

<p style="text-align: center;">SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL CIVIL WEST</p> <p>----- IN RE PELLICANO CASES) -----) ANITA BUSCH,) Plaintiff,)Case No. vs.)BC316 318</p> <p>ANTHONY PELLICANO; ALEXANDER)][Related to BC316439, PROCTOR; MARK ARNESON; CITY)BC349590, BC350832, OF LOS ANGELES; SBC)BC354840, BC356529, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.,)BC356722, BC358270, formerly operating as Pacific)BC358271, BC361319, Bell Telephone Company, a)BC361624] corporation; CLIENT DOE; LAW)VOLUME II FIRM DOE; and DOES 1 through) 100, Inclusive,) Defendants.)</p> <p>----- Continued Videotaped Deposition of ANITA BUSCH, taken at 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, California, commencing at 9:22 A.M., Thursday, July 21, 2011, before Cathryn L. Baker, CSR No. 7695.</p> <p>PAGES 164 - 361</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL (CONTINUED): 2 3 FOR THE DEFENDANT PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE CO.: 4 5 EAGAN O'MALLEY & AVENATTI, LLP 6 BY: JASON M. FRANK, ESQ. 7 450 Newport Center Drive 8 Second Floor 9 Newport Beach, California 92660 10 (949) 706-7000 11 jfrank@eoalaw.com 12 13 FOR THE DEFENDANT MICHAEL S. OVITZ: 14 15 BROWNE WOODS GEORGE LLP 16 BY: ERIC M. GEORGE, ESQ. 17 AMANDA MORGAN, ESQ. 18 2121 Avenue of the Stars 19 24th Floor 20 Los Angeles, California 90067 21 (310) 274-7100 22 egeorge@bwgfirm.com 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p>
--	--

<p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 3 FOR THE PLAINTIFF ANITA BUSCH: 4 5 LAW OFFICES OF IAN HERZOG 6 BY: IAN HERZOG, ESQ. 7 EVAN MARSHALL, ESQ. 8 233 Wilshire Boulevard 9 Suite 550 10 Santa Monica, California 90401 11 (310) 458-6660 12 13 FOR THE CLASS PLAINTIFFS AND PLAINTIFF 14 KEITH CARRADINE: 15 16 THE BALL LAW FIRM, LLP 17 BY: ERIC A. GOWEY, ESQ. 18 10866 Wilshire Boulevard 19 Suite 1400 20 Los Angeles, California 90024 21 (310) 446-6148 22 egowey@balllawllp.com 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL (CONTINUED): 2 3 FOR THE DEFENDANT GORRY MEYER & RUDD, LLP: 4 5 WAXLER CARNER WEINREB BRODSKY LLP 6 BY: DANIELLE SOKOL, ESQ. 7 1960 East Grand Avenue 8 Suite 1210 9 El Segundo, California 90245 10 (310) 416-1300 11 dsokol@wcvbllp.com 12 13 FOR THE DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES: 14 15 OFFICE CITY ATTORNEY 16 BY: GEOFFREY PLOWDEN, ESQ. 17 200 North Main Street 18 Suite 600 19 Los Angeles, California 90012 20 (213) 978-7038 21 Geoffrey.Plowden@lacity.org 22 23 ALSO PRESENT: 24 25 MICHAEL COOLEY, VIDEOGRAPHER</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p>
--	---

1 A. He would have asked about it. He would
 2 have asked me to send.
 3 **Q. You say would have, did he or do you --**
 4 A. Oh, yeah. I would have sent him
 5 something. 10:22AM
 6 **Q. Again, the closest recollection that you**
 7 **have about the actual words he used, can you**
 8 **tell me what happened?**
 9 A. Well, he probably would have -- I don't
 10 know. I mean -- probably called and said, "Do 10:22AM
 11 you have those articles?" And I said, "yeah,"
 12 and I sent them to him. Basically it.
 13 **Q. Why were you discussing Michael Ovitz**
 14 **with Stan Ornellas?**
 15 A. I wasn't discussing that. I was 10:22AM
 16 discussing -- he was asking me about a whole
 17 bunch of people.
 18 **Q. Including Michael Ovitz?**
 19 A. Yeah. A whole bunch of people. A whole
 20 bunch. 10:22AM
 21 **Q. Do you remember what he asked you --**
 22 A. He asked me about the newspaper too.
 23 **Q. Do you remember what he asked you about**
 24 **Michael Ovitz?**
 25 A. He asked me what kind of relationship I 10:22AM
 Page 212

