referring to was not legal objections on the floor of the Congress, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: NO, I don't know what he's referring to.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you knew back then that what Mr. Alexander was responding to your Tweet was to say if they make a rules change and Congresswoman Taylor Greene can't object, we're going to go into the Capitol and do violence.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea. I don't know anything about this.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that term 1776 is the way Mr. Alexander was conveying that to his listeners or his readers.

2.3

2.4

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea.

Again, I don't know anything about this. Never seen it before.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Between January 3 and January 6, 2021, Ms. Greene, you viewed the electoral college certification of Joe Biden as a blow to freedom. Is that fair?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I viewed it as we needed to object because there was so much evidence and so many people had signed their names, thousands of people had signed their name on affidavits saying they witnessed voter fraud and that meant something to me because I care

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: My question is whether you viewed it as a blow to freedom if the electoral college certification of Joe Biden were completed.

about the people and I care about their votes and

I care about our election integrity.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't agree with your wording.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Because once freedom is gone, it doesn't come back by itself, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't agree with your wording.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The only way you can get freedom back is when it's earned with the price of blood. Those are your words, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You're twisting my words and creating a narrative that you're trying to make. That's not my narrative. That's not what I said. That's not what I meant with that.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But on October 27, 2020 that's what you said and that's what you meant, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm sorry.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah on October 27, 2020 when you did the interview with Mr. Door when you said the only way to get freedoms back is when it's earned with blood. That's what you meant, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well you showed a video that's chopped up, that doesn't show my -- even my full sentences so no I don't agree with what you are saying.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you have any explanation, Representative Greene for why it is

2.3

that on January 5 the day before January 6 you described January 6 as our 1776 moment.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember.

Seeing this interview is the first time I've seen it in a long time. I don't remember.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now, prior to January 6, 2021 you spoke publicly on your Facebook page about the transfer of power that would occur on January 6. Do you recall that?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. You said on a video on your Facebook page that the peaceful transfer of power ought not be allowed to occur.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You said that the peaceful transfer of power cannot be allowed to occur because Joe Biden didn't win the 2020 election, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's go to the video tape. Can we start with -- so it's probably best if I explain this. There are two versions of this and I'm going to ask about both of them.

You can tell me if you think they've been chopped

1 up in any way. They have been chopped up. that's 2 true. But tell me whether you were 3 misinterpreted, okay? The first one is PX66. 4 Play that one. 5 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay, just a What's the date and the source of the 6 second. 7 video? ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The source is -- it 8 was something Ms. Greene's Facebook page is not 9 10 available. This is something that was captured by 11 someone else and posted on another Facebook page. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Where it says 12 it's from her Facebook page? 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. I believe it 14 66 has been admitted, Your Honor. 15 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And what is the 16 date? 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We're going to ask her 18 about that, your Honor. 19 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay you don't 20 know. Okay. 2.1

VIDEO: And this is an important time in our history. We can't allow this just to be -- just to let it go. You can't allow it to just transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants

22

2.3

24

25

and allow him to become our President. Because he did not win this election. It's being stolen and the evidence is there.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, that's you, right, Ms. Greene?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, that's me.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and when you say we can't allow it, we can't just let it go, the it in that phrase is to have Joe Biden declare the winner of the 2020 Presidential election.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You are showing a video where it doesn't give us any reference before hand and it doesn't give us any reference afterwards so it's not really my complete -- it's hard to get an understanding of what I was saying.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay so your answer is you don't know what you're referring to.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't. We're watching a partial video and a partial statement of clearly an interview I was doing. I don't know what date it was on and it's definitely off someone else's Twitter or Facebook. I can't see it form here.

2.3

2.4

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, that's you
2	saying you can't allow it to transfer power
3	peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to
4	become our President because he did not win this
5	election. That's you saying that, right?
6	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's a partial
7	statement of on that video.
8	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Can we pull up-
9	
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Did we see the
11	whole thing?
12	
13	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: WE can run the rest of
14	it if you'd like.
15	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's see the
16	whole thing.
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Sure and there's
18	another one on top of it so we'll watch two.
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We've said there
20	are two. I want to be sure that she has an
21	opportunity to see what we're doing.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can I make a
23	suggestion, your Honor?
24	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes.

2.3

2.4

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's go back to the beginning of this one and then we'll play it all the way trough.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: That would be good idea. Let's do that.

VIDEO: And this is an important time in our history. We can't allow this just to be -- just to let it go. You can't allow it to just transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our President. Because he did not win this election. It's being stolen and the evidence is there. The mainstream media for four years talked about Russian collusion conspiracy theories and lies and demanded investigations nonstop into Russian collusion nonstop but yet they refuse to -- and this is an important time in our history.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is that where it ended? It just sort of cut off there? Okay let's show the witness PX12. Let me -- hold off on that for one second. This video that we just saw which we marked as Plaintiff's 66, that's a video that you made in anticipation of objecting to the electoral college account in favor of Joe Biden, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. 1 2 don't see a date. It's not from my specific 3 Facebook page. It appears to be on someone 4 else's. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's see the other video, 12. This is also it's the same thing. 6 Ιt was taken I believe off of the video off of 7 Facebook page the client of Congresswoman but 8 9 let's ask her. 10 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Where did you all get it? Off the Facebook off the Republican 11 [INDISCERNIBLE 04:53:44]. Okay so this secondary 12 source is copied and that's where you got it 13 from. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. 15 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: So this is a 16 different version? Want to play it? 17 18 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Hold on one second. 19 This one is also admitted into evidence, Your 20 Honor. 21 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: For what it's 22 worth. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: For what it's worth. 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1 America reelected Donald J. Trump 2 for four more years. You can't allow it to just 3 transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants 4 and allow him to become our President. Because 5 he did not win this election. It's being stolen and the evidence is there. There is a large 6 7 group of us we're organizing an effort to object to the electoral college votes for Joe Biden and 8 key states where there's real evidence that this 9 10 election has been stolen. I am very convicted in 11 what we're going to be doing on January 6 and it's historic and I feel it's very, very 12 important. On January 6 if you're able, there 13 are going to be possibly a million or more people 14 coming to Washington to be there for this 15 historic event. It's critical for everyone to 16 show up and show the nation who we are. 17 aren't a people that are going to go quietly into 18 the night. We are not a people that are going to 19 be thrust into socialism without stopping it. 20

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now that you've seen that, Representative Greene, do you agree that this is a video that you created in anticipation of objecting to the electoral college vote on January 6?

21

22

2.3

24

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: This video on the Democrat leftist Pac Republican accountability group that looks to be chopped up and sliced, that video? That's not my full video. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Listen to my question. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The words that are shown that you're speaking on those are things that you were talking about in anticipation of objecting to the electoral college account vote on the floor of the Congress, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: cut and sliced video.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

The only thing I was working on was objecting but again that's a

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you said we're organizing an effort to object the college electoral college votes on the video the we were members of Congress, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Well, members of Congress are the only ones that can object. That's part of our ability. That's what we're allowed to do lawfully.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And exactly and making objections is in fact by members of

Congress is part of the lawful transfer of power, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Objecting is part of the electoral count process. Democrats did it with the past three Republican presidents that were elected. They objected and I'm sure there was a lot of planning that went into that and discussion. We put a lot of planning, a lot of work into it and as you can see, we talked about it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So when you were talking about we can't allow it to happen, you can't just let it go, you can't allow it to transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our President because he didn't win, you weren't talking about objections on the floor of the Congress, were you?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: What I believe what I was referencing is we can't allow the electoral count to happen without objecting. I felt it was our dutiful responsibility to object on behalf of the large amount of voter fraud and the people who truly felt like that there was big problems in our elections.

2.1

2.3

2.4

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you're testifying under oath that that's what you meant when you said you can't allow it to transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our President. That was as reference to--

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Without objecting.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Of course, you don't say anything at that part of the video about objections on the floor of the Congress, right? Would you like to see it again?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I believe the video I said objecting.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: But in the sentence where you said you can't allow it to transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our President because he didn't win the election. You don't say anything in that sentence about objections on the floor of the Congress.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sir, we just saw two videos that are cut and clipped and they don't -- my sentences aren't even completed. I think the first video started with me saying and meaning it was starting into partially something

I was already saying. What I was -- from the video and my recollection from watching them just then it was purely talking about objecting.

2.1

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: One of the things that you say in these videos is that you call upon people to come to Washington on January 6, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't -- did I -- I don't remember every single word that we just watched.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's look at it again. I think the P12 is the one that includes that.

VIDEO: America re elected Donald J. Trump for four more years. You can't allow it to just transfer power peacefully like Joe Biden wants and allow him to become our President. Because he did not win this election. It's being stolen and the evidence is there. There's a large group of us we're organizing an effort to object to the electoral college votes for Joe Biden in key states where there's real evidence that this election has been stolen. I am very convicted in what we're going to be doing on January 6 and it's historic and I feel it's a very, very important. On January 6 if you're able, there

1 are going to be possibly a million or more people 2 coming to Washington to be there for this 3 historic event. It's critical for everyone to 4 show up and show... 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, in that segment, 6 Representative Greene, you're asking people to 7 come to Washington on January 6. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: In this video which 8 I saw jump three times which means it's been cut 9 10 and spliced yes I did talk about people coming 11 there to support our objection peacefully, support our objection, support President Trump. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: How did you know that 13 there might be a million or more people coming to 14 Washington on January 6? Did you just make that 15 up or somebody tell you that? 16 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I believe those 18 were the numbers being talked about at the time. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: By who? 20 2.1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The media and just 22 different sources. 2.3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: People who were 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

planning the demonstration?

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea. 2 think I saw that on the news. 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And what you said is 4 it's critical for everyone to show up, right? 5 That's what we saw. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 6 Supporting -- y eah, peacefully supporting our objection. 7 That's the only thing I was interested in doing and 8 planning was objecting. 9 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now the last thing you say on the video is we aren't a people that are 11 going to go quietly into the night. Do you 12 recall that part? 13 14 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now that phrase we 16 aren't a people that are going to go quietly 17 into the night, that's not something that you 18 came up with on your own, is it? 19 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have no idea what 2.1 you mean. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well that's something 2.3

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

that you borrowed from a movie script, right?

