## EXHIBIT A

## IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA



## ORDER

NOW, August 23, 2023, the Special Master hereby ORDERS as follows:

1. The evidentiary hearing for purposes of the Special Master's appointment of a neutral third-party escrow agent currently fixed for Monday, August 28, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 3001, Third Floor, Pennsylvania Judicial Center, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, is hereby RESCHEDULED to begin at 9:00 a.m. on the same date in the same place. If necessary, the hearing shall reconvene on Wednesday, August 30, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., and Thursday, August 31, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., in the same location.
2. The parties are directed to serve all Notices to Attend and Subpoenas on their respective witnesses no later than Friday, August 25, 2023, in conformance with the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure. Notices to Attend and Subpoenas served prior to
issuance of this Order, indicating that the evidentiary hearing would begin at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, August 28, 2023, need not be reserved to reflect the rescheduling set forth in Paragraph 1 above.
3. Respondent/Appellant (Secretary) shall present its evidence and witness testimony beginning on Monday, August 28, 2023, and the parties shall endeavor to complete direct and cross examination of the Secretary's witnesses by the conclusion of this first day of the hearing.
4. Petitioner/Appellees (collectively, Fulton County) shall present its evidence and witness testimony following conclusion of the Secretary's evidence. The parties shall endeavor to expeditiously complete direct and cross examination of Fulton County's witnesses.
5. Fulton County is directed to retain the services of a court reporter for the evidentiary hearing. The court reporter shall be prepared for Court to be in session outside of normal Court hours. The court reporter shall provide a rough transcript to the Court and counsel at the conclusion of each day of the hearing and expedite preparation of a transcript following the conclusion of the hearing.


RENÉE COHN JUBELIRER, President Judge of the
Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania Appointed as Special Master

## EXHIBIT B

## AFFIDAVIT OF BENJAMIN R. COTTON 24 August 2023

1, Ben Cotton, being duly sworn, hereby depose and state as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 , and I understand and believe in the obligations of an oath. I make this affidavit of my own free will and based on first-hand information and my own personal observations. 2. I am the founder of CYFIR, LLC (CyFIR).
2. I have a master's degree in Information Technology Management from the University of Maryland University College. I have numerous technical certifications, including the Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP), Microsoft Certified Professional (MCP), Network+, and Certified CyFIR Forensics and Incident Response Examiner.
3. I have over twenty-five (25) years of experience performing computer forensics and other digital systems analysis.
4. I have over eighteen (19) years of experience as an instructor of computer forensics and incident response. This experience includes thirteen (13) years of experience teaching students on the Guidance Software (now OpenText) EnCase Investigator, the EnCase Enterprise software and the collection and preservation of digital data.
5. I have testified as an expert witness in state and federal courts and before the United States Congress.
6. I regularly lead engagements involving digital forensics for law firms, corporations, and government agencies and am experienced with the digital acquisition of evidence under the under the Federal Rules of Evidence.
7. In the course of my experience I have forensically collected digital evidence from thousands of Windows, Linux, MacOS, and cellular devices.
8. In the course of my experience I have forensically collected digital evidence from thousands of external digital devices such as USB drives, thumb drives, and SD Cards.
9. I have supported legal teams in the forensic preservation and examination of Dominion voting systems in Arizona, Michigan, and Georgia.
10. The dominion voting system individual components, such as the Election Management System (EMS), Image Cast Central (ICC), ImageCast Precinct (ICP), ImageCast X (ICX) Ballot Marking Device (BMD) and Adjudication Workstations, contain specialized applications running on Windows and Linux operating systems. These components and systems can easily be forensically preserved in accordance with the digital acquisition of evidence as outlined the under the Federal Rules of Evidence and the National Institute of Justice Digital Evidence Policies and Procedures.
11. Forensic preservation of all data on a digital device is critical to the preservation process, especially if litigation is either anticipated or ongoing. If a given device or system is currently in a powered down state, it is imperative that the device's hard drive and other digital storage be forensically imaged to preserve system metadata dates and times, data integrity of the device and the admissibility of the evidence into the US legal system. Simply powering up a Windows or Linux operating system will change the date/time metadata for tens of thousands of files, thus interfering with the analysis of that system and calling into question the integrity of the data on the system.
12. It is critical to the admissibility and quality of subsequent analysis that the system to be preserved is maintained in a data state that is as close to the time period as possible. If the system to be preserved is powered on, commonly termed as live, at the point that it is to be preserved then the volatile memory should be imaged first followed by a forensic acquisition of the hard drive and other storage devices. 14. If a device that is to be preserved is not imaged immediately and maintained in a powered on state, there is a technical certainty that the data contained on the hard drive and possibly other digital storage devices will be changed. The changing of the data on the system will not require interactive inputs for
these changes to take place. As a matter of the normal operating system functions, no matter if it is a Windows, Linux or MacOS operating system, if the system is powered on, the system will automatically change logs and perform automated processes (like antivirus scans, scheduled tasks and other operations) that will change the dates and times of files, over write log file entries, modify system configuration settings and change data file contents.
13. It is my experience that the Dominion voting system components have communications devices in the form of Network Interface Cards (NIC), WiFi modems, and Cellular Modems installed by the manufacturer on the mother boards of the systems. Depending on the configuration of the system, these communications devices can automatically connect to remote locations and devices if the systems are powered on. If these devices are allowed to connect to remote locations it is possible for authorized or unauthorized parties to remotely modify the component.

SIGNED UNDER THE PAINS AND PENALTIES OF PERJURY THIS 24th DAY OF August 2023.


