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THE COURT: Good morning everyone.
This is a question to the array. I haven't seen any papers from the State of New York, has the Attorney General of the State of New York appeared in any context at all in this case?

MR. POLUBINSKI: Your Honor, Ed Polubinski.
To my knowledge, no, other than declining to intervene several years ago.

THE COURT: This is your motion to dismiss?
MR. POLUBINSKI: That's right, your Honor.
THE COURT: There is the lectern, please use it (indicating).

MR. POLUBINSKI: Great, thank you.
Good morning, your Honor. Ed Polubinski, I'm here from Citigroup.

As your Honor is aware, this a qui tam action, a qui tam tax case, brought by a business who claims, as your Honor is aware, that my client, Citigroup, defrauded the State of New York in connection with his taxes because it followed official I.R.S. guidance on how to treat so-called net operating loss deductions.

THE COURT: Is it the contention that net operating losses are not to be carried forward under the New York Tax Law?

MR. POLUBINSKI: I believe, your Honor, that it's
the plaintiff's contention that they should be limited, because plaintiff would contend that the transactions, the creditor he engaged in in the 2008/2009 timeframe, according to plaintiff, should have constituted a change in control.

THE COURT: I see.
MR. POLUBINSKI: And that the I.R.S., which Citi relied on, expressly says that they were not to.

So there are three dispositive reasons, your Honor, that we offered in our papers, separate dispositive reasons for why this case should be dismissed.

The first is: The plaintiff's cause of action is barred by the public disclosure bar under the New York False Claims Act.

The second is: There was no false claim at all because Citi's tax recording is correct.

And the third is: Even if there was incorrect reporting of Citi's taxes, the plaintiff has failed to allege sufficiently that Citi knowingly --

THE COURT: Is this the city or the state?
MR. POLUBINSKI: It is the State of New York. I represent Citigroup. So apologies for the shorthand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Be careful.
MR. POLUBINSKI: I will, of course, try to be a little clearer on that. So my client, Citigroup.
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The third reason the claim fails is that he failed to allege that Citigroup knowingly made a false statement because it relied on the only official government guidance, and then it disclosed what it did in this -- in its 10-K's. So, I will start with the public disclosure bar. As your Honor is aware, the New York Law contains a public disclosure bar which requires that a claim be dismissed if substantially the same allegations or transactions were publicly disclosed until the relator is an original source.

In this case, the relator conceded he is not an original source. And I think it's undisputed that the actual alleged facts at issue in this case were amply disclosed in the public.

And, in fact, they were the subject of considerable press attention in the news media, they were the subject of the lengthy Congressional report that was issued in early 2010.

And to top that all off, relator himself published a policy paper, itself based entirely on public facts that alleges the same things that he now alleges in this complaint.

So what relator says is that even though he concedes that all of these facts are public, he claims that the public disclosure bar does not bar his claims because he alone suggests that he alone alleges the Citi's New York
taxes were wrong or were fraudulent.
Respectfully, your Honor, the relator is wrong on both accounts, both on the law and on the facts. On the law, it's not the case that a relator should take publicly disclosed facts, say that they amount to fraud and somehow avoid the public disclosure bar.

THE COURT: The relator is the whistleblower. Did all he do was read the newspaper?

MR. POLUBINSKI: Your Honor is right. And, in fact, directly on point in the Jamaica Hospital case issued in 2011, the quoted that I like in that case reads: "When the material elements of the fraud is already in public domain, the government has no need for a relator to bring the matter to its attention."

On the facts here there's no doubt, substantially, the same allegations and transactions were publicly disclosed. New York follows and incorporates the federal law of net operating loss deductions.

So what that means is that a disclosure about one's federal NOL's, net operating loss deductions, is also a disclosure as to the state operating losses deductions.

And, in fact, relator's central claim here is that the Citi somehow committed fraud by following the I.R.S. notices, which he claims were inconsistent with the Federal Internal Revenue Code. Those facts, as your Honor, noted
were amply disclosed in many different sources. The allegations themselves were also made in the news media and also by relator himself in his complaint.

Realtor also argues, second argument, is that the Court should not consider Citigroup's publically filed 10-K's as public disclosures.

There are two reasons why this is wrong: First is that this is irrelevant. As an initial matter, even if the relator were correct and even if Citi's public disclosures were somehow not to be considered under the False Claims Act, the public disclosure would still apply even if the Citi SEC filings were not considered.

