Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 1 of 19 Page ID #:18430

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WESTERN DIVISION AT LOS ANGELES

HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE PRESIDING

)

)

)

)

LA ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, et al.,

PLAINTIFFS,

VS.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,

DEFENDANTS.

) LACV NO. 20-02291-DOC

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MAY 09, 2023

9:07 A.M.

DEBORAH D. PARKER, CSR 10342 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 350 WEST 1st STREET SUITE 4455 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 (657) 229-4305 transcripts@ddparker.com

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 2 of 19 Page ID #:18431

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, LA ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, et al.: ELIZABETH ANNE MITCHELL UMHOFER, MITCHELL & KING LLP 11766 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SUITE 900 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025 (213) 394-7979 elizabeth@umklaw.com MATTHEW DONALD UMHOFER UMHOFER, MITCHELL & KING LLP 11766 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SUITE 900 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025 (213) 394-7979 matthew@umklaw.com CARA M. ARNOLD UMHOFER, MITCHELL & KING LLP 11766 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SUITE 900 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025 (213) 394-7979 cara@umklaw.com FOR THE DEFENDANT, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, an municipal entity: MIRA HASHMALL MILLER BARONDESS LLP 2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 2600 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067 (310) 552-4400 mhashmall@millerbarondess.com FOR THE INTERVENOR, LOS ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER: SHAYLA RENEE MYERS LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES 7000 SOUTH BROADWAY LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90003 (213) 640-3983 smyers.lafla.org

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 3 of 19 Page ID #:18432

Г

1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, MAY 09, 2023; 9:07 A.M.
2	-000-
3	THE COURT: We're on the record in L.A. Alliance
4	versus the County of Los Angeles.
5	Counsel, just remain seated, but your appearances,
6	please.
7	MS. MITCHELL: Good morning, Your Honor.
8	Elizabeth Mitchell, on behalf of plaintiffs.
9	THE COURT: Nice meeting you.
09:07:03 10	MR. UMHOFER: Good morning, Your Honor.
11	Matthew Umhofer and also Cara Arnold
12	THE COURT: Just a little bit louder.
13	MR. UMHOFER: Yes.
14	Good morning, Your Honor.
09:07:08 15	Matthew Umhofer also for the plaintiffs.
16	And Cara Arnold is making her first appearance in
17	the case. She's an attorney at our firm.
18	THE COURT: It's a pleasure. It's nice meeting
19	you.
09:07:15 20	MS. ARNOLD: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: And then on behalf of the County,
22	please.
23	MS. HASHMALL: Good morning, Your Honor.
24	Mira Hashmall for the County of Los Angeles.
09:07:20 25	THE COURT: Okay. And I think we finally have

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 4 of 19 Page ID #:18433

4

	-	1
09:07:22	1	power, so if you want to turn on the mic.
	2	MS. MYERS: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.
	3	Shayla Myers, on behalf of the intervenors.
	4	THE COURT: It should be a very short discussion
09:07:31	5	today. And I was going to simply send out trial dates, but
	6	I wanted to be courteous. I wanted to ask you your best
	7	thoughts about the setting dates, so let me start with
	8	LA Alliance for just a moment.
	9	MS. MITCHELL: Your Honor, just looking at the
09:07:46		discovery that needs to be done
	11	(Court Reporter requests clarification for the
	12	record.)
	13	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
	14	Just looking at the discovery that has to be done,
09:07:58	15	I think a lot of it is going to depend on how difficult the
	16	County is here and what kind of discovery fights that we're
	17	going to be getting into. But we think a reasonable date is
	18	probably for trial is probably in October. We think we
	19	can get it done that quickly.
09:08:13	20	THE COURT: Okay. Anything you would like to add?
	21	MR. UMHOFER: No, Your Honor.
	22	THE COURT: And
	23	MS. ARNOLD: No.
	24	THE COURT: Let me turn to the County.
09:08:21	25	What are your thoughts?

