	* * * * * SEALED * * * * *
	+ MVII DAGE LEEM INMENTIONALLY DIANY +
	* THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK *
	ATTEN IN MARK COTT
	SEALED MATTER ENCLOSED
	FOR AUTHORIZED PERSONS ONLY
- 1	
-	
-	
- [
	W. Committee of the com
	* * * * * SEALED * * * * *
-	" " " ODALEU " " " "

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEALED

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE BERYL A. HOWELL,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CHIEF JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE UNITED STATES:

THOMAS WINDOM
MARY DOHRMANN
Office of Special Counsel
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 804-7000

FOR TWITTER:

ARI HOLTZBLATT WHITNEY RUSSELL BENJAMIN A. POWELL

WilmerHale

2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037 USA

(202) 663-6964

Court Reporter:

Elizabeth Saint-Loth, RPR, FCRR

Official Court Reporter

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

PROCEEDINGS

_	
2	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Matter before the Court,
3	Case No. 23-SC-31, In the matter of the search of
4	information that is stored at premises controlled by
5	Twitter, Inc. Interested parties, United States of America
6	and Twitter, Inc.
7	Counsel, please come forward and state your names
8	for the record, starting with the government.
9	MR. WINDOM: Good morning, Your Honor.
10	Thomas Windom and Mary Dohrmann for the United States.
11	THE COURT: Yes. Good morning.
12	MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor, Ari Holtzblatt for
13	Twitter.
14	THE COURT: All right. Who else is with you at
15	counsel table, if you would just introduce them again.
16	MR. HOLTZBLATT: I'm sorry. Ben Powell and
17	Whitney Russell.
18	THE COURT: And Mr. Varghese, as I understand, is
19	on his way.
20	MR. HOLTZBLATT: Mr. Varghese is in an interview
21	that could not be rescheduled. So I will be
22	THE COURT: Okay. I thought we were waiting for
23	somebody.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I'm sorry. Yes. Mr. Aaron
Zebley entered an appearance this morning and is on his way.

24

25

He is actually outside the building. He will be joining very shortly.

2.0

THE COURT: So we're not waiting for anybody?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: He is trying to get up here. But
we don't need to wait for him; I will be presenting.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I had gotten a message that the person who was supposed to be arguing today was delayed, but to begin without him. I just want to make sure the record is correct. I presumed it was Mr. Varghese since that was the person who argued the last time we were here earlier this week. But perhaps I misunderstood.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I think something may have been lost in communication. I will be presenting for Twitter today. My colleague Aaron Zebley is on his way, and will be here shortly.

THE COURT: Okay. Fine. Got it. Fine. Because we're not waiting.

Okay. So as I look at this and look at the time of the warrant issuance, I look at how far out we are from compliance with the warrant, the representation by Twitter's counsel when we met earlier this week that they could comply by 5 p.m. on the 7th; and there was some compliance, I think, by the deadline.

But I understand from the government's email to chambers, with a copy to Twitter's counsel, that there has

not been full compliance with the warrant. I want to just find out today what happened, and where are we on compliance with the warrant. Twitter has had quite some time to comply with the warrant and have everything prepared to turn over, so I am a little bit concerned about where we are.

Let me find out first from the government, since we're here at the government's request, what is the government expecting to happen today --

MR. WINDOM: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- other than counting up the amount of the penalty?

MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. A few things.

First of all, the government wanted to raise this with Your Honor since it was inconsistent with what was represented in court by Twitter counsel two days ago.

Second of all, we want compliance; that's the entire purpose of these repeated proceedings and conversations with counsel, is to get the information that the Court ordered them to produce 13 days ago.

Each time we have received an email or had a conversation with counsel over the last 48 hours, we have not been left with any confidence that they have produced everything, that they have a time frame to produce everything, or that they even know the scope of the repositories of information.

2.2

2.4

Even this morning, when we had a phone call with them, it seemed as if they were attempting to cabin one of the requests in the warrant. The only way to describe the end of the phone call after it concluded, I had felt like I had been getting nickle-and-dimed for the prior 20 minutes of conversation. We need the material. We need it now. We needed it 13 days ago.

The purpose of this hearing is to impress upon counsel in a way that apparently the government cannot, that the meter is running. \$50,000 accrued at five o'clock two days ago; \$100,000 yesterday; \$200,000 so far today. It will continue to run until Twitter completely complies with the warrant.

THE COURT: All right. So let's hear from you, Mr. Holtzblatt.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor.

I would like to address three things that counsel for the government just said: First, what we understood we were producing at five o'clock on Tuesday; second, what we have done since then -- actually, four things -- what remains. And the final item that counsel for the government mentioned about the single category where we discovered this morning that we had a different understanding about what that category represents, and I think it may be -- I ultimately would like --

1 THE COURT: Well, I am looking at Attachment B, 2 Part 1. We're just going to go through it line by line, something tediously -- I tried to avoid at the last hearing; 3 4 but it seems like that kind of supervision of Twitter is necessary here. 5 6 Do you have that in front of you, Mr. Holtzblatt? 7 MR. HOLTZBLATT: I do, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Let's start with number 1. 9 All business records and subscriber information in 10 any form kept pertaining to the subject account starting 11 with: A, identity and contact information, past and 12 current, including full name, email address, physical 13 address, date of birth, phone number, gender, and other 14 personal identifiers. 15 Has that been turned over? 16 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor, I was prepared to 17 identify for you the items that we understand are not yet 18 turned over --THE COURT: Well, it's the same way of doing it. 19 20 What have you turned over? What is missing? 21 So everything in "A" turned over? 22 MR. HOLTZBLATT: The one item that I know that is

THE COURT: Which you are still determining

-* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

not yet turned over but is about to be turned over is the

information regarding gender.

