## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

SUSAN SOTO PALMER, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.

STEVEN HOBBS, in his official capacity as Secretary of State of Washington, and the STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Defendants,
and
JOSE TREVINO, ISMAEL G. CAMPOS, and State Representative ALEX YBARRA,

Intervenor-Defendants.

Intervenor-Defendants oppose this Motion for Inquiry Concerning Potential Conflict of Interest ("Inquiry Motion"), (Dkt. \# 150), because there is no procedural basis allowing it, it is brought in a court that has no jurisdiction to hear it, and the motion has no factual basis to support it. Instead, the Motion is essentially a thinly-veiled attempt to sneak in through the back door that which the Court would not allow in through the front: namely, a prohibition on undersigned
counsel representing clients who defend a Voting Rights Act ("VRA") claim while simultaneously representing another client who pursues a Fourteenth Amendment claim against the same map. This Court has already rejected that argument. (See Dkt. \# 69 at 9-10.)

Defendant State of Washington's ("State's") Inquiry Motion" is as lacking in merit as it is in procedural grounding. To quote the Bard, this Motion is "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." William Shakespeare, Macbeth act 5, sc. 5. This is evident from the Motion's own terms, as the Motion seeks not relief, but for the Court to "inquire" as to instant counsel's communications and relationship with their clients. The attorney-client ethics rules were intended as a shield for clients, but here, the State attempts to use them as a sword to sever an attorney-client relationship, despite the fact that the clients do not seek such severance. This Court should roundly reject the State's gamesmanship and deny the Motion.

Responding to a motion devoid of a procedural grounding is tricky business. However, the Palmer Intervenor-Defendants ("Palmer Intervenors") and the Garcia Plaintiff ("Mr. Garcia") are confident that the Court will see the State's Inquiry Motion for what it is: over-thetop gamesmanship designed to disqualify and smear counsel on the eve of dispositive motion briefing deadlines. Such a tactic is designed not to serve the sanctity of the Court, nor to ensure the adequacy of representation, nor to adhere to the duty about which the State opines. Rather, the purpose of the State's frivolous Inquiry Motion is to disadvantage the Palmer Intervenors and Mr. Garcia-with dispositive motion due dates for both cases just days away-in hopes that
it makes the State's job easier. ${ }^{1}$ For the reasons explained below, the Court should deny the State's Motion and take whatever steps the Court deems necessary regarding its actions. ${ }^{2}$

## I. There is No Procedural Basis for the State's Inquiry Motion.

Even if this Court has jurisdiction and the State has standing, there is no procedure upon which the State may base an Inquiry Motion related to potential conflicts in a civil matter. Indeed, undersigned counsel is not aware of a single case where the government has made an inquiry motion in a civil matter for potential attorney conflicts.

Notably, inquiry motions are generally reserved for criminal matters. See, e.g., United States v. Razo-Quiroz, No. 1:19-cr-00015-DAD-SAB, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32410, at *33 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2019) (allowing the filing of an inquiry motion regarding potential conflicts in a criminal matter but denying a concurrent disqualification motion because any potential
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conflicts had been waived); United States v. Medina, No. CR 06-00144-JSW, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21156, at *1-2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2007) (same); United States v. Wegers, No. CR050231C, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30856, at *14-15 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 10, 2005) (same). If this were a criminal matter, the State could perhaps point to Fed. R. Crim. P. 44(c) as the basis for its Motion. See Wegers, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30856, at *3. However, this is a civil matter, which does not carry the same implications because there is no constitutional right to representation in a civil suit as there is with a criminal prosecution. See United States v. W. Titanium, Inc., No. 08-cr-4229-JLS, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79508, at *38 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2010) ("However, once alerted to even a potential conflict of interest, the Court has an independent duty to ensure that criminal defendants receive a trial that is fair and does not contravene the Sixth Amendment." (emphasis added)). This is perhaps why the State is unable to cite a single procedural rule to serve as the basis for this civil Motion. (See generally Dkt. \# 150.)