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 5 of 19 Page ID #:18434

5

MS. HASHMALL: Thank you, Your Honor. 09:08:21 1 2 Well, first, as you know, the County believes 3 there's a binding settlement agreement between the parties. THE COURT: I think we discussed that. And I've 4 5 sent out an order. 09:08:28 6 MS. HASHMALL: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Now, let's move through that, because 8 I tried to get dates and information from you. I was just 9 going to -- so I'm trying to get your best input. MS. HASHMALL: The next sort of threshold issue is 09:08:37 10 whether the plaintiffs -- viable claims. We have filed a 11 12 motion to dismiss which is set for hearing on June 5th. 13 THE COURT: I'm aware of that. 14 MS. HASHMALL: As the Court may recall, we've done 09:08:50 15 prior pleading challenges but have not received a ruling 16 from the Court. And so the scope of potential claims, 17 particularly because the plaintiffs have not been able to 18 establish standing -- a fact noted by the Ninth Circuit in 19 its ruling in this matter and raised again in connection 09:09:05 20 with our pending motion to dismiss -- is going to significantly affect whether claims can go forward and what 21 22 the nature and scope of discovery appropriate in the matter would be. 23 24 THE COURT: And having heard all that, what's your 09:09:17 25 best suggestion concerning a trial date?

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 6 of 19 Page ID #:18435

6

09:09:18	1	MS. HASHMALL: My experience is typically a year
	2	from the scheduling conference is appropriate.
	3	THE COURT: What's your input on behalf of the
	4	intervenors?
09:09:30	5	MS. MYERS: We've obviously joined the motion to
	6	dismiss, particularly
	7	(Court Reporter requests clarification for the
	8	record.)
	9	MS. MYERS: So we've joined the motion to dismiss
09:09:39	10	with regards to the standing issues and the nuance issues.
	11	What the claims are, I think, will shape dramatically what
	12	the discovery is. So we think a year is probably closer in
	13	light of what, I assume, will be the disputes between the
	14	plaintiffs and the County with discovery.
09:09:57	15	THE COURT: Say that again.
	16	MS. MYERS: A year would be appropriate, given
	17	what we assume will be the disputes between the plaintiffs
	18	and the County on discovery. And we don't know how
	19	plaintiffs are going to respond to any discovery request
09:10:08	20	related to standing, too.
	21	THE COURT: Let me ask both of you, what just
	22	your guesstimate, not holding you to the length of the
	23	trial. What I don't want to do is have a jury around, let's
	24	say, the Jewish/Christian holidays, for instance, in
09:10:28	25	December, because you've got trouble then holding that jury
	l	

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 7 of 19 Page ID #:18436

7

09:10:31	1	together.
	2	So what's your thought? And I'm not holding you
	3	to this representation at all. I'm just trying to get a
	4	kind of guesstimate about what your time frame would be.
09:10:44	5	MS. MITCHELL: Your Honor, given what we know
	6	about how the Court conducts trials and how much we can get
	7	done in those days, we think that two weeks is probably
	8	sufficient for plaintiffs.
	9	THE COURT: What are your best I'm not holding
09:10:57	10	you to this trial length.
	11	MS. HASHMALL: Well, I think very few claims
	12	should survive Rule 56 motion practice, if they survive the
	13	Rule 12 motion; but if we're there, I would say five to
	14	seven days.
09:11:13	15	MS. MYERS: We don't have an opinion on that.
	16	THE COURT: Okay. So let's just take the outside
	17	parameter of two weeks. It could be longer. Has there been
	18	any preliminary discussion concerning discovery between the
	19	parties? In other words, since our last meeting, has there
09:11:32	20	been some informal discussion? And I don't want to know
	21	what that is, but you anticipate running into some
	22	obstacles, you say, from the County. I don't know if that's
	23	true or not. I don't know what might be privileged. I
	24	don't know
09:11:46	25	MS. MITCHELL: Sure. Your Honor, at the outset,