24

1	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know what
2	you're talking about.
3	
4	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You borrowed that line
5	from the movie Independence Day, right?
6	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.
7	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's go to the video
8	tape as well. The time stamp is 1:08 to 1:44.
9	Hold on one second. You've seen the movie
10	Independence Day, right?
11	
12	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I've seen it
13	before.
14	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's a great movie,
15	right?
16	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I think it's
17	probably a great movie. I don't watch movies in
18	a long time but from what I remember it's a grea
19	movie.
20	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: This is the one about
21	the aliens who come to the world and then there's
22	a big battle on July 4 to war them off, right?
23	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You are giving us
24	quite the entertainment today. Thank you.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And there's a 2 scene in that movie where the President, the guy 3 who's playing the President of the United States 4 addresses the fighter pilots who are about to go 5 into battle against the aliens. Remember that 6 scene? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not remember 7 no but I'm sure you're going to show us. 8

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah.

JAMES BOPP: Can we see the whole thing? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yeah can we watch the whole movie?

VIDEO: We're fighting for our right to live. Resist. Should we win the day, 4th of July will no longer be known as an American holiday but as the day when the world declared in one voice we will not go quietly into the night. We will not vanish without a fight. We're going to live on. We're going to survive. Today we celebrate our Independence Day.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Great scene, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yeah that was a great scene.

24

2.3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

into the night. You heard that. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: now, yes. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE:

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And the phrase that the actor uses there is we will not go quietly

I heard it just

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And that's the exact phrase that you use in the video that we saw that was previous exhibit. We aren't a people that are going to go quietly into the night.

I don't view court rooms and politics as Hollywood like you do. That is not the first person who said that and it wont be the last and I don't recall getting any inspiration from this Hollywood movie like you're suggesting.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, you were not communicating in referencing that film that January 6 was going to be a new kind of Independence Day?

20

2.1

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: All I was talking about is objecting and standing up for people's votes and our elections.

2.3 24

25

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: By the way, January --Independence Day is July 4, right?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
L	0
L	1
L	2
L	3
L	4
L	5
L	6
L	7
L	8
L	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's July 6 of 1776, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's right.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, this might be a good time to break if you're -- if we're on schedule.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well--.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I've got pretty short piece left but it's up to you.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't need a break.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's keep going.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Great.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: If we're talking you know 30 minutes, we're talking two hours.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No I wont take two hours. Ms. Greene, did you advocate to President Trump to impose martial law as a way to remain in power?

24

25

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall.

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, you're not denying
2	you did it you just don't remember.
3	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember.
4	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And you agree
5	that the storming of the Capitol on January 6 is
6	something that you're is despicable?
7	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. I was very
8	unhappy about it.
9	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Now, I talked earlier
10	about a fellow named Anthony Aguero, right?
11	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You brought up
12	Anthony Aguero earlier, yes.
13	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And he's somebody who
14	you know, yes?
15	
16	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: and he's somebody who
18	you spent a fair amount o time with, is that
19	fair?
20	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Not much time, no.
21	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: He's a friend of
22	yours?
23	
24	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Someone that I do
25	know, yes.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you consider him a 2 friend? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Someone I hardly 4 ever talk to but someone I have known for a few 5 years. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and he is a 7 friend of yours, right? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: A distant friend. 8 9 Someone T know. 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: He refers to you as one of his closest friends. You've heard that, 11 right? 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I have not. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And you 14 referred to him as amazing, right? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: He does a lot of 16 great work down at the border showing the illegal 17 invasion constantly happening in our southern 18 I think that's amazing, the footage that border. 19 he shows and exposes. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and you know that 2.1 Mr. Aquero entered the Capitol on the U.S. 22 Capitol on January 6, 2001, right? 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I had heard that 24 sometime after January 6. 25

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you seen a picture 2 of him in the middle of the crowd when the 3 Capitol Rotunda on January 6, 20--. 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No I have not seen 5 that picture. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let's have a look at 6 PX13B, please. A little bit bigger. 7 Representative Greene, is that man in the red 8 9 circle on the left of our exhibit 13B is that Mr. 10 Aquero? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know I 12 can't really tell. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: If I told you that it 14 was reported that that was Mr. Aguero and that he 15 acknowledged that publicly would that help you 16 discern that's who that is? 17 18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't really buy a whole lot of what you say. You've been using CNN and Mother Jones and other terrible sources as your sources and showing Hollywood movies so but that's what you're trying to say now that I don't know if that's him or not.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I'm just asking whether it if I suggested to you that he's

1 acknowledged publicly that that's him in the 2 Capitol Rotunda would that help you identify him 3 as your friend Mr. Aquero? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't see your 5 evidence of him acknowledging that that's him. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. I think we can probably do something with that. Can I see 13 7 I show you something from CNN probably 8 please? 9 wouldn't accept it as authentic, would you? 10 think we established that today. We'll move on. 11 Have you spoken to Mr. Aguero since January 6? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall 12 speaking to him no. 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Or communicate with 14 him in any way, text, email? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't recall 16 no. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And did you 18 19 20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

communicate with Mr. Aquero at any point prior to January 6 about the plans for a demonstration in Washington on January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: NO, I didn't. did he have press credentials? I mean there was a lot of press in there and that's the job that he does with a border media company that he works

with. I have no idea about what I have not clue about it.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Were you aware that he was going to be in this capacity I guess as a member of the press present on January 6 in Washington for the demonstrations that were planned?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I was not aware.

2.1

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did he communicate with any member of your staff in any way like text or email, cellphone about the fact that he'd be coming to Washington on the 6th?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Not to my knowledge no.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you ever discuss with Mr. Aguero the idea that on January 6 as part of the demonstration that the U.S. Capitol was going to be flooded by people?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. Because the only thing I was working on objecting and had no expectation of anything could happen on January 6.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well, you knew there 2 was going to be demonstrations, right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I knew there was a 4 peaceful march planned. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: On January 6 itself 6 are you in contact with anyone who was involved 7 in what you described as a peaceful march that occurred that day? 8 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. 9 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Does anybody from your 11 staff, Congressional staff or your campaign staff in touch by cell phone, text, email with anybody 12 who was involved in the days demonstrations? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 14 Not of my knowledge. 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: At any time on January 16 6 did you disclose to anyone outside the Capitol 17 your location in the Capitol during that days' 18 events? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I texted my family 20 and told them I was safe. 21 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Anybody other than 22 family? 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: When on January 6 did 2 you first learn that people were entering the 3 United States Capitol unlawfully that day? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: When we were in the 5 House Chamber we were starting the electoral count and we went on lockdown and that's when I 6 first learned that I was shocked. 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you know what time 8 of day that was? 9 10 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know the 11 exact time. 12 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you went on 13 lockdown as you describe, why don't you tell us 14 about that then what you mean by that? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: They had to lock 16 all the doors in the House Chamber and they told 17 us that it was on lockdown and that we could 18 choose to leave or stay inside and it would be 19 safer inside and so I stayed inside. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. And when you 2.1 say you stayed inside, where did you stay? 22

25

2.3

2.4

Chamber.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Inside the House

1	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay and during that
2	time that you were on the in lockdown as you
3	put it on the House floor, you said you were in
4	touch with your family to tell them you were
5	safe?
6	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Not at that time,
7	no.
8	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: When did that happen
9	in the day?
10	
11	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sometime later
12	after we were evacuated.
13	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Where were you
14	evacuated to?
15	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't disclose
16	that location.
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Somewhere in the
18	Capitol?
19	
20	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Mm-hm.
21	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you were in
22	that other location in the Capitol I presume that
23	would be a secure location, is that right?
24	
25	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you have any 2 communication either by phone, by text, some 3 other way with anybody who was outside the room, outside the secure location you were in other than your family? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Not that I recall, 7 no. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And when you were notified that people had entered the Capitol 10 illegally, did you also understand that point 11 that there had been violence at the Capitol? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I only knew what I 12 was told. 13 14 15

I had heard a gun shot. We all heard it. And we were so confused. We thought Antifa was breaking in or BLM because of those were the riots that had gone on and on all throughout 2020 day in and day out. Just horrible riots all over the country and that was the only thing that made sense to most of us.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: What do you mean by BLM?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: BLM rioters.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Is that an acronym for something?

24 25

1

4

5

6

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

1 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Black Lives Matter 2 rioters that rioters that were attending the 3 Black Lives Matter protest. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: To your knowledge, has anybody connected with Black Lives Matter 6 movement or the Antifa movement as you say been subject to arrest or charged in connection with 7 the January 6 events? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know 10 actually. I know they were arrested all over the country much through 2020 and over 95 percent of 11 them had their charges dropped unlike January 6 12 rioters that are still in jail. Some of them. 13 Pretrial. 14

> ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Could I have a few moments to consult and then I think I may be done?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Sure. We don't need a break do we?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Five minutes would be great.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: One five minutes break. You all want to step out that might be.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah that would be great.

25

4

5

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

(BREAK)

2.1

2.3

(OVERLAY)

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, may we approach for a moment, sir?

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: About?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I need to get my notes on that. Thank you for your patience,
Representative Greene. Your Honor. In the previous discussion I had asked about what we marked as Plaintiff's exhibit 27 which is the News Max clip you recall that we showed you. You remember that, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: The one we've already watched?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The one we've already watched, yes. And I asked you whether you recall that you posted that News Max clip on your Facebook page.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall what was posted on my Facebook page. I don't make all of my Facebook posts.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Fair enough. Let's -I'd like to show you this. This is a live
version of your Congressional campaign Facebook
page since there today. And what we have is the

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

clip that we had separated in the previous testimony and I'd like to play that for you just to see if you will acknowledge that that clip is now available on your Facebook page.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

VIDEO: No it wasn't actually planned but President Trump knows how much I support him. knows how much I support our District, Georgia's 14th District and so I was happy to go up there and encourage our voters to get out and vote. We can't allow our two Republican senators lose their seats to two radical socialist Democrats. So, I was excited to get up there and also cheer on Senator Kelly Lenhart for announcing last night that she'll be objecting to this fraudulent stolen election tomorrow on January 6 and I'm very excited that both of us women representing Georgia will be fighting for President Trump and fighting for the integrity of our elections tomorrow. What is your plan tomorrow? How do you plan to handle what could possibly go down in the joint session of Congress tomorrow or what are you prepared for? Well you know I'll echo the words of many of my colleagues as we were just meeting together in our GOP conference meeting this morning. This is our 1776 moment.