23

24

25

whether you have or not? 1 MR. HOLTZBLATT: No. We have determined that we 2 have the gender information. We spoke to the government 3 about the gender information yesterday. 4 5 The email communication from the government suggested that the gender field was not necessarily the most 6 7 pressing of information, but we have gathered it. And, I think, as we speak are producing the gender field information. 9 THE COURT: And everything else in "A," I am 10 understanding from what you said, has been turned over. 11 Is that a correct understanding? 12 MR. HOLTZBLATT: That is my understanding. 13 THE COURT: All right. B. Do I have to read it 14 to you or can you read it yourself? 15 Has everything in B been turned over? 16 17 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor. Can you bear with me for one second? 18 (Whereupon, Twitter counsel confer.) 19 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor, we have turned over 20 21 information in all categories in B with one exception that we are -- we don't possess in the manner in which it is 22 described in B, and so we're attempting to turn over what we 23

THE COURT: What is that precisely?

24

25

do have.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: All associated accounts, 1 2 parentheses, including those linked by machine, cookie, IP 3 address, email address, or any other account or device 4 identifier, that's not -- "associated accounts," as I 5 understand it, is not a category of information that exists 6 in that term within our systems. And so we are attempting 7 to gather a proxy for that, but it's not --8 THE COURT: What is the proxy you are gathering for that? 9 10 (Whereupon, Twitter counsel confer.) MR. HOLTZBLATT: We are --11 12 THE COURT: Is there a reason why Ms. Russell just 13 has to just sit there as opposed to speaking, since she 14 seems to be the person with the answers? 15 MR. HOLTZBLATT: No, Your Honor. We have collectively gathered the information about the answers. So 16 17 before I make a representation to you I wanted to confirm 18 that information because I don't want to make an incorrect 19 representation to Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Of course not. We have already been 21 through that. 22 Okay. So you are still figuring out all of the 23 associated account information in 1B. 24 How long will it take you to figure that out,

* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

produce it, collect it, and produce it?

25

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Well, Your Honor, we don't -- the issue, Your Honor -- there isn't a category of "associated account information"; that's not information that Twitter stores.

What we are doing right now is manually attempting to ascertain links between accounts. But the ascertainment of links between accounts on the basis of machine, cookie, IP address, email address, or other account or device identifier is not information that Twitter possesses, it would be information that Twitter needs to create. So that's the reason why we had not previously produced it because it's not a category of information that we actually possess.

So what we are trying to do is be -- I would say -- because it's not information --

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to do this in a way that makes sense on the record as we're talking about things.

Mr. Windom, with respect to the "all associated accounts," have you obtained -- has the government obtained information like that before from Twitter, if you know?

MR. WINDOM: I can't make that representation with respect to Twitter.

With any number of other electronic communication providers, they keep that information in a consistent form.

To the extent that Twitter does not, it should be a simple process. You have cookies associated with an account; you have the email for the subscriber information; perhaps you have the phone number; you definitely have the IP addresses. Control F that through your system to see what other accounts have come from those IP addresses, are linked to that email address, are linked to the phone number, are linked to the same cookies.

I don't profess to be a technological wizard, but it does not seem to be a complex issue.

THE COURT: And all associated --

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Excuse me. Mr. Windom, you escaped too fast.

MR. WINDOM: Sorry, ma'am.

THE COURT: "All associated accounts" information is helpful and useful for what reason?

MR. WINDOM: It is, as explained more fully in the warrant -- but for these purposes, it is a useful tool in identifying what other accounts are being used by the same user or by the same device that has access to the account.

As oftentimes in any number of cases, user attribution is important. And if there are other accounts that a user is using, that is very important to the government's investigation.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So, Your Honor, all providers are not the same. And it is -- I believe it is correct that other providers possess this information in this form.

The warrant, in Section 1 of the warrant, is a BSI request for basic subscriber information. It, therefore, is asking for information that exists, not information that needs to be created.

and we are -- we were trying to be cooperative, and our communications with the government have aimed at attempting to assist the government -- is for us to create information that does not exist, as opposed to produce information that does exist. We are trying to work with the government. But in terms of compliance with the warrant, the creation of BSI that does not exist, I think, is beyond the scope of the warrant.

THE COURT: Well, it's business records and subscriber information in any form kept. You are saying because of the word "kept" you don't have that information as a business record that you maintain?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's right. If the records -if the linkage between accounts, which is what we understand
this category to be referring to, is not itself a piece of
information that we keep, then it's not a business record

1 that we would ordinarily produce. 2 What I understand the government to be asking is 3 for us to analyze our data, as opposed to produce existing 4 data. And we are trying to work with the government in that 5 respect, but that is the reason that it is not something that -- that is a different category of information. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. 1C, length of service, has 8 that been produced? 9 MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced length of 10 service including start date; and I don't know the answer to the rest of 1C. 11 12 THE COURT: Ms. Russell, do you know the answer? 13 (Whereupon, Twitter counsel confer.) 14 MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced everything, but 15 there is no credit card or bank account number information 16 associated with the account. 17

THE COURT: Really? Then how did somebody pay for that account at all, or --

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HOLTZBLATT: The Twitter services --

THE COURT: -- or identify themselves -- that's just one way to identify yourselves as an account user? You don't have to provider that information to use a Twitter account?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's correct, Your Honor. Twitter service is free.

