1 THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS 1 2 SITTING AS A HIGH COURT OF IMPEACHMENT 3 IN THE MATTER OF § 4 S WARREN KENNETH PAXTON, JR. 5 6 7 8 9 10 TRIAL VOLUME 2 - AM SESSION 11 12 SEPTEMBER 6, 2023 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 2.1 The following proceedings came on to be heard in the 22 above-entitled cause in the Senate chambers before Lieutenant 2.3 24 Governor Dan Patrick, Presiding Officer, and Senate members.

25

Stenographically reported by Kim Cherry, CSR, RMR.

1 APPEARANCES FOR THE TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BOARD OF 2 MANAGERS: 3 Mr. Rusty Hardin Ms. Lara Hudgins Hollingsworth 4 Ms. Jennifer Brevorka Ms. Megan Moore 5 Mr. Daniel Dutko Ms. Leah M. Graham 6 Mr. Armstead Lewis Ms. Aisha Dennis 7 RUSTY HARDIN & ASSOCIATES, LLP 1401 McKinney Street, Suite 2250 8 Houston, Texas 77010 (713) 652-9000 9 rhardin@rustyhardin.com 10 Mr. Dick DeGuerin Mr. Mark White, III 11 DEGUERIN AND DICKSON 12 1018 Preston Houston, Texas 77002 (713) 223-5959 13 ddequerin@aol.com 14 Ms. Harriet O'Neill 15 LAW OFFICE OF HARRIET O'NEILL, PC 919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1400 Austin, Texas 78701 16 honeill@harrietoneilllaw.com 17 Ms. Erin M. Epley 18 EPLEY LAW FIRM, LLC 1207 South Shepherd Drive Houston, Texas 77019-3611 19 erin@epley-law.com 20 Mr. Mark E. Donnelly PARKER, SANCHEZ, & DONNELLY, PLLC 2.1 700 Louisiana, Suite 2700 Houston, Texas 77002 22 mark@psd.law 2.3 Ms. Terese Buess buesster@gmail.com 24 25

			3
1		Ms. Donna Cameron State Bar No. 03675050	
2		Mr. Brian Benken	
3		BENKEN LAW 1545 Heights Boulevard, Suite 900	
4		Houston, Texas 77008 (713) 223-4051	
5		Mr. Ross Garber	
6		THE GARBER GROUP LLC 1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 400E	
7		Washington, D.C. 20005 rgarber@thegarbergroup.com	
8			
9		Ms. Lisa Bowlin Hobbs KUHN HOBBS PLLC 3307 Northland Drive, Suite 310	
10		Austin, Texas 78731 lisa@kuhnhobbs.com	
11			
12	ALSO	PRESENT:	
13		HOUSE BOARD OF MANAGERS:	
14		Representative Andrew Murr	
15		Representative Ann Johnson Representative Briscoe Cain Representative Terry Canales	
16		Representative Terry Canales Representative Erin Gamez Representative Charlie Geren	
17		Representative Jeff Leach	
18		Representative Oscar Longoria Representative Morgan Meyer Representative Joe Moody	
19		Representative David Spiller	
20		Representative Cody Vasut	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
_ ~			

1 PROCEEDINGS WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2023 2 (Proceedings began at 9:46 a.m.) 3 THE BAILIFF: All rise. The Court of 4 Impeachment of the Texas Senate is now in session. 5 Honorable Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate Dan 6 Patrick now presiding. 7 PRESIDING OFFICER: Good morning, everyone. 8 The bailiff will bring in the jury. 9 10 (Senate members enter the Senate chamber) PRESIDING OFFICER: We begin every day with a 11 12 prayer. Senator Campbell, please come forward. 1.3 SENATOR CAMPBELL: Let's go to the Lord in 14 15 prayer. Gracious Heavenly Father, Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, bless this body, bless everybody in this 16 chamber, for with your blessing we need nothing more. In 17 18 Jesus' name, amen. PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you, Senator. 19 20 Y'all may be seated. House Managers and Paxton defense team, I 2.1 understand you have come to an agreement on exhibits. 22 MR. BUZBEE: That is true, Your Honor. 2.3 morning. 24

PRESIDING OFFICER: Good morning.

```
1
                    MR. BUZBEE: We have a couple of our
     colleagues that would like to read into the record, I
 2
     believe, the agreement, if we could do that.
 3
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.
                                             Yes.
 4
                    Please state your name.
 5
                    MS. BREVORKA: Jennifer Brevorka.
 6
                                        Thank you, Jennifer.
                    PRESIDING OFFICER:
 7
                    MS. BREVORKA: The first ones that I'll read
 8
     are the Attorney General's exhibit numbers. And those that
 9
10
     we have agreed to preadmission are 4, 5, 11, 17, 19, 20, 21,
     22, 24, 33, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 56, 57, 69, 72,
11
     74, 75, 87, 90, 95, 100, 103, 105, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112,
12
     113, 121, 122, 127, 131, 134, 135, 136, 139, 143, 144, 146,
1.3
     147, 151, 154, 155, 156, 164, 166, 169, 170, 174, 175, 182,
14
     191, 192, 193, 194, 198, 203, 205, 211, 216, 227, 235, 241,
15
     252, and 273.
16
                    I will now read the House Board of Managers
17
18
     exhibits to which both sides have agreed to preadmission.
                    MR. BUZBEE: And, Your Honor, I'd like to
19
20
     formerly offer the exhibits that my colleague just read out
     into evidence and have them be accepted.
2.1
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Accepted. Thank you.
22
                    (Attorney General Paxton Exhibit Nos. 4, 5,
2.3
                     11, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 33, 37, 39, 40,
24
```

43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 56, 57, 69, 72, 74, 75,

87, 90, 95, 100, 103, 105, 107, 108, 109, 1 111, 112, 113, 121, 122, 127, 131, 134, 135, 2 136, 139, 143, 144, 146, 147, 151, 154, 155, 3 156, 164, 166, 169, 170, 174, 175, 182, 191, 4 192, 193, 194, 198, 203, 205, 211, 216, 227, 5 235, 241, 252, and 273 were admitted) 6 MR. BUZBEE: Thank you. 7 MS. BREVORKA: The House Board of Managers' 8 exhibits to which the parties have both agreed to 9 preadmission are 92, 126, 213, 291, 450, 457, 466, 516-A, 10 558, 45, 39, 233, 90, 110, 614, 109, 51, 305, 319, 389, 565, 11 134, 131, 130, 41, 145, 232, 210, 32, 36, 88, 162, 233, 239, 12 306, 357, 308, 309, 314, 375, 317, 319, 423, 434, 472, 163, 13 231, 227, 445, 71, 86, 77, 71, 62, 85, 67, 64, 91, 226, 90, 14 74, 96, 97, 98, 223, 225, 230, 290, 372, 137, 142, 578, 30, 15 115, 108, 104, 103, 293, 48, 376, 383, 565, 169, 131. 16 is the list. 17 18 PRESIDING OFFICER: For the record, these exhibits are admitted into evidence. 19 20 (House Managers' Exhibit Nos. 30, 32, 36, 39, 41, 45, 48, 51, 62, 64, 67, 71, 74, 77, 85, 2.1 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 103, 104, 22 108, 109, 110, 115, 126, 130, 131, 134, 137, 2.3 142, 145, 162, 163, 169, 210, 213, 223, 225, 24

226, 227, 230, 231, 232, 233, 239, 290, 291,

```
293, 305, 306, 308, 309, 314, 317, 319, 357,
 1
                     372, 375, 376, 383, 389, 423, 434, 445, 450,
 2
                     457, 466, 472, 516-A, 558, 565, 578, 614 were
 3
                     admitted)
 4
                    MS. BREVORKA: I'm sorry, sir?
 5
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: I was -- just for the
 6
     record.
 7
                    MS. BREVORKA: For the record?
 8
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: All of these exhibits are
 9
10
     admitted into evidence.
                    MS. BREVORKA: Thank you, sir.
11
12
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Thank you.
                    Yes?
1.3
                    SENATOR GUTIERREZ: We received the House
14
15
     Managers' response on privilege, and it seems the last page
     on several copies is missing on several of my colleagues'.
16
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Let me take a look at
17
18
     that.
                    MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, may I be heard on
19
20
     this?
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.
2.1
                    MR. BUZBEE: In the interest of time for Your
22
     Honor and for our jurors, and because Attorney General Ken
2.3
     Paxton has nothing to hide, we're going to withdraw our
24
25
     objection and save us all a lot of time.
```

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mr. Buzbee, are you saying
you're withdrawing your objection to all documents that will
be submitted, or just to this one?

1.3

2.1

2.3

MR. BUZBEE: We're withdrawing our privilege objection, the one that's been briefed, the one that we were going to argue. The Attorney General has nothing to hide.

We will be focused on hearsay. We'll raise hearsay issues that will come up, you know, question by question. But as far as the issue about who holds the privilege, whether something the Attorney General said was privilege, which we believe it is, obviously, but we're going to withdraw that so we can proceed with this trial

PRESIDING OFFICER: So to be clear, there will be no further objection on privilege?

MR. BUZBEE: Correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Okay.

MR. BUZBEE: Now, again, Your Honor, just so we're clear, I don't want you to think that I'm playing games with you, obviously. Anything that a witness said or claims to have said to Attorney General Paxton would be hearsay. I know there's issues with regard to what Mr. Paxton might have said, and they're going to argue that's non-hearsay, but we're not going to make a privilege objection.

MR. HARDIN: Your Honor, may I be briefly heard when you get ready? Before you rule, if I could be

11 heard just -- I don't have to be right this second, but --1 PRESIDING OFFICER: Pardon? 2 MR. HARDIN: I think you were about to address 3 him. I just wanted to make sure I make an observation before 4 you rule. 5 PRESIDING OFFICER: You may make an 6 observation, Counselor. 7 MR. HARDIN: Thank you. For clarification, I 8 want to make sure some witnesses --9 PRESIDING OFFICER: Speak up if you can. 10 Speak a little louder. 11 MR. HARDIN: Pardon me? 12 PRESIDING OFFICER: Just speak a little 1.3 louder. 14 MR. HARDIN: Sure. Some witnesses and their 15 lawyers have been concerned in light of the fact they were 16 afraid that the privilege was going to be claimed, and that 17 it was yesterday. So if I could have a clarification from 18 Mr. Buzbee, are we to understand that those lawyers are free 19 20 to tell their clients that the Attorney General's Office nor

21 Mr. Paxton are claiming privilege on any conversations they

22 had?

2.3

24

25

And I understand him to say they may still object to those conversations on hearsay but that the lawyers are free to advise their clients that the Attorney General's

Office -- they do not have to worry about the Attorney General's Office or Mr. Paxton individually claiming privilege on any of their conversations.

1.3

2.1

2.3

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mr. Buzbee?

MR. HILTON: Your Honor, I don't think we can comment on what other lawyers should advise their clients, and we certainly can't make any representations on behalf of the Attorney General's Office right now given the constitutional suspension.

What we're saying is that we, on behalf of Attorney General Paxton, will not assert privilege objections in response to their attempts to admit exhibits or in response to witness testimony. There may be other objections that we have to raise through the course of this trial, but we are not going to burden the Court and burden the jurors with deciding these extremely complex legal issues related to the privileges that we've been discussing and that we briefed last night. So we're withdrawing the motion that we filed last night, and we're not going to continue to assert those privileges.

MR. HARDIN: My problem is -- I don't want to be obstreperous here, but this is important for everybody to understand. I think witnesses and we have a right to expect that this issue of privilege is dead. And if they're going to head off a ruling by the Senate at-large or by the

president in his capacity temporarily but those people -- but everybody is still uncertain as to whether they intend to assert it in the future, that's our problem.

1.3

2.1

2.3

And we would hope and want -- intend to ask that there be a ruling definitively from the Senate that that privilege, whatever basis that we've urged, whether it's been waived or on the law itself, so that people go forth -- forward knowing they're not going to have grievances filed against them claiming they violated the privilege; they're not going to be accused of violating the privilege. We need a determination as to whether or not those people are safe for the future.

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I don't know how much clearer we can make it. We can think about future fights and argue about things that I don't think we're arguing about. Attorney-client privilege, we're not raising that with regard to Attorney General Paxton and the witnesses that they're going to bring. I don't know how much more clearer I can make that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: I think the Court is satisfied with their withdrawal of their motion. They're not going to raise privilege. If they do, then I will stop that.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Bailiff, call Jeff Mateer back to the witness stand.

Mr. Mateer, you're still under oath that you took yesterday.

JEFFREY MATEER,

having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. HARDIN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. Good morning.
- A. Good morning, sir.
- Q. Mr. Mateer, since you and I had a partial trial run yesterday dealing with the circumstances and the microphone, I've been informed by numerous people that I would back up sometime from the microphone and no matter how loud it sounded to me here, some people couldn't hear. So I'm going to stay here.

By the same token, I want to make sure that you are allowed to finish your answers; and you, in turn, will try to answer only that one and trust that we get to the points of concern. Let me -- that you're concerned.

Let me back up a moment. Is one reason that you wanted to make sure that everything you knew about the things as I went along and asked you questions is because this is the first time in three years you've been able to tell your side to the world?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What's that been like for you in terms of

frustration? And so as you read and heard the allegations about you and the others and who you supposedly were and who you -- what you supposedly did and why, what's that been like?

A. Well, you know, I guess --

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. You need to pull the microphone to you now.
- A. Okay. Sorry. Is that better?

I guess at a core, I mean, I am an advocate, and I think one of the things is I believe in truth. And when you hear people saying things that you know that aren't true, I mean, your tendency is you want to correct that, but I was advised that I shouldn't say anything. And so for -- since the events that we've been discussing the last day --

- Q. Without going into details -- excuse me. I interrupted you. Go ahead.
 - A. No, I mean, I finished. I was pausing.
- Q. And without going into details, have you been introduced -- have you been interviewed over the years by law enforcement about some of these matters?
 - A. I have been, yes.
- Q. And were you asked by law enforcement -- though they couldn't order you, were you asked by law enforcement to not talk publicly about the matters you talked to them?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you have followed that request?

A. To the best of my ability.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. That request doesn't apply here today. Do you understand that?
 - A. I do understand that, sir.
- Q. All right. I want to go now to some dates, and I'm going to try about a time line. You know, I -- like you, but not quite the number of years, quite a number of years more, but like you as a trial lawyer, I've always relied on some type of whiteboard or something that was on the wall or what -- and for those of us who are still technologically challenged, I'm going to try as we go forward here, when we hit dates that are important, I'm going to mention them and Ms. Manela is going to try to use the equipment over there to make an entry that it will be on the iPad.

And then at the end of your testimony, I want to ask you to glance at the list of dates that we may put up there and tell us whether those are true and accurate and reflect your testimony about the events and dates that occurred. Are you with me?