## EXHIBIT C

## IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

> County of Fulton, Fulton County Board : of Elections, Stuart L. Ulsh, in his official capacity as County Commissioner of Fulton County and : No. 277 M.D. 2021 in his capacity as a resident, taxpayer : and elector in Fulton County, and Randy : H. Bunch, in his official capacity as : County Commissioner of Fulton County : and in his capacity as a resident, taxpayer and elector of Fulton County, Petitioners/Appellees :
> v.

> Secretary of the Commonwealth, Respondent/Appellant:

## ORDER

NOW, August 23, 2023, upon consideration of Petitioners/Appellees' (collectively, Fulton County) Motion to Stay Proceedings, and Respondent/Appellant's (Secretary) answer in opposition thereto, the Motion to Stay Proceedings is DENIED.

Fulton County seeks a stay of the evidentiary hearing fixed for August 28, 2023, to determine a neutral third-party escrow agent to impound Fulton County's voting systems as directed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in County of Fulton v. Secretary of the Commonwealth, 292 A.3d 974, 1020 (Pa. 2023) (Fulton I). Fulton County asks for a stay based on its filing of a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court (No. 23-96, filed May 27, 2023), challenging the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision in Fulton I. However,

Fulton County has cited no procedural rule or relevant authority to support its request for stay. Accordingly, the Special Master will proceed as directed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, unless otherwise directed by the Supreme Court of the United States.


## EXHIBIT D

## In The Matter Of:

Fulton County Elections Board vs. Secretary of Commonwealth

> No. 277 MD 2021 No. 3 MAP 2022
> August 23, 2023

Media Court Reporting<br>216 West Front Street<br>Media, PA 19063<br>610.566.0805 fax 610.566.0318 www.mediacourtreporting.com

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
FULTON COUNTY ELECTIONS BOARD
V.

SECRETARY OF COMMONWEALTH
No. 277 MD 2021 No. 3 MAP 2022
Proceedings held on Wednesday, 8/23/23
PROOF OF SERVICE
I hereby certify that $I$ am this day serving the Notice of Filing of Transcript upon the persons and in the manner indicated below, which service satisfies the requirements of PA RAP 121. Service of first-class mail addressed as follows:

The Honorable Judge Renée Cohn Jubelirer Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania
601 Commonwealth Avenue
Harrisburg, PA 17106
Service by e-mail at following:
tom@thomasjcarrolllaw.com, with agreement of: THOMAS J. CARROLL, ESQUIRE
LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. CARROLL
610.419.6981

224 King Street
Pottstown, PA 19464
Service by e-mail at following:
rwiygul@hangley.com, with agreement of:
ROBERT A. WIYGUL, ESQUIRE
HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN \& SCHILLER 215.496.7042

One Logan Square, 27th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Dated Thursday, 8/24/23

```
Josephine Cardillo
Media Court Reporting
216 West Front Street
Media, PA 19063
610.566.0805
crjoze52@gmail.com
```

TO: The Honorable Renée Cohn Jubelirer

Please be advised that $I$ have this date
filed a transcript of the record in the case of: IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FULTON COUNTY ELECTIONS BOARD V.

SECRETARY OF COMMONWEALTH
No. 277 MD 2021 No. 3 MAP 2022
Proceedings held on Wednesday, 8/23/23
See PA RAP 1922 (c)
DATED: Thursday, 8/24/23

Josephine Cardillo Media Court Reporting 216 West Front Street Media, PA 19063 610.566 .0805
crjoze52@gmail.com

COUNSEL APPEARED REMOTELY VIA PHONE AS FOLLOWS:

THOMAS J. CARROLL, ESQUIRE
LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS J. CARROLL
224 King Street
Pottstown, PA 19464
610.419.6981
tom@thomasjcarrolllaw.com
Counsel for Petitioner
ROBERT A. WIYGUL, ESQUIRE
HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN \& SCHILLER
One Logan Square, 27th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215.496.7042
rwiygul@hangley.com
Counsel for Respondent
SHAWN N. GALLAGHER, ESQUIRE
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL \& ROONEY
Union Trust Building
501 Grant Street, suite 200
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
412.562.8800
shawn.gallagher@bipc.com
Counsel for Intervener Dominion
Also Present: John Hill, Esquire, Hangley Aronchick

Dimitri Marvrudis, Esquire Tucker Law Group

Kathleen Jones Goldman, Esquire Buchanan Ingersoll

Paul Ritchey, Court Staff
Josephine Cardillo, Court Reporter

MR. RITCHEY: This is Paul,
administrative staff of the
Commonwealth.
First, will the court reporter please identify herself.

COURT REPORTER: Josephine Cardillo, with Media Court Reporting, Media, PA.

MR. RITCHEY: Thank you.
First, counsel for the county of Fulton, then counsel for the Secretary, and then, finally, counsel for Intervener Dominion Voting Systems, Incorporated.

ATTY CARROLL: Yes. From
Fulton County, Thomas Carroll, Counsel for Fulton.

ATTY WIYGUL: Good afternoon. For the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Robert Wiygul, from Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin \& Schiller, and I believe I have two co-counsels dialing in separately, but I'll let them announce themselves.

ATTY HILL: Yeah, this is John Hill, also from Hangley Aronchick Segal

Pudlin \& Schiller, on behalf of the Department.

ATTY MARVRUDIS: And this is
Dimitri Marvrudis from the law firm of Tucker Law Group, on behalf of the Secretary.

ATTY GALLAGHER: I'm Shawn

Gallagher, with Buchanan Ingersoll \& Rooney, on behalf of the Intervener Dominion.

ATTY GOLDMAN: Kathleen Jones Goldman, also with Buchanan Ingersoll \& Rooney on behalf of Dominion.

MR. RITCHEY: Thank you all. Other than counsel, the court reporter, and court staff, is anyone else present on the call or listening to the call?
(No response.)
Okay. Hearing none, please stay on the line. The conference will begin shortly.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Judge Cohn Jubelirer. I believe we have everyone on today's call. Thank you very much,
and you've all identified yourself, I believe, for the court reporter who's on.