Thus, the State's filing of an inquiry motion about a potential conflict in a civil matter is an enigma. Indeed, in civil cases, inquiry motions are usually made to inquire about a docket or some aspect of a case's status. See, e.g., Klucka v. Ostrovsky, No. 2:15-cv-1062-JCM (VCF), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91260, at *1 (D. Nev. July 7, 2015) ("Plaintiff's instant motion for inquiry does not ask for relief. Plaintiff merely asks for clarification from the court regarding the status of his case."); Gray v. Ryan, No. CV-17-00963-PHX-GMS, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195846, at *1 n. 1 (D. Ariz. Nov. 12, 2019) (denying a petitioner's "Motion for Inquiry of the General Docket," whereby the "Petitioner request[ed] the status of his Third Amended Petition"); Newton v. Nevada, No. 2:16-cv-01824-KJD-GWF, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25521, at
*1 n. 1 (D. Nev. Feb. 21, 2017) (denying "Plaintiff"s inquiry [motion] about his financial certificates as moot"); Silver v. Wolfson, No. 2:18-cv-01106-JAD-CWH, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 70121, at *1 (D. Nev. Apr. 4, 2019) ("Presently before the court is plaintiff's motion for inquiry . . [on] the status of his in forma pauperis application, the court's screening order, and his motion for permission for electronic case filing."); Hill v. Harper, No. 2:20-cv-01655-KJDDJA, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 230779, at *6 (D. Nev. Dec. 2, 2021) (denying a plaintiff's "motion of inquiry" that "appear[ed] to ask the Court . . . to send him a copy of Defendant's response to Plaintiff's [] motion"); Patterson v. California, No. 2:12-cv-2475-KJM-EFB P, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28349, at *42 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2014) ("[P]laintiff also filed a motion styled as a 'motion of inquiry' in which Patterson requests the status of his petition."). However, instead of using this motion as a docket-monitoring mechanism, the State's counsel attempts to use it for an advantage in litigation. See infra Part III.

What's more, even when an inquiry motion on purported conflicts of interest is filed in a criminal matter, it is generally construed as a motion to disqualify. See United States v. Rasco, No. CR408-100, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65246, at *7 (S.D. Ga. July 29, 2009) ("Conveniently, courts have been faced with motions to disqualify mistakenly labeled as motions for inquiry before. Generally, the motions are construed as motions to disqualify."); see also United States v. Hanania, 989 F. Supp. 1187, 1192 (M.D. Fla. 1997) (construing a "Notice of Conflict of Interest" and "Amended Notice of Conflict" as "a Motion to Disqualify Defendant's Counsel," which the court denied); United States v. Collins, No. 1:08-cr-47, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39848, at * 1 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 21, 2008) (treating a notice "of a potential conflict involving Defendant's counsel" as a motion to disqualify and denying it) (unpublished); United States v. Evanson, No.
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2:05-cr-805-TC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76244, at * 1 (D. Utah Oct. 18, 2006) (construing motion for inquiry as motion to disqualify). And, in this Circuit, such an inquiry motion is usually filed with a corresponding motion to disqualify. See, e.g., Razo-Quiroz, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32410, at *33; Medina, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21156, at *1-2; Wegers, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30856, at *14-15.

Here, however, the State has not moved to disqualify counsel. Thus, to construe its Inquiry Motion as a motion to disqualify would be inappropriate. See Rasco, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65246, at *6 ("[T]he Court is not aware of any law allowing the Government to move the Court for sua sponte action in a case where the disqualification is for the benefit of the Government, and the Government has provided none."). Crucially, here, the State contends that it "does not take a position on whether disqualification is necessary or appropriate here." (Dkt. \# 150 at 2.) Simply put, the Court should not construe the motion as asking for a remedy that the state has not requested.

## II. The Court Lacks Jurisdiction to Hear the State's Controversy-less Motion.

As an initial matter, this Motion is procedurally defective as the State has not moved for disqualification. Instead, the State invites this Court to appoint itself the arbiter of the attorneyclient relationship between the undersigned counsel and their clients. Contrary to the State's errant belief, federal courts are not roving tribunals, musing over imagined ethical dilemmas or issuing advisory opinions about what would happen if those hypotheticals were reality.

Article III of the U.S. Constitution limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to hear "Cases" and "Controversies." See TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez, 141 S. Ct. 2190, 2203 (2021); Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 559 (1992), thereby "confin[ing] the federal courts to a
properly judicial role," Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016). To demonstrate standing, the party invoking federal jurisdiction must prove that (1) it suffered an injury in fact, (2) the opposing party caused that injury, and (3) a favorable decision would be likely to redress that injury. Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560-61.

However, "neither the United States Supreme Court nor the Ninth Circuit has addressed the particular question of whether the standing doctrine bars a nonclient party from moving to disqualify the opposing party's counsel on the grounds of a conflict of interest." Icicle Seafoods, 523 F. Supp. 3d at 1269 (quoting FMC Techs., Inc. v. Edwards, 420 F. Supp. 2d 1153, 1156 (W.D. Wash. 2006)) "[C]ourts in [the Western District of Washington] have found that the nonclient 'must establish a personal stake in the motion to disqualify sufficient to satisfy the irreducible constitutional minimum of Article III." Id. (citation omitted). The State lacks such a personal stake here for two reasons.