* * * SEALED

1	THE COURT: All right. D?
2	MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. We have produced that
3	information.
4	THE COURT: E?
5	MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced that information.
6	THE COURT: And F?
7	MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced that information.
8	THE COURT: G?
9	MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced that information.
10	THE COURT: H?
11	MR. HOLTZBLATT: This is the source of our
12	divergence of understanding with the government that we
13	discussed with the government this morning. Until we had
14	this discussion this morning, we did not understand how
15	we had a different understanding of what 1H refers to. And
16	if Your Honor will permit, I can explain
17	THE COURT: Well, for purposes of the record, H
18	is: Communications between Twitter and any person regarding
19	the account including contacts with support services and
20	records of actions taken.
21	It seems pretty plain on its face.
22	Have you reached an understanding now with the
23	government as to the scope?
24	MR. HOLTZBLATT: No. We have attempted and would
25	like to continue to attempt to reach an understanding with

the government as to the scope if Your Honor would permit.

THE COURT: I am going to dictate the scope right now: All communications that Twitter had with any person regarding this account including any contacts with support services and records of actions taken. Is that clear?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Well, Your Honor --

THE COURT: What don't you understand about what I just said?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We understand 1H to refer to basic subscriber information because it appears in Section 1 of the warrant.

THE COURT: I think it speaks for itself, and it is not just "basic subscriber information," it is what it says.

So have there been communications between Twitter and any person regarding this account — and given the fact that it was turned off at one point and then turned back on again — one would think that there would be a lot of communications; and all of those communications would be included.

Where are you puzzled as a company?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: This is where we are puzzled,

Your Honor. 1H appears in Section 1 of the warrant which

otherwise refers -- every other category in Section 1 refers

to basic subscriber information.

THE COURT: Forget -- forget what you think this category is.

It's all business records and subscriber information in any form kept pertaining to the subject account.

So any communications between Twitter and anybody else regarding the account — if it's kept, it's communications regarding the account and subject to that paragraph.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We had understood this category to be defined by the including clause here, which says:

Contacts with support services and records of actions taken.

We have searched for that information, and are in the process of producing just, I think, two records. What the government explained --

THE COURT: Well, that's just including contacts.

"Including" does not mean only limited to. "Including"

means including that but any other communications as well.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We understand that is how the government communicated to us their understanding of this clause today because it appears in the basic subscriber information section.

THE COURT: So the government agrees with what I have just read to you, that that is what the scope is?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So we have done -- we have

attempted to conduct searches today, in light of the conversation we had this morning with the government, to understand the scope of this. What we have found is — based on certain types of searches — we are talking about millions of emails that include, for example, realDonaldTrump. That is a dramatically broader scope of information than we had understood would be covered by this category. And what we said to the government —

THE COURT: Why don't you explain that more.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Why don't I explain what we understood it to mean or what we --

THE COURT: No. I understand you thought it was limited to two records with support services; and that's clearly not the full scope of what is covered in H.

So based on what the plain text of H means, and you just mentioned —— made reference to millions of emails, what would the response mean to the plain text of this?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So what -- if what the government believes we need to produce for this category -- and we are prepared to be as cooperative as we can be with the government in doing that.

The government this morning communicated to us that they were most interested in communications between government officials and Twitter regarding the subject account as captured by this.

what we had understood was covered by this category until
the conversation this morning, then, what we would normally
do for that kind of a communication production would be to
meet and confer with the government or -- if we were in
civil litigation with the opposing party -- identify search
terms and, potentially, custodians that would produce a
reasonable set of records that we can review and then
produce in order to produce a manageable amount of
information. That's what we proposed to the government this
morning, is that we meet and confer, try to understand what
search terms would be effective at narrowing down the
search.

As I said, when we did a search for -- simply the keyword search of @realDonaldTrump on emails within the Twitter system, it produced millions of hits. I think there are other ways of constructing a search that would produce an appropriate scoped search for this category.

THE COURT: And those millions of hits consist of people concerned about Twitter turning off the account, is that why it was millions? Why would it be millions?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Well, that's with only the search term @realDonaldTrump, so that's obviously broader than what Your Honor just said.

H says: Communications between Twitter and any

person regarding the account. To give meaning to that in -to be responsive to the government about what they are most
interested in with respect to this category, we proposed -and would still propose -- that we meet and confer,
understand what a set of search terms would be that would
obtain the kind of information that the government is trying
to obtain under this category --

THE COURT: Mr. Holtzblatt, why are -- are there a million emails? Why are there a million emails? From whom?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Within the Twitter email system.

It's not limited to emails — between people outside the

Twitter set of employees and Twitter itself.

So we -- so, for example, one way of addressing this category would be to limit our search to -- that was from 2006 to the present. So there is no date limitation within Category 1, which is another reason we understood it to be BSI information.

So what would help to narrow this down would be to impose a date limitation, which is not currently within Category 1; to, perhaps, add a set of to/from or bcc, or cc recipients. For example, if the government is interested in specifically communications from government officials, then we can do a: To/from .gov.

THE COURT: Okay. Please sit down.

Mr. Windom, do you really need that from 2006 to

the present on H?

MR. WINDOM: This is the first time I have heard a complaint about a date limitation on 1H. The answer is no. I don't need it from 2006 forward.

If we were to pick a date right now, I would say October 1st of 2020 through January 20th of 2021, which is consistent with 1F.

But this information about, you know, what it is that we say that we're most specifically interested in, I did not represent that we were most interested in communications between government officials and Twitter regarding the account.

We did point out that -- much as Your Honor did just now -- it seemed beyond comprehension that there weren't communications regarding the account when it was suspended and terminated, but that doesn't mean government officials at least cabined to that. It can mean campaign officials. It can be anybody acting on behalf of the user of the account, or the user of the account himself.

THE COURT: So any person regarding the account is broader than what you just said, though, Mr. Windom.

"Any person regarding the account" is quite broad.

It could be all the complaints of all of the Trump

supporters out in the world saying: What are you doing,

Twitter?