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 8 of 19 Page ID #:18437

Г

8

09:11:47	1	we anticipate needing e-mails. We anticipate needing
	2	harvesting cell phones certainly of supervisors and senior
	3	staff. So when we look at those significant issues and
	4	we expect a lot of pushback from the County we are
09:12:02	5	looking at probably a lot of motion practice, which is going
	6	to take some time.
	7	We reached out to the County to have the initial
	8	Rule 26 conference. They would not engage with us, so we
	9	have not discussed it amongst the parties. But looking at
09:12:16	10	what we are looking at, I do think there's going to be some
	11	discovery disputes.
	12	THE COURT: Okay. I'm not too concerned about
	13	participation or nonparticipation at this point in a formal
	14	26 scheduling conference. But I think your input today is
09:12:39	15	going to be valuable, because I will set dates, and I
	16	started to set dates without input from you. I re-thought
	17	that, trying to get the best, you know, thought you have and
	18	to share transparently what my concerns are.
	19	If there's going to be difficulty between the two
09:12:54	20	of you in terms of discovery, I'd like to know what that is
	21	as quickly as possible. I agree with you to some extent
	22	that perhaps January might be the best date, but I'm not
	23	going to set that date. I'm probably going to set an
	24	October date, but I want to go back and think about that for
09:13:14	25	five or 10 minutes. And what that will do is, it will put

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 9 of 19 Page ID #:18438

9

all of you in a position of responding quickly to discovery 09:13:18 1 2 or not responding to discovery. So if I'm running into 3 discovery problems, I might as well know that between the 4 two of you just as quickly as possible. 5 Do you have any more input? If not, the motion to 09:13:35 6 dismiss has been filed, noted by the Court. The opposition 7 is due. There are prior rulings handed down. I want to look at those prior rulings in addition to whatever 8 9 additional claims that have been brought. And do you have any further input? I'd just like 09:13:58 10 11 about five or 10 minutes to sort out what would be 12 appropriate. 13 L.A. Alliance? 14 MS. MITCHELL: No, I don't think so, Your Honor. 09:14:10 15 I think beyond the discovery dispute, there's likely to be 16 Rule 56 practice, as -- raised and plaintiffs are likely to 17 bring that as well. And so, I think that's the only other consideration. 18 There's likely to be expert discovery. We think 19 that if we move quickly -- and we do think we should move 09:14:25 20 quickly on this -- that we can get all of that done, but 21 22 it's going to take dedication. 23 THE COURT: Let me turn to the County. 24 MS. HASHMALL: Your Honor, I do think we should 09:14:37 25 clarify exactly what has happened and not happened in

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 10 of 19 Page ID #:18439

r

10

09:14:41	1	connection with discovery in this matter.
	2	Back in 2021, we tried to engage with plaintiffs'
	3	counsel with regards to the Rule 26 process. We even
	4	initiated written discovery because many of the local rules
09:14:51	5	in the Central District actually encourage the parties to
	6	move expeditiously. They balked at that. We've not engaged
	7	on the Rule 26 process. It would be requested and obtained
	8	a stay of the proceeding. So it is not accurate to suggest
	9	that any intransigeance on our part is why the parties have
09:15:10	10	not conducted discovery.
	11	The reason there was no Rule 26 conference is
	12	because the Court set this scheduling conference at the
	13	April 20th hearing on a time frame where the parties had
	14	already missed the scheduling time frame for conducting that
09:15:28	15	Rule 26 conference.
	16	THE COURT: I understand that concern.
	17	MS. HASHMALL: And with regard to discovery, you
	18	got to establish standing before you can do discovery in a
	19	case where you're attempting to legislate executive
09:15:38	20	decision-making about the County's resources in the absence
	21	of any cognizable injury under federal law. You know, we do
	22	believe the Rule 12 motion is critical and
	23	THE COURT: Waiting for the opposition. And I
	24	think that's due in a week or so. I didn't look at the date
09:16:00	25	before I came out. So that will be resolved, one way or the