- A. Okay. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Now, I want to apologize to you also in asking these questions that one of the difficulties here is about for every exhibit we show and discuss, it takes a little bit of time, correct? And are you aware that we're on some very strict time requirements here?

1 A. Yeah, I read the --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. You lost the microphone.
- A. I've read the president's order.
- Q. All right. If you pull it just a little bit further, just the top of it, move that.
 - A. This way?
 - Q. There you go.
 - A. All right. Sorry.
 - Q. Right there. That's good.

All right. Now, for instance, we talked about the date of July the 22nd of 2020 in which you had conversations with the Attorney General. Do you recall?

- A. Yes, I do recall.
- Q. All right. And the original reason for that meeting was what?
- A. Well, the original reason was that the Attorney General was going to appear in Travis County district court on that day. And Darren McCarty, the deputy for civil litigation, had advised me.
- Q. All right. And so as the meeting started -- by the time the meeting started, had you learned that Mr. McCarty, I think you said yesterday, had already talked the Attorney General out of it?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Did you then still take the occasion of that

meeting to have several conversations with him?

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.3

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I'm going to object.

Almost every question is leading, and I'm just going to ask

Mr. Hardin not lead this witness.

MR. HARDIN: I'll be glad not to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

MR. HARDIN: And I'll hopefully remember that later.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) All right. Now, having said -- in that particular meeting, what subjects did you want to make sure that he understood what your position and concerns were?
- A. I wanted to have a meeting with the Attorney

 General to discuss why he was involving himself in the

 affairs of Nate Paul; why would he, you know, an Attorney

 General, want -- feel like he had to go to Travis County

 district court on behalf of someone.
- Q. All right. And by the time that July 22nd came around of 2020, had you begun -- you, yourself, started to have very much concerns about his relationship with Nate Paul?
- A. I had -- that memo reflects that I had already raised concerns with the Attorney General. So this was reiterating concerns that -- not only that I had, but all the staff, all the senior staff had about being involved with Mr. Paul and his companies.

MR. HARDIN: Can I have Exhibit 87 back up please, Stella?

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Now, this is in evidence. It was admitted yesterday. When did you prepare this memo that is dated July the 22nd, 2020?
 - A. I prepared it that day.
- Q. All right. I'm going to ask you to publish it to the jury. And what I mean by that is I want you to read relevant portions.

Well, first of all, the first two paragraphs talk about what you have described, do they not, as the purpose -- the initial purpose of the meeting?

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. And in those two paragraphs, what is your testimony as to whether it accurately describes your original concern?
 - A. It does.
- Q. I would ask you then to read to the jury out loud the last two paragraphs of this exhibit.
 - A. Okay.
- MR. BUZBEE: Objection, Your Honor. The document speaks for itself. It's on the screen of every Senator here. I'm sure they can read it for themselves.
- MR. HARDIN: That may be, but I'm allowed to publish it and have the jury read it.
- MR. BUZBEE: It is published because it's on

their screens.

1.3

2.1

2.3

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled. Continue.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Would you please.
- A. Yes, sir. During the course of the meeting, I relayed concerns that I previously raised to General

 Paxton --
- Q. Now, remember, I'm going to slow you down here for her. She's got to get that.
- A. That Yankee comes out in me occasionally. Let me start again.

During the course of the meeting, I relayed concerns that I had previously raised to General Paxton about his personal involvement in any matters related to Mr. Paul. General Paxton agreed that going forward, he would not have any further personal involvement with any matters that this office is handling that relate to Mr. Paul or his companies and partnerships. Instead, as any -- as any other matter, paren, civil or criminal, closed paren, our division attorneys would handle as they deem appropriate with oversight by their division chief and the appropriate deputy.

Q. At the time you wrote that memo, had you become -- and had that conversation that you are memorializing, had you become aware that he, in the Mitte Foundation case, had begun

going around the shop supervision and been dealing and pressuring line employees?

A. I had.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. Is that, in fact, one of the things you're referring to in the last sentence of that memo?
 - A. It is.
 - Q. And what's the problem with that?
- A. Well, the problem is the office is being used for the benefit of one person. It's not exercising its own independent judgment. You have the Attorney General acting on behalf of one person. And by this time I knew that he was a campaign donor. And so that -- I mean that concerned me because there have been allegations in the past made against the office and against the Attorney General that he had taken actions on behalf of campaign donors. So I was super sensitive to that.
- Q. If in fact -- in addition to being to the advantage of a campaign donor, by definition, does that mean it was also to the disadvantage of other citizens?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. All right. Now, after July the 22nd, did you discover whether or not he had kept -- let me back away. How would you -- back up.
- How would you describe his representation to you at this meeting in terms of whether you considered it an actual

promise or commitment? How would you describe it?

- A. I mean, I believed that he would allow the professionals, the lawyers in the Office of Attorney General, that they would do their jobs. And so I believed he would commit -- I believed that he would do that as of July 22nd. Let's say this, I hoped he would do that.
 - Q. Did you believe he had given you his word?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. And did you believe he would keep it?
 - A. I hoped he would keep it.
 - Q. Did you discover differently after that meeting?
- 12 A. I did.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Do you recall the first time you became aware he was continuing to pursue activities on behalf of Mr. Nate Paul?
- A. Yeah. What I recall is I think the first week in August, I -- for the weekend, I rented a house out in east Texas where I met my son and his wife, and we took the weekend at a lake house. When I returned to the office on Monday, I learned that the office had issued an opinion letter with regard to foreclosures.
- Q. Now, let me ask you, you were not involved in that process, were you?
- A. I was not involved at all and was not alerted to it until after the fact.

- Q. At the time that opinion was issued, what had the unrelenting position of the Attorney General's Office been to the public and anyone affected that asked for opinions as to the issue of openness during COVID?
 - A. I was proud of the office and, quite frankly, proud of the Attorney General. We were at the forefront of having Texas reopen and to stop COVID restrictions. We did it with regard to churches. We did it with regard to entertainment. So we were the ones pushing to open Texas back up. That was General Paxton's policy; that was the office's policy.
 - Q. What did you -- what was wrong, then, with this opinion that -- wait a minute. You don't have to lean back.
 - A. I won't talk if I back up.

Just bear with me. Okay?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

Ο.

- What did you -- what was wrong, then, with this opinion?
- A. The opinion took the complete opposite view. It was if Anthony Fauci had written it. And it was shut down, you know, that you can't do outside foreclosure sales. I remember coming back and talking to Mr. Bangert, like, what was this? This is completely contrary.
- Q. All right. So for those who believed that it should shut down, that would have been a good opinion, right?
- A. Well, I mean, but, again, this is August. This isn't April. I mean, we've been through that. I mean, COVID

- is March, the shutdown, the 14 days, we've been through that.

 We had issued opinions with regard to churches that said, you know, that no county judge can shut down a church, no government can shut down a church. We had done that with entertainment. I mean, this -- to me, this was in line with all that.
 - Q. And my question is based no matter what side of that issue a member of the public, Senate, or anyone else came down on, are you testifying that to help Nate Paul, Mr. Paxton directed an opinion that was totally contrary to his and his administration's policy and his public statements on a regular basis?
 - MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt again, but that is leading, absolutely leading.

MR. HARDIN: I'll rephrase it.

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained. Please rephrase.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Put it in your words as to whether -- no matter which way one person came down on the issue, what was the import of the seriousness of that opinion?
- A. Well, it was contrary to what I believed Attorney
 General Paxton believed and what had been the office policy.

 It was completely contrary. I mean, we were not for shutting

things down, certainly not shutting down outside foreclosure sales.

- Q. All right. Now, when the opinion on foreclosures comes out, at that time were you aware of any -- any benefit it might carry for Mr. Paxton -- I mean, for Mr. Paul?
 - A. That I do not remember.
- Q. All right. So was your objection initially the substance of what the opinion was?
 - A. That was my objection, the substance.
- Q. And you were not aware one way or the other as to whether it carried a side benefit to Mr. Paul?
- A. Not during that week, which I guess was the first full week of August.
- Q. All right. Then after the August 1st, 2nd, 3rd period of time, when is the next time you became concerned about what Mr. Paxton was doing in terms of positions that might aid a donor, Mr. Nate Paul?
- A. Yeah. My wife and I went to Maine to visit my daughter who works in Boston. On the first night there -- and we were at a cabin on Mount Desert Island. And sometime during that evening, I got two texts from Mrs. Paxton, Senator Paxton. And the first one was asking me --
 - MR. BUZBEE: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.
- MR. HARDIN: Let me -- let me try it
- 25 this way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Did you -- do you recall the date?
 - A. August 14th, 15th.
- Q. August 14th, 15th. And did you get an inquiry from anyone?
 - A. I did.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. And from whom was the inquiry from?
- A. From Mrs. Paxton.
- Q. From whom?
- A. Mrs. Paxton.
- Q. Mrs. Paxton. What was the nature of the inquiry?

 MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor, he's just

 trying to get around what's clearly hearsay. He wants to
- talk about what maybe Senator Paxton said to him via text.
- 14 That's hearsay.
- 15 PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.
- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) When you got that particular
 message from her, did you become concerned about where --
- MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor --
- MR. HARDIN: Let me just finish the
- 20 question.
- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Did you become concerned about where Mr. Paxton might be?
- MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor, I would object
- 24 to this as hearsay. He's trying it all different ways, but
- 25 it's still hearsay.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained. Continue.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Mr. Mateer, later did you get an inquiry -- did you get a response that made you no longer concerned?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor, I'm sorry to keep interrupting. The witness knows this too. This is all hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: That is not hearsay. I'm not asking him for an answer on a matter trying to prove the truth of the matter asserted outside of the courtroom, which, of course, is what hearsay is. I've asked just simply about his state of mind.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled. Continue.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) You can answer.
- A. Yes, I was no longer concerned.
- Q. But do you recall about what time that you got that call?
- A. I would have seen it the next morning, but in the middle of the night.
- Q. All right. Now, after that date, when is the next time that you became concerned about Mr. Paxton's dealings with Mr. Paul?
 - A. I think it then fast-forwards to sometime in

September.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. All right. Can you give me an idea -- by the way, at the time that you were going through -- let's take the first week in September. First week in September, can you describe for the jury what your state of mind and concern was by then in terms of Attorney General versus Mr. Nate Paul?
- A. Well, the Attorney General had made a promise to me --
 - Q. Keep your --
- A. I'm sorry. The Attorney General had made a promise to me and to other senior staff that he wouldn't have any more dealings with Nate Paul. It became apparent by September, in light of Mrs. Paxton's text, in light of the foreclosures sale, that he wasn't -- he was not honoring that commitment any longer.
- Q. By that time, were you having any conversations with -- without going into what was said at the time, were you having any conversations with Mr. Penley about his concerns over in the criminal justice area?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Without going into the conversations specifically, what were your concerns?
- A. The concerns were that Mr. Penley was attempting to follow up on a request of Mr. Paul at the Attorney General's urging to conduct an investigation with regard to Mr. Paul's

- allegations that federal and state law enforcement had engaged in improper conduct towards Mr. Paul.
- Q. Now, we'll get to the facts of those kinds of circumstances with other witnesses. But as of the time you hit about the first week in September, had you had any -- were you involved in any of the details of investigating Mr. Paul's allegations?
 - A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. You, yourself?
- A. I was not.
- Q. All right.
- MR. HARDIN: Your Honor, I left my glasses over, if I could go get them.
- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Let me ask you, if I can go back to the latter part of August. In August of 2020, did you have occasion to meet a man named Mr. Brandon Cammack?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. And what were the circumstances?
- A. What I recall is I was in my office on the 8th floor, probably with the door closed, probably working on either Google or opioids, and either my assistant or actually probably the Attorney General --
- Q. I'm going to apologize. This is not your fault or anything, but I need to kind of shorten --
 - A. I'm sorry.

- Q. That's okay. So did you have occasion to meet him? Where were you when you met him?
 - A. I was in my office on the 8th floor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.3

24

25

- Q. All right. And how is it that you met Mr. Cammack?
- A. The Attorney General brought him by my office.
- Q. And I hope you understand, sir, going forward, I really apologize when I interrupt you. Under the old days without time limits, I would love to not have to do that, okay? So I'm just apologizing --

PRESIDING OFFICER: Counselor, I remind you that the parties agreed to the time limits. Continue.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. And I want you to understand I'm not complaining about them, I was just explaining them.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) All right. Now, how long did you visit with him?
 - A. I mean, must have been 15, 20 minutes.
 - Q. Who brought him into your office?
 - A. The Attorney General, Mr. Paxton.
- Q. And what -- do you recall what you talked to

 Mr. Cammack about? Without saying what it was, do you recall

 the conversation one way or another?
 - A. I mean, vaguely recall the conversation.
 - Q. Did you interview him at all?
 - A. It was not an interview.

- Q. And did you offer him a job?
- A. I did not offer him a job.
- Q. And at that time did you have any idea that he was going to later be employed by the Attorney General?
 - A. I did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. And so after that meeting, what was your understanding as to whether Brandon Cammack was going to be ultimately one day an employee of the Attorney General's Office?
 - A. I had no expectation of that.
- Q. All right. Now, after that meeting -- let's move now into September. I want to -- at some time did you become aware that the Attorney General wanted to hire Mr. Cammack?
 - A. I did become aware of that.
 - Q. How did you become aware?
- A. I believe Mr. Penley told me and then sent me a memo or an e-mail.
- Q. All right. And did you, yourself, have a position as to whether Mr. Cammack should be hired?
- A. I supported Mr. Penley's position, which he did not support him being hired.
 - Q. And the reason for not hiring Mr. Cammack was what?
- A. Well, Mr. Cammack was a five-year lawyer who didn't have any prosecutorial experience.
 - Q. And what was it the Attorney General wanted

Mr. Cammack to do?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. He wanted him to, I guess, assist with or perhaps lead an investigation into the allegations that Mr. Paul was making against federal and state law enforcement.
- Q. What was the position of your criminal justice division as to whether they wanted Mr. Cammack hired? I mean, more specifically, Mr. Penley, what was his position?
- A. Mr. Penley's position was he did not want
 Mr. Cammack hired because he felt like he could do the job.
 - Q. And Mr. Maxwell's position?
 - A. The same.
- Q. All right. Had that position been made clear to the Attorney General?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Were you aware one way or the other as to whether the Attorney General was then contacting other deputy levels to try to get them to agree that Mr. Cammack be hired?
 - A. I learned that after the fact that that was the case.
 - Q. And what would you tell the jury unanimously was the position of the deputies as to whether Mr. Cammack would be hired to conduct an investigation?
- MR. BUZBEE: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.

 We're going to hear from Penley and Maxwell. They can tell
 us their position.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Let me ask you this: Did you, yourself, ever have conversations with the Attorney General expressing your opposition to Mr. Cammack being hired?
 - A. Several.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Do you recall when those conversations were?