2.3

So I take it, from what you just said, that you are interested only in -- rather than "any person," a person who was the subscriber or user of the account or on behalf of that person regarding the account?

MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. An agent thereof.

THE COURT: All right. How long -- with that clarification, Mr. Holtzblatt, how long will it take Twitter between -- with the date limitation and the limitation on any person, to produce records?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor, I just want to make sure I understand the limitation.

There are two additional limitations that are being placed on 1H, one is -- is that it be limited by date, from October 1st, 2020, to January 20th, 2021, is that correct, or the end of January --

THE COURT: January 20th, 2021.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: -- January 20th, 2021, and that the individuals covered would be only the owner of the account or an agent of the owner of the account for communications?

I will need to talk to my client about how long it will take. But what I can represent to the Court is that, within an hour of today's hearing, I will be able to provide an estimate. And my hope would be that I will be able to produce today that information, but I don't feel like I can

make a representation without first talking to my client about it.

THE COURT: All right. Is that sufficient, subscriber or agent of the user of the account?

MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am, with the qualification that I can't know the universe of who those agents or putative agents may be.

THE COURT: Well, how is Twitter going to know that?

MR. WINDOM: It would be beyond all comprehension to imagine that, with this account, there is not a file known within the general counsel's office or some other liaison office within Twitter regarding the account with everything that transpired during the relevant time period.

THE COURT: We'll see how that goes because hopefully -- I don't want to see you all here again. I am sure none of you want to be here again.

All right. So now we're on to 2, which is -MR. HOLTZBLATT: Just on one -- on the agents,

Your Honor, one category that I could propose is the
representatives of -- that subject to the account assigned
to be responsible for all presidential records with respect
to the archivist, so there are a limited -- a defined and
limited set of individuals who were assigned to be
responsible for presidential records. And as we have talked

about before, at least during the relevant time period, both the archivist and Twitter understood these to be presidential records. Whether or not -- I know Your Honor has some questions about that. But in terms of the contemporaneous understanding of the parties, that's how Twitter understood the records --

THE COURT: Well, when this account was set up,
was there a communication from the person or persons who set
up the account with Twitter as to who could access it and
who could communicate regarding the functionality and any
other concerns about the account?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: The account was set up in 2006, Your Honor. A great deal transpired between 2006 and 2020 with respect to the individual who is the owner of the account. So I don't -- there is obviously -- there is sign-in information with the account, but you don't need to provide very much information to open a Twitter account. So it's -- it may be surprising to the government or to the Court, but there is not a -- we don't keep dossiers on users in that sense.

I can represent to Your Honor that the current email -- we have a name of an individual who is the current email contact for the account, and that is a person who is a credible --

THE COURT: What is that name?

* * * SEALED * * : So I think we can MR. HOLTZBLATT: 1 certainly look at the NARA -- the individuals who are 2 assigned to be agents for the account --3 THE COURT: And expand it beyond to 4 include those people as well? 5 MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's correct, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Right. Mr. Windom, I am not sure what else they can do. 8 MR. WINDOM: Your Honor, that's a starting point. 9 10 We can add names to the extent we think appropriate. I will say this, the letter that they're talking 11 about was signed on January 19th and includes the sitting 12 Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel. 13 I highly doubt that that person is having communications 14 15 with Twitter in the relevant time period about this account. I would not cabin it to that --16 THE COURT: Well, I know the NARA representatives 17 are -- limiting it to them would be useless, generally 18 useless. 19 MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. 20 THE COURT: I am fully aware of that. But 21 22 would not be. 23 MR. WINDOM: is one person I can consult, and add additional names to the extent that their 24 list is not robust. 25

* SEALED

THE COURT: All right. Well, you can provide the 1 2 list of names to them. 3 MR. WINDOM: Thank you, Judge. 4 THE COURT: All right. We're on to 2A, 5 Mr. Holtzblatt. 6 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And for purposes of the record, so 8 we're all clear, 2 states that the warrant demands: All 9 content, records, and other information relating to 10 communications sent from or received by the subject account 11 from October 2020 to January 2021 including but not limited 12 to: A, content of all tweets created, drafted, favorited, 13 liked, or re-tweeted by the subject account including all 14 such deleted tweets, and all associated multimedia, 15 metadata, and logs. 16 Has that been produced? 17 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes, Your Honor. We have --18 THE COURT: You can stop at "yes," if it's all 19 been produced. If there is an exception --20 MR. HOLTZBLATT: It's more complicated, so I was 21 going to explain. 22 THE COURT: Okay. That's unfortunate. 23 MR. HOLTZBLATT: At 5 p.m. on February 7th, I 24 think that was our day, we produced all data in this 25 category that was in the standard production tools of

Twitter.

We communicated with the government on February 8th that there were prior preservations of the subject account that are not within Twitter's standard production tools and that would, therefore, require engineering to obtain information. And we asked the government whether it wished us to undertake that effort, and the government confirmed that it did.

And we have since then -- when we produced on February 7, we indicated to the government in our production letter that there was potentially deleted data that might exist, which is what would be found in prior preservations, but that it would require additional engineering efforts.

At 2 a.m. last night, or this morning, Twitter produced additional information from those prior preservations that falls within category 2A. There are --

THE COURT: When you say "prior preservations" what are you talking about?

Prior litigation holds of some kind or that you had a stash or a cache of preserved data sitting in different places? What are you talking about?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I am referring -- with respect to this particular account, I am referring to preservations from two specific dates.

There is a preservation that was made that

includes the subject account covering January 3rd to 9th, 2021. There is a second preservation of this that includes this account that covers January 11 to 12, 2021.

2.2

Those are collections of data that -- they are not -- it's not coterminous with the categories that would exist in the active account right now and -- and that's data that does not exist within a production environment. So it's not data that you can just click -- we have a system to just click a button and produce, which is why we indicated that further engineering efforts might be necessary.