Can I be heard?
COURT REPORTER: This is
Josephine Cardillo, the court reporter.
It sounded like, Your Honor, You were cutting out, but $I$ will do my best with what $I$ can hear.

THE COURT: Thank you very
much. Please speak up if you cannot hear us.

Has everybody identified themselves? Have all counsel identified themselves for you?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, they
have.

THE COURT: Okay, excellent.
Thank you.
As you all know, we are here today for a prehearing conference in the matter of County of Fulton et al., Petitioners and Appellees versus the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Respondent, 277 MD 2021 and as before the

Supreme Court 3 MAP 2022.
And as indicated in the order issued Yesterday, the primary focus of today's conference was to determine whether it is necessary for the thirdparty escrow agent to have experience or expertise with election security or election technology or whether an agent with expertise in convention of physical security be sufficient.

It is recognized that -- well, it appears that both parties, the secretary and the County, have in the recent past proposed alternative escrow agents. The Secretary, the Insurance Evidence Services (IES) and Fulton County Auld \& Associates Investigation, Inc.

So let me first ask the County - well, let me first ask the Secretary: Do You believe that we need to have a third-party escrow agent with experience in election security, or would some other entity be sufficient?

ATTY WIYGUI: Thank You, Your
Honor. This is Robert Wiygul for the
secretary.
We do believe that the escrow agent should have experience with the particular type of evidence that is at issue here, which is, as we interpret the Supreme Court order, voting equipment, but also potentially data stored on that voting equipment.

And so, I think I agree with Your Honor's order that the purpose of the escrow agreement is to secure physical evidence for potential use in future litigation, but we think that the type of evidence at issue and important for your consideration here -- and we're prepared to present evidence of the hearing on Monday on why that's the case and why the specific type of evidence at issue calls for expertise and experience that would not be possessed simply by entities that may have experience, other types of physical evidence such as documents or, you know, weapons, what have you .

So I think, in some ways, you
know, the background in election
experience is important. Your Honor did point out that the secretary at one point had proposed as an alternative candidate to be escrow agent Insurance Evidence Services.

We made clear in our filings, I
think, that we believe they would be our second-choice alternative. We believe that Pro V\&V was head-and-shoulders the best candidate here.

But even Insurance Evidence Services had expertise and experience with storing pieces of technology with data on them, things of that nature. We think that that is, you know, a bareminimum qualification, but, again, we do think that there are aspects to the security in preservation of election equipment that are unique and do call for unique experience and expertise.

THE COURT: Well, I'm just
trying to understand why, if the equipment is locked in a room and even if we have cameras that would show who's coming and going and there's a
log and nobody is allowed to get in, and if the equipment is taken offline in a way that the Court goes in there, everybody watches, and your experts are comfortable with, why would you need to have anything more than that?

ATTY WIYGUL: Well, Your Honor, we're prepared to present testimony on Monday, but there are particular environmental conditions -- you know, humidity, temperature, et cetera -that are appropriate and necessary for the preservation of different sorts of digital assets such as data stored on election equipment. We think there's particular expertise called for in that respect.

In addition, I think one
important aspect of the supreme Court's order was maintenance of chain of custody, and there are particular ways in which the chain of custody of election equipment is preserved that turn on particular nature of the evidence at issue.

There are all sorts of different fields that are attached to different parts of the equipment. There are different ways of recording information to ensure that the chain of custody for each relevant component of an election machine is preserved.

We don't know what condition the machines are going to be in at the time they are picked up and collected by the escrow agent. The escrow agent may need to take steps at that point of acquisition to document and inventory the equipment so that an appropriate chain of custody can be kept from that point forward. That also requires specialized knowledge about election equipment and the way the security of election equipment is maintained.

I'm also informed that it may be necessary to charge the machines in a particular way on a particular schedule in order to ensure the preservation of data required thereon and obviously doing that in a way that is safe and isn't
going to pose any sort of other issue regarding the preservation of the machine as a matter of requiring specialized experience and expertise.

So, again, I don't pretend to be the expert here, but we have consulted extensively with our expert, and we do believe, for that reason and others, that this is a matter requiring specialized knowledge, and it's not a role that any party that might be suited to preserve other types of physical evidence would be qualified to play.

THE COURT: Well, if there was some sort of examination, I mean, would have anticipated that both parties and their experts would probably want to be present when the machines are, you know, examined and then transported into the custody of whatever the escrow agent states would be. And if there are times when there needs to be maintenance or other work on the machines pending this litigation, that both parties and their experts would
want to be there when the door is opened and people are inside.

So wouldn't that be sufficient
rather than requiring the actual escrow agent to be the expert?

I don't mean to put you on the spot; I'm just trying to understand what the needs are here of what we have to do. I'll tell you what. Let me ask the County's attorney to weigh in here, and then $I$ can come back to you.

ATTY CARROLL: Thank You, Your Honor.

First, I would ask, respectfully, for a clarification from Attorney Wiygul as to his position as to which vendor they're keeping. He just threw out the possibility of a second one. I thought that had been rejected, so I would like Clarification on that before I answer the next question.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I was
just talking in generalities, and I think I'm the one who threw out this

Insurance Evidence Services. I know,
in reviewing the filing in this case, I saw that that had been recommended as an alternative as well as an Auld \& Associates investigation from Fulton County.

So I think I'm just trying in a general fashion to find out what requirements the parties believe there are for an escrow agent and whether the third-party escrow agent needs to have experience or expertise with election security.

Does the County have a position about that?

ATTY CARROLL: We should be able to resolve this if we knew whether there was more than one vendor being proposed at this point.

THE COURT: I'm not thinking about who's being proposed; I'm trying to find what the type of vendor that needs to be selected must be. Does the County have a position?