 And that last answer, I think the microphone missed it. There you go.
 - A. Several.
 - Q. And do you know when they were and where they were?
- A. They would have been in September, and they would have been in various locations. They would have been --
- Q. All right. Where was the first conversation you remember having with Mr. Paxton expressing your opposition to Mr. Cammack being hired?
- A. I don't know if it was the first one, but the first one that I -- sitting here right now that I recall was I remember I was driving to Houston, actually to The Woodlands, for a Federal Society Leadership event, and the Attorney General called me. He was on an airplane; I was driving. And we had a discussion about Mr. Penley not being for hiring Cammack.
 - Q. And can you give us a date for that conversation?
 - A. Yes. It was Friday, September 25th.
 - Q. All right. And on Friday, September 25th, you were

in your car. Who was with you?

A. My wife.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. And were you informed very quickly in the conversation who was accompanying the Attorney General for this September the 25th conversation?
- A. Well, I know that the Attorney General was in Washington, D.C. with Mr. McCarty, the deputy for civil lit, for a -- I believe it was a Google meeting. And they were on a plane coming -- they were literally on a plane coming back from D.C.
- Q. What did Mr. Paxton tell you in that phone conversation?
- A. Well, he was upset at Mr. Penley because Mr. Penley had expressed that he was not in favor of hiring Mr. Cammack, but the Attorney General wanted Mr. Penley to sign the contract.
- Q. Do you recall what he said and what tone he said it in?
- A. You know, I -- in my time, you know, over four years and -- over four and a half years with the Attorney General, I think he only raised his voice to me and we had a heated discussion on two occasions. This was the first occasion. He was not happy.
 - Q. And what did you tell him?
 - A. I told him I would support Mr. Penley --

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: This is a response not being offered for the truth of the matter, but that he simply stated this to the Attorney General.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled.

MR. HARDIN: We're not seeking to prove the truth one way or the other. So my argument is it is not hearsay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Go ahead.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. Yeah. I mean, so the Attorney General was upset that Mr. Penley wouldn't sign the outside counsel contract for Mr. Cammack.
- Q. What did he want you to do as it applied to Mr. Penley?
- A. Well, he wanted me to talk to Mr. Penley and have him sign the contract on this conversation.
- Q. And what did you tell him as to whether you would do that or not?
 - A. I told him I would not do that.
 - Q. And why did you tell him you would not do that?
- A. Because I was going to back my deputy. Mark Penley is a 20-plus year law enforcement prosecutor, and he told me he could do the job that he was being requested to do.

Q. And then how long did you say that conversation lasted?

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.3

- A. It couldn't have been that long because he was on an airplane, and I think he was told to get off.
- Q. And then when is the next -- when was the next conversation that you had with Mr. Paxton again about whether Mr. Cammack should be hired?
- A. Now, this was a -- this was in my office on the following Monday, so that would have been the 28th.
- Q. And on the 28th when you had this conversation, what was said there and what were the circumstances?
- A. Well, the Attorney General came into my office -and actually he came in and he -- he didn't raise Cammack or
 Penley. Instead -- and, again, I don't have a strong
 recollection other than it wasn't those issue. So it was
 probably he was updating me on the Google meeting, for
 instance. And I said, But I understand you've got a problem.
 One thing that I didn't say --
- Q. I didn't understand that part. What did -- you said this to him?
- A. I said this to the Attorney General. So he didn't raise the issue. And then I said to him -- I probably said Ken. Ken, I understand you're upset with me.
- Q. And how did you understand that? Where did that come from?

- A. Mr. Penley had met with Mr. Paxton.
- Q. Without going into what they said, let's try to do it this way. Were you aware of a meeting that Mr. Paxton had with Mr. Penley on Saturday the 26th in McKinney?
 - A. I was aware.
- Q. That would have been two days before you having a conversation with him, is that right --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- in your office?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So if we have the sequence of these conversations, on the 25th did you say that you were driving to Houston --
- 13 A. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

22

2.3

- Q. -- and had the conversation with Mr. Paxton on the phone?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And then were you aware -- did you inform -- without going into what you told him, did you inform Mr. Penley on the 25th after your conversation with Mr. Paxton of the contact -- content of the conversation with Mr. Paxton?
 - MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor, I hate to keep interrupting, but every question is leading this witness.
- 24 PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained. Continue.
 - Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Let me ask you this: After you

got through with the phone conversation with Mr. Paxton on the 25th that you've described, did you alert any member of your staff to that conversation?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BUZBEE: Again, Your Honor, leading. If he wanted to ask him, "What did you do thereafter," that would not be leading. But he's just basically telling the witness what he wants him to say. Leading.

MR. HARDIN: I don't know how that question alerts him to anything other than my question is, did you talk about that conversation with anyone else after you had it? That's my question.

MR. BUZBEE: That's a different question, and I have no objection to that one.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Did you?
- A. And the answer is yes.
- Q. And whom did you talk to?
- A. With Mark Penley.
- Q. And when and where did you have that conversation with Mr. Penley?
- A. I was at the meeting, the Fed Soc meeting in The Woodlands. It would have been that -- the evening, Saturday evening.
- Q. All right. And as a result of that conversation or anything else, did you become aware that General Paxton had

- arranged a meeting with Mr. Penley that was scheduled to happen the next day?
- A. Actually, I believe it happened that day. This was after that meeting.
 - Q. You were aware he had one conversation?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

17

18

19

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. And then after Mr. Penley had the conversation with the Attorney General on the 25th, which followed your earlier plane conversation with Mr. Paxton, did you become aware of a meeting that Mr. Penley was to have with Mr. Paxton the next day on Saturday the 26th?
- MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, objection, leading. He's suggesting the answer to the question in the question, which is classic leading, and I object to it.
 - PRESIDING OFFICER: Rephrase, please.
- MR. HARDIN: Thank you.
 - Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Do you have any knowledge from any source of whether or not on Saturday the 26th --
 - A. Mr. Hardin, I took notes.
- Q. Pardon me?
 - A. I took some notes --
 - Q. I know that.
 - A. -- that maybe would help refresh my memory, that I made. So I think I provided those to everyone.
 - Q. I'm going to show you -- I can't put them on the

1 screen.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.3

24

25

MR. HARDIN: Do we have a separate set of hard copy?

And also can I ask, Your Honor, permission -Ms. Brevorka, is 240 one of those that you agreed to,
exhibit? Okay. Ms. Brevorka, the question has been answered
by Stella. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Would you
provide a copy, please, to the President, please.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) All right. I'm going to ask you, first of all, to look at these documents real quickly. We're not going to talk about what's in the contents of them. I'm going to ask you to look and, first of all, authenticate them for me. Are these notes that you, yourself, prepared?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Keep your voice and microphone --
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And when you did -- when did you prepare these notes?
- A. I prepared these notes on the Sunday after I resigned.
- Q. All right. And so this is after you had left; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct, but I resigned -- I'm sorry.
 - Q. Go ahead.
 - A. I resigned on Friday the 2nd.

- 1 Q. Let's talk -- the 2nd. All right.
 - A. And these were written on Sunday morning the 4th.
 - Q. Now, I'm asking you to look and see if these notes truly and accurately reflect the events that you were recording as you remembered them on that Sunday over several days. Do they?

And do these notes -- I want you to look at what we were talking about. We were on the period of the 25th and the 26th. I don't want you to tell me what your notes say. I want you to read and see if that helps refresh your recollection and then I may ask you some questions, but not you reading the notes or anything. I'm going to ask you about your memory.

Would you briefly read and review your memory?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

Okay. Mr. Hardin.

- Q. All right. Does that help refresh your memory?
- A. It does, sir.
- Q. All right. I want to go back, then, to your -- you put the notes -- just keep them there, but testify from what you remember.

During your conversations with Mr. Paxton on the 25th, was there -- did you alert him to your feeling -- or let me put it another way. Was there any contention by Mr. Paxton that you had approved the hiring of Mr. Cammack?

- A. Mr. Paxton said that -- Mr. Paxton said that to me during that phone conversation.
 - O. He said what?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. He said, Well, you approved the hiring of Cammack.

 And I said, Absolutely not.
- Q. And has it been your contention from the very beginning always that you did not approve of the hiring of Mr. Cammack?
 - A. I never approved the hiring of Mr. Cammack.
- Q. Was that -- how would you describe that part of your conversation with Mr. Paxton when he suggested you had?
- A. I think it's probably the first time I ever raised my voice to the Attorney General in response to him raising his voice to me.
- Q. So we've got two raised voices, one on a plane and one in a car?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Who was driving?
 - A. I was driving unfortunately.
- Q. All right. Now, have you had a chance to look at your notes and refresh your memory as to whether or not -- when and where, if you did, call Mr. Penley after that call?
- A. Yes. I spoke to Mr. Penley twice, once on the 25th and then I spoke to him again on the 26th.
 - Q. All right. And when you talked to him the 25th,

- what -- do you have any memory as to whether or not you learned he was going to meet with Mr. Paxton on the 26th?
 - A. I learned that he was going to meet with Mr. Paxton on the 26th.
 - Q. And did you have concerns about that meeting?
 - A. I did, because my concern was -- my concern was that General Paxton was going to fire Mr. Penley.
 - Q. So what did you urge Mr. Penley?
 - A. I told Mr. Penley, Do not --

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: Okay. That's fair enough. I'll withdraw it, Your Honor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

MR. HARDIN: I'll withdraw it. Thank you.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) And during the call, did you and Mr. Paxton have any further conversation concerning why in the world y'all were involved -- he was involved with Mr. Paul?
- A. During that conversation and then just briefly, but certainly on the meeting the following Monday.
 - O. On the 28th?
 - A. On the 28th.
- Q. All right. So -- but in the call in the airport -- I mean, on the airplane, what I call the airplane call, did you express any concern about why y'all were -- why he was

involved with Mr. Paul?

1.3

2.1

2.3

- A. I mean, I recall that I, again, asked him -- this wasn't the first time -- but, Ken, why are we involved in this? What -- I mean, it just didn't -- it just didn't make sense to me. Of all the things going on, why was -- why were we involved?
- Q. What do you mean with all this going on? What are you talking about?
- A. Well, by this time -- this is the end of September. So by this time, we knew about -- we knew a lot more about Nate Paul. We had learned a lot more about who he was, what was being alleged against him. I mean, he was not a good guy and had a lot of concerns about that. We knew about the Attorney General wanting to appear in court on behalf of Nate Paul by that time. We knew that he -- by that time, I knew he had been pressuring the other deputies and actually other line lawyers to do more on behalf of Nate Paul. So all this was starting. By the end of September, all this is coming to fruition.

And of course, this with Penley, Penley just simply saying, I want to investigate it. I've asked him for -- Mark Penley was a loyal person. I mean, he was Mr. Paxton's friend for decades. And during one of these -- this call, Ken actually says that Mark's lying, that Mark Penley is lying. Well, I mean, that to me -- and sort of like the fact

that the Attorney General wanted to appear in court, hearing Mr. Paxton saying that Mark Penley of all people was lying, I mean, I just -- I mean, you have to know Mark Penley.

- Q. Why -- why was that such an a-ha moment for you?
- A. He --

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. Hold on. What was that such an a-ha moment for you?
- A. Because my experience had never been Mark Penley -I mean, he was -- he is honest to the fault, just absolutely
 honest to the fault. And so when General Paxton says that
 Mark Penley is lying, I just -- I mean, you know, bells and
 whistles are going off that this is not good. This is bad.
- Q. Did you become aware during -- after that conversation -- do your notes help refresh your memory as to whether you knew that Mr. Penley was then going to meet with the Attorney General on the 26th?
 - A. I did know that.
- Q. Without going into what Mr. Penley told you after that meeting, did you have a conversation with Mr. Penley in which he fills you in on the conversation with Attorney General Paxton?
- A. After Mr. Penley met with the Attorney General, Mr. Penley called me.
- Q. All right. Now, then after that Saturday the 26th, what happened in terms of conversations with Mr. Paxton after

the -- on the morning of the 28th?

1.3

2.1

2.3

- A. On the morning of the 28th, I was in my office, and the Attorney General came in to meet with me.
 - Q. What did he want?
- A. He -- my best recollection is the first part of the conversation was about other cases, probably about Google because he had just been in D.C. He was as friendly as ever. I mean, it was the Ken Paxton that I had known for four-plus years; very friendly, very communitive. And I was actually -- I mean, I was actually surprised by that because our last discussion had been so heated and then I knew about what had occurred during the weekend. And I asked him -- because he had told Mr. Penley that he was frustrated with me and compared -- compared me to my predecessor who had been very frustrated at one time. And so I brought that up. The Attorney General didn't bring it up in that meeting.
 - Q. What did you say?
 - A. I said --

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: No, it's with Mr. Paxton. This is a conversation between the two. There's really no hearsay here with an admission against interest of Mr. Paxton that's about to follow. It's a conversation the two of them had.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled. Go ahead.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Go ahead.

- 1 2

- A. He doesn't -- he didn't address whether he was frustrated with me. Instead, he expressed that he was frustrated with Penley.
 - Q. What was he upset about again?
- A. It was almost a replay of the conversation that we had on Friday, the Friday before, except this one was -- it was not a heated discussion. This was, you know, General Paxton one-on-one, just the two of us. And he was -- he was what I would say normal Ken Paxton. Just, I don't understand, why won't Penley sign this?
 - Q. What did he want you to do?
- A. Well, he -- during -- during the conversation, I attempted to explain to him something that I thought he already understood, which is we have policies and procedures at the Office of the Attorney General. We have an executive approval memo process. And I tried to explain to the Attorney General that, you know, that was there -- that process is to protect him; it's to protect the agency. And so the hire-an-outside-counsel contract where we're going to spend money that the State has given us, that we have to go through a formal process, part of that process has several steps to it. And the Attorney General acted as if he didn't understand that process.
- Q. Was all of these conversations of these about wanting Penley to sign the contract so that Mr. Cammack could

- be an official employee on a mission for -- as outside counsel to investigate things, complaints brought by Mr. Paul?
- A. Well, actually, what he wanted to do was Mr. Penley to sign the memo, which Mr. Penley is just one of the persons in the chain of command.
- Q. We'll get to that. But was this a memo that would authorize the outside-counsel contract for Mr. Cammack?
- A. It would. And eventually it would be actually the first assistant who would sign that contract under normal procedures.
- Q. All right. You mentioned earlier yesterday your process for different hirings and things like that. Would this have been a contract that had to go through about eight of you to be approved?
- A. I think that's correct. The memo would show that.

