NAU5rob1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 GRAHAM CHASE ROBINSON, 4 Plaintiff, New York, N.Y. 5 19 Civ. 9156 (LJL) v. ROBERT DENIRO, et al., 6 7 Defendants. 8 9 October 30, 2023 9:20 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN, 12 U.S. District Judge 13 -and a Jury-14 APPEARANCES 15 16 SANFORD HEISLER SHARP, LLP 17 Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: BRENT HANNAFAN 18 ANDREW MACURDY KATE MACMULLIN 19 VINCENT MCKNIGHT, JR. 20 21 TARTER, KRINSKY & DROGIN, LLP Attorneys for Defendants 22 BY: RICHARD C. SCHOENSTEIN INGRID CARDONA 23 LAURENT DROGIN BRITTANY LAZZARO 24 -and-TRAUB LIEBERMAN STRAUS & SHREWSBERRY LLP 25 BY: GREGORY BENNETT

1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Starting with counsel for the
3	plaintiff, please state your appearances for the record.
4	MR. McKNIGHT: Good morning, your Honor. Vincent
5	McKnight for plaintiff.
6	MR. HANNAFAN: Good morning, your Honor. Brent
7	Hannafan for the plaintiff.
8	MR. MACURDY: Andrew Macurdy for the plaintiff, your
9	Honor.
10	MS. MACMULLIN: Good morning, your Honor. Kate
11	MacMullin for the plaintiff.
12	THE COURT: Good morning.
13	And for defense?
14	MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Richard Schoenstein for defendants.
15	Good morning, your Honor.
16	MR. DROGIN: Laurent Drogin for defendants. Good
17	morning.
18	MR. BENNETT: Good morning, your Honor. Gregory
19	Bennett for defendants.
20	MS. LAZZARO: Good morning, your Honor. Brittany
21	Lazzaro for defendants.
22	MS. CARDONA: Good morning, your Honor. Cardona card
23	for defendants.
24	THE COURT: Good morning, all. I understand that each
25	side has issues that they wish to raise with the Court. Why

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't I hear from plaintiff first and then I will hear from defendants while we are waiting for the jury.

MR. MACURDY: Thank you, your Honor. A couple things I think will hopefully make our presentation faster.

The first is on opening statements. So, both sides have agreed no mention of Netflix in the opening or their expert Dr. Resnick's testimony about cognitive distortions or personality traits which are the subject of motions in limine that your Honor has reserved on. We do have a disagreement about mention of Ms. Robinson's retention of certain Canal property after her employment ended that she returned during the discovery period. I won't put words in defendants' mouth but I understand they want to mention that in their opening and your Honor has reserved on our motion in limine on that, and we think that there is really no relevance or basis and it is just prejudicial for them to begin mentioning that in opening, particularly given the history, your Honor. I won't rehash our motion in limine but, essentially, Ms. Robinson worked from home and when her employment ended, she had certain items at her home. At the very first Rule 26(f) conference our counsel, back in the beginning of 2020, mentioned that she had bankers' boxes and odds and ends and made them available for inspection and defense counsel never took us up on that, and subsequently those items were returned at the end of discovery. them to bring in the retention of this property into the case

would get into Ms. Robinson's advice from her counsel and things like that so we would submit that shouldn't be brought up at all and certainly not in opening statements.

THE COURT: Is that the only issue that you have got?

MR. MACURDY: No. I can tick through my list.

THE COURT: Why don't you tick through them and then I will hear from the defendants on your issues, and then after that I will hear from defendants on their issues.

MR. MACURDY: Sounds good, your Honor.

Just so you know, your Honor, we have redacted private e-mail addresses throughout the exhibits. Both parties agree that witnesses won't get up there, to the extent they have control over the witnesses won't get up there and say no, it is not my e-mail because my e-mail address is blacked out.

Your Honor, plaintiffs would invoke the sequestration rule of witnesses.

THE COURT: Let me just ask, is that an issue, Mr. Schoenstein, from your perspective?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No. We agree.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Your Honor, I will say, obviously Mr. De Niro is a party and Tom Harvey will be our corporate representative for Canal so he will be entitled to be here. Otherwise, we agree.

THE COURT: I assume that that's fine from plaintiff.

Ms. Robinson will also be here.

MR. MACURDY: Correct, your Honor; so long as Mr. De Niro isn't also.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Sure. Mr. De Niro is a party and Mr. Harvey represents Canal that is a party, they'll both be here.

THE COURT: Parties are entitled to be here.

MR. MACURDY: I understand.

Your Honor, I wanted to see how you would like to handle judicial notice of things like the day of a week that a date was that is likely to be relevant. Is that something that I would offer up to your Honor as it comes up? We have a calendar we could use.

THE COURT: I think the most efficient way for you to do that is just to stipulate with the other side as to what the dates are and then you can just say that it is stipulated, and if you want to prepare for a formal stipulation, that's fine, but a statement on the record that indicates that your Honor stipulated and then I will ask Mr. Schoenstein or defendants whether that is correct and that will take care of it.

MR. MACURDY: OK. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: That avoids the issue of judicial notice because of stipulation.

MR. MACURDY: Understood.

Your Honor, you had asked us to bring to your

attention if we had intended to get into conduct that was pre-statutory period on the other side's claims. With Mr. De Niro, there likely will be not relevant to our claims but relevant to Ms. Robinson's defenses to their counterclaims, so testimony that predates 2016, relevant to the dynamic of their employment relationship, Mr. De Niro's degree of control over Ms. Robinson, and knowledge of her whereabouts, as well as negotiations, discussions, arrangements regarding
Ms. Robinson's work expenses, perks, benefits that predated 2016, but are certainly relevant to the conduct that's been alleged in the case.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I just wanted to see what your preference was on impeachment. In Mr. De Niro's deposition there are some fairly lengthy answers that we would argue are not totally relevant or responsive to the question. Do we need to impeach with a full answer? Can we propose the relevant portion of the answer to keep things efficient?

THE COURT: I think the proper way to handle that is for you when you are going to impeach the witness, to refer to the page and particular lines that you want to impeach him with and then for the defendants, if as a matter of completeness, they want to have a remainder asked then they can do that and ask that you read the whole statement. Do it that way up until it becomes abusive. If it looks like the remainder is not

actually appropriate under the rule of completeness, then we will just go with whatever is inconsistent.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ MACURDY: So, your Honor, we will make a decision for each one about whether it is --

THE COURT: I think that is the right way to do it, unless I hear otherwise from the defendant.

MR. MACURDY: OK. Another thing, I can speed things along, your Honor, after an exhibit is admitted do we need to ask another question about publishing it to the jury?

THE COURT: No. I should make that clear. Once an exhibit is in evidence either side can publish it to the jury without asking permission.

MR. MACURDY: And, your Honor, for the purposes of keeping time for our presentation when we go into a side bar that is excluded from our time?

THE COURT: That is excluded from the time.

MR. MACURDY: Two other things, your Honor. So we talked about in the motions in limine, Dan Harvey was another worker at Canal. We have decided we are not going to pursue damages based on disparity between Ms. Robinson's pay and Dan Harvey's pay at Canal as part of the gender discrimination claim. However, we would still want to present evidence about what Mr. De Niro said to Ms. Robinson when she brought up the issue of pay disparity, namely that she was single and he had a family to support, as support of our gender discrimination

claim and the cumulative environment that it created. But we wouldn't seek specifically to pursue damages based on that disparity so that should save some time in terms of putting in Mr. Harvey's W-2s or salary, putting him on the stand, things like that.

THE COURT: I am going to hear from the other side with respect to the admissibility of the evidence but with respect to the claim, you had a claim in your complaint based on New York City Human Rights Law of pay disparity. Do I understand that you have made the decision to abandon that claim?

MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor, so long as we are still allowed to put on the evidence of the statement that was made to Ms. Robinson and the fact of the disparity.

THE COURT: Well, no. I think the first question is what claims are you pursuing and then the question is, is the evidence relevant. I am indifferent to whether you are pursuing the claim but I just want the record to be clear for all kinds of purposes whether the claim is being pursued or not.

MR. MACURDY: We don't want to pursue damages based on a pay disparity but we want to present the evidence of this, what we allege to be discriminatory comment, and what evidence of defendant's motive and mindset when it came to gender.

THE COURT: So if you are not pursuing damages with

respect to a claim, do you have a claim for that alleged violation?

MR. MACURDY: I think it can go to emotional damages as well as potentially punitive damages, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, I take it you are not abandoning your claim based on the New York City Human Rights Law with respect to gender disparity. You just need to be clear with me.

MR. MACURDY: I understand. I was trying to help — defendants raised that they thought this would make the trial a lot longer for them having to call Mr. Harvey. I think we were trying to streamline the presentation so we are not pursuing economic damages based on that. So it doesn't have to get into the details of Mr. Harvey's pay, things like that.

THE COURT: I hear what you are saying.

MR. MACURDY: It doesn't do us any good, your Honor, but --

THE COURT: I hear what you are saying. I am not sure whether it does it good or not.

MR. MACURDY: And the last thing, your Honor. So Canal, in addition to this lawsuit, they brought the allegations to the Manhattan district attorney for the purpose of essentially pressing charges against Ms. Robinson and we would propose to be able to ask Mr. De Niro essentially three questions about that: You and Canal in fact brought these allegations to the Manhattan district attorney for the purposes

of initiating a criminal case against Ms. Robinson; Manhattan District Attorney did an investigation and did not bring criminal charges against Ms. Robinson; and any other employee at Canal that you suspected of wrongdoing you have never brought that wrongdoing to the Manhattan district attorney.

THE COURT: What relevance does any of that have?

MR. MACURDY: It goes to Ms. Robinson's targeting

versus other employees, how she was treated differently based
on her gender and to retaliation based on her protected

activity.

THE COURT: OK. Anything more on your list?

MR. MACURDY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schoenstein, I think I can strike off of the plaintiff's list private e-mail addresses, sequestration, stipulations/judicial notice with respect to items such as day of the week, side bars excluded from timekeeping and that's it. Do you disagree that as to those issues there is no decision I need to make?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes, your Honor. Just to be clear, we have seen the calendar in plaintiff's exhibits and we stipulate that the dates in that calendar are, indeed, the dates.

THE COURT: Why don't you even prepare a written stipulation to that effect. It makes life cleaner.

All right, Mr. Schoenstein, what do you have to say.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Let me connect the last thing they said with the first thing they said because they're connected, your Honor.

They want to argue in this case that Canal made up all of these issues about Ms. Robinson's conduct and targeted her and went to the Manhattan DA but they want to preclude us from pointing out that she took stuff, including almost \$30,000 of cash and gift cards, and when asked to give it back, didn't. They can't have it both ways. If they're going to challenge Canal for what Canal did, then the evidence of what plaintiff did, keeping stuff, keeping money, keeping files, keeping a safe, keeping electronic documents and not return it when she was requested to do so in, by the way, a letter that plaintiffs are going to put into evidence, they are going to put Mr. Harvey's letter asking her to return property into evidence, but they want to preclude us from pointing out that she didn't return the property. That does not seem fair to me.

THE COURT: So let's go through these point by point.

What is the relevance of the evidence that the plaintiff -- I gather you have got evidence that the plaintiff continued to retain property belonging to Canal even after she was asked to return it; is that right?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes, your Honor. We have property that was eventually returned a couple years later.

THE COURT: And what's the nature of that property?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: So, it is a mix. There was cash, there were gift cards, there were files, there was camera equipment, there was a safe, there were computers.

THE COURT: How is that evidence relevant to any of your claims?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Well, because it shows that she was acting beyond her authority, and inappropriately, and it tied into the actions that Canal took at the end of her employment. It ties into why Mr. De Niro was upset. It ties into why Mr. Harvey sent her a demand letter which demand letter the plaintiffs want to put into evidence in the case. It is all connected. It goes to her credibility that she had stuff and, when asked to return it, didn't. It all connects.

THE COURT: I take it you are not asserting that retention of property as a separate element of conversion, that is, that during the period of time after Mr. Harvey demanded it and before she returned it, the property was converted and you are entitled to damages.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: We are not making a claim for the property that we now have back.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Correct, your Honor. Correct. But I think if we are going to tell one side of the story you have to be able to tell both sides of the story, that's my fundamental contention about this. If plaintiff's argument is

that Canal viciously attacked this poor, innocent woman because she had a discrimination claim, they actually have it backwards. She left, made demands, refused to return stuff, and then came up with a discrimination claim.

THE COURT: What's the timing of the Harvey demand for the return of property and the filing of this lawsuit of the claim's conversion with respect to the property that was not returned?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Plaintiff leaves on April 6, 2019.

On June 11, 2019, she sends an e-mail to Mr. De Niro: I want severance, \$600,000. I want a press release. I want recommendations. I want attorneys fees. And if you don't give me all of that stuff, I'm going to hire attorneys. And then, on July 2, she forwards that e-mail again because she hasn't received a response. On July 2 Mr. De Niro and Ms. Chen exchange some texts. Plaintiff is going to put those texts into evidence. The texts on July 2 are a direct response to plaintiff's e-mail. Plaintiff's e-mail demanded a response by July 12. On July 11, Mr. Harvey sent his letter and his letter said, amongst other things, return property. No property returned.

On August 17, Canal files its lawsuit. No property has been returned.

THE COURT: OK. Let me ask you one other question. This pertains both to opening and I gather to the scope of your

NAK5robC examination of Mr. De Niro, as well as other witnesses. 1 Mr. De Niro is expected to be the first witness in the trial. 2 3 Is all of that correct, Mr. Schoenstein? 4 MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Let me ask a question of plaintiff. 6 fair to say from plaintiff's perspective -- is plaintiff 7 preparing to introduce the Harvey demand for the return of property in their examination of Mr. De Niro? 8 9 MR. MACURDY: No. 10 THE COURT: Is plaintiff planning to go into, with 11 Mr. De Niro, the accusations of conversion of property, the 12 decision to commence an investigation into Ms. Robinson to look 13 at whether she took property that belonged to Canal and to 14 return it? 15 MR. MACURDY: No. I'm sorry. THE COURT: You are not going to do any of that --16 17 MR. MACURDY: I'm sorry? 18 THE COURT: What is going to be the scope of your examination of Mr. De Niro? 19

MR. MACURDY: It will go both to our claims -- specifically go into the retention of this property, your Honor?

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: No, no, no. Are you going to explore in your examination of Mr. De Niro the claims by the defendants, the counterclaims of the defendants of conversion and breach of

fiduciary duty? I assume you are.

MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Thank you.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: And, your Honor, they have specifically told us they intend to use Mr. De Niro's text messages on July 2, which were his direct reaction to the July 2 e-mail from Ms. Robinson forwarding her June 11 e-mail.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Let me hear from you with respect to the issue of the conduct prior to 2016 as it relates to the conversion and breach of fiduciary duty claim and the defense's authorization ratification — authorization, really.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Well, if there are documents that go to authorization and ratification they're probably OK, your Honor. I think plaintiffs have the right to put on that part of their case. A lot of this is document-specific and will depend on the foundation. I know we want to resolve as many of these issues in advance as possible.

THE COURT: Some of it may be testimonial.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes. I mean, they certainly have a right to ask Mr. De Niro whether plaintiff was authorized to do this, that, or the other thing.

THE COURT: I think they also would have a right to ask about how close the relationship was and wasn't Ms. Robinson informing Mr. De Niro of everything that she was doing.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No problem.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Let me hear from you with respect to the Harvey issue.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: So, I'm giving an opening statement in a couple hours and I need to know if this claim is in or out of the case and I, frankly, found the presentation by plaintiff equivocal.

THE COURT: I think it is in the case.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: OK.

THE COURT: I don't think it was equivocal at all. I think what I heard is that they're not seeking economic damages from it but they are claiming that there is a violation. And I don't know whether they will be permitted any further damages but there is at least a possibility, I suppose, of nominal damages.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I think -- I thought what they were saying is we want to present evidence that Mr. De Niro made a comment to Ms. Robinson that Mr. Harvey was paid differently because he has children and family.

THE COURT: They did say that, but then when I asked the question of is the claim in or is the claim out, they just said, listen, there is a form of damages we are not seeking.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: OK. Well, if --

THE COURT: Unless there is any more definitive statement from the plaintiff, it's in.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: OK. So if the claim is in then they can present their evidence.

THE COURT: They can present their evidence, you can present your evidence.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Let me tell you how I'm going to rule with respect to the issues raised by the plaintiff.

With respect to the retention of Canal property after it was demanded by Mr. Harvey and then its return at a later date, the defendant can open with respect to that. The extent of any evidence with respect to that issue will depend upon the way in which the door is opened during either the opening of the plaintiff or during the examination of Mr. De Niro. So, defendant can open on it and defendant takes the risk, as all parties take risk, with respect to opening statements, that what they promise the jury they will not be able to deliver on.

With respect to the conduct predating 2016, as a general matter, I'm not going to preclude conduct predating 2016 to the extent that it goes to issues of ratification or acquiescence or that the defendant did not -- sorry, the plaintiff did not, during the relevant time period, breach her fiduciary duties. Whether there are particular questions that would be excludable under 401 or 403 is best addressed on a question by question basis.

With respect to the Harvey issue, I think it is in the

case.

I didn't hear from the defendant with respect to the issue about going to the Manhattan DA's office.

Mr. Schoenstein?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes, I think it is a 403 issue. I think the prejudicial value of that outweighs the probative. You know, there is no need to get into the fact that — there is nothing in there that is germane to the discrimination or retaliation claim that is left in the case since the retaliation in the case cuts off at the end of her employment. So, the thing about reporting to the Manhattan DA is just not germane to any of that. And I would add if that didn't — if the Manhattan DA stuff comes in at all, that door to the return of property issue has been kicked wide open because that's one of the things they would have talked to the DA about and we would have a right to show that that was part of the decision to go to the DA.

THE COURT: Let me go back to plaintiff with respect to that issue.

I have got two concerns with respect to that evidence, one is whether Mr. Schoenstein mentioned, which is that it seems to predate and be relevant to the acts of discrimination that are still in the case; and second, it could lead the jury, impermissibly, to infer that the Manhattan DA's decision was a reflection of the quality or the quantity of the evidence

presented by the defendant, in other words that the Manhattan DA's office made an affirmative decision that there wasn't a crime here where it could have just as easily represented a decision by the Manhattan DA's office about where it wanted to devote its resources or any other issues so it just would be a side show. Those are the two things I would like you to address.

MR. MACURDY: I understand, your Honor. We wanted to be very narrow so I suggested it would be essentially three questions, and the purpose of it is not to a point of discrimination or -- well, it is to discrimination, it is not to retaliation. It is to say there were others -- and we will present evidence -- other male employees who were suspected, accused of misconduct, similar unauthorized spending, and that no criminal investigation was brought against them. So, it goes to show the disparity, the discriminatory treatment, as well as motive evidence to go get Ms. Robinson and, therefore, undermine Mr. De Niro's credibility on the stand.

So that's the very specific purpose of the testimony, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to exclude it under Rule 403. Like any in limine decision, it's subject to reconsideration if the defendant does something that opens the door or changes the playing field.

Mr. Schoenstein, you had a series of issues?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Mr. Drogin, do we have issues?

MR. DROGIN: Judge, we exchanged a list of documents

that are anticipated to be used during Mr. De Niro's direct

testimony and cross and we have narrowed the disagreements

regarding those documents down to a total of 14 and I am

wondering if you would like to hear about that now or if we are

going to take it up when the particular document is offered.

THE COURT: Let me see where we are in terms of getting a jury. Hold on for a moment. We are calling to see how close we are to getting a jury. While we are waiting, let me ask plaintiffs, you sent me an e-mail indicating that you were going to send a markup of the jury instructions with all of the defendant's exceptions to my proposed instructions and plaintiff's exceptions. I don't think I have received that from you.

MR. HANNAFAN: No, your Honor. We were working on that over the weekend and I had actually emailed with Mr. Schoenstein last night about trying to figure out whether there were some things we could agree on. We can send your Honor what we have, but we thought it might make more sense to speak with them again before sending that version to the Court. If you would like us to send you what we have now we can certainly do that, but that's why the delay, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. I don't need it right now. When do you think your meet and confers will come to a point where it

doesn't make sense to meet and confer anymore?

MR. HANNAFAN: I don't think it has been acrimonious, your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean just in terms of you need a Judge to make a decision.

MR. HANNAFAN: I think we can talk at the end of the day. Today is a full day so perhaps we can have it to your Honor tomorrow. If there are any issues, we will let the Court know.

THE COURT: Maybe by, before we begin Court tomorrow if you it to send me.

MR. HANNAFAN: Sure. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just give me one moment.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, may I say one other thing about the retention of the property?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MACURDY: As I mentioned, Ms. Robinson's counsel, in our initial Rule 26(f) conference in January of 2020, mentioned that she had items from Canal and offered them to be available for inspection. That was never taken up by Canal's counsel, so what I am worried about is them getting up and opening and her saying she retained this property for years, I think is something he mentioned just now. I think, your Honor, if they are able to talk about it, I would request that they can't talk about her retention of property for years, only up

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

until the point that Rule 26(f) conference. Because then it becomes an issue between her advice and discussions with her counsel.

THE COURT: Mr. Schoenstein, from the defense side, is there any reason why you would need to say anything beyond, you know, even after we made a demand for it, she continued to hold on to the property.

MR. DROGIN: Yes, and I just want to clarify something that counsel said. What they have omitted is they're talking about a 26(f) conference in a federal court action that was filed two months after I filed the state court action and that is where the conversion claim came from. It was filed in August of 2019 and there was not a peep from defense -- they were then the defendants. So Ms. Robinson's counsel, faced with a state court action, made absolutely no representation or statement or offer to return that property. I was not involved at the 26(f) conference and Mr. Bennett was not representing a party that had a conversion claim. I was. So the nonsense -withdrawn. I apologize. So, the contention that somehow they raised this issue at a 26(f) conference, they raised it in the wrong court. They should have come to me and said, hey, we have got this property, can we return it to you? But that never happened so they are omitting that.

THE COURT: Listen. I mean, in your opening statement, unless the plaintiff opens the door, you are going

to limit yourself to the notion that even after she -- even after we retained the property -- I'm sorry, even after we demanded return of property, she still continued to hold on to all of this property. You are not going to go beyond that into the details of, you know, when it was returned, the state court lawsuit and the like. All of that may become relevant in this case but we are talking about evidence that is intended to respond to an argument that you anticipate with some reason that the plaintiffs will make but it's not direct evidence of a conversion claim so you can limit yourself on your opening.

MR. DROGIN: Mr. Schoenstein is going to do the opening statement. Will he be permitted to identify the property --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DROGIN: -- specifically that was requested?