First, the State has not moved for disqualification. (See Dkt. \# 150 at 2.) The entire inquiry centers around whether the opposing party has standing to move to disqualify opposing counsel. Icicle Seafoods, 523 F. Supp. 3d at 1269. However, the State has not filed a disqualification motion. Instead, it has moved for the Court to inquire about whether a potential conflict exists. Thus, the "merely 'speculative"" nature of the State's motion demonstrates that standing is lacking here. See Lujan, 504 U.S. at 561 (citation omitted). For all its bluster, the State's Inquiry Motion is actually a request that this Court issue an advisory opinion, which the Court is constitutionally prohibited from doing. See Flast v. Cohen, 392 U.S. 83, 95 (1968).

Second, the State has not been injured because no one has been injured. There is no unwaivable (or un-waived) conflict here. See infra Part III; see also Icicle Seafoods, 523 F. Supp.

3 d at 1269 n .3 (finding that "the record does not support a finding of conflict of interest" and that the movant "fail[ed] to meet standing requirements in the first instance"). Undersigned counsel's clients have not filed an ethics complaint, raised an issue with this court, or expressed displeasure with the underlying goals of the Palmer or Garcia litigation. In short, there is no issue other than the one the State has conjured in its imagination.

In sum, the State has not been injured, and its motion presents no opportunity for redressability but, instead, seeks an impermissible advisory opinion. Consequently, the State lacks standing for the instant motion, and the Court should deny the State's Motion for lack of jurisdiction. See Flast, 392 U.S. at 95 ("[N]o justiciable controversy is presented . . . when the parties are asking for an advisory opinion ... and when there is no standing to maintain the action." (internal citations omitted)).

## III. Even if the Court has Jurisdiction, and the State's Motion had a Procedural Basis, the Inquiry Motion is Wholly Without Merit.

As an initial matter, the State attempts a burden-bait-and-switch here. Although the State has not moved for disqualification and avers that it takes no position on the appropriateness of disqualification, (Dkt. \# 150 at 2), it later contends that undersigned counsel here bears the burden of demonstrating that disqualification is inappropriate, (id. at 8) (citing Icicle Seafoods, Inc., 523 F. Supp. 3d at 1268-69). Put differently, the State suggests that undersigned counsel must disprove a motion that the State has not made. This contradictory suggestion alone is sufficient to deny the State's Motion, as it really seeks nothing but an advisory opinion.

Moreover, even if the State had moved for disqualification, the very case it cites regarding the burden of proof indicates that the burden likely does not rest with the law firm whose disqualification is sought. See id. at 1269 n .3 (indicating that the recent decision of the

Washington State Supreme Court in Plein v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company, 195 Wash. 2d 677, 687 (2020), raises concern "that federal district courts [have] misinterpreted Comment 6 to ABA Model Rule 1.9 in concluding that the burden rests with the firm whose disqualification is sought" but declining to rule on whether the same is true of Rule 1.7 because there was no conflict and the movant lacked standing). Indeed, such an interpretation would accord with other jurisdictions where "[t]he party moving to disqualify counsel bears the burden of proving the grounds for disqualification." In re BellSouth Corp., 334 F.3d 941, 961 (11th Cir. 2003) (collecting cases from the Second, Fifth, and Eighth Circuits). Thus, if the burden rests with the State, its speculative motion has come nowhere near meeting its burden because it does not contend that there is an actual conflict, only a potential one. (See generally Dkt. \# 150.)

Regardless, even if the burden rests with the non-movants here, they can easily meet it should the Court order any inquiry. ${ }^{3}$ First, this Court already rejected the State's argument that undersigned Counsel's defense of a VRA claim against Washington's Legislative Map conflicts it from simultaneously pursuing a Fourteen Amendment claim against the same map. (Dkt. \# 69 at 9-10.) As the Court previously ruled when Palmer Intervenors filed their Motion to Intervene, "the Court does not perceive an insurmountable conflict between the claims set forth in Garcia ... and intervenors' opposition to plaintiffs' Section 2 claim." (Id. at 9.) Nothing of substance has changed since that ruling other than the depths to which the State will descend to prevent undersigned counsel from performing their duty to their clients.
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Indeed, in an attempt to breathe new life into this argument, the State misconstrues the litigants' goals and testimony. ${ }^{4}$ The Palmer Intervenors believe that the map should not be redrawn because it does not dilute the votes of Hispanics in LD 15; but if it must be redrawn, then it should be redrawn in a race-blind manner as not to be discriminatory. Garcia Plaintiff believes that the map must be redrawn-without consideration of race-because race predominated in the original drawing of LD 15 . Both parties agree fundamentally that a raceblind map is appropriate, which is what the Constitution demands in this and all instances. Neither Ismael Campos, Alex Ybarra, Jose Trevino, or Benancio Garcia are attorneys or experts in the nuances of redistricting law, nor is that required of them. Cherry-picked and misleading questions and answers ${ }^{5}$ provided in a deposition by a non-attorney regarding the intricacies of redistricting law should be given little—if any—weight. ${ }^{6}$ How can anyone expect a lay party to