And the reason for that is even setting aside the 10-K's, substantially the same allegations and transactions were disclosed in the news media and in relator's own paper.

But in addition to that, and this is important as well, your Honor, is that relator wrongfully suggested he can bring a qui tam case based on allegations that were fully disclosed in a company's 10-K's.

There is a host of federal case law that states to the contrary. Jamaica Hospital case that I cited to your Honor also supports the same conclusion, and there is no court that holds otherwise. So that's the public disclosure bar.

The second independent reason for dismissal here is
the relator has not alleged a false statement, and the reason for that is that Citi's tax reporting -- Citigroup's tax reporting, even accepting all of plaintiff's allegations to be true, was accurate and correct.

And there are a couple of clear undisputed points on this as a place to start. First, that no one disputes that Citigroup followed the I.R.S. notices. Likewise, I don't think anybody disputes that New York follows federal law and the law of net operating loss deductions.

And then on top of that, I don't think anybody suggests that there is any contrary authority from the state that tells us that we should not be following the I.R.S. notices. So, in other words, no state tax authority has said you should not follow the I.R.S. notices in your net operating loss deduction reporting.

And as I mentioned at the very start of the argument, the Attorney General has declined to intervene in this case.

Relator doesn't claim that Citi's federal taxes are wrong, at least as far as $I$ can tell, but instead he says that Citi's New York taxes were wrong because he claims that New York law does not incorporate the I.R.S. notices. But relator is wrong on that, as well, and some bedrock principles of New York law.

The first is that New York law borrows expressly
from the federal law in defining taxable income. And in particular, Section $1453(a)$ provides that the taxable income that a taxpayer corporation would need to report in New York is what the taxpayer is required to report to the U.S. Treasury Department.

There is no dispute that Citi did exactly that; reported precisely what it was required to report under $1453(a)$.

In addition to that, the definition of net operating loss also borrows expressly from the -- 1453(k)(1) says that a net operating loss in the state shall be presumably the same as the net operating loss deduction allowed under Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Both the Court of Appeals and the Third Department in an opinion that was affirmed by the Court of Appeals have made clear that the word "presumably" in that statute does not mean that a taxpayer is free to imply his own interpretation that is different from the federal interpretation.

Instead, it means only that it's in the statute to afford a taxpayer with an opportunity to have a hearing, if there's a claim of accuracy in it's federal reporting. There's no claim of accuracy here.

And the last point is that there is a long line of New York authority that makes clear that New York interprets
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its Tax Law in accordance with federal law wherever possible. The relator says those authorities don't apply to informal guidance like the I.R.S. notices that are at issue here, but that's wrong.

There is nothing in the authorities that we cite that limits in any way the kinds of federal authorities that the state looks to.

In fact, a quote from Michaelson, the Court of Appeals case on this, is instructive. It says that New York Income Tax Law evinces strong intent to conform to federal authority wherever possible, and the authority is not limited in any way.

So at the end of the day, the relator may not like the notices, but they are the law. And New York State follows those interpretations in the absence of contrary interpretation from New York State.

The last independent basis for dismissal, your Honor, is that even if Citigroup's tax treatment were somehow incorrect, plaintiff has failed to allege sufficiently that Citigroup acted with the requisite state of mind.

The False Claim Act is a fraud statute, it doesn't entitle people to recover from pure innocent misstatements. Instead, plaintiff must allege that the defendant acted knowingly. And the relator has not come close here. At
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most, the word "knowingly" appears three times in the statute.

The plaintiff just simply reciting the elements of the claim, that is clearly not enough. And, in fact, the allegations here are affirmatively inconsistent with Citigroup's knowledge of any false statement.

As I've said before, Citigroup followed the only official guidance that was out there. That guidance, the notices, say on their face, quote, "taxpayers may rely on rules described in this notice."

New York State follows federal law. There is no contrary New York State interpretation. And then Citigroup, did disclose in it's 10-K's that it was relying on the notices. None of that, of course, is remotely consistent with knowingly making a false claim. For that reason, plaintiff failed to allege knowledge.