We asked the government if they wished us to undertake those efforts. We had an engineer working through the night, after the government asked us to, to undertake those efforts. At 2 a.m. in the morning we produced additional information that came from those preservations.

There are two categories of information that -actually, I'm sorry, three categories of information that we
are still working to produce because of the engineering
challenges associated.

One of those categories is the list of -- I am not sure this is from 2A. But I think, for purposes of coherence, it would be helpful for me to describe it now because it connects to this preservation; that is, followers -- a list of followers for this account that were contained within the January 11 through 12th prior

preservation. We have segregated that information. It is a complicated and large set of information. And we are unable to deliver it in the manner that we normally deliver information to law enforcement, which is to send a token. We believe right now it would require physical media to put that information on and to hand it over to the government.

This morning we indicated to the government: If there is a mechanism, like an FTP site or something, that you have that you can work with us, we would like to work with you on this. We have it. We have segregated it. We just don't currently have a tool that allows us to produce it to you. So that --

THE COURT: This is really just a list of followers attached to the preserved account from January 11 through 12, 2021?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's this particular -- there are two others that I need to address, but that's this particular one that I am addressing. That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Category two of the three.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: As I mentioned, Your Honor, there were two prior preservations, and then there is the current production tools. In two of the three of those sets, the January 3 through 9 and the current one, we have produced the tweets and related tweet information for the account.

In the January 11 to 12th prior preservation, the way that the tweet and tweet-related information is stored, it goes all the way back to 2006. We don't have a warrant — that is contents of user communications. We don't have a warrant that would permit us to produce the entirety of that information. So what we have is a tool that — what we refer to as a redaction [sic] tool or a trimming tool. Because this is not a production environment, a human being has to go in and manually trim the information to isolate the date range. That, as I think Your Honor can understand, is a laborious process, including for this particular account, given the time frame; and we need to isolate it, I think, over a three-month, four-month period, I'm sorry, Your Honor. So we are undertaking it.

We are underway on that effort, but the second piece of information that we are working on producing but have not yet produced is the tweets for the January 11 to 12th prior preservation for the subject account as we undergo the trimming process.

THE COURT: Okay. And how long will it take you to produce -- do that trimming process?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I am hopeful that we will be able to finish it today. I don't know that we will be able to finish it today. What I would propose to the government — what we have proposed and what we would propose again is

that we provide updates this afternoon on where we are with that engineering process.

We are working as, I think, evidenced by having an engineer come in overnight and work with this tool through the night. We are working very diligently to try to produce this information. We have produced this category of information for two of the three repositories where this type of information is held, and we are working on this last one --

THE COURT: And these tweets in the preserved data set from January 11 through 12, 2021, are different from in the current -- your current status of the account?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's a great question, Your Honor.

So they are probably not different and they are certainly not, in any large sense, different. It is possible that between when the account was suspended on January 8th, which is before this preservation occurred, and then it was reinstated recently -- it is conceivable that, after it was reinstated, someone that has access to the account deleted some of the tweets. If that happened, they would be present in the January 11th and 12th, but not in the current one. I don't know. It may be -- I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

The third category of information that you are

* * SEALED * * *

1 still working on. 2 MR. HOLTZBLATT: The third category is something 3 called fleets with an "F." I will be honest with you, Your 4 Honor, until this morning I didn't know that that was a content category that existed. I am a Twitter user and have 5 6 worked with Twitter a long time; that was not something that 7 I was aware of. But we are collecting that from the January 11th 8 9 through 12th production set, and only that set; and it 10 presents, I believe, a similar problem, of having to trim it down. We're working on that well. 11 12 THE COURT: What precisely is fleets? 13 MR. HOLTZBLATT: It is similar to tweets, and I 14 don't know more than that, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: You don't use "fleets." 16 MR. HOLTZBLATT: I had not heard of fleets until 17 this morning. 18 THE COURT: And was fleet used on this account? 19 MR. HOLTZBLATT: It is a vanishing tweet. 20 THE COURT: A vanishing tweet. 21

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I guess fleet -- that makes sense, fleeting.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So it's a vanishing tweet. do you know whether that vanishing tweet or fleet functionality was active on this account? And are you able

-* * * * SEALED

to tell that?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I don't, as I stand here now, know whether it was. If there is data -- if there is fleet data in the prior preservation from January 11 and 12th, then that would be -- it would have been active, and that would correspond to it, and that's what we're working to obtain.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me interrupt you for a second.

Mr. Windom, of these three categories is the government particularly interested in Category No. 1, this list of followers for the account from January 11 through 12, 2021?

MR. WINDOM: Yes, Your Honor.

The answer is going to be yes for all three. I have some additional information that may be of assistance.

This is a perfect example of why it was imperative that we come before Your Honor. Twitter counsel has just mentioned two things that we have never heard of before in our calls.

What we were told was that there was one preservation done of the entire history of the account on January 11th. This is the first time we are hearing about another preservation between January 3rd and January 9.

Second, I have never heard of "fleets" in part of

any discussion that we have had. I don't know if that is information in this account; it may or may not be. It still will be relevant, it still will be responsive.

THE COURT: Well, it seems to me that that's a functionality that you would probably understand from the -
1C, types of services utilized.

MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: But perhaps people -- representatives of Twitter can explain why that's just not indicated in 1C, which is: Functionality uses of the account?

MR. WINDOM: I can't speak to that given our review of the material at this point. I do want to point out, though, Your Honor, what Twitter counsel told us, in terms of the preservations, they said that according to Twitter's policies, if the user deletes tweets or direct messages Twitter, nonetheless, retains that information for 14 days. These two prior preservations could have deleted tweets, could have deleted direct messages that are not part of the instant production from this year.