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Ms. Greene, that's up 2 on your Facebook page today, right? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: If it's if that's' 4 there then yes it's on there. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right and that's been posted since January 5, 2021, correct? 6 7 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I didn't post it but if that's' when it was posted then that's 8 when it was posted. 9 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And the things that 11 are posted on your Facebook page are posted with your authorization and permission, right? 12 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I do not view 13 things that are posted before they're posted. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That wasn't my 15 question. My question was it was posted on your 16 page that's something that you authorized and 17 permitted whether you viewed it in advance or 18 not. 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I think if I'm 20 authorizing I would view it in advance before 2.1 it's posted. 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Well no one put that 2.3 up on your Facebook page without authorization 24

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

from you in some sense, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall 2 authorizing but you have to understand as a 3 member of Congress we have staff and many people that post interviews and so forth on our social media for us. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: if we can make it a 6 7 little bit larger, if you look in the top right you'll see there's a message, Ms. Greene. that larger. January 5, 2021. That's a comment 10 that you posted on your own Facebook page. This is our 1776 moment. Right? 11 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That is my campaign 12 13 Facebook page. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. And that was 14 15 16 says. 17

1

4

5

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

posted as it says on January 5, 2021. Correct? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: That's what it

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. I asked about a couple of other things. Prior to the inauguration in 2021, did you advocate for marital law with the President of the United States?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You know President Trump, right?

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
2	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: He's supported you
3	politically, right?
4	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
5	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And obviously very
6	important person in general, right?
7	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 45th
8	President of the United States.
9	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've had a number of
10	meetings with him, right?
11	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And you had meetings
13	with him between the election in 2020 and January
14	20 of 2021, right?
15	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.
16	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And in those meetings
17	you discussed with him your advocacy for the idea
18	that there should be marital law declared in the
19	United States.
20	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, I don't recall
21	ever discussing that.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Are you saying it
23	didn't happen or you're saying you don't know one
24	way or the other?

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

24

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall ever discussing that.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you discuss that topic, the idea that there should be marital law declared in the United States prior to the inauguration of President Biden?

JAMES BOPP: Your Honor, I'm going to have to object. I actually [INDISCERNIBLE 05:29:55] President of the United States and that's covered by executive privilege. She can't get into this conversation.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Executive privilege?

She's not a member of the executive and this counsel is here on her behalf not on Mr. Trump's behalf unless there's something I've missed. Not a proper objection, Your Honor.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm sorry. What was the question again?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: The question was whether prior to the inauguration of Joe Biden Ms. Greene whether you ever advocated for marital law to be imposed in a conversation with the Chief of Staff of then President of the United States Mr. Trump.

2.3

2.4

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Answer the 1 2 question. 3 I don't recall. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Did you ever advocate 5 for martial law prior to the inauguration of Mr. 6 Biden with any member of the White House staff 7 that was part of the Trump Administration? MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 8 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Are you aware of any 10 other congressional elected congressional representatives advocating for martial law to 11 stop the peaceful transfer of power before the 12 inauguration of Mr. Biden? 13 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember. 14 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Do you regard the 15 people who were arrested and charged in 16 connection with the January 6 events as Patriots? 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think them 18 being arrested and charged on January 6 effects 19 the fact that they're Patriots or not. 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. So, you do 21 regard them as Patriots? 22 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, some of them 2.3 are veterans, yes. Some of them definitely are 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Patriots.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Can we have PX60? This is PX60. The screen I've placed in front of you what we marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 60 which is the story that appeared in the Washington Post on January 5, 2021. Did you read that story in the Washington Post?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't think I've read this one.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Do you recall hearing that the -- prior to January 6 did you recall hearing that the Washington Post was reporting that there were concerns that there were going to be violence in Washington on January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I had not heard that. I heard no threats of violence that I remember at all for January 6.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. Can we also look at the export? The screen should be this one. The screen I've placed before you a January 5, 2021 article titled, Violent threats ripple through far right internet forums ahead of protests. This is a article that appeared in NBC News on the fifth. Do you recall reading the NBC was reporting that there were violent threats

1	that were expected to occur on January 6 and that
2	they reported that on the fifth of January?
3	
4	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Sir, we were really
5	busy just preparing to object on the sixth. I
6	don't recall that news report.
7	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Have you read this
8	news report before?
9	
10	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Not until you placed
11	it in my hand.
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Probably didn't have
13	much time to read it.
14	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.
15	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Let me consult for one
16	minute. One last thing, Ms. Greene. You told us
17	early in the day that you were suspended from
18	your Twitter account or permanently taken off
19	Twitter, is that right?
20	
21	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Permanently banned.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Banned. You're not
23	banned from Facebook though, right?
24	
25	MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We saw your live 2 Facebook page just a couple of minutes ago, 3 right? 4 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: You pulled that up, 5 yes you did. 6 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: And on your Facebook 7 page you have directed that certain videos be removed from the Facebook page, right? 8 9 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: One of the videos that 10 you had removed was the one from February of 2019 11 where it talked about a sea of people and 12 flooding the capitol and violence in the Capitol 13 in connection with the Fund the Wall matter, 14 right? 15 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know what 16 you're implying. 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You have your staff 18 take that one down, didn't you? 19 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't refer -- I 20 don't know what you're referring to. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Facebook never ordered 22 you to take any video off your Facebook page, did 2.3 they? 24 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't recall. 25

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I have nothing 1 2 further, Your Honor. 3 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: You want to proceed or do you need a break? 4 5 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Oh no I'm doing 6 great. 7 (OVERLAY) JAMES BOPP: Representative Greene, I want 8 9 to take you back to January 6. You've already 10 testified that you were on lockdown in the House 11 Chamber. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm sorry, Judge. 12 I just need Mr. Bopp to speak up a little bit. 13 I'm having a hard time hearing him. Thank you. 14 JAMES BOPP: You've already testified that 15 you were on lockdown in the House Chambers. 16 17 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 18 JAMES BOPP: And did you have an opportunity 19 to do a video? 20 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 2.1 JAMES BOPP: And a Tweet accompanying that 22 video? 2.3 24 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

JAMES BOPP: And about what time did that occur on January 6?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I believe it was around 2:30 in the afternoon.

JAMES BOPP: And where were you when the video was completed when you took the video?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was inside the House Chamber and we had gone on lockdown and it was after I had learned that there had been some violence outside the Capitol and someone had been shot and there was just -- we were only told there were people inside the Capitol and I got very concerned because at that time I was confused -- I was so confused I was shocked. I never been in anything violent before or any kind of situation like that and I was really scared. and I went inside the cloak room inside the House Chamber in the Republican cloak room into one of the phone booths where you can go to make a phone call or anything. I went inside there and I made a video telling people to be peaceful not to be violent and just getting out a message and I Tweeted that video from the Republican cloak room.

25

2.4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

JAMES BOPP: Did you know at that time who was attacking the Capitol?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No. I didn't know. There was people were saying different things. We mostly thought that it was Antifa dressed up as Trump supporters. That was the first thing we were told. We had no idea. I was in the cloak room, couldn't see the news. I just knew that we were on lockdown and they said by that point they said you cannot leave. You have to stay in here.

JAMES BOPP: I'll show you what's marked as R1. It's the Tweet and I don't know -- I think we just had the [INDISCERNIBLE 05:38:27] in the electronically. Is this your Tweet and is this your face?

2.1

2.3

2.4

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

JAMES BOPP: And for -- did you say in this Tweet a message from the Capitol, be safe, be smart, be peaceful, obey the law, this is not a time for violence, this is a time to support President Trump and support election integrity, God bless.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1 JAMES BOPP: Can you show the video, please, 2 R1? I don't see Devan. He was setting it up. 3 Devan was -- set it up yesterday. Maybe the day 4 before. I'm sorry. [INDISCERNIBLE 05:39:40]. 5 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Everybody is here. I 6 think that's a universal rule of life. 7 JAMES BOPP: We have a thumb drive delivered, Your Honor, on the list. 8 9 M2: I know. I scanned that. I apologize. 10 Technology. JAMES BOPP: Yeah. 11 M2: This may be it. Is that it? 12 [INDISCERNIBLE 05:40:39]. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We'll take five 14 minutes so we have enough people I think we can 15 come back in ten minutes. Sorry. 16 (BREAK) 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor? 18 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yes. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: If you want to use my 20 laptop. 2.1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well again let's 22 -- [INDISCERNIBLE 05:46:02] here's an actual box 2.3 if you want. 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Not it's in evidence. You're right.

2.1

2.3

JAMES BOPP: As I remember it, at the very beginning a little low and it came up in sound.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It sounds like [INDISCERNIBLE 05:48:11]

JAMES BOPP: Is it ready? Okay. Let's go.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's go.

(OVERLAY)

JAMES BOPP: You'll need to turn that up.

Can you turn the sound up to maximum, please?

VIDEO: [INDISCERNIBLE 05:48:50] wonderful

Americans present from that are here in

Washington D.C today. It was time to support

your President and just note ...

JAMES BOPP: Would you start it over please?

VIDEO: Just a message to you all just letting you know for all the great people, wonderful Americans who support President Trump that are here in Washington D.C today. Today is a time to support your President and just know that we're fighting for you here in the Capitol in Congress fighting for your vote and fighting for President Trump. So, I urge you to remain calm. I urge you to have a peaceful protest.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 Make sure that everyone is safe and protected and 2 let's do this in a peaceful manner. This is not 3 a time for violence. This is a time to support 4 President Trump, support our election integrity 5 purport this important process that we're 6 going through in Congress where we'll allowed to 7 object. So, this is very important. So, I urge 8 you to stay calm, be the great American people that I know you are and just know that we're in 9 10 here fighting for you. So, God bless everyone. And be careful. Be safe and be smart and obey 11 the laws. Thank you very much. 12 13

JAMES BOPP: Representative Greene, is that you?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JAMES BOPP: As I look at your face and hear your voice, I think you're scared.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Objection. This is not for Mr. Bopp to testify about his feelings.

JAMES BOPP: What was your feelings at the time?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I was scared. I was very scared. I was concerned. I was shocked, shocked, absolutely shocked. Every time I said we're going to fight, it was all about

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

objecting and to me that was the most important process of the day and I had no idea what was going on and I just didn't want anyone to get hurt. I didn't want to see anything terrible happen and it was very upsetting. I was very, very upset when I made that video.