Unless your Honor has further questions, those are the reasons upon which we ask that the Court to dismiss the claim.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. POLUBINSKI: Thank you.
THE COURT: Plaintiff.
MR. SINATRA: Good morning, your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. SINATRA: John Sinatra from Hodgson for the
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plaintiff relator, Eric Rasmusen.
What we've got to do here, your Honor, is go a little bit deeper; deeper into the specifics and deeper into some exceptions and not spend all of the time just on the general rules because the case, it is our view, that the case has to be decided a little bit deeper than that; on the specifics and on the exceptions.

Regarding public disclosure, there's a lot of law out there on the robust federal public disclosure provision, including a lot of federal case law. But what's going on here is we've got to apply the New York State Ealse Claims Act and the federal disclosure bar provided in that statute. So the announcements here must adhere to that statute.

Before I get there, Judge, let me cover a couple of points.

One is that what was out there in the public domain, what was out there and discussed in a lot of different places, was how Citigroup handled it federal tax return and what it did in its federal tax return with respect to net operating losses. That was what was out there in public.

THE COURT: What was it that your client discovered that no one else did?

MR. SINATRA: He discovered, your Honor, that Citigroup was also applying the same net operating loss
deductions and he adduced that --
THE COURT: How did he discover that, by reading the newspaper and reading the $10-\mathrm{K}$ 's?

MR. SINATRA: By reading the $10-\mathrm{K}^{\prime}$ s, your Honor, is the only way he could have adduced it.

But --
THE COURT: Isn't that a public disclosure?
MR. SINATRA: Except, except under the New York False Claims Act, which is in Section 190 (9)(b) -- 190 (9)(b) (ii), where the state makes it clear that its public policy is different.

The State of New York wants cases brought that would otherwise be barred under the federal statute, if what we're dealing with -- if the public disclosure comes from something just like this, an SEC report, SEC findings.

The state statute specifically --
THE COURT: Hang on. All of a sudden you've deviated from quoting from the statute.

MR. SINATRA: I was about to quote from the statute.

THE COURT: This is 1450, correct?
MR. SINATRA: No. No. No, we're not there yet.
THE COURT: Not there yet?
MR. SINATRA: We're not there yet.
The New York State False Claims Act --

THE COURT: Which exhibit is that?
MR. SINATRA: It was attached to my affirmation as the Tax Law.

THE COURT: As?
MR. SINATRA: The Tax Law.
THE COURT: It was a tab?
MR. SINATRA: Right. But we're still at the State Finance Law first, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's what I'm looking for.
MR. SINATRA: That's not a section in the
affirmation.
THE COURT: Does anyone have a copy of the section you're referring to so $I$ can look at the section itself instead of your characterization of it?

MR. POLUBINSKI: Your Honor, we have one in a very, very small type book. I would be happy to hand it up. THE COURT: I'll do the best I can. I am half blind from looking at computer screens.
(Handing.)
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. POLUBINSKI: You're welcome. THE COURT: Now, which section are you relying on? MR. SINATRA: Sure. 190. THE COURT: Subsection?

MR. SINATRA: Nine.
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THE COURT: Certain actions barred?
MR. SINATRA: Correct. Then under that it is (b).
THE COURT: The Court shall dismiss unless -- and I'm going to skip some -- unless the qui tam the plaintiff is an original source of the information.

MR. SINATRA: The Original Source Doctrine is an exception to the public disclosure rule. We don't claim to be an original source, but that is only an issue if the public disclosure rule applies in the first place.

THE COURT: Then we have to dismiss.
MR. SINATRA: No, your Honor. Whether or not we're the original source is irrelevant, because the public disclosure rule doesn't apply in the first place. And (b) (ii), towards the end of that provision where we're at where we need to be, or under any federal, state or local law, rule or program.

THE COURT: Under (ii)?
MR. SINATRA: Yes.
THE COURT: Let me read it.
MR. SINATRA: Sure.
(Pause taken.)
THE COURT: How does the $10-k$ not satisfactory this provision?

MR. SINATRA: I think a 10-k does satisfactory this provision. And that is an exception to the public
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disclosure rule, your Honor.
THE COURT: Now I'm not following your logic at all.

MR. SINATRA: Sure. The flush language of (b) sets out the rule.

THE COURT: It says: "Providing such information shall not be deemed 'publicly disclosed' in a report or investigation because it was disclosed or provided pursuant to article six" -- that is not applicable.

MR. SINATRA: Right.
THE COURT: "Or any other federal, state or local law, rule or program enabling the public to request, receive or view documents or information in the possession of public officials or public agencies."