THE COURT: Yes, you can do that.

MR. DROGIN: Which, to be clear, was identified in the Harvey letter. Mr. Harvey's letter, among them, the SkyMiles which are a major issue in this case so it is going to be hard to have an opening statement where we can't --

THE COURT: You have got my ruling.

I am informed that we have about 20 minutes until we have got the jury. I have the e-mail with objections. Why don't I get some sense first from the defendants as to their objections to plaintiff's potential exhibits and then from the

plaintiffs to their objections to defendant's potential exhibits with the notion that some of this I may not be able to resolve until after I hear the opening statements.

Let me first ask the plaintiff, there are six exhibits listed in the e-mail to me as plaintiff's potential exhibits to which defendants have objections. Do you intend to use each of those six exhibits in the direct of Mr. De Niro?

MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. All right, so there is a live issue. The first one is 148.

MR. DROGIN: Your Honor, this appears to be an e-mail from July 2014 from Ms. Robinson to Mr. De Niro regarding flights and it is, from our perspective, completely irrelevant to the issues that are to be tried. We don't understand here what they're looking to show with this document and if we do, we can address it. It doesn't appear to have anything to do with SkyMiles and there is no dispute in this case that, at times, Ms. Robinson was permitted to use SkyMiles both for business travel and even for personal travel when she took her vacations. So it is unclear to us how this document fits into this case.

THE COURT: Let me hear from plaintiff.

MR. DROGIN: Relevance objection.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, it is highly relevant, it is about SkyMiles, it is about Ms. Robinson discussing with

Mr. De Niro a flight that she is going to take, the indication that it is in a personal capacity. He asks: How are you doing tickets? And she says: Miles/purchase, depending on what we have and what is the cheapest way to do it. So, it shows their course of conduct going back all the way to 2014 and evidences the arrangement that they had then and, you know, is a basis for the evolving arrangements regarding SkyMiles over the course of her decade at Canal.

MR. DROGIN: But that's not the --

THE COURT: I am going to permit it to be used. The jury can make an inference from the e-mail as to authorization with respect to later conduct and defendants can re-examine to show that it has very little weight, if any, but under the 403 balancing test the probative value is slightly outweighs any prejudicial effect.

Next one I think is PX- 154.

MR. DROGIN: Correct.

THE COURT: Let me hear from defendants.

MR. DROGIN: This appears to be a random e-mail from 2013 where Ms. Robinson is thanking Mr. De Niro for agreeing to change the expenses she says that you are being generous. There is absolutely no context to know what is being spoken about here. There isn't a debate or discussion or even a dispute that Ms. Robinson was permitted to make some expenditures but this document sits in a complete vacuum and it

appears that they're just looking to show that all expenses were approved and, look, here is a random e-mail from 2013 without any context or explanation, so there. And we don't think that that is right. We think in that case the prejudice outweighs any probative value.

THE COURT: Let me hear from plaintiff.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, there is no prejudice from a document like this. The defendants may not like what it says but there is no prejudice to Mr. De Niro or Canal to this and this, once again --

THE COURT: What will Ms. Robinson say about what the nature is of the expenses.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, at that time starting at the end of 2013, Ms. Robinson began working in L.A. remotely for Mr. De Niro. He permitted that and he also had Canal pay for \$2,000 worth of her rent expense as a business expense of Canal during that time period, and so this is memorializing that agreement. And so, your Honor, it shows their arrangements regarding expenses which then evolved from there, as you mentioned before, over time. There is no prejudice to Canal and our position is we should be able to cross-examine

THE COURT: So what you want to bring out is that in 2013 he agreed to permit her to work from L.A. and to cover some of her expenses in L.A.?

MR. MACURDY: That Canal paid for her rent in L.A.;
yes, your Honor, and that that came about, well, for a variety
of reasons. I can get into it if it would be helpful to your
Honor but, yes. And it goes to the course of conduct of them
having arrangements between the two of them to figure out what
expenses Canal would pay for of hers and this is, you know, a
couple of years into her employment but it establishes sort of
an understanding and then these sort of conversations evolved
from there, your Honor.

MR. DROGIN: So now we know and the irrelevance becomes equally clear. This doesn't have to do with any improper expenses. We now know it has to do with living expenses and rent relating to the time Mr. De Niro permitted her to work from Los Angeles. There is no dispute about that so it is not clear what this shows. There is no issue here --

THE COURT: Do you object to questions to Mr. De Niro to the effect of when she was working in L.A. that he agreed that Canal could pay for her rent in L.A.?

MR. DROGIN: It is not disputed. He was very generous.

THE COURT: So I take it that Mr. De Niro can be asked questions to that effect?

MR. DROGIN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to exclude 154 but if Mr. De Niro ends up denying that he agreed that Canal could

cover the expenses -- rental expenses in L.A. while she was permitted to work in L.A., then that ruling is subject to reconsideration.

Next one is 193.

MR. DROGIN: This is another exceedingly random e-mail from December 2014. We just don't understand what the relevance is to this case.

THE COURT: I had a question about this one also. Let me hear from plaintiff.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, one of the allegations made against Ms. Robinson is the L.A. trip. And what we heard from defense questioning the reasoning for that trip, which was Mr. De Niro asking Ms. Robinson to scout hotels for his ex-wife Toukie Smith in L.A. So this is an example of her doing one of her job functions, which is negotiation for a day's visit to scout a hotel which she mentions here she is doing on a Saturday, as part of her job duty. So this is showing that that was a regular job duty that she did.

THE COURT: This is not with respect to the challenged trip; correct?

MR. MACURDY: Correct, your Honor, but to the -- I expect them to challenge the trip and the purpose of the trip and this is to show that it is something that she regularly did. As a separate matter, your Honor, it is her doing this work on a weekend day, which also goes as defense to the

counterclaims, their allegations that she had, was reimbursed improperly for vacation days so it goes to the nature of her work, her relationship with Mr. De Niro, as well as a basis for her going to scout a hotel in L.A.

THE COURT: It seems a marginal relevance but I will wait to see how the testimony develops with respect to this.

MR. DROGIN: May I just add something on that, just to be clear, the trip that they're talking about that is actually an issue in this case was in March of 2018. It is also undisputed that Ms. Robinson would scout hotels or homes for Mr. De Niro on shooting sites where he was going to be filming. That was part of her job. So I have no idea from this document whether this relates to Mr. De Niro, whether it relates to somebody else. It is completely out of context and, again, this relates to undisputed facts. If they want to ask —

THE COURT: I have heard you. I understand the point.

195. What is the next one?

MR. DROGIN: 195 is an e-mail which had been sent in 2011, five years outside of the statute of limitations where, as it appears, all plaintiff is doing is talking about how hard she works for Mr. De Niro. She may have worked very hard. She can certainly testify to that. I don't think Mr. De Niro is going to deny that she worked very hard but this is, you know, in substance, just a self-serving e-mail that she can be asked about or that he can be asked what he thought of her work

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

performance and it is quite remote in time. And, obviously, we know things went bad. So, if things went bad in 2019, what does it matter how plaintiff viewed herself in 2011?

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, this e-mail is hugely relevant to Ms. Robinson's defenses to their counterclaims. The third-party down, second sentence she writes -- you are incredibly generous with allowing me to travel on miles and sometimes paying to allow me to be in Spain or L.A. when you are away and all the other things.

So, your Honor, this goes to show that back in 2011, six years, eight years before the period that they're even focusing on, she had this understanding with Mr. De Niro that she could travel, the implication is personally on the SkyMiles, and then she could work remotely in Spain or L.A. So that goes both to their conversion claims about her using SkyMiles personally, as well as to their claims about vacation days that he allowed her to work remotely in Spain or L.A. and their assertions, thus far, have been that simply because she was out of the country she must have been on vacation, which is not the case at all, she worked remotely regularly, he knew that, he authorized it, it was happening as early as 2011 and so their objection here is a 403. There is no prejudice to Canal, no undue prejudice for an e-mail like this, and it is very, very relevant, not only to defeating the elements of their counterclaims, the authorization, but also to the

NAU6ROB2

affirmative defenses that we have the burden of proving of acquiescence and ratification.

(Continued on next page)

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question. I'll hear from defendants in a moment.

Everything after that particular paragraph, the paragraph also that says "I handle a lot for you," the paragraph that says "I take my job seriously," the paragraph that says "I do love my job," the one that says "I will always give it a hundred percent," and so on, how is all of that not self-serving hearsay that even if your point with respect to the one paragraph you mentioned was well-taken, the rest of it should be excluded.

MR. MACURDY: We could happily redact the rest, your Honor. I think this e-mail is also relevant for a nonhearsay purpose that, again, goes to our defenses that Mr. De Niro was aware that she had this understanding that she could use SkyMiles for personal travel, that she could work remotely in Spain and LA, and she has conveyed that to him. And this is an e-mail he received in 2011 that sets the undertone for all the context for the claims that they brought against her.

So if your Honor is concerned about all those other parts, we can certainly redact those out. But this is relevant for a nonhearsay purpose.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I'm so glad to be able to address this now. This is a jury confusion issue. And they keep coming back to the SkyMiles. The issue in the SkyMiles here

NAU6ROB2

has nothing to do with pre2019, we're not pursuing claims for the use of SkyMiles in 2011, 2012, '13, '14, '15, '16, '17, '18.

What we're focusing on is in a four-month period in 2019, plaintiff, knowing that she was leaving, planning her exit strategy, methodically on four separate occasions made transfers of 999,000 miles from the Canal account to her personal SkyMiles account. That is all this case is about. Nothing else regarding SkyMiles.

And if she's going to say that she is authorized to take those miles and keep them, then she's going to have to change her deposition testimony before the jury. Because at deposition, she told us under oath, "we never had such a conversation." And we'll hear an audio tape of Robin Chambers in a call that she recorded saying, "no, it's like a computer. When you leave the job, you give it back." She got so upset when she heard that, she hung up on Robin Chambers. That's what this is about.

THE COURT: I'm going to reserve on this. This is, again, a 403-type issue. And so that will depend on what I hear in the openings. So next one is 362.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Do I begin.

THE COURT: 362 is the next one from defendant.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: The only objection here that we have is to the dollar value that's mentioned. We think this is just

put in here for shock value. If they want to use it for some other purpose, that this trip was charged on Amex, we don't have a problem with that. We think it's only being used here to show that this was an expensive rental. That's it. If they can redact the dollar amount, we're fine with it.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, the purpose of this is to show an example of Ms. Robinson's job duties which is vetting vacation rentals for Mr. De Niro and his family, and not just a matter of picking out any old vacation rental. These are monster transactions that require a lot of coordinating and figuring out. So this is offered as an example of that.

THE COURT: I think the dollar amounts is hardly —
the relevance of the dollar amount is extremely small and the
prejudicial impact is great. So the —— I'm going to authorize
the redaction of the dollar amount in front of the jury and it
can be offered with the dollar amount redacted.

Next one is 372.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: This is an e-mail from 2017.

Mr. De Niro's e-mail at the top is exactly my point. He says,

"Not clear what you mean. I don't understand what they mean
here."

This is simply offered to show that she handled bookings for Mr. De Niro or his family or another Canal employee. That's not disputed, so it's unclear what this e-mail is necessary for. And if it's going to come in, I would

NAU6ROB2

also ask that the dollar amounts be removed. It's not relevant here.

THE COURT: The dollar amounts here looks like it's \$359 a night per room. That's not a figure that in this day and age shocks the conscious, is it?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I'm looking at the June 17 -- sorry, June 19th e-mail, where it says "Did you approve Dan at the Greenwich Hotel in May and June," is that what you're looking at?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I think I'm looking at the wrong exhibit.

MR. MACURDY: 378.

THE COURT: I was looking at 372. Let me look at 378. Just to be clear, I don't see what the relevance if it's simply to show her job duties, which among other things are not in dispute or at least regarding this aspect of her job, why do we need this document and why do we need this dollar amount?

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, this document is also extremely relevant to Ms. Robinson's defenses. In the first in time e-mail, she is bringing up to Mr. De Niro, an e-mail to Mr. De Niro about Dan Harvey, the trainer that we've been talking about, asking if Mr. De Niro approved Mr. Harvey's hotel expenses at the Greenwich Hotel in a single month that he charged his company Amex.

If you add it up, it's over \$5,000 worth of hotel

NAU6ROB2

charges in a single month, she's asking him did he approve it.

And Mr. De Niro writes back, no, really -- not really, but
leave it. The rest of it is not necessarily what we're focused
on.

But it's going to show that for this other employee,
Ms. Robinson raised the issue of approval of expenses.
Mr. De Niro now has knowledge and he explicitly said, no, we'll
leave it. So it goes to show disparate treatment, shows
discrimination, it shows how this was a focus, it goes -focused investigation on Ms. Robinson for retaliatory purposes
and all that.

THE COURT: So what does defendant have to say about that? The equal payment thing about Mr. Harvey is in the case. You're going to bring out all the testimony about how Mr. Harvey actually helped train Mr. De Niro for some of his performances. That he was the physical trainer, and that he's not at all similarly situated to the plaintiff. Isn't -- isn't all this the -- I mean...

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I mean, I think it's very tangentially related, I don't see why we need the dollar amounts next to the dates. This can all be explained as to why he's there.

What I would further object to is any sort of characterization that this is showing any form of gender discrimination. If that's what it's being offered for, I don't

see any connection. If it's simply being offered for Dan Harvey, who I sort of get the sense they may not even call, then I don't see the connection.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I mean, this is Ms. Robinson bringing up to Mr. De Niro whether he approved specific Amex charges for a hotel by another employee. She has been accused in this case of making unauthorized charges for hotels, meals, Ubers, things like that. And Mr. De Niro is saying "not really, but leave it."

So it goes directly to our affirmative defenses, acquiescence, gratification, as well as how he handled this disparately for this employee versus Ms. Robinson who Ms. Chen had serious issues with, based on her intimate position --

THE COURT: Okay. So I will permit it to be offered solely with respect to its relevance on the New York City equal pay act claim. Which means that if the equal pay act claim does not survive the defendant's motion at the close of plaintiff's case, then it will not be something that the jury will be permitted to consider. And I'll give a limiting instruction that this is being offered solely with respect to the claim of equal pay by the plaintiff and can be considered only for the purposes of whether -- of an equal pay claim.

All right. That brings us to the question of plaintiff's objection to defendant's exhibits. Before we get into those, let me check again on the jury.

Actually, before I do that, I should note there are a number of people in the gallery. Once we have the jury, we're going to fill up the box, and then the other jurors are going to be sitting in the first couple of rows.

If there is -- the jurors take priority, so people who are in the gallery will have to move and relocate themselves in order to make space for the jurors.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Can I ask the Court a question about timing?

So I assume the jury will be up here soon and we'll do jury selection. It seems to me likely that will take into lunch. Will we then have a lunch break and then have openings?

THE COURT: That's my expectation.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I'm trying to make sure we have our client here at the appropriate time. So I will make sure. I will anticipate we'll have a lunch break and we'll be back up at 2 o'clock.

THE COURT: I don't think you should anticipate that your client would be put on the stand until after -- some point after lunch.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: When after lunch, I don't know.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Hold on for a second.

(Pause)

THE COURT: It looks like within the next ten minutes we'll have the jury. Let me go to the plaintiff's objections to the defendant's exhibits.

The first is DX8

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, we withdraw our objection to DX8.

THE COURT: Okay. Next is DX61.

MR. MACURDY: DX61 you'll see is an e-mail from counsel conveying metadata about audio recordings. So this is hearsay, your Honor.

THE COURT: How is that admissible in Mr. De Niro's testimony?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: So it is anticipated that

Mr. De Niro will -- while testifying an audio clip will be

played. And this document contains the metadata to show the

date that the recording was made. If counsel will stipulate to

that date, then on Mr. De Niro's testimony it won't be

necessary.

THE COURT: That may be right, but it still doesn't mean that Mr. De Niro can authenticate this document or establish that it's not hearsay.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: It's a document they produced to us in discovery. We would have no other way authenticating the document. They were in possession of the audio recordings. We asked them to provide the metadata as to when the recordings

were actually made, and this is their response.

We included counsel's letter just for completeness.

THE COURT: Which portion of DX61 do you believe is relevant?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: So it relates only to defendant's Exhibit 285, which is also on their list. And --

THE COURT: There's a lot of lines in PX61.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Can someone give me the RB number for Exhibit 285?

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, while we're waiting for that --

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Found it.

THE COURT: Yes. Let me hear from plaintiff with respect to that.

MR. MACURDY: Just, your Honor, it is — under that argument, any document that we produce would be admissible against us, that's certainly not the case. These are out—of—court statements offered for the truth that this recording took place on this date. So I'm not hearing any response to how they get around the hearsay issue.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Well, we asked -- again, they were in control of these recordings to which there's no dispute. This is essentially a part of the recording, and they've gathered this information for us to simply tell us when the recordings were made. I mean, it goes to authenticity of the

recording themselves. Nobody is arguing that Ms. Robinson crafted these recordings after the fact.

As it relates to this particular recording, it's our -- Robinson 7178. And it was recorded, according to this, on April 2, 2019. If they'll stipulate that that's when it was recorded, then we don't -- this document is not necessary for any other purpose during Mr. De Niro's testimony. Unless, of course, there's another audio clip that comes up.

THE COURT: So let me hear. You said this also ties into the admissibility of DX285; is that right?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: That's what I just told you. In other words, we're looking to introduce and play an excerpt from DX285. They objected.

THE COURT: Let me hear the objection with respect to $\mathsf{DX285}$.

MR. MACURDY: I'm not objecting for them to play it.

It's about a two-minute call between Ms. Robinson and

Mr. De Niro. We just ask that they play the full call, rather than jumping in the middle. So two minutes instead of one minute.

THE COURT: I've listened to it. The full two minutes has all kinds of information about prescriptions he was -- drugs that he's taking. How is that relevant?

MR. MACURDY: I think it sets the context for the call. If she's coming to him to do her job and it's also

evidence of what her job entails. It's intimate personal details and daily coordination with him about things like prescriptions.

THE COURT: Let me hear from defendant.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: The purpose of the excerpt we're playing is it ties into the calendar here and the sequence of events. It's an April 2nd call. And he very directly says to, "I need to speak to you in person. I want to talk to you."

That's --

THE COURT: I gather that's the purpose for which you're offering it. So I'm going to permit 285 to be offered without objection as to the portion that the defendants have proffered. And under the rule of completeness, I'm going to reject the plaintiff's portion because I don't think that it is necessary to under the rule of completeness to provide the proper context.

So that's my ruling with respect to 285.

With respect to DX61, I'm actually going to need you all to give me a little bit of legal authority for it. I'm well aware of the proposition that if a party provides in discovery a business record of its business, that the provision of that document by the party establishes authenticity. And then the document can come in as a business record because the business record foundations are established. That takes care of the hearsay issues.

But that proposition doesn't self-evidently apply to DX61. So you'll have to put in some evidence. Meanwhile, Mr. De Niro can testify as to when he believes approximately this conversation took place.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: To at least either avoid the issue for Mr. De Niro or perhaps to kick it down the road to another point in the trial, will counsel stipulate that that recording was made on April 2, 2019?

THE COURT: Why don't you talk to them before -- over the lunch break on that.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Next one is DX87.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, we have the same objection to this one as well as a couple others. So I can try to bucket it for you. They have e-mails on here and DX87 is one where Mr. De Niro is not a recipient or a sender. He's not involved with the e-mail at all, so there's no foundation to ask Mr. De Niro about this e-mail.

And the same holds for DX162, DX247, which are text messages between Michael Kaplan and Tiffany Chen. And Plaintiff's 97 which is Ms. Chen's text messages with other people besides Mr. De Niro.

THE COURT: I'm informed the jury is on its way up. So I'll hear from the defendants with respect to that issue after we've completed jury selection.

25

1	MR. SCHOENSTEIN: May I say one thing, Judge? It		
2	takes me five seconds to read on something. We can withdraw		
3	87.		
4	THE COURT: 87 is withdrawn?		
5	MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Yes.		
6	THE COURT: Great. Do you want to withdraw anything		
7	else to make my life easier?		
8	MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No.		
9	MR. HANNAFAN: Excuse me, your Honor, is there a		
10	possibility to take a quick bathroom break or have counsel step		
11	out?		
12	THE COURT: Let me see where the jury is.		
13	MR. HANNAFAN: I'll live, if not.		
14	THE COURT: Why don't you wait.		
15	You can take a quick break, if you want. I'm going to		
16	stay on the bench.		
17	MR. HANNAFAN: I appreciate it, your Honor.		
18	(Recess)		
19	(A jury of eight was impanelled and sworn)		
20	THE COURT: You may be seated.		
21	Members of the jury, I'm going to give you some		
22	preliminary instructions. It will take us right until about		
23	1:00 o'clock, and then you'll have your lunch break, and we'll		
24	return for opening statements.		

Now that you have been sworn, I am going to give you

preliminary instructions to guide you in your participation in the trial.

To begin with, you are here to administer justice in this case according to the law and the evidence. You are to perform this task with complete fairness and impartiality, and without bias, prejudice, or sympathy, for or against the plaintiff or the defendants.

It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone will be the judges of the facts. You will then have to apply those facts to the law as the Court will give it to you. You must follow that law, whether you agree with it or not. Nothing the Court may say or do during the trial is intended to indicate or should be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be.

The evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents, and other things received into the record as exhibits, as well as any facts that the parties agree to or stipulate to, or that the Court may instruct you to find.

Certain things that are not evidence must not be considered by you. I will list them for you now.

First, statements, arguments, and questions by lawyers are not evidence, nor are my own statements to you evidence.

Only the answers given by the witnesses and the documents admitted as exhibits are evidence.

Second, objections to questions are not evidence. The lawyers have an obligation to their clients to make an objection when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be influenced by the Court's ruling on an objection. If the objection is sustained, ignore the question. If it is overruled, treat the answer like any other. If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

Third, testimony that the Court has excluded or told you to disregard is not evidence. It must not be considered.

Finally, anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom. When you are determining the facts, keep in mind that there are two types of evidence: Direct evidence and circumstantial.

Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact such as the testimony of an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts from which you may infer or conclude that other facts exist. The word "infer" or the expression "to draw an inference" means to find that a fact exists from proof of another fact. An inference is to be drawn only if it is logical and reasonable to do so and not by speculation or quesswork.

In deciding whether to draw an inference you must look at and consider all the facts in light of reason, commonsense, and experience. Whether a given inference is or is not to be drawn is entirely a matter for you, the jury, to decide.

Circumstantial evidence, does not necessarily prove less than direct evidence nor does it necessarily prove more.

