	1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
3	WESTERN DIVISION
4	
5	ACLU of Tennessee, Inc.,
6	Plaintiff,
7	vs. NO. 2:17-cv-02120
8	City of Memphis, Tennessee,
9	Defendant.
10	
11	
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	NON-JURY TRIAL
15	VOLUME I
16	
17	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JON P. MCCALLA, JUDGE
18	
19	MONDAY
20	20TH OF AUGUST, 2018
21	
22	
23	
24	LISA J. MAYO, CRR, RMR OFFICIAL REPORTER
25	FOURTH FLOOR FEDERAL BUILDING MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE 38103

2 APPEARANCES 1 2 3 4 5 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff: 6 THOMAS HAUSER CASTELLI AMANDA STRICKLAND FLOYD 7 American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Tennessee 8 210 25th Avenue N. Suite 1000 Nashville, TN 37212 9 (615) 320-7142 10 11 12 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant: 13 BUCKNER WELLFORD JENNIE VEE SILK 14 LAWRENCE LAURENZI R. MARK GLOVER 15 Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz 165 Madison Avenue, Suite 2000 16 Memphis, TN 38103 (901) 526-6000 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

WITNESS INDEX WITNESS_ PAGE LINE HEDY WEINBERG Direct Examination By Mr. Castelli Cross-Examination By Ms. Silk Redirect Examination By Mr. Castelli TIMOTHY REYNOLDS Direct Examination By Ms. Floyd

EXHIBIT INDEX

4

Τ	EXHIBITINDEX					
2	EXHIBIT_		PAGE	LINE		
3						
4	1	ACLU Charter September 18, 1968	43	9		
5	2	BY-LAWS OF THE ACLU of TENNESSEE, INC. (Revised March 1973)	46	14		
6 7	3	Agenda and Minutes from the Board of Directors Meeting (October 4, 1975)	50	3		
8	4	Minutes ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. (December 11, 1971)	51	5		
	5	Complaint in Case No. 76-449	53	2		
9	6	ORDER, JUDGMENT, AND DECREE in Case No. 76-449 (Kendrick et al.)	57	2		
11	7	Memo to Board of Directors and Chapter Presidents, Tennessee ACLU from John W. Cleland	65	5		
12 13	8	(September 2, 1969) West TN ACLU Board of Directors Regular Meeting (May	76	12		
14	9	12, 1980) Minutes of Regular Meeting of Board of Directors of ACLU	77	15		
15 16	10	(January 15, 1979) Minutes of Board Meeting (January 10, 1983)	79	25		
17	11	West Tennessee ACLU Chapter Meeting Announcement for Thursday, February 11 at 7:00	83	9		
18 19	12	pm Memo to West Tennessee Chapter Board of Directors and Other Interested ACLU Members re:	84	8		
20	13	Next Board Meeting MEMORANDUM OF DIRECTOR'S MEETING (JUNE 2, 1988)	85	8		
22	14	Letter from Hedy Weinberg to Bruce Kramer (11 March 1991)	86	15		
23	15	Letter from Hedy Weinberg to Mary Gibson (27 July 1994)	87	15		
24	16	Agenda - Thursday, 14 March 1991 West Tennessee Chapter Reorganization Meeting	88	13		
25	17	Letter from Andrew C. Branham to Hedy M. Weinberg 20, 1994)	89	10		

Í	•			5	ı
				J	
1	18	Letter from Sheri Lipman to Hedy Weinberg (7 November	90	2	
2	19	1994) Memo from Hedy Weinberg to	90	19	
3		Sheri Lipman RE: Revitalizing the Memphis Chapter (24			
4	0.0	October 1994)	00		
5	20	Letter from Sheri Lipman to Andy Branham, et al. (December	92	1	
6	21	1, 1994) Letter from Sheri Lipman to	93	22	
7		Andy Branham, et al. (March 9, 1995)			
8	22	letter from Sheri Lipman to Andy Branham, et al. (January	94	12	
9		11, 1995)			
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

MONDAY

August 20, 2018

The trial of this case began on this date,

Monday, the 20th day of August, 2018, at 9:00 a.m., when

and where evidence was introduced and proceedings were had

as follows:

THE COURT: I will allow a brief opening statement on behalf of each side if they would like to do that. Of course, we start with the ACLU.

In connection with the subsequent request for potential modification of the consent decree, that issue has not been briefed by ACLU at this point in time, and I assume you're not ready to proceed on that?

MR. CASTELLI: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. And that's not an issue that we'll be going into. If it's necessary to go into that issue at appropriate time, then we'll do that at another proceeding. I think that probably covers what we needed to preliminarily. Of course, we have the pretrial order and it will govern the proceedings.

Counsel, any -- I think -- did you want to introduce anyone for the record today? I know that we went through and got a list earlier.

MR. CASTELLI: Certainly, Your Honor.

And is this picking up?

THE COURT: Make sure your mic is on, and it's actually close enough that it actually picks up.

MR. CASTELLI: That may be better.

THE COURT: That's an improvement.

MR. CASTELLI: Your Honor, my name is Tom

Castelli, representing the ACLU, the Plaintiff in this

action. I'm here with Mandy Floyd, who you'll be hearing

from today, and our executive director of the ACLU of

Tennessee, Ms. Hedy Weinberg, with us. And then Ms. Lauren

Davis will be helping us out throughout the proceedings

this week.

THE COURT: Certainly, that's fine.

MR. CASTELLI: And if I may approach, I'll deliver a brief opening.

THE COURT: That's fine. Why don't I let the other side do any introductions they need to at this time on the record, because I notice that Mr. McMullen came in. And you may want him to sit up here. I didn't want him to be relegated -- or anybody else that needs to sit up. In fact, if there's anybody else who needs to be up at the table or closer to the table for consultation, please let them get in those positions.

Looks like they're going to let you come up,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8 Mr. McMullen, if you want to, or whoever else needs to be here from the City, and anybody else that needs to be close for the ACLU to consult with, also. MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, can you hear me with the microphone? THE COURT: Oh, it's perfect. MR. WELLFORD: Buck Wellford for the City with Larry Laurenzi and Jenny Silk and Mark Glover as the attorneys. And we've got Mr. McMullen and Ms. Sink, if you'd permit both, as representatives of the City, the city attorney and the deputy city attorney. THE COURT: Absolutely. Certainly. MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, at what point do you invoke the Rule? THE COURT: Now, at this time. Before opening statements, it's usually invoked. The Rule is now called for. I think we talked about that earlier in pretrial. And so if there's anyone who is a witness in the proceeding, we'll let them go to the witness room and -hope everybody's been shown where that is.

(Whereupon the Rule was invoked and witnesses excused from courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. All right, Counsel. I think we are now set. Yes, sir.

MR. CASTELLI: Thank you, Your Honor.

So there's been quite a bit of briefing already in the case over the course of the almost two years this case has been going on. So I don't want to go into the extensive background too much, but to frame the case, Judge, as you're aware, this is a petition for contempt based on a consent decree that was entered in the case of -- that was filed in 1976. The decree was entered September 14th, 1978. And the decree centers around protecting the free speech rights under the First Amendment of the US Constitution of people protesting in the city of Memphis.

What sparked this particular petition was a list of persons left at City Hall who were -- where the list indicated they needed to have an escort at all times. Originally, this case was filed by four individual plaintiffs, who have since been dismissed. And my client, the ACLU of Tennessee, had moved to intervene and is the sole remaining plaintiff in the case at this point.

The Court has ruled on several of the issues already in this case, which has limited the issues that are before us for the next few days, and the Plaintiff has identified those issues as the following: Under this consent decree, whether the City is in contempt by learning about protest events through the monitoring of social media; whether the City operated an office, division,

bureau or unit for the purpose of gathering political intelligence; whether the City infiltrated a group for the purpose of gathering political intelligence; whether the City disseminated derogatory or false information for the purpose of political intelligence; whether the City photographed participants at a public protest for the purpose of chilling or affecting the First Amendment rights; whether the City contacted organizers about events for the purpose of chilling their First Amendment rights; whether there was a different standard for applications of protests through the City's permitting process than other events; and whether the City has substantially complied with the requirement that it refrain from disseminating information about -- or disseminating political intelligence to third parties.

All of those except for the last one, I believe the Plaintiff bears the burden with regard to substantial compliance; that's the City's burden to prove.

Through this case, the -- by agreement, the parties have kind of taken a snapshot of -- you know, we've got a 40-year-old decree here. So rather than -- in that 40 years of information, we've limited a snapshot that basically covers the time period before the escort list was discovered and then subsequently revised, which was May 2017.

So most of the evidence that the Court's going to hear throughout the next few days is going to be focused on the time period between probably the spring of 2016 through the spring of 2017. There may be information that is presented that's before or after that time period, but I just wanted the Court to be aware that most of the time we're focusing on that time period, during which there were several major protests, which the -- which occurred, including a protest at the zoo for the Greensward where arrests were made, a protest at an oil refinery here in Memphis, the Valero oil refinery where some arrests were made, the protest that blocked the bridge, the I-40 bridge, which was in July of 2016, and a protest at Graceland, which also resulted in some arrests.

There also -- the proof will discuss several other free speech events that occurred during this time period. So we're not just focusing on these kind of big flash spots, but also smaller events that occurred on private property, public property throughout the course of this about -- roughly year, year-and-a-half time period.

This is a -- as we have found over the course of the -- of discovery, a fairly document-intensive case. So we expect that the Court will see a lot of what -- in particular, the Memphis Police Department's intercommunications about some of these events and about

its gathering of political intelligence, and then how those -- those particular persons working for the police department operated and what type of information they were seeking and for what purpose.

And I think that's mainly what we're focusing on for the hearing today, since the Court has ruled that the City has -- or the police department did, indeed, gather political intelligence in violation of the decree. We hope to focus more on these issues of purpose or intent.

The witnesses that the Court will hear from at least from the Plaintiff -- and apologies, Your Honor, there is one more outstanding issue that we're going to hear, which involves the standing of the ACLU in Tennessee.

THE COURT: I was going to ask about that. That's an important one.

MR. CASTELLI: Yeah, it is.

So we're going to start with that first, Your Honor. We're going to call the Ms. Weinberg, who is the executive director of the ACLU of Tennessee and has been for the past 30 plus years, to basically explain how the organization has worked in her time period and then to facilitate discussion of some of these historical documents that the Court has, I believe, seen before, but we want to put in the record and discuss and be able to argue about their significance or their meaning, including minutes and

bylaws of the ACLU of Tennessee in its early stages in the early 1970s before the filing of this -- the original Kendrick case in 1976.

Then the Plaintiff will continue into our substantive witnesses, Your Honor. And we will plan to call Sergeant Tim Reynolds, who was a -- at the time period relevant was a detective with the Office of Homeland Security, which is the office that is central in this case as far as the collection of and dissemination of political intelligence.

Mr. Reynolds -- we believe that the proof will show that Mr. Reynolds was instrumental in collecting this, was kind of the key figure as far as researching, surveilling individuals and was the detective behind an undercover or covert Facebook account that surveilled protest groups or advocacy groups throughout Memphis.

We will then call Major Chandler, who at the time was the -- one of the supervisors. I believe he was a lieutenant over the Office of Homeland Security. So he worked with Detective Reynolds in some of these research or these surveillance endeavors in collecting the political intelligence. Often time, he was in a position of ordering it and sometimes responding to a third witness that we will call, who is Lieutenant Colonel Eddie Bass, who was the colonel in charge of the Office of Homeland Security

during the relevant period.

So the three of those witnesses will be kind of this unit that the Plaintiff is -- will prove was operating for the purposes of political intelligence.

Plaintiff will also call the director, Michael Rallings, to discuss his oversight of the entire police department, his involvement in political intelligence, policies that may have governed the Office of Homeland Security during this time period, and just generally his involvement in some of the political intelligence that was gathered and disseminated.

Plaintiff will then call Sergeant Bradley
Wilburn, who is or was at the time an officer with the Real
Time Crime Center, which will be another unit that will be
important in our discussion over the next few days. The
Real Time Crime Center, the Plaintiffs will show, worked
with the Office of Homeland Security in gathering this
political intelligence.

The Real Time Crime Center covers a whole host of different things across the City, including surveillance cameras that are disbursed across the City, but what I think our evidence is going to focus on is the part of the Real Time Crime Center that use what's called a social media collator, which is a computer program that will search through social media posts and -- based on key words

and pull them out. So Sergeant Wilburn is familiar with that, can explain what it is to the Court, how it works, and then how he used it in conjunction with the Office of Homeland Security in the gathering of political intelligence.

And then finally, as far as the witnesses from the Defendant, the Plaintiffs will call Mr. Aubrey Howard, who is in charge of the City's permitting department. And Mr. Howard is the final authority on whether somebody who seeks a permit will receive it, and so he can explain the -- how permitting works in the City and also go through some of the documents about what permits were granted during this time period and for whom.

And then finally, the Plaintiff will call a few of the citizens who were implicated in a lot of the materials that have already been submitted to the Court and will be submitted to the Court over the course of the next several days. We plan to call Mr. Paul Garner, Ms. Elaine Blanchard, Mr. Earle Fisher, and Mr. Keedran Franklin to discuss their interactions with the police, their knowledge of some of these surveillance techniques and how that affected their free speech.

After that and after the Defendant puts on their proof -- and as we discussed in the pretrial, we anticipate that Defendants will, through their cross-examinations of

especially the witnesses of -- that are employed by the City, will take care of a lot of -- we won't have a lot of overlap of calling the same witnesses. But after that, Your Honor, we'd ask the Court to consider the evidence and find the City -- that the City has violated the order on several other issues that I've covered in my opening, in addition to those that the Court's already determined in its order on our motion for summary judgment, and also find that the ACLU of Tennessee does, indeed -- is a proper party withstanding to enforce this decree. So thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Wellford?

MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, may I cross in front?

THE COURT: Oh, certainly. Certainly. No problem at all.

MR. WELLFORD: I assume the Court will tell me if you have trouble picking me up, but -- or if I'm getting too loud or too close.

THE COURT: It's not a problem. And, of course,

I can see everything on the screen. It's no problem for

me. Main thing is so that everyone in the room can hear

you.

MR. WELLFORD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, we will, of course, contest the issue of standing, which is still an open issue

for trial, and that will be appropriately one of the first issues addressed through witnesses.

We will be cross-examining. We won't be putting independent witnesses on, but we will be cross-examining the witnesses that are put on by the Plaintiff and probably presenting some of the documents that have been stipulated in the record, whether or not it's with cross-examination, and we'll address the standing issue at the close of Plaintiff's proof.