 It went through several layers.
- Q. And at that time -- what was your understanding as to where the approval rested at that time? How far down the chain or up the chain had it gotten?
 - A. It stopped at Mr. Penley.
 - Q. Had it gotten to you at all?
 - A. It had not gotten to me.
- Q. Had you seen the contract?
- A. I had not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

- Q. Did you know whether or not a contract had already been signed?
 - A. Signed, no, I had no idea.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. Did you know that it was pending and it had been approved by certain levels until it got to Mr. Penley?
- A. I mean, it would have to have been approved before it got to Mr. Penley.
- Q. All right. Now, when you had this conversation with him, when it ended, how would you describe what the tone was?
- A. I mean, again, it was normal Ken Paxton. He asked for copies of our policies and procedures. And so I asked Lacey Mase, who is the deputy for administration, to gather those for him. And at the end of the day, we provided them to him. Actually, I think I gave it to his travel aide, Mr. Wicker, and gave them to General Paxton.
- Q. Did you have -- did he in that conversation tell you what he wanted you to do with Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell?
- A. I assumed -- in that conversation, no. I assumed that we were back to Penley and Maxwell involved and certainly Penley involved in the investigation.
- Q. The conversation on the 28th, at any time did he ever take the position that he wanted you to fire Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell?
 - A. Not in the morning meeting.

Q. All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

22

2.3

24

- A. That was later.
- Q. Okay. You've referred now to a later. So did you have a second conversation on the 28th with Mr. Maxwell -- excuse me, with Mr. Paxton?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And what was the occasion of that conversation?
- A. It was -- my best guess is it was sometime after 9:00 p.m., because I was in my condo. And this was completely contrary to the morning's conversation.
 - Q. In what way? How was it different?
- A. This was the second time that Attorney General Paxton was very upset, very angry.
- Q. Did you form any opinion in your own mind in terms of how he was acting as to what was going on here?
- A. I believed he had been -- I believed he had been drinking.
- Q. All right. Did he sound like that to you?
- A. I mean, again, the best you can tell over the
 phone. It was so unlike any conversation I've ever had with
 him.
 - Q. How would you characterize the conversation?
 - A. I mean, he was angry; he was upset. I felt like perhaps there was someone else with him because he was literally saying the same things that we now had discussed

- two times before, repeating the same things but in an agitated -- I thought maybe he was recording the conversation. I mean, it was a horrible, horrible feeling, especially for someone that --
 - Q. How long did that conversation last?
 - A. I mean, 10, 15 minutes.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. And in your situation, what was your response?
- A. I mean, I didn't -- I was -- I did not get angry with him. I was really confused. I was troubled because he kept pressing the same things over and over again.
 - Q. And what were those things over and over again?
- A. It was -- it all dealt with the hiring of Mr. Cammack.
 - Q. And what did it have to do with Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell?
 - A. Well, he -- at one point in that conversation he wants me to fire them. And he says he's reviewed the policies and procedures, and the first assistant can sign the contract.
 - Q. I want to ask you about that. So did he suggest -- what did he suggest, if anything, about whether you could or should sign the contract?
 - A. He suggested that I could and I should sign the contract.
 - Q. And what did you say?

- A. I said I would not sign the contract.
- Q. Did you tell him why?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

- A. I said because I -- I'm a rule of law guy. I believe in those -- those policies and procedures.
- Q. And a schedule for that, if the contract would have been approved, if Mr. Penley had approved, where would it go next?
- A. I think it goes up -- and we'd have to look at the memo, but I think Ms. Mase has to approve it. I think it then either goes up to either Missy or Ryan. It's a couple before it reaches me, but the memo would be the best.
- Q. Would it have to work its way up to Mr. Bangert for sure before it got to you?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. All right. At the end of the day, did he -- do you recall whether he ever said anything to you about whether -- ask you a question about anything having to do with what if -- about him signing?
- A. Yeah. He asked -- you know, now in retrospect I think I understand why he asked it, but we had this discussion about the policies and the procedures again. This would have been at least the third time that we had it. He urges me to sign it. And then at one point near the end of the conversation he asks me the question, Well, what if I've signed it? And I --

- Q. What if he signed it?
- A. Yeah. He asked me -- he asked me, Well, what if I signed it already?
 - Q. Right. What if I've signed it?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HARDIN: Stella, what if -- what if I signed it. Thank you. If you would put that on --

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) It would be the evening -- the evening of 9-28, in that conversation he says to you, What if I had already signed it?
 - A. What if I had already signed it.
- 12 Q. And you're certain of that?
- 13 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. All right. What did you tell him?
 - A. I told him that I would consider the contract void.
 - Q. Did he say to you he had already signed it?
 - A. He did not say that.
- Q. Now, how much -- why would you consider a contract void if the Attorney General signed it even if you were opposed to it?
- A. Because the policies and procedures were in place in such a way to protect him and to protect the agency. If he had gone so far outside our policies and procedures on behalf of one person against the whole -- against your whole staff pursuing -- pursuing a private matter using public

resources, I mean, to me that's just -- that has to be a void contract.

- Q. Well, do you think he had the authority to sign a contract hiring Mr. Cammack?
- A. I think the Attorney General has the authority to sign contracts. I will say, however, that the policies and procedures of the office, the Attorney General did not sign many contracts.
- Q. All right. Had you ever known him to sign one of these types of contracts before?
 - A. Not an outside-counsel contract.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. But more to the point, do you think it was illegal under any circumstances for him to do it or did you think it was a violation of policy that had been running the department since you were there?
- A. Well, I thought it was wrong in this case knowing everything I knew. That doesn't mean I don't believe the Attorney General can't sign contracts, but I think --

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, nonresponsive. He asked him whether it was legal for the Attorney General to sign contracts. We would like to have an answer to that question.

MR. HARDIN: He's giving his answer. There's cross-examination for him to explore, in all due respect.

MR. BUZBEE: Nonresponsive, Your Honor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained. 1 MR. HARDIN: Thank you. 2 (BY MR. HARDIN) Well, let me ask you this --Q. 3 MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, we'd like an answer 4 to the question then. Is it legal for the Attorney General 5 to sign a contract? That was the question. 6 MR. HARDIN: You know, as much as -- I've made 7 it this far in life without advice from Mr. Buzbee. I'm 8 going to try to make it the rest of my life. I'll ask my 9 10 questions; and if he objects, that's fine. PRESIDING OFFICER: I believe you asked the 11 12 question. MR. HARDIN: Yes, I'll be glad to. I was in 1.3 14 the process of trying to. PRESIDING OFFICER: I believe you asked it. 15 Let me go look at the transcript. 16 MR. HARDIN: Thank you very much. 17 (BY MR. HARDIN) When do you --18 Q. PRESIDING OFFICER: Hold on one second, 19 20 counsel, I'm looking at the transcript. 2.1 MR. HARDIN: Sure, sure. PRESIDING OFFICER: You asked the question, 22 the witness can answer. Is it illegal for him to sign a 2.3 contract? 24

(BY MR. HARDIN) Now, let me ask you this.

25

0.

MR. BUZBEE: Actually, he needs to answer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

PRESIDING OFFICER: Counselor, you asked the question. We've confirmed it on the transcript. The witness will answer the question.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you very much.

A. Can you -- can you restate it? Because if the question is can the Attorney General sign a contract, is that illegal, and that's what I understand the question to be -- PRESIDING OFFICER: Counselor, restate the

MR. HARDIN: Thank you, Your Honor. I was looking back to see what I asked.

question. You've asked it once. Restate the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: It was line 21.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) I think the question that I see that I asked through all that exchange was, do you think it was illegal under -- was it a violation of policy that had been running the department since you were there?

But my question -- let me try to break it down. Did you have an opinion that it was --

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. I'd like the witness to answer the question.

MR. HARDIN: I've withdrawn the question. I will proceed to the next, with permission, of course, of the Court.

PRESIDING OFFICER: You asked the question,

the witness hasn't answered.

1.3

2.1

2.3

MR. HARDIN: We don't know what the question was anymore. I'm sorry.

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, he suggested that it's illegal for the Attorney General of the State of Texas to sign a contract. This witness knows it's not and he should say so.

MR. HARDIN: And I have -- I'll be glad to ask that question my way. I'll withdraw the question before and with the Court's permission, proceed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: You may withdraw the question.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Now, but I do want to proceed with the topic. And that is did you believe -- or what was your belief as to whether it was legally unlawful for him to sign a contract and hire Mr. Paxton [sic] unilaterally, or did you think it was a violation of your policy? Just explain to us what your thought process was.
 - A. And I believe you mean Mr. Cammack.
 - O. Pardon me?
- A. You said Mr. -- hiring Mr. Paxton instead of Mr. Cammack.
 - Q. I'm glad you're following me. You're right. With that correction, Mr. Paxton. Back into the microphone so

that both of us -- there you go. What's your answer?

- A. So I believed at that time in that conversation with the Attorney General on the evening of September 28th that not only did signing that contract -- if in fact the Attorney General had signed it, I believed that it violated our policies and procedures. But I also believed in the circumstances of Mr. Cammack, knowing everything that we knew, that it was unlawful.
- Q. And why did you mean -- why did you think it was unlawful in light of all the circumstances?
- A. Because Mr. Cammack was being hired to do something that I did not believe was in the interest of the State and that there wasn't a -- I mean, the Attorney General is not above the law. He has to comply with the law like all of us. And so, again, knowing the whole circumstances at this point in time, that's what I believed.
- Q. What was your opinion, one way or the other, as to whether -- if that signing of that contract was in pursuit of an unlawful purpose, was it in your opinion, therefore, unlawful?
 - A. Correct.

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.3

Q. All right. Now -- and the purpose in this matter, were you aware of what your staff, meaning Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell, believed as to whether what they were being asked to do --

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, Your Honor, hearsay.

We're going to hear from both Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Penley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Whether what they were being -- do you have an opinion or were you aware of one way or the other --

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) -- as to what their position was. That's all I'm asking.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Repeat that question.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Were you aware at this time as to what position Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell had taken as to whether what they were being asked to do was unlawful?

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, can we hear from Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell about their belief of this contract rather than hear him tell us what they told him? This is hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: I'm not asking for communication. Excuse me. I think she was talking, I apologize.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Restate the question.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Were you aware at that time -- and we are in September of -- 9-28 of 2020. Were you aware at that time one way or the other as to whether -- what Mr. Penley and Mr. Maxwell's position was as to whether or

not what the Attorney General and Mr. Paul were asking them to do was lawful? Just whether you were aware of what their opinion was. I'm not asking you if you were -- what it was.

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I object to that.

He's suggested Mr. Paul was somehow talking about this contract. There's no evidence of any of that. And the -- and, therefore, the question is vague and assumes facts that certainly are not in evidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: You can ask the question, was he aware.

MR. HARDIN: That's all. Was he aware and not what it was. I haven't asked him what it was.

A. I was aware.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) All right. And did that have anything to do with your opinion as to what you were telling the Attorney General and how resistant you were to what he wanted to do?
 - A. Yes, it did.
 - Q. By the way --
- A. Yes, it did.
- Q. Thank you very much.
 - All right. Now, how did that conversation end?
 - A. It ended abruptly.
- Q. And then I want to -- I want to try to move pretty quickly here through these last matters. That was Monday the

28th, was it not?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. Correct.
- Q. On Tuesday the 29th, did you learn any new information that concerned you greatly?
- A. Yeah. I was in a conference call, a Zoom meeting actually, involving all the chief deps across the country, bipartisan meeting. We were dealing with opioids. And I got an urgent message first from my assistant and then from Ms. Mase, the deputy for admin, that there was an emergency.
- Q. All right. And what did you do when you got that call -- that message, excuse me?
- A. I excused -- I think I was leading the meeting and I excused myself from the meeting because Ms. Mase and Ms. Hornsey wouldn't interrupt me unless it were really something important because they knew I was on an important call.
 - Q. What did you learn?
- A. I learned that -- that a bank had called Ms. Mase and informed her that --
 - MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay.
- MR. HARDIN: All right.
- 22 PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.
- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) You don't need to tell what you did, but what did -- as a result of the phone call or the conversation, did you talk to Ms. Mase or how did you find

1 out?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- A. I talked to Ms. Mase.
- Q. All right. And what were you concerned about then?
- A. I was concerned that someone was -- that

Mr. Cammack was saying that he was working for the Office of the Attorney General and was engaged in activities.

- Q. What kind of activities?
- A. He was serving subpoenas.
- Q. What type of subpoenas?
- A. He was serving -- seeking information from banks that appeared to be related to Mr. Paul and his activities.
 - Q. And were they grand jury subpoenas?
 - A. They were grand jury subpoenas.
- Q. Did you have any idea how or why he was obtaining grand jury subpoenas?
 - A. Not on September 29th.
- Q. All right. And at that time what did you do as a result of getting that information?
- A. I -- I debriefed with Ms. Mase. I believe at a certain point Mr. Bangert, perhaps Mr. Brickman and some of the other deputies were actually over here at the capitol meeting with either the Governor's Office or the Lieutenant Governor's Office. I don't remember.
 - Q. And so what -- and what did you do as far as them?
 - A. I called them back.

- Q. All right. So when you called them back, where did you call them back to?
 - A. Back to the 8th floor.
 - Q. And then was there a meeting?
 - A. There was a meeting.
 - Q. And as best you remember, who all did you have in that meeting?
 - A. I know it was Mr. Bangert, Ms. Mase --
 - Q. And we're September the 29th?
 - A. September the 29th.
 - Q. Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

22

2.3

- 12 A. It was Mr. Bangert, Ms. Mase, Mr. Penley.
- 13 Mr. Maxwell was out of town. Ms. Cary was out of town.
- Mr. Vassar, Mr. Brickman. I may be missing someone, but that's the best of my recollection.
- Q. And what was purpose of this meeting?
 - A. We were trying to figure out what was going on.
- Q. What was your concern?
- A. My concern was we had somebody out there that
 wasn't part of our organization representing that he was an
 official with the Attorney General's Office.
 - Q. Now, did you have any idea at that time whether or not there was a signed contract between Mr. Paxton and Mr. Cammack?
- A. I had no idea.

- Q. All right. Had you ever seen such a contract?
- A. Not at that time.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. Had everybody ever suggested to you there was such a signed contract?
 - A. Not at that time.
- Q. All right. Now, what -- can you describe sort of the atmosphere of this group? I mean, what's happening? I want you to try to describe it for me without going into what each person was saying.
- A. I mean, we considered it sort of a crisis moment. I mean, everything regarding Mr. Paul was kind of coming to a head. And so at some point Mr. McCarty joined. I don't think I had mentioned Mr. McCarty. And he wasn't in the original meeting, but eventually he joins. And so it's really the first time that each of the deputies started to share -- and without getting into what they shared, but started to share information concern -- each bits and pieces about Mr. Paul and his activities with the Attorney General.
- Q. What is your testimony, Mr. Mateer, as to whether or not in many ways people shared different things that you had never heard before?
- A. I mean, I learned things in that meeting that I hadn't known before.
- Q. In terms of relationships with the Attorney General and Mr. Paul?