JAMES BOPP: And you've been on a stand for several hours here during direct examination and they showed you multiple Tweets and multiple videos. Did they show you that video?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: No, they didn't show that one or all the other social media posts that have been made on my accounts that I have made or videos I have made where I've always denounced violence and all the videos I've said and speeches I've said of how upset I was about the riot on January 6 and how much I didn't like it and how much I was against it and even when I went and visited the January 6 defendants -- pretrial defendants in the BC Jail and I went there to see their conditions because we had heard horrible things about their treatment--.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, I don't know what this is relevant to. I object.

2.3

2.4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: It's not relevant. Sustained.

JAMES BOPP: Cutting you off is going to be on the question. Thank you. Now let me show you what's been admitted as R4. Now this is a transcript of the video that's been admitted into evidence. And I want you to turn to page two and did you say these words? "So, I urge you to remain calm. I urge you to have a peaceful protest. Make sure everyone is safe and protected. And let's do this in a peaceful manner. This is not a time for violence. This is a time to support President Trump, support our election integrity and support our important process that we're going through in Congress where we're allowed to object. So, this is very important. So I urge you to stay calm. Be the great American people that I know you are and just know that we're in here fighting for you. So, God bless, be careful, be safe and be smart and obey the law. Thank you."

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

JAMES BOPP: I think there was a subsequent
Tweet that you did referring to the violence that

occurred on January 6 and it's P1P and I am actually not certain whether that has been admitted or not admitted. P1P. So,

Representative Greene, did you Tweet this Tweet - you know what I'm talking about?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't remember but I see it's my @mtgreene Twitter account.

JAMES BOPP: So, it went out from your Twitter account but you don't know if you did it or another member of your staff or another?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I can't recall exactly but I think I actually did this one.

JAMES BOPP: Now, this says and this day is January 12. Is that correct?

2.1

2.3

2.4

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

JAMES BOPP: Okay. This Tweet says, "I proudly stand with Representative Mel Brookes and everything in his statement" which you link to later on. "The unhinged left is out of control and their disgusting witch hunt is full of hypocrisy. Democrats are on record for support of violence all year. We did not plan, cause and denounce" and that's capital letters, "denounce the January 6 attacks. I defend my honor and

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 reputation." So, was that the message sent out 2 on your Twitter account? 3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, it's the same 4 message I've sent over and over again about 5 January 6. JAMES BOPP: Now, Representative -- oh 6 excuse me -- Kathy [INDISCERIBLE 05:56:42]or 7 Christopher Ray testified before Congress that 8 soon after the attack it was before the senate on 9 10 March 2, 2021 ad that's is R5 which has been admitted into evidence. Let me show you this. 11 It has. I don't believe this has been submitted. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Alright are you 13 moving to admit? 14 Yes, I am. JAMES BOPP: 15 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Any objection? 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No objection, Your 17 Honor. 18 JAMES BOPP: T1P. Thank you. 19 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. 20 JAMES BOPP: Now when he testified before 2.1 Congress on March 2 of course you were a member 22 of Congress, right? 2.3 MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes. 24

JAMES BOPP: And he said, "I was appalled like you at the violence and destruction that we saw that day." He's referring to January 6.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

JAMES BOPP: "I was appalled that you" -he's testifying before the Congress looking at
members of Congress -- "our country's elected
leaders were victimized right there in these very
halls." Were you a victim of the attack?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes, I was. I was in the house Chamber when it happened. I had to be evacuated to safety. We were held for hours in a secret location protected by Capitol Police, military members for hours until they cleared the Capitol. Yes, I was a victim of the riot that day.

JAMES BOPP: No further questions.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, I believe the testimony is opened the door on the issue of text messages that Representative Greene sent on January 6 during the insurrection. We would call for their immediate production and the ability to have a moment to look at them so that we can examine around them.

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I thought the 2 testimony was she had not seen any text messages. ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No she's testified 3 4 that she sent them. Messages to her children and 5 her family. 6 JAMES BOPP: Those were text messages. 7 Those were not Tweets. We did not talk about any 8 text messages. That was the controversy over the 9 admission of the text messages which we have not 10 referred to at all. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Except that 12 13 14 15

Representative Greene referred to it when I asked her if she was in touch with anybody from the -from that date from the floor and she said she texted her family.

JAMES BOPP: You can't open the door. Only I could open the door.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: First of all, do you have any questions other than?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I do and I'm going to preserve that position but --.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I understand. little chaotic.

2.4 25

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

J

2.3

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Representative Greene, you mentioned a number of statements that you made after January 6 when you talk about being upset about the fact that there was violence, right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: Yes.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can you point to one press release or Tweet or comment on Facebook prior to January 6 where you used the word peacefully and in terms of urging people to behave peacefully at the demonstrations that were expected to occur?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I would have to look all through my social media but I'm sure that it's there. And I've always denounced violence. I denounced those Antifa BLM riots all over the country over and over just like I denounced that January 6 riot over and over. Even to the people in jail. I told them that it was wrong. I told them in the DC jail I did not like what they did but that I'm there because I support their due process rights which is being violated.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Can you point to one video prior to January 6 where you urged people

to behave peacefully on January 6? One time in public that's on video where you said those words?

2.3

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't have a computer. I don't have my social media. I didn't remember many of the social media posts that you pled up and interviews.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: I was interested that you answered some questions about FBI Director Reyes testimony in Congress. Do you believe the FBI was behind the January 6 violence in the Capitol?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I don't know. I certainly think there's a lot to be investigated. We don't know who Reyes is, the scaffolding commander. We don't -- the Governor Witmer certainly leads to questions about things that happened on January 6. I think there's a lot of investigations that need to happen.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: You've referred to January 6 as the Fed selection right?

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE: I'm not sure.

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Nothing further.

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Mr. Bopp, 2 [INDISCERNIBLE 06:01:58]. Anything else? 3 4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No, sir. 5 JAMES BOPP: Do they rest or what? 6 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Do you rest? 7 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No we have -- well we 8 9 have an issue that we want to consult on but 10 either we're going to put in a video or we're 11 going to move to closing statements but the video has been admitted. So, it's a timing issue that 12 we want to talk about. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay. So you 14 don't need -- she's excused? 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's right. Thank 16 you. 17 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you. You 18 are excused. And may step down. Alright. Now, I 19 believe we discussed we would take a break. 20 [INDISCERNIBLE 06:02:32] Take a break. I don't 21 know what you got. Five minutes or an hour? 22 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yeah I think -- Your 2.3 Honor, we would appreciate a very short break. 2.4

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well, let's take 2 fifteen and be back at quarter to. 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Your Honor, can I ask 4 a question? Are we absolutely dedicated to 5 stopping at 4:30 if we went a little longer than 6 that with that piece? 7 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I will have to 8 consult the real powers. 9 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Only because we're 10 trying to figure out our presentation, the last 11 piece of our presentation that we want to close or do we have some one more thing and so it would 12 be nice to know how much--. 13 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: We will set our 14 consultant. He will respond [INDISCERNIBLE 15 06:03:10]. 16 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you. 17 (BREAK) 18 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Let's take our 19 Is that ready to go? Mr. Celli, before 20 you start, I trust the message got to you. 2.1 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It did. Thank you. 22 Very much appreciated, Your Honor. I appreciate 2.3 Counsel on the other side as well. 2.4

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: So, where did we leave?

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: So, Your Honor, there are two last matters before we rest. We would apply for the entirety of P1 and P2 which are the Tweets reflected in the pro public report and the law firm report to be admitted. We believe the Representative Greene's testimony about how her Twitter account was operated, that she authorized Tweets to be issued is sufficient foundation for them to be admitted. So, we would ask that those two sets of plaintiff's exhibits be admitted.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Mr. Bopp?

2.3

2.4

JAMES BOPP: Yeah if they -- well, oh my goodness sorry. It made a lot more sense if we had them at the time because just because its authenticated doesn't mean it's admissible.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Well that's why
I'm asking. What's your position on it. There
were a number of that we went over and then there
were some that I don't think we went over. And I
think there was one you requested.

JAMES BOPP: And it was.

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And it was.
2	JAMES BOPP: yeah it was. I have no
3	objection.
4	
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Alright. We're
6	talking about so we're going to take all of
7	the authenticity to make sure I got it right
8	basically everything [INDISCERNIBLE 06:22:00].
9	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. That's correct.
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: They're in
11	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Right. MP2 as well
12	which is the law firm.
13	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: N ow wait a
14	minute. That's [INDISCERNIBLE 06:22:11]. What
15	are we talking about? Are you talking about a
16	whole thing?
17	
18	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Yes. These are her
19	social media posts.
20	JAMES BOPP: I do not object to the social
21	media post.
22	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's all they are.
23	JAMES BOPP: Well but there's also it isn't
24	too the entire report.
25	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Actually

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: It looks like
2	this is again you might want to [INDISCERNIBLE]
3	
	06:22:37.
4	JAMES BOPP: Well and I have looked at
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Yeah looks to me
6	like everything that's in P2 looks like it is
7	there's a cover page.
8	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We're happy to exclude
9	that, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: that was my
11	question. What about the cover page.
12	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: We'll exclude that
13	from
14	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Okay so you
15	basically are going to pick up page 22, 128 to
16	128, 22.
17	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's right, Your
18	Honor. Thank you.
19	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Which is just
20	the text and the Tweets and the enclosures.
21	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Exactly, your Honor.
22	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I'm going to
23	admit it unless
24	JAMES BOPP: : You've reserved yes and I
25	know you reserved ruling on this whether or not

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 it was authenticated and of course we have made 2 our individual objections yesterday. And if 3 that's--. 4 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And they're 5 preserved. If you want to -- you're preserving 6 those notices. 7 JAMES BOPP: Yes please. 8 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: alright. We're going to preserve the objection. Okay. 9 10 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Before we rest, Your Honor, we have one last piece of evidence which 11 is Plaintiff's -- I'm sorry -- P73 which is a 12 video. It's 14 minutes long, Your Honor. 13 This is the Washington Post. It shows the events of 14 January 6. 15 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Is that not 16 already admitted? 17 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: yes I think it --. 18 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Then why does 19 the audience need to watch that? 20 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: That's fine. We 2.1 thought that --. 22 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I've already 2.3 watched it a couple of times. 2.4 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Okay. 25