Here is an example to help you think about the difference between direct and circumstantial evidence. Assume that when you came into the courthouse this morning the sun was shining and it was a nice day outdoors. Also assume that the courtroom blinds were drawn and that you could not look outside. Assume further as you were sitting here someone walked in with an umbrella that was dripping wet and a few moments later, somebody else walked in with a raincoat that was also dripping wet.

Now, because you could not look outside the courtroom and you could not see whether it was raining and because no witness has testified that it is raining, you would have no direct evidence that it was raining. But on the combination of facts that I have asked you to assume, it would be reasonable and logical for you to conclude that it was raining.

That is all there is to circumstantial evidence. You infer on the basis of reason, experience and commonsense from one established fact the existence or nonexistence of some other fact. I will give you further instructions on these as

well as other matters at the end of the case. But keep in mind that you may consider both kinds of evidence.

One of your most important tasks as jurors is to evaluate the credibility of the witnesses who will testify before you, that is, how truthful and believable they are. Listen carefully as each witness testifies during both direct and cross-examination and consider whether the witness is telling the truth. It will be up to you to decide which witnesses to believe, which witnesses not to believe, and how much of any witness' testimony to accept or reject.

Now, how do you decide what to believe and what not to believe? You are to listen to the witnesses, observe their testimony, and then decide as you would decide such questions in your own life. Did they know what they were talking about, were they candid, honest, open and truthful, did they have a reason to falsify, exaggerate or distort their testimony?

Sometimes it is not what a witness says, but how he or she says it that may give you a clue as to whether or not to accept that witness' version of an incident or an event as credible or believable. In short, the way a witness testifies may play an important part in your reaching a judgment as to whether or not you can expect the witness' testimony as reliable.

Now, a few words about your conduct as jurors. First, during the trial you are not to discuss the

case with anyone, nor are you to permit anyone to discuss it with you. This includes posting anything on the Internet about the case, whether it be on personal blogs, Facebook, Twitter, or X, Threads, or TikTok. Until you retire to the jury room at the end of the case to deliberate, you simply are not to talk about this case with anyone, including your spouse, partner, family or close friends. Do not even discuss the case with each other until you begin your actual deliberations at the end of the trial.

Second, please do not, while you are serving as jurors in this trial, have any conversations with the parties, the attorneys, or any witnesses in this case whether in the courtroom, in the hallways, in the elevators outside or anywhere else. By this, I mean not only to avoid talking about the case, do not talk at all, even to say good morning or to acknowledge any of these people. Someone seeing a juror in conversation with a party, lawyer or witness might think something improper was being discussed. To avoid even the appearance of impropriety then avoid any such contacts or conversations.

So I can tell you that when the parties, lawyers or witnesses pass you in the halls without even acknowledging your presence, they do not mean to be rude. They are simply following my instructions.

Third, do not read or listen to anything outside the

courtroom that relates to this case in any way. Similarly, you are not to allow anyone to speak to you about this case. If you are approached by anyone to speak about it, politely but firmly tell them that the judge has directed you not to do so. If anyone seeks to contact you about this case, you are required to report the incident promptly to me by sending me a note through my courtroom deputy, Mr. Fishman.

Also be sure that I am informed of any person that you know that comes into this courtroom. This is a public trial, so that could happen. But it is important that you do not hear from them what may have happened in the court while the jury was not present. If you should see a friend or a relative come into the court, please send me a note through Mr. Fishman at your first opportunity.

Fourth, do not try to do any research or make any investigation about the case or the issues presented by the case. For example, do not go onto the Internet tonight and research any matters pertaining to the case. Do not call up your lawyer friends to ask about the types of matters at issue in this case.

Fifth, I know that many of you use cell phones, smartphones, the Internet and social media and other tools of technology. You must not use these tools to communicate electronically with anyone about the case. This includes your family and friends. You may not communicate with anyone about

the case on your cell phone which includes smartphones, through e-mail, text messaging, any blog or website, any Internet chat room or by way of any other social-networking websites including Facebook, Twitter, X, Threads, TikTok, LinkedIn, or YouTube.

Finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. The case can only be presented step by step, witness by witness, until all the evidence is before you. Keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

You are permitted to take notes during the trial.

Mr. Fishman will give each of you a notepad and pen. Please write your name on the cover of the pad. If you do take notes, please do so only in these pads. Remember that any notes you take are for your use only and they are only to be used as an aid for your memory. Your memory controls. If you do take notes be careful to not get so involved in taking notes that you're not listening to the evidence.

Once you are in your deliberations if there is any disagreement between one juror's notes and another juror's notes or between one juror's notes and another juror's recollection, you can ask to have the court reporter to read back the testimony or to have that portion of the transcript sent to you, for it is the official court transcript that controls, not any particular juror's notes.

During the course of the trial, exhibits will be received into evidence, they will be marked by exhibit number. If there is an exhibit that you are particularly interested in seeing during your deliberations, write down the exhibit number. At the end of the trial, as you begin your deliberations, we will provide each of you with a list of all of the witnesses who testified during the trial, as well as a list of all exhibits that have been received in evidence.

We will now begin the trial. As I told you earlier, the trail is expected to be done by next Friday. Let me tell you again about the trial day. We will begin each day at 9:00 a.m. It is very important, it's critically important that you each be on time. To help ensure that we start on time, please be in the jury room by 8:45 a.m. at the latest so that we can begin without delay.

I will add that a light breakfast will be available in the jury room each morning at 8:30 a.m. You are not required to take us up on that hospitality. But in my experience many jurors do.

The key thing is nobody be late. If any of you are late, we will have to wait, for we cannot start unless all of you are here. And all of us, myself, the lawyers, the parties, the witnesses, and most importantly, your fellow jurors, will have to wait. And if we lose ten or 20 minutes every day, we may not be able to get the trial completed on time.

As to the rest of the trial day, we will take a lunch break at approximately 1:00 p.m., we'll take a short mid-morning comfort break and we'll take a midday comfort break in which refreshments will be served.

This is how the trial will proceed. First, after lunch we will have opening statements. An attorney for the plaintiff will make an opening statement, then an attorney for the defendants will do so. The opening statements are neither evidence nor argument. They are simply outlines of what the attorneys believe the evidence will show and they are given to help you follow the evidence as it is presented.

After the opening statements, the plaintiff will present her case. The plaintiff will call her witnesses and after each witness testifies on direct examination, counsel for the defendants will have an opportunity to cross-examine the witness. If that witness is also one of the witnesses that the defendants would have called on their counterclaim, the defendants may also examine on matters relevant to that case so that the witnesses do not have to testify twice for both plaintiff's claims and defendant's counterclaims. After the cross-examination, there may be a little bit of what we call redirect and recross examination.

Following the plaintiff's case, the plaintiff will rest, defendant Canal will then present its case, including its defense to plaintiff's case in its counterclaims. The defense

witnesses will testify and plaintiff will have an opportunity to cross-examine them.

Plaintiff and the counterclaim defendant will then have an opportunity to present any additional evidence relevant to defendant's counterclaim alone.

After the evidence is completed and all sides have rested, the attorneys will give their summations. This is the opportunity for the lawyers to summarize the evidence and to give their closing arguments. Following the summations I will give you instructions on the law. You will then finally retire to deliberate on your verdict.

You have a tremendously important task as jurors. It is to determine the facts. You, and not the Court, are the sole judges of the facts. The Constitution itself recognizes your unique role in our system of justice. So please pay careful attention to the witnesses and the evidence received at trial as well as my instructions on the law.

(Continued on next page)

NAU5rob3

THE COURT: We will now break for lunch. I'm going to ask each of you to be back here a couple minutes before 2:00, by 1:55 at the latest, so that we can start promptly at 2:00. Please don't discuss the case amongst yourselves or with anyone else during the break. Please don't do any investigation of the case during the break.

There is one final thing that I will mention. You will have noticed that when I came in this morning you were all asked to rise for me. You will no longer have to do that. In fact, there is a different custom that presides in this court house and court houses across the country and it is a sign of respect for you and your role in our system. Now when you enter, I will be on the bench, and when you enter, everybody will rise for you. Same thing holds true for when you retire, everybody will rise for you out of respect for you. So have a good lunch, be back here by 1:55 at the latest, and I now direct everybody to please rise.

(Continued on next page)

1 (Jury not present)
2 THE COURT: How lo

THE COURT: How long do we expect the direct examination of Mr. De Niro to go?

MR. MACURDY: I would expect it would go into tomorrow, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then in that event, I think there is no need for me now to address the objections that plaintiff had to defendant's exhibits. Do you agree with that?

MR. MACURDY: I agree.

THE COURT: I think what we will do is at the end of the trial day, 5:00 today, I will be prepared to address those issues and hear any argument with respect to those issues, as well as with respect to anything else that we can expect for tomorrow.

Is there anything else from plaintiff before we break for lunch?

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, a small thing. I was wondering, since it is eight jurors, is it possible to do them four and four or?

THE COURT: I will confer with my deputy but you should assume not. We will also move the podium so that you can address all of the jurors.

MR. MACURDY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from the defendant?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Not at this time.

	57	
	NAU5rob3	
1	THE COURT: Have a good lunch, everyone. Be here at	
2	10 of 2:00.	
3	MR. HANNAFAN: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.	
4	(Luncheon recess)	
5	(Continued on next page)	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	II	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:05 p.m.

THE COURT: We may still be waiting for one juror.

During the break, my courtroom deputy was informed by one of the jurors, juror no. 3, that she has some child care issues that she was worried about. I don't propose to do anything with respect to juror no. 3 right now but I am just bringing that to the parties' attention unless, in case there is an application. I do think that it highlights the need for the parties to be efficient in terms of their examinations. that end, I think one of the lawyers asked about Veterans Day and whether we will be sitting on Veterans Day. The answer is that we can't sit on Veterans Day. I don't know the answer to the question as to whether, if the jury has been charged and has started to deliberate whether they want to sit on Veterans Day, continue to deliberate, they can. I rather doubt it. When we calculated the hours for the parties we did not -- we factored in that Veterans Day was not going to be a court day, a day for testimony.

Let's see where we stand on the jurors.

Mr. Schoenstein, is your client prepared to take the stand right at 3:00 if that is when we finish the opening statements?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: He is, your Honor. He is right here.

NAU5rob3

1		THE COURT: OK. I am informed that the jurors are
2	prepared	to walk in so it shouldn't be much longer. (pause)
3		We have everybody. Let's bring in the jury.
4		(Continued on next page)
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
د ی		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Be seated.

Welcome back, members of the jury. We will now proceed to opening statements. Plaintiff will go first.

MR. HANNAFAN: Thank you, your Honor.

May it please the Court: This bitch needs to get put in her fucking place. Those are the words of Tiffany Chen, Robert De Niro's girlfriend. And the person Ms. Chen was referring to as "this bitch", who she wanted to put in her place, is Chase Robinson, the plaintiff in this case. When Ms. Chen made that statement in April of 2019, Chase Robinson had worked for Mr. De Niro's company, Canal Productions, for over a decade. Mr. De Niro was her boss. He had put Tiffany Chen in charge of managing and supervising Chase on a project of his since 2018. Within days of making this statement about how Ms. Chen wanted to put Chase in her place Ms. Chen, with Mr. De Niro's knowledge and approval, sent an e-mail to some of Chase's co-workers at Canal stripping her of some of her duties and removing her assistant. She told the employees at Canal that they were not to have any contact with Chase on any projects that either Ms. Chen or her boss Mr. De Niro were working on. Because of that, because of that action, the defendants -- Canal Productions and Mr. De Niro -- violated anti-discrimination and retaliation laws. Now, Ms. Chen's retaliation against Chase Robinson is the end of the story and

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

now I would like to go to the beginning of the story.

Chase Robinson was hired by Canal Productions in 2008 as the executive assistant to Mr. De Niro. Although her responsibilities and titles changed over the next decade, her job, at its core, never really did. Her job, at its core, was to do what Mr. De Niro wanted when he wanted her to do it. And Mr. De Niro is a very busy man and he wanted Chase to be available 24/7. And she was. She worked nights, she worked weekends, she worked holidays. Regardless of where she was, whether she was here in New York or she was traveling, Chase was to be available for Mr. De Niro 24/7. She had to be on-call all the time. And call her, he would. He would call her early in the morning. He would call her late at night. He would text or call or e-mail her throughout the day. If Chase said to him, I'm going to be unavailable for a few minutes, I'm going to go for a run, he would call her. if She would tell him I'm going to be unavailable tomorrow, I'm going to my grandmother's funeral, he would call her, twice. She said to him on the phone, I'm with my elderly mother and I have to take her to the emergency room, I'm going to be unavailable, he called her 10 minutes later as she is in a taxicab to the ER.

Chase's job at Canal involved handling production matters on Mr. De Niro's many films. Mr. De Niro also had her taking care of many personal matters for him and his many family members. For Mr. De Niro, there was no line between his

professional life and his personal life in terms of what he expected Chase to take care of. He came to rely upon her for some of the most intimate aspects of his personal life. She even helped him pick out a school for his young son. She worked with his divorce attorney on his latest divorce proceedings. She would make sure his prescriptions were being refilled and picked up. She would attend medical appointments with him.

When Mr. De Niro had an accident and had to go to the emergency room at the crack of dawn, who did he call to take him? Chase Robinson. When he got there and he needed to have his medical forms filled out, who did he have do it? Chase Robinson. Who did he tell her to put down as his emergency contact? Not his wife, not his adult children -- chase Robinson.

When a fire started in Mr. De Niro's home and the alarm goes off, who rushed over to try and put it out? Got a case of smoke inhalation and a trip to the emergency room herself? Chase Robinson.

Now, it may seem odd that an employer would have an employee take care of some of these most intimate aspects of their personal life but for Mr. De Niro, there wasn't any line between them. Unfortunately for Ms. Robinson, the longer she worked for Mr. De Niro the less of a line there was between her personal life and her professional life. Ultimately, her work

23

24

25

was her life and her life was her work. And the fact that her work had become her life and her life had become her work was incredibly frustrating to her. She didn't want to be taking care of all these personal matters for Mr. De Niro. She wanted to do, focus on the production work of Canal Productions. wanted to try and focus on a career. On several occasions she had enough, she went to Mr. De Niro and said I can't take it anymore, I want to resign. Each time she did that his response was the same. It was the carrot and the stick. He would say to her, You can't leave me. Please don't go. I need you. He would promise her to pay her more money or give her more perks or benefits at her job. He would promise her that she wouldn't have to do certain work. He would promise her that things would change. He would promise her that he would change. That was the carrot. He would also give her the stick. stick was if she left him, he wouldn't give her a recommendation. And the thought of Mr. De Niro not giving her a recommendation terrified her. Mr. De Niro is one of the most well-known, wealthy, and powerful individuals in the entertainment industry. In addition to his acting, he is the owner of many successful businesses. Chase was worried that if he wouldn't give her a recommendation, she would not be able to get another job.

So eventually, because she was afraid of not having that recommendation, afraid of not getting another job, she

would stay. Every time she agreed to stay she would think to herself, Well, things will change. Things will be different this time. And every time she was wrong. Not long thereafter, she would be back to taking care of all these personal matters she would be back to working insane hours. It was a vicious cycle that repeated over and over.

Now, working for Mr. De Niro was a roller coaster for Chase Robinson. He could be quite generous. He is a very wealthy man and he could be quite generous with his employees. But, he was a very demanding boss. If he didn't do what Chase wanted him to do when he wanted it and how he wanted it done, he would yell at her, he would berate her, he would make her life difficult. And on top of that, while she was working for him, he would make sexist remarks that he treated her less well because she was a woman.

As you will hear, Mr. De Niro repeatedly make sexist remarks about Chase and other women. He called his female business partner a cunt. He called Chase and other women a bitch. He called Chase a bitch to her face repeatedly. And he also had her taking care of tasks that he didn't ask his male employees to take care of. He asked her to help choose gifts for his children, wash his sheets, pick out items for his home, vacuum his home, setting the table for a dinner party.

Something else he had her do was to ask her to scratch his back. To literally scratch his back. And when Chase

objected, when she said, rather than me doing this why don't you use that back scratcher you got from a friend, he looked at her and he said, I like the way you do it. That's what the male employer said to his female employee about scratching his back: I like the way you do it.

When Chase went to Mr. De Niro to seek a raise and ask to be paid as well as one of his male employees, he trotted out the old line of how that man was a breadwinner, he had a family to support. Chase heard that. She was furious. It was insulting to her, it was demeaning to her, Mr. De Niro knew very well that she was a single woman with no children.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will hear other evidence about how Mr. De Niro and Canal discriminated against Chase based upon her gender and that is why she has sued Mr. De Niro and Canal for gender discrimination. The other claim that Chase Robinson has made in this case is one of retaliation based upon her gender and that brings us back to Tiffany Chen.

In 2018, when Mr. De Niro introduced Ms. Chen to Chase as his girlfriend, Chase had been working for him for over a decade. Mr. De Niro told Chase that he and Ms. Chen were going to be moving into a luxury townhouse here in Manhattan and he told Chase that she had to do what Ms. Chen wanted; Ms. Chen was going to manage and supervise her on this townhouse project. Chase, whose title at the time was vice president of production and finance at Canal, objected. She didn't want to

be working on this townhouse project and she certainly didn't want to be working for the defendant's girlfriend, but as always, she did what Mr. De Niro wanted her to do.

Now, Ms. Chen, who at the time was the other woman to Mr. De Niro's wife, looked at Chase Robinson, an even younger woman, and did not like what she saw. She did not like how involved Chase was with Mr. De Niro's life. She did not like how much Mr. De Niro relied upon Chase, particularly when he relied upon her instead of Tiffany Chen. Although Ms. Chen played nice with Chase for a little while, it wasn't long before she began trying to make things difficult. She made wild allegations about Chase. Ms. Chen said that Chase wanted to marry Mr. De Niro, that Chase wanted to move into the house with him, that Chase had imaginary intimacy that she wanted to be the lady of the house. Ladies and gentlemen, none of that was true. Chase Robinson never had any romantic interest in Mr. De Niro. Zero. None. He was her boss and that is all.

Now, she cared for Mr. De Niro as her boss? Of course. Did she want what was best for him as her boss? Of course. But there was never anything romantic between the two of them. She didn't want to be his girlfriend, she didn't want to move in with him, she didn't want to have children with him. It was never anything like that. But Ms. Chen did not see it that way. Ms. Chen was jealous of Chase and her relationship with Mr. De Niro. She wanted Chase out of Mr. De Niro's life,

she wanted to do so by making Chase miserable.

After a few months of working on the townhouse, Chase went to Mr. De Niro in 2018 and said I can't take this anymore, I want to resign. His reaction was the same as always, the carrot and the stick. He threatened her that if she left, he wouldn't give her a recommendation and, again, she was afraid that without a recommendation of her boss of 10 years, how would she be able to get another job. He also eventually made promises to her; he would give her a raise, she wouldn't have to work for Ms. Chen, she wouldn't have to work on the townhouse project anymore. Once again, reluctantly, she agreed to stay. She thought things would change but they didn't.

Very quickly, Ms. Chen was once again ordering her around.

By late March of 2019 Chase was a mess. She wasn't eating, she wasn't sleeping, she was a nervous wreck. She didn't know what to do. She thought no matter what she did she couldn't make Ms. Chen happy and she thought that Ms. Chen was out to get her, targeting her, because she was a woman. And Chase was right. At the end of March after a series of e-mails with Ms. Chen about this townhouse, Chase forwarded an e-mail to Mr. De Niro and asked if they could talk. This is that e-mail: Chase says: It has been pretty obvious for a while that there is an issue with me working for you and I have tried really hard, without bothering you, to get out of the middle and out of your home and get back to my job. It's not working.

23

24

25

Rather than respond to Chase, Mr. De Niro forwarded her e-mail 1 to Tiffany Chen and, as you will hear, Ms. Chen was furious 2 3 when she read that e-mail. After getting no response from 4 Mr. De Niro to that e-mail, Chase emailed him a couple days 5 later on April 2nd. Now, as background for this e-mail, Chase understood that Mr. De Niro had fired a prior female assistant 6 7 of his, a woman named Robin, years before, because his prior wife -- his wife still at the time but his wife Grace, was 8 9 jealous of Robin. Chase saw the writing on the wall and she 10 thought to herself, well, Mr. De Niro fired Robin because Grace 11 was jealous. Mr. De Niro is going to fire me because Tiffany is jealous. So she wrote in this e-mail, she said: 12 13 worried that my presence in the house, amongst other things, is 14 not working for Tiffany and, therefore, you. And I've felt 15 this way since September/November. It's been very difficult. Part of me worrying is thinking about what happened to Robin 16 with Grace, and I don't want it to get to that point. I want 17 18 to be able to finish what we agreed upon and fulfill my 19 commitment to you and the job. Mr. De Niro forwarded that 20 e-mail on, once again, to Ms. Chen. Ms. Chen did not take it 21 well.

A few days later, after Tiffany Chen made that statement with Mr. De Niro's approval and knowledge, Ms. Chen did put Chase in her place. Ms. Chen sent an e-mail to several of Chase's co-workers at Canal telling them that Chase was no

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

longer working on the townhouse project. She also told them that they were no longer to communicate with Chase about any project with either Ms. Chen or Mr. De Niro. She told Chase's assistant, I would like to remind you that we all work for Bob and you are no longer Chase's assistant. On top of that, Ms. Chen asked Canal employees to begin looking into Chase's spending.

Now as you hear, Canal is a small company and word travels fast. Chase soon found out what Ms. Chen had done and she was devastated. She didn't want to be on that townhouse project. She didn't want to work for Ms. Chen, that's for sure. But what Ms. Chen had done had gone far beyond that, telling her co-workers they weren't to talk to her about any projects with her boss Mr. De Niro. Without that, Chase didn't feel she could do her job. She felt she had no choice but to resign and resign immediately, and she did so. Unfortunately for Chase, her fears about Mr. De Niro's threats about not giving her a recommendation came true. He did not give her a recommendation he knew she desperately craved. He did not give her a recommendation that she had certainly earned. When he wouldn't respond to her and she told him that she might seek outside counsel to protect herself, he became enraged. Employees at Canal were told to dig up whatever dirt they could find on Chase and the dirt that they tried to dig up is the basis for Canal's claims against Chase.