A. Correct.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. All right. Do you have any explanation as to how you, the first assistant, would not know what all had been going on over the last nine months or so?
- A. I mean, you know, quite frankly I beat myself up a little bit. I felt like I probably should have known more. But in my defense, we had a lot going on and the way -- I mean, we believed, and I believe General Paxton believed, we believed in letting our leaders lead. And so they were each handling and managing their various divisions. And so I would only know what I'm told. And this was really the first time, with everybody in a room together, folks began to share.
- Q. How would you describe in terms of their alarm one way or the other?
 - A. I mean, we were -- very serious.
- Q. I want to go back to a subject and you know that the allegations here -- and all this has been public -- about an affair that Mr. Paxton had with another person.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. When did you first -- before I go into questions about it, I want you to explain or express in your own way why that is relevant to the bigger picture of Mr. Paxton and Mr. Paul in your mind, if it is.
 - A. No, it -- unfortunately, it is relevant.

- Q. Stay with the microphone, please.
- A. I'm sorry. Unfortunately, it is relevant. During that week, the last week in the office -- and I have to wind back, if I can, a little bit. I have to wind back a little bit, if I can, Mr. Hardin.

I first became -- I, and other senior leadership in the Office of the Attorney General, became aware that Mr. Paxton was involved in an extramarital relationship sometime in 2016.

- O. In when?
- A. In 2016.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. All right.
- A. Prior to -- that's incorrect. No, that is --
- O. And then --
- A. I've got to get my -- it was before his -- I have to think back to his reelection. It's his second -- his first reelection.
- Q. My question is: Did you become aware of it for the first time in 2018?
- A. 2018, that's when he was reelected. He was elected in 2014 the first time, 2018 the second time. So it would have been in August/September time period of 2018, before his fall election.
 - Q. How did you become aware?
 - A. I think the first person I heard was someone in

D.C. that actually mentioned it.

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay, Your Honor.

And I'm also -- this was a prime example of counsel suggesting the date to this witness. The witness -- and this demonstrates the witness --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HARDIN: The way -- pardon me. The way this should work is simply state an objection. It is --

MR. BUZBEE: Objection to this is hearsay.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you. Let me --

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you very much, Your

12 Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) So let's go back. Were you present at an occasion when Mr. Paxton confessed the affair to members of his staff?
- A. Yes. Mr. Paxton, Mrs. Paxton, Senator Paxton, gathered senior staff from the Office of the Attorney General and senior staff from the campaign. We had a meeting at the campaign office in which Mr. Paxton revealed that he had been engaged in an extramarital affair and asked for our forgiveness.
 - Q. And was it a very emotional, sympathetic meeting?
 - A. It was a very emotional meeting, yes.
- Q. And that was with both Mr. and Senator Paxton; is that correct?

- A. They were both in attendance, yes.
- Q. And at that -- would it have been a general moment of sympathy for the whole event?
 - A. Absolutely.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. All right. After that -- were there any assurances and so made by Mr. Paxton at that time?
- A. Yeah. I mean, Mr. Paxton apologized and then, you know, using Christian terminology, I would say, he, you know, repented. And I know that's a Christian term, but from my perspective, that's what I believed.
- Q. And was that really the tone and the way the whole encounter --
- A. It actually was. And, you know, then we moved on and obviously with the expectation that that -- he had -- he had made a mistake, he had apologized, and we were moving on from it.
- Q. When that meeting was over, did you -- what was your assumption going forward as to whether that event was over, the affair?
- A. I mean, I assumed it was over because that's what he said.
- Q. When did you first become aware that it was not over and how? Without what somebody told you, was there any other personal -- I'm only asking you for a time, dates or years, that you became aware that it was not over.

A. It wasn't until --

1.3

2.1

2.3

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, this is -- unless
Mr. Paxton told him something after that meeting, this is all
based on rumor or hearsay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained. Continue.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) In your own mind, did you ultimately believe that it had resumed?
 - A. All during that --

MR. BUZBEE: That would be based on hearsay, and it's not relevant what he believed about Mr. Paxton -PRESIDING OFFICER: Just state your objection.
What is your objection?

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay and relevance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) All right. Why did you think, if you believed the affair had resumed, that was relevant to be of concern about the lieutenant -- about the Attorney General and Mr. Paul?
- A. Because it answered one of the questions that I kept struggling with, is why would General Paxton jeopardize all this great work that we had been doing in the Office of the Attorney General? Why would he be engaged in these activities on behalf of one person? I mean, all these different things. And by this time we knew he had hired

- Mr. Cammack. Why would he do this against his advice of

 his -- the people who he trusted to run his office, including

 me? And it answered that why question.
 - Q. Had you become aware by that time that the woman he was having the affair with had been hired by Mr. Paul?

 MR. BUZBEE: Objection, hearsay, Your Honor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled. You can continue.

MR. HARDIN: Thank you.

- A. I learned that -- that this person had been hired by Mr. Paul that week.
 - Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) And why was that relevant to you?
- A. Because it answered the question why is he engaging in all these activities. And it was like --
 - O. On behalf of Mr. Paul?
- A. On behalf of Mr. Paul. Why is he engaged in this?

 I mean, it seemed to me he was under undue influence. At

 one -- at times I thought is he being blackmailed? I mean,

 this was so unlike what I experienced with him for four

 years. Like -- and this was part of it. There may have been

 more, there may have been others, but this was certainly part

 of it.
 - Q. Mr. Mateer, did you ultimately resign?
 - A. I did.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. When did you resign?

1 A.

1.3

2.0

2.1

2.3

Q. And I believe we have asked before, but let me make sure I'm right. You did not sue and you do not have any suit pending against either the Attorney's General's Office or Mr. Paxton or anyone out of this; is that correct?

I resigned on that Friday, October 2nd.

- A. I do not.
- Q. If you go back to the things -- what is your testimony as to whether you learned a lot more that gave you concern? Without going into what it was, on the 29th as all of these deputies began to compare notes, what is your testimony as to the very reluctant conclusion you came to?
- A. I mean, by that time, the 29th -- because the next day is when we go to the FBI and DOJ. By that time, I had -- I concluded that, you know, Mr. Paxton was engaged in conduct that was immoral, unethical, and I had a good faith belief that it was illegal.
- Q. What did you -- what was your thought process as to what you believed would happen if you did this? What do you believe might happen to you and the others if you did come forward?
- A. I mean, I knew by that time that my tenure as first assistant was coming to a quick end. So I knew that there would be -- I mean, any time someone stands up, that there could be consequences. So I knew I was in the process of leaving the office.

- Q. You, of course, were not here and did not hear the opening statements in this case, did you?
 - A. I did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Q. Let me ask you this: How long by the September 29th and 30th had -- by then had you become aware that different members of the top-level administrators in this department had, in different ways, been trying to stop the Attorney General from helping Mr. Paul?

MR. BUZBEE: Objection, leading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Sustained.

- Q. (BY MR. HARDIN) Did you have a thought process in your own mind as to why you needed to go finally to law enforcement?
- A. I felt like we had been trying to protect

 Mr. Paxton. On several occasions I had gone to him and,

 really, my -- he had become -- I mean, he was my boss. He

 had become a friend. I cared for him; I cared for Senator

 Paxton. And I wanted him -- I wanted him -- I mean, I think

 in one of the memos I say, Come clean. I mean, I wanted to

 help --
 - O. Come what?
- A. Come clean.
- Q. Microphone.
- A. Come clean. I wanted to -- I mean, my job -- I

 feel one of the jobs of the first assistant is to protect --

- in addition to running the office was to protect the Attorney

 General. And quite frankly, I obviously failed at that.
- 3 And -- but I came to the conclusion that Mr. Paul had enabled
- 4 Mr. Paxton, and despite my efforts, the other deputies'
- 5 efforts, we couldn't protect him because he didn't want to be
- 6 protected.

18

19

- Q. As you ultimately made your decisions and as you have learned and things that have happened soon, did you change your mind as to whether or not General Paxton was simply being blackmailed or something else? Did you ultimately make a conclusion of what you believed,
- A. Again, I -- in the end, I reached the conclusion that Mr. Paul enabled him to engage in the conduct that

reluctantly, about the conduct of the Attorney General?

- 15 Mr. Paxton engaged in.
- Q. What is your opinion as to whether or not a level of responsibility the Attorney General had?
 - A. I mean, ultimately, the Attorney General was responsible for his conduct.
- MR. HARDIN: I'll pass the witness.
- 21 PRESIDING OFFICER: We'll take a ten-minute
- 22 break here.
- 23 (Break taken at 11:21 a.m. to 11:36 a.m.)
- 24 THE BAILIFF: All rise. The Texas Senate is
- 25 now in session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Please be seated. We'll have to wait until all the jurors get here.

Members, will all the jurors in the back please come forward immediately.

We're missing one juror. Senator Miles and Senator Kolkhorst. Okay.

Members of the jury, just a reminder, if we take a ten-minute break, be here in ten minutes. Even if I'm not here, I need the jury to be here because I don't like walking out and not having the jury here, so just moving forward as best we can.

Mr. Buzbee?

MR. BUZBEE: Yes, sir.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. BUZBEE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

16

17

19

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Mr. Mateer, you told us Ken Paxton was your friend?
- A. He became my friend, yes.
- 18 Q. And you were trying to protect him?
 - A. That's correct, sir.
- 20 Q. And you were trying to protect him from himself?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And when you found out that this young man, Brandon Cammack, had sent a subpoena to a bank, you guys sent everybody on the 8th floor home and had a meeting, right?
 - A. I don't recall sending everybody home. I do recall

1 | we had a meeting.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. And in order to protect Ken Paxton, what you did was then call the FBI, right?
 - A. That's --
 - Q. That's how you protected your friend?
- A. That's not correct, sir.
 - Q. Did you not go to the FBI thereafter?
 - A. Not that day, sir.
 - Q. What day?
- 10 A. The next day, sir.
- Q. Okay. Did you talk to Ken Paxton before you went to the FBI?
- 13 A. General Paxton was out of state.
- Q. Did you talk to Ken Paxton before you went to the FBI?
 - A. I talked to him on the 28th, yes.
- Q. After -- sir, listen, you found out about -- you found out that Brandon Cammack had served a subpoena on a bank, right? Right?
- 20 A. That is correct, yes.
- 21 Q. You thought it was a crisis situation, right?
- 22 A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. You rallied the troops together and had a meeting, right?
- A. We had a meeting, yes, sir.

- Q. The next day you went to the FBI?
 - A. We did, yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Did you after your meeting talk to Ken Paxton?
- A. I did not talk to Ken Paxton.
- Q. Okay. So in order to help your friend, a guy that had given you a really plum of a job, instead of asking him some questions, you instead circled up and decided to go to the FBI. That's what happened, right?
 - A. I did have conversations with General Paxton.
 - Q. Not after that meeting, right?
 - A. Not after the meeting on the 29th, correct, sir.
- Q. You had no clue that Brandon Cammack had received a second referral from the DA's Office, did you?
 - A. I did not.
- Q. You were wondering why they were serving subpoenas on a bank when the complaint that you knew about had to do with the FBI and the magistrate judge, right?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. You had no clue that there had been a second referral from the DA's Office directly to Brandon Cammack; isn't that right?
 - A. That's right. No one had shared that with us.
- Q. So you thought this Cammack fellow is sending -- is sending subpoenas to banks related to some FBI thing, right?
 - A. I didn't know what he was doing.

- Q. You know how you could have found out? Do you know how you could have found out? You could have picked up the phone and called your boss and said, Hey, boss, what's up with this Brandon Cammack? He's sent a subpoena to a bank.

 And he could have told you, Well, I have the authority to sign a contract because I am the elected AG, and he's sending subpoenas based on a second referral. You could have done that, right?
 - A. I could have done that.
 - Q. But instead what you did -- instead what you did was rally your troops, get your stories together, and go to the FBI; isn't that right?
 - A. That's not how I would characterize it.
 - Q. Did you also talk to Dick Trabulsi?
 - A. Not at that time, no.
- Q. How soon after that did you talk to Dick Trabulsi?

 You know who I'm talking about, don't you?
- 18 A. It's the --

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

19

22

2.3

- Q. Tell us who he is.
- A. I believe he's the leader of Texans for Lawsuit
 Reform.
 - Q. Oh. He sent you a text, didn't he?
 - A. He sent me a text after I resigned.
- Q. A text of support?
- 25 A. I got many texts of support. He was one of them,

1 yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Where are your texts by the way?
- A. I don't keep texts.
- Q. What do you mean by that, you don't keep texts? You deleted your texts?
- A. After I left the Attorney General's Office, when I'm no longer employed at the Attorney General's Office, I didn't keep texts.
- Q. You didn't think anybody might want to look at your texts?
- A. I adhere to zero -- excuse me, zero inbox policy, and I think anybody who has ever worked for me knows that.
 - Q. Is that right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. So just so we're all clear and everybody that's watching is clear, you were having conversations with the leader of Texans for Lawsuit Reform who was showing support for you after you had went to the FBI and resigned, right?
- A. I had one text message that I received from Mr. Trabulsi after I resigned.
- Q. How did he have your phone number? I thought you weren't the kind of person that would talk to people like that. How did he have your phone number?
- A. A lot of people have my phone number. Probably General Paxton gave it to him at one time.

- Q. You know we do have some of your texts, don't you?
- A. I mean, I assume you do if others produced them, yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. Yeah, we don't have any from you because you say that you delete them. Tell me how you delete them, by the way, because that seems like a challenge. Do you delete every text that's sent to you?
- A. I look at e-mail, I look at text every day, okay, within a 24-hour time period. If it requires an action, I then note it as a to-do item. If it's unrelated to anything, then I delete. That's just my -- that's been my policy for years, sir.
- Q. Wow. You're -- you worked for the government, right?
 - A. Well, this was after I worked for the government.
 - Q. Right. After you had no longer -- you were no longer working for the government, you deleted your texts, is that what you're telling me? Or you delete them real time?
 - A. I delete them basically real time within a period of time.
 - Q. Did anybody else in the office do that or was that just your practice?
- A. The other person that probably did that was the Attorney General.
 - Q. You think so?

1 A. Yeah, I think so.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Did he have a burner phone, by the way?
- A. No. Someone mentioned that to me at one time.
- Q. Who mentioned that? You read about that in the newspaper?
- A. No, I don't think I read about it in the newspaper. It would have either been Mr. Wicker or Mr. Rylander.
- Q. Mr. Wicker didn't mention it to you because he was questioned. He said he didn't know what a burner phone was. Who told you that he had a burner phone?
- A. Again, my best recollection would have been Mr. Wicker or Mr. Rylander.
 - Q. Did you ever see a burner phone?
- A. I know the Attorney General had several phones. I don't know, you know, a burner phone.
- Q. You know what a burner phone is. This would be a burner phone. You can go to 7-Eleven, you can buy it, use it for a certain amount of minutes, you throw it in the trash.