Transcript by TransPerfect
Legal Solutions

1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: One of these 2 things about the --. 3 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: It's only 17 minutes. JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: There's a lot of 4 5 material in the record which obviously was not 6 the subject of today's hearing. Which I'm 7 perfectly happy to refer to with you and you actually -- so but I don't know if we need to 8 9 play the video. Washington Post video they are a 10 public source. 11 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: AS you wish, Your Honor. 12 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: alright great . 13 Okay. Any thing else? 14 15 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: No. The petitioner's 16 rest. 17 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Rest. Anything 18 else, Mr. Bopp? 19 20 JAMES BOPP: We rest. 2.1 JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Very well. 22 I'll hear closing. [INDISCERNIBLE Alright. 2.3 06:24:36] get the last word. Mr. Bopp, you get 24 to go first. 25

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1

2

3

4

JAMES BOPP: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. I didn't want to talk about the law and then I'll talk about the evidence that has [INDISCERNIBLE 06:24:58] about that evidence meets the correct legal standard that we believe are applicable. Of course we end our procedure [INDISCERNIBLE 06:25:08] North Caroline State law 22-1-5 which permits Secretary of State to remove someone as a candidate for office if, one, they do not qualify as a candidate for office or, number two, if they are not eligible to take office and in this case on January 3, 2023. Now, they assert a disqualification under session three is that Representative Greene engaged in insurrection on rebellion after taking the [INDISCERNIBLE 06:25:48] of office on January 3 and I assume enough though they're not clear on January 6. Section three also provides that, quote, Congress made by a vote of two thirds of each House remove such disability. In other words remove the political disability of not being able to take office by taking the oath which is the truth. And they can do that at any time. You can see the wording of the lats sentence is not time limited. In other words, it could have been done

Ιt

1 last week. It could be done next month. 2 could be done on January 3, 2023 when 3 Representative Greene presents herself and before 4 she's sworn in Congress could pass a statute 5 under section 3 the lats sentence and she would 6 then be qualified to take office. How in the 7 world do we know right now that she will not be qualified on January 3, 2023. When congress at 8 9 any time either for her in particular or for her 10 class of people as Congress has done. In fact, there were thousands of individual amnesties 11 granted and then two general amnesties granted by 12 the Congress. They can do that at any time. 13 is impossible for this court to know at this time 14 that she is not eligible to take office because 15 of that contingency. They can be exercised by 16 Congress at any time in the future. Up until 17 January 3. That means this is nothing. 18 cannot be viewed as disqualified today because it 19 cannot be determined that she is ineligible for 20 office on January 3, 2023. That should end this. 2.1 Now, second, this has already happened. 22 amnesty has already been granted. The simple 2.3 argument about this is the 1872 amnesty act 2.4

relieved the disability under Section 3, to

1 quote, all persons whomsoever. Representative 2 Greene is an all persons whosoever. And it 3 relieved the political disability that Section 3 4 imposed and by the way the word imposed here is a past participle meaning that phrase imposed by 5 6 Section 3 is an adjective on regarding what 7 political disabilities are we talking about. Because absent that modifier of political 8 disability it could be you're a felon, you lost 9 10 your civil rights and we're giving you amnesty from that political disability that you cannot 11 take office as a convicted felon. So, the only 12 way to know what political disabilities we're 13 talking to is the past participle. I didn't know 14 this at the beginning, Your Honor. The past 15 participle imposed by Section 3. Now we also 16 know that Section 3 is both retrospective because 17 it affected anyone in the past that had engaged 18 in insurrection or rebellion after taking the 19 oath and disqualified them from office. But tie 20 also had a prospective effect because why would 21 we be here? If it didn't have a prospective 22 effect what would be the basis to apply this to 2.3 Representative Greene. So, we know it has both 24 prospective and retrospective and in the Amnesty 25

And the

1 Act of 1872 it was removed. That retrospective 2 or prospective political disability under Section 3 3 was removed for all persons whosoever. 4 court -- District Court in North Carolina agreed 5 with that analysis. That case is now in appeal. 6 The district court here in Atlanta did not and 7 that case is on appeal. So you get to be the tie 8 breaker. Now, we also know that when they use -in 1872 Amnesty Act was adopted that they did 9 10 intend it to be both retrospective and prospective. Because of the wording of the 1898 11 Amnesty Act the 1898 Amnesty Act after the phrase 12 disabilities imposed by the third section of the 13 14th Amendment -- Articles of Amendments to the 14 Constitution of the United States, inserted the 15 words, heretofore encouraged. That is not in the 16 '72 version. So, Congress knew very well how to 17 do a retrospective amnesty if they chose to do 18 Because in 1889 that's exactly what they 19 They retrospective only amnesty based on did. 20 the words heretofore incurred. So, in accordance 2.1 with the English language and the terms of 22 construction we can't treat heretofore incurred 2.3 as like [INDISCERNIBLE 06:32:27] or something. 2.4

25

It is comports with the understanding of Section

1 3 that the political disabilities were both 2 retroactive and prospective. In 1872 the wording 3 of that amendment -- of that act encompassed 4 both. The 1898 wording only referred to 5 retrospect. Now, you know, we heard some you 6 know interesting things about the history of our 7 country from my fellow Hoosier law professor. -- but he admitted that when Congress first 8 considered the 14th Amendment in Section 3 there 9 10 was not a word about any other insurrection [INDISCERNIBLE 06:33:32] other than the Civil 11 And that means that history about 12 War. [INDISCERNIBLE 06:33:43] and about the Whiskey 13 Rebellions as interesting as they are simply 14 played no role. In other words, it was a 15 historical occurrence there is no evidence even 16 if we need to look at legislative history no 17 evidence that Congress considered that at all. 18 So, I will soon be talking to you about what we 19 do know about what they thought in 1867. 20 now, so let's get to the meaning of the words in 21 Section 3. Engage in insurrection or rebellion 22 is one and giving aid or comfort to the enemies 2.3 thereof is number two. Well, that number two is 2.4

about foreign wars as I will soon explain.

1

Number one is about domestic wars and was -which were described at the time by authorities when they talked about those phrases. So, what It denotes conduct and you will soon see here are the authority for the proposition that that is, quote, direct and a direct overact such as voluntarily joining the armed forces, the Confederacy, giving them food, giving the army food, you know, cash, whatever, shelter, the people in the war department prosecuting the war, etc. Now, there is not a single piece of evidence that any of those things occurred here with respect to Representative Greene. were certainly some 700 people involved at least they have been charged to have been involved in the attack on the Capitol. Greene wasn't one of They agree with that. And there's no other act of direct overact of an insurrection nature that she has engaged in. not a single one. of course, they're not satisfied with that. They want to use political speech. And when they use their political speech they want to use the nuances or the fragments or wait a second you didn't use the word peaceful in this one sentence

1 even though you said it over here. You didn't 2 use it in this one sentence right here. 3 words for goodness sakes. Right there this state 4 is an insurrection -- are insurrections. It says 5 it right there. 1876. Now, if you're going to 6 use speech which you can't use here because they 7 didn't use the word insight violence. They said 8 engaged or insight and insurrection. They said engaged in insurrection. But it is instructed 9 10 and it's different because you can see for instance in the act of 1862 where it was a felony 11 to, quote, insight, set on foot, whatever that 12 means, assist or engage in any rebellion or 13 insurrection and [INDISCERNIBLE 06:37:55]. 14 That's codified at 18USC Section 23 and 3. Those 15 two words are used in the same list. Rules of 16 construction telling you that they have to be 17 different. Or they're spuriously -- we never 18 assume that Congress is just throwing words out 19 there at surplus. So, they necessarily mean a 20 different thing. Brandenburg defined incitement 2.1 as requiring speech that, quote, directed or 22 inciting or producing imminent, lawless action 2.3 that is likely to incite or produce such or that 24 is likely to produce such action. Producing

imminent lawless action. Now that's very 1 2 restrictive. That's very limiting. And of 3 course the reason is the protection of the First Amendment which we have now seen on full display 4 5 here, full display. The danger of construing 6 words way beyond their meaning to allow political opponents to smear their opposition in a court of 7 I know you got -- I understand the 8 law. constraints, Your Honor, as I do and the role 9 10 that you play and they have exploited that to the max. Well, what are the words that do not amount 11 to insurrection? Well, we know there are words 12 like that. There are statements like that. Klu 13 14 Klux Klan leader, quote, advocating the duty, necessity or propriety of crime, sabotage, 15 violence or unlawful methods of terrorism as a 16 means to accomplish industrial or political 17 The court said that's advocacy. That's report. 18 not incitement for violence. Representative in 19 the NAACP said if we catch any of you going in 20 any of them racist stores, we're going to break 2.1 your damn neck, end of quote. In the NAACP case. 22 That is advocacy not incitement for violence. 2.3 And a Vietnam War protestor, we're taking the 24

F'ing streets again. End of quote. Not

1 incitement for violence but advocacy, protected 2 by the First Amendment. So, we know the kind of 3 words that will be considered that. So what do 4 we have from then? We have a rally. There is no 5 evidence that there was anything but that that 6 was anything but a peaceful rally. And an accusation she organized it which she didn't and 7 while she on a few occasions urged people to go 8 to it, she didn't even go to it herself and speak 9 10 and there was zero evidence that anything 11 unlawful happened there. These kind of rallies happen in the Capitol of the United States 12 numerous times every single year on the 13 [INDISCERNIBLE 06:41:44]. I attend one of them 14 every year. And you know guess what is one of 15 the things they always say and of course these 16 are left wing, right wing, Democrats, 17 Republicans, whatever, what do they always say? 18 Well, once we're done here go to the Capitol. 19 Tell your Representative to vote for our issue. 20 Okay? That in their world is calling for 21 When it is absolutely appropriate for violence. 22 people to go to the Capitol of the United States 2.3 to enter into it is absolutely lawful to do that, 24 to go talk to their Congressman. Watch the House 25

1 and Senate, whatever. Whatever they might do. 2 Flood the Capitol. It was a code word I quess. 3 Flood the Capitol. Then, well what about this, 4 Representative Greene? Did your staff take 5 anyone on a tour of the Capitol between January 3 6 and January 6? Did any of you give any maps of 7 the Capitol to anybody? What are they talking about? Congressmen do that every single day for 8 9 their constituents. Is giving a tour or giving 10 out a map some kind of code word or to be viewed 11 as what participating in a lawless riot? 1776. Or what about Independence Day? Or how 12 about talking bout the Declaration of 13 Independence? Or what about talking about the 14 Revolutionary War for our independence? 15 are now code words for advocating a violent 16 overthrow of the Government of the United States. 17 What an outrage. They want to hijack and cancel 18 words like 1776, the Declaration of Independence, 19 Independence Day and the American Revolution. 20 What about oh no defense of the Second Amendment? 2.1 If you advocate for defense of the Second 22 Amendment you are in favor and in fact are 2.3 engaging in the violent overthrow of the 24

Government of the United States. That's the

I mean

1 implication isn't it? Right? And of course the 2 Second Amendment says that the first part of it a 3 well regulated militia necessary for free 4 republic or whatever. I don't remember exactly. 5 Then citizens have the right to keep and bear 6 So, yes, there is a military application, if you will, the militia. I mean the militia was 7 a major factor in winning our Revolutionary War. 8 Many people who are in the Indiana Militia fought 9 10 in the Civil War. And so, and they were able to do that because of the Second Amendment in many 11 So, advocating for the Second Amendment 12 cases. is now a code word for engaging in insurrection 13 and rebellion in the United States. How about 14 get our freedoms back? Getting our freedoms 15 back. She said those words. Oh my word. 16 yes people on the conservative side are concerned 17 that the Biden Administration is eroding our 18 freedoms. I mean we've just got one back as a 19 result of a Federal Judge just like what two or 20 three days ago and so yeah tha tis a concern 21 about what will happen with the election of Biden 22 and has proven to be the case. We have lost our 2.3 freedoms. Some of them. And to be concerned 2.4

about that is quintessential political speech.