We acknowledge that the Court's ruling on
August 10 has resolved some issues, unless evidence comes
before the Court in this hearing that would give rise to
some kind of a motion to alter or amend the Court's
previous ruling. And our proof, as well, is going to be
heavily focused on the parts of the consent decree where
the motivations of the City of Memphis Police Department
personnel are at issue. And we think that's what the Court
has identified as a key issue that the Court wishes to hear
evidence about, and that's where our evidence will be
focused. We understand that the motion to modify is not
procedurally ripe.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WELLFORD: But in the context of demonstrating the motivation of some of the police officers, especially from the director down, there will be

evidence presented on best practices because part of the theme of the defense is that they were motivated by the things that -- same things that motivate other police departments throughout the country, and they were not motivated in their actions by the content of the political speech and associations that were being -- that were involved on the part of the individuals whose -- who we'll be studying through the course of the presentation.

The motivations of a number of the protesters who were involved in some of the events that are before the Court is appropriately an issue. The Court identified the motivations of those involved in alleged First Amendment activities as a relevant item, and we do think that that will be a relevant subject for us to cover and we intend to cover that as a part of our presentation.

Fundamentally, the most important thing that we wish to demonstrate in our evidence is that the police, from the director down, were attempting to enforce the laws of the state of Tennessee and the Code of Ordinances of the City of Memphis, and that that was a driving, motivating factor behind much of what they did.

And with respect to that, can you pull up the permit ordinance, please?

THE COURT: Well, we've already had a discussion about the permit in the materials.

MR. WELLFORD: We've had a discussion --

THE COURT: I don't know that it matters what the permit ordinance is. We can look at it, certainly.

Certainly not -- hope it's not the central part of the City's case.

MR. WELLFORD: Well, it is an important part of the City's case because Your Honor has touched --

THE COURT: Otherwise, the City could simply pass ordinances and prohibit all sorts of things that are protected by the United States Constitution.

MR. WELLFORD: We acknowledge that, Your Honor, but Your Honor's order has stated that simply because someone appears at a rally or engages in speech in an unpermitted ordinance doesn't categorically place it outside the context of the First Amendment. We understand that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WELLFORD: But the permit ordinance does go through a number of obligations on the part of the police director that we think are relevant to what motivated the police director and the police.

THE COURT: The question in so many ways in this case, not entirely, is whether or not the City violated the decree that it entered into in 1978, and so that has to be a focus of the inquiry. And to a degree, this could be

collateral and not central to the issues before the Court.

I'm not saying it's something we couldn't consider, but we want to stay focused as much as we can on the decree and what the City did. That's the best way to do it.

I'm not -- I'm not going to -- I'm going to let you have a lot of leeway, but it's not a policy decision as to whether or not the City had a good idea or in some respects was trying to do something that was for the benefit of the public. That's important, but the question is, in a significant degree, did the City comply with the order. And it was -- I remind everybody, it was a consent decree. The City agreed to do these things.

So we don't want to get -- it's certainly okay to submit materials and we're going to have them before the Court and they may be of some importance, but we don't want to move so far away from the central issue in the case that it's confusing.

So I'm certainly -- I know you want to present those things. I did focus in and talk about some of those things in the order, and I think it does matter, but we kind of have to see what's -- just like the standing issue, just like -- you're right about that. If the -- both -- both of you are right to focus on that because if the Plaintiff in the case doesn't have the ability to bring the case, then the case would be over.

So it's a couple of very key general propositions. So go ahead and certainly if you want to talk about it, but you be mindful that you can't ordinance your way out of the consent decree.

MR. WELLFORD: We understand that, and the purpose of showing the parts of the ordinances that we're going to spend time on is to demonstrate what was motivating, right or wrong, whether it was a correct motivation or not --

THE COURT: Sure, sure.

MR. WELLFORD: -- what was motivating the conduct of the director. And we'll -- but I get the Court's point. Believe me, I've been in here before and I understand that what you want to hear is where you want to focus the case.

THE COURT: Sure, absolutely.

MR. WELLFORD: But in terms of what we do intend to present to demonstrate the motivations of the director on down, would you please turn to the second page -- actually -- of the ordinance. Actually, let's go ahead and skip down to the third page with the director's obligations, the next page.

The ordinance does have an entire section that places responsibilities on the director, and then the following page.

THE COURT: Well, you know, it's just not about

the ordinance.

MR. WELLFORD: I understand, Your Honor. And if I could just -- if I could get it in the record, we'll move on.

THE COURT: No, no, no, that's perfectly fine. I have no problem at all. I just don't want to create confusion about the central focus of the case.

MR. WELLFORD: I understand.

We will be pointing to the specific sections of the permit ordinance that, on the next page, Page 4, require the police director, direct him -- not as a legal defense, but as a motivation to attempt to do certain things --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WELLFORD: -- that were, we think the evidence is going to show, active in his mind as his purpose, as his motivation, not as a legal defense. We acknowledge completely that the permanent ordinance is not a legal defense to compliance with the consent decree. So with that, we'll move on past the permanent ordinance.

Now, we also want to demonstrate -- can you pull up the timeline -- that what motivated not just the director but the Office of Homeland Security in particular, the Real Time Crime Center in particular and the police command staff and, indeed, the entire police department was

a concern over safety issues; and that meant public safety, that meant the safety of protesters themselves, that meant the safety of counter-protesters who increasingly, especially since Ferguson in 2014 where a lot of events occur where you have protesters and counter-protesters and when you have a lot of realtime activity associated with that, the motivations of the police to try to prevent these types of conflicts at the events were important. And we think the Court will hear evidence that that was their motivations, and so some of the events that were motivating them, we will briefly go through.

If we could start with the -- the events in Ferguson are well-known and will not be discussed in great detail, but one of the most significant things about Ferguson for law enforcement in Memphis and elsewhere was a tactic of shutting down thoroughfares and streets became something that the department was concerned about and wanted to prepare for.

In 2015, fueled in part by social media, a number of high profile events nationally, including the Freddie Gray incident in Baltimore, and in Memphis particularly, including the Darrius Stewart incident with a Memphis police officer and a shooting incident and the death of Darrius Stewart, crystallized within Memphis a lot of national events that were focused on the same sorts of

issues, often associated with the national or local chapter, Black Lives Matter, movements at the time which increased tension between law enforcement and protesters and counter-protestors. And the Darrius Stewart event brought that home in the Memphis community.

And what the Court will hear is that the Office of Homeland Security, which was up until about the time of the Darrius Stewart shooting, very much focused on the types of things you read about with the Federal Office of Homeland Security, working in conjunction with State and Federal agencies, very much focused on domestic, international terrorism-type issues. And it started to shift a bit in 2015, started to shift particularly after the Darrius Stewart shooting, so that the necessity of planning for and trying to avoid confrontations in often unpermitted and spontaneous events that were springing up around Memphis in the aftermath of the Darrius Stewart shooting became something that the Homeland Security's office started focusing more of its attention upon.

As we entered into 2016, what you're going to hear that is the Office of Homeland Security and Real Time Crime Center react to hot button issues of the time.

Situational awareness is a term that the Court will hear.

And during 2015 and much of 2016, much of that was associated with Black Lives Matter events and with the

aftermath in Memphis of the Darrius Stewart shooting, but it wasn't the only issue.

And, in fact, one of the earliest uses of an undercover social media account that's been referred to as a Bob Smith account was associated with protests at the Greensward in Overton park. And it generated quite a lot of activity and concern over disruption to public thoroughfares and access to zoo property and the police's concern about protecting the rights, private property rights and public property rights of the zoo and those who wanted to go in it, the rights of protesters, and to avoid confrontations between people who were parking in a place where lots of activists didn't think they should be parking.

And we will see that one of the first things that the Bob Smith account uncovered was an overt threat to hack into the computer system at the Memphis Zoo. And we think that the evidence on that point -- and we understand that the Court has found that it violated another section of the decree, failing to get written authorization from the director, but in terms of the motivation of the surveillance, the motivation of the followup that was done in connection with the hacking threat, none of it had to do with the content or the opinions themselves. It all was focused, as we believe the Court will see, on the clear

threat of a criminal violation that was about to be committed in the Memphis City Zoo's computer system.

Your Honor will end up hearing that as followup to the investigation, the zoo's systems were sound enough that they didn't believe that they had or could be hacked, but the concern was focused on that and not the content of the opinions.

Your Honor will also see that in 2016, which is a particularly fraught time and a lot of the evidence in this case will focus on events occurring in 2016, once again, situational awareness, the Pulse nightclub shooting was a very significant event in June of 2016. The Plaintiffs will spend a lot of time in this case talking about JIBs, Joint Intelligence Briefings. Your Honor has addressed them in your order already. We'll hear a lot about them.

The very first JIB that was published by the Office of Homeland Security and distributed within and certainly for a period of time without the police department didn't concern Black Lives Matter, didn't concern the Greensward. It was specifically caused, the catalyst for it was the Pulse nightclub shooting. And the very first event that's described in that JIB is a gay pride awareness series of events in Memphis in the immediate aftermath of that shooting and the importance of keeping everyone safe. So that was the motivating factor

between the JIBs.

July 2016 was probably the most tumultuous month, barring the assassination of Martin Luther King, that the Memphis Police Department has maybe faced in modern times, and it concerned events that were occurring in Memphis as well as elsewhere.

On July 5th, we had a high profile shooting incident involving a law enforcement encounter and an African-American man, Alton Sterling. In Baton Rouge in July 6th, there were violent protests following the deaths of another African-American man who was involved in an encounter with a Minnesota police officer.

And on July 7th, at a peaceful Black Lives Matter rally, and that's one of the points that you're going to hear, just because the organizers actually want a peaceful event, just because the vast majority of the people at the event are peaceful does not mean that terrible things can't happen at the event. And what happened in Dallas was a big concern with the Memphis Police Department in the aftermath of these other high profile events.

And then, of course, we are getting to the bridge, but there was another quite controversial event on July 10, 2016. It was a celebration of Nathan Bedford Forrest birthday. It was an annual celebration, and people would come in who had certain points of view that were not

popular with a lot of other people in Memphis concerning
Nathan Bedford Forrest. It was a permitted event, but it
nonetheless occasionally caused counter-protests, caused
disruption, and the Memphis City Police Department was
sufficiently concerned about it that they deployed
undercover agents to -- undercover operatives to watch what
was going on at that event.

By the way, Your Honor, although we understand the permit ordinance is not central to the case, I will point out that part of the series of tools that the permit ordinance provides the director is to deploy undercover officers in connection with events where the director reasonably anticipates disruptions to public safety.

Right or wrong, that's what they did and that was the motivation for what they did on July 10th. There was a particular concern that the people at that rally would come into contact with the people who were having a Black Lives Matter allowed -- it didn't require a permit, but it was permitted by FedEx Forum -- who were having a rally at the FedEx Forum. There was great concern that those two groups would come into contact with each other. They didn't, but there's a lot of social media traffic that contained overt threats that was being bandied about that that was a realistic possibility.

We will spend some time talking about the bridge

because it was a pivotal event in terms of the Memphis

Police Department. It was a wake-up call, tangible wake-up

call for the Memphis Police Department about danger to

infrastructure and the importance of protecting the City,

protecting the people involved in the protest from the

consequences of unlawful activity at events such as what

led to the bridge.

We have distilled about five hours of video in the evidence that we'll present to the Court in 28 minutes, but we do wish to have a two-minute spotlight right now, because it's an important focus of the case, on the events of the bridge and we would ask to play that.

THE COURT: It's not in evidence, and normally if you want to play it, it's an argument. It's going to be submitted as evidence and it can be considered as evidence. This is not argument.

MR. WELLFORD: Then we'll pass it by if Your Honor doesn't want to hear it.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, it's not that I don't want to. It relates to the fact of whether or not it's appropriate for opening statement.

MR. WELLFORD: It is in evidence. It's been stipulated that they are admissible. But, Your Honor, I don't -- I want to move on because we will see a broader version of this in the evidence.

THE COURT: It's not exactly a brief opening.

MR. WELLFORD: So we'll move on from the bridge incident.

Suffice it to say that it generated great concern within the department about similar events that were likely to occur and that were threatened to occur on social media and elsewhere in the days and weeks following.

Two days later, there was an unpermitted, spontaneous demonstration at Graceland, which shut down traffic, and arrests were made. Three days after the event, there was a nonpermitted protest on the grounds of the Commercial Appeal. And by the way, the evidence is going to be that Commercial Appeal was reaching out to the police department to make sure they were quite aware of that and --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WELLFORD: -- watch what was going on.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WELLFORD: We had reports of a National Day of Rage, which turned out to not be something that happened but were widely circulated nationally where locations including Memphis were identified by a group called Anonymous as having violent and disruptive events, and the police took it seriously here, as they took a lot of the threats that were being made.

One of the difficulties that the Memphis Police
Department had during this period of time is telling
unverified rumors from verified and important rumors. They
would get -- and the Court will hear it in evidence, people
from the DEA would send them during this time frame, we
have a reliable report of a man coming across from Arkansas
with an AK15 and he's going to exercise his Second
Amendment rights. And then we would have reports that were
unverified and turned out to not happen of, there's going
to be six shutdowns of streets at -- they would identify
the intersections around the city. And part of what the
Office of Homeland Security and Real Time Crime Center were
tasked to do was anticipate which of these were real and
which were unlikely to happen, and that was what was
motivating them at the time.

The week after the bridge incident, we had other high profile incidents involving shootings in Baton Rouge of police officers, which concerned the officers a great bit because they were concerned about their own personal safety.

There's a JIB that Your Honor will see from July 19 which references five different police shooting incidents in different parts of the country, which, once again, is what was a motivating factor behind what was of the most pressing concern for the department at the time,

safety of the public, sometimes safety of protesters as well as -- and definitely counter-protestors, and the safety of the officers themselves.

During this period of time, Your Honor will see evidence that the director actually was instructing the people within his department to wear their vests everywhere they went. There were firecrackers — fireworks that had been set up under officer's cars. These threats were real and tangible to the Memphis Police Department during this time frame.

THE COURT: Well, there's no question that there are many issues that the police department has to deal with. I don't think anybody in this -- is the ACLU saying that they don't have to deal appropriately with threats of violence? ACLU, are you going to speak up there?

MR. CASTELLI: No, that's not what we're saying, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does most of this have much to do with what we're talking about today?

MR. WELLFORD: Respectfully, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Excuse me. I didn't ask you that question.

MR. CASTELLI: Your Honor, the ACLU will take the position that this is not particularly relevant to our discussion today. We have not taken the position that the

City is not able, because of the decree, to investigate certain incidents or to provide public safety. Our focus is really more on incidents where the City's gathering of political intelligence had nothing to do with this public safety concern.

THE COURT: I don't think anybody's saying that the director or the department is not able to take appropriate steps to protect the public. No one is saying that. That's not a central issue in the case. I think we need to stay focused.

The environment in which things occur immediately, locally can be important. The fact that there are large national issues is less relating -- relevant to whether or not the City complied with the 1997 consent decree. I can't go back and say it enough times. It was a consent decree. It's an agreement between the City and interested parties, including the ACLU, if the ACLU is able to establish standing, to not engage in certain conduct, and this is not about some of the things that are being brought up.