 That's called a burner phone.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Did you ever see Ken Paxton with a burner phone?
- A. He had a flip phone.
- Q. Did you ever see a burner phone, one that he bought at 7-Eleven so he could do some sort of illicit business?
 - A. I don't know, sir.

- Q. Okay. How about a secret e-mail address? Did you ever see him with a secret e-mail address?
 - A. He had a Proton e-mail address.
 - Q. Didn't you have a Proton e-mail address?
 - A. I sure did, yes.
- Q. Oh, goodness gracious. So he had the same kind of e-mail address that you had?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. We've been told that's a secret e-mail address, but you had the same kind of e-mail address, didn't you?
 - A. I think a lot of people had them.
- Q. Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. I think your co-counsel has one.
- Q. They do have it. Do you know why people use the Proton e-mail address?
- A. Because -- well, I know why we did. Because we were concerned that Google might be monitoring our conversations. We were investigating Google.
- Q. Right. And also Ken Paxton and several others went to China, and they wanted to make sure that their e-mail did not get hacked, right?
 - A. Okay. Correct.
- Q. But yet this Board of Managers -- the House of
 Managers claims that that's some kind of secret, weird thing
 to do when everybody in the office was doing it; isn't that

right?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. Well, I don't think everybody in the office was doing it, but there were some, yes.
- Q. Sure. Now, back to your texts. Just so the Court is clear and the jurors are clear, your testimony is when you receive a text, if it needs action, you note it, and otherwise you delete it?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And you still do that now?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Well, the good news is Mr. Brickman didn't have that same practice. Let's look at what is marked and in evidence, AG 170.
- MR. BUZBEE: And, Eric, if you don't mind, go to -- the page is Brickman 187. Let's put it on the screen so the jurors can see it.
- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) What we're going to look at, sir, is a text stream that you were on with Brickman and several others, okay?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. I need you to speak into the mic, please.
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- MR. BUZBEE: Eric, let me know when you're ready. Go to 187, Eric. We were looking at AG Exhibit 170.

1 187.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) All right. Here's a text you sent at 3:02 p.m. on 9-29-2020; is that right?
 - A. That appears to be correct, sir.
- Q. You said, We have a major problem. The kid has served a subpoena on a bank. Showed up there in person at the bank. Right?
 - A. That's what it says, sir.
- Q. And you were thinking in your mind, why in the devil is he serving a subpoena on the bank? Nate Paul's complaint has to do with the FBI, right?
 - A. That was one of the things I was thinking, sir.
- Q. Because you had no clue that there had been a second referral, true?
- A. I did not know there was a second referral at this time.
- Q. Now, is this the first time that you had found out that the kid -- you're referring to Brandon Cammack, right?
 - A. I am referring to Mr. Cammack there.
- Q. And you didn't say, hey, Brandon Cammack. You said the kid. Everybody knew who you were talking about, right?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. All right. So Cammack wasn't a surprise, was he?
- A. Cammack wasn't a surprise in the sense that we knew who he was, that's correct.

- Q. Sure. And you actually got a copy of his contract too, didn't you?
- A. At some point I got a copy of the contract, but not through the DocuSign, no, sir.
- Q. Right. I mean, I know -- and we're going to talk about your bureaucratic procedures. What did you call it, your executive action memo? What do you call it?
 - A. Executive approval memo.
 - Q. Executive approval memo.
 - A. Uh-huh. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.3

14

- Q. Some procedure in writing put in place of how things should work at the AG's Office?
 - A. That's what it was, yes.
 - Q. Right. In some policy manual?
 - A. It's a policy, yes.
- Q. Okay. It ain't the law, though, is it?
- 17 A. No, it's not the law.
- Q. No. The power of the Attorney General derives from the Texas Constitution; is that not true?
- 20 A. From the Texas Constitution and Texas law, 21 statutes.
- Q. The Constitution is what gives the Attorney General the power to act; isn't that right?
- A. The Constitution and the statutes passed by the legislature, yes.

- Q. Your power to act, if any, derives directly from the AG; isn't that right?
- A. It's derived from the AG, but it's also derived from the statutes.
- Q. You're not authorized to take his name off his letterhead, are you?
- A. Am I authorized to take his name off the letterhead?
 - Q. I'm sorry, is that a question or are you --
- A. I'm repeating your question to make sure I understand it. Could you restate it?
- Q. I can absolutely restate it. You, as deputy, as first assistant, are not authorized to remove your boss's name from his letterhead, are you?
 - A. I don't know if that's true or not.
- Q. Did you not look? I mean, aren't you a lawyer?

 Isn't that something you better look at before you do it?
 - A. I don't recall doing it, sir.
- Q. You don't recall sending correspondence with the Attorney General's name removed?
- A. I do not.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

18

22

- Q. You wouldn't have done that, would you?
- A. By implication of your question, it must have happened, but I don't remember.
 - Q. Oh, it happened. My question is, is that legal?

- A. I don't -- I don't know it's illegal.
- Q. Well, did you check before you guys were sending correspondence without your boss's name on it?
 - A. I didn't personally check, no.
- Q. Well, I thought you were a rule of law guy. Isn't that what you told us, I'm a rule of law guy?
 - A. I am a rule of law guy.
- Q. Okay. Rule of law guy, is it legal to send out correspondence without your boss's name on it, official correspondence from the AG's Office?
 - A. I don't think it's illegal, no.
 - Q. You don't think it's illegal?
- A. I do not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

24

- Q. Is that how you decide your legal analysis is by just whether you think it is or not?
- A. No. It would be based upon what I believed and what I know about the law.
 - Q. Well, what do you base that on? What don't you --
- A. What I believe is -- what I do recall is before I
 became first assistant, the prior first assistant -actually, one of the complaints that the Attorney General had
 with the prior first assistant was that the original
 letterhead didn't have Mr. Paxton's name on it.
 - Q. So you knew that the official letterhead, according to General Paxton, had his name on it. That was his --

- that's what he insisted upon, right?
- Well, he insisted on it. I don't know about the word "official."
- And yet you were party to correspondence where his name was removed?
- That I don't know, sir; but if you're saying that, then I must have been.
- Well, let's make sure we're all clear that you did Ο. get the contract because it's in the text even.
- MR. BUZBEE: Eric, turn to same exhibit, AG 170, go to Brickman 180.
- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) Vassar texted you a copy of the executed contract, didn't he? 1.3
 - Looks like on October 1st. Α.
 - Yep. Did you go back then -- was that the same day Q. you met with the FBI?
 - Α. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

24

- What day did you meet with the FBI? 18 Q.
- I believe we met with the FBI on the 30th, sir. Α. 19
- 20 Q. Okay. So you -- did you go back to the FBI and say, Hey, you know what? I made a mistake. There actually 2.1 is a contract. My boss signed it, and there's a second 22 referral. Did you do that? 2.3
 - Α. Not on October 1st.
 - Ο. You went to the FBI uninformed; isn't that true?

- A. No, I wouldn't say that, sir.
- Q. I just want to try to get the time line because the jurors may wonder. You spoke to the FBI about -- what did you call it, a good faith belief that a crime had occurred?

 Is that what you said? Did you -- did you go to the FBI with a good faith belief that a crime had occurred? Is that what you told us?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. And that was on October the 1st?
- 10 A. No, sir.

2

3

5

6

7

8

- 11 Q. What day?
- 12 A. That was on the 30th.
- Q. September the 30th?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. That's when -- you called Mr. Sutton before that, right?
- A. I didn't, no.
- 18 O. What --
- 19 A. I had not, no.
- Q. One of you did?
- 21 A. I believe that's true, yes.
- Q. One of the group called Mr. Sutton before that,
- 23 right?
- 24 A. I believe that's true.
- Q. Okay. We'll get to that in a minute.

So on September 30th, you went to the FBI and you made your good faith complaint, right?

- A. We told the FBI the knowledge that we had.
- Q. Did you then go back and give them a copy of the actual signed contract from the duly elected Attorney General?
 - A. I did not.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.3

- Q. You did not?
- A. I did not.
- Q. Did you go back and tell them, Hey, you know what? There was actually a second referral that didn't even come into our office. It in effect went directly from the DA's Office of Travis County directly to Brandon Cammack. Did you tell them that?
- A. Not on October 1st.
 - Q. Did you tell them at some point?
 - A. I think at some point we did tell them that, yes.
- Q. Did they indict Ken Paxton?
- A. As far as I know, they have not.
- Q. Okay. Let's see. Let's try to get our time line right. That was September of 2020, and this is September of 22 2023. It's been three years?
 - A. Your math is correct.
- Q. So in three years they've done nothing with the information that you provided them that's the subject of this

impeachment, right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- A. I don't know what they've done, sir. You can ask them.
- Q. Well, they certainly are pretty good about letting us know if somebody's been indicted, aren't they?
- A. That's your area. I would assume we would -- well, actually, I don't know.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. BUZBEE: Your Honor, I know you were concerned about timing. This might be a good break for me if you want to do it. It's up to you, though, of course. It's noon. I'm getting ready to go into another topic, and it's going to take some time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: You have a good half hour, 45 minutes.

MR. BUZBEE: Okay. I'm all for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Keep going.

- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) You know, before I get into some of these others areas like the Mitte Foundation, which you approved of the intervention, right?
 - A. I did approve, yes, sir.
- Q. The Mitte Foundation where you approved to investigate them, right?
 - A. I did sign that memo, yes.
 - Q. I mean, let's just make sure we're all clear here.

One of the Articles of Impeachment -- in fact the very first Article of Impeachment has to do with the -- the AG's Office intervening in the Mitte Foundation lawsuit, right?

- A. If you say so, I'll accept that.
- Q. Well, I know you're a rule of law guy. Let's look at Article I, make sure we're all clear. Article I of the impeachment, first article. Just confirm with me, if you would, Mr. Mateer, that that is, in fact, the very first Article of Impeachment that we're here arguing about.
 - A. Correct, sir.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. And just so we're all clear for our jurors, you,

 Jeffrey Mateer, approved, along with multiple other people in
 the office, of that particular intervention; is that true?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. We're going to come back to that.

I believe you have said that you resigned and it was on October 2nd, 2020, right?

- A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. You resigned because there was no longer a trust between yourself and General Paxton?
 - A. That is true, sir.
- Q. And we know that on September 30th, after talking to -- or at least some of you talking to a lawyer, you went to the FBI to make a good faith report that you thought a crime had been committed?

- A. Yes, we went to the FBI on September 30th. That is correct, sir.
 - Q. Where else did you go? Who else did you talk to?
 - A. Later that day we had a meeting with the Office of the Governor.
 - Q. Wait a minute. So we're all clear about this, you -- you had a meeting with the Office of the Governor? Is that what you just told us?
 - A. Yeah. We had -- we met with the Office of the Governor sometimes weekly, sometimes every other week, but that was normal course. The Governor was our largest client.
 - Q. Right. I'm just trying to figure this out. You didn't talk to -- after your meeting, you didn't talk to Ken Paxton. You instead spoke to, one, the FBI; two, the Office of the Governor. Who else did you speak to?
 - A. I'm not recalling anyone else.
- Q. Well, we know you got a text of support from TLR, right?
 - A. That was after I resigned, sir.
 - Q. Did you talk to George P. Bush?
- 21 A. I've never talked to George P. Bush.
 - Q. Never?
- A. Never.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

19

20

22

Q. Can you tell us why he just recently -- or I guess sometime in May applied to renew his law license?

- A. I have no idea. I've never talked to George P.
 Bush.
 - Q. Okay. We'll come back to that too.

 Do you recall that at some point after you resigned that they did an inventory of your office?
 - A. I -- yes.

1.3

2.1

2.3

- Q. And you're a guy that keeps journals, aren't you?
- A. I keep notes, yes.
- Q. Okay. Where are your notes in the time frame that you're here to testify about?
- A. At some point I began using a program called OneNote. I had gotten -- the office had provided me with an iPad with a -- the pencil, Apple pencil. And I started -- from my one-on-one meetings I started a practice that actually I do even through today, although I now use a different program, but I used a program called OneNote. I mean, whenever my written notes end, that's when I started using OneNote. And those were on my iPad that I turned in when I resigned. And I think it's a Microsoft -- I'm not a tech guy either. I think it's a Microsoft Word -- Microsoft product that was part of the Word suite. And so when I turned in -- and it did link to my computer and my iPad, sir.
- Q. I don't really understand anything you just said.

 I'm trying to figure out where your notes are.
 - A. Well, you're -- well, you're not representing the

Office of Attorney General. The Office of Attorney General would have those notes.

Q. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. They're on OneNote.
- Q. Sir, sorry to interrupt you.
- A. I'm sorry.
- Q. You wiped it clean.
- A. I wouldn't know how to wipe something clean, sir.
- Q. Well, you know how to delete texts. That's for sure, right?
- A. That's just hitting delete and having automatic delete on your device.
- MR. BUZBEE: Eric, let's look at AG Exhibit

 127 and go to Exhibit 36 within that exhibit. I hope that's

 not too confusing.
 - Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) This document is in evidence, and we're going to look at what was found in your office and what was not found after you left.
 - MR. BUZBEE: Eric, we're going to Exhibit 36 within that exhibit. Almost there. Now, go to the fourth page of that exhibit. We're looking at Exhibit 127, Exhibit 36 to that exhibit, page 3.
 - Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) Now, you can see that in your office there was an inventory made, right?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. And we can see that you're a guy that kept a journal, right?
 - A. I kept notes, yes, sir.
 - Q. And we can see that these notes --

MR. BUZBEE: If you flip back to the page prior, Eric.

- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) You can see they go from 2018

 January and they go all the way to June of 2020, right? June of 2020. That's where they stop; isn't that right?
 - A. That's what that reflects, yes.
- Q. Where are they?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. Where are what, sir?
- Q. The notes that are missing.
- A. Again, sir, I began using a program called OneNote. And OneNote, what it does -- I know you don't understand. But OneNote, what it does is it's an electronic note-taking system. And you can do it by -- and what I had -- the way I had it organized was, I had civil lit, I had child support, I had admin, I had criminal justice, I had law enforcement. And so that was a tab. And so it let me more effectively organize my notes by deputy. When I turned in my machines, OneNote was there. It may still be there. I don't know. When I turned in, I lost access.
 - Q. Who is Jordan Berry?
 - A. Jordan Berry is a political consultant who is a

political consultant for Mr. Paxton, among others.