ATTY CARROLL: I'm having a
little difficulty hearing, and $I$
apologize.
I think we might be able to
resolve this matter if we understood that we have more than one vendor because we understood they were only proposing Pro $\mathrm{V} \& \mathrm{~V}$.

THE COURT: Right. We're not -- let me be very clear, Attorney Carroll.

Putting aside the vendor, the name, who's proposing the vendor, my question for you is whether it is necessary for whatever vendor is proposed to have experience or expertise with election securities or election technology or whether an agent with expertise in conventional physical security be a sufficient third-party escrow agent here. If you have a position.

ATTY CARROLL: Yes. Well, we
would need to establish the issues that relate to the conflicts of interest that exist for their recommendation before $I$ can answer that question,
address the competency Of their
third-party vendor and protect the equipment. We would need to evaluate that, too.

THE COURT: Okay. So,
basically, what $I$ understand you to be saying, then, is that it's possible that -- it's not necessary for the third-party escrow agent to have the experience with the election integrity, and that you're more concerned about conflicts of interest with the vendor as opposed to any particular expertise.

Is that what I'm understanding?
ATTY CARROLL: Right, correct.
And competency and qualifications as well if they're going to be doing any kind of evaluations of these machines, which they should not be doing.

THE COURT: Okay. So --
ATTY CARROLI: And the
competency and the ability to secure it. That's the question at hand.

THE COURT: The competency and
the ability to secure the machines?
ATTY CARROLL: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And so, how
much storage space would be needed; does anybody know? Secretary, do you know, Attorney Wiygul?

ATTY WIYGUL: Your Honor, I can't. Unfortunately, I'm not in a position to give you, you know, the square footage or quantify it in that respect. We've spoken to a number of different potential vendors, and at the end of the day, Pro V\&V was the one that was, in our view, willing and able to do the job.

So what I've done is, I've
obviously shared the specifics on the nature of the equipment and the items and the equipment with the vendors, and they confirmed to me whether they have sufficiency or not, but $I$ can't give you a particular area number. Sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. And, basically, we've got temperature and humidity concerns. Is there something
different about -- you know, every
year, when the machines are not being used, they're being stored by all of the counties, you know, and taken out and prepared for use for the primary, then put back in storage, and then taken out and prepared for use in the general election, and then put back into storage.

And so, can somebody explain -and I understand this isn't on the record, but I'm just trying to understand.

You know, I'm looking at the filings that have come in and am thinking about our task was simply to select a third-party vendor that could store these machines, and it did not appear initially to me that it was going to be anything more complicated than what occurs every Year with all of the vending machines that are stored and then prepared for use.

And so, what I'm trying to understand is why it appears that there
is such a specific -- why there might be a need for the type of storage that we have here.

So, Mr. Wiygul, you're the one who seems to be saying that there needs to be this special kind of expertise. Could you explain that a little bit more?

ATTY WIYGUL: Yeah. Your
Honor, I think $I$ would answer, if I may, and I apologize for not seeming to answer your earlier question.

But I think part of the answer is -- and, again, I'm paraphrasing what I've spoken to my expert about. There are indicators for escrowing technology such as election machines but not that they're unique to election machine. And those standards are followed by the companies that do business in that area, in that industry. And they do involve, You know, particular specifications in terms of environmental controls.

And I'm not -- again, not being an expert myself, $I$ can't tell you, unfortunately, what the, you know,
specific ranges that need to be maintained for the temperature and the humidity are, but $I$ know that there are industry standards Eor that, and I think that it's important in this case.

In addition -- well, let me make a separate point. I think another part Of the issue here is, we are talking about potentially long-term preservation of data on pieces of equipment. We're not in a situation where, you know, the machines, as $I$ understand it, when they're used in elections, before each and every election, there is an inspection of the machines that is done. You know, there is a verification made that everything is installed with the version of software, et cetera, that it should be installed on. So the machines are not being used to preserve data over extremely long periods Of time, which is what their value as evidence is. So I think that might also be a consideration, I'm sure, as well.

But $I$ think our primary point is that these are digital assets as opposed to documents or, you know, other physical objects. And so, they're more sensitive, and they do require more refined conditions in order to ensure that they are properly preserved over what could potentially be a long period of time.

THE COURT: So, basically, any escrow agent that is familiar with preserving digital data, so any kind of computers or any kind of technology that contains digital information. Any of those types of entities would be an appropriate escrow agent for this equipment. It would not need to be a company that specializes in voting equipment.

ATTY WIYGUL: Your Honor, I don't know that it would absolutely have to be a company that specializes in voting equipment.

My understanding is -- and, again, I'm a little nervous about making factual proffers just because I'm not the
expert here and I'm relying on my expert - -

THE COURT: Right.
ATTY WIYGUL: - - but I
understand that there are certainly a categorical distinctions between storing sensitive pieces of technology, the data, versus I'll call them, you know, dumb objects, you know, that don't have data on them.

And even within the category of technology, $I$ understand that there are different industry standards in terms of environmental conditions for different types of technology. And, again, I expected that this is something that our expert is going to be able to illuminate more $f u l l y$.

So I think the short answer to your question is: No, we don't think it has to be, you know -- that only a voting system test lab would have -- would be able to provide the appropriate environmental conditions, but we do think that some knowledge and some particular
types of facilities are required here. THE COURT: Okay. (Indiscernible cross talk.) ATTY CARROLL: Your Honor, if I may --

THE COURT: Yes, of course. ATTY CARROLL: I'm sorry. I apologize if $I$ interrupted, Your Honor.

I would ask for clarification of that position, of Mr. Wiygul's position, that data can disappear from these machines if they're not turned on and charted. That seems to be what he's saying.