I'm not saying it's not something we're not going to listen to, because we are, and it may be that it can be shown to have some relevance to the immediate situation here in the context of a consent decree. Maybe it can be, but it's a pretty big jump, and that's -- that's the

problem about discussing matters that happened in Missouri or -- and the tragedy in these situations in Dallas and Louisiana, but it's not central to the issues that we have to address.

I just don't -- I fear that we will be on a proceeding that is not a -- focused on legal matters.

MR. WELLFORD: And, Your Honor, we believe that Your Honor has identified the key legal issue in this case as whether the City was taking certain action -- one of the remaining issues, whether the City was taking certain actions for the purpose of political surveillance, and --

THE COURT: Right. And let's make it clear, there can be multiple reasons that entities engage in conduct. You might do it to engage in political surveillance. You might also do it to do something else, to attempt to preserve public safety. Public safety is important, but we need to stay -- very important, but we need to focus a little bit more; otherwise, we will -- we lose sight of why we're here, and that's what I'm worried about.

MR. WELLFORD: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We wouldn't be here if the City had not signed a consent decree. We wouldn't be here in this case in this context.

MR. WELLFORD: I'm going to move on because --

based on the Court's admonition, we will attempt to focus our evidence on what the motivating factors behind the Memphis police officers and the executive level, Memphis police --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WELLFORD: -- the director included, were accused of doing, and we will demonstrate to the Court that they were not motivated at all by political intelligence.

They were heavily motivated by these other things that I am bringing up.

Let's move on to another -- so we'll play this in evidence. What I just skipped through was, you will hear that there are videos of people in the weeks and months following the event overtly threatening to take back the bridge. The department's concern over the bridge specifically and other valuable parts of infrastructure was a major motivating factor behind everything they were doing during this time frame. So I'll leave it at that and say that the evidence will demonstrate that.

THE COURT: And you're right, that's different from talking about Dallas or Ferguson or someone else.

MR. WELLFORD: And then with respect to the die-in on Mayor Strickland's lawn and the AOA where the Court -- we understand that -- and a lot of the evidence is pre-permitted by the Court's order in terms of whether

that's political intelligence, but apparently the ACLU still takes the position that the inclusion of the AOA list by the chief of the mayor's security for a period of time at the part of a security list at City Hall was motivated for purposes of political intelligence and motivated by a desire to intimidate and chill, and we think the complete opposite is true.

It was motivated, frankly, by a desire to protect the mayor and motivated by a desire to keep people from coming back and trespassing on his private property. It morphed into something that, frankly, we think the evidence is going to demonstrate it was not intended to be. And once that became obvious, that it had morphed into something it wasn't intended to be, they pulled it off. They pulled it back.

And the most pertinent fact is that during the entire period of time, I think it was a six-week period that the AOA list was included with a security list at City Hall, no one was ever escorted the entire period of time, which we think demonstrates that the motivation of the department was not to chill, not to intimidate and not to do anything for the purpose of political intelligence.

2017, events started occurring that were unrelated to the -- a lot of the protests in 2016, but they were overt threats to infrastructure. The Valero Refinery

arrests, and the Court will see the photographs, the Court will see the video, was an openly unlawful activity that concerned an important part of Memphis infrastructure, and the City took it seriously. The director was personally involved, directed an investigation into it, and the motivations behind that had nothing to do with the content of the political opinions that were being expressed.

What Your Honor is going to hear -- this is an example of -- this is not a modification of the consent decree, but one of the pieces of evidence that the Court's going to hear with the removal of the Nathan Bedford Forrest statue, that was another high profile event where violence was anticipated, there was lots of chatter on social media about people coming to town, what's going to happen to them, what's going to happen to counter-protestors who wish to confront them, what's going to happen to the public.

And the City took its playbook, right or wrong, the City took its playbook on how to address that situation from the Charlottesville incident and a very thorough report that was prepared that sort of summarized what went right, what went wrong in Charlottesville. And the City was motivated to try to learn from that and try to protect public order, not political intelligence in any manner or respect whatsoever.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Some of the evidence that the Court is going to see is quite alarming with respect to the blow-back from that event, from the -- and you'll see the evidence of it. Some of it is extremely strong language about threats to the mayor, but we will also see that some of the evidence that's coming forth on social media is more ambiguous. And part of what the Court will hear is that the department is attempting, even as we speak, to react to the Court's order. The City is attempting to develop plans to implement an effective system that can try to keep its citizens safe while complying with the Court's order because it takes it seriously. THE COURT: A consent order between the City and the ACLU. MR. WELLFORD: You're correct, and I need to withdraw that. THE COURT: I think suggesting that the Court ordered that is simply not correct. MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, I misspoke. misspoke. THE COURT: Well, good. MR. WELLFORD: The Court's interpretation of the consent decree is what the City's working with right now. THE COURT: You entered the consent decree, Mr. Wellford.

MR. WELLFORD: And the Court's going to hear how
we are attempting to comply with it right now. At the end
of the case --

THE COURT: If you enter into an agreement with a party to do certain things and not do certain things, that's important.

MR. WELLFORD: It is.

THE COURT: And the City -- that's the question.

It's not -- nobody's -- nobody forced the City to sign that document. The City did it on its own. And everyone in America would expect the City to live up to what it agreed to do, and that's all that's being asked.

Now, I'm not sure it's going to come out, but the mischaracterization of what occurred might be confusing to others, and we don't want to do that. We want to be straightforward and honest about why we're here.

MR. WELLFORD: At the end of the presentation, at the end of the evidence, one of the things that the Court's going to be asked to find is whether one of the remedies for what you've already found or may find, depending upon the evidence presented at the hearing, is whether a monitor is going to be required.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WELLFORD: And so we are going to be presenting evidence to demonstrate that the City takes its

responsibility seriously, the City is discussing and putting into place plans that we believe would comply with the Court -- with the consent decree, and that we have moved to modify it and we will deal with that separately, but unless and until it is modified, the City understands that it is bound by the order, needs to follow the order, and we believe --

THE COURT: Bound by the consent decree. We're going to use the word "consent decree." Is that okay?

MR. WELLFORD: Well, I meant the consent decree. The consent decree. And that the City intends to follow it and that there's not going to be a need for the Court to appoint a monitor to ensure that the City complies with it prospectively.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WELLFORD: That's going to essentially be our evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think we're all set now. And, Mr. Castelli, I think you need to call your first witness.

MR. CASTELLI: Thank you, Your Honor. Plaintiff calls Ms. Hedy Weinberg.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG

41

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

17

18

20

HEDY WEINERG,

was called as a witness and having first been duly sworn testified as follows:

THE COURT: We'll try to follow the same procedure with every witness every time, which is, for the sake of the reporter, every time asking the name and the spelling of the name so that we're comfortable that we have it the way it should be in the record.

MR. CASTELLI: Certainly.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CASTELLI:

- Q. Could you state your name and spell your name for the record, please?
 - A. Sure. Hedy Weinberg, H-E-D-Y, W-E-I-N-B-E-R-G.
- 16 Q. Thank you.
 - Ms. Weinberg, what is your position with the ACLU of Tennessee?
- 19 A. I'm the executive director of the ACLU of Tennessee.
 - Q. How long have you held that position?
- 21 A. September 8th, 1984.
- Q. And can you explain kind of your obligations and duty
- as executive director?
- A. Sure. I am responsible for the overall operation of the ACLU of Tennessee, and that involves oversight of the

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG

Liberties Union, Inc. and the Middle Tennessee Civil

1 Liberties Union, Inc. would merge and to become the ACLU of

2 Tennessee, and that in the future, at a future time, the

3 West Tennessee Civil Liberties, Inc. would, in fact, join

and become part of the statewide organization.

- 5 Q. Can you describe just the relationship between the --
- 6 the term is used here, affiliate, with the ACLU with the
- 7 national organization?

- 8 A. Yeah, the national organization is the umbrella
- 9 organization currently for our statewide affiliate, and
- 10 back then, the same -- it was the same. So that if there
- was a local chapter, branch, however they were referred to,
- 12 and it was loosely identified different ways, the national
- 13 ACLU was in relationship -- was in partnership with
- 14 those -- with those entities.
- Q. Can you explain to the Court what a chapter is?
- 16 A. When I -- and I'm going to speak from my knowledge,
- which is in 1984 when I came to the ACLU as ED, there were
- about five chapters; one in the Memphis area, one in the
- 19 Chattanooga area, a Knoxville chapter, an Oak Ridge chapter
- and a Chattanooga chapter. And they were loosely -- loose
- 21 networks of individuals located in those communities who
- 22 were committed to ensuring that the promises of the Bill of
- 23 Rights were protected in their communities.
- 24 Q. And when you came to the ACLU, how were chapters
- 25 formed?

1 The ones I just identified were actually formed prior 2 to my coming. If a community of people in a location 3 wanted to build a chapter, they would come to the ACLU of Tennessee. They needed approval. They couldn't just sort 4 of formally organize. 5 6 And what would the approval -- what would determine or 7 what would tell you or the ACLU what was necessary to form 8 a chapter? There was probably a lot of informal 9 10 conversation that took place before so that there was a 11 relationship that had already been developed, but the group 12 would have to prepare bylaws and -- which would describe 13 what their mission was and how they related to the statewide organization. 14 Okay. This might be quicker. I can put this document 15 16 that is -- Ms. Weinberg, if you can -- let's see. Pull it 17 down there. Do you recognize this document that I've put 18 on your monitor? 19 MS. SILK: Your Honor, what -- we need to know 20 what the exhibit is. 21 THE COURT: Right, exactly. 22 MR. CASTELLI: I'm sorry. It's Exhibit --23 THE COURT: It will be Exhibit 2; is that 24 correct?

MR. CASTELLI: We'll mark this -- yes, we'd ask

As I recall, the board was composed of chapter

representatives, and those -- the number of representatives was based on the size of the membership at the time.

So I mean, again, relating to when I joined, there were probably nine chapter representatives, there were, from Memphis and there were actually nine from -- eight or nine from Nashville. Few were from Knoxville, Oak Ridge, and Chattanooga.

- Q. And turning to the next page here at the bottom of the page, can you identify Article 8 there for the record?
- A. Okay. Article 8? Oh yes. That's very clear and, you know, states that the chapters are chartered by the ACLU of Tennessee board of directors where there's an interest and a commitment to adhering to the mission of the organization, and they presented bylaws to ensure that they're, you know, adhering to that commitment.

And again, that the chapter's Section 2 speaks about a chapter being disbanded, either being revoked for cause or absence of activity.

- Q. And then that -- does that article continue on to the second page, discussing the chapters?
- A. I'm sorry, which one?
- Q. On the -- on the next page there at the top of -- is that the continuation of sections about chapters?
 - A. Yeah. Again, making it very clear, the chapters only exist because they're part of the ACLU of Tennessee, and

the bylaws which formalize their establishment have to be approved by the board of directors of the ACLU of Tennessee.

There's additional conversation about requiring proposed programs, activities and a budget that has to be and had to be at the time submitted to the ACLU of Tennessee in order for the ACLU of Tennessee to provide funds to support those programs.

Yeah, the Section 5, we -- again, this is before my time, but it was the same conversation that took place besides just chapters, you know, based on members that the student -- there could be student chapters, as well, and again, that the ACLU of Tennessee had to formalize and charter those chapters.

- Q. And so those would be chapters at universities, student chapters?
- A. Exactly.

- Q. Okay. As far as in the bylaws from 1973, can you read Article 4 there about the -- who is a member of the ACLU of Tennessee?
 - A. All members in good standing of the American Civil
 Liberties Union, Inc. resident within the state of
 Tennessee shall be deemed members of the ACLU of Tennessee.
 - Q. So a member of the national organization that is within a resident of the entire state of Tennessee,

- wherever they're found in Tennessee, would automatically become a member of the ACLU of Tennessee?
 - A. Exactly. And that's right today. If you're a member of the ACLU of -- ACLU, you automatically become a member of the affiliate in the state with which you reside --
- 7 Q. And here's an exhibit.

within which you reside.

Speaking of today, are there chapters of the ACLU of Tennessee currently?

- A. There are no chapters. That's a model that's no longer being used across the country. There are just a couple affiliates that still have chapters remaining, but there's not a chapter structure that is part of the ACLU of Tennessee.
- Q. And were you involved in phasing out that structure for ACLU of Tennessee?
- A. Yes. Those chapters were phased out. I think probably by 2000, there were no longer chapters.
- MR. CASTELLI: I'm going to ask to mark this as Exhibit 3.
 - THE COURT: Marked and received. Announce what it is very briefly.
- MR. CASTELLI: Sure. Your Honor, these are minutes from 1975 of the board of directors meeting.
- THE COURT: That's fine. That's no problem.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG 50 1 Minutes 1975. 2 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 3 marked as Exhibit Number 3.) BY MR. CASTELLI: 4 And, Ms. Weinberg, do you recognize these -- this 5 6 document that I put on the screen? 7 Α. Yes. That's an agenda from a meeting in the fall of 1975, the ACLU of Tennessee board of directors. 8 Okay. And so then the second page, is that -- what is 9 10 that? And that's the list of board members at the time. 11 Α. 12 as you can see, they come from across the state. There was a commitment to always have members from across the state 13 14 compose the ACLU of Tennessee board of directors. So there 15 were a list of various chapters representatives. 16 And the first chapter listed, Ms. Weinberg, is which Q. 17 one? 18 The West Tennessee chapter. Α. 19 Okay. And what was the date at the top of the Q. 20 minutes? 21 October 4, 1975. Α. 22 Q. And again, obviously this is a copy, but are the 23 original minutes -- where are they maintained?

Yes. They sit in our office in a very old folder.

24

25

Α.

Q.

Thank you.

25

Α.

process; is that correct?

That's correct.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG 52 1 Okay. 2 But we have members across the state, so you didn't 3 have to be affiliated necessarily. Okay. So if you weren't a member or affiliated with a 4 5 chapter, you could still be a member of the ACLU of 6 Tennessee? 7 A. Exactly. 8 THE COURT: Can you go down to the last page of the minutes? 9 10 MR. CASTELLI: Your Honor, I'm sorry? 11 **THE COURT:** The last page of the minutes? 12 Go ahead. I'm not sure if there's a reference to the ACLU West Tennessee or not, not necessarily on the last 13 page. I was just -- I don't have the document in front of 14 15 me. 16 MR. CASTELLI: I don't believe there is in this 17 document, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. CASTELLI: And we'll mark this document as 20 Exhibit Number 5. 21 THE COURT: Certainly, marked and received as 5. 22 Try to announce briefly what it is. 23 MR. CASTELLI: Which is the complaint to the 24 Kendrick V. Chandler case. 25 THE COURT: No problem.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG

- 1 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 2 marked as Exhibit Number 5.)
- 3 BY MR. CASTELLI:
- Q. Ms. Weinberg, do you recognize the document that I've
- 5 put on the screen?
- 6 A. I do.
- 7 Q. What is it?
- 8 A. It's the complaint from the Kendrick case.
- 9 Q. Were you aware of this case when you became executive
- 10 director?
- 11 A. I'm pretty sure we discussed it and I learned about it
- 12 possibly even at the interview. Bruce Kramer was one of
- 13 the people who interviewed me for the position, and this
- 14 always stood out as an important case, probably starting --
- 15 the Scopes case and this case were important cases to the
- 16 ACLU.
- 17 Q. Of course, ACLU of Tennessee did not exist when the
- 18 Scopes case was tried.
- 19 A. It did not. I apologize.
- 20 Q. Turning to the section here about the parties in the
- case, could you read for the record the beginning of
- 22 | Paragraph C there?
- 23 A. Sure. The American Civil Liberties Union of West
- 24 Tennessee, Inc. is a chapter of the American Civil
- 25 Liberties Union of Tennessee, Inc., which is an affiliate

MS. SILK: Good morning, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Good morning.