1 Well what about they keep saying this. Evens of January 6. So, what we're going to do is just 2 3 mush them all together, right? They're all one 4 thing. Just mush them all together. Well the 5 first amendment then allow you to do that. Like 6 the Frist Amendment provides with respect to 7 freedom of association which is what a rally is or under the First Amendment as an assembly 8 protected by the First Amendment is that if you 9 10 have a peaceful rally which they had. There's no 11 evidence otherwise. Some people leave as some people did over the Capitol and some of them 12 committed an illegal act. This rally does not 13 lose its First Amendment protection. Because the 14 actions of a few that show up in that situation 15 are not -- cannot be attributed to the 16 organization itself or who could ever have a 17 rally? I mean nobody can guarantee that somebody 18 might show up whether they be supporters of what 19 the rally is about or agent provocateur or 20 whatever and cause illegal acts to occur or 21 violence. You can't -- I mean I've been to a 22 rally that 500,000 people on the lips of the 2.3 Capitol. And how do you do that and so what --24

there's a two step analysis. First, was the

1 rally peaceful? And not violent? Unquestionably 2 so. Under what we know and what the evidence is. 3 Well, can the rally be held into account for what 4 the few did that left the rally, went to the 5 Capitol and the few there, some 700, who attacked 6 the Capitol? And this is what the Supreme Court 7 said in the NAACP case. The right to association does not lose all constitutional protection 8 merely because some members of the group may have 9 10 participated in conduct or advocated doctrines 11 that itself is not protected. The NAACP is particularly instructed here in that -- and that 12 was end quote -- the NAACP is particularly 13 instructed here as there were constitutionally 14 protected speech, association and [INDISCERNIBLE 15 06:49:12] designed to influence Government 16 actions, i.e. support the constitutional right of 17 member of Congress to object in the two votes on 18 the regrading the electoral college. Along with 19 the illegal actions by a few but the acts of the 20 latter don't strip the others of their First 21 Amendment rights where the Government failed to 22 prove that, quote, the NAACP authorized either 2.3 actually or apparently the unlawful conduct, 24

25

either authorized it or ratified it. Actually or

1 apparently. There is no evidence of that. 2 There's not a single word about that. So, we 3 have different events, some that are subject to 4 Frist Amendment protection, others the attack on 5 the Capitol that are not. And to drag her into 6 well did you promote the rally, did you put it on 7 your calendar, did you -- were you invited to speak, Joe Blow said you were invited to speak, 8 9 is to strip her of her First Amendment right. 10 All of these are First Amendment protected activities. Every single one of them and none of 11 them constitute even incitement much less 12 constitute engaging in unlawful conduct. Now, of 13 course, the question of the quote insurrection. 14 The insurrection is narrowly defined. 15 cases, some from 1894, some from 1842, some from 16 the 1795 Militia Act that all said basically the 17 same thing which is it has to be an armed 18 uprising that is so formidable as to defy the 19 authority of the United States in order to 20 suppress it. And of course, we have a case --2.1 CJS says about riot is that you can have mob 22 violence and it's not an insurrection. Unless it 2.3 is so serious that actually military force is 24

25

required to suppress it. Now, I mean how do we

know all this? Well, in 1867 and it came up -went up on the screen, P48 that has been admitted
was put up on the screen for a moment and I have
that and I'd like to give you a copy. Now I
don't know who can read the exhibit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: I was getting ready to say.

Okay. I confess I cannot. JAMES BOPP: However, therefore, what I have done is at 3:00 in the morning Thursday morning I figured out how to not only zoom it to make it larger, the applicable section but copied them so I did that and those are the attachments. Now because it was 3:00 in the morning I kind of screwed up on my numbering so it's 1A and 1B and then I go through 14 or so. And this takes you step by step through the analysis of the Attorney General of the United States in 1867 that was mentioned on the stand and shown to you. What the words engage in insurrection and rebellion and giving aid or comfort to the enemies mean and meant. IN 1867 because those words were not just used in 1868 in the 14th Amendment. But they were used and this is what the Attorney General was addressing, it was used in Reconstruction Act

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

So,

1 because they were going to open up voting to the 2 people who lived in the Confederacy. Old 3 Confederacy. And they were required to take an 4 oath and that oath In order to register to vote 5 one of its sections was that they have to swear 6 that they did not, quote, engage in insurrection 7 or rebellion or gave aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. Exact words. 8 the first 1A starts about in the middle column 9 10 and we're going to go down the middle column for a while and it starts with considering I now come 11 to consider the meaning of the disqualification 12 arising from this point for the oath that 13 14 requires a person to state that he is, quote, not engaged in an insurrection or rebellion against 15 the United States or given aid and comfort. 16 of these are separately considered according to 17 the Attorney General. The next page now it's on 18 the left a little bit. My duty here is one of 19 simple construction. And I thought that was 20 important. He was not applying constitutional 21 concepts to his construction. Which of course 22 under modern First Amendment jurisprudence I mean 2.3 you absolutely have to do that and has happened 24

in the NAACP case, etc. as we have discussed.

1 And even at that give you the oath because you 2 couldn't vote as depriving you of a right. 3 that was important to his analysis. On page two 4 he goes to that the requirement of the oath and 5 the disqualification must be viewed as a 6 punishment for that conduct and as a result it made the oath even more objectionable than the 7 fact that it was also a violation of a right and 8 a right to them. Now, then on page three he said 9 10 any doubts must be resolved in the favor of the voter and then said what acts then are within the 11 meaning of this provision? Well, at the bottom 12 he says, well the first sentence, engage in 13 insurrection or rebellion covers the case of 14 domestic war and the second phrase, aid or 15 comfort to the enemy, applies to foreign war. 16 So, in this context we need to be looking at 17 engaging in insurrection or rebellion. Continues 18 on on page four on that analysis. Page five is 19 not I'm sure interesting but not relevant. 20 then we go to page six. We are now to inquire 21 what is meant by engaging in insurrection or 22 rebellion against the United States. 2.3 first the force of the term to engage carries the 24

idea of active rather than passive. And

1 voluntary rather than compulsory. And analyzes 2 the voluntary part that conscripts cannot be 3 charged with engaging because it's involuntary. 4 But somebody who voluntarily joined can be. 5 page seven he takes -- begins to consider the 6 question of whether persons may have engaged in 7 the rebellion without having actually levied war 8 or taking up arms and he finds in that regard that for instance people in the war department of 9 10 the Confederacy did engage even though they 11 didn't' literally take up arms. We then go to why civil officers are not covered. People that 12 just run the government, maintain the peace, do 13 perform civil functions are simply not covered. 14 So, and he continues that discussion on page 9. 15 That I now concur what amounts to individual 16 participation in the rebellion. And of course, 17 he agrees that it isn't only the Civil War that 18 is to be considered but that the Civil War 19 provides much instruction on what is meant by 20 rebellion or insurrection. Then page 11 is 21 continuing the discussion of voluntary 22 participation and then on page 12 at the top he 2.3 says what is engaged. It says, quote, " I am of 24

25

the opinion that some direct overt act done with

1 the intent to further the rebellion is necessary to bring a party within the purview of engaged". 2 3 A direct over act done with the intent to further 4 the rebellion. That is where I get the phrase 5 direct over act and then he says, "Mere disloyal sentiment" think of their evidence "mere disloyal 6 7 sentiments or expressions are not sufficient" because they're not acts. They're talk . And so 8 that is where we find out surely -- I mean by one 9 10 of the most authoritative sources, the Attorney General of the United States at the very time 11 these phrases are used in several constitutional 12 provisions, one, and statutes, several, about 13 what it means. It does not mean nuance. 14 not mean inuendo. It does not mean code words. 15 It does not mean First Amendment protected 16 A direct overt act is conduct and it has speech. 17 to be with the intent to further not some 18 political agenda or whatever but the actual 19 insurrection that is occurring, the domestic war 20 as he described it. That was occurring. 21 Anything short of that and every political 22 disagreement is going to be characterized by bold 2.3 well funded lawyers and [INDISCERNIBLE 07:02:35] 24

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

into you're going to have to fight for your

1 right. You're going to be disqualified from 2 Congress, you're going to be whatever they can do 3 to you. Maybe in the worst possible situation 4 charged with a Federal offense. Those are the 5 same words they used in a federal crime with a 6 I mean and that's why I said at the 7 beginning two things. This is not about 8 hyperbole, political smears, at least in my opinion. It has never been about that. 9 10 to be about the law. And what the law provides. Understanding that if this line is breached so 11 that the political hyperbole of calling people 12 insurrectionists turns into lawsuits brought by 13 interest groups in order to abort our democracy, 14 destroy the rights of voters to vote for 15 candidates for the other choice and preclude 16 individual members from running for reelection. 17 Our democracy, your Honor, can't survive that. 18 We can't survive these trials right here. This 19 was never designed to do what they have employed 20 it to do. Wea re stripped of our rights. We 2.1 can't do discovery. We can't move to dismiss 22 their complaint before a trial and certainly 2.3 there's no time -- I can give it a try but no 24 time to do it, right? And we come into a hearing 25

all these cameras and all these live streaming and all this, why are they interested in this? Because Representative Greene's on the ballot. Oh please. No. this is a political agenda. And this has been a political show trial. Not because of your fault but because of their exploitation of what we have done here. I mean this procedure is for you're not 25, Representative Greene and she comes in with a birth certificate. This is not for a major trial that intents, factual and legal consequences. And elements part of which constitutional claims, Federal claim can be heard by you in terms of decisions. We have got to put a stop to this and this is where it should happen. Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, Mr. Bopp talked a lot about the law, a little bit about the history, not much about the facts. I'm going to try to confine my remarks to the facts. We're going to submit a brief, as your Honor knows, next week with responses to all the interesting legal issues that Mr. Bopp has raised. But it's been a long day and it's been a difficult day and it's been a