Q. Among who others?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. Good question. Probably some individuals in this room. I don't know all his clients, so I would be guessing.
 - Q. You don't know who Jordan Berry represents?
- A. I don't know all of his clients. I mean, in this room, maybe Senator Middleton, I think.
- Q. I don't want to talk about the Senators. I'm talking about other entities that Jordan Berry may represent. Do you know of any?
- A. Other entities that Jordan Berry may represent. I know he represents members of the House.
 - Q. Entities.
 - A. Entities. I don't know, sir.
- Q. Don't know. Okay.
- So I just -- I guess we kind of all got to know, when you went to the FBI, what crime did you have this so-called good faith belief had occurred?
- A. The good faith belief that we believed had occurred was I believed that he potentially could have been subject to blackmail. And as a result, he was taking illegal actions on behalf of what we then knew was a campaign donor, but he was taking actions on behalf of Mr. Paul.
 - Q. You believed he was being blackmailed?
 - A. At one point I actually believed he was being

blackmailed, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. So you didn't think he was committing a crime; you thought somebody was committing a crime against him?
 - A. At one point in time I believed that, yes, sir.
 - Q. And that's why you went to the FBI?
- A. Well, eventually we went because I had tried on several occasions to have -- as I think in one of my memos says you probably have on here, I said -- I asked him -- I mean, I really wanted him to come clean. I even said, Are you under undue influence, sir?
 - Q. And he said no.
 - A. He did say no, yes.
- Q. He never said, Oh, I'm being blackmailed. I'm under undue influence.
- A. But his actions didn't reveal that. I mean, when we found out that this woman that he had had the affair with from years ago that had moved up to Austin and was now employed by Mr. Paul and that he was taking these unusual actions --
 - Q. Did you --
 - A. -- it just didn't make sense to me, Mr. Buzbee.
- Q. I hear you. You made some assumptions, did you not? You made some assumptions?
 - A. I made some reasonable assumptions, yes, sir.
 - Q. You made some assumptions, right?

1 A. I made some -- yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. And you know that sometimes assumptions are wrong, right?
- A. I remember that Odd Couple episode. We're probably similar age. Probably no one else gets that, Mr. Buzbee.
- Q. You believed he may have a potential conflict of interest. That's what you said at some point, right?
 - A. You'd have to refresh my memory on that, sir.
- Q. You said, I do not have any specific evidence, right?
 - A. You'd have to refresh my memory, sir.
- Q. Let me ask you something. When you -- do you remember there was a hearing in Travis County district court where you testified?
 - A. That by Zoom, I believe, yes.
- 16 Q. Yeah.
 - A. I was subpoenaed.
 - Q. And you were asked point-blank -- let me make sure I get this exactly right because this might be something that's important to our jurors. You were asked under oath whether you believed the AG was engaged in ongoing criminal activity in connection with Nate Paul. Do you remember being asked that question?
 - A. I don't think that's the question I was asked, sir.
 - Q. You don't think that was what was asked?

A. I do not think that was the question that was asked.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. Do you remember -- what question do you think was asked? Just so we can -- maybe we can refresh your recollection.
- A. I'd love to see the transcript. That would be the best evidence.
- Q. Were you ever asked whether you believe that Ken Paxton was engaged in criminal activity?
- A. I don't believe I was ever asked that question during that hearing.
- Q. Okay. You believe you were asked about the AG's Office itself?
- A. The best -- again, if I could look at the transcript, that would tell us all what was asked.
- Q. Let's do that. We're going to look at the transcript from Travis County district court, the 250th Judicial District, a hearing that was held on the 1st day of March, 2021.
- MR. BUZBEE: We're going to turn to page 189 of that transcript, Eric.
- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) You were asked point-blank under oath, six months after you had went to the FBI, this question.
 - MR. BUZBEE: Line 15, page 189, Eric.

Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) I'm going to read it. You make

sure -- tell me if I read it right. And did you come to

believe that the Office of Attorney General was being engaged

in ongoing criminal activity in connection with Nate Paul?

That was the question, correct?

- A. Which is different than the question you asked me.
- Q. That's why we're looking at it.
- A. I know.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. That was the question you were asked, true?
- A. That is true. Yes, sir, you read it correctly.
- Q. Let's look at what your answer was, page 190, line

 15. You said -- tell us what you said. If you don't want me
 to read it, you can read your testimony yourself.

MR. HARDIN: Objection. I don't believe this is in evidence, Your Honor. I stand to be corrected. If so, I'll withdraw the concern, but I don't believe it's in evidence.

MR. BUZBEE: This is House Board of Managers' Exhibit 466 that was offered and received by this Court. We're looking at page 190, line 15.

Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) You said: And I know it called for yes or no, but it's a question that it's hard to give a yes or no. So that makes it difficult for me as -- as -- as the witness. But I would say it is -- it could have led to that. Certainly, it's -- did I have concerns? I had --

```
1
                    MR. HARDIN: Pardon me. I apologize again,
     Mr. Buzbee. Excuse me, please. I think this comes under the
 2
     heading of -- it is one, of course, of our exhibits. I don't
 3
     object to it being introduced, but I don't believe it has.
 4
     It is not one of those that was agreed to by the parties.
 5
     you recall, they wouldn't originally agree to any of our
 6
     exhibits and then we reached agreements we read in this
 7
     morning. I don't think it's one of them. So if he wants to
 8
     offer it, I'm not going to object, but I don't believe this
 9
10
     document is in evidence.
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: Would you like to offer
11
     it?
12
                    MR. BUZBEE: Well, first, it's in evidence.
1.3
14
     But just to satisfy my co-counsel or a colleague over there,
15
     I'll offer it again.
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: He did not object.
16
                    MR. BUZBEE: Yeah.
17
                    PRESIDING OFFICER: It's admitted into
18
     evidence.
19
20
                    (House Managers' Exhibit No. 466 was
                     admitted)
2.1
                    MR. HARDIN: Thank you.
22
               (BY MR. BUZBEE) Now, let's focus on this document
2.3
          Ο.
     that's in evidence. You were asked point-blank -- and this
24
```

is six months -- I mean, come on, six months after you left

the office, six months after you had went to the FBI. This is -- this is after some of your colleagues had filed a very public lawsuit, right?

A. Correct.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. And this is even after that you had been interviewed in the press, right?
 - A. I believe one time, yes.
- Q. Yeah. And all kinds of things were going on in the press about these so-called whistleblowers and crimes and all kinds of things. And then here you are placed under oath in March of 2021. And you were asked point-blank whether you believed the Office of the AG was engaged -- had been engaged in ongoing criminal activity in relation to Nate Paul, and you couldn't even give an answer, could you?
- A. With regard to the Office of Attorney General, correct.
- Q. You're making some distinction between the Office and the AG himself?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Because you didn't want to say that you had been engaged in criminal activity, right?
 - A. I don't believe -- no.
- Q. I mean, part of the so-called criminal activity is the Mitte intervention, isn't it? And you were dead and in the middle of that, weren't you?

1 A. I approved the executive memorandum.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Isn't it ironic that the first witness called in this case for the House on the first Articles of Impeachment that was passed, that this witness, you, approved that intervention? Isn't that ironic?
 - A. I don't know, sir.
- Q. Don't you think that really reflects -- kind of reflects the whole House's case, that they put you up here as the witness to tell us how bad Ken Paxton was, and on the very first Article, you approved it? Isn't that ironic?
 - A. The irony I guess is lost on me, sir.
 - Q. Is it?
- A. It is.
 - Q. Before I get to some of these other more difficult topics, would you help us -- and we have people watching and, of course, some of our jurors are not lawyers. I want to talk to you about the burden of proof. You know what the burden of proof is, right? You know what that concept means?
 - A. I do, yes.
- Q. Okay. There's one burden called more likely than not. You understand that concept?
- 22 A. Okay. Yes.
- Q. What does that mean?
- A. Whether a fact is more likely than not, like the preponderance of the evidence.

- Q. Yep. And that's the easiest standard of proof if you're somebody advocating for something, right?
 - A. That's the normal standard in a civil court.
 - Q. Okay. Let's focus --
 - A. With some exceptions.
 - Q. Sure. There are --

MR. HARDIN: Objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Turn your microphone on,

please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2.3

24

25

MR. HARDIN: There we go. Thank you. I'm sorry.

He's not being offered as an expert on the burden of proof, and that's something for the jury to decide in their own mind. His view of what it is or not, he didn't bring these charges. The House Managers did. He's not here for that purpose. It's unfair for him -- and irrelevant for him to be being asked what his definition of the burden -- in fact I must say I've never heard that done before. And so I object to it as being totally irrelevant and improper for this witness to be even cross-examined about it. What difference does it make what he thinks the burden of proof is? It's what they think the burden of proof is.

MR. BUZBEE: Wait a minute, Your Honor. With all due respect, this counsel asked this man many times about his opinion on whether a law has been broken, many times.

And so I'm entitled to ask him about the burden of proof, especially on illegality which, remember, he stood up there -- or sat up there and said that Ken Paxton signing a contract was illegal. So you can't open the door and then close it now.

1.3

2.1

2.3

MR. HARDIN: He has not testified as to what this jury ought to do or how they ought to look at the burden of proof. He was asked whether or not he thought the conduct was unlawful. He said he did, but the burden of proof has nothing to do with it. Those are two different things. The burden of proof is decided by the jurors out there, not this man or any other witness.

MR. BUZBEE: I'm entitled to explore why he would say something like that, like in his -- what is the burden of proof? And I'm going to get to that if I quit being interrupted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Overruled. You opened that door.

- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) Now, let's talk about the burden in this case for the Senators, our jurors. Beyond a reasonable doubt, what does that mean?
- A. It means what it says. It means that you don't have any reasonable doubt.
- Q. In other words, any doubts I have are not reasonable?

- A. I'm not a criminal lawyer, but that's, you know, beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Q. When you went to the FBI and you offered up a good faith belief that Ken Paxton had been engaged in criminal activity, in your mind, was that beyond a reasonable doubt?
 - A. I didn't think about that at all, sir.
 - Q. You just suspected; isn't that true?
- A. I didn't think about the burden of proof at all in those conversations.
- Q. You know, I would think that you, if you're -you've portrayed yourself, and I'm not challenging that, that
 you were a good and trusted friend, a good and trusted
 advisor, a good and trusted confidant in some cases, right,
 to Ken Paxton?
 - A. I don't know about confident.
 - Q. Well, you -- confidant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- A. Confidant. Sorry about that. Sometimes my speech impediment comes through. I apologize.
- Q. No worries. I'm not picking on you. I just want to make sure you understand the concept.
- I mean, you've told us, the entire public, that you had a meeting with Ken Paxton and he talked about his marriage. Told us that, right?
- A. Well, Mr. Paxton and Mrs. Paxton had a meeting with senior staff and talked about their marriage, yes.

- Okay. So I guess it brings me to the point, 1 wouldn't you want to make sure that you are absolutely sure 2 that Ken Paxton was doing something untoward and illegal 3 before you went to the FBI? Wouldn't that be what a trusted 4 confidant would do? Somebody who's a trusted friend, 5 somebody who's been trusted to run the office, at least you 6 should make yourself sure. You know what, before I do 7 this -- because when I pull that trigger, when I do that, all 8 bets are off. You even said, I knew when I did that, I 9 10 wouldn't be the first deputy again, right?
- 11 A. First assistant, yes.
- Q. First assistant. So wouldn't -- shouldn't you be sure before you do that?
 - A. Sir, we were very -- we were confident.
 - Q. You were confident?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.

15

2.3

- 17 Q. You thought that Nate Paul had made repairs on his home?
- 19 A. I had been told that, yes.
- Q. Who told you that?
- 21 A. I believe, again, it was either Mr. Wicker or 22 Mr. Rylander.
 - Q. You think that Mr. Wicker said that to somebody?
- A. Yeah. I -- again, it was either Mr. Wicker or
- 25 Mr. Rylander.

- Seems to me that would be so important you would 1 Ο. remember who told you that. I mean, you're telling me 2 somebody told me my boss was having a campaign donor pay for 3 renovations of his house, and you can't even tell us who told 4 vou that?
- Α. Well, I said I believe it's Mr. Wicker or 6 Mr. Rylander, sir. 7
 - So if it's not Mr. Wicker, because it wasn't, Ο. you're saying it would be Mr. Rylander?
 - Α. Yes, sir.

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Okay. You ever play the telephone game with your 11 Q. kids? 12
- I played the telephone game in youth group, yes, 1.3 Α. 14 sir, not with my kids.
 - Okay. Well, how many kids you got? Q.
 - I've got three.
 - I've got four, so sometimes I play the telephone Ο. game. And you know what that is, right?
 - Α. I do, yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. That's the game where somebody whispers something to somebody else, and then they turn around and whisper something to somebody else, and then they turn around and whisper something to somebody else, and so on and so on, and then they let the last person repeat what they think they were told.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

20

2.1

22

25

- Α.
- And sometimes it's comical how different the story Q. 2 is that's been passed from person to person to person and 3 person, right? 4
 - Α. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Yeah. That's what happened here.
 - Α. I don't know.

Yes, sir.

- A stray comment from Drew -- that Drew Wicker Ο. claims he heard that he misunderstood, you, a trusted advisor, a trusted friend, you believed that Nate Paul had paid for the renovations of Ken Paxton's home.
 - Α. I believed that that was possible, yes, sir.
 - Do you know that it's not true? Q.
 - I do not know that it's not true. Α.
 - Have you ever tried to find out? Q.
- No, I went to -- that's why we went to law 16 enforcement for them to find out. 17
- Why didn't you just ask Ken Paxton? 18 Q.
- Α. I had resigned. 19
 - Uh-huh. You know, he could have shown -- he could Q. have shown you the invoices, the wires, the receipts, the samples. You didn't ask him?
- Α. Well, I saw them because you had a press conference 2.3 where you had them. That's --24
 - Ο. Oh, I've only shown a few. I'm going to show them

all in this trial.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. Okay. I haven't seen them, no, sir.
- Q. How many times have you told people that Ken Paxton had somebody pay for the renovations of his home? How many times have you said that to people?
- A. I don't know if I've ever said that until you asked me the question.
 - Q. You wouldn't say that to somebody, would you?
 - A. I don't have a recollection of saying it.
 - Q. I mean, you shouldn't say it, should you?
- A. Shouldn't say it?
- Q. In other words, if you don't know it's true, you shouldn't be out there repeating it, should you?
 - A. I don't believe I've been repeating it.
 - Q. Okay. I think you said, if I'm not mistaken -- let me just ask you point-blank: Do you remember you talked about your potential concerns about the office? Remember that question?
 - A. From the transcript?
- Q. Yeah. Do you remember that?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. You have said that in 2020 you became aware that Nate Paul had donated to Ken Paxton's campaign; is that right?
 - A. That's when I became aware of that campaign

contribution.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

- Q. When you became aware, you learned, I'm sure, that that one campaign donation was actually made in October of 2018, right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And you learned that that October 2018 campaign donation was \$25,000, right?
 - A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. And that Nate Paul -- or that Nate Paul was a campaign donor played a part in your belief that Ken Paxton was engaged in unlawful conduct with regard to Nate Paul, right?
 - A. That was part, yes.
- Q. Okay. So let's make sure we ferret that out a little bit. You learned in 2020 of a campaign donation almost two years before, right?
- A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. And that -- the fact that a donation had been made two years prior played a part in your belief that Ken Paxton was doing something wrong with regard to Nate Paul; is that right?
 - A. That was part, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know who else he gave money to?
- A. Who else Nate Paul gave money to?
 - Q. Did you check?