You're saying a $10-\mathrm{K}$ does not satisfactory that?
MR. SINATRA: No. No. We're saying the $10-\mathrm{K}$ 's does satisfy that.

THE COURT: Does satisfy that, but it doesn't satisfactory the exception?

MR. SINATRA: Which is the exception in the general rule, in (b); which says that you dismiss if there is something substantially similar out there in public. And what (ii) is saying, except in this situation.

THE COURT: But doesn't (b) require your client to be the original source of the information?
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MR. SINATRA: No. The Original Source Doctrine would be an exception if the public disclosure bar applied in the first place.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Am I reading the section wrong? It says "the Court shall dismiss the action under this article, unless opposed by the state -- the state is not taking a position -- or an applicable local government -- not here -- or unless the plaintiff is an original source of the information. They're not. We know the plaintiff is not; correct?

MR. POLUBINSKI: Agreed, right.
THE COURT: Then there is's comment: "If substantially the same allegations or transactions as alleged in the action were publicly disclosed."

MR. POLUBINSKI: Your Honor, if I may.
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. POLUBINSKI: So --

THE COURT: I don't understand how that still gets us off the hook here.

MR. SINATRA: I guess I overlooked that the semi-colon is in (ii).

THE COURT: What is your take on this, please?
MR. POLUBINSKI: Thank you, your Honor.
So, Section $190(b)(2)$ here does clearly apply to SEC rules. The language that Mr. Sinatra is quoting here is
language that was inserted into the statute specifically aimed at FOIL -- F-O-I-L -- exceptions and the federal equivalent.

Essentially, the language stands for the proposition, if the relator goes and receives information and receives it in response to a FOIL request or a FOIA request under the New York law, that's not public disclosure.

But it certainly does not change the decades of law that's already out there that says that SEC reports do qualify for federal reports for purposes of (b)(ii). So you can look to SEC reports as federal disclosure for purposes of dismissing under the public disclosure bar.

And, that is in addition to the fact -- the point which I've already made, your Honor. That even if you were to set aside Citi's SEC filings, there would still be more than enough information available in the public domain and Congressional report and the news media and relator's own article.

THE COURT: Well, the relator doesn't allege that he discovered this on his own, he doesn't.

MR. POLUBINSKI: Agreed. Exactly, your Honor.
MR. SINATRA: But, your Honor, we're the provider in that section. "Provided that such information shall not be deemed publicly disclosed in a report or investigation
because it was disclosed, or provided pursuant to article six of the Public Officers Law, or under any other federal, state or local law, rule or program, enabling the public to request, receive or view documents or information in the possession --

THE COURT: That's a FOIL request.
MR. SINATRA: Except that we've got article six of the Public Officer's Law. Or under any other federal -federal, state or local --

THE COURT: Where does your client say he got this information? Only from the $10-\mathrm{K}$; is that the allegation in the complaint?

MR. SINATRA: Certainly with respect to the New York State, the only place it could have come from is from the $10-\mathrm{K}$.

THE COURT: It wasn't in the newspaper?
MR. SINATRA: No.
THE COURT: You're saying this is not just a FOIL request?

MR. SINATRA: Nope. The section in (b) (ii) is not just for FOIL.

THE COURT: You can have your opinion; I can have mine.

MR. SINATRA: Of course, your Honor. THE COURT: Let's go on.
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MR. SINATRA: There's one last wrinkle, your Honor, and that is the state regulation that the Attorney General issued on this very point.

If in case this Court, your Honor, is inclined to dismiss on public disclosure for federal report grounds, the State AG has issued a regulation, which is 13 NYCRR cited in our brief, 400.5, that requires the Attorney General to oppose the dismissal, if the dismissal is going to be based solely on alleged public disclosure.

THE COURT: That's why I asked, where is the Attorney General's Office?

MR. SINATRA: I think that before this Court can dismiss on that basis, the Court has to grapple over that issue; what to do about the regulation when the AG is not here?

THE COURT: I don't second guess the Attorney General, I rule on cases. That's what I do.

What is the false statement that you are alleging?
MR. SINATRA: Certainly, Judge, the New York State tax filing. The tax return submitted to the State of New York was the false statement.

THE COURT: What was false about it?
MR. SINATRA: Because it takes the net operating loss deductions when it shouldn't have. And the reason there on the merits, your Honor --
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THE COURT: Why does that constitute a false statement? They're not misrepresenting anything, they're just saying this is the net operating loss which we have taken under the federal statute; we're taking it here.