1 <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>

BY MS. SILK:

2

- Q. Good morning, Ms. Weinberg.
- 4 A. Good morning.
- 5 Q. Ms. Weinberg, you were not affiliated with the ACLU of
- 6 Tennessee in 1976 when the Kendrick complaint was filed,
- 7 were you?
- 8 A. I was not.
- 9 Q. And you were not affiliated with the ACLU of Tennessee
- when the Kendrick consent decree was entered in 1978, were
- 11 you?
- 12 A. I was not.
- Q. So you have no personal knowledge of the Plaintiff or
- 14 the group of people that made up the Plaintiff that was the
- party to the 1978 Kendrick consent decree, do you?
- 16 A. I know Mr. Kendrick. I haven't seen him for many,
- many years, but he was a colleague, because he left
- 18 Tennessee and went to another affiliate.
- 19 Q. Okay, but I should have been more clear. You don't
- 20 have any personal knowledge of the entity that was also a
- 21 Plaintiff of the 1978 Kendrick consent decree, the American
- 22 | Civil Liberties in West Tennessee, Inc.? I believe you
- 23 stated that earlier. Is that correct?
- 24 A. I don't -- I only know the West Tennessee Chapter of
- 25 the ACLU of Tennessee.

56

1 Okay. So it's your position that the Plaintiff in the 2 Kendrick case was the West Tennessee Chapter; is that 3 correct? My understanding was that it was the ACLU of Tennessee 4 because typically -- I mean, the West Tennessee Chapter was 5 6 very engaged in it and part of it, but I see them as one 7 entity because the West Tennessee Chapter doesn't exist without the ACLU of Tennessee. 8 Let's take a look at the Kendrick consent decree 9 10 itself. This is known as Plaintiff's Trial Order 182. 11 THE COURT: Do you want to just mark one so you can -- so you can display it? Will that be easier? Might 12 13 be easier. I know it's part of the record, but... 14 MS. SILK: I'm sorry? THE COURT: Why don't we mark one --15 16 MS. SILK: Okay. 17 THE COURT: -- so that everybody can use the same 18 document. 19 MS. SILK: Okay. Let's mark the --20 THE COURT: Right. 21 MS. SILK: Let's mark the Kendrick --22 THE COURT: That will be 6. 23 MS. SILK: Number 6. 24 THE COURT: No problem. That way, you can show

it and be -- everybody can use the same document.

```
CROSS-EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG
                                                          57
                 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
 1
 2
       marked as Exhibit Number 6.)
 3
                 THE COURT: Okay. That will be marked as 6, and
       that's the consent decree ACLU.
 4
 5
    BY MS. SILK:
 6
            Ms. Weinberg, is the ACLU of Tennessee listed as a
       Q.
 7
       party in the heading of the 1978 consent decree?
 8
       Α.
            In the heading -- well, it says et al.
                 THE COURT: Why don't you put it up? I mean,
 9
10
       that's the idea of putting it on the screen.
11
                 MS. SILK: I'm sorry. Oh, I thought he was going
12
       to pull it up.
                 THE COURT: Just lay it down. I think you've got
13
14
       it. You're in good shape. That's very easy. Sure.
15
                 MS. SILK: Okay.
16
     BY MS. SILK:
17
       0.
            So is the ACLU of Tennessee listed here as a party?
            The highlighted part or the heading?
18
       Α.
19
                 THE COURT: Well, let's use the one that's in the
20
       evidence and not the one on the screen, because it has
21
      highlighting and that constitutes an argument. So we won't
22
      be using that.
23
                 MS. SILK: Okay.
24
    BY MS. SILK:
            So do you see on this page in the first paragraph or
25
```

Okay. You don't know when that entity was formed, do Q. you?

24

25

My understanding was there was never an American Civil

- 1 Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc. It was the
- 2 American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, Inc.
- 3 Q. But you weren't affiliated with the ACLU of Tennessee
- 4 at this time, so you wouldn't necessarily have any
- 5 knowledge of this entity, the American Civil Liberties
- 6 Union of West Tennessee, Inc., would you?
- 7 A. I understand what you're saying. There's always been
- 8 an understanding that the American Civil Liberties Union of
- 9 Tennessee, when it was incorporated, was a statewide
- 10 organization that included whatever past organizations had
- 11 been engaged in ACLU work in the state.
- 12 Q. So you testified earlier that to become a chapter of
- 13 the American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, Inc., that
- 14 you would have had to have bylaws; is that correct, the
- chapter would have had to have bylaws?
- 16 A. That was the requirement and what we assumed happened
- 17 at the time.
- 18 Q. And you have not and cannot provide any documents
- 19 reflecting the creation of the American Civil Liberties
- 20 Union of West Tennessee, Inc. as a chapter of the ACLU of
- 21 Tennessee, Inc., can you?
- 22 A. No. That's -- I don't know that it existed with that
- 23 name.
- Q. Okay. Can you -- you can't provide any bylaws of a
- 25 West Tennessee Chapter that existed during the time of the

Kendrick consent decree or complaint, can you?

Civil Liberties Union of West Tennessee, Inc.

A. I don't recall any.

Q. Well, I will submit to you that in response to the request for production, the ACLU of Tennessee supplied 561 pages of documents, none of which contained the bylaws of the West Tennessee Chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee, nor did they include the bylaws of the Plaintiff, American

So I'm asking, I guess, one last time, if you have any documentation at all that the -- either of these two entities' bylaws were ever formally adopted, pursuant to your own bylaws, to become an official chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc.

- A. Again, as you said, I wasn't there then. And sometimes what is officially required doesn't always -- because it was a very informal network. And so whether or not they were ever shared with the board, I don't know.
- Q. Okay. Let's take a look at Exhibit 4 again. So your attorney noted to the Court that in 1971, that the bylaws for the Upper East Tennessee Chapter had been adopted and approved. So there was obviously some sort of recording of the type of when this event would occur, correct?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Do you have any minutes in your possession, custody or control that evidence when the bylaws for the West

- 1 Tennessee Chapter were ever adopted and approved?
- 2 A. If they were not submitted to you, we must not have
- 3 them.
- 4 | Q. Please look at Exhibit 3. I'm going to go to Page 2.
- 5 Exhibit 3 is the minutes of the meeting of the American
- 6 Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee from October 4th, 1975.
- 7 And if you go down to the bottom here, you can see that the
- 8 Middle Tennessee Chapter distributed copies of the bylaws
- 9 of the Middle Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. and
- 10 they were approved. Do you see that there?
- 11 A. I do.
- 12 Q. So in 1971, you have minutes showing that the East --
- the Upper East Tennessee Chapter's bylaws were approved.
- 14 And then four years later, you see that the Middle
- 15 Tennessee Chapter's bylaws were approved. But yet, we
- 16 don't have any bylaws or minutes showing that the West
- 17 Tennessee Chapter's bylaws were ever approved; is that
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. Let's talk for a second about the entity that your
- 21 attorney mentioned to you, the West Tennessee Civil
- 22 Liberties Union, Inc. Now, you testified that you don't
- 23 have any personal knowledge of that entity; is that
- 24 correct?
- 25 A. Correct.

1 MS. SILK: So if you could pull up stipulated 2 fact Number 9 and 12, Matt, please.

BY MS. SILK:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

- Q. So these are stipulated facts from the pretrial order that governed this hearing. And you can see here that the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. has stipulated that the entity known as West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. existed in 1967, and that if we go to Number 12, which is above it, that that entity was dissolved as a corporate entity in 1983.
- A. Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. Do you see that?
- So it's been stipulated that the West Tennessee Civil
 Liberties Union, Inc. was operating from 1967 until 1983,
 correct?
 - A. When you say operating, I'm not sure what you mean. I don't --
 - Q. Well, it existed as a corporate entity.
- 19 A. It existed, uh-huh.
- Q. And then your position is that there's also a second entity known as the West Tennessee Chapter, unrelated to this entity, that was also operating during this same time
- 23 frame; is that correct?
- A. The West Tennessee Chapter was engaged with the ACLU of Tennessee. I don't know that the West Tennessee Civil

- 1 Liberties Union, Inc. was engaged in activity during this 2 time period after 1968.
 - Q. But you acknowledge that it existed as a corporate --
- 4 A. It says that here, yes.

- 5 Q. So since you've stipulated that the West Tennessee
- 6 | Civil Liberties Union, Inc. existed from '67 to 1983 but
- 7 | now you're asserting that a different entity that was a
- 8 party to the consent decree, that that was -- you're saying
- 9 it was the West Tennessee Chapter although the document
- 10 says American Civil Liberties Union of West Tennessee,
- 11 Inc., it follows that in the '70s, there were clearly at
- 12 least two groups of people who were acting in the name and
- the spirit of the ACLU in West Tennessee; is that correct?
- 14 A. I just don't know that.
- Q. But you can -- but you've stipulated that the West
- 16 Tennessee Civil Liberties Union existed and then you've
- 17 asserted that you had your own chapter.
- 18 A. Again, I wasn't here, so I can't speak to what was
- actively happening. I see on what paper what you're
- 20 referencing.
- 21 Q. Understood.
- 22 So if, indeed, the West Tennessee Civil Liberties
- 23 Union, Inc. was at one time a chapter of the ACLU or
- operating in the name of the ACLU but it never became a
- 25 part of the ACLU of Tennessee, it's possible, isn't it,

CROSS-EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG 64 that the American Civil Liberties Union in West Tennessee, 1 2 Inc., which was a party to the Kendrick decree, also chose 3 to never become an official chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee? 4 I don't think that's correct because if you look at 5 6 the signed order and Jack Novac, who's part of the American 7 Civil Liberties Union Foundation, their relationship with the ACLU of Tennessee was such that that's why the ACLU of 8 9 Tennessee was, in fact, a party to this case. Does that 10 make sense? 11 It does -- I understand what you're saying, but the Q. Plaintiff that is listed on the consent decree is not Jack 12 Novac; is that correct? 13 Correct. He's not the Plaintiff. He's the attorney 14 15 who would have been engaging with Mr. Kramer and Mr. Herder 16 on behalf of the ACLU of Tennessee. 17 MS. SILK: I would like to mark Plaintiff's Trial 18 Number 195 as the next exhibit. 19 THE COURT: We don't have -- we're just going to call them Exhibit 7. How is that? 20 21 MS. SILK: Okay. 22 THE COURT: And just identify the document versus 23

the other number unless it -- it's okay to do it, but

MS. SILK: Understood.

it's a -- we want to avoid confusion if we can.

24

THE COURT: No, that's fine. And you can display that when you're ready. And, of course, we'll use the overhead and not the computer.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 7.)

BY MS. SILK:

Q. At the time of the Kendrick decree in --

THE COURT: You can display that on the ELMO.

MS. SILK: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine.

11 BY MS. SILK:

Q. So these are the board of director meetings from -the meeting minutes from September 2nd, 1969 and it looks
to be the Tennessee -- the ACLU of Tennessee.

So if we scroll down here to the bottom, to the last paragraph, a chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee owed some fairly significant responsibilities to the state affiliate; is that correct?

- A. It did, uh-huh.
- Q. So let's read through here in this paragraph. It states, "The chapters must sacrifice income, raise money for local problems and even consider the prospect of raising local moneys as to support the state affiliate office. Mr. Clayton concluded that the Tennessee -- the TACLU might consider or be forced by economics to give up

the state office unless the chapters were willing to make the sacrifices necessary."

Is that what the document says?

- A. That's what the document says, yes.
- Q. So it's possible then, isn't it, that the American Civil Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc. that was a party to the Kendrick consent decree could have reasonably decided that it was not willing to make the sacrifices necessary --

THE COURT: Possible is not a relevant standard.

It's probable or improbable.

MS. SILK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You know, it's possible that anything happened. So that's not a relevant standard. We'll let you rephrase your question, just so we have some relevant evidence.

MS. SILK: So it's not improbable.

THE COURT: That's fine. No problem.

BY MS. SILK:

Q. It's not improbable that a group of people acting as a chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee, including the party that was an entity listed on the Kendrick complaint, could have decided that they were not willing to make the sacrifices necessary to be an official chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee, right?

A. I don't know who Mr. Clayton is. I do know that once the ACLU -- whenever a state affiliate is organized and incorporated, they then become the formal entity. So I'm not quite sure if a chapter in and of itself could exist and be identified with ACLU.

- Q. Well, my question is, you know, if the chapter decided that it did not want to raise money for the affiliate, the Tennessee -- the ACLU of Tennessee, then it would no longer be considered a part of the ACLU of Tennessee; is that correct?
- A. But it would also not be part of the ACLU, I don't think, because of the way the structure was formulated, because the goal back then was to build statewide affiliates. So chapters existed --
- Q. Understood.

So if a group decided that it was not willing to make the sacrifices necessary and it was not a part of the state affiliate or the national affiliate, then it couldn't reasonably be considered at a later time to be a part of the entity that it decided to disassociate itself with; is that correct?

A. Well, one, I don't think that happened. And number two, I think they're talking here about giving up the state office, not necessarily changing the relationship with the affiliate.

Q. Right. But my question is that they -- they were going to have to give up the state office unless the chapters were willing to make the sacrifices necessary?

- A. I understand what you're saying, and perhaps that's what they meant. I don't read it exactly like that. I think there was a lot of relationships between chapters and the state affiliate and who kind of, you know, made -- how decisions were made, and it was a new relationship that was forming because there was a staff person and new director in that position.
- Q. Okay. I want to go back to Exhibit 5. This is the complaint filed in the Kendrick V. Chandler case in 1976. Let's flip to Page 3 of the document.

So here for a moment, we're -- it should be noted that the designation WTCLU is referring to the entity the American Civil Liberties Union of West Tennessee, Inc. And here it says, "On information and belief, the WTCLU alleges that it has been the subject of unlawful surveillance by the Memphis Police Department's Domestic Intelligence Unit." Is that correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Does it say in here that the American Civil Liberties
 Union of Tennessee alleged that it had been the subject of
 unlawful surveillance by the Memphis Police Department?