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 11 of 19 Page ID #:18440

11

	_	
09:16:03	1	other, rather quickly, okay?
	2	Ms. Myers.
	3	MS. MYERS: I do think October, given the dates
	4	that have been articulated and given what I think is already
09:16:13	5	clear about the intransigence between the two parties the
	6	two primary parties related to this. I expect that there
	7	will be significant motion practice, and I would hate to
	8	waste the Court's time with a date that is unreasonable,
	9	literally given the timelines for motion practice in order
09:16:30	10	to get rulings and those kinds of things. And so I would
	11	just I would just say that January seems like a more
	12	reasonable date under the circumstances, but
	13	THE COURT: When Mayor Bass and chairwoman
	14	Supervisor Hahn and President Paul Krekorian with counsel
09:16:53	15	asked for a recess not on the last hearing, but the prior
	16	hearing, none of you as counsel were present.
	17	I think it's widely known now that the Court was
	18	requested to recess for 90 days, while Mayor Bass went back
	19	to Washington, and there was some other discussion that will
09:17:17	20	remain private.
	21	I think the Court was very gracious. I was
	22	inclined not to grant that. I listened to the parties,
	23	thought that that was a reasonable effort and agreed with
	24	Mayor Bass to that 90 days.
09:17:28	25	You know, my main concern here, amongst others, is

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 12 of 19 Page ID #:18441

Г

12

09:17:31	1	the unaccountability of the settlement offered to the Court.
	2	And it's that report a simple report to the Court,
	3	amongst other things that's causing me great concern.
	4	My colleague, Judge Pregerson, I haven't spoken to
09:17:52	5	him recently. He's in the middle of a contempt proceeding
	6	fairly soon with the County where there is actually a
	7	consent decree. And whatever that ruling is, that's going
	8	to before maybe I don't know if your law firm is
	9	representing that or Bob Dugdale, maybe Todale [phonetic]
09:18:10	10	is.
	11	Are you involved in that?
	12	MS. HASHMALL: I am not.
	13	THE COURT: Well, let me make you aware of it.
	14	Apparently, five years ago, a consent decree was signed
09:18:20	15	concerning mental health at the Orange County strike
	16	"Orange County" at the Los Angeles Jail.
	17	Judge Pregerson now has undertaken a contempt
	18	proceeding in that matter. And my concern transparently
	19	with all of you is: If the County was in contempt, if that
09:18:35	20	wasn't fulfilled, let alone with a consent decree given by
	21	the County and I don't know when Judge Pregerson is going
	22	to rule why would this Court ever accept a simple report
	23	to the Court with no accountability in this matter?
	24	I think we've been through that discussion a
09:18:51	25	number of times. You chose to raise it again today. I give

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 13 of 19 Page ID #:18442

13

09:18:55	1	that back to you as simply not accountability and that's why
	2	the settlement amongst other reasons has been turned down.
	3	You also have the power, regardless of your public
	4	positions, to resolve this at any time. You both know that.
09:19:13	5	So this idea that you can't resolve it, you can resolve
	6	this.
	7	And I ask this one question for all of you: Can't
	8	we do much better? I mean, with this crisis on our hands,
	9	can't all us just do much better?
09:19:29	10	What that "much" is, I'm not certain yet. I don't
	11	want to dictate terms. I don't think it's appropriate for
	12	me to give you a number, but I think it's pretty widely
	13	known, and I keep going back to Dr. Sherin's report. And in
	14	2019, Dr. Sherin says, I need 3,000 subacute spaces, and he
09:19:47	15	undertakes a pilot program and the County undertakes a study
	16	called the "Mercer Report." I wrote about that in my
	17	opinion. It's in a footnote, for goodness sakes. You're
	18	all aware of that. There were initially 500 acute spaces.
	19	He was given 164. Go back and check the history of this.
09:20:05	20	Then later on there was a little bit of a fill-in
	21	by the County. But if you talk to Jon Sherin, when I could
	22	talk to him, that was a very difficult place for the
	23	Department of Mental Health to be in this kind of
	24	incremental need. Now, I don't know if he deserved 3,000
09:20:22	25	subacute bed spaces. I don't if he deserved 500, but it was