1 A. No. That wasn't my concern.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

20

2.3

- Q. Do you know how much money Ken Paxton raised in 2018 for his campaign?
- A. I did at the time. I know it was several million dollars.
 - Q. What did you say?
- A. I knew -- I would have known the number at the time. I know it was several million dollars.
 - Q. Where is that --
- MR. BUZBEE: Where is that blowup? You have it blown up?
- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) Do you know what percentage -what percentage of -- in 2018, what percentage Nate Paul's
 campaign contribution was with regard to the total amount
 raised by Ken Paxton?
 - A. Well, if your math is correct on this demonstrative, it's there, but I wouldn't have known that then, no.
- 19 Q. .37 percent, right?
 - A. That's what your demonstrative says.
- Q. In 2018 Ken Paxton raised \$6.7 million. Did you know that?
 - A. I would have known that at the time, yes, sir.
- Q. You checked into that?
 - A. No. He would have told me.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

- Q. And Nate Paul donated 25,000 of that, right?
- 2 A.
- Q. And the illegal activity that you complain about or at least you claim you had a good faith belief had occurred is .37 percent of that?

I know Nate Paul donated 25,000, yes.

- A. If that is the correct math, I have no reason to dispute you on the math.
- Q. So let me just make sure I'm clear. When somebody feels aggrieved and they came to the AG's Office to get help, that's the job of the AG's Office, right, to help constituents?
 - A. That's part of our job, yes.
- Q. I mean, isn't that what we taxpayers are paying for?
 - A. That's part of our job, yes.
 - Q. So when somebody feels aggrieved in some way, they don't know where to turn, and they go to the AG's Office, do you check to see if they're a donor of some sort?
 - A. We -- because of allegations made in the past against Attorney General Paxton, we were very sensitive when we were asked to do things on behalf of folks who had contributed to his campaign. So, yes, we were concerned about things like that.
 - Q. You were. So that's -- you decide whether you're going to do your job --

1 A. No, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Let me finish my question, please, if you don't mind.
 - A. I'm sorry. I apologize.
- Q. No worries. You decide whether you're going to do your job based on whether the person has donated to your boss? Is that what you're telling me?
 - A. I'm not telling you that, sir, no.
- Q. Okay. You look at someone with a jaundiced eye if they're asking for assistance and they've also given money to the elected official that you're working for?
 - A. No. No, sir.
- Q. You're skeptical of somebody who's just asking for help how to deal with a situation and you're skeptical because they might also be a campaign donor?
 - A. No, not skeptical, no, sir.
- Q. Okay. But you already told us that Nate Paul, as a campaign donor, played a part in your belief that Ken Paxton was engaged in unlawful conduct. That's what you said under oath, right?
 - A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. Is it possible, Mr. Mateer, that you jumped to a lot of conclusions really fast?
- A. I don't believe so, sir.
 - Q. And you could have -- you could have put all this

- to bed if you would have just talked to your boss?
- A. I attempted to talk to him starting probably in June, July, August, September.
 - O. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.3

- A. I did.
 - Q. Take it easy now.
 - A. I did talk to him, sir.
 - Q. Take it easy. You could have -- once you met up with the rest of your colleagues on the 8th floor, you could have then, as the leader -- you were the leader, right, of the group?
- 12 A. I was the first assistant.
 - Q. Yeah, you're the leader?
- 14 A. First among equals, yes.
- Q. You even said in your testimony, you said, Look,
- 16 | I -- I managed the day-to-day business in that office.
- 17 Remember saying that?
- 18 A. I did manage the day-to-day office.
- 19 Q. And I control the office, remember saying that?
- 20 A. Control the office. I don't know if I said it in that way, sir.
- Q. We'll get to it.
- 23 A. Okay.
- Q. But you as the leader, once you heard all these foolishness concerns, some of which you might have believed,

- some of which you didn't, your job at that point in time was to go to the boss; isn't that right?
 - A. I had tried to go to the boss.
 - Q. Is it because you wanted to be the Attorney General? Is that what was going on?
 - A. Anybody who knows me, Mr. Buzbee, knows that that is not one of my ambitions. I had my dream job. I came to help Ken Paxton, came down here, a city I didn't want to move to.
- Q. Wait. Your dream job is to be a federal judge, and that got squelched; isn't that right?
- 12 A. No. Actually, my dream job has always been to be at First Liberty.
 - Q. Weren't you supposed to be a federal judge and then the two Senators objected to you?
- 16 A. What two Senators, sir?
- Q. The two that would have the ability to object to you. You know who I'm talking about.
- 19 A. You're talking about our Senators?
- 20 Q. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

- 21 A. They didn't object to me.
- Q. They didn't?
- A. No. Senator Cruz certainly didn't.
- Q. Well, somehow something went awry and you're not a federal judge, are you?

- A. That's absolutely true. My nomination was withdrawn by President Trump.
 - Q. Yeah. And that's the job you really wanted, right?
 - A. That was -- I did want to be a federal judge.
 - O. Sure.

4

5

6

9

10

18

- A. But my dream job was First Liberty.
- Q. Okay. Now, I understand that you took the place of Chip Roy; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Chip Roy was the first assistant before you?
- 11 A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. Okay. And you mentioned kind of in passing that

 Ken Paxton at some point became unhappy with Chip Roy?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- Q. That Chip Roy was not doing what he wanted him to do?
- 17 A. That's correct.
 - Q. And he felt the same way about you during the conversation about Cammack, right?
- 20 A. The Attorney General never expressed that to me --
- Q. But you told --
- 22 A. -- has never expressed that to me.
- Q. I'm sorry. You told us all that he compared you to Chip Roy, remember?
- A. What I said was Mr. Penley said that.

- Q. Penley said that Paxton had said that?
- A. And I asked the Attorney General whether he was frustrated with me, and he didn't respond about being frustrated with me.
- Q. Have you seen the second referral from the DA's Office to the AG's Office?
 - A. I may have.
 - Q. Why would you have seen it at this point?
- A. I had a conversation with Margaret Moore after I resigned and may have seen it during that conversation, who was the Travis County District Attorney at the time.
 - Q. Yeah, I know who she was.
- Listen, because we're running up against the lunch hour, I want to focus on Mitte real quick so we can just put this Mitte thing to bed, okay? Are you going to help me here?
 - A. You're asking the questions. I'll answer them.
- Q. Okay. Let's look at AG Exhibit 151. It's in evidence. And just so the members of the jury understand how the office worked, there's some policy or procedure there that you described as executive action?
- A. It's approval. The title is there, Mr. Buzbee. See executive approval civil litigation -- he just --
 - Q. Oh, executive --
 - A. He highlighted it for us.

- 1 Q. Sorry. Executive Approval Civil Litigation 2 Memorandum?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

2.1

- Q. Okay. We see here the letterhead. Letterhead is Ken Paxton?
 - A. I see that.
 - Q. Okay. And basically, it takes us through various people within the bowels of the AG's Office who would approve something like this, right?
- A. It starts with someone in the division and goes its way up, yes, sir.
- Q. And this is just found in some policy manual somewhere, right?
 - A. Well, it was a policy of the office.
 - Q. Is it written down?
- 16 A. It is written down, sir.
- Q. Okay. Now, so let's just look. With regard to
 intervention on behalf of the public interest in charity, we
 have a sign-off of Mary Henderson, who's a senior attorney,
 right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. We have, looks like, Josh Godbey, who is the chief of the financial litigation and charitable trust division, right?
 - A. That's correct, sir.

- Q. We have also signed off here Darren McCarty, who is -- what is he? For civil litigation, head of civil litigation?
 - A. He's the deputy attorney general for civil litigation.
 - Q. And then at the top of the chain is your name where you signed off on June 8th of 2020, correct?
 - A. That is correct, sir.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. And, of course, all of these people here that we see on Exhibit 151 derive their authority from the Attorney General; isn't that right?
- A. From the Attorney General and the statutes and the Constitution, yes.
- Q. I mean, it doesn't matter whether you think it's a good idea or not. He, the Attorney General, is the decision-maker ultimately; isn't that true?
- A. And that authority is delegated down to and through.
- Q. I understand you can delegate authority, but you can also take it back, can't you?
 - A. I think that's correct, sir.
- Q. Right. So let's make sure we're clear. Any authority you had only existed as long as you serve the Attorney General; isn't that right?
 - A. I think the Government Code gives the first

assistant authority when the Attorney General is absent.

- Q. When he's absent?
- A. That's correct.

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

- Q. Right. Not when he's on a business trip doing work on a case for Google. You don't get to just say, Oh, he's out of town, now I'm in charge. That ain't how it works, is it?
 - A. I certainly never did that, sir.
- Q. Yeah. And you better not do that because that would get you fired, right? I mean, if you were to do that, that should be a fireable offense, right?
- A. Again, as long as the Attorney General were exercising his proper authority as well pursuant to the Constitution and the laws.
- Q. Let's look at why the person that generated this Executive Approval Civil Litigation Memorandum, let's look at why they thought it was the right thing to do to intervene into this Mitte litigation.
- MR. BUZBEE: Turn over, if you would, to page 2 of this document, Eric.
- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) It goes on for several pages with the justification as to why it's a good idea for the AG's Office to intervene; is that true?
- A. That's the purpose of the memo, to set forth the reasons why to take an action.

- Q. Did you review it before you signed it?
- A. I did.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.3

- Q. Did you have the opportunity to say, you know, I don't think that's sufficient justification?
 - A. I would have had that, yes.
- Q. And can we agree that even if you thought it wasn't a good idea, that you could be overruled by your boss?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Just so we're clear on that, I want to make sure everybody hears that, that even if -- let's just say as an example, using the Mitte intervention as an example, if you had looked at this and said, You know what? I don't think this detailed memo that goes into line by line of all the problems that the Mitte -- the Mitte Foundation has had, I don't think that's sufficient justification to intervene, and you said, You know what, I'm not going to sign that, the Attorney General could overrule that however he chose; isn't that right?
 - A. I believe that's correct.
 - Q. Because you're not in charge, are you?
- A. Ultimately, the elected official is the Attorney
 General.
 - Q. Because you've never gotten any votes, have you?
- 24 A. No.
 - Q. You didn't get 4.2 million votes, did you?

- 1 A. I've never run for any office, sir.
- Q. He did.
- 3 A. Never any desire.
 - Q. He did, right?
 - A. He did.

5

6

- Q. He's the one that's elected, right?
- 7 A. He is elected.
- 8 Q. He's the boss, true?
 - A. He is ultimately, yes.
- 10 Q. And you serve at his pleasure; isn't that right?
- 11 A. The first assistant serves at the Attorney
- 12 | General's pleasure.
- Q. You're a political appointee; isn't that right?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- Q. And if he doesn't trust you anymore, then you're out the door; isn't that right?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. And that's how it works with political appointees,
- 19 | isn't it?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. It's at will. When he doesn't trust you anymore,
- 22 you leave, right?
- 23 A. Or vice versa, yes.
- Q. Sure. Let's look at all the problems with the
- 25 Mitte Foundation.

MR. BUZBEE: Go, Eric, if you would, to page 4
where they're laid out -- the bullet points are laid out, the
justification of the intervention by the AG's Office.

- Q. (BY MR. BUZBEE) Do you see them there?
- A. I see the allegations, yes, sir.
- Q. And are those sufficient still in your mind for the intervention?
 - A. Again, I approved that memo at the time, yes, sir.
 - Q. You stand by it today, don't you?
 - A. That I approved the memo on that day, yes.
- Q. Okay. Nobody tricked you to get your signature, did they?
 - A. No one on that date tricked me, yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. And we can see all the problems. Apparently or allegedly the former chairman attempted to conjure a sale of the investment properties in a self-dealing transaction. See that bullet point?
 - A. I see it there, sir.
- 19 Q. It says that they hadn't filed the proper IRS 20 forms. See that?
 - A. That fourth bullet point?
- 22 Q. Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

2.1

- 23 A. I see what it says.
- Q. They refused to disclose certain fee agreements, right?

1 A. I see that bullet point, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. You knew, of course, that one of the individuals who had been involved had gotten in trouble criminally. You knew that, didn't you?
 - A. I don't know if I knew that, sir.
 - Q. You don't remember that?
 - A. I do not remember that.
- Q. Okay. You know, there's been some saying here, let's -- I want to make sure we're -- because we're putting Article I to bed, which I think puts the whole case to bed. But look at Article I. Impeachment Article I, please.

It starts off, it says, Protection of Charitable
Organization. Do you see that there?

- A. One second. At the top, yes, I see it.
- Q. Sorry.
- A. Sorry about that.
 - Q. I'm kind of doing you like --
 - A. I was reading the paragraph, not the --
- Q. That's false in itself, isn't it?
- 20 A. What --
- Q. The AG's Office is not there to protect charitable organizations, is it?
- A. No, I think that is part of our role.
- Q. It's there by statute. It says, By statute, the authority to intervene is to protect the public interest in

charity; isn't that true?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. I think that's what that means.
- Q. That's a whole different thing than protecting charities, isn't it?
 - A. No, I don't -- I don't think so, sir.
- Q. I mean, the reason for the intervention is because they thought the people within the charity were doing things that were wrong, and so we're protecting the public's interest in the charity, correct?
- A. I think -- I don't think they're necessarily exclusive, sir.
- Q. You also authorized -- you also authorized an investigation of the Mitte Foundation, didn't you?
- A. I remember seeing those documents, yes, sir.

MR. BUZBEE: I didn't know what time you wanted to do lunch. Is it now? This is a good time to break for me if you want to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Good time for you?

MR. BUZBEE: Yes, sir.

20 PRESIDING OFFICER: All right. We will break

21 until 1:30, 45 minutes.

(Recessed for lunch at 12:42 p.m.)

23

22

24

	127
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	THE STATE OF TEXAS)(
4	COUNTY OF TRAVIS)(
5	
6	I, Kim Cherry, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
7	for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the
8	above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.
9	I further certify that I am neither counsel
10	for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties
11	or attorneys in the action in which this proceeding was
12	taken, and further that I am not financially or
13	otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
14	Certified to by me this 6th day of September, 2023.
15	
16	<u>/s/Kím Cherry</u> KIM CHERRY, CSR, RMR
17	Texas Certified Shorthand Reporter CSR No. #4650 Expires: 7/31/24
18	kcherry.csr@gmail.com
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	