[^2]understand the nuances of redistricting jurisprudence when such issues are regularly misconstrued and debated in the highest courts of the land? See, e.g., Merrill v. Milligan, No. 21-1086, 142 S. Ct. 879 (U.S., Feb. 7, 2022) (Section 2 redistricting case presently pending in the United States Supreme Court); Covington v. North Carolina, 316 F.R.D. 117, 166 (M.D.N.C. 2016) (citing Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900, 921 (1995), aff’d North Carolina v. Covington, 137 S. Ct. 2211 (2017) (discussing the effect of a redistricting map that was drawn predominantly based on race, when the map drawers operated under the mistaken belief that the VRA required a majority-minority district).

Second, the State makes similar misrepresentation about the Palmer Intervenors and Mr. Garcia's knowledge about the litigation funding. ${ }^{7}$ Palmer Intervenors and Mr. Garcia were advised of, and consented to, the existence of the third-party payor in their respective litigations. This financial arrangement has not adversely affected anyone's representation, and undersigned counsel has at all times adequately represented their clients. At no point in either litigation have any of undersigned counsel's clients claimed otherwise.

Third, as it relates to Mr. Garcia, a motion for inquiry based on an ongoing deposition is premature at best. Mr. Garcia's deposition is set to continue at a future date. (See Dkt. \# 153.) Premising a motion on testimony that has yet to conclude is flawed $a b$ initio. The State's action to the contrary has wasted the time and resources of the Court and the parties.

[^3]Finally, if the State truly had ethical concerns about the conduct of Holtzman Vogel, it would have kept its distance instead of assisting counsel in its defense. Notably, during the deposition of Dr. Henry Flores, Mr. Hughes emailed Dallin Holt—of Holtzman Vogel—multiple times to provide real-time assistance in the questioning of Dr. Flores. ${ }^{8}$ That interaction highlights that Mr. Hughes had no qualms working with Holtzman Vogel when it served his interestsnamely, defending against the same VRA claim as Palmer Intervenors. The only thing that has changed is that it no longer serves the State's interests to work with counsel from Holtzman Vogel because they are representing clients who are effectively pursuing a Fourteenth Amendment claim against the State of Washington. Simply put, the Inquiry Motion is not about an emerging conflict of interest, but the State's emerging difficulty in defending against Mr. Garcia's Fourteenth Amendment claim.

In sum, to the extent the State brings up purported new information, it is-at best-a misconstruction of the facts. To the extent it raises previously rejected arguments, they should again be rejected. Undersigned counsel has more than met its burden-assuming arguendo that it is even their burden to bear-and the State cannot rebut it. Therefore, the Court should deny this motion.

## IV. Conclusion.

For the forgoing reasons, the Court should dismiss the State's Inquiry Motion as improvidently filed and take whatever other steps the Court deems necessary regarding the State's conduct.
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## Deposition of Benancio Garcia III

# Garcia III v. Hobbs, et ano. / Palmer v. Hobbs, et al. 

## February 3, 2023

Garcia III v. Hobbs, et ano. / Palmer v. Hobbs, et al.