There's no false statement. They're not hiding the fact that they had some additional income and they are not inflating a loss. They're being very open and candidly saying, we're going to take the NOL's.

MR. SINATRA: What they're candidly saying is that we're taking the NOL's and they're properly -- by implication, that they're properly taking them.

THE COURT: Is there any case law that says that we can say that they are making a false statement by implication? We're talking about fraud here.

MR. SINATRA: I believe the state takes the position that false tax filings are false statements.

THE COURT: Anybody files an erroneous tax return, that gives a relator the right to come into court and seek a portion of the recovery?

MR. SINATRA: If that's done with the requisite scienter; if it's done knowingly and deliberately, with disregard or reckless; that is the scienter piece of it.

THE COURT: But you don't deny that the defendant complied with the federal guidelines?

MR. SINATRA: Citigroup did comply.
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THE COURT: It's one thing to say that they did something wrong -- and we all know, hopefully, what something wrong is -- but it's kind of hard to say that somebody did something wrong when they've complied with the instructions given to them by the government.

MR. SINATRA: Right. The I.R.S. told Citigroup --
THE COURT: You just don't agree with what the government has done?

MR. SINATRA: We're talking about two different things. What the I.R.S. did vis-a-vis the federal tax return, it's different from what's owing under the New York State Tax Law. And that's where we've got our tab in there.

THE COURT: So if I file a tax return and I make a mistake on my tax return and I take a loss and I'm not entitled to take this, this gives you your client the right to bring a lawsuit against me?

MR. SINATRA: If the dollar amount thresholds are satisfied.

THE COURT: Yes. Assuming I'm not a judge because I can never get to the threshold.

MR. SINATRA: And if you did it with the requisite scienter, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: And the requisite scienter comes from where?

MR. SINATRA: Also in the New York law. The New

York False Claims Act, it requires such a statement to be made in order to be actionable, to be made with the requisite scienter, as I've just stated.

THE COURT: What other, than the fact that they knowingly did it?

MR. SINATRA: They knowingly did it and they should have known that the New York applied it differently.

Your Honor, that's where we have Section 1453, which takes the entire net income right from the federal return, which is great, and that's where Citigroup wants you to focus on, but $1453(k)(1)$ speaks more specifically as to net operating losses, and specifically incorporates the Internal Revenue Code.

And the most important thing to take away here, your Honor, is that the Internal Revenue Code is still on the books what would have barred the net operating loss deductions, if it weren't for the I.R.S. notice.

The I.R.S. notice is an free pass to Citigroup; don't take -- you may take the net operating loss deductions that are otherwise barred.

And if I might, your Honor --
THE COURT: But doesn't the state follow form then?
MR. SINATRA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.
THE COURT: Doesn't the state follow form? That is, we follow -- doesn't the State of New York follow the
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federal form?
MR. SINATRA: It exactly says that as to entire net income, but it says something different with net operating losses. It doesn't want to know what you put on the bottom of your federal tax return. It wants to know what's calculable under the federal tax law.

And the Bosch (phonetic) case from the New York Court of Appeals says, when a federal regulation -- even as high as a regulation, never mind the sub-regulatory guidance -- but when the federal regulation is the opposite of a federal statute, the state agencies must apply the federal statute.

THE COURT: So you are faulting the state and Citigroup, okay.

MR. SINATRA: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. POLUBINSKI: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. POLUBINSKI: If I may. I have just a handful of points in rebuttal, which $I$ believe will be helpful. Maybe not.

THE COURT: Please.
MR. POLUBINSKI: The first one is just to address 400.5, which is one of the regulations that Mr. Sinatra addressed in the context of the public disclosure bar. That is the regulation that he claims would have required the
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Attorney General to oppose dismissal here.
Your Honor, that regulation doesn't apply here for two reasons. The regulation reads that the attorney general must oppose in a case that would be dismissed solely because of alleged disclosures in a federal report. There are two reasons why it doesn't apply here.

The first is that the Attorney General didn't intervene, as your Honor noted.

But the second is, even if the attorney general had intervened, this regulation wouldn't apply because the federal reports are not the only disclosure here and the sole basis for dismissal.

Instead, as your Honor pointed out, the news media and other sources reported precisely on plaintiff's allegations. And plaintiff himself issued his own public article which contained all of his allegations, as well.