And Mr.

solemn day and we find ourselves back where we 1 2 started with the disqualification clause of 14th 3 Amendment and it's three very simple 4 requirements. That the candidate for Federal 5 office had taken the oath of the constitution 6 that an insurrection occurred and that the 7 candidate having taken that oath engaged in 8 insurrection , promoted it, supported it, assisted it, helped bring it into fruition. Those are the 9 10 three elements we came here today prepared to prove and those are the three elements that had 11 Let's talk about each of the three. 12 proved. Marjorie Taylor Greene took the oath of office on 13 January 3 of 2021. She became a member of the 14 United States House of Representatives. 15 that represents not the states but the people of 16 the country in general, we the people. 17 Bopp said this morning words matter. We agree 18 with that. Our proof today started with the oath 19 because in taking the oath Ms. Greene understood 20 a very -- undertook a very solemn and very 2.1 specific obligation. To uphold the Constitution, 22 to defend the Constitution against all enemies 2.3 foreign and domestic. Now, taking that oath was 24

an honor. But it was also an obligation.

She

1 Greene was no longer a simple citizen of the 2 great state of Georgia. She wasn't just another 3 person with opinions and a Twitter account. 4 became part of our Government. And she took on 5 an affirmative obligation as part of our 6 Government to protect the Constitution, to 7 protect its processes from anyone who would seek 8 to block or impede that. That is what the disqualification clause is all about. That. 9 10 special status that is conferred upon a person when she takes the oath of office. Now we'll 11 argue in our brief to this court that that status 12 means that Ms. Greene can't just say anything she 13 wants that she could have said as a private 14 citizen and our brief will also point out that 15 there are lots of things that people say that are 16 words that matter and that also have legal 17 consequences. But all of that is for another 18 Today the evidence has proven factually 19 that not only did Marjorie Greene engage in the 20 ceremony of taking the oath for the Constitution, 21 we've proven that the oath has meaning, that it 22 has teeth, that it has consequences. 2.3 Insurrection. What happened at the U.S. Capitol 24

> Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

25

building on January 6, 2021 was an insurrection.

1 It's as clear as day. Even Mr. Bopp doesn't 2 really deny it. And how do we know that? 3 Because he keeps talking about the rally. It's 4 the rally. It's the ellipse. It's the rally. 5 We're not talking about the rally. We're talking 6 about what happened at the Capitol. Now there 7 are lots of words and phrases that can be used to describe what's on that Washington Post video 8 9 that Your Honor has viewed a couple of times. 10 Lawlessness, disturbance, a riot and Ms. Greene and her counsel have used some of those words 11 today in their briefs. But the word they really 12 avoid using is insurrection. A riot can be an 13 insurrection. We learned that today from 14 Professor Magliocca. Insurrections can be 15 disturbances. They are lawless. They are 16 unrest. But when it's used in the 17 disqualification clause, an insurrection is more 18 than these things. It is something where the 19 purpose of it is to block, impede, disrupt a 20 Constitutional process or to overthrow the very 21 existence of the Government itself. Professor 22 Magliocca explained all of this and how American 2.3 history has faced many insurrections in the past 2.4

and how all of them share the same features.

1 Violence. Aimed at the processes or the 2 legitimacy of Government. Sometimes they're 3 aimed at the courts. In this case they were 4 aimed at the legislature. And the violence that 5 cannot be quelled by ordinary law enforcement 6 Judge Beaudrot, you saw and heard with 7 your own eyes not just violence, horrific and sickening as it is but its goal which was to stop 8 the certification of the electoral college vote 9 10 in favor of Joe Biden. It's goal was to stop the Constitutional process of the 12th Amendment. 11 The peaceful process of transferring power 12 between presidents. Its goal was to physically 13 prevent Congress from meeting to do the essential 14 work of our democracy. Here's the worse thing. 15 It worked. For a time the insurrection worked. 16 It succeeded only briefly but it worked. 17 joint session of Congress adjourned for several 18 hours into the next morning and ceased carrying 19 out its 12th Amendment function all because of 20 the insurrection. Because people violently 2.1 flooded the Capitol with the goal of striking 22 fear in the hearts of the people who work there 2.3 and to use violence. Fear, violence, flooding 24

the Capitol, these are words that came out of

That's

1 Marjorie Taylor Greene's mouth. Now many people 2 were responsible for this attack on our 3 democracy. Most of all of course the individuals 4 that you saw on the Washington Post video and 5 many other places. They defiled the people's 6 But they're not the only ones. 7 were others as well, the leaders, the people who 8 justified, who promoted, who supported, who assisted, who encouraged this in the days and 9 10 weeks leading up to January 6. Margorie Taylor 11 Greene is one of those people. And how do we know this? We know this from the evidence. 12 Let's start by talking about what we're talking 13 about. As a legal matter, in order to be 14 disqualified from Federal office, Ms. Greene had 15 to have engaged in insurrection sometime after 16 January 3, 2021 when she took the oath. Your 17 Honor, you've said it yourself, it's a narrow 18 January 3 to January 6, 2001. 19 evidence is very clear that in fact Marjorie 20 Taylor Greene justified, assisted, supported, and 21 promoted the insurrection in that window. 22 what the term engaging in insurrection means 2.3 under the law and we will lay that out in great 24

detail in our brief next week. Its' a legal

She

1 point but it's a common sense point as well. 2 Jefferson David didn't take up the musket and 3 fire on Union troops, at least as far as I 4 remember my history, but he was just as much an 5 insurrectionist as the tens of thousands of 6 soldiers to the Confederacy who did. 7 January 3 to January 6 window can really only be understood by looking at the facts of what 8 happened before that window and before the oath. 9 10 There's really no dispute about this either. have proven that Marjorie Taylor Greene was an 11 advocate for violence against government 12 officials. In fact, she advocated violence 13 against the speaker of the House, the highest 14 ranking member of the House Mrs. Pelosi the very 15 House that was attacked on January 6, 2021. 16 admitted it. She kind of wiggled there for a 17 second and then she admitted it and you saw that 18 with your eyes. Treason. The death penalty. 19 bullet in the head. That's what she said about 20 Nancy Pelosi. And we have proven that she saw 21 the invasion of the Capitol building and creating 22 fear, fear is the word that she used, in the 2.3 hearts of public officials that she saw that as a 24

25

legitimate political tactic. And when she told

1 people when she was discussing this tactic that 2 she told them they should feel like they can act 3 in a violent way. She denied it not really. She 4 said I don't remember. That's not -- that's CNN. 5 That's fake news. Don't buy that. You don't 6 have to accept that. You saw the videos and you 7 saw the testimony. WE have proven that Marjorie Taylor Greene was very clear on certain occasions 8 9 with her supporters about her support for 10 political violence. She said it on tape. price of blood would need to be paid if the 11 government took away her freedoms. She wouldn't 12 even admit that that was a call for violence. 13 She said something about the First Amendment, the 14 Second Amendment, a bunch of other amendments. 15 The price of blood could not be more clear. Now, 16 this didn't happen in high school as Mr. Bopp 17 suggested in one of his objections. 18 happened in late October of 2020 when she was 19 interviewed by Mr. Door and she was talking about 20 how her freedoms and the freedoms of Americans 21 could be taken away by a tyrannical government. 22 It doesn't just come back on its own these 2.3 freedoms, she said, it has to be taken back with 2.4

the price of blood. These are things that

2 candidate for Federal office but a private 3 citizen nonetheless before the 2020 election. 4 And maybe she has the right to say those things 5 or had the right before she took the oath but 6 let's keep going. Let's keep moving down the 7 timeline to the period after the election. 8 in that period you saw and heard Ms. Taylor Greene speaking out consistently in claiming that 9 10 the 2020 election was stolen by the Democrats. disagree with that point of view. But I respect 11 that people can have that point of view and it's 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 because he didn't' win the election. 24 25

1

a perfectly acceptable part of our political discourse for better or for worse. But then she said this. Not just that the election was stolen. Not just that there were ballots that were fraudulent. Not just that its time to make objections, perfectly legitimate thing to do. have no problem with her objections on the floor of the House. Then she said something else. That mask that Mr. Fein spoke about this morning came down from just a minute. We can't allow power to transfer peacefully like Joe Biden wants We can't. allow power to transfer peacefully. You saw and Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Marjorie Taylor Greene said as a private citizen,

heard it with your own eyes, Judge. She said the quiet part out loud. She spoke her truth in a video that she made, that she posted on her own Facebook page and that she wanted her hundreds of thousands of Facebook followers and the untold millions of other people who knew it would be available to know that her point of view was that you can't allow -- we can't allow poverty the power to transfer peacefully. Marjorie Taylor Greene said this when she was a Federal official or right about to be. It's not clear. But what we can tell from the context of that tape is that she stated her opposition to the peaceful transfer of power. And it was a stunning This is not internet dribble. statement. This is not the dark corners of parlor. This is a person who's a federal official, am member of Government and this wasn't even a rhetorical flourish on the back of a campaign truck after a long day. This is somebody who sat down in front of the camera and calmly and carefully told her viewers we will not accept the peaceful transfer of power. We can't allow it. And then she said we will not go quietly into the night. framed this as an existential battle. New fourth

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

us right up to an into that critical window that critical phase of time, January 3, to January 6. Marjorie Taylor Greene's rallying cry for violence at the Capitol on January 6 were the words 1776. Now I think we all know that those words have a lot of meanings. They mean a lot to They are on the seal of the great state of Georgia and I venerate that. That's not what Marjorie Taylor Greene was talking about. how we know this. Because here's what we proved. Marjorie Taylor Greene organized objections on the floor of the House and this was not an insurrection. This actually was part of the Constitutional process and we have no issue with it. But then Marjorie Taylor Greene promoted, encouraged and supported the idea of large demonstrations in Washington on January 6. there's nothing wrong with large demonstrations either and this is Mr. Bopp's point about a rally on the ellipse. Not the insurrection at the Capitol. He says well you know who cares. It's a good thing. I agree. People do these things all the time. I've done them as well. demonstrations are an important and venerated

She worked

2 with organizers and made calls for people to come 3 and that's not a problem. Out of context. Out 4 of context it's not a problem. In context this 5 support was part of a scheme. A scheme where 6 lawful demonstrations were plan A the first step 7 and there was also plan B. what was going to happen when all the lawful demonstrations 8 9 happened and all the objections on the floor of 10 the House were heard and as everyone knew they 11 were futile. The votes were there to certify the 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 22 2.3 2.4 25

part of our democratic tradition.