 A. It doesn't say there -- say that there. The use of

- acronyms changes throughout a lot of these documents in a lot of our history.
 - Q. Okay. Now, flip to Page 12 if you will, please.

 That's the wrong page. I apologize.
 - Flip to Page 7. I'm sorry. Okay. In Paragraph 12, it states that, "Prior to 2:30 p.m. on September 10th, 1976, the Plaintiff Chan Kendrick, individually and in official capacity as executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, and Plaintiff WTCLU requested that the Defendants not destroy, alter or disseminate any of the files maintained by the Domestic Intelligence Unit." Is that what it says?
- 13 A. It says that, yes.

- Q. Okay. So it seems to me and does it seem to you that
 there's -- that this paragraph is drawing a distinction
 between American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, and
 the Plaintiff WCLU, does it not?
 - A. I understand what you're saying, but just given the history of the organization, WTCLU or West Tennessee Chapter would be part of the ACLU of Tennessee at that time.
 - Q. But just for the record, the American Civil Liberties
 Union of Tennessee is not designated as a Plaintiff in this
 paragraph, is it not?
- 25 A. It's not designated in that paragraph.

Q. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

So as I'm sure you're aware, the Kendrick complaint, as you can see on the first page, was filed in 1976?

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And I will submit to you that the Kendrick consent decree was filed in 1978. You don't have any personal knowledge of what transpired within the organizational structure of the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. between the time
- 10 A. I do not.

of 1976 and 1978, do you?

- Q. It's not improbable, is it, that the organizational structure could have changed between 1976 and 1978?
 - A. It might have. Again, I don't have that knowledge.
- Q. Chapters were coming and going all the time during this time; is that correct?
- A. Right. There were casual relationships, I suppose.

 But there was also some commitment to try to engage and
- energize people within the various communities and the
- excitement about being part of the ACLU of Tennessee, the
- 20 newly formed -- you know, formed in 1968, kind of drew people together.
- Q. Does the ACLU of Tennessee have any evidence that the party that was here on the complaint in 1976 was the same entity that the City entered into an agreement with in
- 25 1978?

A. I don't know that, except to say the history I always learned both from people within the organization in Tennessee and then from Mr. Kendrick, who was an executive director and a different affiliate, was that this was an ACLU of Tennessee case.

Q. Thank you.

I'm going to go back to the bylaws from 1973. That's Exhibit 2. Opposing counsel showed this document to you as the bylaws for the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. from 1963.

THE COURT: We're actually going to take our morning break right now.

MS. SILK: Okay.

THE COURT: And then we'll come back. We'll be out for about 12 minutes. We'll see everybody in 12 minutes. Of course, don't discuss the case with anybody else. And we'll see you at that time. This is our morning break. And we'll probably take our lunch break close to 12:15 or 12:20. Thanks very much.

(Brief Recess)

THE COURT: Okay. We're ready to proceed. I probably need to remind everybody that the Judicial Conference rules prohibit broadcasting from a courtroom, just so everybody knows. And there's only one official record, and that is the record prepared by the court reporter.

So I think everybody knows that. We don't make those rules, but we are obligated to follow them, so -- just like in every other case, we're going to follow the rule in that regard. I think that covers it.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. SILK: I'm ready to proceed if you are.

THE COURT: Are you examining from there? You're welcome to come back up. That's fine. No problem at all.

BY MS. SILK:

- Q. We left off at trial Exhibit 2. Do you have that in front of you there, Ms. Weinberg?
- A. I do.

- Q. Could you please flip to the Page 3, which you've already read, Article 8, Chapters, Section 1, 2, and then we're actually going to read from Section 3 of that article on Page 4. And there it says, "Bylaws for any chapter shall not go into effect until they have been approved by the board of the directors of the affiliate." Is that correct?
- A. That's what it says, yes.
- Q. And in Section 4, it states, "Each chapter shall submit a proposed program and budget and a review of the previous year's activities each year within one month following the annual meeting of the affiliate. The board of directors shall allocate funds to the chapter as it

- deems appropriate." Is that what it says?
 - A. It does.

- 3 Q. So those are fairly specific requirements for a
- 4 chapter; is that correct?
- 5 A. Yeah, and it's on paper, not necessarily always
- 6 happens that way, but yes.
- 7 Q. But the ACLU of Tennessee has not provided any bylaws
- 8 for the West Tennessee Chapter at any time, much less the
- 9 time pertinent to the Kendrick complaint; is that correct?
- 10 A. That's what I understand.
- 11 Q. And what about this requirement that each chapter
- submit a proposed program and budget annually? Did the
- 13 West Tennessee Chapter -- the West Tennessee Chapter didn't
- provide this to you, or you would have provided it to us in
- 15 the document production; is that correct?
- 16 A. If we had it, we would have. I will say just from my
- owner experience that that didn't even happen when I was --
- that just didn't necessarily happen with chapters when I
- 19 joined the organization in '84.
- 20 Q. But you were not a part of the organization during the
- 21 time of the Kendrick complaint; is that correct?
- 22 A. I was not.
- Q. So during the time that these bylaws were in effect,
- you really have no way of knowing whether the requirement
- of Section 4 was enforced or not, do you?

A. I don't know that, but I do know it was a part-time

director -- or a full-time director at that point, but that

these requirements -- they should have been required, but

whether they were or not -- whether or not they were, I

don't know.

MS. SILK: Your Honor, I left my exhibits over

 $\mbox{\bf MS. SILK:}$ Your Honor, I left my exhibits over here. Do you mind if I --

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely. In fact, they're supposed to stay here with the exhibits.

MS. SILK: I'm talking about the ones I'm -
THE COURT: Oh, sure. That's fine. Sure. No

problem at all.

MS. SILK: This one may already be admitted. I apologize for the delay.

15 BY MS. SILK:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. Okay. Now we're going to look at Exhibit 3.
- 17 Exhibit 3 is the agenda for the meeting of the American
- Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, Inc. from October 4th,
- 19 1975; is that correct?
- 20 A. It is.
- Q. And these are the types of meeting minutes that were kept by the ACLU of Tennessee through the regular course of business throughout the history of the organization, to your knowledge --
- 25 A. Correct.

Q. -- correct?

So in this exhibit, as we've noted, the -- on Page 2, that the Middle Tennessee Chapter's bylaws were approved in these minutes. So is this the type of thing that would be memorialized in typed meeting minutes when bylaws of a chapter were approved?

- A. Again, I wasn't there and I don't know who was taking the minutes, but --
- Q. But clearly from the documents you produced, this is something that occurred?
- 11 A. Certainly, these minutes show that for the Middle
 12 Tennessee Chapter minutes -- yes, bylaws.
 - Q. But in all the pages of documents that you produced to the City, there's no instance in the minutes where the bylaws of the West Tennessee Chapter were approved; is that correct?
 - A. If they were not submitted to you, we don't have record of them.
 - Q. Now, I would like to talk for a few minutes about how a chapter would initiate litigation in the '70s around the time of the Kendrick complaint. It was the chapters who decided what cases to litigate and not the state affiliate; is that correct?
 - A. Again, I wasn't there. The chapters existed only -- exist and existed only because they were part of the ACLU

- of Tennessee, which was the formal entity.
- Q. But to your knowledge, it was the chapter that made the decision?
- A. I imagine sometimes chapters did and sometimes the affiliate did and sometimes they made the decision in partnership. I just don't -- I don't know.
 - Q. Okay. Let's take a look at a couple of exhibits.

MS. SILK: I'm going to mark the next exhibit.

THE COURT: Right. Marked and received as 8 without objection. You can briefly identify it.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 8.)

13 BY MS. SILK:

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

- Q. Exhibit 8 is the regular meeting minutes of the West
 Tennessee ACLU board of directors; is that correct?
- 16 A. Correct.
- 17 Q. And it's from May 12th -- I'm sorry, May 12, 1980?
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Now, let's go down to the next to the last paragraph, and it says, "Wilson wages reported on the Brownsville

21 police false arrest case. The consensus of the group was

that we should not take the case because the damages were

slight and the impact value would apparently be limited. A

letter rejecting the case will be sent to the client." Is

25 | that what it states?

- 1 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 2 Q. Does it state anywhere in this -- it doesn't state
- 3 anywhere in this letter that the West Tennessee ACLU had to
- 4 consult with the American Civil Liberties Union of
- 5 Tennessee, Inc. before deciding not to take this case, did
- 6 it?
- 7 A. And typically, I think that's how it happened. If
- 8 they weren't taking a case, it didn't have to be discussed
- 9 with the ACLU of Tennessee.
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Marked as 9. And, of course, you can
- identify it.
- 14 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- marked as Exhibit Number 9.)
- 16 BY MS. SILK:
- Q. Okay. Exhibit 9 is the minutes of the regular meeting
- of the board of directors of the West Tennessee Chapter,
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And it's from January 15, 1979.
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Now, if you could please turn to Page 2, the second
- 24 paragraph, "Phil Arnold reported that in accordance with
- 25 the previous board decision, he had prepared a letter

indicating that the American Civil Liberties Union

willingness to undertake representation of the family of an

individual killed by the Memphis Police Department while

fleeing the scene of a burglary. Upon motion duly made,

seconded and unanimously carried, the board authorized

Mr. Arnold to proceed with the case."

So is this another example -- this is another example of a chapter approving a case; is that correct?

- A. It says he had prepared a letter indicating that

 American Civil Liberties Union willingness to undertake

 representation. So again, it was the ACLU as an entity.
- Q. These are the minutes from the West Tennessee Chapter, correct?
- A. Correct, but of the ACLU.

- Q. Now, the West Tennessee Chapter that existed at some point in the '70s, '80s and '90s -- the West Tennessee Chapter that existed in the '70s and '80s, it ceased existing around 1987; is that correct?
- A. I don't know if that was the -- I just don't know the formal date.
 - Q. Okay. If you could pull up stipulated fact Number 13, please.

So the ACLU of Tennessee has stipulated that the Memphis field office of ACLU of Tennessee was closed because the budget was inadequate to support it on

1 December 11th, 1987. Do you see that there?

A. Yeah, but that doesn't refer to the West Tennessee Chapter. That refers to just closing the second office.

When I came to Tennessee -- when I took this position, there was an office in Memphis. They had opened a new office in Nashville with the intent of closing, I understood, the Memphis office, not because we didn't want two offices but because it was costly. So it had nothing to do with specifically the West Tennessee Chapter.

- Q. But the West Tennessee Chapter was struggling for several years before it was finally shuttered; is that correct?
- A. When you say shuttered, do you mean the chapter or the office?
- Q. The chapter.

A. The chapter -- as you know, chapters stay alive as long as there are people who can stay active. So there were many attempts to keep the chapter open, but the work still took place in Memphis. We still have representation on our state board of individuals who lived in Memphis.

MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit.

THE COURT: Marked and received as 10. Can you just identify the document.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 10.)

1 BY MS. SILK:

- 2 Q. This document, Exhibit 10, is the West Tennessee
- 3 Chapter meeting minutes from the board meeting on
- 4 January 10th, 1983; is that correct?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. And I would like for you to please -- give me one
- 7 second. If you look here in this paragraph denoted as
- 8 fundraising, it says that, "Cathy reported that the West
- 9 Tennessee fundraising in 1982, although not a loss, was
- 10 insufficient to adequately support the chapter. The
- 11 Memphis office depends on raising enough money to support
- 12 it." Is that what it says?
- 13 A. That's what it says.
- 14 Q. So in 1983, it's clear from this document that the
- West Tennessee Chapter was struggling to meet its
- 16 obligations?
- 17 A. Again, my understanding is that the support of the
- 18 money raised in Memphis was part -- you know, it was part
- 19 of the ACLU of Tennessee and that there couldn't exist a
- 20 chapter without an office in the city, and so it's a little
- 21 bit complicated how this is expressed. It's not
- 22 necessarily just because the office closed, the chapter
- 23 dies.
- Q. This doesn't reference the office, though. This just
- 25 references the organization that is the chapter; is that

1 correct?

- A. Right. I was reading ahead to the second.
- 3 Q. So in 1983, they reported that fundraising was
- 4 insufficient to adequately support the chapter, and the
- 5 Memphis office depends on raising enough money to support
- 6 it. So as early as 1983, it appears that the -- this is an
- 7 ACLU of Tennessee document, but whatever entity was a
- 8 chapter in 1982 was flailing, for lack of a better word?
- 9 A. Yeah, I -- I can't speak to that.
- 10 Q. And there were several unsuccessful attempts at
- reorganizing the West Tennessee Chapter in the '80s; is
- 12 that correct?
- 13 A. There were.
- 14 Q. And it looks like maybe from 1983 to 1988, there
- really wasn't a West Tennessee Chapter presence at all; is
- 16 that right?
- 17 A. There were West Tennessee representatives that sat on
- our board from the chapter, but the -- there was not a
- 19 robust chapter. That's maybe the better way to put it.
- 20 They weren't actively engaged in programming and things of
- 21 that nature.
- 22 Q. Now, it looks like you had a big push in 1988 to
- reorganize the West Tennessee Chapter, but that ultimately
- failed, as well, did it not?
- 25 A. Well, again, I think at that point -- you know,

chapters were one model that affiliates, state affiliates had been used to working with. And then as the chapters — as things moved away, it was understood that it would be centralized statewide organization and still have cases and work with legislatures and do fundraising across the state with or without chapters, frankly.

- Q. So what you're saying is that there was a -- there was really no official structure as to who could be a chapter or who could not be a chapter?
- A. No. What I'm saying is, you still had to be formally identified through, you know, relationships with the affiliate. You had to be affiliated with the ACLU of Tennessee in order to have a chapter. Sometimes there were groups who wanted to create chapters but they weren't part of the ACLU, so they could not use the ACLU designation.
- Q. Could such a group be the party that was a party to the Kendrick consent decree? The American Civil Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc., I mean, you've testified that --

THE COURT: I think the "could" is the problem. Why don't we just change that to something that has evidentiary value? Is it probable?

23 BY MS. SILK:

Q. Is it probable that the entity that was a party to the 1978 Kendrick consent decree was exactly the type of group

you just referenced in your testimony that was somehow acting or affiliated with the ACLU of Tennessee but not formally a part of the ACLU of Tennessee?

A. No, I don't believe it could.

MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit.

THE COURT: 11, marked as 11. Identify the

document.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 11.)

BY MS. SILK:

Q. This document is a document from the ACLU of
Tennessee, Inc., February 1st, 1988. It says, "The West
Tennessee Chapter is at a crossroads."

Now, you were executive director during that time.

What -- that signifies to me that the West Tennessee

Chapter was about to stop existing.