21

22

23

24

25

As Judge Liman has explained earlier today, Canal is not only a defendant to Chase's claims of gender discrimination and retaliation, Canal has brought claims against Chase. Judge Liman will give you the instructions on exactly what those claims mean under the law, but essentially what they have accused Chase of doing is stealing from Canal and not being a loyal employee.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, just as we, here representing Ms. Robinson, representing Chase, have the burden to prove our claims, so, too, does Canal have the burden to prove their claims. Ladies and gentlemen, based upon the evidence, Canal will not be able to prove their claims. As for their claim that Chase stole from Canal, the evidence will be that she did not steal from Canal in any way, shape, or form. Over the decade that they worked together, Chase and Mr. De Niro had many conversations, many agreements about what her job was and what she could spend money on while working for him. And because he relied on her so much, because she was there for him 24/7, because he trusted her so much and she worked for him so long, he gave her benefits and perks over the years and you will hear about those. One of those perks was that Chase was allowed to use frequent flier miles that built up from Canal's American Express spending. She was allowed to do that for her personal travel and she had done that for years before she was resigned.

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will be that Chase Robinson would not have and did not spend a dime of Canal's money that she hadn't been authorized to spend. The evidence will be that she did not transfer a single frequent flyer mile that she hadn't been authorized to spend by her boss.

Just as Mr. De Niro came to trust Chase Robinson over the years that she worked for him and with good reason, she trusted him. She trusted him that he would keep his word on the agreements they made, that he would keep his word about the promises he made to her as to how she could spend the money when she was working for him. Now that she isn't working for him, now that she isn't on call 24/7, Mr. De Niro wants to claim those agreements didn't exist, or he wants to claim he just doesn't remember ever making them.

As for Canal's claim that Chase Robinson is a disloyal employee, we will ask you at the close of this case whether a disloyal employee would run into her boss' townhouse when there is a fire. We will ask you whether a disloyal employee would meet her boss at the crack of dawn to take him to the ER and whether a disloyal employee would agree to give her own personal contact information as his emergency contact.

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence will be that there was no one -- there was no one -- more loyal to Canal and Robert De Niro than Chase Robinson.

As for Chase's claims, the evidence will establish

that Mr. De Niro and Canal discriminated against her and retaliated against her, at least in part, based upon the fact that she is a woman. The evidence will be that Chase, as a result of the defendant's actions, has suffered greatly. She has suffered severe emotional distress. She has suffered severe reputational harm. She will testify — she will sit in that chair and you will get to see just how damaged she is. You will hear how she has been afraid to leave her home, how she has not been able to get a job for the past four years, how she has had to get on medication because she has crippling anxiety. Because of what the defendants did, because of their actions, we will ask you to award Chase Robinson significant damages.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am almost done. During this trial you will get to hear Mr. De Niro testify. You will get to hear Chase Robinson testify. You will be the judges of their credibility. You will get to decide who has a better recollection. You will get to decide who has a better memory about what happened and about the agreements that they made. You will get to decide what the truth is.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the close of this case, after you have seen and heard all of the evidence during trial and based upon Judge Liman's instructions on the law, we will ask you -- excuse me -- we will return and we will ask you to return a verdict that puts Mr. De Niro and puts Canal in their

_

place. We will ask you to return a verdict that does justice for Chase Robinson. We will ask you to return a verdict in her favor on all counts.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

MR. HANNAFAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: We will now hear from defendants' counsel.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: I never get to answer the questionnaire they give you all jurors in the morning but you know what kind of movies I like -- if you're interested -- I like a movie that seems like one thing at the beginning but turns out to be something completely different than what you thought; plot twists, surprises. Sometimes when a movie starts it is not even clear who is the hero and who is the villain. This trial is going to be a little bit like a movie, although it is terribly long and I apologize there is no popcorn, but if you forgive me a couple of spoilers, the story that is going to unfold is much different from the one you just heard from plaintiff's counsel.

This is not a story about a helpless woman subjected to discrimination by her employer. This is about a breach of trust. This is about a person who was treated very well by her employer but always felt she deserved more. It is about an employee who created conflict and drama in the workplace only to complain that she was the victim. Plaintiff treated others

badly, dreamed up enemies, did not respect appropriate boundaries, and took advantage of her position. And you will learn whenever she was called on it she always had an excuse. She always had someone to blame. And I will tell you right off that we should all be as lucky to work for Robert De Niro. Kind, reasonable, generous, supportive. His requirements for employees are simple: Do the right thing. If you made a mistake, admit it and we will move on. It's the honor system. You do right and I will do right by you. Plaintiff breached that trust.

The evidence will show that everything that happened to Ms. Robinson happened because of the way she conducted herself, not because she's a woman. The evidence will show that Chase Robinson is not the hero of this story. What counsel just said to you and what I'm saying now are not evidence, it's only the introduction. These are the opening credits, so to speak. And just as typically you don't know how a movie is going to turn out right at the beginning, my fundamental request is that you hold off reaching conclusions now. We want you to hear all of the witnesses who will testify including, of course, Ms. Robinson and Mr. De Niro, but also many others who will be here, especially the people who worked with them both. We want you to see all the evidence, not just a few texts that we pick to show you, but all of them. And when you see an e-mail you have to see the beginning of the

e-mail stream and the end, not just the middle part.

Now, that being said, my job is to tell you from our table's point of view what this case is about and what is going to unfold so let's start with the parties.

To tell you that Robert De Niro is accomplished would be a great understatement. He is a prolific and beloved actor who has been on movie screens for 60 years. He has two Academy Awards, he has countless other honors but, if you asked him, more important than all of that are his seven children and his grandchildren. He is super talented, very hard-working. He grew up in Greenwich village not very far from this court house. He developed an interest in acting. He studied and worked, got film roles, and eventually became one of the biggest movie stars, really, in the history of cinema.

Bob -- he goes by Bob, by the way -- Bob took his acting income and got involved in business. He founded the Tribeca Film Center in 1989 he opened a restaurant you may have heard of called the Tribeca Grill. He converted an old building into condo units for film makers. And in 1994, he opened Nobu. You may have heard of that too, that's another restaurant and is now 55 restaurants and 36 Hotels worldwide.

After 9/11, Bob doubled down on New York. He founded the Tribeca Film Festival, opened the Greenwich Hotel, and built out offices in Tribeca. He acts, he produces, he directs, he has other business ventures. He works very hard to

oversee all of that. Bob has earned everything he has achieved. Why do I tell you all of that? Not to embellish him, but because you will learn that Bob is also a great guy and a good boss. With the exception of plaintiff, every other witness who testifies at this trial will tell you he is down to earth and a pleasure to work with.

The other defendant in this case is called Canal Productions. You will hear that that company is Bob's hub or what they call in entertainment a "loan out company". That's where he gets paid his acting income. I know it is called Canal Productions but Canal does not produce anything. It doesn't make movies or television, it doesn't run restaurants or hotels. There are other companies that do all of that.

Canal Productions also doesn't finance anything, it's just the corporation through which Bob coordinates his professional and his personal life. Canal is Bob, Bob is Canal. And you will find out at trial that being Robert De Niro is very hard work and requires a lot of support. That's why Canal, the company, has employees — to make sure, Bob is where he needs to be when he needs to be there, to help take care of Bob and his family, to handle Bob's every need.

Ms. Robinson was an employee of Canal from 2008 until she resigned in 2019. She was Bob's lead assistant. And for most of the time she was a happy employee. She loved her job and adored Bob. That's what she wrote in some of the e-mails

counsel didn't show you. And Bob trusted and valued her. That trust was so important to him. So, how do we all end up in federal court in downtown Manhattan with a lawsuit?

Plaintiff's lawyer has told you her version but the truth is much different and this story begins with a flashback.

When Ms. Robinson was hired in early 2008 she was 25 years old. She had a liberal arts degree and almost no work experience. She got the job and her job was to service the professional and personal needs of Bob, to be his assistant. That remained her job until the day she left Canal. The evidence will show the job of plaintiff, and every other employee at Canal, is to do whatever Bob needs. And taking care of Bob requires getting him where he needs to be when he needs to be there, getting him what he needs when he needs it. His schedule has to be organized, he has to be kept on schedule every day. He requires help organizing his professional life and his personal life and it is interconnected.

Bob's office does all sorts of things. It assists with medical appointments and prescriptions, it runs his errands, it does his gift shopping, it helps with his family, and it serves as the backbone of the very hard job of being Robert De Niro. Now, if that sounds unglamorous, I can assure you, it often is. It is nice to work for a movie star but it can be a little mundane. I think someone said this morning there are positives and negatives about being an assistant.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And that's true here too. And almost every worker I have ever 1 2 met in any line of work wants two things: More money and a 3 better title. Plaintiff was no different. And she also 4 eventually wanted to get into the entertainment business 5 herself. There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing 6 wrong with wanting to advance and further your career, that's 7 the American way. But, at the same time, make no mistake about it, plaintiff had a great job at Canal. Wait until you hear 8 9 what she was paid and what the perks were. In addition, she was permitted to work remotely from her home years before the 10 11 COVID pandemic made that more common. In fact, she was allowed to work while she lived in Los Angeles, while she lived in 12 13 Spain, while she lived in London. She was permitted to work 14 all over the world.

Jump forward to 2017, she's been there now for nine years, and she talked about leaving Canal but she decided to stay and she pushed for a new title: Vice president of production and finance. And just to be really clear about this, that was not a job that existed at Canal. That was not a title somebody else had. That was a title plaintiff made up. Again, Canal does not produce or finance anything but she wanted the title. The job, at its core, did not change. You heard opposing counsel confirm that this morning. The title changed, the job did not.

As you listen to the witnesses in this case, most of

whom worked or still work at Canal, you will hear confirmed again and again that Bob is a great guy, he is kind and generous, he is supportive, he is very easy to get along with, and reasonable. His basic requirements are do the right thing, be honest. And you will learn that the single most difficult person to work with at Canal was plaintiff. Her fellow employees are going to tell you the truth. She was condescending, demeaning, controlling, abusive. I could go on but it would be better to hear from them directly when they take the stand. They will all come in here to testify.

You will also learn that Ms. Robinson manufactured grievances with a variety of people in and around Canal, male and female, over the years. She always played the victim. If anybody made Canal a challenging workplace, it was the plaintiff herself. And in that regard, you will learn that it has been significantly better since the day she left.

In 2018, as counsel said, Bob separated from his wife. He had a new relationship, and in the fall there was a lot going on because he was moving into a newly rented townhouse on the upper east side, a big one, that could accommodate his kids and grandkids. A big townhouse, upper east side, it needed work. It needed furniture. It needed a lot. They were building a home from scratch. And like everything in Bob's life, he engaged the employees of Canal to assist. Everyone, from his lawyer and his accountant to the lowest level

employees at Canal, had to do stuff with respect to the townhouse. That's the way it is at Canal.

Now, Ms. Robinson took on responsibility for the townhouse project. She might tell you she did it because she felt badly for Bob. She might even tell you that she did it reluctantly, but her co-workers are going to testify and they're going to tell you she relished the opportunity to be in charge of the project. She threw herself in it asserting herself as head of operation, shopping up a storm, and requiring that she got to approve every detail. Do you know why she had to run into the house when the fire alarm went off? She hadn't given anybody else the codes. She was controlling them and kept them for herself, that's why she had to go in the house.

She seized the opportunity to be in charge. And at the same time, you will see from the evidence that she was talking again about moving on from Canal. She used that and the fact that Bob needed her help at the time to negotiate. She told Bob she had another opportunity in London and was thinking of leaving Canal. You are going to hear, by the way, there was no opportunity in London but that's what she told Bob.

Ms. Robinson said she could stick around if only they could come up with some money, a lot of money. And in a series of discussions culminating in January 2019, Ms. Robinson and

Bob worked out an arrangement, a pretty sweet arrangement for her. She would stay at Canal and transition out of her role over the next two years and he would increase her salary to \$300,000 a year. You did not hear counsel tell you that she was being paid \$300,000 a year. Bob thought the matter had been resolved. In fact, when we pull back the curtains and we see the evidence, it reveals that Ms. Robinson took the money but never intended to stay at Canal. She kept working on her resume, she was working on a film treatment, she was telling people she was in exiting mode — another e-mail that her lawyers didn't show you. She was telling others she was planning to leave but just waiting for the right time.

Back to the townhouse. By early 2019, work on the townhouse was largely done and by March the end was well in sight. It was almost over on the townhouse. Now, let me talk about Tiffany Chen. Plaintiff's counsel showed you a picture. You don't have to go by a picture, she will be here in person and you will meet her. And the staunch defenders of women's rights on the front table left out a few things about Tiffany Chen. She was a New York State golden glove boxer, she was a martial arts world champion, she helped run a very prominent family business for years all before meeting Bob. She is smart and dedicated and, yeah, sometimes she is a little opinionated.

So Tiffany was moving in with Bob and moving into the townhouse. And in her role as Bob's lead assistant, one would

think that Ms. Robinson would have made it her job to warmly greet her and help her out. That was part of her job. But instead you will hear plaintiff immediately treated Tiffany with suspicion and disdain, acted rudely, and perpetrated a series of micro aggressions, for lack of a better term. And, insulted Tiffany behind her back.

Now, without even hearing that trash talking, Tiffany was offput. She felt the plaintiff wasn't acting appropriately and was not respecting appropriate boundaries. Too pushy, too controlling in the home that Tiffany was moving into. Tiffany tried to deal with Ms. Robinson as best she could. She tried being nice. She asked Ms. Robinson to clarify what her role was, or what she did and didn't want to work on. None of it worked. Plaintiff is going to tell you a different story, not surprising. Again, she always plays the victim.

Plaintiff's counsel showed you some snippets of texts and e-mails with Tiffany's name on it and they're going to keep coming back to those in this case. They're going to keep saying a couple of texts must tell you the whole story. But, you know, those texts and e-mails, first of all, they're not even all of the e-mails which you are going to have to see and they start very late in this story, they start in March 27 of 2019. There was so much that happened before that that you are going to have to hear about to know what happened. You need the full story and I'm going to say, flat out, at no point was

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Tiffany Chen worried that plaintiff was trying to steal her boyfriend. She just didn't like the way Ms. Robinson conducted herself. Tiffany Chen did not want Ms. Robinson out of Bob's life, she just wanted her out of the house that she lived in, which was her right.

So, it all blows up a little bit in this late March 2019 weekend. You are going to hear about it in probably more detail than you want. Tiffany was trying to get some painting done in the house on the walls. Bob was off skiing with his youngest daughter out of town. So, Tiffany reached out to Ms. Robinson with a simple question: Can you help get me in touch with the painters? Because I want to remove some artwork before they paint. Ms. Robinson refused to help. She wasn't being asked to paint or to come in and do anything, she was just being asked for some phone numbers. But she refused to help and she complained to Bob. Again, you saw a teeny part of that chain, we are going to make sure you see all of it. So, Ms. Chen was offended by that and being upset led to some of the texts that you saw and some bad language, for sure, but you are also going to see and hear in this case that there was bad language on both sides. For her part, you will see evidence that plaintiff, Ms. Robinson, called Tiffany a bitch, a whore, and a psychopath. That's somehow she spoke of her boss' girlfriend. At the time it seemed like the eminently logical thing to do was to remove Ms. Robinson from the townhouse

project. I think counsel just said that's what she wanted, she didn't want to be on the townhouse project. Thus, a decision was made to take plaintiff off of it and to do it decisively, to do it clearly, to tell employees you are not dealing with Ms. Robinson on the townhouse project anymore, she officially will have nothing to do with the townhouse. Nobody was firing or demoting Ms. Robinson, the plan was to keep her working on all of the other job duties that she said she had and loved. She was just being taken off the townhouse, which is what people thought she wanted, but it seems now that either plaintiff didn't really want it or changed her mind, or saw yet another opportunity to negotiate. I told you she was planning to leave Canal for several months at this point but she was doing some other stuff that only came to light after she left.

Defendants did not know then but now know that

Ms. Robinson was secretly accessing and reading some of Bob's

private communications with his girlfriend. We now know that

plaintiff was secretly recording phone calls with some of her

Canal colleagues. There are something like a hundred recorded

phone calls that she made in a three-month period. We now know

that Ms. Robinson secretly accessed e-mails that were sent to

and from Canal people where she wasn't copied on them. They

say word travels fast. Well, word travels really fast when you

are spying.

While plaintiff was doing that, Tiffany Chen was

7 8

9 10

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

getting organized with a new team to go forward with the townhouse without Ms. Robinson. And she started to look at the spending that had been done. Tiffany will take the stand and she will tell you something didn't smell right. She was becoming concerned that plaintiff, and some others -- including both men and women, by the way -- were taking advantage of Bob. There was a plan to have a serious meeting to sit down with Ms. Robinson to address those issues. But, before they could do that, she quit. As I said, despite her agreement to stay for two years, Ms. Robinson was planning to leave when the time was right.

You will see, plainly set forth in the documents, and apparently the right time came and the timing itself is a little suspicious, but on April 6, 2019, plaintiff quit her job. She sent an e-mail to Bob resigning, effective immediately, no notice, after 11 years. And after Ms. Robinson resigned there was, frankly, relief and celebration by her co-workers. You will see the texts. They were happy plaintiff was leaving. They had not enjoyed working with her and were glad she was gone. And you will also hear that Canal worked to gather information regarding the concerns that had been raised. It started to become clear that plaintiff had taken advantage of her position at Canal and had not acted appropriately. evidence will show the following:

Plaintiff had charged an extraordinary amount of

personal expenses, like Ubers and taxis, food and groceries and personal items, to the company. In the few months preceding her resignation, during the period where she had committed to stay but was -- and in between then and her April resignation she transferred -- get this -- 5 million Delta SkyMiles from Canal's account to her own account. Now, at times during her employment she had been allowed to use the company's miles to book a flight but there was never any agreement that she could sweep 5 million valuable miles out of Canal's account into hers while she was planning to leave. And there was certainly no agreement that she could keep them after she left.

There were improprieties regarding plaintiff paying herself for unused vacation days. She claimed, year after year after year, she hadn't taken a single vacation day and she had to be paid for all of them. She had taken a trip to

Los Angeles in 2018 for personal reasons but on the company dime and under false pretenses. All of this was adding up to a serious breach of trust. Again, Bob has a plain and reasonable code about stuff like this: Mistakes are fine and understood, but you have to do the right thing and you have to tell the truth. And plaintiff did neither.

About two months after she left Canal, Ms. Robinson sent an e-mail to Bob. Plaintiff referred to that e-mail, they said she let Bob know she was thinking about hiring a lawyer. But this is what else she said in that e-mail. She demanded

1 t 2 t 3 E 4 F 5 k 6 5 7 C 8

that he pay her two years of severance and healthcare even though she had resigned. She wanted an in-person meeting with Bob, she wanted multiple signed recommendations, she wanted a press release, she wanted legal fees paid. And here is the kicker — not one word about discrimination or retaliation. Just her trying to negotiate money. Those demands were outrageous, particularly in the context of everything that had come out about plaintiff's actions while she was employed. Breaching trust, taking advantage, and making demands is a bad combination.

Canal's lawyer, Tom Harvey, wrote to plaintiff in response to her e-mails raising the issues relating to her conduct and to insist she return any company property in her possession. Plaintiff did not return the company property in her possession. Instead, she suddenly said for the first time:

I have discrimination claims. Now she claimed, months after leaving, that she had been discriminated against because of her gender and retaliated against by having job duties taken away from her. And it will be clear from the evidence that those arguments came about only after her misconduct had been identified. Look out for the timing. Always in this case, look out for the timing.

All of a sudden, plaintiff was full of complaints about the job she loved and the boss she adored, little things all out of context. She says her job at 11 years was

demeaning. She says Bob was too demanding, or he urinated too loudly, or that she hadn't been paid as much as a personal trainer who, by the way, had been working with Bob for 40 years. She makes ludicrous assertions that the things were taken away from her because Tiffany Chen thought she was having a romantic relationship with Bob. Nobody thought she was having a romantic relationship with Bob, certainly not Tiffany Chen.

Plaintiff says a lot of things, more opportunities to explore, more people to play. Nobody discriminated against Ms. Robinson for any reason, certainly not because she is female. What happened to plaintiff at the end of her employment had nothing to do with her gender, it had everything to do with her conduct.

Claims went back and forth and eventually we ended up here with you all, and over the next two weeks you will hear about all of this in great detail. You will see testimony from Ms. Robinson and Mr. De Niro but also from Ms. Chen, Mr. Harvey, and the Canal employees and representatives who worked with plaintiff. And you are also going to see a lot of documents and hear some audio recordings probably, as well. And let me tell you how it is going to play out. Plaintiff gets to go first, that's the way it is in a case like this. They get to call whatever witnesses they want in whatever order they want. So Ms. Robinson can step right up there on the

stand and tell you her story and look you right in the eye or they can do something differently and try the case a different way. But whoever they call, we get to examine the witnesses after they do. We can also wait and examine them later under certain circumstances. We might do that. But, when plaintiff is done presenting its case, we will present ours. My point here about all of that is that this movie is not necessarily sequential. Right, it is like one of those art films that goes back and forth from different perspectives and you have to put it together at the end. (Continued on next page)

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: But since you're here until the end, I'm going to ask you to watch it all. Defendants want you to see every witness, hear every question, see every document before you render your decision.

We think the evidence will show the following: One, there was no discrimination against plaintiff, she was treated very well, salary increases, title changes, lots of perks. Did she love every day at work? Of course not. Some days are better than others. But none of the things that happened occurred to her because she's a woman.

Two, there was no retaliation against plaintiff. She was removed from the townhouse before she made any claims about discrimination and because of what was going on. And she supposedly wanted out of the townhouse, so it wasn't retaliation in any event.

Three, plaintiff abused her privileges at Canal. She had no business transferring 5 million SkyMiles to her own account. And she took advantage of the ability to charge expenses. And you'll see from the totality of the conduct that plaintiff did not do the right thing.

THE COURT: Mr. Schoenstein, your time is up.

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

Thank you, all, very much for being here and for listening to me this morning. I'll get to talk to you one more time at the end of the case.

NAU6ROB4A

25

1 THE COURT: We're done with the opening statements. 2 Plaintiff will call their first witness. I'm going to take a 3 very brief stretch break, and I commend that to you also, and we'll take our midafternoon break at 3:30. 4 Plaintiff can call their witness. 5 6 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, may we approach just 7 previously before that? THE COURT: No. 8 9 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, the plaintiff calls Robert 10 De Niro. 11 THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, you may step up. Step into 12 the witness box, and remain standing. My deputy will 13 administer the oath. 14 ROBERT ANTHONY DE NIRO, 15 called as a witness by the Plaintiff, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 16 17 DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your full name for the record and please spell out your first and last name. 18 THE WITNESS: Robert Anthony De Niro. R-O-B-E-R-T. 19 20 Capital D, small E, small space, capital N, small I-R-O. 21 THE COURT: Counsel, you may proceed. 22 Mr. De Niro, I ask you to keep your voice up, speak 23 into the microphone, speak loudly, and clearly. 24 Go ahead, Counsel.