We know with certainty that there were deleted tweets on January 6th. Twitter said that the President had to delete those tweets in order to reinstate his account from suspension. We do not know if those deleted tweets are part of what we got from this year's preservation versus either of those two prior preservations. That is one of the

reasons it is very concerning to us.

I will also point out that the introductory paragraph in the warrant for Part 1 specifically says anything in their holdings -- it mentions including any preservations that were made pursuant to 18 U.S.C. -- I think it is 2703.

It is not clear to us whether these preservations were made pursuant to a federal order or just for internal reasons. But, in any event, that opening paragraph of Part 1 clearly covered all of these things. And all of the problems that they say they're encountering and redacting, and going back and looking at things, we're 23 days from the date that the Court entered an order and they're just starting to learn about things now.

THE COURT: Okay. So were these -- I mean, I didn't pursue the preservation orders and why they were in place, presuming that they were government orders and you might already know about those. But were these government preservation requests under the Stored Communications Act?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So we don't believe they were, but the individuals who would know definitively are no longer employed with Twitter. But we don't believe that these are 2703; and one of the two is definitely not.

That's what I thought, yes.

One of the two is certainly not, and the second

1 one we don't know the answer. 2 THE COURT: Doesn't Twitter keep track of why 3 they're preserving data? 4 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Your Honor, this particular time 5 frame --6 THE COURT: Like, which order, for how long, and 7 so on? 8 MR. HOLTZBLATT: So I don't know -- yes. 9 THE COURT: Does Twitter keep track of why it's 10 preserving data and pursuant to which order? 11 MR. HOLTZBLATT: So I don't know -- I have two 12 answers, Your Honor. As a general matter, I don't know the 13 answer to your question. 14 In this particular instance, we do not have a 15 record of a government request that corresponds to either of 16 these two preservations. 17 THE COURT: Interesting. Okay. 18 MR. HOLTZBLATT: So if a negative pregnant is to 19 be followed, then it would suggest that these were done not 20 pursuant to a preservation order. But I cannot -- I do not 21 wanted to stand up here and make a representation to Your 22 Honor that I don't know to be true. 23 So I can tell you we do not have a record. I know 24 that one of the two was not; and I don't know the answer as

* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

25

to the other one.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And for the -- let 1 me just go back for one second just to make sure my notes 2 3 are complete. For Category 1, the list of followers, did you 4 tell me when you think that is going to be produced? 5 MR. HOLTZBLATT: We need the government's help 6 7 with this. We have it ready to go, it's simply a question of how to do it --8 9 THE COURT: He just needs to know where to do it. 10 MR. HOLTZBLATT: If the government would like us to deliver a hard drive to the FBI office in San Francisco, 11 we can do it today. If they would like us to do it to an 12 FTP site and they can provide us an FTP link, we can do it 13 today. We stand ready to produce that as soon as we have a 14 15 mechanism to do it. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Windom, on that issue? 16 MR. WINDOM: I am advised that there is an FTP 17 link in their email in-box now. 18 19 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Great. THE COURT: Okay. So that can start now. 20 With respect to 2, the time frame is possibly 21 today, possibly tomorrow; no promises on that. But you are 22 23 going to keep the government updated on the status of two. And for the fleets, what is your time frame? 24

* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

25

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So the fleets is only as to one

of the three repositories we're talking about, January 11 through 12.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's in the same category as the tweets for January 11 and 12. I am hopeful that we will have it today. I can commit to having -- to providing an update to the government this afternoon about where we stand with that effort; and we are working around the clock.

THE COURT: Okay. So you are going to give

Mr. Windom and Ms. Dohrmann an update on both 2 and 3, let's
say, by 4 p.m. today if you haven't delivered everything by
then.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's move on to B, the content of all direct messages, the DMs: Sent from, received by, stored in draft form, in or otherwise associated with the subject account including attachments, multimedia, header information, metadata, and logs.

Am I understanding correctly, Mr. Holtzblatt, that that has been produced, to the extent it's subject to your standard production tool, but to the extent that this data falls in the two preserved caches --

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have also produced --

THE COURT: You have also produced it?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That is -- happily, that was one

of the things our engineers were able to pull at 2 in the morning; and that included deleted direct messages and not just nondeleted, but also deleted direct messages.

THE COURT: And then 3, content which -- for the record's clarity, 3 asked for: All content records and other information relating to all other interactions between the subject account and other Twitter users from October 20th to January 20, 2021 including but not limited to -- this is where we get into the, A, users the subject account has followed, unfollowed, muted, unmuted, blocked or unblocked, and all users who have followed, unfollowed, muted, unmuted, blocked or unblocked the subject account.

Do you want to give me the status of that?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So I -- the one category that is not produced from that is this physical media, this production that we need to do, I guess, through an FTP site that's in my email box or George's, Mr. Varghese's --

referred to before; and you are ready to produce that today?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We are ready to produce that today.

THE COURT: Got it. Via the FTP site or mechanism.

THE COURT: Which is the Category 1 that you have

B, all information from the connect or notifications tab for the account including all lists of Twitter users who have favorited or re-tweeted tweets posted

by the accounts, as well as all tweets that include the user name associated with the account, i.e., mentions or replies.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So, Your Honor, this is a category we have not produced, and I want to explain why.

The items in 3 are all date limited. This is not a category of information that was -- is contained within the prior preservation, so it's not saying we can go back to January of 2021 and collect to fit it within the time frame.