|  | Page 5 |  | Page 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | TACOMA, WASHINGTON; FEBRUARY 3, 2023 | 1 | didn't -- I felt he didn't honor the deal, and then we |
| 2 | 9:09 a.m. | 2 | ended up settling for -- |
| 3 | -000- | 3 | Q. That was auto bodywork? |
| 4 | BENANCIO GARCIA III, witness herein, having been | 4 | A. Yeah, auto bodywork. |
| 5 | first duly sworn on oath, | 5 | Q. And about how long was -- go ahead. Sorry. |
| 6 | was examined and testified | 6 | A. Oh, I can't recall exactly how long ago, but I |
| 7 | as follows: | 7 | was with the military at the time, and it was after I |
| 8 | EXAMINATION | 8 | had just returned from Iraq. |
| 9 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 9 | Q. Okay. |
| 10 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Garcia. I know we met just | 10 | A. And -- |
| 11 | very briefly off the record, but I'm Andrew Hughes. I | 11 | Q. I'd like to go over -- go ahead. Sorry. |
| 12 | represent State of Washington in this matter. | 12 | A. -- the second time was, I took a -- a |
| 13 | Do you mind just stating your name for the | 13 | deposition done, and it was a private matter, and I |
| 14 | record, please? | 14 | settled the case. |
| 15 | A. Yes. Benancio Garcia III. | 15 | Q. And about how long ago was that? |
| 16 | Q. And what's your address, for the record? | 16 | A. I'm sorry. I'm trying to recall. Maybe 2013, |
| 17 | A. Physical address? | 17 | '15, somewhere. |
| 18 | Q. Yes, please. | 18 | Q. Okay. So it sounds like you've done this |
| 19 | A. 311 Birch Avenue, Grandview, Washington 98930. | 19 | before, and probably know the rules, but I do want to |
| 20 | Q. And that's in Yakima County? | 20 | just go over a few quick, you know, guidelines that will |
| 21 | A. Yes, it is. | 21 | hopefully make this go as smoothly as possible. |
| 22 | Q. Have you recently moved? | 22 | You understand this is being recorded by a |
| 23 | A. Yes. It's still in Yakima County because I had | 23 | court reporter, so we need verbal answers. |
| 24 | a house fire. So I moved five times during that | 24 | That make sense? |
| 25 | transition. | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | Page 6 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | Q. Gosh. What was your most recent permanent | 1 | Q. So no nodding, no shaking the head, etc. |
| 2 | address? | 2 | And because there's a court reporter taking |
| 3 | A. Oh, my goodness. I want to say -- I bel- -- | 3 | everything down, we can't talk over each other. |
| 4 | 822 Olmstead Road, Grandview, Washington 98930. | 4 | Understood? |
| 5 | Q. Okay. And I guess what I'm trying to ask is, | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | what was the address of the house that burned down? | 6 | Q. So l'll try and wait until you're done speaking |
| 7 | A. Oh, 311 Birch Avenue. It didn't completely | 7 | to ask my next question, and vice versa. |
| 8 | burn down, but quite a bit of fire damage was done. | 8 | Does that work? |
| 9 | Q. Gosh. I'm sorry to hear that. | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | A. Thank you. | 10 | Q. And you also understand that you're under oath |
| 11 | Q. And that's all in the legislative district -- | 11 | here? |
| 12 | let me -- strike that. | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | You live in Legislative District 13 -- 15? | 13 | Q. If I ask you a question and you don't |
| 14 | A. 15. | 14 | understand it, can you please ask me to clarify that? |
| 15 | Q. 15. And you've lived there during the course | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | of this moving because of the house fire? | 16 | Q. Okay. I just want to be sure that you |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | understand the questions I'm asking, and that your |
| 18 | Q. Okay. Mr. Garcia, have you ever been deposed | 18 | answers actually go to the questions that l'm asking. |
| 19 | before? | 19 | Okay? |
| 20 | A. Yes. | 20 | A. Yes. |
| 21 | Q. Can you tell me about that? | 21 | Q. I don't anticipate we'll be here all that long, |
| 22 | A. I was de- -- I was deposed many years ago when | 22 | but if you do need a break at any time, you should feel |
| 23 | I was with the military because of a business | 23 | free to ask for one. I'd just ask that, if there's a |
| 24 | transaction where I needed to get bodywork done, and we | 24 | question pending, you answer that question before taking |
| 25 | had agreed upon a certain price, and we didn't -- he | 25 | a break. Okay? |