A. Again, as I recall, there were -- it was hard to get a chapter -- it was hard to get individuals engaged in chapter activities, be it fundraising or pub ed programs, probably mostly from -- because of lack of time and people engaged in other activities.

And so we wanted to still keep a presence, keep our members in West Tennessee in the Memphis area engaged if they wanted to meet with and organize activities. So we were continuing to try to, based on one or two or three

A. It's hard for me to -- operation-wise, formal. There were people who were part of the West Tennessee Chapter who wanted more people to get involved.

MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit.

THE COURT: It will be 13, marked and received without objection.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 13.)

BY MS. SILK:

Q. This Exhibit 13 is the memorandum of that meeting that was referenced in Exhibit 12 on June 2nd, 1988.

Now, if you flip to Page 2, it says in the second paragraph, "A successful annual meeting is the first step in the reorganization and revitalization of the West Tennessee Chapter. It is incumbent on us to put a successful program and meeting together." Is that correct?

- A. Yes, that says that.
- Q. So when a chapter is being reorganized and revitalized, that's because it no longer was a chapter?
- A. Well, the people present at that meeting who were named on the first page remained active in the organization as a chapter, but they needed more people involved.
- Q. But if a chapter was vital and viable, there would be no need to reorganize it, would there?
 - A. Reorganization is an interesting word. I think

- revitalization really refers to wanting more people to be part of the formal structure.
 - Q. But it does say reorganize, does it not?
- 4 A. It does say that, yes.

- 5 Q. It's true, isn't it, that there was no ACLU of
- 6 Tennessee presence in the form of a chapter in West
- 7 Tennessee from 1988 to 1996, was there?
- 8 A. I just don't know offhand. I know that the chapter --
- 9 well, there was interest -- the chapter was not actively
- 10 engaged. And many of the chapters were not as actively
- 11 engaged as they once were at that time.
- 12 MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit.
- 13 **THE COURT:** 14.
- 14 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was
- marked as Exhibit Number 14.)
- 16 **THE COURT:** Let's try to follow the practice of
- 17 stating what it is and then just ask for it to be marked.
- 18 BY MS. SILK:
- 19 Q. The next exhibit is -- I'll wait until he marks it --
- 20 is a March 11th, 1991 letter from the ACLU of Tennessee,
- 21 Inc. to Bruce.
- 22 Okay. This is a letter, appears to be from you; is
- 23 that correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. And it's from March 11, 1991, so three years after the

last set of documents that we looked at where we were trying to reorganize the West Tennessee Chapter. Three years later, you wrote to Bruce, "I am excited about the response we have received from people about the West Tennessee Chapter reorganization meeting."

Is that what it says?

- A. That's what it says, yes.
- Q. Okay. So in 1991, it's clear that the West Tennessee Chapter had still not been reorganized; is that correct?
- A. That's what it appears.

MS. SILK: The next exhibit I'm going to mark is the agenda from March 14th, 1991, West Tennessee Chapter.

THE COURT: Marked as 15.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 15.)

BY MS. SILK:

- Q. So this is a document from the ACLU of Tennessee, and it's an agenda, appears, from the March 14th, 1991 West Tennessee Chapter reorganization meeting; is that correct?
- A. Yes, it is.
 - Q. Okay. And then here in Number 4, it lays out the plans for the West Tennessee Chapter, which includes identifying a board and a president, establishing a legal committee, discussing ideas for future public education and selecting two chapter representatives, plus a president to

So this letter that you sent on July 27th, 1994,

25

Q.

is a letter to the Honorable Judge Lipman from November 17th, 1994.

THE COURT: Marked as 18.

23

24

1 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 2 marked as Exhibit Number 18.) BY MS. SILK: 3 This letter is from November 17th, 1994, and it's a 4 letter from you, it looks like, to the now Honorable Judge 5 6 Sheri Lipman. And if you look down at the bottom here, you 7 state, "Our work is clearly cut out for us, and I 8 appreciate your willingness to coordinate the effort to get things going in Memphis." 9 10 So in November of 1994, there was still no West 11 Tennessee Chapter; is that correct? 12 Α. There was not -- appears there was not a formal 13 chapter. MS. SILK: I'd like to mark the next exhibit, 14 which is an October 24th, 1994 letter to Judge Lipman from 15 16 you. 17 THE COURT: Marked as 19 and received. 18 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was 19 marked as Exhibit Number 19.) BY MS. SILK: 20 21 This is a letter -- predates the one -- I got out of Q. 22 order a little bit -- but it says from -- to Sheri from 23 Hedy. Subject, Revitalizing the Memphis Chapter. It says, 24 "As promised, here is the information on those people attending the September 12th event at Bruce's home who 25

expressed an interest in helping to revitalize the Memphis
Chapter."

And the Bruce you're referring to there, I presume, is Bruce Kramer; is that correct?

A. Correct.

3

4

5

- Q. So Bruce Kramer was affiliated with the Kendrick
- 7 litigation, was he not?
- 8 A. He was, yes.
- 9 Q. But here he is trying to organize a West Tennessee
- 10 Chapter in 1994, is it not?
- 11 A. Well, Bruce stayed involved with the organization
- 12 from -- you know, from Kendrick on. He was involved prior
- 13 to Kendrick. So he was always engaged and always served on
- 14 our board and always represented the ACLU of Tennessee and
- was also very active in the West Tennessee Chapter, which
- 16 was part of the ACLU of Tennessee.
- Q. But at this time, there was no chapter of the ACLU of
- 18 Tennessee in West Tennessee?
- 19 A. There was not a formal chapter, but there was activity
- 20 and interested parties.
- 21 MS. SILK: The next exhibit I would like to mark
- is a letter from December 1st, 1994 to -- which you were
- copied on from the Honorable Judge Lipman.
- 24 **THE COURT:** Marked as 20 and received.
- 25 (WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was

```
CROSS-EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG
                                                          92
       marked as Exhibit Number 20.)
 1
 2
     BY MS. SILK:
 3
       Q.
            This letter is from the Honorable Judge Lipman?
                 THE COURT: Actually, it may be a little
 4
       confusing. She certainly was not a judge at the time, and
 5
 6
       I think you just --
 7
                 MS. SILK: I just wanted to be respectful.
                 THE COURT: I think you're being confusing.
 8
                            Okay. I apologize.
 9
                 MS. SILK:
10
                 THE COURT: I don't think she'll be offended.
11
       And it would also be improper for a judge to be in those
12
       communications, as you know.
                 MS. SILK: Okay. That was not my intent.
13
14
       apologize.
15
                 THE COURT: She wouldn't want us to incorrectly
16
       state her status at the time.
17
                 MS. SILK: Okay. I apologize.
                 THE COURT: No. Apologize to her, not me.
18
19
                 MS. SILK: Well, don't tell her.
20
     BY MS. SILK:
21
            And you were copied on this letter; is that correct?
       Q.
22
       Α.
            Yes.
23
                  And if you go back to the first page, it says,
       Q.
       "I realize that it's been a while since we first met in
24
25
      Bruce's office to discuss the revitalization of the Memphis
```

Chapter. As you will recall, our final plan was to have a gathering for those interested in restarting the Memphis Chapter of the ACLU of Tennessee, and I hope we get a few people out of that group who are willing to put some work in to accomplishing that goal. Pass along to the others in attendance the good work that the ACLU has been doing."

So here it seems like Sheri Lipman is also trying to get the West Tennessee Chapter going again because it did not exist in December 1st, 1994. Is my understanding of that correct?

A. Yeah. It seems like the chapters did not exist. I totally agree with you, but there was activity taking place and lawsuits being filed across the state on behalf of the ACLU of Tennessee of which chapters, if they existed, were part of that organization. It was a way to engage people.

MS. SILK: Okay. The next exhibit I would like to mark is from March 9, 1995, and it's a letter from Sheri Lipman to "the gang." Please mark that.

MS. FLOYD: Thank you.

THE COURT: Marked as 21 without objection.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 21.)

BY MS. SILK:

Q. So here we are now in 1995, this letter you were copied on and it says, "Dear gang, as you each have

probably guessed by now, our kick-off event will not take place on Sunday, March 12th, 1995."

So from this communication, it appears that this 1994 effort to revitalize and reorganize the Memphis or West Tennessee Chapter was unsuccessful; is that correct?

A. It certainly appears that way.

MS. SILK: The next exhibit I would like to mark is a letter from January 11th, 1995 from Sheri Lipman, which you were copied.

THE COURT: 22, marked and received.

(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 22.)

BY MS. SILK:

Q. Now, this letter, as I stated, was from January 11th, 1995. And it's a letter again to "the gang" from Sheri Lipman, CC Hedy Weinberg. Now, in this one, if we flip to Page 2, Number 4, it reads, "Hedy Weinberg will give an enthusiastic talk about the work of the ACLU of Tennessee and other chapters in the state, including a sampling of fascinating quality programs which have been put on by other chapters. We will have sign-up sheets and literature available."

So in this document, it stated that you were giving a talk, an enthusiastic talk, trying to enlist enough people to be -- well, to be interested in forming another West

- 1 Tennessee Chapter. Is my reading of that correct?
- 2 A. Yeah. The goal was to have chapters, if they were so
- 3 engaged, to organize public education programs as a way of
- 4 staying visible outside of just pursuing litigation in our
- 5 legislative work. So it -- and a way to increase
- 6 awareness. So that was the goal of chapters --
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. -- at this time, and there was a -- the goal was to
- 9 ensure that chapters had information about how they could
- 10 go about organizing pub ed programs.
- 11 Q. And this meeting in which you gave an enthusiastic
- 12 talk, was it to the same group of people that were -- it
- was not to the same group of people that were the entity
- 14 that was the West Tennessee Chapter in 1978, was it?
- 15 A. There might have been similar people there, but I have
- no idea who was part of the -- this particular January 9th
- 17 | meeting. I just don't recall.
- 18 Q. But it certainly -- it couldn't have been the same
- group of people or you wouldn't have had a need to have the
- 20 meeting at all; is that correct?
- 21 A. It might have been trying to reengage people. I don't
- 22 know. Certainly Bruce Kramer was part of the organization
- 23 in 1978.
- Q. And on the first page, it says, "We had a meeting
- 25 | yesterday to organize our kick-off gathering." So it seems

- that this kick-off gathering was trying to kick off the
 still yet reorganized West Tennessee Chapter.
 - A. It sounds -- that's what it sounds like.
- 4 Q. Now, you've stated that the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. no
- 5 longer operates with chapters; is that correct?
- 6 A. Yeah. The ACLU of Tennessee, including most of the
- 7 affiliates across the country, do not use chapters anymore.
- 8 More centralized. And again, as you might imagine, because
- 9 of e-mail and other kinds of ways to communicate, we don't
- 10 have chapters formally engaged.
- 11 Q. Now, the party that was listed in the Kendrick consent
- 12 decree, the American Civil Liberties Union of West
- 13 Tennessee, Inc., that was not -- well, let me back up.
- 14 So it's been stipulated, stipulated fact Number 18 --
- so in May 1996, the West Tennessee Chapter was reformed.
- 16 That's been stipulated by both parties. It's true, isn't
- it, that the West Tennessee Chapter that was re-formed in
- 18 May 1996 was not the same entity that was the American
- 19 Civil Liberties Union of West Tennessee, Inc.; is that
- 20 correct?

- 21 A. Is that the -- what you've referred to as the West
- 22 Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc.?
- 23 Q. No, ma'am. I'm referring to the American Civil
- Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc. that's listed on
- 25 the Kendrick complaint and consent decree.

- A. I just -- I don't know. Can you rephrase that -- ask
 me that question again? I'm not sure I'm hearing what
 you're asking.
 - Q. Sure. I'm asking you if the May 1996 version of the West Tennessee Chapter that was finally formed after eight years of fix and starts, if that was the same entity, legally and organizationally, as the American Civil
- A. These chapters are informal entities. I mean, they
 exist because they're part of the ACLU of Tennessee, which
 was the same with the West Tennessee group that's mentioned

Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc.

in the complaint.

4

5

6

7

8

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. But they're not informal if they have to have bylaws, right?
- 15 A. They exist only, though, because they're part of the
 16 ACLU of Tennessee. They don't exist separate from the
 17 state entity.
 - Q. That was not my question.

My question is, was the entity that was the West

Tennessee Chapter in May 1996 the same entity as the

American Civil Liberties Union in West Tennessee, Inc.; and

I mean, the answer was it was not, correct?

MR. CASTELLI: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that a question? It sounded like testimony.

1 MS. SILK: Let me rephrase.

- 2 BY MS. SILK:
- Q. The West Tennessee Chapter that was re-formed in 1996
 was not the same entity as the American Civil Liberties
- 5 Union in West Tennessee, Inc., right?
- 6 A. There were new people involved in this.
- 7 Q. And it's true, then, that the West Tennessee Chapter
- 8 in 1996 did not have the same set of bylaws as the West --
- 9 what you're referring to as the West Tennessee Chapter in
- 10 1996; is that correct?
- 11 A. I just don't know about the bylaws. I mean, I don't
- 12 have memory of those.
- 13 Q. So if the ACLU of Tennessee had subsumed, as your own
- 14 pleadings and filings with this Court have alleged, if it
- had subsumed the entity that was the ACLU of West
- 16 Tennessee, Inc., it wouldn't need to form a new chapter in
- 17 1996, would it?
- 18 A. I think the goal of the chapter was to engage people
- 19 to be present. I mean, you can talk about a chapter but a
- 20 chapter without people, so you wanted to ensure that there
- 21 were people doing the work and, you know, being ambassadors
- 22 for the ACLU.
- 23 Q. And so, from the time when there wasn't a West
- Tennessee Chapter, it follows, doesn't it, that there
- weren't enough people interested in the efforts of the ACLU

Tennessee members and our -- yeah.

of Tennessee, Inc. to support an entity that could bring, for instance, a lawsuit or enforce a consent decree?

- A. No, that's not correct, because it was the responsibility of the ACLU of Tennessee to do that. So we were still filing lawsuits and engaging with the legislature and doing pub ed programs, and we had members in Memphis and the West Tennessee area who were ACLU of
- Q. So I want to just go back to one exhibit. Sorry, I have to find it.

And this is Exhibit 1, the charter of the ACLU of Tennessee. And this is going back to -- there we go. This is going back to the entity that was known as the West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc.

So Number 2, it says that the -- your attorney presented this to you, and it states that the purpose of the Charter of Incorporation was to consolidate the affairs and activities of the previously existing East Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. and Middle Tennessee Civil Liberties, Inc. and continue the previous operations of said corporations and to also absorb at a future time, if agreed to by the membership and/or board of directors of both corporations, to assume and continue the operations of the West Tennessee Liberties, Inc., a Tennessee corporation.