THE COURT: No. Well, I think what he's saying is, there's -- that -well, that data can be very -- I'm not sure exactly of what he was saying, but he was trying to answer my question. I think that in trying to figure out the appropriate -- because all we're looking at here, the only purpose, my only purpose in talking with you and what we're trying to do here is to find a place for these machines to be stored
while your other litigation continues.
And, you know, obviously, to the extent we can find a secure facility where the machines can be safely maintained in their current status without any additional or unnecessary complication is what $I$ think we're looking for.

ATTY CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor, I understand what you're saying, but I'm just trying to understand the -make a clarification so that $I$ can evaluate my witness list to determine the standards of the industry that he is proposing in this proposed hearing.

I've never seen this equipment in
any way, but I think that, if I
understand, a room that's ten-by-ten would be sufficient in terms of the size to store the equipment.

THE COURT: Okay. It would be climate-controlled with controls on the humidity and temperature where he would keep, you know, sensitive equipment.

Have both sides looked into such
vendors?
ATTY WIYGUL: We have, Your

Honor. This is Robert Wiygul for the Secretary.

We've investigated a number of different vendors that deal with the technology and preservation of technological pieces of evidence. And, you know, we thought Pro V\&V was head-and-shoulders the best choice, and as has been alluded to, at one point, in an effort to try to negotiate the case, we explored the possibility of an alternative vendor who we did not think was as qualified as Pro V\&V, but that we thought might meet the baseline requirements here.

And at the end of the day, they were not willing to, you know, put themselves into candidacy. And so, that's why we have applied for the appointment of Pro V\&V.

THE COURT: So they took
themselves out of consideration?
ATTY WIYGUL: That's right,

Your Honor.
ATTY CARROLL: Your Honor, I think that, again, the Fulton County's response is dependent on whether Mr. Wiygul's position is that data can disappear over a period of time. He is not clarifying that position, and that's the key to this question here.

ATTY WIYGUL: Your Honor, may I -- would you like me to address that point?

THE COURT: Sure.
ATTY WIYGUL: I think the point that I'm making here is I -- again, I'm imparting information from my expert, who has told me that it may be important to him to do everything that is necessary to preserve the equipment and the data, that the machine be charged periodically.

But I think -- I mean, the other consideration here -- and I think this goes back to the evidence that came in in the November hearing is, it's not always clear whether data has been altered.

And so, part of the point of these vigorous standards regarding both environmental control and chain of custody, and so that the parties, to ensure that the procedures were such that they have minimized to the greatest degree feasibly possible, if not wholly eliminated, the risk that, you know, data may have been altered in a way that is undetectable.

And I think that would be
important to the special managers in the Supreme Court findings of our exspoiliation in the underlying proceedings, which was that there would necessarily be concrete proof that changes or alterations or deletions had occurred, but that there could be no certainty, given what had transpired, that they did not occur.

And I think that's -- you know, it's that general phenomenon that is in part in forming our advocacy for fairly rigorous standards of maintenance and chain of custody here.

ATTY CARROLL: Your Honor, I
would object to that. That's not what we're here for today, Your Honor. It's clearly stated what we're here for, and he's trying to expand the scope into something that has already been resolved.

THE COURT: In what way? Can You explain your objection?

ATTY CARROLI: I'm sorry. Could you say that again? It's hard to hear you.

THE COURT: Okay. This is informal. There are no real objections, and I will overrule Your objection.

So, okay. I wanted to have a better understanding, and I think I do now. I had hoped that we would be able to avoid some Of the testimony that if it was possible to find a vendor that would be competent and capable of storing technologically-sensitive equipment but not necessarily having an expertise in voting machines.

I had thought that the parties' experts would be able to examine the machines, you know, before they're placed into custody, you know, when necessary for purposes of the litigation. But we can think about that.

ATTY CARROLL: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I could not hear you. Can I ask for a clarification of what you said about an examination? I'm not hearing you.

THE COURT: What $I$ said was what my initial understanding had been of how the escrow would occur, you know, that there would be an inspection at the beginning, before the items were placed into escrow. And then to the extent that they were needed during the course of any litigation obviously that would occur.

But either there would be inventory, and when you take possession, if there were any inspections necessary in order to document the condition of the equipment as it was placed into escrow so
that it would be there.
But I think that what we're going
to have to do is continue with the
hearing as it's currently scheduled on Monday, but $I$ would like you both to think of whether you can come up with a potential escrow agent that would have expertise in maintaining technologicallysensitive equipment and whether that would be sufficient for our purposes here.

And I'm not sure if there's anything further that needs to be discussed here. Is there anything further, Attorney Wiygul?

ATTY WIYGUL: I'd just like to
make two quick points, if I may, Your Honor. One is, I appreciate the goal that Your Honor has laid out. I think that ensuring evidence, as I understand Your Honor's suggestion, really was a candidate that fell into that niche from our perspective. And as I said, they, unfortunately, were not willing to go forward. So we did make that
effort and, unfortunately, it was not successful at the end of the day.

The second point $I$ would make is, as I was reading Your Honor's order from yesterday with respect to the question of experience specific to election security, the secretary does agree that the expert is certainly not going to be involved in any kind Of forensic examination of the machines or any audit or anything like that.
so to the extent that there are evidentiary questions or questions of presenting potential evidence regarding auditing or forensic analysis, we do believe that that evidence is not relevant to the purpose of this hearing.

ATTY CARROLI: Your Honor, if I may just reply.

THE COURT: Yes.

ATTY CARROLL: You had put
forward today that it was your understanding that there would be an inspection that is, in fact, new evidence or new information that was
not - -
THE COURT: NO, I'm sorry. I may have -- I apologize if I misspoke. Maybe "inspection" was the wrong word to use. Probably "inventory" was a better word for me to use.