|  | Page 9 |  | Page 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | Q. And do you still work for the federal |
| 2 | Q. Now, Mr. Garcia, is there any reason you can't | 2 | government? |
| 3 | give full, accurate, and truthful testimony here today? | 3 | A. No. |
| 4 | A. No. | 4 | Q. When did you stop working for the federal |
| 5 | Q. You're not sick or taking any medications or | 5 | government? |
| 6 | anything like that, that affect your memory or your | 6 | A. In April of 2019. |
| 7 | cognitive function? | 7 | Q. So now you're just enjoying retirement? |
| 8 | A. No. | 8 | A. I ran for U.S. Congress. That's why I left the |
| 9 | Q. Okay. Your attorney might at some point object | 9 | federal government. |
| 10 | to my questions. Those objections are mostly just for | 10 | Q. And what party did you run -- well, let me back |
| 11 | the record. So unless Mr. Stokesbary tells you not to | 11 | up. |
| 12 | answer, you still need to answer my question. | 12 | Which congressional district did you run from? |
| 13 | Does that make sense? | 13 | A. 4th Congressional District. |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | Q. That's federal congress; correct? |
| 15 | Q. Okay. Mr. Garcia, what did you do to prepare | 15 | A. Correct. |
| 16 | today for this deposition? | 16 | Q. And what party did you run as? |
| 17 | A. I didn't prepare for this deposition. | 17 | A. Republican. |
| 18 | Q. You didn't have any meetings with Counsel? | 18 | Q. And why did you choose to run for congress, |
| 19 | A. Well, we spoke about -- a little bit about me | 19 | Mr. Garcia? |
| 20 | showing up, and not so much showing up, but doing a | 20 | A. Because I believe in protecting our |
| 21 | Zoom. But I was already here, so I really didn't have | 21 | constitution as it was written, and l've served in |
| 22 | much to say. | 22 | combat to protect those rights, and I truly believe in |
| 23 | Most of my information came in, was through the | 23 | the American dream. |
| 24 | subpoena. So that's why I planned to be here and didn't | 24 | And I believe, in my life history, being Ebony |
| 25 | have a laptop and expected to be here at this location | 25 | Senate rep in college, being part of LULAC, being part |
|  | Page 10 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | that I feel awkward about. | 1 | of the Republican National Hispanic Assembly, I believe |
| 2 | Q. Understood. I do apologize for that. | 2 | that we should all have fair representation according to |
| 3 | Did you speak with anyone besides | 3 | our laws. |
| 4 | Mr. Stokesbary about this deposition? | 4 | Q. And what does that mean, "fair representation |
| 5 | A. Yes. The attorney that's right here that l'm | 5 | according to our laws"? |
| 6 | using the office for because we were both confused. | 6 | A. Fair representation meaning to me, like in our |
| 7 | Q. Fair. | 7 | 4th Congressional District, we are largely a |
| 8 | Did you review any documents in preparation for | 8 | Latino-based district, and it would only make sense that |
| 9 | this deposition? | 9 | leadership qualities in the sense of the district |
| 10 | A. Other than what my attorney, Drew Stokesbary, | 10 | population, that you would see a fair number of Latino |
| 11 | had -- we'd written in the Complaint versus Steve Hobbs. | 11 | representation. But whether it's on the other side of |
| 12 | Q. Fair enough. | 12 | the mountains, if it's the Vietnamese district, or |
| 13 | Mr. Garcia, what do you do for a living right | 13 | Russian district, you would see fair representation. |
| 14 | now? | 14 | Q. Okay. And why did you feel like you were the |
| 15 | A. I'm retired military. | 15 | right person to represent the people in the 4th |
| 16 | Q. Okay. And what did you do before you retired | 16 | Congressional District? |
| 17 | from the military? No. That was a -- that was a | 17 | A. I grew up there. I was born there. I |
| 18 | foolish question. | 18 | understand our culture there. We're a rural area. I've |
| 19 | How long were you in the military, Mr. Garcia? | 19 | been able to make a difference in approximately 1,000 |
| 20 | A. I was in the military from -- active duty | 20 | households being homeowners when I worked for the |
| 21 | part -- 2003 to 2008. | 21 | federal government. |
| 22 | Q. And what did you do after you retired from the | 22 | So there are over 1,000 people, families, that |
| 23 | military in 2008? | 23 | don't know l'm the reason why they're a homeowner. I've |
| 24 | A. I worked for a nonprofit, then worked for the | 24 | done many, many non- -- hours, like with AmeriCorps. |
| 25 | federal government. | 25 | I've worked in Granger High School. I am 51 years old, |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | and I have -- I always believe in a life of service. | 1 | the fact of what was being stated on the redistricting |