All we have that could conceivably fall within this category is information that is there today. This is dynamic information, so it's information that changes. And so the information that would be contained in this today is a mix of information that might have been responsive to this category and information that is definitely not. Because it is contents of communications, we don't believe we can produce without a warrant the information that's available in this category on our systems today because it is -- it includes a category of information that goes beyond the scope of the warrant. So we don't have a way of disaggregating this information --

THE COURT: Meaning, you don't have a way to put a time frame on it?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: That's correct, Your Honor.

It is information that -- because it's dynamic -- whatever is in the account today is not what was in the

account at the time == at the relevant time frame. 1 2 THE COURT: I see. MR. HOLTZBLATT: And I don't -- so I don't know if 3 this is important to the government or not. If it is, we 4 5 have to come up with a different solution. I don't think we actually can -- I don't think we are permitted to produce 6 7 what we have today. THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me just --8 Mr. Windom, do you want to think about that or do you want 9 10 to respond? Do you think Mr. Zebley is standing outside the 11 locked door? 12 MR. HOLTZBLATT: I think there is a chance. 13 THE COURT: Could you check? Poor Mr. Zebley. 14 15 MR. WINDOM: Should I wait, Your Honor, or proceed? 16 THE COURT: Proceed. In my chambers we wait for 17 no man. 18 19 MR. WINDOM: Thank you. 20 Your Honor, I mean, the short answer is of course 21 it's important to us. Just by PC -- for it to be in the 22 warrant, and Your Honor signed a warrant with this in it, I 23 don't understand -- I just don't understand the explanation that was given as to what exists or does not exist. 24 25 It sounds like they have more information than is

responsive and so there can be an overproduction of material. Honestly, I am not clear what they're saying; nor do I understand if the two preservations that they have identified today would somehow ameliorate the problem that they have just raised at the podium.

I don't understand the technology behind it. If they would like to explain further or if they would like to talk to me offline, that is fine. The bottom-line --

THE COURT: I am going to let you-all talk about this offline.

MR. WINDOM: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because I think -- what I am understanding from Twitter is that -- I am not a Twitter user; most judges are not.

The connector notifications tab -- I am not exactly sure what that is. But I do understand lists of Twitter used who have favorited or re-tweeted tweets posted by the account.

As I understand what Twitter is saying, that is just a mass of data that is not segregated or segregable by date frame -- by a time frame. And so I think that they are having trouble figuring out how to do that.

And then, the last part of this is: All tweets that include the user name associated with the account.

That could be a lot of data. So I think you need to talk to

1 them about how to refine that. Okay. MR. HOLTZBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: C, all contacts and related sync information, produced? 4 5 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Okay. All associated logs and 7 metadata, produced? MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. 8 9 THE COURT: 4, for the record, reads: All other 10 content records and other information relating to the use of 11 the subject account including but not limited to: A, All 12 data and information associated with the profile page 13 including photographs, bios, and profile backgrounds and themes. 14 Has that been produced? 15 16 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: B, multimedia uploaded to or otherwise 18 associated with the subject account. 19 Has that been produced? 20 MR. HOLTZBLATT: With one exception, yes. 21 The one exception is that there is tweet media which are associated with the tweets. And so in the 22 23 January 11th through 12th repository that we are trimming --24 that requires the trimming -- that one of the things that 25 has to be trimmed down to includes the tweet media. Other * SEALED

than that, we have produced for this category.

THE COURT: Okay. C, all records of searches performed by the subject account from October 20th to January 20, 2021.

Has that been produced, Mr. Holtzblatt?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: We have produced saved searches;
and we are in the process of producing actual search
queries, which can be produced today.

THE COURT: Today.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: It may have been included in the earlier production, I don't know the answer to that. We are producing additional information of actual search queries today.

THE COURT: Okay. D, all location information including all location data collected by any plug-ins, widgets or the quote-unquote tweet with location service from October 20th to January 20, 2021.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. We have produced what we have. It is not something we normally have, so it may be a small or null set. But to the extent we have it, we have produced it.

THE COURT: Okay. E, information about the subject account's use of Twitter's link service including all longer website links that were shortened by the service, all resulting shortened links or information about the

number of times that link posted while the subject account was clicked, which is a lot of information in there.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes. We have not -- we have not produced this information. We're struggling to understand what would be responsive, and it's one we're continuing to work on and would like to be able to continue to talk with the government to make sure we understand what they understand would fall in this category, so we're working on it.

THE COURT: Can I just ask why is it that when there are questions about the scope, and so on -- to be quite honest, we are J.D.s, we are not IT professionals. So it's oftentimes the case that, when we lawyers look at language, we have to confer with IT to find out what is feasible, what they have, how much longer it is, does it exist, and so on.

So why is it on February 9th you-all are just starting to have that conversation?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: Well, Your Honor --

THE COURT: When I do take, at face value,

Twitter's representation in connection with its motion

challenging the NDO, that it was perfectly prepared to

comply with this warrant?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: So I would like to explain that, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: It's a puzzle from where I sit. 2 MR. HOLTZBLATT: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 3 In communication with the government 4 prior to any filing in this case, one of the things that 5 said to the government was: Once these issues, by which she 6 meant what was the subject of our -- what is still the 7 subject of our pending motion -- what was the subject of the government's motion are resolved, which we understood to be 8 9 the big question -- there are some technical issues that we 10 will need to discuss with respect to this account. These 11 are the kinds of things was referring to, about the need to talk about technical information. 12 13 That's everything from: We have a standard 14 production tool, which is how -- for thousands of warrants 15 we produce information --16 THE COURT: So was putting the cart before the 17 should have been working on getting the warrant horse. 18 production ready to go while she litigated whatever else 19 Twitter wanted to litigate. 20 Okay. Well, that's been clear from the process 21 here. 22 Okay. So let's break down E. 23 So information about use of Twitter's link 24 service, which is shortening longer website links. Does

* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

Twitter maintain that information, when a Twitter user

25

accesses and uses the link service?