1 right after the indictments is when I found out.
 2 To my knowledge, Mike had hired -- his
 3 private investigator was a guy name Gavin de
 4 Becker. So I didn't know there was any
 5 connection whatsoever. 10:24AM
 6 **Q. When did you -- you said it was after**
 7 **the indictments?**
 8 A. Oh, yeah.
 9 **Q. Give me a time period.**
 10 A. Well, it was when the -- it was when the 10:24AM
 11 New York Times articles came out. So it would
 12 have had to have been after the indictments
 13 because I was -- I was thinking Jules. So it
 14 had to be -- when I saw the articles in the New
 15 York Times, I remember going, what? And then it 10:24AM
 16 was -- that's when I realized that Mike Ovitz
 17 had a relationship even with Anthony Pellicano.
 18 **Q. Before then -- before the indictments**
 19 **were handed down, you didn't know that Michael**
 20 **Ovitz had a relationship with Pellicano?** 10:24AM
 21 MR. HERZOG: She said before the New
 22 York Times articles.
 23 THE WITNESS: Before -- I didn't know --
 24 no, before the New York Times article was after
 25 the indictment. 10:25AM
 Page 214

1 had with him.
 2 **Q. Do you remember what you said?**
 3 A. I had a good relationship with him.
 4 **Q. Do you remember when this conversation**
 5 **occurred?** 10:22AM
 6 A. It would have occurred around this time
 7 frame. I remember saying that I had -- he
 8 invited me to his Bar Mitzva, his kid's Bar
 9 Mitzvah. We had a pretty good relationship.
 10 **Q. And in mid-2003, about the time that 10:23AM**
 11 **these articles were sent, did you have any**
 12 **additional conversations about Michael Ovitz**
 13 **with Stan Ornellas?**
 14 A. No. He just wanted to know what kind of
 15 relationship I had with him. I told him it was 10:23AM
 16 a good one. And sent some articles of stuff
 17 that I had done previously on all sorts of
 18 stuff, and -- it didn't seem to matter much.
 19 **Q. Did he suggest at any point -- at any**
 20 **point in the year 2003 did you suggest to Stan 10:23AM**
 21 **Ornellas that Michael Ovitz might be responsible**
 22 **for Anthony Pellicano's actions against you?**
 23 A. No. Because there was no connection
 24 between Michael Ovitz and Pellicano. I didn't
 25 know about that until much later. It was like 10:23AM
 Page 213

1 BY MR. GEORGE:
 2 **Q. Right. You're talking about the New**
 3 **York Times articles that referenced the**
 4 **indictments?**
 5 A. No. The New York Times articles -- 10:25AM
 6 well, yeah, maybe they did. I don't remember.
 7 I just remember they were about Mike and I had
 8 no idea that -- I thought Mike worked with Gavin
 9 de Becker. I had no idea that he had any
 10 relationship whatsoever to Anthony Pellicano. 10:25AM
 11 It was, like, shocking.
 12 **Q. So just so I'm clear. It was only after**
 13 **you learned about the indictments being handed**
 14 **down --**
 15 MR. HERZOG: That's not what she said. 10:25AM
 16 After the New York Times articles.
 17 THE WITNESS: No, it was after the New
 18 York Times articles.
 19 BY MR. GEORGE:
 20 **Q. Which New York Times articles? 10:25AM**
 21 A. Those appeared after the indictments.
 22 **Q. Right. Were those the articles that**
 23 **referenced the indictments? You don't know?**
 24 A. I don't know if they referenced the
 25 indictments, but they were about people's 10:25AM
 Page 215