| 2 | And so my heart leads me to my desires, and that is to | 2 | lines, you know, so it caught my attention. The Yakima |
| 3 | make a difference for our community and our country, and | 3 | Herald one, and then another friend. |
| 4 | that's what l've been able to do in my -- my 51 years. | 4 | But when I realized the redistricting lines |
| 5 | Q. That sounds fantastic. | 5 | were not of my personal -- I believe are based on |
| 6 | You mentioned -- I didn't get the name of it, | 6 | illegal gerrymandering and based on race, and I don't |
| 7 | sorry, the Republican Hispanic -- some organization you | 7 | agree with that. |
| 8 | were part of? | 8 | Q. Who was it who called you? |
| 9 | A. Yes. The Republican National Hispanic | 9 | A. I didn't know her very well. I met her at a -- |
| 10 | Assembly. | 10 | a -- gosh. I'm trying to remember her name right now. |
| 11 | Q. And what is the Republican National -- oh, go | 11 | I -- I can't recall her name at this point. But I met |
| 12 | ahead. Sorry. | 12 | her at a political event with both parties. So it was |
| 13 | A. I'm sorry. It was founded in 1967, and it was | 13 | both parties event, both Democrats and Republicans in, I |
| 14 | to get more of the Latino population organized to help | 14 | want to say, the Bellevue area. So -- and what was |
| 15 | them get registered to vote. And I truly believe it | 15 | written, like I said, in the Yakima Herald. |
| 16 | doesn't matter which party it is, that registration for | 16 | Q. So this person called you out of the blue, |
| 17 | every American is truly important. That's why I fought | 17 | looking for a plaintiff for this lawsuit; is that right? |
| 18 | for the rights for us to be free. | 18 | A. Well -- |
| 19 | Q. And you also mentioned being a member of LULAC. | 19 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. |
| 20 | What's LULAC? | 20 | BY MR. HUGHES: |
| 21 | A. Yes, Legal United Latin American Citizens. I | 21 | Q. You can answer, Mr. Garcia. |
| 22 | was the secretary when it was founded, I want to say, in | 22 | A. You know, I must have made an impression. |
| 23 | 2026 in Granger, Washington. | 23 | That's all I can say because I had only met her once. |
| 24 | Q. And why did you choose to be a part of LULAC? | 24 | So I can't even say a friend, only because I -- I met |
| 25 | A. There are many unregistered voters, and I | 25 | her once, so, you know... |
|  | Page 14 |  | Page 16 |
| 1 | wanted to be part of a Latino organization that has a | 1 | Q. I just want to be clear. Yes, this person |
| 2 | good history, and also be part of getting people | 2 | called you, recruiting a plaintiff for this lawsuit? |
| 3 | registered to vote. I strongly believe that our voting | 3 | A. Let me know about the situation, which was, you |
| 4 | rights are so critical to each American. | 4 | know -- let me know about the situation and it may be |
| 5 | Q. I think you touched on this a bit earlier, but | 5 | something I may want to be involved in. I'm trying to |
| 6 | why is it important, in your view, that people be | 6 | recall the whole -- the conversation. It's been a |
| 7 | represented by someone who shares their -- their life | 7 | little while. |
| 8 | experiences or understands their culture? | 8 | Q. Do you recall what organization this person was |
| 9 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. | 9 | with? |
| 10 | A. Well -- | 10 | A. Actually, she had ran for the state position |
| 11 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 11 | for OSPI. I'm just forgetting her name. |
| 12 | Q. You can answer. | 12 | Q. Was it Maia Espinoza? |
| 13 | A. Could you repeat the question one more time? | 13 | A. That's correct. |
| 14 | Q. Yeah. I said -- I think you touched on this | 14 | Q. So Ms. Espinoza reached out to you about |
| 15 | earlier, but why is it so important that people be | 15 | potentially serving as a -- a plaintiff in this lawsuit? |
| 16 | represented by a representative who understands their | 16 | A. Well, no. She didn't say personally, but she |
| 17 | culture and shares their life experiences? | 17 | said that I may be interested, and she didn't have much |
| 18 | A. I think it's important that when you share | 18 | details, but we had talked a little bit because I was |
| 19 | cultural experiences, that you relate to them why it's | 19 | interested in her brochure that she had also. |
| 20 | so important to vote. It's just having something in | 20 | Q. What about her brochure? |
| 21 | common. | 21 | A. It was about getting people to vote. |
| 22 | Q. Mr. Garcia, how did you get involved in this | 22 | Q. And about when did Ms. Espinoza call you? |
| 23 | lawsuit? | 23 | A. I can't recall. It's been a little while. |
| 24 | A. I got involved in this lawsuit by a phone call | 24 | Q. Did you follow the redistricting process as it |
| 25 | from someone l'd known in the political realms and also | 25 | was happening? |