But that there would be some -you know, that the machines and all of the equipment that would be placed into escrow would be inventoried before it's placed into the escrow, into storage, where it will be safely and securely maintained during the pendency of the litigation.

And, frankly, I didn't appreciate
how complicated this idea of securing these machines would be, but I look forward to being educated about it beginning Monday.

ATTY CARROLL: Right. Your
Honor, I would just then -- now that you clarified that you meant inspection over --

THE COURT: Inventory.
ATTY CARROLL: I mean inventory
over inspection, $I$ would have the same question: Who would do the inventory and what would it consist Of? 'Cause that has never been put forward before. That's what I'm asking now.

THE COURT: Well, I would think
that whenever items are placed into an escrow, that there would be an inventory of those items so that everybody is on the same page as when the escrow is finished, that the inventory would need to be matched with the items that are there to assure that
there has been -- you know, that everything continues to be secure.

ATTY CARROLL: So my question
would be: Is the Court ordering - -
THE COURT: I'm not ordering anything.

ATTY CARROLI: -- a forensic inventory? This is --

THE COURT: No, this court is not ordering anything. This court is not ordering anything. ATTY CARROLL: Okay. I'm
sorry, Your Honor. Thank You.
THE COURT: I think that we -Dominion, I apologize. I have not asked you for your... position on anything that we've discussed.

ATTY GALLAGHER: This is Shawn Gallagher, Your Honor.

I mean, we agree with the position of the secretary. I mean, we were just asked if the equipment at issue has been designated as critical infrastructure by the Department of Homeland security, you know.

And for those reasons, we agree that Pro V\&V, which is a nonpartisan, federally-accredited voting system test lab, would be the appropriate escrow agent.

THE COURT: Okay. And with regard to the question of whether a vendor with experience in maintaining sensitive technological information but not necessarily voting equipment would be an adequate third-party escrow agent. Does Dominion have a position
about that?
ATTY GALLAGHER: I would just echo the comments of Mr. Wiygul. Same position.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
ATTY GALLAGHER: Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate your time today, and I will look forward to seeing all of you on Monday.

ATTY WIYGUL: Your Honor, will
you indulge me? Can $I$ just ask a couple of administrative questions that will help us in preparing for the hearing? It doesn't involve the outstanding evidentiary issues.

THE COURT: Okay.
ATTY WIYGUL: Thank you, Your Honor.

One of our proposed witnesses is going to be in Florida, a representative of Pro V\&V, and he has filed a motion seeking permission for him to testify remotely. I don't believe that either party filed an opposition to that.

And just for administrative
purposes, I wonder if Your Honor might give us some guidance about when we might expect a ruling on that.

THE COURT: Yes. We will issue an order with regard to this afternoon.

ATTY WIYGUL: Thank you.
And I think my only other
questions are that the parties seem to have a pretty wide difference of opinion about the length of the hearing, and $I$ wonder if Your Honor had any guidance as to that for purposes of making hotel reservations and that sort of thing.

THE COURT: I am not inclined
to have this hearing last any longer than is necessary. We have not made arrangements for that. So I suppose that would be -- let's see.

Secretary, you've said six hours, was it?

ATTY WIYGUL: I think it was four hours, Your Honor, to present the direct testimony of our witnesses.

THE COURT: Okay. And let's see, Mr. Carroll, your estimate was
significantly different.
ATTY CARROLL: Yes. I think it would take several days to address the competency, conflict, and ability to secure the evidence from all of these witnesses.

THE COURT: Well, yeah. And we do have other hearings scheduled. In fact, we have another hearing in another case scheduled for the next day.

So I was anticipating it taking only one day. If we need to have it go into a second day, it would have to be later in the week, but $I$ don't anticipate it taking more than a day-and-a-half or two days.

We'll have to try to, you know, limit the testimony or be very efficient with the questioning, $I$ think.

ATTY CARROLL: Your Honor, I
just have one question if Mr. Wiygul is finished with his remarks.

THE COURT: Yes.
ATTY CARROLL: That would be if
the Court intended rule on our request to stay based on the petition having been filed.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Could you say that again, please?

ATTY CARROLL: With regard to the application of these files for a stay based on the petition being filed to the United states Supreme Court, are You planning on making a ruling on that?

THE COURT: I can make a ruling on that before we begin.

ATTY CARROLL: Thank You, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I appreciate the difficulty of trying to approve the proper place for this equipment to be stored, and $I$ understand the importance Of it. I do want to make sure that both sides have the opportunity they need to present the testimony that is relevant to the inquiry at hand.

And so, we will endeavor to do
that if we have to come early or stay
late or two breaks. Whatever we need to do, we will do.

But I would also respect the time and effort that everybody is putting in and the fact that, under the current orders of the supreme Court, the taxpayers of Fulton County are paying a price for this, and $I$ want to be mindful that we're careful in how we spend their tax dollars as well.

And so, I think I'm going to ask everyone to be as efficient as they can with the questioning of the witnesses and be as prepared as they can and see how expeditiously we can resolve this inquiry, which is really just -- the focus is just to an find an appropriate place where this equipment can be maintained securely during the pendency Of the litigation that you have and that You're currently involved in.
(Indiscernible cross talk.)
ATTY WIYGUL: I'm sorry, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

ATTY WIYGUL: I was just going to inquire in terms of, again, just from an administrative standpoint to make sure, in the interest of efficiency, that we have our witnesses ready to go at the right time.

Does Your Honor have a view as to which party should go first in presenting the evidence? I think, you know, the Secretary could be accurately described as the (indiscernible), so we were prepared to put on our evidence first, but I did want to inquire the Court about its expectation.

THE COURT: Thank You.

We'll issue an order later today that will set forth our understanding of how the hearing will proceed, and that will give you what you need.