1 relationships with Pellicano in Hollywood. And
 2 in that article it was talking about how Ovitz
 3 had admitted to hiring Pellicano. And I was
 4 like what? Because he -- I always thought his
 5 private investigator was Gavin de Becker. 10:26AM
 6 That's all I had heard that he had used was
 7 Gavin de Becker. I just didn't think that Mike
 8 would associate himself with a thug like Anthony
 9 Pellicano.
 10 **Q. And that was the very first time that** 10:26AM
 11 **you realized that?**
 12 A. Yeah.
 13 **Q. And that was because of the New York**
 14 **Times piece that came out?**
 15 A. Yeah, there was a couple of them. Yeah. 10:26AM
 16 **Q. So we're going to find those.**
 17 **MR. FRANK: Ms. Busch, the indictments**
 18 **were unsealed in a public record in February of**
 19 **2006, are you saying it was after that time?**
 20 **THE WITNESS: Yeah, it was probably --** 10:26AM
 21 **it was real close to that time because I was**
 22 **still thinking it was Jules at that time.**
 23 **MR. FRANK: Okay. Thank you.**
 24 **THE WITNESS: I was waiting for Jules to**
 25 **be indicted. I didn't know -- the investigation** 10:26AM
 Page 216

1 was still going on. I thought there was going
 2 to be more indictments. I was waiting to see.
 3 And then the New York Times articles came out
 4 and I was, like, "What the hell is this?"
 5 **BY MR. GEORGE:** 10:26AM
 6 **Q. So that I'm clear. So February 2006**
 7 **indictments, New York Times piece after February**
 8 **2006, and then it crystalizes in your mind,**
 9 **first of all --**
 10 **A. Well, that's when --** 10:27AM
 11 **Q. Hang on. Hang on. I got to ask the**
 12 **question.**
 13 **That's when you learn that Michael Ovitz**
 14 **has any affiliation with Pellicano, correct?**
 15 **A. That's right.** 10:27AM
 16 **Q. And you didn't know before that time?**
 17 **A. No way.**
 18 **Q. That's when you learned for the first**
 19 **time that Michael Ovitz is no longer -- had**
 20 **stopped using Gavin de Becker, was using Anthony** 10:27AM
 21 **Pellicano?**
 22 A. Yeah. That's the first time I ever
 23 heard Mike Ovitz's name associated with Anthony
 24 Pellicano. It was, like, what is this?
 25 **Q. Is this the first time you had any** 10:27AM
 Page 217

1 **suspicion, in other words, after February 2006,**
 2 **that Michael might be responsible for Anthony**
 3 **Pellicano doing this to you?**
 4 A. Well, after I realized that he did have
 5 a relationship with the guy, and he did hire 10:27AM
 6 this total thug, then I started going back. It
 7 was like over time, I started going backwards in
 8 time and going, okay. Well, this, and then
 9 that, and I started like realizing what -- what
 10 all this stuff was adding up to. But it kind 10:28AM
 11 of -- yeah, it crystalized. I was like -- I
 12 looked at that and I was stunned. And I went,
 13 "What the hell is this? What do you mean?"
 14 **Q. I'd just like to have my question read**
 15 **back so we can have a specific focus.** 10:28AM
 16 A. Sorry.
 17 **MR. HERZOG: I think she used your word**
 18 **crystalize. She did use --**
 19 **MR. GEORGE: I know she did, but I want**
 20 **to have the question read back. Thank you.** 10:28AM
 21 **THE WITNESS: Yeah, so it was during**
 22 **that -- it was after that.**
 23 **MR. GEORGE: But hang tight. Go for it.**
 24 **(The record was read by the**
 25 **reporter as follows:** 10:28AM
 Page 218

1 "Question: Is this the first
 2 time you had any suspicion, in
 3 other words, after February 2006,
 4 that Michael might be responsible
 5 for Anthony Pellicano doing this to 10:27AM
 6 you?"
 7 **BY MR. GEORGE:**
 8 **Q. So is your answer yes?**
 9 A. Say that again. Let me make sure that I
 10 answer correctly. Go ahead. Can you read that 10:29AM
 11 one more time.
 12 (The record was read by the
 13 reporter as follows:
 14 "Question: Is this the first
 15 time you had any suspicion, in 10:27AM
 16 other words, after February 2006,
 17 that Michael might be responsible
 18 for Anthony Pellicano doing this to
 19 you?"
 20 **THE WITNESS: Yeah, because I didn't** 10:29AM
 21 **associate Mike Ovitz with Pellicano. It seemed**
 22 **incongruent.**
 23 **MR. GEORGE: Move to strike after**
 24 **"yeah."**
 25 **Q. Okay. Let me move to --** 10:29AM
 Page 219