MR. MACURDY: Thank you, your Honor.

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

1 | DIRECT EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 3 Q. Good afternoon, sir.
- 4 | Sir, who owns Canal Productions?
- $5 \parallel A$. Oh, I own it.
- 6 | O. Who runs Canal?
- 7 A. Technically I run it.
- 8 Q. You run Canal Productions, correct?
- 9 A. Well, I run, yeah -- I mean, I have people run it for me,
- 10 | but I own it, if you will.
- 11 | Q. You run Canal Productions, correct?
- 12 | A. Yeah.
- 13 Q. You're the boss at Canal?
- 14 A. The what? Sorry.
- 15 | Q. You're the boss at Canal?
- 16 A. All right. Yeah. All right.
- 17 | Q. Correct?
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 Q. And it's a loan-out company, as the attorney said, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. It loans out --
- 22 | THE COURT: Hold on for a second. Let me ask you not
- 23 | to speak over each other. Counsel, wait until the witness'
- 24 answer is done. Witness should wait until counsel's question
- 25 | is done. Go ahead.

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

- 1 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 2 | Q. It loans out the services of Robert De Niro, correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. One reason to have a company like that is because you can
- 5 have tax benefits of claiming business expenses, correct?
- 6 A. Well, that's part of it, yes, I guess it is. Yeah.
- 7 Q. Canal has a lawyer that serves as its general counsel,
- 8 | right?
- 9 A. Mm-hmm, yes.
- 10 | Q. His name is Tom Harvey?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 Q. He's sitting here today, right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. It has an accounting firm that reviews and pays its bills,
- 15 | correct?
- 16 | A. Right.
- 17 | Q. It's called Berdon; that's the accounting firm?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Michael Tasch is the main accountant?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. You were the final decision-maker when it came to policies
- 22 | at Canal; is that correct?
- 23 | A. Yes, ultimately.
- Q. You were the final decision-maker, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. Now, you hired Ms. Robinson as an executive assistant,
- 2 | right?
- 3 A. Mm-hmm, yes.
- 4 Q. 2008?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- Q. She gained responsibility over time to become your lead
- 7 | assistant?
- 8 A. I forget. I mean, she was my assistant, my main person,
- 9 | from the time that I hired her.
- 10 | Q. So going all the way back, she was your lead assistant; is
- 11 | that your testimony?
- 12 A. More or less. I mean, she might need help from other
- people to find out what to do exactly, this and that, you know.
- 14 Q. So she gained responsibility over time, correct?
- 15 | A. Yeah.
- 16 Q. At the time that Ms. Robinson departed from Canal, she was
- 17 | the Vice President of Production and Finance, correct?
- 18 A. Yeah, that was a title I gave her because she wanted it.
- 19 | You told her it really doesn't matter, but I'll give you the
- 20 | title if you want.
- 21 | Q. Well, she didn't force you to give her the title, correct?
- 22 A. She wanted me to give her the title. She was very -- put a
- 23 | lot of pressure on me to put the title, give her the title.
- 24 | Q. She worked for you, correct, sir?
- 25 | A. Mm-hmm.

- THE COURT: Hold on for a second. Mr. De Niro, you have to answer yes.
- THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, yes.
- 4 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 5 Q. You were the decision-maker at Canal?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. You gave her that title, correct?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Throughout her tenure, ten or 11-year tenure at Canal,
- 10 Ms. Robinson was your point person at Canal?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. She had been your point person for many years, correct?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. She did anything and everything that you asked?
- 15 A. Well, not anything and everything. Anything within the
- 16 norms of a job like she had.
- 17 Q. Did you give a deposition in this case, sir?
- 18 A. Excuse me?
- 19 Q. You gave a deposition in this case?
- 20 | A. Yes, I did.
- 21 | Q. You were asked questions --
- 22 THE COURT: Hold on a second. Do I have a copy of the
- 23 deposition?
- MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor, I can bring it up.
- 25 (Pause)

- NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct 1 THE COURT: You may approach. 2 MR. MACURDY: Thank you, your Honor. This is all of 3 them. 4 THE COURT: That's good to hear. Don't worry, members 5 of the jury, it's not going to all be read to you. 6 Go ahead, Counsel. 7 BY MR. MACURDY: 8 Q. Sir, you gave a deposition. You were asked questions by an 9 attorney for Ms. Robinson, right? 10 Α. Yes. 11 You had an attorney present? 12 Α. Yes. 13 And you swore to tell the truth in that deposition? Ο. 14 Α. Yes. And it was video recorded and transcribed, correct? 15 Q. 16 A. Yes, it was. 17 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I'd like to read from deposition day one of Mr. De Niro, April 4, 2022, Page 98, 18 Lines 5 through 19. 19 20 THE COURT: Hold on for a second. 21 Any objection?
- MR. DROGIN: No.
- 23 THE COURT: Go ahead.
- "Q. So besides getting presents and going to stores, what else would she do?

- 1 "A. Well, you know, whatever, whatever. She helped me with the
- 2 house. She pulled in a friend of hers. I said fine, the
- 3 | interior designer. We would go to the Design Center or here
- 4 and there, look for furniture, order furniture to certain
- 5 | specifications. She helped me with this, a piece of furniture.
- 6 Be there waiting when it would come in, or somebody. She'd
- 7 | have Michael there waiting for when it would come in. You
- 8 know, it was anything, anything and everything."
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. So was anything and --
- 11 THE COURT: Your question is, did he give that
- 12 | testimony?
- 13 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 14 | Q. Did you give that testimony, sir?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. So it was anything and everything related to your
- 17 professional life?
- 18 | A. No, it was -- yeah, it was related to my professional life,
- 19 of course it was. When I said anything and everything, it's
- 20 anything and everything related to, in this case, the townhouse
- 21 | or any other duties that she had as my personal assistant.
- 22 | Q. Right, sir. So anything and everything you asked her to do
- 23 | related to your professional --
- 24 A. I don't know what you're trying to say. Are you trying to
- 25 | say I asked her anything and everything, or are you asking me a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

commonsense question? I asked her to do anything within reason and within the confines of her job.

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. De Niro. Let him finish the question.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Then we can know what he's asking.

Go ahead.

BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. My question, sir, is anything and everything that you asked Ms. Robinson to do, related to your professional life, she had to do, correct?
- A. Again, I have to say what do you mean by anything and everything? Anything and everything within the confines of her job. Yes.
- Q. Those were your words at the deposition, correct, sir?
 - A. They are my words but those words mean something specifically. They don't mean anything and everything. I'm careful about what I ask her to do because she works for me and has to do certain things but not everything.
- Q. She also had to do anything and everything related to your personal life, correct?
- A. No, that makes it sound like it's something that it's not.

 I don't like that implication. She -- anything and everything within the confines of her job working for me as my assistant.
 - Q. So she worked her way up over time to supervise other

NAU6ROB4A

De Niro - Direct

- 1 | assistants at Canal, correct?
- 2 A. Say that again, sorry.
- 3 Q. She worked her way up over time to supervise the other
- 4 assistants at Canal, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. She was your enforcer with those other assistants, correct?
- 7 A. I don't like to use that word, "enforcer." She's not an
- 8 enforcer. And if she ever enforced with people, I wouldn't
- 9 approve of that. I wouldn't like it.
- 10 | Q. Any assignment you had for anybody to do at Canal, one of
- 11 | the assistants, would go through Ms. Robinson, correct?
- 12 A. More or less unless she wasn't there and I had to have
- 13 somebody else do it. That was a job, a privilege that she had
- 14 | to do that, and I trusted her to do that. That meant doing it
- 15 | properly, not doing anything that's wrong, not bullying,
- 16 | nothing improper. That's the number one rule.
- 17 THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, can you try to limit yourself
- 18 | to the question that's being asked. You'll have the
- 19 poportunity on examination by your counsel to elaborate.
- 20 Go ahead, Counsel.
- 21 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 22 | Q. For example, it would be up to Ms. Robinson to make sure
- 23 other assistants were available and on call for you to contact
- 24 | them if needed, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. You employed Ms. Robinson for over a decade because she was a good worker, right, sir?
 - A. Well, yes, she was a good worker, I relied on her, I trusted her. As I said say, I've always -- I work on the honor system. I expect people to treat people the way they would
- 6 want to be treated. And it's that simple.
 - Q. You increased her responsibilities over time because she was a good worker, correct?
- 9 A. Yes.

4

5

7

8

18

- 10 | 0. She took care of business?
- 11 A. She took care of business.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Can I say one thing, your Honor?
- 13 | THE COURT: If you need to make --
- 14 THE WITNESS: I'll just say one thing. She took care
 15 of business as long as she did it the right way with the
 16 people. If she did it the wrong way, which came to me later
 17 after all this past, no, that I don't accept and don't like and
- 19 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 20 Q. She took care of business, correct, sir?
- 21 A. Fine. You want to say she took take care of business,
- 22 | yeah, she took care of business.

would never support.

- 23 | Q. She was thorough?
- 24 A. Well, I hope she was thorough.
- 25 | Q. She was thorough, correct, sir?

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

1 A. She was thorough, I hope.

- Q. Ms. Robinson was a thorough worker?
- 3 $\mid A$. She claimed to be -- gave me the impression she was. I
- 4 cannot say in all certainty whether she was a thorough worker
- 5 completely, no.
- 6 0. She was conscientious?
- 7 A. Excuse me?
- 8 Q. She was a conscientious worker?
- 9 A. Yes.

- 10 \parallel Q. There was a time when she found an e-mail?
- 11 | A. Sorry.
- 12 | Q. There was a time when she found an e-mail in which someone
- 13 | you knew falsified something. And she found a letter to --
- 14 | that identified the falsification?
- 15 | A. Right.
- 16 | Q. You paid her more than your other assistants, correct?
- 17 A. Yes. I paid her more eventually, yes, I paid her well.
- 18 | Q. And that was because you valued the work that she did?
- 19 | A. Well, that was one part of it. Then later on it was
- 20 because I needed her and I was at a time going through a
- 21 divorce, getting rent -- starting to rent a new townhouse. And
- 22 | it wasn't an elaborate townhouse, it was a functioning, good,
- 23 practical townhouse, which is what I needed.
- 24 And so she said, "I'm going to leave just before
- 25 Christmas." And I said, well, let's figure this out. And we

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

- worked out a situation where I would pay her more, give her a title and so on.
- 3 Q. The townhouse was 3200 square feet by Central Park,
- 4 correct, sir?

- 5 A. It's a few blocks east of Central Park.
- 6 | Q. It was large?
 - A. It's large by -- yeah. Not that large, but it's large.
- Q. And you paid her more, you needed her for that work because
- 9 she did valuable work for you, correct?
- 10 A. Yes. It was valuable to me, and, again, I always stress
- 11 | this, as long as she was doing it properly.
- 12 | Q. Sir, my question is a yes-or-no question. You valued the
- work that Ms. Robinson did for you?
- 14 A. I did value the work. And I valued the work if it's not
- done right because that reflects on me. So, yes, in that way I
- 16 | did value the work.
- 17 | Q. At a certain point Canal even hired someone to work as an
- 18 assistant to Ms. Robinson, correct?
- 19 A. Say that again, sorry.
- 20 | Q. At a certain point, Canal even hired a person to work as an
- 21 | assistant to Ms. Robinson?
- 22 A. It might have been at her request.
- 23 | Q. Her name was Lulu White, correct?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Is that correct, sir?

- 1 Α. That's correct, yes.
- 2 Now, on multiple times throughout Ms. Robinson's 11 years
- 3 with you, you had negotiations with her about her position,
- 4 correct?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 Negotiations about her job duties? 0.
- 7 Α. Yes.
- Negotiations about her compensation at Canal? 8 Q.
- 9 Α. Mm-hmm, yes.
- 10 You knew that she aspired to be an executive in the film
- 11 industry, correct?
- 12 I didn't really know that, no.
- 13 So it's your testimony you didn't have any idea about
- Ms. Robinson's aspirations in the film industry? 14
- No, I didn't, not really, no. 15 Α.
- She asked to be more involved in production at Canal, 16
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Well, yes, people want and I can only do so much. The way
- 19 my situation works, I don't want people to think that they are
- 20 getting into something that's going to give them an opportunity
- 21 when it's not there. If it is there, I tell them take the job,
- 22 it's better for you, it's better for your career. I never get
- 23 in the way of that.
- 24 I tell them go, it's most important that you take care
- 25 of what you want to do because I'm not sure, this could be a

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

- steppingstone but I'm not sure it's going to be what you 2 ultimately are going to be satisfied with. I wish I could help you more, that's all I can do. 3
- 4 Sir, my question was, Ms. Robinson asked --Q.
- 5 A. No, I'm not saying to you, I'm saying to them, I wish I could help you more, that's all I can do. 6
- 7 To get back to my question, sir, Ms. Robinson asked to be more involved in production at Canal, yes or no? 8
 - A. Yes, and my job -- the job is what it is. So I couldn't do more than say, look, this is it, you know.
- 11 Q. First in 2011, you elevated her to director of production 12 at Canal, correct?
 - A. She wanted the title, she bugged me about it, and I said, okay. It's not going to really matter. The most important thing is that you just do your job, work for me, do the right thing, and I will always have a good thing to say about you, you know, period. That's the most important thing.
 - Q. The most important thing was how you would or would not recommend her, correct?
- 20 What do you mean how I would or would not recommend her?
- 21 Well, you just said, sir, the most important thing is what 22 you would say about her?
- 23 A. Yes, it was -- I don't think I said would not, I think I 24 said what I would say about her. It's that simple. The titles 25 were not important. It was doing the job, doing it well, doing

- it honorably. As I say, it's the honor system, I trust you're 1
- 2 going to do the right thing. That's all I ask. And you are
- 3 protecting me. By doing the right thing, you are in turn doing
- 4 the right thing by me.
- 5 Q. Sir, you elevated Ms. Robinson's title because you wanted
- her to continue working for you in 2011, correct? 6
- 7 Α. Yes.
- In 2017, you elevated her title to VP of production and 8
- 9 finance because you wanted her to continue working --
- That's what she wanted and that's what I said, okay, I'll 10
- 11 give it to you.
- 12 You did it so she would continue working for you?
- 13 If you want to put it that way, okay. Α.
- You thought she was pushy about these titles, right? 14 Q.
- 15 Α. I did. I don't think she understood what was really
- 16 important.
- 17 You thought she was forward in asking for that, correct?
- I don't want to say forward. If somebody wants something 18
- 19 and it's important to them, part of me says, okay, if it's
- 20 important to you, I'll give it to you, though I'm giving you
- 21 some other advice and saying that's really not what's the most
- 22 important thing. But if you want it, okay, I'll give it to
- 23 you.
- 24 Q. You also negotiated with her over the years about her
- 25 compensation, correct?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Including the perks and benefits of her job.
- 3 A. Yeah, I guess, we did, or she did maybe with Michael Tasch
- 4 or even I guess with Berdon, some things.
- 5 Q. She spoke with you, sir --
- 6 A. Yeah, no problem. I'm not saying we didn't, I'm saying
- 7 | there might be other things. But basically yes, it was us.
- 8 Q. I'd like to go through some of the tasks you regularly had
- 9 Ms. Robinson do for you over those 11 years at Canal.
- 10 She would manage your schedule?
- 11 A. Mm-hmm. Yes.
- 12 | Q. She would remind you often multiple times a day the next
- 13 | event on your schedule?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. She would manage your contacts list?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Field media requests on your behalf?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Interview candidates for other assistant positions at
- 20 | Canal?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Sir, you frequently traveled on private jets, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Probably once a month you take a private jet?
- 25 A. Not that often, no.

II NAUGRUB4A

- Q. Multiple times a year?
- 2 A. A few times a year, sometimes.
- 3 | Q. Ms. Robinson arranged your travel on a private jet?
- 4 A. She did, yes.
- 5 Q. Now, in the period Ms. Robinson worked for you from 2008 to
- 6 2019, you had over 25 movies come out. Does that sound about
- 7 || right?
- 8 A. Could be, yes.
- 9 Q. Ms. Robinson would scout hotels for you when you had to
- 10 | shoot on location?
- 11 A. She would what, sorry?
- 12 Q. She would scout hotels for you.
- 13 A. There were times she started doing that, yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we bring up plaintiff's
- 15 211?
- 16 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 17 | Q. Mr. De Niro, this is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson, top one
- 18 is from Ms. Robinson to you. Sunday March 26, 2017, at
- 19 | 8:52 a.m., do you see that? Do you see that, sir?
- 20 A. I'm trying to, sorry.
- 21 | THE COURT: Give him a moment to look at it.
- 22 | Sir, do you recognize that as an e-mail from you to
- 23 Ms. Robinson?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm just...
- 25 THE COURT: The question is really simple, do you

1 recognize that?
2 THE WI

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do, of course.

THE COURT: From Ms. Robinson.

Okay, go ahead.

BY MR. MACURDY:

Q. This is an e-mail on March 26 on this Sunday, Ms. Robinson telling you that she's going to tour a hotel that day, correct?

THE COURT: Are you offering the --

MR. MACURDY: Yes, I can go ahead and offer Plaintiff's 211.

A. I'm sorry, but it says --

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. De Niro.

Is there any objection to this exhibit?

MR. DROGIN: Your Honor, can there be a representation as to what time zone the parties were in. Because this can be misleading with a lot of these e-mails and there's been testimony -- sorry, there's been mention that at times,

Ms. Robinson was in Los Angeles or London or Spain. We don't really know where any of these people are.

THE COURT: Is there representation about time zone?

MR. MACURDY: I don't have a representation about time zone, your Honor.

THE COURT: I take it there's no other objection to the exhibit?

MR. DROGIN: No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 THE COURT: The exhibit is received.

Members of the jury with respect to the time zone, that will be a judgment you will have to make if there's evidence with respect to it. Go ahead.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 211 received in evidence)

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, you can show that to the

BY MR. MACURDY:

10:05 p.m.

jury.

- Q. So, sir, this is the Sunday March 26, 2017, 7:23 a.m., the first e-mail, Ms. Robinson writes, second line down: My flight leaves to Atlanta at 11:55 a.m. and lands at 2:46 p.m. I'll tour the hotel and return on a 7:45 p.m. flight landing at
- 14 You see that, sir?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- Q. So this is an example of Ms. Robinson on a Sunday going to tour a hotel for you in Atlanta prior to you going there; is that right?
- 19 A. Yes. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: You can take that down, Mr. Kelly.
- 21 | Thank you.
- 22 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 23 Q. Ms. Robinson would coordinate your production schedule for
- 24 | shoots?
- 25 A. I'm sorry, say that again.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Ms. Robinson would also coordinate your production schedule for your movie shoots?
 - A. Yes, yeah, we would coordinate -- there's a few parts to that, yeah.

THE COURT: Sir, let me just ask the exhibit that we just saw, was that Plaintiff's Exhibit 211, is that what it is?

THE COURT: So 211 is received.

MR. MACURDY: Yes.

BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. She would help create initial budgets for your production costs, correct?
- A. Not for production costs of the film. There was a period where she was doing stuff for me. I would be given a certain amount of money and I had to figure out how I would pay people who work directly with me. So it wasn't the budget of the film or anything like that, it was just that small area.
- Q. So you would coordinate or work on the budget related to your costs, sir?
- 19 A. With my costs.
- 20 | Q. Ms. Robinson communicated with your agent?
- 21 A. She did, yeah.
- 22 | Q. She communicated with your entertainment lawyer?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- Q. And, sir, we heard from your counsel, you're the owner or part owner of many businesses, right?

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Greenwich Hotel?
- 3 A. Excuse me.
- 4 | Q. You're the owner of the Greenwich Hotel?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 | Q. Tribeca Film Festival?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. Ms. Robinson helped vet the schedule for the film festival?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. You own Nobu restaurants and hotels around the world?
- 11 | A. Sorry?
- 12 | Q. You own Nobu restaurants and hotels around the world?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. You also had Ms. Robinson perform errands for you and your
- 15 | family, correct?
- 16 A. What kind of errands Can you be specific?
- 17 | Q. As a general manager, you would agree you had Ms. Robinson
- 18 perform errands for you and your family?
- 19 A. Yeah, at certain -- yes, okay.
- 20 | Q. For example, it was Ms. Robinson's job to remind you about
- 21 gifts for certain people, whether it be professional or
- 22 personal relationships, each year, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Birthdays?
- 25 A. Yes.

NAU6ROB4A De Niro - Direct

- 1 | Q. Christmas?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. So you had a list of Christmas presents for hundreds of
- 4 people in your life, correct?
- 5 A. A lot of people.
- 6 Q. You had her help you shop for the gifts?
- 7 A. Sometimes.
- 8 Q. You had her send flowers to coworkers and family members on
- 9 | your behalf?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. You had her vet and coordinate vacation rentals for you?
- 12 A. What did you say, vet?
- 13 Q. Vet and coordinate vacation rentals for you?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. You had her research schools for your kids?
- 16 A. I don't remember that, but maybe she did.
- 17 THE COURT: Counsel, whenever you get to a convenient
- 18 | breaking point, we'll take our midafternoon break.
- MR. MACURDY: Now is fine, your Honor.
- 20 | THE COURT: Members of the jury, it's just about 3:30,
- 21 so we'll take a 15-minute break now. Please don't talk about
- 22 | the case amongst yourselves or with anybody else and please
- 23 don't do any research on the case. Enjoy your break.

24

25

1 (Jury not present) 2 THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, you may step down. Please be 3 back here and ready to be on the stand in ten minutes. 4 Plaintiff's counsel, you had an issue you wanted to 5 raise at sidebar. Can you raise it from where you are? MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. MACURDY: It relates to counsel's opening 8 9 statement. Two points, I think that counsel violated two of 10 your in limine rulings during their opening statement. So one 11 is -- relates to talking about personal dislike by other employees. This was our motion in limine 8. 12 13 THE COURT: I recall -- did I give any instructions 14 with respect to the opening statement? 15 MR. MACURDY: Not opening statement. THE COURT: What's your next issue, because I just --16 17 I only ruled on the admissibility of evidence on that. So 18 what's your next issue? 19 MR. MACURDY: If I could just say one thing, your 20 Honor? 21 So your Honor said that they can pull the poison by 22 asking -- their witnesses are going to be cross-examined on the 23 fact that they personally dislike the plaintiff and that they 24 dislike colors of testimony. They can't be asked about the

specific events that caused them to have negative personal

25

would --

feelings towards plaintiff unless, of course, we get into that 1 2 on cross-examination, and they talked about specifics about 3 celebrations after she left. 4 THE COURT: You've got your record. I understand your 5 The motion is denied. point. 6 MR. MACURDY: The other one, your Honor, is they went 7 into the details of a June 11th e-mail that Ms. Robinson sent with a severance proposal which your Honor had ruled that that 8 9 comes in only for impeachment reasons. And I'm suggesting that 10 they opened the door -- that comes on the heels of them sending 11 a waiver of claims to her. And your Honor has ruled the waiver 12 is not coming in. 13 But if they're able to go into the details of what she 14 put in that responsive proposal, I think we should be able to 15 discuss the waiver that went to her from Canal before that, and admit that into evidence. 16 17 THE COURT: I would think that's not at issue with respect to the De Niro testimony, but only with respect to the 18 Harvey testimony; is that correct? 19 20 MR. MACURDY: I think -- you'd like have to --21 THE COURT: Let me put it more specifically. Is that 22 something that you're intending to do through Mr. De Niro this 23 afternoon?