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 14 of 19 Page ID #:18443

14

09:20:26	1	clear in the report that was actually put forward by the
	2	County.
	3	So while it's not the reason, you know, my concern
	4	is and I'm praising you for the progress. I want you to
09:20:37	5	hear that. I recognize you got 300. Probably the Court is
	6	badgering up to 1,000. But if, in fact, you have the need
	7	of 1,000 or 1,500, if you count the 500 for the seniors, and
	8	that's in 2019, which is one-half of what John Mercer is
	9	asking. And then you're asking the Court to also approve
09:21:02	10	four years later, on a five-year program, which means
	11	nine years, half of what your Department of Mental Health is
	12	asking in 2019: 1,500?
	13	Well, I could probably get through that if there's
	14	accountability, but there's got to be accountability here.
09:21:25	15	This document you submitted to me doesn't have
	16	accountability, and I'm not going to accept a simple report.
	17	I've alluded to the City I've been, I think, working very
	18	well with the City. Haven't interfered in one way or
	19	intruded with the City, including Mayor Bass, you know,
09:21:41	20	making her best efforts.
	21	So you can quite frankly settle if you chose to
	22	without me, but you know that the Court doesn't have the
	23	approval for the settlement. I think it's inadequate, and I
	24	think there's no accountability here.
09:21:54	25	And so with that in mind, I'm inclined but I

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 15 of 19 Page ID #:18444

15

09:21:57	1	want to take a few moments and finish this cup of coffee
	2	to October, because if I set a date in October, that puts
	3	tremendous pressure on you, but I know two things: Are you
	4	really going to settle outside the Court's bailiwick? And
09:22:14	5	if you're not and I've got discovery problems, I'll handle
	6	those discovery problems. Those won't go to a
	7	Special Master. And so I'll know very quickly what the
	8	problem is, if there is a problem between the two of you.
	9	Now, I can delay this with a scheduled 26 and give
09:22:30	10	you more time. And I think if we can work together, we can
	11	come up with some dates today. And, quite frankly, I think
	12	that 90 days that I granted before was extraordinarily
	13	gracious. And I regret it, quite frankly. I should have
	14	set it two weeks after that initial meeting.
09:22:47	15	I'll be back with you in about 15 minutes or
	16	20 minutes. If you want to go downstairs and get a cup of
	17	coffee, why don't we just say at 9:45, okay? I'll have you
	18	out of here. Thank you.
	19	MS. MITCHELL: Thank you.
09:22:58	20	MS. HASHMALL: Thank you, Your Honor.
	21	(Recess taken from 9:23 a.m. to 9:44 a.m.)
	22	THE COURT: These will be the dates, and I'll be
	23	transparent concerning my reasoning with both of you,
	24	whether you agree with it or not.
09:45:10	25	First, the trial date will be on Monday,

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 16 of 19 Page ID #:18445

16

09:45:19	1	November 6th. I'll check with the Clerk of the Court to
	2	make certain jurors are available on Monday, but Kiry will
	3	be, I think, very cooperative. If it's a two-week estimate,
	4	you'll probably finish by the 16th; if not, I understand
09:45:42	5	that that's Thanksgiving week. We would have to go over a
	6	week and we would resume on the 27th or the 28th, depending
	7	upon jurors. Because in 40-some-years now, I've never been
	8	able to hold a jury together over Thanksgiving. They're
	9	catching good fares on a Friday night; because on a Friday
09:46:01	10	night, they're \$300. Thanksgiving week, they're three times
	11	that amount.
	12	So I would expect, if we don't finish, that you
	13	should plan that we would be in recess through the
	14	20th through the 24th, because Thanksgiving is on the 23rd.
09:46:16	15	If we do finish, hopefully, the jury can go into
	16	deliberations. Now, that assumes two weeks, and I'm not
	17	holding you to it. It may be longer.
	18	The pretrial will be on October 24th. The motion
	19	cut-off date, which is the actual day that we will hear
09:46:34	20	motions, will be on October 10th. That means you're filing
	21	30 days prior.
	22	Your discovery cut-off date will be September 8th.
	23	It's a Friday.
	24	Now, let me be completely transparent with you.
09:46:49	25	You've raised, regardless of who's correct, that there might