1 A. Yes.
 2 **Q. Did you use all three telephone lines or**
 3 **just the two?**
 4 A. I used the third one too.
 5 **Q. You actually made -- 02:00PM**
 6 A. I may have --
 7 **Q. -- telephone calls on that line?**
 8 A. It was mainly fax.
 9 **Q. It was mainly fax?**
 10 A. Yeah. 02:00PM
 11 **Q. Okay.**
 12 **But you're certain that you used the**
 13 **other two lines both for your work as a**
 14 **journalist and to make personal calls, correct?**
 15 A. Yes. 02:00PM
 16 **Q. In the course of your work as a**
 17 **journalist, would you call your sources from**
 18 **your landline?**
 19 A. Yes.
 20 **Q. When I say your landline, I'm going to 02:00PM**
 21 **refer to these landlines --**
 22 A. I understand.
 23 **Q. -- is that understood?**
 24 A. Yes.
 25 **Q. Were your sources located in the 323 02:00PM**

Page 304

1 vertigo. It's from the pressure probably.
 2 BY MR. FRANK:
 3 **Q. Do you need to take a break?**
 4 A. No, I'm okay.
 5 **Q. Let me ask the question again. How did 02:02PM**
 6 **you determine that the relevant time period of**
 7 **the wiretapping began in April or May of 2002?**
 8 A. Well, Pellicano was involved during that
 9 time frame, so I figured it was -- you know.
 10 **Q. And you figured that it ended in 02:02PM**
 11 **November of 2002 because that's when --**
 12 A. The phone company told me that.
 13 **Q. The phone company told you that the**
 14 **wiretap was removed in November 2002?**
 15 A. Yeah. 02:02PM
 16 **Q. And the phone company told you that**
 17 **there was a wiretap in place?**
 18 A. They didn't use that word. They used
 19 half-tap I think, or part-tap, something like
 20 that. 02:02PM
 21 **Q. But you understood that to mean,**
 22 **essentially mean, a wiretap, correct?**
 23 A. I had to ask questions, but then I found
 24 out what it was, yes.
 25 **Q. In November 2002 you understood that to 02:02PM**

Page 306

1 **area code?**
 2 A. They were located in all area codes.
 3 **Q. And it's correct that the telephone**
 4 **service provider for your landlines was Pacific**
 5 **Bell Telephone Company? 02:01PM**
 6 A. Yes.
 7 **Q. How did you determine that the time**
 8 **period or the relevant time period of the**
 9 **wiretapping was April or May 2002 to November**
 10 **2002? 02:01PM**
 11 A. Well, November is when I was told by the
 12 phone company that they had -- you know, I had a
 13 problem with both lines. They took it off of
 14 one line, it went back on the next line the next
 15 day. The same problems came back. I was told 02:01PM
 16 by the phone company that was November
 17 18th of -- whoa. 2002.
 18 **Q. Are you Okay?**
 19 A. Yeah. It's from not sleeping. I got
 20 vertigo. Yeah, it's from not sleeping. I'm 02:01PM
 21 okay.
 22 MR. HERZOG: You scared me.
 23 THE WITNESS: I scared me too.
 24 MR. GEORGE: Shall we take a break?
 25 THE WITNESS: I just have a little 02:01PM

Page 305

1 **mean a wiretap, correct?**
 2 A. Yes.
 3 **Q. I want to -- if you look at the fifth**
 4 **paragraph, it says, "I would estimate that I**
 5 **made at least 190 to 200 calls per week to other 02:03PM**
 6 **California residents using the telephone lines**
 7 **identified herein during the relevant**
 8 **wiretapping time period."**
 9 A. Yeah. I would say that's accurate.
 10 Yeah. 02:03PM
 11 **Q. How did you come up with that estimate?**
 12 A. I just started figuring how many calls I
 13 made a day and then added it up.
 14 **Q. Now, during this time period from April**
 15 **to November 2002, were you -- was there a period 02:03PM**
 16 **where you were not living at your primary**
 17 **address?**
 18 A. No.
 19 **Q. You don't recall a time period that you**
 20 **had actually left your apartment because you 02:03PM**
 21 **were afraid?**
 22 A. Oh. Oh, yes, that's correct. Yeah,
 23 you're right.
 24 **Q. So what time period was that?**
 25 A. That would have been June 20th or 21st, 02:04PM