2.0

You can tell me you don't know if you don't know.

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I think the safest thing for me to say to Your Honor would be that I don't know the answer. It is something that, I think, we are trying to produce today; but it is also something that there was some confusion about what it is. To the extent there remains confusion, we will speak with the government and continue speaking with the government until we have eliminated that confusion.

And if it is available -- I think I am saying that it is not hard to produce. We will endeavor to produce it today. And if not, we will provide an update and explain why we have not at the end of this afternoon, at four o'clock.

THE COURT: This may be why the government keeps insisting at each of these meetings that a personal representative from Twitter be sitting at the table to answer more technical questions. I am not sure why they keep asking for a personal representative, but perhaps that's one reason.

You are going to find that out. It will be produced today if Twitter maintains it?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: It will be produced today if we maintain it. And with the only caveat that if, for some

reason, there is an engineering challenge that we cannot overcome today, I will give an update to the government at four o'clock and explain that.

THE COURT: Okay. And then -- so if the account user used the link service. And then, the second part of this is: All resulting shortened links. And then, the third part of it is: The number of times that a link posted by the subject account was clicked.

Do you understand what that means by "clicked"?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I understand what it would mean
to click a link. I don't know if that is information that
Twitter maintains, the information about the clicking of
links that have been shortened through any link service. I
don't know the answer to that.

THE COURT: Because, certainly, the source link might maintain the number of clicks on its link. But does Twitter maintain information about those number of clicks for links accessed via Twitter?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: I don't know. That is not standard information that Twitter produces. I have some doubt about whether this is information that Twitter maintains, but I am not going to make a representation to the Court when I don't know.

-* * * * * SEALED * * *

THE COURT: Mr. Windom.

Let's get clarity right now on what is being

25 Let's get clari

2.4

1 requested in 4E. Just reading the English here, I think it reads --2 3 but you can correct me if I'm wrong -- it's requesting three 4 things, the number of times the user of this account accessed and used Twitter's link service which shortens 5 6 links -- so far so good? 7 MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. 8 THE COURT: And then the second thing is what were 9 the shortened links. 10 MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. 11 THE COURT: Is that right? 12 MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. 13 THE COURT: And then, finally, any information 14 that Twitter has about the number of times that a link posted by the subject account was actually clicked, which 15 is, basically, clicking on the tweet -- clicking on a link 16 embedded in a tweet. 17 18 Is it the government's information that this is information that can be preserved, maintained, collected by 19 20 an electronic communications provider like Twitter. 21 MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am. And there is some 22 reference to this in the affidavit I will read briefly. 23 Twitter tracks --

-* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

THE COURT: In the affidavit?

MR. WINDOM: Ma'am?

24

25

1	THE COURT: In the affidavit?
2	MR. WINDOM: Yes, ma'am.
3	THE COURT: Which is currently sealed, and Twitter
4	hasn't seen it?
5	MR. WINDOM: This is a line that is a statement of
6	fact responsive to your question.
7	THE COURT: What a privilege to
8	MR. WINDOM: "According to the government's
9	information, Twitter tracks how many times these shortened
10	links are clicked." Period, full stop.
11	THE COURT: Well, we'll find out if that
12	representation in the affidavit is correct, but that is
13	certainly information that the government has.
14	The government has been living and working and
15	obtaining information from Twitter since its existence,
16	probably, so they have experience before they put that in
17	their affidavit. Perhaps that can help counsel in
18	communicating with Twitter.
19	MR. HOLTZBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. I
20	appreciate that.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So E, 4 p.m. update
22	to the government today, Mr. Holtzblatt, about how much of
23	that you can produce, and when.
24	MR. HOLTZBLATT: Yes, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: All right. I think that's it for what

hasn't been produced, and a time frame for production.

It's clear to me that Twitter didn't comport or comply with the deadline by 5 p.m. on February 7th and is working hard to do so now. So that's good news.

When production is complete, I will expect the government to let me know and what the government's calculation is at that point because I am not keeping count of the penalty, but I am sure the government will. I will enter an order at that time for the amount. And, hopefully, the government will confer with Twitter that everybody is counting the days the same way and doing the math the same way. But \$50,000 a day is a pretty big -- easy to calculate round number even for us J.D.s. Hopefully, this production will get wrapped up promptly.

Is there anything further today, Mr. Windom?

MR. WINDOM: No, ma'am. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further from Twitter?

MR. HOLTZBLATT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Hopefully, I won't see you all again. You will be able to work this out.

I will just wait for your submissions on Twitter's motion, and then we'll proceed from there. As I said, I was hoping that the hearing we had on Tuesday pretty much covers most of the issues that I might be concerned about with both motions that were pending in front of me. But, as I said,

* * * * * SEALED * * * * 1 if something comes up in the briefing where I think I 2 need -- another hearing is necessary on Twitter's motion, 3 we'll hold it then. 4 All right. If there is nothing else, you are 5 excused. 6 MR. HOLTZBLATT: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 MR. WINDOM: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 (Whereupon, the proceeding concludes, 12:15 p.m.) * * * * * 9 10 CERTIFICATE 11 12 I, ELIZABETH SAINT-LOTH, RPR, FCRR, do hereby 13 certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate 14 transcript of my stenographic notes, and is a full, true, 15 and complete transcript of the proceedings to the best of my 16 ability. This certificate shall be considered null and void 17 18 if the transcript is disassembled and/or photocopied in any 19 manner by any party without authorization of the signatory 20 below. 21 Dated this 11th day of February, 2023. 22 /s/ Elizabeth Saint-Loth, RPR, FCRR Official Court Reporter 23 24

* * * * * SEALED * * * * *

25