1

election of Joe Biden. There was a plan B. Plan B was violence at the Capitol. Plan B was to physically enter the Capitol illegally, not on a tour, tourist tour busting in the windows and doors as you saw on that video, insuring and ultimately causing the deaths of law enforcement to block the certification of Joe Biden as the winner of the 2020 election. That's' what plan B Plan B had a name. it had a code name. 1776. And how do we know that? Well, the clues are everywhere. December 30 Marjorie Taylor Greene Tweets out a rumor that there are lawful objections on the floor of the House may be blocked by a rule change. And Ali Alexander who Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

Τ

1 she acknowledges knowing who says she's a friend, 2 he's an organizer of a major demonstration. 3 Tweets in response to that 1776 is always an 4 option and he refers to what 500,000 people will 5 do to that building if the objections are 6 suppressed by a rule change. That's what that 7 Tweet exchange is about. I don't believe that 8 Marjorie Taylor Greene doesn't read every response to her Tweets and care about them. 9 10 think she acknowledged it in truth. And she knew exactly what 1776 meant in that context. 11 denied it sort of not really, I can't remember, 12 don't buy it. She knows exactly what Mr. 13 Alexander was referring to. By the way, when 14 that Tweet came out and that reference came out 15 to 1776 we don't see a response -- what is this? 16 I don't know what this is about. Or gee if 17 you're talking about doing violence in the 18 Capitol 500,000 people doing something to that 19 building, I don't want no part of that. 20 heard a lot about Ms. Greene saying that she's 2.1 always peaceful and she put out comments about 22 peacefulness. Never one before January 6. Only 2.3 That video, after. Those press releases, 24

after.

25

You got to ask yourself, why is that?

Ιt

2 only a few hours and then the tide turned. 3 people saw it for what it was and she needed to 4 help her story. Marjorie Taylor Greene new 5 perfectly well what 1776 meant, that it meant 6 violence against the Government overthrowing a 7 tyrannical government and that that was plan B of January 6, 2021. She embraced it and she 8 9 promoted it. And probably the most important 10 piece of evidence our point of view in this case is Plaintiff's exhibit or Petitioner's exhibit 11 27. This is the short clip of Marjorie Taylor 12 Greene on News Max. it's the night before January 13 6. She's asked a number of questions about the 14 objections that she and others are going to 15 lawfully file on the floor. And then the 16 broadcaster asks her so what's your plan? How do 17 you think this is going to play out and role out 18 tomorrow? And her answer is one sentence. this 19 is our 1776 moment. It's a stunning statement. 20 It has no meaning unless you know the code. 2.1 has no meaning unless you're in the club. 22 1776. It's plan B. it's block the certification. 2.3 It's flood the Capitol. It's use violence if you 24 This is a message posted, stated on have to. 25

Well obviously the insurrection succeeded for

1 January 5 in the middle of that window posted on 2 Facebook where there are hundreds of thousands of 3 followers and anybody else who wanted to see it 4 on January 5 from a sitting member of the United 5 States Congress. It was her clarion call. 6 People knew what she meant. They knew exactly 7 what she meant. Tomorrow is our 1776 moment. Now it's interesting the examination that Mr. 8 Bopp did of his client. Never asked her about 9 10 Never asked her about providing support to 11 people who were planning to demonstrations. providing support for people who ultimately broke 12 into and trashed the People's Temple. Never asked 13 her any of those questions. She never addressed 14 When I asked her she said I don't remember, 15 I'm not sure, I don't think so. So what do you 16 have before, Your Honor, at this point? You have 17 her own words in context against nothing. 18 even a real denial. Judge Beaudrot, Marjorie 19 Taylor Greene comes to this court and this nation 20 and she asks to be a candidate for Federal 21 office. She comes with [INDISCERNIBLE 07:29:52]. 22 With her hands, her words, her actions she was 2.3 one of several leaders who gathered the kindling, 24

25

who created the conditions , who made it possible

Taylor

1 for there to be an explosion of violence at the 2 Capitol on January 6. And then, she dropped the 3 Now she comes into this courtroom and she match. 4 says she's surprised and appalled that a fire 5 Sticks of wood and dry leaves are burned. 6 harmless in and of themselves. In fact, they're natural, they're healthy for the environment. 7 Rallies, protestations, objections on the floor, 8 these are all things that are good for the 9 10 Republic. They're part of our tradition. 11 when the conditions are dangerous, some people capitalize on those conditions and they add a 12 spark. A flame. That cause all of those things 13 to explode into a fire of violence and death. 14 That flame can be in the form of actually 15 assistance given to people who perform the acts 16 of violence like the quarter master in the 17 Confederate army who passes out the muskets and 18 the balls and the rations but that flame can also 19 be a spark by words, by signals, by signs, by 20 code, by promotion, by justification, by support, 21 by assistance and that is what Marjorie 22 Greene did. That's why we're here. Your Honor, 2.3 we urge you to find that Marjorie Taylor Greene 24

25

is disqualified from the ballot under Section 3

1 |

of the 14th Amendment of one of the greatest political documents in the history of the world. The United States Constitution.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you, Mr. Celli. It's quite late. I'd like to take a couple minutes just to talk about the briefing and a couple things. First of all, I would greatly appreciate it if someone give us a copy of this blown up version or something easier to read. And I appreciate what you did, Mr. Bopp but somebody can do a better job of it. No offense.

JAMES BOPP: It was my capacity--.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: But I'm sure you had folks that could do that. And that gets into a couple things about the brief. And briefings do midnight on Thursday. A couple of things. I want to be sure that Mr. Bopp one of your objections in the first one I think in the motion was about the fact that this procedure -- and I know I can't determine it's on the constitution but I'm talking about [INDISCERNIBLE 07:32:54]. About related to the belief and the concerns some which you voiced in your closing argument. I would like to hear what you'd like for me to

1 think about finding. I mean we haven't talked 2 about that very much because it's not 3 constitution -- it's not. It's something I can 4 decide but its' something I need to consider in 5 particular I think the question for the word belief, I think I mentioned reasonable. 6 there is issues there. I would appreciate both 7 sides [INDISCERNIBLE 07:33:24] but I'd like to 8 understand your views of that I'm sure 9 10 [INDISCERNIBLE 07:33:28]. I want to mention Something we're reviewing that's very 11 ancient, historical ancient 200 years old 12 [INDISCERNIBLE 07:33:40] than our country. 13 in all seriousness, some of these authorities are 14 pretty obscure. As long as we can find them and 15 pull them up that's great particularly like 16 there's a link and it's public somewhere that's 17 great if it's something that's really obscure 18 that's not really made available on the internet, 19 first of all our first preference is just showing 20 -- tell us where it is on the internet, where we 2.1 can find it or really that's not a problem. Ιf 22 that's not available, please [INDISCERNIBLE 2.3 07:34:08] copies like that so we don't have to 24 spend time chasing this stuff down because we

1 don't have time. Obviously I got to 2 [INDISCERNIBLE 07:34:20] organize briefs, at this 3 point the record is gotten a little bit chaotic because we've had so much back and forth and had 4 5 a number of quarters and stuff and I know Mr. 6 Bopp you got your original motion to dismiss. A lot of those arguments which were made in 7 closing. It might help if you don't mind doing it 8 to maybe put them together again in light of this 9 10 hearing and be focused and streamlined so I just don't have to wallow around find legal documents. 11 I'm sure Mr. Celli the same way. Brevity is 12 always better. [INDISCERNIBLE 07:34:57]. Because 13 we do need to get this done. I mean the Georgia 14 courts have been very fast. [INDISCERNIBLE 15 07:35:04] very fast. I hope to have it out 16 within a week if you all get it. This is 17 extraordinary stuff. 18

JAMES BOPP: Your honor, thank you for the directions on the briefing. And fortunately my associate Melina Seibert who's done a really fine job is listening and I'm sure taking notes. So we'll do the best we can.

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Right and again I know everybody is running and gunning and I

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1 know there's been an appeal filed to the 11th 2 circuit so I don't know what your brief schedule 3 is on that. I know there's a briefing schedule 4 in the fourth circuit case. I'm sur you have a 5 lot of fires to put out and I'm fully cognizant of that but so just do -- I'm sure you'll do the 6 7 work by the way [INDISCERNIBLE 07:35:54] everybody is working under excellent 8 circumstances, very quick and everybody is taking 9 10 seriously I'm sure it will be very helpful and we look forward to getting it and finishing this 11 state -- the matter. Before we close, is there 12 anything else? 13 ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Nothing from 14 Petitioner, Your Honor. 15 16

JAMES BOPP: No other than, Your Honor, you really done a fine job out there. Extraordinary.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: Thank you.

Flattery is always [INDISCERNIBLE 07:36:21].

ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Put us down for flattery too, Judge.

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

JAMES BOPP: I think when this narrative it ought to be provided in the best way--.

JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: And I appreciate your guys time. Appreciate everybody's

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions

1	scrambling to be here so with that I think that
2	concludes the hearing. That's it.
3	ANDREW G. CELLI JR.: Thank you, Judge.
4	(OVERLAY)
5	JUDGE CHARLES R. BEAUDROT: The record is now
6	closed.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Transcript by TransPerfect Legal Solutions



I, Anders Nelson, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings before the office of State Administrative hearings, state of Georgia, of, File No: 220196, David Rowan, Donald Guyatt, Robert Rasbury, Ruth Demeter, and Daniel Cooper v. Marjorie Taylor Green, Docket No.: 2222582 2222582-OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-57-Beaudrot, was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Anders Nelson
Project Manager

April 28, 2022