ATTY WIYGUL: Thank You, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Thank You for
asking the question.
Are there any other questions?
ATTY CARROLL: Not from the

Fulton County side, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank You very much. I appreciate Your input today and your all being present, and look forward to seeing you on Monday. Thank you.
(Proceedings end at 1:55 p.m.)

*     *         * 
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| 11:19;20:2;24:5 |  | $27: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 12 ; 12: 16,25 \\ & 14: 8 ; 27: 4 ; 36: 8 \end{aligned}$ | points (1) |
| 32:13;39:19 | N |  |  | 30:17 |
| 30:8;34:21 | name (1) | offline (1) | 29 | 12:1 |
| maintenance (3) |  | 10:2 | parts ( | position (13) |
| 10:20;12:23;27:24 | 15:11 | one (13) | pars | 13:16;14:13,23 |
| aking (4) | nature (3) | 9:2;10:18;13:18 | party (4) | $5: 20 ; 17: 9 ; 23: 10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 24 ; 26: 14 ; \\ & 36: 12: 38: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $9: 14 ; 10: 24 ; 17:$ | $24 ; 14: 17 ; 15: 4$ | 7:6;12:11;35:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 ; 26: 5,7 ; 34: 4,9,25 ; \\ & 35: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 36: 12 ; 38: 10 \\ \text { managers (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { necessarily (3) } \\ \text { 27:16;28:24;34:23 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 13 ; 19: 4 ; 25: 11 \\ & 0: 18 ; 35: 19 ; 37: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 40:8 past (1) | $\begin{gathered} 35: 4 \\ \text { possessed (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 27:12 | necessary (9) | 22 | 7:13 | 8:20 |
| MAP (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 5 ; 10: 12 ; 11: 21 ; \\ & 15: 13 ; 16: 8 ; 26: 18 \\ & 29: 4,23 ; 36: 16 \end{aligned}$ | only (6) | Paul (1) | possession (1) |
| 7:1 |  | 15:5;22:21;23:22, | 4:1 | 29:22 |
| MARVRUDIS (2) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23;36:7;37:13 } \\ & \text { opened (1) } \end{aligned}$ |  | possibility (2) |
| 5:3,4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:4,23;36:16 } \\ & \text { need (13) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $39: 7$ | 13:18;25:13 |
| matched (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 20 ; 10: 5 ; 11: 11 ; \\ & 15: 22 ; 16: 3 ; 19: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $13: 2$ | pendency (2) | possible (3) |
| 33:12 |  |  | 32:13;39:19 | 16:8;27:7;28:21 |
| matter (4) | 20:1;21:16;33:12; | $\begin{gathered} \text { opinion (1) } \\ 36: 9 \end{gathered}$ | pending (1) | potential (4) |
| 6:22;12:3,9 | 37:13;38:22;39:1; | opportunity (1) | 12:2 | 8:12;17:12;30: |
| may (11) | 40:19 | 38:21 | people (1) |  |
| 8:21;11:11, | needed (2) | opposed | 13:2 | potentially (3) |
| 19:10;23:5;26:9,16; | $17: 4 ; 29: 1$ | $16: 13 ; 21: 2$ | period (2) | $8: 7 ; 20: 9 ; 21: 8$ |
| 27:9;30:17;31:19; | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { needs (6) } \\ 12: 22 ; 13: 8 ; 14: 10 \end{array}$ | opposition (1) | $21: 8 ; 26: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prehearing (1) } \\ & 6: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| Maybe (1) | 22;19:5;30:13 | order (10) | :20 | prepared (7) |
| 32:4 | negotiate (1) | 7:2;8:6,10;10:20 | periods (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:15;10:8;18:5,7, } \\ & 22 ; 39: 14 ; 40: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| MD (1) | 25:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 23 ; 21: 6 ; 29: 24 ; \\ & 31: 4 ; 36: 5 ; 40: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $20: 22$ |  |
| 6:25 | nervous (1) |  |  | preparing (1) |
| mean (6) | 21:24 | ordering (4)$33: 17,18,23,24$ | 35:22 | 35:13 |
| 12:15;13:6;26:21 | new (2)$31: 24,25$ |  | perspective (1) | ```present (7) 5:16;8:16;10:8; 12:18;36:22;38:22; 41:4``` |
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| $32: 22$ Media (2) | 13:21;37: |  |  |  |
| Media (2) | niche (1)$30: 22$ | $\begin{gathered} 12: 8 \\ \text { out (10) } \end{gathered}$ | Petitioners (1) | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { presenting } \\ 31: 14 ; 40: 8 \end{array}$ |
| $4: 7,8$ meet (1) |  |  | $6: 23$ |  |
| meet (1) $25: 16$ | nobody (1) $10: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:8;9:2;13:17,24; } \\ & 14: 7 ; 18: 4,7 ; 23: 21 \end{aligned}$ | phenomenon (1) 27:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { preservation (6) } \\ & 9: 18 ; 10: 13 ; 11: 23 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| might (7) | none (1)$5: 19$ | $\begin{gathered} 14: 1 ; 18: 4,7 ; 23 \\ 25: 24 ; 30: 19 \\ \text { outstanding (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { physical (6) } \\ & 7: 9 ; 8: 11,22 ; 12: 12 \\ & 15: 17 ; 21: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 12:2;20:9;25:7 |
| $12: 11 ; 15: 2 ; 19: 1$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { preserve (3) } \\ & 12: 11 ; 20: 21 ; 26: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $20: 24 ; 25: 16 ; 36: 1,2$ | nonpartisan (1) | $35: 15$ |  |  |