MR. MACURDY: Not this afternoon, your Honor, but I

	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
1	0		
1	1		
1	2		
1	3		
1	4		
1	5		
1	6		
1	7		
1	8		
1	9		
2	0		
2	1		
2	2		
2			
2			
2	Е		

THE COURT: I'll hear from the parties with respect to that this afternoon after we break from court.

MR. DROGIN: Your Honor, I may be able to make it a lot easier. We would withdraw the objection provided that there were simply two redactions.

THE COURT: So you'll meet and confer and you'll see if there's an issue for me to address.

Is there anything else from plaintiff?

MR. MACURDY: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything from defendant?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Nope.

THE COURT: See you back here at -- make sure you are back at 3:40, so we can start promptly at 3:45.

(Recess)

THE COURT: All right. Let's bring in the jury.

Mr. De Niro, please take the stand.

1 (Jury present)

THE COURT: Counsel, you may continue.

MR. MACURDY: Thank you, your Honor.

- 4 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 5 | Q. So, Mr. De Niro, we were talking about the tasks that you
- 6 had Ms. Robinson perform in the course of her employment. One
- 7 was that you had her assist with your pets.
- 8 A. With my pets?
- 9 Q. Correct.
- 10 A. Yes. Sometimes, yeah, when -- Tiffany had pets. We had a
- 11 | lot of dogs. She might have asked her to help in that area,
- 12 yeah.
- 13 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson vet housekeepers for you?
- 14 A. Sorry?
- 15 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson vet housekeepers?
- 16 A. I can't remember, but I might have.
- 17 Q. Had her in charge of finding plants for your homes?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Had her pick out photos to be framed in your home?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. You often had Ms. Robinson work on sensitive assignments,
- 22 | correct?
- 23 | A. I'm not sure what is meant by that.
- 24 | Q. Well, things that needed to be handled discreetly, correct?
- 25 A. One thing, two things -- I don't know what they are, so

- 1 sometimes but not that discreet, not that sensitive.
- 2 Q. For example, you tasked Ms. Robinson with various items
- 3 related to your former partner, Toukie Smith, who has multiple
- 4 sclerosis, correct?
- 5 A. Yes, that's -- that would be, I asked her at one point to
- 6 help with her -- yes.
- 7 Q. You have two kids with Ms. Smith, correct?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You asked Ms. Robinson to help out with Ms. Smith's
- 10 caregivers and social workers?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. You asked Ms. Robinson to help clear out Ms. Smith's Miami
- 13 | apartment for sale?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson address Ms. Smith's home health needs,
- 16 correct?
- 17 | A. I'm sorry?
- 18 | Q. Her home health needs.
- 19 A. That could have been, yes.
- 20 | Q. And you decided Ms. Robinson's assignments in conversations
- 21 between you and her?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. You didn't discuss with others at Canal assignments you had
- 24 Ms. Robinson doing for Ms. Smith?
- 25 A. No. In this case, it was with her, Robinson.

correct?

3

9

- Q. You instructed Ms. Robinson to collect evidence for you to use in your divorce proceeding against Grace Hightower,
- A. I don't know exactly about that. She might have been asked by the lawyers to go back and search through e-mails and records of that sort, maybe.
- Q. So, yes or no, sir, you instructed Ms. Robinson to collect evidence for you to use in your divorce proceeding with
- 10 A. I guess if it was like that, I'd have to say yes, I
 11 suppose.
- 12 THE COURT: Sir, just, answer the question to the best
 13 of your ability.
- 14 THE WITNESS: Okay.

Grace Hightower?

- 15 A. To the best of my ability, I -- you know, I did -- she did
 16 do that.
- Q. You had Ms. Robinson communicate with your divorce attorney on your behalf, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson go with you to doctors' appointments?
- A. At times. It was only one. There was one where I had gotten hurt, and she took me early in the morning to a doctor
- 23 or to the hospital, you know.
- 24 | Q. She went with you to the emergency room, correct?
- 25 A. She did, yes.

- 1 Q. And that was in 2017, you fell down the stairs, correct?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Early in the morning, before 6:00 a.m.?
- 4 A. Yeah, it was very early.
- 5 Q. You called Ms. Robinson to come to your house?
- 6 A. I called her -- I guess it happened about 1:00, 2:00 in the
- 7 | morning, and I didn't want to call her too early. I didn't
- 8 | want to go -- I went back up, managed to get back in bed, and
- 9 then I called her around 4:30, 5:00, and then said if you can
- 10 come with a car, cab, or whatever, we can go to a hospital.
- 11 | Q. She went with you to the ER?
- 12 A. Mm-hmm, yes.
- 13 Q. Your wife, Grace Hightower, didn't go with you?
- 14 A. She was sleeping. I didn't want to bother her.
- 15 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson fill out medical forms for you,
- 16 correct?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. You had Ms. Robinson list herself as the emergency contact
- 19 on your medical forms?
- 20 A. I could have, yes.
- 21 | Q. You didn't list your wife?
- 22 A. That doesn't matter. It's another type of thing. It's
- 23 more of a professional -- nothing to do with anything. She's
- 24 going to contact my wife if there's anything serious, so it was
- 25 | just the office way.

- 1 | Q. You did not list your wife --
- 2 A. No, I didn't.
- 3 | Q. Sir, please wait for me to finish the question.
- 4 A. Go ahead.
- 5 | Q. You did not list your wife on your emergency contact forms?
- 6 | A. No.
- 7 Q. Ms. Robinson knew more about you than any other person in
- 8 | your life; isn't that right?
- 9 A. No, she didn't.
- 10 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 12 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 13 Q. You asked Ms. Robinson to make photo albums for your kids'
- 14 | birthdays?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 0. You have seven kids?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. You had her make photo cards for your former wife on
- 19 | Valentine's Day?
- 20 A. Yes, I did. And she's very good at it.
- 21 | Q. You had Ms. Robinson --
- 22 | A. It's one of the things -- few things, good things that she
- 23 | really was quite good at.
- Q. You had Ms. Robinson go to one of your houses to assess
- 25 what you should keep before the house was demolished?

- 1 A. Oh, after the fire?
- 2 Q. House in Montauk.
- 3 A. I don't remember. I could have.
- 4 | Q. 2018, you were moving into a new home, correct?
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. You were separating from your wife, Grace Hightower, and
- 7 | moving in with your new girlfriend, Tiffany Chen?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You had Ms. Robinson walk through apartment rentals for you
- 10 | while you were on FaceTime, correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. You eventually selected the townhouse we've been talking
- 13 about, which is near Central Park, correct?
- 14 | A. Right.
- 15 | Q. You wanted Ms. Robinson to help you set up that home?
- 16 A. Well, she was helping me with basic things. She introduced
- 17 | me to her friend, Rachel, who was an interior designer. I
- 18 | said, okay, we'll use her. And, you know, yeah, she was
- 19 | helping me get moved in.
- 20 | Q. Well, she was helping with more than just basic things.
- 21 | She helped you fully set up that townhouse in a matter
- 22 of months, correct?
- 23 A. She -- yeah. Well, she was helping me, as she should,
- 24 yeah.
- 25 | Q. She was filling five bedrooms, five baths all from scratch,

NAU6ROB4 De Niro - Direct

1 | correct?

- 2 A. If you want to say it like that, okay.
- 3 | Q. Well, she furnished it all?
- 4 THE COURT: You don't need to subscribe or not
- 5 subscribe. You just need to answer the question.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. All right.
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 9 Q. Ms. Robinson helped you furnish that entire townhouse,
- 10 | correct?
- 11 A. With Rachel, she helped -- I guess all the other people she
- 12 | brought in like Sabrina a little bit and Lulu, yes.
- 13 Q. Ms. Robinson oversaw the furnishing of this entire
- 14 | four-story townhouse, correct?
- 15 | A. I can't remember, but you could say I guess she did, yeah.
- 16 \parallel Q. By 2019, you had Ms. Robinson spending the majority of the
- 17 | time on your townhouse, right?
- 18 A. A lot of the time, yes.
- 19 Q. A majority of the time, correct?
- 20 A. A lot of time.
- 21 | Q. A majority of the time?
- 22 | A. I wouldn't say majority. I said a lot of time.
- 23 | Q. You tasked her with interior design for the townhouse?
- 24 | A. I'm sorry?
- 25 | Q. You tasked her with interior design for your townhouse?

- 1 A. I asked -- you know, I didn't even ask. She suggested
- 2 Rachel. I said okay, I met her, I liked her. I said okay.
- 3 Q. You had Ms. Robinson work -- design the room layouts in
- 4 your townhouse, correct?
- 5 A. Not really. She did it with my looking at stuff, saying I
- 6 want this here, I want that, those paintings here, I want the
- 7 bed here, and all that stuff.
- 8 | Q. She helped you pick out artwork?
- 9 A. The artwork was all my father's, so she might have helped
- 10 | in some ways, but it was all basically his.
- 11 | Q. She ordered furniture?
- 12 A. Yes. That I picked out.
- 13 Q. You had her unpack your belongings in the townhouse?
- 14 A. There might be times that she did, yeah, putting stuff
- 15 | away.
- 16 | Q. You had her childproof the townhouse?
- 17 A. I could have.
- 18 | Q. Did you or did you not, sir?
- 19 A. I don't know. I don't remember. If she said she did,
- 20 | then, okay, she did.
- 21 THE COURT: No, sir. It's just you give what you
- 22 know.
- 23 | THE WITNESS: I don't remember really if she
- 24 childproofed the townhouse. There were certain commonsense
- 25 | things that I had to do with the -- in the townhouse to make

sure that the kids -- my little daughter would be safe or any 1 2 other kids would be there. So I can't remember specifically 3 but there might have been stuff. But I was also looking at 4 this and saying, you got to do this, you go to do that. 5 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I'd like to read from Mr. De Niro's deposition from April 4, 2022, 173, 3 to 6. 6 7 THE COURT: Any objection? 8 MR. SCHOENSTEIN: No objection. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 "Q. Ms. Robinson helped coordinate in 2018 childproofing for 11 your townhouse windows, didn't she? "A. Yes." 12 13 That was your testimony, correct? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And when Tiffany Chen, your current girlfriend, came into the picture, you told Ms. Robinson to assist Ms. Chen with 16 17 whatever Ms. Chen needed? A. She didn't tell her to assist. She asked her certain 18 19 things, to do certain things. I introduced them, knowing that 20 this was the time to be introduced, and that what Chase 21 Robinson --22 Q. Sir, can I clarify my question? 23 THE COURT: Your question is what Mr. De Niro 24 instructed?

(212) 805-0300

MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor.

- THE COURT: Let's do the question again. Ask the question again.
- 3 BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. When Tiffany Chen, your current girlfriend, came into the picture, you told Ms. Robinson to assist Tiffany Chen with
- 6 whatever Ms. Chen needed. Yes or no.
- A. Yes, that was the implication, if you will. Introduced them and she should help us move forward.
 - Q. That was in September of 2018?
- 10 | A. Okay.

- 11 | Q. Is that correct?
- 12 A. I don't remember, but if you say so, it must be.
- 13 | Q. Eventually --
- THE COURT: Sir, the questions are not evidence, so you just give your best recollection.
- THE WITNESS: Then I'll say yes, because I'm not sure if it's there, then that's yes.
- 18 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 19 | Q. Eventually, Ms. Robinson was -- Ms. Chen was supervising
- 20 | Ms. Robinson at that point when it came to setting up the
- 21 | townhouse, correct?
- 22 A. Yeah. I mean, she was -- I guess you would say she was
- 23 supervising.
- 24 | Q. It became part of Ms. Robinson's job to work for Ms. Chen?
- 25 A. To work for us.

	NAU6ROB4 De	Niro - Direct
1	MR. DROGIN: Objec	tion.
2	THE COURT: Object	ion is overruled.
3	A. To work for me and Ms.	Chen.
4	(Continued on next	page)
5	5	
6	5	
7	7	
8	3	
9	9	
10		
11	L	
12	2	
13	3	
14	1	
15	5	
16	5	
17	7	
18	3	
19		
20		
21	L	
22	2	
23	3	
24	1	
25	5	

- 1 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 2 | Q. Part of Ms. Robinson's job was to work for Ms. Chen; yes or
- 3 no.
- 4 A. For me and Ms. Chen. Period. I make decisions there. We
- 5 make decisions together.
- 6 Q. Part of Ms. Robinson's job was to work --
- 7 | A. Part of it --
- 8 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Objection sustained. New question.
- 10 | Q. Ms. Chen also directed other employees at Canal; is that
- 11 | right?
- 12 | A. Sorry?
- 13 | Q. Ms. Chen also directed other employees at Canal; isn't that
- 14 right?
- 15 A. Can you give me an example?
- 16 | Q. Michael Kaplan?
- 17 A. She could have told him, yes, things to do; yes.
- 18 Q. Michael Tasch, the accountant?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Tom Harvey, the lawyer?
- 21 | A. Not told him but she made him aware of certain things.
- 22 | Q. She gave him instructions; yes or no.
- 23 A. Who? Who did she give instructions to?
- 24 Q. To Tom Harvey, Canal's lawyer.
- 25 A. That doesn't quite sound right. The lawyer is there for

advice and certain things, it is not instructions. I don't like the way that's put. I'm sorry.

- Q. Sir, working for you doing anything and everything is a demanding job, correct?
- A. Depends on how you look at it.
- 6 Q. It would be unpredictable hours?
- 7 A. No. The hours were civilized. I never went over and -- 8 somebody made some statement before at all hours of the night.
- No, I never did that. I was very proper as far as my hours and times. What Chase did on her own working and saying she worked all night, that's her thing. But what I had is I called at a decent hour in the morning and I go until a decent hour at
 - Q. Sir, you testified a few minutes ago that you called her at 4:30 a.m.?
 - A. That was one time when I cracked my back falling down the stairs, yes. I was just about to bring that up.

THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, let me instruct you -- both the questioner and counsel -- keep your voices down and wait until each other finishes, respectively, the question and the answer.

Go ahead.

- 23 Q. Sir, is it your testimony that you did not call
- 24 | Ms. Robinson late at night on a regular basis?
- 25 A. No.

3

4

5

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

night.

Q. You didn't call her early in the morning on a regular basis?

- A. 7:00 in the morning? Yes. If it -- I don't even think much earlier than that I could have but it was not like 4:00 in the morning, 3:00 in the morning. I just didn't do those things. And at night I called her at a reasonable hour unless it was an important thing that then it would be understood that I would have to call her, like when I hurt my back and I asked her to come. And I waited to call her at 5:00 or something to come in a cab to pick me up. I didn't call her at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning when it actually happened. It actually happened
- Q. Sir, you relied on Ms. Robinson picking up your phone call at 4:30 in the morning; correct?
- A. I relied, not necessarily at that time. If she did, she picked it up. If she hadn't, I would have left her a message.

 But it wasn't like I relied on her to be on standby at 4:00,
- 18 4:30 in the morning.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 19 Q. Well, Canal always had assistants who were on call; 20 correct?
- 21 A. Yes, but not in the middle of the night like that.
- 22 | Q. So it is your testimony --

at 1:00, 1:30, 2:00 at the latest.

- 23 A. Civilized hours.
- Q. It is your testimony, sir, that Canal did not have assistants who were to be waiting by their phone for you to

1 call?

- 2 A. No, they did, but not in the middle of the night.
- 3 | Q. So you did not -- it is your testimony you did not expect
- 4 | Canal's assistant, or at least one Canal assistant to be
- 5 | available to answer your call in the middle of the night?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 MR. DROGIN: Objection. Your Honor, we are talking 8 about an 11-year period of time.
- 9 THE COURT: That's a fair point. Objection is
 10 sustained. Why don't you frame it in terms of time periods.
- 11 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 12 Q. So at any point, Mr. De Niro, during Ms. Robinson's tenure
- 13 | at Canal, is it your testimony that Canal did not have an
- 14 assistant available to answer your phone call any time of day
- 15 or night?
- MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 18 | A. There --
- 19 THE COURT: Sir.
- 20 | THE WITNESS: I don't have to answer?
- 21 | THE COURT: Right. When there is an objection, you
- 22 | pause. If I sustain the objection, the questioner goes on to
- 23 something new. If I overrule it, you answer.
- Go ahead.

25

Q. Ms. Robinson was in fact available to you 24 hours a day

seven days a week; correct?

MR. DROGIN: Same objection.

THE WITNESS: I will answer it.

THE COURT: Basis.

MR. DROGIN: I don't understand what available --

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Exactly. So sorry.

MR. DROGIN: -- means and he is talking about 24 hours a day. She can be in Spain, she can be in California.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: So --

THE COURT: So you have answer the question.

THE WITNESS: OK. When she moved to Spain to work I let her. I didn't question her. I said as long as you can take care of the things that I need taken care of and the hours are different, say in Europe it is a six-hour difference, L.A. it is a three-hour difference in the other direction, or England it is a five-hour direction over there, then you -- it is unsaid even that you know you have to -- if you have to wake me up or remind me of something, then even if it is in the middle of the night for you, that's the deal. But you go over, I don't question what you do over there, you are working for me. As long as you take care of what I need, no problem. That was it. So in that sense, if she was over there in the middle of the night but it was my morning or my, whatever the time is middle of the night there but say it was -- I don't know I

can't -- but anyway, where the time difference is different it is not it the middle of the night for her and another time for me, then I would expect it and she would know that. But not like in New York, 2:00, 3:00 in the morning, I call her any time she is available. That's something that I never would do, unless it was a total emergency like the one time I had the

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I ask that you instruct the witness to answer my questions.

THE COURT: No. I think it is responsive.

BY MR. MACURDY:

accident.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

- Q. You expected that Ms. Robinson be available to you at all hours; correct?
- A. No, I did not expect her. If I called her in the middle of the night and she didn't answer I would say, OK, I don't expect her to. I don't expect the kids working for me now to answer at that time and sometimes they don't.
- Q. So it is your testimony, sir, that you did not rely on
- 19 Ms. Robinson being available to you at all hours?
- 20 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 21 | A. No.
- 22 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. Ms. Robinson let you know whenever she was traveling;
- 24 | correct?
 - A. Yes. Well, she would have to.

- 1111001000
- 1 Q. You expected her to, correct?
- 2 A. Well, that's what she knows she has to do. That's the
- 3 | least that she can do. If she says I'm going to go here for
- 4 | this period of time in Europe, or London, or L.A., and I will
- 5 be here and this and that so I would say, OK. So, we keep in
- 6 touch, when needed.
- 7 Q. You wanted to know where Ms. Robinson was at all times;
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. I didn't want to know where she was at all times. It was
- 10 set up that I would know where she was because she told me.
- 11 Q. She was meticulous about keeping you informed about her
- 12 | whereabouts; correct?
- 13 A. She let me know, yes, as she should.
- 14 Q. Even when it was --
- 15 | A. You are making it look like I demanded and this and that.
- 16 | She wanted to take, go to a place like Europe or L.A. or London
- 17 | or England. She knew that that was an unusual request. I said
- 18 | if you can get the job done, go ahead. And she did, so.
- 19 | Q. Sir, she let you know where she was going even though it
- 20 was on a weekend; correct?
- 21 | A. I don't remember. Sometimes. If it was something we had
- 22 | to deal with on the weekend and I needed to talk to her about
- 23 something then she of course knew, as we both did, that we had
- 24 | to talk about it and deal with it.
- 25 | Q. She let you know, as a regular course of business, if she

NAU5rob5 De Niro - Direct was going anywhere on the weekend; correct? 1 2 MR. DROGIN: Objection. 3 THE COURT: Sustained. Mr. De Niro, when there is an objection, you pause --4 5 THE WITNESS: Sorry. THE COURT: -- and then I will rule. 6 7 Next question. THE WITNESS: Sorry. 8 9 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you bring up Plaintiff's 10 116? 11 BY MR. MACURDY: 12 Q. Mr. De Niro, plaintiff's 116 is an e-mail exchange between you and Ms. Robinson on Friday, March 1, 2019, around 8:00 p.m. 13 14 Do you see that? 15 A. Yeah. Yes. MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I would move to admit 16 17 Plaintiff's Exhibit 116 into evidence. I don't believe there 18 is any objection. 19 MR. DROGIN: No objection. 20 THE COURT: 116 is received. 21 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 116 received in evidence)

BY MR. MACURDY:

22

23

24

25

Q. The first e-mail here, Mr. De Niro, Ms. Robinson writes on this Friday evening, at 7:10 p.m: I'm going to be out of town at a friend's birthday next weekend. I'll leave on Friday

1 | night and back Sunday so I won't be in NYC for the weekend.

Just wanted to let you know. If you need anything this

3 weekend, let me know. I'm around.

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yeah.

2

4

5

- 6 Q. You write back: OK.
- 7 A. I don't know if I wrote -- I did write back, yes. OK.

8 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's

- 9 || Exhibit 227?
- 10 | O. Mr. De Niro this is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson now on
- 11 | Monday, December 24, 2018, at 9:43 a.m.
- Do you see that?
- 13 | A. Yeah.
- MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move to admit Plaintiff's
- 15 | Exhibit 227 into evidence.
- MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Received.
- 18 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 227 received in evidence)
- 19 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 20 | Q. This is on Christmas Eve, sir?
- 21 | A. Yes?
- 22 | Q. Ms. Robinson writes: Taking off. I land at 9:30 p.m. NYC
- 23 | time. I hope you enjoy a relaxing and peaceful Christmas Eve.
- Do you see that?
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

1 THE COURT: You have to answer yes or no.

- Yes. Sorry. Α.
- 3 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 4 Exhibit 225?