Page 307

1 it always outside a certain mile range or what?
 2 **Q. As I said, my understanding is that**
 3 **depending on the distance from your home to the**
 4 **call that you're making, will reflect if you're**
 5 **going to be billed for the call or not. 02:45PM**
 6 A. But what is the mile -- do you know what
 7 the mile range is?
 8 **Q. I don't. I believe it's somewhere**
 9 **between 8 to 12 miles, but I can't say that for**
 10 **sure. 02:45PM**
 11 A. No, it can't be, because Dave is closer
 12 than that.
 13 **Q. And Dave's number appears on these**
 14 **bills?**
 15 A. No, it's not on here. 02:45PM
 16 **Q. Right. If it's closer then it would not**
 17 **appear on your telephone bills.**
 18 A. Okay.
 19 **Q. Looking at the chart, you'll see that**
 20 **there's a number of calls that only last one 02:45PM**
 21 **minute in duration?**
 22 A. Uh-huh.
 23 **Q. Yes?**
 24 A. Yes.
 25 **Q. You've had the experience, I assume, of 02:45PM**
 Page 344

1 BY MR. FRANK:
 2 **Q. You can keep that here.**
 3 **Do you have Exhibit No. 45 in front of**
 4 **you?**
 5 A. Okay. 02:47PM
 6 **Q. Exhibit No. 45 is an article in the Los**
 7 **Angeles Times headlined "Pellicano Accused of**
 8 **Wiretapping" byline Dave Rosenzweig.**
 9 A. Uh-huh.
 10 **Q. Do you know Dave Rosenzweig? 02:47PM**
 11 A. Yes, I knew him.
 12 **Q. Did you work with him?**
 13 A. Yes. He passed.
 14 **Q. I'm sorry to hear that.**
 15 **I understand you may not have seen it in 02:47PM**
 16 **this format because this is a LexisNexis**
 17 **printout, but have you seen this article before?**
 18 A. I don't remember reading this, no.
 19 Honestly, I don't remember reading it.
 20 **Q. Did you have a subscription to the Los 02:48PM**
 21 **Angeles Times --**
 22 A. No.
 23 **Q. -- in 2003?**
 24 **You got to wait until I finish my**
 25 **question. 02:48PM**
 Page 346

1 **calling someone and getting their answering**
 2 **machine or voicemail, correct?**
 3 A. Of leaving a message, uh-huh.
 4 **Q. Looking at any of these calls that are**
 5 **one minute or less in duration, can you tell me 02:46PM**
 6 **if the call is a call in which you actually**
 7 **spoke to someone on the phone or if you got**
 8 **their voicemail?**
 9 A. I don't know.
 10 **Q. You're not able to look at the bills and 02:46PM**
 11 **determine that, correct?**
 12 A. Right.
 13 MR. FRANK: Mark this as the next
 14 exhibit.
 15 (Deposition Exhibit 45 was marked for 02:46PM
 16 identification.)
 17 THE WITNESS: Do you want this back?
 18 MR. FRANK: Sure.
 19 THE WITNESS: Can you get it back from
 20 everyone. 02:46PM
 21 MR. FRANK: If everyone can please
 22 return their charts.
 23 THE WITNESS: Eric, did you have one?
 24 Just checking. Does this go back to you
 25 or go in here? 02:47PM
 Page 345

1 **Did you have a subscription to the Los**
 2 **Angeles Times in 2003?**
 3 A. I don't believe so.
 4 **Q. Were you working for the Los Angeles**
 5 **Times in 2003? 02:48PM**
 6 A. Yes.
 7 **Q. Would you regularly read the newspaper?**
 8 A. No.
 9 **Q. If you can go to Exhibit No. 16, which**
 10 **is your book, or the manuscript. 02:48PM**
 11 A. I don't have -- oh. What am I looking
 12 at?
 13 **Q. Actually, before I direct you to a**
 14 **certain page. Let me ask you this: Did you**
 15 **provide Dan Moldea with your personal notes? 02:48PM**
 16 A. No. You mean on stories?
 17 **Q. Your personal notes in connection with**
 18 **your experiences dealing with the Grand Jury.**
 19 A. I don't remember providing him with
 20 stuff about the Grand Jury. 02:49PM
 21 **Q. Did you keep personal notes of your**
 22 **experience with the Grand Jury?**
 23 A. I don't think I did. I don't remember
 24 doing it. I may have -- I don't remember doing
 25 it. 02:49PM
 Page 347