So I just want to get the record straight that the 1 2 Charter of Incorporation did not consolidate the affairs of 3 the West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. at its inception, but it only stated that it would do so if agreed 4 to at a later time by both boards; is that correct? 5 6 The anticipation was that they would join with 7 the ACLU of Tennessee, merge into that organization. 8 guess in its absence, that they would cease not to function. 9 10 So it's probable, isn't it, that the West Tennessee 11 Civil Liberties Union, Inc. that was never officially a 12 chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, 13 Inc. was actually the party that initiated the Kendrick litigation? 14 15 I don't think it was probable. Α. 16 But you don't have any knowledge? Q. 17 My understanding is it was part of the ACLU of 18 Tennessee. 19 But you have no evidence that the party was not the 20 WTCLU, using the acronym for West Tennessee Civil Liberties 21 Union, Inc.? 22 My knowledge is that the West Tennessee Civil 23 Liberties Union or Civil Liberties, Inc. was no longer a 24 formal entity.

Q. So my last question is, if there was here a group

known as the West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. and also a West Tennessee Chapter, operating around the same time, it's probable that there could have been a third or fourth group of people also operating in the name of ACLU; and you, yourself, testified that this was a very fluid and loose structure? Is that correct?

A. Let me step back from that. There could not be other entities operating with ACLU in the state. And if there were, they would not -- ACLU would not have supported them. We would probably challenge their existence because the ACLU sort of name and presence.

So when I said that they were fluid, I meant chapters, as part of the organization, were alive as long as the people who were engaged in those chapters -- or as long as people were engaged in those chapters. That's what I meant by fluid.

- Q. Did the ACLU of Tennessee, Inc. ever challenge the West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. as not being formally affiliated?
- A. My understanding is the West Tennessee Civil
 Liberties, Inc., like the East Tennessee Civil Liberties
 Union, Inc. and the Middle Tennessee Civil Liberties Union,
 Inc., were entities prior to the ACLU of Tennessee being
 incorporated. And once it became clear that there was
 going to be a state affiliate, the movement, while it took

some time, was to -- those organizations were going to blend and become part of the ACLU of Tennessee.

That was my understanding when you -- just with my knowledge of the national ACLU and watching statewide affiliates incorporate.

Q. But you've asserted that the -- well, if the WTCLU was never absorbed at a later time by the ACLU of Tennessee,

Inc., would the -- it seems like the ACLU of Tennessee,

Inc. would have challenged them and their authority to act in the name of the ACLU, wouldn't they?

I mean, you just stated if some group were acting in the name of ACLU that wasn't officially affiliated with the state affiliate, that you would have challenged it; but you didn't challenge the West Tennessee Civil Liberties Union, Inc. that existed from 1967 to 1983, did you?

- A. I don't think they were engaged in activities independent of the ACLU of Tennessee.
- Q. But you don't know?
- 19 A. I don't know --
 - O. But what we do know is that it did exist?
- 21 A. They were not actively involved.

22 MS. SILK: I have nothing further. Thank you.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MR. CASTELLI: Yes, Your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CASTELLI:

1

2

3

4

5

6

- Q. Let's start, Ms. Weinberg, those -- the records that you've talked about earlier where these minutes and the -- were found, do you have every document that was created by
- the ACLU of Tennessee or its chapters since 1968?
- A. I don't. And our office has moved.
- Q. How many times has the office moved since you came to the ACLU?
- 10 A. I think we're in our fifth space. Plus, we closed the
 11 office in Memphis and I'm afraid things were probably lost
- when we moved.
- Q. Do you know where the office was located in 1976 when
- 14 the Kendrick complaint was filed for the ACLU of Tennessee?
- 15 A. I think it was in Memphis.
- Q. Okay. Was that the only statewide office?
- 17 A. That was the only statewide office, yes.
- Q. And then a second office was opened in Nashville at some point?
- 20 A. Yeah, I think in '83, '82 or '83.
- Q. And then as you've covered a minute ago, that Memphis office was then closed down at some point?
- 23 MS. SILK: Objection, leading.
- 24 **THE COURT:** Objection sustained.
- 25 BY MR. CASTELLI:

- Q. What happened to the Memphis office?
- 2 A. Right. When I was hired, it was my understanding that
- 3 the state office would be in Nashville, central part of the
- 4 state, ability to be -- we would be more accessible to the
- 5 state legislature and that we would have to close the
- 6 Memphis office, which had been the state office. And so
- 7 that office was closed, I think, in '86 or '87.
- 8 Q. Do you know, in your role as executive director,
- 9 whether there was ever any formal dissolution of the West
- 10 Tennessee Chapter?
- 11 A. There was no formal dissolution that I'm aware of.
- 12 Q. Was there a board of directors meeting during your
- tenure where the West Tennessee Chapter was dissolved?
- 14 A. No.

- 15 Q. For any reason?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Can you explain how the West Tennessee Chapter wound
- 18 down?
- 19 A. I think people -- the Daniels, Carol and Tom Daniels,
- 20 moved to Alaska. Various people moved out of state. There
- 21 was still some great energy in Memphis, but people were
- 22 | getting busy with their careers, families and so things
- 23 slowed down. The statewide office was getting stronger and
- 24 | we were able to do more work and engage more people. And
- so it was not out of disinterest but just out of people

105

1 having a lot of other commitments.

- Q. And when the West Tennessee Chapter began to -- when
- 3 people began to lose interest in working with the West
- 4 Tennessee Chapter, did -- how did that affect the ACLU of
- 5 Tennessee's work in the region?
- 6 A. I don't believe it affected our work. We were still
- 7 engaged in the courts and in -- we had media -- a presence
- 8 in the media. We had, you know, a good membership for the
- 9 longest time. Our membership base, the largest base was in
- 10 Memphis. And so our work began taking place statewide but
- 11 certainly had a strong presence in Memphis.
- 12 | O. Let's look at Exhibit Number 5. Now, there -- at the
- bottom of the page, you were asked during your
- 14 cross-examination about this exhibit. Can you tell us what
- 15 this acronym, WTCLU that's in Paragraph 5, what that is
- being referenced to in the complaint?
- 17 A. My sense is that it references the chapter of the ACLU
- 18 of Tennessee.

- 19 Q. And the word -- what's -- can you just read after that
- 20 acronym appears what the next -- the text says?
- 21 A. Sure, WTCLU, which is in quotes, is a chapter of the
- 22 American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, which is an
- 23 affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union.
- 24 Q. And then the last sentence there at the bottom of the
- 25 page, I think earlier I had asked you to read part of this

106

but I don't think I got to the last sentence. Could you
read that, please?

- A. The West Tennessee Chapter?
- 4 Q. Yes.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 5 A. "The West Tennessee Chapter is comprised of approximately 500 members."
- 7 Q. And then continuing on to the next page?
 - A. "Residing in the Western District of Tennessee, each of whom is dedicated to and involved in activities and conduct protected by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. And the corporate entity itself is dedicated to and involved in such Constitutionally protected

Do you want me to go ahead?

activities."

Q. No, that's good. That's fine.

I'm going to look at Exhibit 22. And I believe on your cross-examination, you were asked to read the first paragraph that's on Page 2 of Exhibit 22. Could you read the second paragraph?

A. "Hedy is sending a list of Memphis area members for anyone who would like to review and to get ideas of people to target. Also, we will try to send you the invitations for the people on your list so that you can write a personal note to people you know."

- 1 Q. And this was, again, during a period of time where the
- 2 Memphis Chapter was -- there were efforts to revitalize or
- 3 reorganize the Memphis Chapter?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. Or the West Tennessee Chapter?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Were there still members, though, in West Tennessee at
- 8 this point in time?
- 9 A. Oh, of course. There have been all -- always been
- 10 several hundred members at a minimum in the Memphis area.
- 11 Q. And is that what Ms. Lipman was referencing there?
- 12 A. Yes.
- MS. SILK: Objection, leading.
- 14 **THE COURT:** Objection is sustained. That
- 15 suggests the answer. You know, those yes/no questions, it
- 16 could be yes or no, but I'm going to sustain the objection.
- MR. CASTELLI: That's fine, Your Honor. I'll
- 18 rephrase. Thank you.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Thank you.
- 20 BY MR. CASTELLI:
- 21 Q. Ms. Weinberg, that paragraph I asked you to read, can
- 22 you tell me what this list of area members, what that's
- 23 referencing?
- 24 A. Sure. We -- we have members statewide and we were
- able to break up our membership to identify who resided in

108

what part of the state. So this would have been a list of those folks who were ACLU of Tennessee/ACLU members, and we would have shared them in order for that group of people to identify if they knew the people who they could reach out to.

- Q. So when a chapter dissolves or wanes, what happens to the membership privileges of the members of the chapter?
- A. Well, the members are always ACLU of Tennessee members and also members of the national organization, and that's a formal entity always.
- Q. And the word "entity" was used quite a bit to refer to the West Tennessee Chapter, is a chapter a formal
- incorporated entity?

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A. The chapters are not and never have been, you know, since the ACLU of Tennessee incorporated, formal incorporated entities. And, you know, in fact, that was sometimes difficult for chapter members to recognize because they were -- they existed because they were part of the ACLU of Tennessee and they couldn't exist on their own.
- Q. Thank you.
- A. And wouldn't have access to the member list and things like that.
- 23 MR. CASTELLI: Thank you. Those are my redirect questions.
- 25 **THE COURT:** All right. Well, thanks very much,

REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG 109 1 and we're going to let you step down. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: We're going to see who our next witness is going to be. Who will our next witness be? 4 MR. CASTELLI: Ms. Floyd has our next witness. 5 6 THE COURT: Certainly, that's fine. 7 MS. FLOYD: Plaintiff will call Sergeant Tim 8 Reynolds. THE COURT: That's fine. We'll have him come to 9 10 the stand and be sworn in. Anything else? 11 MR. WELLFORD: Your Honor, before we get to 12 Detective -- Sergeant Reynolds --13 THE COURT: Well, where is Sergeant Reynolds? We'll let him come in and be sworn. I mean, what do we 14 15 need to talk about? 16 MR. WELLFORD: We wanted to raise a motion under 17 Rule 56 -- under Rule 52C, a judgment on partial findings 18 on the standing issue, since it doesn't appear that there's 19 any more evidence that's being presented on the standing 20 issue and all of --21 THE COURT: Sure. 22 MR. WELLFORD: And the record is sufficient for a 23 ruling. 24 THE COURT: No, I agree. I agree. 25 Okay. Well, that's appropriate. Let's just make

sure we've got the witness close by. I think that we -this is a really important issue in the case. And I
certainly don't want to try to rule on it from the bench.
I think that's not a good idea. I do think it would be
useful to rule on it as quickly as possible. I agree with
that.

Do you -- do you want to brief that a little further, because now we have a complete record?

MR. WELLFORD: We could brief it based on the testimony this morning and these exhibits over the lunch hour if the Court wanted to take that.

THE COURT: Right. That would be better, because I think we need to be thoughtful about that. And I would anticipate that we'll need at least some time to give it -- to complete the analysis on that.

So I don't want to -- I don't want to -- I certainly think it's an important issue. Don't get me wrong. I think it's very important. I just don't -- I would prefer that we get a little more briefing on it now that we have the record complete, because we didn't have it complete before and now we do, and I think you probably want to get the transcript here. What do you think?

MR. WELLFORD: Well, Your Honor, of course, has discretion under Rule 52C to defer the ruling, and that's completely within Your Honor's discretion.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF H. WEINBERG

THE COURT: 1 Sure. 2 MR. WELLFORD: We thought it was appropriate. 3 THE COURT: I think you nailed it down correctly. I'm agreeing with you. 4 5 MR. WELLFORD: So I mean, we frankly think 6 it's --7 THE COURT: I have the right to defer. 8 MR. WELLFORD: And we're ready for you to rule on it if you -- right after lunch, but your --9 10 THE COURT: No, I'm not waiting to rule on it 11 right after lunch. There's an optimist in every room, but 12 I think we need to -- I think it's more important to get it 13 right than to get it fast. Besides, I think that there were some interesting 14 15 things that came up at the end of the testimony. I do not 16 know if the ACLU of Tennessee anticipates calling anyone 17 that was discussed in the testimony at any point in the proceeding that might have personal knowledge of the 18 19 events. Have you given that any consideration? 20 MR. CASTELLI: Well, we can and we have actually 21 listed --22 THE COURT: I'm not telling you what to do. You 23 don't have to do it at all. MR. CASTELLI: Well, no. And obviously, I need 24

to respond to the motion that was made. I mean, our proof

hasn't closed, so we do have that option, Your Honor, of putting on more evidence if we choose to.

THE COURT: I think that's correct, but it's a little awkward situation because if you fail on the standing question, then nothing else would be before the Court. That would resolve all issues. So I agree with you in that regard.

MR. WELLFORD: May I --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. WELLFORD: The only pretrial order witness that's been identified as a may call witness to offer any further evidence by the ACLU is Mr. Cody, and they could call Mr. Cody.

THE COURT: They could.

MR. WELLFORD: But barring that, there -- we would object to new witnesses being called. But, Your Honor, that said, we've made the motion. We will immediately start briefing it.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. WELLFORD: And just wanted to make sure it was on the record and we proceed as Your Honor wishes us to proceed.

THE COURT: No, absolutely. And I -- well, what about that? You do have another witness that you indicated you might call.

MR. CASTELLI: Yes, Your Honor, and we may reach out to that witness and see if we can get him here to testify.

THE COURT: He's just down the street. He's not very far away.

MR. CASTELLI: So I mean, that -- so that certainly -- if Mr. Cody is available and willing, since we have not subpoenaed him, you know, we may bring him in to testify and maybe clear up some of the things that we heard today, but --

THE COURT: Well, okay. I think that everybody knows it's a very important issue in the case, and I'm not disagreeing at all. I think we want to go through the rest of the day at least, through the rest of this day, and make sure that we have any proof that ACLU of Tennessee is going to submit.

And then you're right, Mr. Wellford, at some point, I think they have to -- with all due respect, Counsel, at some point, Mr. Castelli, you have to complete the record on that issue. I think what Mr. Wellford is asking is that we complete that record first, and we didn't really organize it that way. That's what he would like for us to do. It's not a bad idea.