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 17 of 19 Page ID #:18446

Г

17

09:46:52	1	be some difficulty during discovery between the two of you.
	2	This is going to flesh out the problems concerning discovery
	3	immediately. And so if there is a problem, I'm going to
	4	know about it literally within a month or two.
09:47:08	5	If we delay until January, we're not treating this
	6	as the emergency that it is, but I'm flexible. Along the
	7	way, I do expect all parties to cooperate in discovery. And
	8	the reason for that is, the Court has the power of adverse
	9	inferences in front of the jury. And I'll remind you both
09:47:26	10	of that. So I'm encouraging your cooperation so that I
	11	don't get into a position potentially of an adverse
	12	inference in front of the jury.
	13	I will resolve all discovery disputes in my court
	14	and it will not go to a Special Master, so I'll know the
09:47:42	15	cooperative level very quickly between the two of you.
	16	I don't need a formal write up. I'll simply put
	17	this in the docket to get this case moving. I think this
	18	has "emergency" written all over it. I think I've delayed
	19	further or long enough concerning listening to the parties
09:47:56	20	ask the Court for additional time, and I've been cooperative
	21	in terms of those 90 days, but it ends here.
	22	So November 6th for your trial; October 24th,
	23	pretrial. Motion cutoff, which is the day I'm hearing
	24	motions, on October 10th.
09:48:10	25	September 8th is discovery cutoff, and that's for

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 18 of 19 Page ID #:18447

18

09:48:12	1	experts and laypeople. And the reason for that is, I'm not
	2	going to push your discovery with your experts earlier in
	3	case you decide to settle outside the Court's from
	4	outside this Court's well, in case you decide to settle
09:48:30	5	privately. I don't want to run up the costs, in terms of
	6	the experts, okay?
	7	All right. We'll put that out in a minute order.
	8	I want to thank you very much for your courtesy.
	9	MS. HASHMALL: Your Honor, may I raise one more
09:48:39	10	thing, please?
	11	THE COURT: Please. Certainly.
	12	MS. HASHMALL: It's been a year or maybe more
	13	since the plaintiffs withdrew as counsel for one of the
	14	individual plaintiffs, Gary Whitter. The County and the
09:48:49	15	City moved jointly for an OSC re Dismissal regarding that
	16	individual.
	17	THE COURT: Do I have that on my docket?
	18	MS. HASHMALL: It was filed in October and it has
	19	not been ruled on.
09:48:57	20	THE COURT: You know, I've neglected it. I'll go
	21	back and look at that. Thank you. It's probably sitting
	22	there. I didn't see it, okay. I'll resolve it for you.
	23	MS. HASHMALL: Thank you.
	24	THE COURT: Thank you very much for your courtesy.
09:49:07	25	

Case 2:20-cv-02291-DOC-KES Document 565 Filed 05/10/23 Page 19 of 19 Page ID #:18448

19

09:49:07 1	(At 9:49 a.m., proceedings were adjourned.)
2	-000-
3	CERTIFICATE
4	I hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753,
5	Title 28, United States Code, the foregoing is a true and
6	correct transcript of the stenographically reported
7	proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the
8	transcript page format is in conformance with the
9	regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
10	
11	Date: May 9, 2023
12	
13	
14	/s/DEBORAH D. PARKER
15	DEBORAH D. PARKER, OFFICIAL REPORTER
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	