2

- 5 Q. Sir, this is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson on Friday,
- September 28, 2018, at 10:33 p.m. 6
- 7 Do you see that?
- A. Yes. 8
- 9 MR. MACURDY: I move to admit Plaintiff's Exhibit 225 10 into evidence.
- 11 MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Received.
- (Plaintiff's Exhibit 225 received in evidence) 13
- 14 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 15 Q. The subject is flight, sir? Do you see that?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- She writes: Taking off. Land at 5:45 a.m. your time. 17 Q.
- Yes. OK. 18 Α.
- 19 She is telling you this on a Friday night at 10:33 p.m.?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 She is letting you know where she is going from 10:33 p.m.
- 22 to 5:45 a.m. your time; is that right?
- 23 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 24 Well, especially that she is probably going to Europe
- 25 because if it is 5:45 a.m. my time, most likely she was going

1 to Europe or England.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I realize that there is an objection but the witness answered before I had a chance to rule so the objection is overruled.

Go ahead.

BY MR. MACURDY:

Q. Sir, she is telling you she is going to land at 5:45 a.m. your time so she is letting you know that she is unavailable overnight; correct?

A. Yes.

MR. DROGIN: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. DROGIN: Beat me to the punch.

THE WITNESS: Sorry. Sorry.

OFFICIAL REPORTER: I could use everyone to slow down, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. That's a good point.

Both counsel and the witness are to slow down. The court reporter is taking down the testimony. If you don't slow down, the court reporter is not going to have an accurate record and it is critical that we have an accurate record.

Question, pause, answer, pause.

Go ahead.

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 221?

1 BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. Mr. De Niro, this is an e-mail exchange between you and
- 3 Ms. Robinson on Sunday, April 1, 2018.
- 4 Do you see that?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 MR. MACURDY: I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 221 into evidence.
- 8 MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 9 | THE COURT: Received.
- 10 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 221 received in evidence)
- 11 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 12 | Q. The subject is: Flight. Do you see that, sir?
- 13 \blacksquare A. That she -- yes.
- 14 | Q. And Ms. Robinson is writing on a Sunday: I take off at
- 15 | 5:30 your time and land at 1:30 p.m. If you are around, I will
- 16 | try to call you before my call with Elizabeth. Happy Easter.
- 17 Do you see that?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. She is letting you know of her whereabouts on Easter
- 20 | Sunday?
- 21 | A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And she is saying that she will call you on Easter Sunday;
- 23 | correct?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- MR. DROGIN: Objection.

1 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

2 THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. DROGIN: The document speaks for itself. The document speaks for itself.

THE COURT: I know the document speaks for itself.

Go ahead.

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 303?

THE COURT: It is relevant what the witness' understanding is of the document when he received it.

11 BY MR. MACURDY:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Q. Sir, this is two e-mails sent from Ms. Robinson to you February 9, 2018.

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 303 into evidence.

MR. DROGIN: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 303 received in evidence)

21 BY MR. MACURDY:

Q. February 3rd Ms. Robinson wrote you: Since Morgan is taking a vacation from February 15 to 20, was planning on staying in town just in case you will be in NYC. I would like to take a long weekend to celebrate my birthday with friends

1 | from Friday 2/23 and Monday 2/26, returning on Tuesday 2/27,

late morning. I will still be working normal hours but I want

3 to take a long weekend.

She writes back: Reminder, I'm going to take a long weekend at the end of February.

Do you see that, sir?

- A. Yes.
- Q. She is telling you three weeks in advance about a long weekend?
- 10 | A. OK.

2

4

5

6

7

13

11 THE COURT: The question is you are being asked your
12 understanding of the communication that you received.

Go ahead.

14 THE WITNESS: Yes.

- 15 BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. You had no problem with her working remotely there;
- 17 | correct, sir?
- 18 A. We had established it so, yeah, she went and she was
 19 checking in.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 21 Exhibit 207?
- 22 | Q. This is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson to you, Saturday,
- 23 | December 17, 2016.
- 24 Do you see that?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit

- 2 207 into evidence.
- 3 MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 4 THE COURT: Received.
- 5 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 207 received in evidence)
- 6 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 7 | Q. The subject is "taking off", Mr. De Niro.
- 8 Do you see that?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. She writes: Taking off shortly. Land at 5:30 a.m. your
- 11 time.
- 12 Do you see that?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 15 | Exhibit 204?
- 16 Q. This is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson to you on Friday,
- 17 | September 9, at 11:43 p.m.
- 18 A. Right. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit
- 20 204 into evidence.
- 21 MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Received.
- 23 | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 204 received in evidence)
- 24 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 25 | Q. She writes: Taking off in an hour. Land around 5:45 a.m.

- $1 \parallel A$. Right.
- 2 | Q. She is once again telling you where she will be overnight,
- 3 your time, on a Friday night?
- 4 | A. OK.
- 5 | Q. Correct?
- 6 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 7 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 8 | Exhibit 203?
- 9 Q. This is an e-mail exchange between you and Ms. Robinson on
- 10 | Monday, September 5, 2016; do you see that?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit
- 13 | 203 into evidence.
- MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 15 THE COURT: Received.
- 16 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 203 received in evidence)
- 17 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 18 Q. The first in time e-mail is Ms. Robinson writing: Getting
- 19 on my flight from San Francisco to L.A. Lands around 3:30 your
- 20 | time. Happy Labor Day.
- 21 Do you see that?
- 22 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 23 Q. You write back: K.
- 24 A. Right. Right.
- 25 Q. A few hours later she writes to you: Landed.

1 | Correct?

- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. And you write back: K.
- 4 A. Right.
- 5 Q. You didn't write back: Stop telling me your status.
- 6 | Correct?
- 7 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 8 A. Why would I do that? She's checking in.
- 9 | THE COURT: Sustained.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 11 | Exhibit 304?
- 12 | Q. This is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson to you, February 24,
- 13 | 2016. Do you see that, sir?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 MR. MACURDY: Move to admit Plaintiff's Exhibit 304
- 16 | into evidence, your Honor.
- 17 MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: Received.
- 19 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 304 received in evidence)
- 20 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 21 Q. The first in time e-mail she is writing to you about taking
- 22 | a birthday trip; correct?
- 23 A. Can I ask a question?
- 24 THE COURT: No.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Your Honor --

1 THE COURT: You don't get to ask questions.

THE WITNESS: Is this birthday trip? Is this a vacation? She never took vacation time. She always charged me for them. So now I see birthday trips and all this stuff. I'm just throwing it up there.

BY MR. MACURDY:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

17

18

25

Q. Sir, do you see the last line in her e-mail: While I am away, I will always be reachable and I will be working.

Do you see that, sir?

- A. OK. Yes, she did. She says it there.
- Q. She writes back to you again on the 24th, said: Hi. Just wanted to make sure a few days during this time was OK.

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. So she routinely worked all night in NYC for you; correct?

 MR. DROGIN: Objection.

THE COURT: You are not asking about the e-mail, you are just asking -- not the e-mail. Ask the question again.

- 19 BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. So sir, routinely, Ms. Robinson worked for you remotely while she was not in New York City; correct?
- A. She said she worked for me, I always believed her. As I said, it is the honor system, I never questioned it. So who she -- she is the only one who knows.
 - Q. You were certainly aware that you had an arrangement with

1 her that she could work remotely for you; correct?

- A. But she said she worked all this time. You know, what can
- 3 | I say? I trusted her. What can I say? Only she knows.
- 4 | Q. So, sir, your testimony, yes or no, you were aware --
 - A. I was sure aware.

2

5

9

10

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

6 | Q. -- you were aware --

7 THE COURT: Wait for the question --

8 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

THE COURT: -- to be completed.

Go ahead, counsel.

- 11 Q. Yes or no, sir. You were aware that you had an arrangement
- 12 | with Ms. Robinson that she could work for you remotely outside
- 13 New York City; correct?

14 MR. DROGIN: Objection.

15 THE COURT: Basis.

MR. DROGIN: This is a completely open-ended question.

THE COURT: Sustained. You can make it a little bit

more limited in terms of time.

With respect to yes or no, when you are asked the question: "Answer it yes or no", you are to answer yes or no if you can answer yes or no truthfully.

THE WITNESS: OK.

THE COURT: If you need to, if you can't answer yes or no truthfully, then you give the answer to the question.

Go ahead, counsel.

1 BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. Let's take this e-mail in front of us, sir, Plaintiff's
- 3 | Exhibit 304. This e-mail is taking place February of 2016,
- 4 | correct?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So at least at the time of February 2016 you were
- 7 | allowed -- you would allow Ms. Robinson to work for you from
- 8 places other than New York City?
- 9 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 12 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 13 | Exhibit 199?
- 14 Q. This is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson to you, sir, on
- 15 | Thursday, December 24, 2015?
- 16 A. OK. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit
- 18 | 199 into evidence.
- MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Received.
- 21 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 199 received in evidence)
- 22 BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. Ms. Robinson writes: Boarding my flight for Miami. I take
- 24 off in about 15 and land at 2:45. Should have Internet on the
- 25 plane.

1 Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

- 3 Q. This is on Christmas Eve?
- 4 A. Yeah. That's what it says.
- 5 Q. Ms. Robinson would let you know if she was going for a run;
- 6 | isn't that right, sir?
- 7 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 8 A. What's that?
- 9 THE COURT: Did Ms. Robinson ever let you know if she 10 was going for a run?
- 11 THE WITNESS: For a run? Sometimes she did, yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's
- 13 | 117?
- 14 | Q. This is an e-mail from Ms. Robinson on Saturday, November
- 15 | 22nd, 2014. Do you see that?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, move Plaintiff's Exhibit 117
- 18 | into evidence.
- MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Received.
- 21 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 117 received in evidence)
- 22 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 23 | Q. Subject is: Run. Do you see that, sir?
- 24 A. I'm sorry? Yes, subject is run, yes.
- 25 | Q. She says: Going on a 7 miles run (1 hour)?

- 1 \parallel A. Right.
- 2 | Q. On iPhone and gives her number. Do you see that?
- 3 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 4 | Q. That was a Saturday?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. She is letting you know when she is going for an hour run
- 7 on a Saturday afternoon?
- 8 A. OK.
- 9 Q. Yes or no, sir.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. That's because you expected her to let you know her
- 12 | availability at all times; correct?
- 13 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 15 | THE WITNESS: Uh, can I answer?
- 16 THE COURT: Sir --
- 17 THE WITNESS: No. I didn't expect her at all times.
- 18 THE COURT: Sir, you are not answering that question.
- 19 You are not answering that question.
- 20 MR. DROGIN: We won that one.
- 21 THE WITNESS: That's ridiculous.
- 22 | THE COURT: The answer is stricken.
- 23 THE WITNESS: Sorry.
- 24 THE COURT: Go ahead. New question.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's

1 | Exhibit 214?

- 2 | BY MR. MACURDY:
- 3 | Q. This is an e-mail between you and Ms. Robinson, September
- 4 | 26, 2016; do you see that?
 - A. Yes.

5

8

9

10

11

12

18

6 MR. MACURDY: Move to admit, your Honor, Plaintiff's

7 | Exhibit 214.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DROGIN: No.

THE COURT: Received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 214 received in evidence)

- BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. Ms. Robinson wrote you, 8:30 that morning: I know I mentioned this to you a while ago. My father is having surgery today. Since I'm not able to be with him, I might be on the phone throughout the afternoon with the doctors. Just wanted to let you know in case you were trying to reach me but I was
- 19 A. OK. Yes.

on a call.

- 20 | Q. Ms. Robinson was a conscientious employee?
- A. Well, not after everything I am going through now but -you know, as far as I'm concerned. But she was doing this and
 checking in and that she is supposed to do, let me know if she
- 24 | is taking time off, doing this, going there, traveling,
- 25 especially for a family member, of course.

- 1 | Q. She was a conscientious employee; correct, sir?
- 2 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 3 THE COURT: Sustained. Asked and answered.
- 4 | Q. Tiffany Chen is your current girlfriend?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You met her on the set of the movie "The Intern," right?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 \square Q. That was filmed in 2014?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And you were married, at the time, to Grace Hightower?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And when did you start dating Ms. Chen?
- 13 A. Oh, about two years after I finished the movie.
- 14 | Q. You guys moved in together in fall of 2018?
- 15 | A. Yeah.
- 16 Q. That was when Ms. Robinson began interacting with Ms. Chen;
- 17 | correct?
- 18 A. I guess about that time, yeah.
- 19 | Q. September of 2018?
- 20 | A. I don't remember. If that's what you have and that's what
- 21 | she said then I'll say OK.
- 22 | Q. And the first time they met you had Ms. Robinson let
- 23 Ms. Chen into your home so that no one would see you going in
- 24 | with her; correct?
- 25 A. No, I don't remember that.

Q. Ms. Robinson had been working for you for 10 years at that point?

- A. About I guess, yes.
- 4 | Q. And you wanted, of course, Ms. Chen to be happy; correct?
- 5 A. Wouldn't you want your girlfriend to be happy? To a point?
 - Q. If something makes Ms. Chen unhappy, you want to deal with it if you can; right?
- 8 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. In late 2018, early 2019, it is fair to say Ms. Chen was not happy with Ms. Robinson's role in your life; correct?
- 12 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 13 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. Ms. Chen told you that she thought Ms. Robinson was in love
- 15 with you?

3

6

- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Ms. Chen told you that she thought Ms. Robinson wanted to move in with you?
- 19 A. I -- yes, and I just -- jeez, I said I couldn't believe 20 that but now, looking in hindsight, she might have had a point.
- 21 Q. Ms. Chen was jealous of Ms. Robinson's place in your life?
- 22 A. She wasn't jealous.
- 23 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 24 A. No, she wasn't.
- 25 THE COURT: Objection is sustained.

Q. Well, Ms. Chen --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

THE COURT: You can ask questions, obviously, about what Ms. Chen said to the witness. You can't ask the witness what was in Ms. Chen's mind.

couldn't make decisions without Ms. Robinson; isn't that right?

A. Well, I relied on her to, Robinson, to do things, because I had -- I relied on her and I was hoping that they both would be working well together, you know, so that was, like, what I

Q. Well, Ms. Chen expressed to you that she felt like that you

THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, the question I think was just directed to whether Ms. Chen said a certain thing to you or not.

14 THE WITNESS: What was the alleged question? Sorry.

BY MR. MACURDY:

hoped for.

- Q. Sir, it was that Ms. Chen expressed to you that she felt like you couldn't make decisions without Ms. Robinson; correct?
- 18 A. She might have.
- 19 Q. Now, Ms. Chen would tell you that she felt like
- 20 Ms. Robinson lived with you and Ms. Chen?
- 21 A. Well, no. That's too far.
- 22 | Q. Your testimony --
- 23 A. She might have been saying stuff because she was annoyed
- 24 but she was annoyed because Robinson was disrespectful to her.
- 25 Period. And that is unacceptable. She has to -- she is

working for me, she has to do what I'm asking. It is not like
I'm asking her to go out on the floor and scrape floors and go
out and mop the floor. I didn't do any of that and neither did
Tiffany, so this is all nonsense.

- Q. So, sir, it is your testimony that Ms. Chen did not tell you she felt like Ms. Robinson lived with you and Ms. Chen?
- A. Excuse me? Could you say that again?
- Q. It is your testimony, sir --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: Did Ms. Chen tell you that she felt like Ms. Robinson lived with you and her? Ms. Chen?

THE WITNESS: Did she say it in an e-mail?

THE COURT: Do you remember her saying it?

THE WITNESS: I don't -- she might have said it out of anger and annoyance because I was -- I was loyal to Chase. I said I want her to work for me. She is doing stuff. She's supposed to do this stuff. I didn't want her to break everybody's chops and create a big chaotic problem. Of course I wanted it all to work. I wanted everybody to be happy and play nice and unfortunately it didn't happen.

BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. Your testimony is that you were loyal to Chase as far as --

A. Yes, I was loyal to Chase as an employee of mine, yes.

- 23 wanted her to do things and I was sorry it didn't work out but
- 24 | it didn't, she was not behaving properly. What am I supposed
- 25 | to do? I didn't fire her, I said you have to leave the

1 | townhouse.

- 2 | Q. And so you, is it your testimony, sir, that you defended
- 3 Ms. Robinson to Ms. Chen during this time?
- 4 A. Not -- well, sort of. I said no, no, she is a little like
- 5 | that but she'll be OK. I am always trying to make it work.
- 6 Q. Ms. Chen would tell you that Ms. Robinson acted like a
- 7 stepmother to your kids; isn't that right?
- 8 A. She sometimes took a little liberty to talk to, in a way or
- 9 | this and she -- and if you want to go further, I had one of my
- 10 | kids who was kind of annoyed by it.
- 11 Q. So yes or no, sir. Ms. Chen would tell you that
- 12 | Ms. Robinson acted like a stepmother to your kids?
- 13 MR. DROGIN: Objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
- THE WITNESS: So you are asking me if she acted like a
- 16 stepmother to my kids?
- 17 THE COURT: No, no. The question is did Ms. Chen ever
- 18 | say words to you to the effect of Ms. Chen acted like a
- 19 | stepmother to your kids. Did she say words to you to that
- 20 | effect?
- 21 MR. DROGIN: I think Ms. Robinson.
- 22 | THE WITNESS: That Robinson acted like a stepmother.
- 23 THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I don't remember that.
- 25 BY MR. MACURDY:

NAU5rob5	De Niro -	- Direct

- Q. Let's talk about an example, sir. When you were setting up the Central Park townhouse, you had Ms. Robinson decorate your Christmas tree in 2018; correct?
 - A. Yes.

4

8

- 5 MR. DROGIN: Objection, there is --
- 6 THE WITNESS: OK. Sorry, I didn't --
- 7 THE COURT: What is the objection.
 - MR. DROGIN: I don't know what a Central Park townhouse is.
- THE COURT: The townhouse. Is that what you mean to refer to?
- MR. MACURDY: Yes, your Honor.
- THE COURT: OK, we don't know where the townhouse is,
 we are not going to say where the townhouse is.
- THE WITNESS: Do we have to say the address?
- 16 THE COURT: No, you don't.
- 17 Ask your question.
- 18 BY MR. MACURDY:
- Q. The townhouse in Manhattan, Ms. Robinson, you had her help decorate your Christmas tree at the townhouse; correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 THE COURT: Where Mr. De Niro's townhouse is is a 23 matter of complete irrelevance in this lawsuit.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 172?

Your Honor, I move to admit this. I don't believe there is any objection.

MR. DROGIN: Can you just scroll up? No objection.

THE COURT: 172 is received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 172 received in evidence)

BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. The first page, this shows that this is text messages between you and Ms. Chen on December 6, 2018. Do you see that?

 A. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up a 1:00 a.m. text from Ms. Chen?
 - Q. I'm not going to read this full text message but I will, Mr. Kelly, if you could highlight a couple points, lines, I will read from Ms. Chen.

Mr. De Niro this is at 1:00 a.m.: In all honesty, I don't like her having to do with anything that contributes to the feeling of our place. She was an asshole when she came over to help with Marty's birthday.

The "her" in that sentence is Ms. Robinson; correct?

A. Yes. Yes.

MR. MACURDY: And Mr. Kelly, a few sentences down?

Q. And I don't need to hear any more about how Helen should pick the tree.

Helen is your daughter, sir?

A. Yes.

Q. She's so out of line and lost in her fantasy she talks like she is the stepmother.

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Q. So Ms. Chen is saying here that Ms. Robinson is talking like she's a stepmother; do you see that?

MR. DROGIN: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. The next line I would like to read: But I'm really done with her fooling with me and her doing it with your indirect consent. It's like you can't make decisions with me but you can't make them without her. This bothers me, I find it weird, and it makes me feel like she does live with us more than I exist here.
- 15 A. Well, you know --
- THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, there is actually no question pending.
- I assume there is going to be a question?
- 19 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 20 Q. Do you see that, sir?
- 21 A. I see it, yeah.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we move on to 6:20 p.m.
- 23 | in this text exchange?
- 24 | Q. Hours later that day Ms. Chen is writing to you about the
- 25 Christmas tree again. Do you see that, sir?

- 1 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- Q. She writes: You know what? I can decorate a tree. I will
- 3 go through photos of different looks with you and I will just
- 4 do it.

At the end of that text she writes: I prefer for her not to do too much more with anything having to do with the

7 | interior feeling here.

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

8

- Q. Now, Ms. Chen also told you that Ms. Robinson had imaginary intimacy with you; correct?
- 12 A. Did she say it in an e-mail?
- 13 | Q. Sir, my question to you --
- 14 THE COURT: Do you remember her saying that.
- THE WITNESS: I don't remember her saying that but
- 16 | it's possible.
- Q. Ms. Chen told you that Ms. Robinson thought she was your
- 18 | wife; correct?
- 19 A. She did.
- 20 Q. Ms. Chen expressed to you that she believed Ms. Robinson
- 21 was messing with Ms. Chen's belongings at your house; correct?
- 22 A. She did.
- 23 | Q. In January 2019, Ms. Chen believed Ms. Robinson had
- 24 purposefully failed to have Ms. Chen's private plane from
- 25 | Antigua stocked with catering during a trip; correct?

- 1 Α. Can I see that? Is that in an e-mail?
- 2 It is just your recollection. THE COURT:
- 3 THE WITNESS: What's the question again?
- 4 In January of 2019, Ms. Chen believed that Ms. Robinson had Q.
- 5 purposefully failed to have Ms. Chen's private plane from
- 6 Antiqua --
- 7 A. It wasn't Ms. Chen's private plane, it was a plane that I
- chartered. So we are not flying around in private planes all 8
- 9 the time and all. Let's keep it in perspective. Sorry.
- 10 Q. Well, sir, it was a plane that you chartered from
- 11 Antiqua --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- that Ms. Chen believed that Ms. Robinson purposefully
- 14 failed to stock it with catering; correct?
- A. Sorry? No. She did feel that she somehow had messed with 15
- that. I don't know what it was but she felt there was 16
- 17 something there and she could have been right.
- 18 Q. Well, sir, you are aware now that it was the airline's
- 19 mistake and they actually refunded some of the cost?
- 20 A. Well, that doesn't mean that -- if they refund it they want
- 21 to make -- the customer is always right, especially for those
- 22 planes, so they say, well, we are sorry that that happened, it
- 23 shouldn't have happened under any circumstances we will refund
- 24 to you, absolutely, so.
- 25 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we pull up Plaintiff's

1 | Exhibit 4?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Your Honor, I move this into evidence. I don't believe there is any objection.

MR. DROGIN: This is 4?

MR. MACURDY: Correct.

MR. DROGIN: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 received in evidence)

BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. Mr. De Niro, from this first page these are texts between you and Ms. Chen, January 22nd, 2019; right?
- 12 A. I don't see them, I just see --

THE COURT: What you are showing is just something that is a short message report, so.

MR. MACURDY: Yes.

- Q. Sir, this is the cover page to text messages, an outline of conversations. Do you see now on the screen text messages?