But obviously, you can't do that on such short notice, so we're going to go ahead and let you call your

first witness, but you will need to complete that record. 1 2 And we may have a discussion at the end of the day about 3 the fact that if you have no other witnesses to present on the issue, then we would perhaps be able to resolve the 4 question. 5 6 MR. WELLFORD: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Sure. MR. GLOVER: Your Honor, just a point of order 8 before we bring in the witness, we're coordinating to get 9 10 witnesses here when counsel wants them. 11 THE COURT: Sure. Sure. 12 MR. GLOVER: And there was a little confusion 13 about the way Mr. Castelli described who would be on next. 14 And we want to make sure we have our officers available for 15 your testimony at the time, so if --16 THE COURT: Absolutely. 17 MR. GLOVER: To get a better understanding who 18 would come after --19 THE COURT: You're just asking who -- what's 20 their sequence of witnesses. 21 MR. GLOVER: Who's after Director Reynolds so we 22 can get the --23 THE COURT: Absolutely appropriate. Your next 24 witness would be --25 MR. CASTELLI: Our next witness is going to be

	DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS 115
1	Mr. Reynolds or Sergeant Reynolds.
2	THE COURT: Right, Sergeant Reynolds.
3	MR. CASTELLI: And after Sergeant Reynolds, we
4	will be calling Major Chandler.
5	THE COURT: Okay, Major Chandler. And who after
6	that?
7	MR. CASTELLI: After that, if we have time today,
8	we would call Sergeant Wilburn.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's important.
10	You're certainly entitled to have that list, and let me see
11	if there's anything else that we need to check there.
12	I think we're ready for our next witness. We'll
13	go for another 15 minutes or so.
14	MS. FLOYD: Plaintiff calls Sergeant Timothy
15	Reynolds.
16	THE COURT: Sure. That's fine. We'll have him
17	come in. If you would stop there and raise your right
18	hand.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS 116 1 2 TIMOIHY REYNOLDS, 3 was called as a witness and having first been duly sworn 4 5 testified as follows: 6 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MS. FLOYD: Good morning. 9 Q. 10 Good morning. Α. Could you --11 Q. 12 THE COURT: You've got your lapel mic on. MS. FLOYD: Yes, Your Honor. 13 14 That'll be fine. Just speak up a THE COURT: 15 little more and we'll be fine. 16 BY MS. FLOYD: 17 Q. Good morning. 18 Good morning. Α. 19 Could you please state your name for the record and Q. 20 spell it? 21 Timothy, T-I-M-O-T-H-Y, Reynolds, R-E-Y-N-O-L-D-S. Α. 22 Q. And what is your role within the Memphis Police 23 Department? 24 I'm a sergeant with the Memphis Police Department. Α. 25 All right. And what position do you hold at this Q.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS

117

1 time?

- A. I'm in the Office of Homeland Security.
- 3 Q. And what role did you hold in the Memphis Police
- 4 Department between 2016 and 2017?
- 5 A. Detective in the Office of Homeland Security.
- 6 Q. And how large an office was the Office of Homeland
- 7 Security at that time? How many people worked there?
- 8 A. Two officers.
- 9 Q. Two officers.
- 10 And what was the supervision structure of the Office
- of Homeland Security?
- 12 A. We report to a lieutenant and then there was a major.
- Q. Okay. And who was your lieutenant at that time?
- 14 A. At that time, it was Lieutenant Chandler.
- 15 Q. And who was your major?
- 16 A. At that time, it was Major Bass, Eddie Bass.
- 17 Q. And did the Office of Homeland Security investigate
- protest activity between 2016 and 2017?
- 19 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 20 Q. And what was the nature of those investigations?
- 21 A. It started right after the Pulse nightclub. We were
- 22 worried about large public gatherings and the safety --
- 23 public safety therein.
- Q. Now, do you recall giving a deposition in this matter?
- 25 A. I do.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS

- 1 Q. And do you recall whether you mentioned the Pulse
- 2 nightclub during that deposition?
- 3 A. No, ma'am. I didn't.
- 4 Q. You did not mention it?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. So why did you not mention it at that time?
- 7 A. The time frame was within the 2016. When I got to
- 8 read a lot of material that was being put in as an exhibit,
- 9 it refreshed my memory.
- 10 Q. Okay. And so when was your memory refreshed?
- 11 A. There's lots of stuff to go over. It was a lot of
- memory to be refreshed, but the whole process was a nice
- 13 refresh for me.
- 14 Q. When in time?
- 15 A. Recently.
- 16 Q. How recently?
- 17 A. Like within the past two weeks.
- 18 Q. Within the past two weeks, okay.
- 19 What is the Real Time Crime Center?
- 20 A. Real Time Crime Center is Memphis Police Department's,
- 21 like, real time analysis. There's officers and analysts
- 22 inside. They do a lot of number crunching for Part I
- crimes to get back to the precinct.
- 24 Q. And what was the interaction between the Office of
- 25 Homeland Security and the Real Time Crime Center?

- 1 A. We occupy the same building. And sometimes when the
- 2 task requires it, we collaborate.
- 3 Q. And how would you collaborate?
- 4 A. When a directive would come in that a certain event is
- 5 coming up, they had social media collators, and we would
- 6 try to get a handle on upcoming threats in large public
- 7 gatherings.
- 8 Q. And when you say "they," do you -- are you referring
- 9 to the Real Time Crime Center?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. And so how did -- did you request that they use
- 12 the social media collator?
- 13 A. That's above my pay grade. It was -- it was
- 14 already -- the request was made already.
- 15 Q. Who would make the request?
- 16 A. People in charge.
- Q. Okay. And so there was never an occasion where you
- would make a request of the Real Time Crime Center?
- 19 A. From time to time, yes. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. Okay. And what was the nature of that request?
- 21 A. There's tips from CrimeStoppers, public complaints,
- 22 tips from the precinct. We have to collaborate sometimes,
- and especially when it comes to follow-up investigations in
- 24 social media. So you have to go to them to see what they
- 25 have, what the nature of the complaint to see if we can

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS 120 1 assist. 2 And with respect specifically to protest activity, how Q. 3 did RTCC help OHS? They --4 Α. THE COURT: 5 Do not use act acronyms. 6 MS. FLOYD: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Because that is not the way human 8 beings actually speak. Let's use real words so everybody can understand what's being said. 9 10 MS. FLOYD: Yes, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Do you want to get that and try it 12 again? 13 MS. FLOYD: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Sure. 15 BY MS. FLOYD: 16 How did the Real Time Crime Center assist the Office Q. 17 of Homeland Security with respect to protest events 18 specifically? 19 They monitor -- the Real Time Crime Center monitors a 20 lot of social media platforms. There's a lot of them out 21 there. And they have a larger net than we do. There --22 that's -- this is not all we do over there, but that's --23 they have a broader selection than what we would have. We 24 are a narrow -- more narrow focus. 25 Okay. And you're more narrow in what way?

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS 121 1 Specific threats. Α. 2 Q. Specific threats? 3 Yes, sir -- yes, ma'am. Α. Okay. And so the Real Time Crime Center handles 4 Q. 5 general casting a net? 6 Yes, sir -- yes, ma'am. 7 Okay. All right. So what tools did the Real Time Q. 8 Crime Center use to investigate protest activity other than the social media collators? 9

- 10 As I mentioned before, there's tips from the public.
- 11 There's open source from news media --
- 12 THE COURT: We're going to get you to pull the 13 mic. I can hear you fine, but I think people probably want 14 to -- pull it a little closer.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 16 THE COURT: Just make it comfortable.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
- 18 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Open sources from media across the
- 20 country, tips from the public, and also complaints from
- 21 like CrimeStoppers and the precincts and the bureaus.
- BY MS. FLOYD: 22
- 23 Okay. And when you say open source, what does that Q.
- 24 mean?
- 25 Open to the public. I mean, in public domain.

- 1 Q. Okay. With respect specifically to social media
- 2 platforms, what does open source mean?
- 3 A. A lot of social media has an open source component.
- 4 In other words, as long as you have access to that
- 5 platform, you can see posts that are made to the public.
- 6 Q. Okay. And where a post is private, how would -- how
- 7 did the Office of Homeland Security access those posts?
- 8 A. Through UC accounts, undercover accounts.
- 9 Q. So through undercover accounts. What undercover
- 10 accounts did the Office of Homeland Security use?
- 11 A. Bob Smith. A Facebook platform, Bob Smith.
- 12 Q. You said -- you said undercover accounts with an S.
- 13 Was there -- were there accounts other than the Bob Smith
- 14 account?
- 15 A. No, ma'am. Not that I had access to.
- 16 Q. Who had access to the Bob Smith Facebook account?
- 17 A. I did.
- 18 Q. Who else had access?
- 19 A. Occasionally, my supervisor when I'm -- like I said,
- 20 there's only two of us. When I was on vacation or if I
- 21 needed to illustrate something that was going on, my boss
- 22 had access to my -- that account.
- 23 Q. And when you say your boss, who are you referring to?
- 24 A. Lieutenant Chandler.
- 25 O. Would the other detective within the Office of

- 1 Homeland Security have access to the Bob Smith account?
- 2 A. If -- well, it's -- if he walked around to my side of
- 3 the desk, yes, ma'am, he would have access to it.
- 4 Q. Did anyone within the Real Time Crime Center have
- 5 access to the Bob Smith account or any other undercover
- 6 accounts?
- 7 A. Not to my knowledge.
- 8 Q. Okay.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I tell you what, it looks like we may be at a transition point. We'll go ahead and take our lunch break at this time. I will make it a little longer since we have more people here. So we'll come back at a

And I do need to know from ACLU Tennessee if there will be any additional proof at this time. If you can tell me -- I understand you might not be able to.

quarter 'til 2:00. That should be enough time.

MR. CASTELLI: I can.

THE COURT: If you can tell me when we come back, then we will know if the record is complete on the standing issue. If it's not complete, that's okay, but you will need to --

MR. CASTELLI: I can tell you right now, Your Honor. We had planned to call Mr. Mike Cody. He'll be available tomorrow morning.

THE COURT: Okay. Then that answers that

question.

Now, I will want to know and I think that, just as a matter of efficiency, I will want to know if you contemplate that there might be anyone you would be adding to the list. And I understand that that will be within my discretion to allow you to do so, but I think that both Mr. Wellford and I want to know when this record is closed on that issue.

If you think that you will need to add someone else, you will need to tell us because I'll need to decide if they can be added to the list and I'll need to give the defense team a chance to be prepared as to that witness. So I'm not going to ask you to tell me right now, but I think that Mr. Wellford is correct that that issue will need -- we'll need to have at least that much notice as to where we are on that issue. Is that something we can accomplish?

MR. CASTELLI: We can do that after lunch. We can have an answer to the Court and to the defense on --

THE COURT: Mr. Wellford, I think that was a good suggestion on your part, and we'll try to complete that record so we can get the issue wound up if we can.

MR. WELLFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure. Absolutely.

MR. WELLFORD: Before we adjourn, can we approach

briefly on a matter?

THE COURT: Sure, absolutely. Absolutely. But yeah -- and -- well, looks like we get to see you after lunch. Nice thing is you don't have to -- you cannot talk to anybody about -- you know that. You cannot talk to anybody about your testimony, and so we'll see you at a quarter 'til 2:00. I think we'll be on that schedule unless they hold me here really late.

Okay. Thank you.

All right. Then I'll have at least a representative counsel come up. You don't all have to come up unless you just really want to.

(Bench conference between the attorneys and the Court.)

MR. WELLFORD: I don't want to make too big a deal of it, but I will report that my paralegal has thought she saw somebody on the back row --

THE COURT: We have already stationed an officer and they're not supposed to be videoing. They're not supposed to be photographing, and it is a policy of the Judicial Council. So I can't -- I mean, even if I wanted to change that, I can't change that. So that's -- please let everybody know.

MR. WELLFORD: Now I understand why the Court made its comment.

THE COURT: Mr. Laurenzi and I have had this on more than one occasion in his previous life and absolutely, certainly no photographs of any witness, no photographs of anybody, absolutely no photographs of any witness or the Court or the Court staff or you guys.

I mean, really, you know, if somebody wanted background when nobody's here and they want to take a picture of the seal, that's fine. That's when nobody's here except a court officer will allow that, but we don't really -- there's no exception to that rule. I know you're familiar with that, too.

MR. CASTELLI: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Please let everybody know because that's a security issue. It's also process issue and it's an order of the Judicial Council and none of us in this group want to run counter to that order.

MR. WELLFORD: And one other thing while we're
just --

MR. CASTELLI: Should the Court make an announcement that no one can be videoing in here.

MR. WELLFORD: Frankly, the Court made the announcement. I didn't appreciate the why.

THE COURT: I think I've said it once.

 $\ensuremath{\mathbf{MR}}.$ LAURENZI: I would simply ask the CSO be put on alert.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF T. REYNOLDS 127 THE COURT: He is. And we know that's a very serious matter. We just can't do it that way. I know it seems odd to people who see Court TV, but it's not allowed and none of us can have -- we can't run counter to the rule. MR. WELLFORD: And Mr. Castelli and I talked about this briefly. It's a very logistical point, I wanted the Court to understand why, with all of the exhibits that we got and we're not using them all. THE COURT: That's okay. We just recently had a case in Nashville and they identified about 400 exhibits,

and we used -- I'd have to go back and look -- 83, I think, something in that range.

MR. WELLFORD: Since we don't know which, the way we are keeping up is we know them by the pretrial order number, so what we're trying to do is avoid saying the word exhibit, 114.

THE COURT: Can do that, but we want to be careful because I want that stack up there to be the official stack and not cause people confusion.

MR. CASTELLI: Once we reference that one, another we'll refer to exclusively as the other exhibit.

THE COURT: And Mr. Sample will print that out for you as you need it.

MR. WELLFORD: We just wanted you to know why

we're doing it.

THE COURT: Do you want me to say?

MR. CASTELLI: Maybe turnover and people coming
in, so it may not hurt.

(Bench conference between the attorneys and the Court concluded and the proceedings continued as follows:)

THE COURT: Counsel have asked me to explain one thing, which is that the Judicial Council of the United States does not allow the filming or photographing of any proceeding in a United States courtroom. I don't make that rule. That is -- it is a rule that they have promulgated and we are obligated to respect. So just like a rule in any other circumstance, we must do that.

There are many reasons for it, but that's simply an important rule. The courtroom deputy will remind anybody if that's confusing. It's not meant to impinge on anybody or do anything else. It relates more to respecting the process. It's very important that everyone feel free within this environment, just like we don't in any other environment, to proceed in an effective way. And we certainly wouldn't want anyone's ability to do that to be impaired; and therefore, there's no broadcasting. There's no filming and there are no photographs.

So I just urge everyone, please respect that.

That's an important rule. I think we're having a case

about people not wanting to be photographed and filmed, et cetera, we ought to respect the same thing for the Court, and I'm going to ask everybody to be careful in that regard.

All right. We're going to let everybody be excused. We'll look forward to seeing everybody back -- I tell you what, because we got started here, there are a good many people here, lunch is not so easy to do since there's no facility in the building. We'll come back at 2:00, and that will give everybody, including counsel, who has an important announcement to make, to give him a chance to make sure he's made it and he's content with that, both of you. Thank you very much. We'll see you at 2:00.

(Lunch break.)

(End of Volume 1.)

CERTIFICATE I, LISA J. MAYO, do hereby certify that the foregoing 130 pages are, to the best of my knowledge, skill and abilities, a true and accurate transcript from my stenotype notes of the trial, on 20th day of August, 2018, in the matter of: ACLU of Tennessee VS. City of Memphis, Tennessee Dated this August 28, 2018 S/Lisa J. Mayo LISA J. MAYO, LCR, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Western District of Tennessee