| mindful (1) | $\begin{gathered} 34: 15 \\ \text { November (1) } \end{gathered}$ | over | picked (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { preserved (3) } \\ 10: 23 ; 11: 7 ; 21: 7 \end{array}$ |
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| 27:6 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{9}{ }^{27} 16$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | pretend (1) |
| 9:16 |  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { pretty (1) } \\ 36: 9 \\ \text { price (1) } \end{gathered}$ | R | $\begin{gathered} 11: 24 ; 23: 1 \\ \text { requirements (2) } \\ 14: 8 ; 25: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Schiller (2) } \\ & 4: 20 ; 5: 1 \\ & \text { scope (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { show }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 9: 24 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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| 7:3;18:5;21:1 | rather (1) | requiring (3) | 13:18;31:3;37:14 | 24:25;38:21 |
| Pro (8) | 13:4 | 12:3,9;13:4 | second-choice (1) | significantly (1) |
| 9:9;15:5;17:13; | reading (1) | reservations (1) | 9:8 | 37:1 |
| 25:9,15,22;34:15; | $31: 4$ | 36:13 | Secretary (15) | simply (2) |
| 35:21 | ready (1) | resolve (3) | 4:11,18;5:6;6:24; $7 \cdot 1215,10 \cdot 8 \cdot 1 \cdot 9 \cdot 2$. | 8:20;18:16 |
| probably (2) | 40:6 | 14:16;15:3;39:15 | $7: 12,15,19 ; 8: 1 ; 9: 2$ $17 \cdot 5 \cdot 25 \cdot 4 \cdot 31 \cdot 7 \cdot 34 \cdot 9$. | situation (1) |
| procedures (1) | real (1) $28: 14$ | $28: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 5 ; 25: 4 ; 31: 7 ; 34: 9 ; \\ & 36 \cdot 10 \cdot 40 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20: 1 \\ \operatorname{six}(1) \end{array}$ |
| 27:5 | really (2) | respect (4) | secure (6) | 36:19 |
| proceed (1) | 30:21;39:16 | 10:17;17:11;31:5; | 8:11;16:23;17:1; | size (1) |
| 40:18 <br> proceedings (2) | reason (1) | 39:3 <br> respectfully (1) | 24:3;33:15;37:5 | $24: 19$ <br> software (1) |
| $27: 15 ; 41: 7$ | $12: 8$ reasons | $13: 14$ | $32: 12 ; 39: 19$ | $20: 18$ |
| proffers (1) | reasons 34 | Respondent (1) | securing (1) | somebody (1) |
| 21:25 | recent (1) | 6:25 | 32:16 | 18:10 |
| proof (1) | 7:13 | response (2) | securities (1) | sorry (9) |
| $27: 16$ proper (1) | recognized (1) | $5: 18 ; 26: 4$ | $15: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 22 ; 17: 22 ; 23: 7 ; \\ & 28: 10: 29: 8: 32: 2: \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { proper (1) } \\ 38: 18 \end{gathered}$ | 7:11 <br> recommendation (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reviewing (1) } \\ & 14: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { security (9) } \\ 7: 7,10,22 ; 9: 18 ; \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 10 ; 29: 8 ; 32: 2 ; \\ & 34: 1 ; 38: 4 ; 39: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| properly (1) | 15:24 | Right (6) | 11:18;14:12;15:18; | sort (3) |
| 21:7 | recommended (1) | 15:7;16:16;22:3; | 31:6;34:13 | 12:1,15;36:13 |
| proposed (7) | 14:2 | 25:25;32:20;40:6 | seeing (2) | sorts (2) |
| 7:14;9:3;14:18,20; | record (1) | rigorous (1) | 35:9;41:5 | 10:13;11:1 |
| 15:13;24:15;35:19 | 18:12 | 27:24 | seeking (1) | sounded (1) |
| proposing (3) | recording (1) | risk (1) | 35:22 | 6:7 |
| 15:5,11;24:15 | $11: 4$ | 27:8 | seem (1) | space (1) |
| protect (1) | refined (1) | RITCHEY (3) | 36:8 | 17:4 |
| 16:2 | 21:5 | 4:1,9;5:14 | seeming (1) | speak (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { provide (1) } \\ 22: 23 \end{gathered}$ | regard (3) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Robert (3) } \\ 4: 19 ; 7: 25 ; 25: \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19: 10 \\ \text { seems (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:11 } \\ \text { special (2) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Pudlin (2) | regarding (3) | role (1) | 19:5;23:13 | 19:6;27:12 |
| 4:20;5:1 | $12: 2 ; 27: 2 ; 31: 14$ | 12:10 | Segal (2) | specialized (3) |
| purpose (4) | rejected (1) | room (2) | 4:20,25 | 11:16;12:3,9 |
| 8:10;23:22,23; |  | 9:23;24:18 | select (1) | specializes (2) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 31:17 } \\ \text { purposes (4) } \end{gathered}$ | relate (1) | Rooney (2) | 18:16 | 21:17,21 |
|  |  | 5:9,13 | selected (1) | specific (4) |
| 29:5;30:10;36:1, | relevant (3) | rule (1) | 14:22 | 8:18;19:1;20:1; |
| put (7) | relying (1) | $38: 1$ ruling (3) | sensitive (5) | 31:6 specifications (1) |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ruling (3) } \\ 36: 3 ; 38: 10,12 \end{array}$ | 21:4;22:7;24:24; 30:9;34:22 | specifications (1) 19:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31: 21 ; 33: 4 ; 40: 12 \\ & \text { Putting (2) } \\ & 15: 10 ; 39: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { remarks }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 37: 23 \end{gathered}$ | 36.3,38.10,12 | separate (1) | specifics (1) |
|  |  | S | 20:7 | 17:17 |
|  | remotely (1) |  | separately (1) | spend (1) |
| Q | 35:23 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { sare }(1) \\ 11: 25 \end{array}$ | $4: 22$ | 39:9 |
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