 A. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, if we can go to the 6:08 p.m. text message?
- Q. Once again I'm not going to read this full text message at 6:08 p.m. but a few excerpts. Ms. Chen writes to you: In my experience, on private planes they rarely have a mixup like
 Chase claims happened. I don't trust her when it comes to me.

25 Her sense of entitlement stems from this imaginary intimacy she

has with you and I have seen it in her texts about the house all over again. She thinks she's your wife and I'm tired of her rearranging things and throwing my stuff on the floor in chaos whenever she decides she wants to be "the lady of the house." It's very bizarre and it really has to stop.

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you bring up Plaintiff's Exhibit 57?

Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 57 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. DROGIN: No objection.

THE COURT: Received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 57 received in evidence)

THE WITNESS: Should I --

THE COURT: You are not being asked a question yet but you can review the document.

19 BY MR. MACURDY:

Q. Mr. De Niro, this is a March 27 e-mail exchange involving, at the end, you and Ms. Robinson; prior to that Ms. Robinson and Ms. Chen.

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. This is an e-mail exchange your counsel spoke about in his

1 | opening argument?

A. Sorry?

- 3 Q. This is an e-mail exchange your counsel spoke about in
- 4 opening argument regarding painting removal?
- 5 | A. Uh-huh.
- 6 | Q. In the townhouse?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we go to the first in

 time e-mail? And we will go through each one. The very first

 in time e-mail, Mr. Kelly.
- 11 Q. So March 27, 2019, at 11:14 a.m. Ms. Chen writes: Has any
- of this been put into motion yet? They're coming tomorrow
- morning to do the living room, Elliot's room and the gym.
- 14 Do you see that, sir?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | O. And that was to Ms. Robinson?
- 17 A. This is the response from --
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we take a look at the response?
- 20 | Q. It is from Ms. Robinson so that e-mail was from -- was to
- 21 Ms. Robinson. Do you agree?
- 22 | A. Now which one am I looking at again? Sorry.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you highlight the last two e-mails in this exchange, the earliest in time two e-mails?
- 25 Q. So we read the one on the right, sir. Ms. Robinson writes

back six minutes later at 11:20: Jerry and his guys are
handling everything so I'm not sure what additional painting
removal would need to be done. I can ask Jerry and have him

Do you see that?

contact you about the work.

A. Yes.

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

7 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you go to the next two 8 e-mails?

- Q. Ms. Chen writes back six minutes later: The paintings that are hanging on the walls. Ms. Robinson writes back four minutes after that: That would be a Kap question.
- "Kap" refers to Michael Kaplan who is another assistant at Canal; correct?
- 14 | A. Yeah.
 - Q. Ms. Robinson writes: Kap, possible to get Force over there to get the RDN, Sr.s down?
- 17 Do you see that?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. The RDN, Sr.s refer to the artwork; correct?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: That your father's artwork?
- 22 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. Yes.
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we go to the next e-mail on this chain?
- 25 Q. A few minutes later, sir, Ms. Chen wrote: I sent the

e-mail to both of you with Bob's cc. Bob said to e-mail you both. It is sometimes hard to fully understand your hierarchy of responsibilities, who does what for who and when. This needs to get done by the time the painters are here tomorrow. It is time sensitive. It is necessary for you to have to pick on a detail like this --

- A. Is it necessary.
- Q. Correct; is it necessary for you to have to pick on a detail like this and waste time addressing Kap when you have a contact for the people who handle the artwork? This could have gotten started when you instead had to ask Kap if he could get it done. Bob, we just spoke. This is time sensitive. Do you want to go over Chase's list of rules of who does what so that we don't have this silliness in the future?

Do you see that, sir?

A. I do.

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up the next?

Q. Ms. Robinson writes back 10 minutes later: Hi, Tiffany.

Unfortunately, I'm not in touch with Force, nor do I have their direct numbers. I know Kap will handle and make sure it's done.

Do you see that?

- A. Yeah.
- Q. So, sir, only about 30 minutes has elapsed during this exchange; right?

1 A. OK.

- 2 | Q. Do you agree?
- 3 A. If that's what it is it is 30 minutes. OK.

4 MR. MACURDY: Can you pull up the next e-mail,

5 Mr. Kelly?

Q. Ms. Chen writes back, at 12:00 p.m. again on March 27, 2019

7 | to Ms. Robinson, and Michael Kaplan is cc'd as well as

8 | yourself: You handled this in the past as well as other things

9 where we didn't have to have so much of a definition of what

10 you do and don't do. It is becoming increasingly difficult to

11 understand what do or don't know. What you will do versus what

12 | you don't do. Maybe you should make a new guide for both Bob

13 and myself. This way he and I know what you have determined

14 your responsibilities to be. This way, going forward, we have

15 less confusion about what you have determined your job

16 responsibilities to be. Again, this is time sensitive. As you

17 | yourself have pointed out in the past, Kap has kids and now has

18 | health issues that come first and foremost. There is no way to

19 | find an old invoice from this company to contact them? Again,

20 | this is time-sensitive. Kap may be in a doctor appointment. I

21 don't know why I have to go through explaining this logic to

22 \parallel you. It is clear there are things you do not and will not do.

23 | Bob said to e-mail you and Kap. I think we all have to be

24 sensitive to Kap's current and ongoing recovery. Bob, should I

25 ask the girls in the office to look up an old invoice and

contact Force myself? Chase clearly is saying she does not want to be helpful here.

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes.

MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you pull up the next two e-mails?

Q. Later that day Ms. Robinson forwards the chain to you, sir. She writes: It has been pretty obvious for a while that there is an issue with me working for you, and I tried really hard without bothering you, to get out of the middle and out of your home and get back to my job. It is not working. When you can, let's talk. It is not a heart attack conversation, it is not about throwing in the towel, I just want to make sure that everything runs smoothly. Your guidance will be helpful. Hope you and Helen are having fun skiing.

Do you see that, sir?

- A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- Q. And your understanding of this was when Ms. Robinson wrote it, the issue that she was raising was that Ms. Chen had an issue with her; correct?
 - A. Yeah. It was a simple thing and if she had done the right thing and set, got it in motion and got the people over there to take the paintings down so that the place could be painted, none of this would have happened. Already there is an issue.

25 | That's what I don't understand.

- Q. And Ms. Robinson, your understanding, is that she wanted to get out of the middle and out of your home and you understood that to mean that she wanted to get out of the middle of your relationship with Ms. Chen; correct?
 - A. I want -- if she's not able to do what we ask her to do -
 THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, listen to the question. The

 question goes to what you understood Ms. Robinson to be saying.

 That's what he is asking about.

Counsel, why don't you ask it again.

THE WITNESS: I understood to --

THE COURT: No.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, hold on.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

THE COURT: Counsel is going to ask the question

16 | again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 17 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 18 Q. Sir, when Ms. Robinson wrote to you --
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- that she has tried really hard to get out of the middle
- 21 and out of your home, you understood that to mean that she was
- 22 | trying to get out of the middle of your romantic relationship
- 23 | with Tiffany Chen; correct?
- 24 A. Yes, but she created the situation. Instead of just doing
- 25 what we had asked, what Tiffany had asked her to do -- that

would have been the right thing to do, that would have been the things to say jeez, that's great, she rose above this squabbling and just did it.

Q. Yes or no, sir --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. You wanted yes? Yes.
- Q. When you forward --

THE COURT: Actually, you don't have an answer to your question because he just said yes or no and he gave a "yes" answer to something that has no -- nothing attached to it.

So I realize you may be in a rush, Mr. De Niro -- I realize you may be in a rush -- but ask the question again and, again, let's get a clean answer.

MR. DROGIN: Your Honor, can we strike the response which was not to a question?

THE COURT: I think what the transcript reads is:
"Yes or no, sir --"

"You wanted yes? Yes."

I think that's meaningful so it doesn't need to be stricken. New question.

MR. MACURDY: I will ask it again, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: OK.

BY MR. MACURDY:

Q. Mr. De Niro, when Ms. Robinson wrote to you: I tried really hard to get out of the middle and out of your home, you understood her to mean that she was trying to get out of the

1 | middle of your romantic relationship with Ms. Chen; correct?

- A. OK. Yes.
- 3 | Q. And you forward Ms. Robinson's e-mail on to Ms. Chen; do
- 4 you see that?
- 5 | A. OK.

- 6 Q. And you write: Just sending for no reason but just to be
- 7 | aware; correct?
- 8 A. Yes. Uh-huh.
- 9 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we pull up Plaintiff's
- 10 | Exhibit 5?
- 11 | Q. Sir, you subsequently texted with Ms. Chen on that same day
- 12 about this e-mail that you just forwarded to Ms. Chen; correct?
- 13 A. What was that? I'm sorry.
- 14 | Q. You texted with Ms. Chen about that e-mail that you just
- 15 | forwarded to her that same day; correct?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 MR. MACURDY: Now I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 into
- 18 | evidence.
- MR. DROGIN: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: Received.
- 21 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 received in evidence)
- 22 BY MR. MACURDY:
- 23 | Q. Plaintiff's 5 are texts between you and Ms. Chen on March
- 24 | 27, that same day; correct, sir?
- 25 A. What's the question again?

1 Q. This exhibit --

A. Yeah.

- 3 Q. -- Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 --
- 4 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- are text messages between you and Ms. Chen on that same
- 6 day as that e-mail on March 27th; correct?
- 7 | A. Yeah.
- 8 Q. You write -- or Ms. Chen writes at 3:27: Did you see
- 9 | Chase's bitchy e-mail? I've had it with Chase's bullshit.
- 10 Do you see that, sir?
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 | Q. At 5:12 Ms. Chen writes: Just so you know, because of
- 13 Chase's bullshit we had to scramble to move the movers who
- 14 adjusted their schedule for us today to be able to accommodate
- 15 | Kap because he has a doctor's checkup for his heart. This is
- 16 | all because Chase is a straight up, nasty, bitch.
- Do you see that, sir?
- 18 A. Yeah.
- 19 | Q. Then you writ at 6:38: I'm going to forward an e-mail she
- 20 sent.
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Ms. Chen writes: OK.
- 23 Three minutes later she writes: Where is it?
- MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can you go into the 8:31 p.m.
- 25 texts?

1 Q. 8:31, Ms. Chen writes to you: The e-mail is a bit strange.

And you understood her to be talking about the e-mail exchange we just read; correct, sir?

- A. Sorry? What was that? Sorry.
- Q. Well, Ms. Chen refreshes to an e-mail that is a bit strange and you understood her to be talking about that e-mail exchange we just discussed?
- 8 | A. Yes.

2

3

4

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 9 Q. Ms. Chen writes: I sense an undertone of worry with
 10 blanketed by her imaginary intimacy. To say she is in the
 11 middle is odd.
- 12 A. Yup. It is odd.
 - Q. It is an odd desire to instigate her personal relationship with you, which in her mind is far more developed and weird than what is really happening.

And the last sentence: She is scared now because her persistent manner and demented imaginary intimacy with you has finally pissed me off.

Do you see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Ms. Chen communicated with you at other times and told you you were too attached to Ms. Robinson; correct?
- 23 | A. What was that question?
- Q. Ms. Chen communicated with you at other times and told you that you were too attached to Ms. Robinson; correct?

25

She did. She -- yeah. Well, I was. I worked with 1 Yes. her a long time, I wanted her to do things. I relied on her. 2 3 I thought she was going to do this and this is what happened. 4 Q. Ms. Chen gave you an ultimatum for getting rid of 5 Ms. Robinson; correct? This was about her not being in the townhouse. Period. 6 7 Q. So, sir, yes or no, Ms. Chen gave you an ultimatum for getting rid of --8 9 A. From the townhouse. 10 MR. DROGIN: Objection. 11 THE COURT: Sustained. 12 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we pull up Plaintiff's 13 Exhibit 6? 14 Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 into 15 evidence. THE COURT: Any objection? 16 17 MR. DROGIN: Give me a minute to retrieve it, your Honor, please? 18 19 THE WITNESS: Can you --20 MR. DROGIN: No objection. 21 THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 is received. 22 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 received in evidence) 23 THE WITNESS: Can you blow it up a little? 24 MR. MACURDY: Mr. Kelly, can we pull up or blow up

half of it, the 1:53 a.m. text?

1 BY MR. MACURDY:

- Q. Mr. De Niro, these are texts between you and Ms. Chen on that night at 1:53 in the morning, March 28, 2019. Do you see
- 4 | that? Correct, sir?
- 5 | A. I'm -- yes.
- 6 Q. So, Ms. Chen --
- 7 THE COURT: Give him a moment to read it.
- Sir, when you are ready to answer the question, let me know.
- 10 | THE WITNESS: OK.
- 11 Q. 1:53 a.m. --
- 12 A. Wait, wait. Sorry. Yes. OK.
- Q. 1:53 a.m. Ms. Chen writes: I was thinking about Chase's e-mail.
- Next sentence: She doesn't mind playing stepmom with twins when you ask her to suffer them she is all in. She is a real asshole.
- Do you see that?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- Q. She next texts 1:58 a.m.: My concern with her is that when you are not around and I need help getting things together she will pull exactly this kind of shit. You are away, she knows this, she had to throw in her "hope and you and Helen are having fun skiing." I asked for her help she did exactly what
- I was worried about her doing, she is not good news.

1 Do you see that?

A. Yes.

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And you wrote back: So she's doing nothing when I'm away,
- 4 | is that what you are saying?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- Q. So your information about what Ms. Robinson is doing or isn't doing is coming from Ms. Chen; correct?
- 8 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
 - Q. In your experience Ms. Robinson did what you asked; correct?
 - A. She didn't do the whole thing about getting the paintings taken from the wall and she says somewhere in here that she didn't have the number, Kap has the number. She had the number.

THE COURT: Counsel, when you get to a convenient breaking point we will break for the day.

MR. DROGIN: Your Honor, may I object? On this exhibit the text that was highlighted there actually continues with a further answer that is not being shown. I think for completeness there is a further dialogue where he explains that answer.

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I certainly am not going to read all of these exchanges. I think counsel is free to on their examination.

MR. DROGIN: I have an objection.

THE COURT: You can leave that for a later moment.

Are you done with your examination for the day?

MR. MACURDY: Now is a good breaking point, your

Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, that concludes testimony for the day. Please follow my instructions. You are not to have any communications with anybody about this case overnight, you are not to talk to anybody about this case overnight. That includes members of family, close friends and the like. And you are not to do any investigation about the case or issues related to the case.

We start tomorrow morning at 9:00. Please try to be on time, a couple minutes early, so we can get started on time. Have a good afternoon, everybody.

(Continued on next page)

25

1 (Jury not present) THE COURT: Mr. De Niro, you may step down. 2 3 (Witness steps down) 4 THE COURT: Counsel may be seated. 5 There were a couple of defense exhibits that I had not 6 yet ruled on. I believe those were 162 and 247, maybe PX- 18, 7 PX- 97. Are those the ones from plaintiff's counsel where there still are issues outstanding? 8 9 MR. MACURDY: I think they withdrew 87, your Honor, I 10 have in my notes, and then Defendant's Exhibit 162, Defendant's 11 Exhibit 247 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 97, there is two other docs 12 but those three, they all don't involve Mr. De Niro so our 13 objection is to -- there is no foundation to ask this witness 14 about them. 15 THE COURT: Let me hear from defense counsel. 16 MR. DROGIN: I just need to find them. It was 61? 17 THE COURT: No. The issues are DX 162, 247, and 97, 18 none of which Mr. De Niro was copied on, and the objection as I 19 understand it is the use of those documents through 20 Mr. De Niro. 21 MR. DROGIN: So on the first one, 162, it is an e-mail 22 from Ms. Robinson to Mr. De Niro, it is a thread between them. 23 MR. MACURDY: I can pull it up as well, your Honor, 24 unless I am looking at the wrong one.

THE COURT: Yes, we are all looking at the wrong one

1 | if that is the point.

MR. MACURDY: I have it as an e-mail from Ms. Robinson to Ms. Robinson.

THE COURT: It is from Ms. Robinson to Ms. Robinson?

MR. DROGIN: Oh, I see where it is. Sorry.

You are showing me the wrong exhibit.

THE COURT: I can read them but just me how you intend to use it and why it is permissible.

MR. DROGIN: So it has to do with the date of a meeting and in the event that Mr. De Niro is asked about the meeting and does not recall the day, the plaintiff has recorded the date of the meeting in her time sheet which we don't dispute, so it is really just to refresh the witness' recollection if there is a dispute over that date.

THE COURT: You are not looking to offer it, you are just looking to use it to refresh recollection; is that correct?

MR. DROGIN: Correct.

THE COURT: All right. So I don't think there is an objection to rule on with respect to that. The document can be used to refresh recollection if there is a need to refresh recollection if the foundation for that is established.

Next one is 247. And this is a set of texts that

NAU5rob5

De Niro - Direct

Mr. De Niro is not on so how are you going to use it?

MR. DROGIN: Give me a second, please?

So this also, your Honor, this has to do with the 9:51 text on April 2nd, and again, this is to be shown to the witness just to refresh his recollection if he didn't recall.

THE COURT: So you are not looking to offer it into evidence?

MR. DROGIN: Correct.

THE COURT: So we will see if a foundation is laid that the witness' recollection needs to be refreshed. But since it is not going to be offered into evidence, it is not going to be read, it is just going to be shown to the witness with a preface of I'm showing you this exhibit, I'm directing you to these pages, does this refresh your recollection as to the following and the witness will say either it refreshes his recollection or it doesn't.

MR. DROGIN: Favor enough.

THE COURT: Next, PX- 97, it is a plaintiff's exhibit. Again, this appears to be a set of messages on which the witness Mr. De Niro is not copied, so let me hear from defense counsel.

(Continued on next page)

1	MR. DROGIN: Okay. So on this one, he is copied on,
2	if you scroll down, it's here we go. It's the Bates
3	stamp number is Canal 4 I'm sorry. You know what? That's
4	98. That's the problem. Okay. So the Bates number, maybe
5	it's a matter of how it is stamped. It's stamped as
6	Exhibit 98.
7	THE COURT: All right. So you're not offering 97; is
8	that correct?
9	MR. DROGIN: Correct.
10	THE COURT: So that resolves that.
11	Okay. Do you know what 98 is, plaintiff's counsel?
12	Is there an issue with respect to 98?
13	MR. DROGIN: I don't think there is.
14	MR. MACURDY: I can look it up.
15	THE COURT: I wasn't asking defense counsel.
16	MR. DROGIN: There's no issue with 98, if you were
17	asking us.
18	THE COURT: I wasn't. Does defendant intend to use
19	98?
20	MR. DROGIN: Yes. But I don't think there's an
21	objection about 98.
22	THE COURT: Let me hear from plaintiffs.
23	MR. MACURDY: I think it's hearsay if they try and use
24	it, your Honor.
25	MR. DROGIN: Well, which part?

THE COURT: No, you're not talking to each other. Let me look at it.

Let me understand plaintiff's objection.

MR. MACURDY: It's Canal's internal e-mail exchange. It doesn't involve a party opponent.

THE COURT: All right. Why is 98 admissible?

MR. DROGIN: Well, the top e-mail is from Ms. Chen to Mr.-- it's actually to Michael Tasch copying Mr. De Niro, so he's on this thread.

THE COURT: I understand that, but the objection was a hearsay objection. So tell me what the relevance is of this, and then I can figure out whether there's a well-founded hearsay objection.

MR. DROGIN: So counsel raised this in their opening statement about once Ms. Chen started asking questions about Ms. Robinson, the professionals here were gathered up, and they set out to find information on her. This is the — this is the thread that actually shows Ms. Chen making inquiry of the accountant, Mr. Tasch, relaying what Mr. Drogin had specifically asked that they locate.

So they are specifically asking for Mr. Tasch to find and provide them with certain information first about purchases and returns and then about American Express. So we're literally watching this unfold through these e-mails.

And the timing is -- well, that's the answer to your

question. There's no relevance objection, so I'm not going to explain why it's relevant. But he's -- it specifically -- the words are being attributed to him, and then he's on the e-mail, the subsequent e-mail.

THE COURT: Let me hear from plaintiff's counsel why there's only a small portion of this that, it seems to me, to be admitted for its truth, and as to that, Mr. De Niro's audit arguably falls within a shepherd-type of exception for a statement of forward-looking intent. So why isn't it admissible just for the purpose of showing what Ms. Chen's directions were at a particular point in time?

MR. MACURDY: Your Honor, and this is on our exhibit list. We may very well seek to use this. My point was that it is hearsay as to them. They can --

THE COURT: All right. Listen, we'll wait and see whether you use it, and if they seek to use it and you want to object, you can object, and I'll rule on it at that time.

All right. Is there anything else from plaintiff before we break?

MR. MACURDY: There was one other exhibit on their list, your Honor, to use, which was another plaintiff's exhibit.

THE COURT: Oh, yes.

MR. MACURDY: Plaintiff 18. So this is Ms. Robinson writing to Mr. De Niro about, you haven't responded to my

proposal in July of 2019, I'll see counsel unless I hear back from you. And your Honor ruled on this and said that this is a document that only can be used for impeachment purposes. It goes back to again they don't want to let us bring in the fact they sent -- well, we'll talk with counsel per your instruction about maybe a redacted release, but pursuant to your Honor's ruling, this is only coming in as impeachment.

THE COURT: I think I directed you to meet and confer regarding the release, and this, we will await to see what you bring out through your examination of Mr. De Niro. You also opened some doors I think in your opening, but I don't need to resolve this issue right now.

Anything else from plaintiff?

MR. MACURDY: One thing I will bring up, in defendant's opening statement, I mean, they went on for a while about Mr. De Niro and how he was a pleasure to work with, and it seems like they have opened the door for something like the voicemail that he left Ms. Robinson berating her and yelling at her through those sort of statements to impeach that suggestion that he was a pleasure to work with.

THE COURT: My ruling stands on that.

Okay. Anything from defendants?

MR. SCHOENSTEIN: Only thing, your Honor, housekeeping. I assume it would assist the Court if the parties collated a list of admitted exhibits every day and got

that to your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. Please do that with a brief description of what the exhibits are in a form. When it comes time for the jury to retire to deliberate, we can then convert that into an exhibit list that goes back into the jury room.

Just send that to me before midnight tonight.

All right. I will see you all at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Please try to be here a couple minutes before that.

(Adjourned to October 31, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.)

* * *

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	ROBERT ANTHONY DE NIRO
4	Direct By Mr. Macurdy
5	PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS
6	Exhibit No. Received
7	211
8	116
9	227
10	225
11	221
12	303
13	207
14	204
15	203
16	304
17	199
18	117
19	214
20	172
21	4
22	57
23	5
24	6
25	