Your Honor, as you've pointed out in terms of the propriety of the Citi's tax reporting, the New York State law does follow form for all the reasons I've identified in my opening argument.

The Bosch case, which Mr. Sinatra cited, was a situation in which the state itself had issued a regulation that was contrary to federal regulation. And the Court held, in that case where the state drew up the regulation, you follow state's regulation, and you can follow the
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state's interpretation of the federal law.
As your Honor noted, the state has not appeared in this case and has never taken a contrary position here.

Finally, your Honor, I guess to end on the last point, which is the plaintiff has not sufficiently alleged knowledge. If there is one case that I would ask your Honor to read on the knowledge point, it is chief Judge Lippman's opinion in the SPRINT case.

I direct your attention to Page 113. That discussion is instructive because it shows a stark difference between that case in which the Court of Appeals held that plaintiff had in fact alleged knowledge, and this case where the plaintiff clearly hasn't.

Just a couple of the differences. One of them is SPRINT actually chose not to follow the available government guidance there. Obviously, Citigroup did follow the available government guidance here.

The second point is that SPRINT was an outlier in that case. It was alleged that the industry as a whole followed the government guidance and SPRINT did not.

The last point is that SPRINT received explicit warnings from the state. Not only has Citigroup never received a warning from the state, but the states never took the position that Citigroup was not permitted to rely on federal guidelines.
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Unless your Honor has anything further, we ask that the complaint be dismissed.

THE COURT: Gentleman, the motion is granted. The case is dismissed.

Thank you very much. Get a copy of the transcript, I'll so order it.

MR. SINATRA: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.

Certified to be a true and accurate transcription of the minutes taken in the above-captioned matter.

Denise M. Paternoster, RPR
Senior Court Reporter

|  | A | adhere [1]-11:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 23,7: 2,7: 5,7: 6, \\ & 7: 10,7: 11,7: 17,7: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { article }[6]-15: 10, \\ 16: 7,17: 20,18: 2, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'publicly [1]-15:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{a}[80]-2: 3,2: 17, \\ & 2: 18,3: 5,3: 25,4: 3, \\ & 4: 7,4: 8,4: 20,5: 5, \\ & 5: 14,5: 20,5: 21,6: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:3, 13:12 } \\ & \text { affirmatively }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 10:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 2,8: 15,8: 25,9: 12, \\ & 9: 15,9: 26,10: 5, \\ & 10: 13,11: 4,11: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 8,24: 17 \\ & \text { as }[30]-2: 17,2: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 |  |  | $11: 8,11: 13,11: 18$ | $6: 9,6: 17,7: 7,7: 17,$ |
| 15 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 14,5: 20,5: 21,6: 19, \\ & 6: 20,6: 21,7: 2,7: 6, \end{aligned}$ | affirmed [1]-8:16 <br> afford [1]-8:22 |  |  |
| 18:12, 18:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 7,8: 4,8: 12,8: 18 \\ & 8: 22,8: 23,8: 25,9: 9, \end{aligned}$ | AG [2] - 19:7, 19:15 | 13:10, 14:4, 14:14, | 13:3, 13:5, 16:14, |
| 10-k[2]-14:23, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:26, 15:23, 17:3, } \\ & \text { 17:6, 17:7, 17:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 17:13, 22:4, 22:12, |
| 14:25 10-K's [8] - 4:5, 6:7, | 9:23, 10:16, 11:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:17 } \\ & \text { agencies }[2]-15: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:6, 17:7, 17:15, } \\ & \text { 17:18, 17:19, 19:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:3, 23:9, 23:10, } \\ & \text { 24:9, 24:14, 24:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6:15, 6:20, 10:14, | 11:15, 11:18, 12:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:12 } \\ & \text { ago }[1]-2: 9 \\ & \text { agree }[1]-21: 8 \\ & \text { agreed }[2]-16: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 25,20: 7,20: 8 \\ & 20: 11,20: 19,20: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 24:9, 24:14, 24:17, <br> 24:18, 25:3, 25:20 |
| 12:4, 12:5, 15:17 | 12:18, 13:7, 13:11, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aside [2] - 6:14, } \\ & \text { 17:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $100[1]-1: 17$ | 13:13, 13:16, 14:25, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:11, 20:19, 20:22, } \\ & \text { 21:3, 21:13, 21:14, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
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