1 Q. Can you turn to page 1673. And if you
 2 refer to the middle of the page it says,
 3 "Writing her personal notes, Anita describes the
 4 experience saying": And then it purports to
 5 quote from your notes. 02:49PM
 6 If you can read those notes and tell me
 7 if those appear to be an accurate reflection of
 8 your notes?
 9 A. They weren't personal notes. This is
 10 something that I would have told him. 02:50PM
 11 Q. So this is something you told --
 12 A. I probably -- yeah.
 13 Q. -- Mr. Moldea?
 14 A. Yeah. I didn't write anything down. I
 15 didn't have personal notes on this. I remember 02:50PM
 16 this now.
 17 Q. Does this accurately reflect what you
 18 told Mr. Moldea?
 19 MR. HERZOG: You got to read it. It
 20 goes over for many, many pages, so I don't know 02:50PM
 21 how far --
 22 BY MR. FRANK:
 23 Q. Just read for -- just 274.
 24 A. No, it's not accurate.
 25 Q. Please tell me what's not accurate. 02:50PM
 Page 348

1 A. The questioning by Dan Saunders that I
 2 realized my phones were illegally wiretapped and
 3 the confirmation. That did not -- that was not
 4 the confirmation that it was illegally
 5 wiretapped at all. Not at all. Absolutely not. 02:50PM
 6 I knew they were investigating my phones. I
 7 knew they were investigating my phones.
 8 Q. Is there anything else inaccurate in
 9 this section?
 10 A. I don't remember anybody asking me what 02:51PM
 11 the guy in the car looked like. I don't
 12 remember the woman looking at me and nodding her
 13 head in sympathy. I know that happened during
 14 the trial but -- I don't remember that. I don't
 15 remember talking -- 02:52PM
 16 Q. You've already flipped the page?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. Then we're fine.
 19 I'll refer you to Exhibit 27, which was
 20 the catalogue of documents from Mr. Moldea that 02:52PM
 21 he purports to have received from you.
 22 A. What number?
 23 Q. Exhibit No. 27.
 24 A. Okay.
 25 Q. And if you turn to page 1986. 02:52PM
 Page 349

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. You'll see approximately half the page,
 3 about the fifth entry or sixth entry up from the
 4 bottom, it's an article written by Dave
 5 Rosenzweig? 02:53PM
 6 A. Yes, I see that.
 7 Q. Any reason to believe that you did not
 8 provide this article to Mr. Moldea?
 9 A. I didn't provide every article to him.
 10 He got things on his own. 02:53PM
 11 MR. FRANK: I'll mark as the next
 12 Exhibit 46.
 13 (Deposition Exhibit 46 was marked for
 14 identification.)
 15 BY MR. FRANK: 02:53PM
 16 Q. I'll represent to you, if you see the
 17 Bates stamp on the bottom 1310, this is a
 18 document that you produced to us in this
 19 lawsuit.
 20 MR. HERZOG: Do we have a copy? 02:53PM
 21 BY MR. FRANK:
 22 Q. Is this a document that you produced in
 23 this lawsuit?
 24 A. I guess so.
 25 Q. This is a document that was in your 02:54PM
 Page 350

1 records?
 2 A. Probably, yes.
 3 Q. And the date of this article is March
 4 13th, 2003?
 5 A. Uh-huh. 02:54PM
 6 Q. Yes?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Where in your records did you find it?
 9 A. What?
 10 Q. Where in your records did you find this 02:54PM
 11 article?
 12 A. Oh, I don't know. I had thrown a bunch
 13 of stuff in a box.
 14 Q. There was a box that had newspaper
 15 articles in it? 02:54PM
 16 A. Uh-huh.
 17 Q. Yes?
 18 A. Yeah.
 19 Q. And there's some handwriting on a box --
 20 A. There's what? 02:55PM
 21 Q. There's some handwriting on a little
 22 box.
 23 MR. HERZOG: Right here.
 24 THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't
 25 know who did that. 02:55PM
 Page 351