|  | Page 17 |  | Page 19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Ido. | 1 | doing, if any? |
| 2 | Q. Sorry. You do, or you did? | 2 | A. From the Complaint that was sent, I was not |
| 3 | A. No, I do. | 3 | very pleased whatsoever. |
| 4 | Q. So did you ever submit any comments to the | 4 | Q. What do you mean, "from the Complaint that was |
| 5 | Redistricting Commission about any maps? | 5 | sent"? |
| 6 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. | 6 | A. That I filed, the lawsuit that I filed. It |
| 7 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 7 | also was attached, the redistricting zones that had |
| 8 | Q. When Mr. Stokesbary says objection as to form, | 8 | occurred throughout the process of the voting. |
| 9 | you can still answer the question, Mr. Garcia. | 9 | Q. Mr. Garcia, did someone send you a Complaint |
| 10 | MR. STOKESBARY: Yeah. Sorry for the | 10 | before you agreed to be a plaintiff in this lawsuit? |
| 11 | confusion. The only time you don't need to answer, I | 11 | A. No. |
| 12 | will make it very clear, and it will be when it involves | 12 | Q. Okay. So you didn't see a Complaint until you |
| 13 | attorney-client privileged communication between us, but | 13 | had agreed to be a plaintiff? |
| 14 | otherwise l'll just say it for the record, and then you | 14 | A. I had already -- so repeat that again. |
| 15 | can go ahead and answer anyway. | 15 | Q. You did not see a Complaint in this matter |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you, sir. | 16 | until you had agreed to become a plaintiff? |
| 17 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 17 | A. Not from -- no, no. |
| 18 | Q. So let me back up and re-ask the question in | 18 | Q. You started saying "not from." Is there more |
| 19 | light of that interruption -- "interruption." I use the | 19 | to -- |
| 20 | term not pejoratively at all. | 20 | A. No, no. I'm sorry. I had -- I had not -- like |
| 21 | Mr. Garcia, did you ever submit any comments to | 21 | from -- the Complaint right now, why I am doing this |
| 22 | the Redistricting Commission? | 22 | deposition, I was unaware of any other cases. So I |
| 23 | A. I don't know if I -- I don't recall if I did | 23 | mean -- any other Complaints that were legal, you know, |
| 24 | submit comments. I know I have made comments about it. | 24 | brought against Steve Hobbs. |
| 25 | Q. To whom did you make comments about it? | 25 | Q. I guess I'm asking a different question. |
|  | Page 18 |  | Page 20 |
| 1 | A. As I ran for congress. So I may give a speech | 1 | Did you see a copy of the Draft Complaint that |
| 2 | here and there. | 2 | was filed in this matter before you agreed to become a |
| 3 | Q. I hear you. I'm asking about the period during | 3 | plaintiff in this matter? |
| 4 | which the Redistricting Commission was doing their work, | 4 | A. I saw a copy, yes, I did, of my Complaint, but |
| 5 | so from about March of 2021 to November 15th of 2021. | 5 | not of the one that we're doing the deposition on. |
| 6 | Does that make sense? | 6 | Q. So to be clear, this deposition that l'm taking |
| 7 | A. Yes. You would see it filed in my Complaint | 7 | right now is in the matter of Garcia v. Hobbs. |
| 8 | with my lawyer. | 8 | Do you understand that? |
| 9 | Q. So during the time in which the Redistricting | 9 | A. Okay. No. I thought it was under the matter |
| 10 | Commission was drafting the current legislative plan, | 10 | of Susan Soto Palmer. |
| 11 | did you ever submit any comments through their website | 11 | Q. That's why typically an attorney would start a |
| 12 | or through email or anything like that? | 12 | deposition by showing you the dep notice, but, you know, |
| 13 | A. That I recall, no. | 13 | I play by my own rules. |
| 14 | Q. Did you ever propose any redistricting plans? | 14 | So okay. Knowing now that we are -- |
| 15 | A. I did not -- | 15 | A. That's -- that's why I'm confused, when I'm |
| 16 | MR. STOKESBARY: Sorry. Same objection as | 16 | talking my Complaint, I know what my Complaint is, but I |
| 17 | to form. | 17 | have not seen anyone else's Complaint. I'm sorry. |
| 18 | A. What you would see is my objections on the | 18 | Q. Understood. No, no need to apologize. |
| 19 | Complaint that was filed. | 19 | So did you see the Complaint in the case that |
| 20 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 20 | became Garcia v. Hobbs before you agreed to become a |
| 21 | Q. Did you ever attend any meetings of the | 21 | plaintiff? |
| 22 | Redistricting Commission? | 22 | A. I seen -- I seen the Complaint first, yes. |
| 23 | A. No. | 23 | Q. And who sent you that Complaint? |
| 24 | Q. During the time that the commission was doing | 24 | A. That was my lawyer. |
| 25 | its work, what was your impression of the work they were | 25 | Q. Mr. Stokesbary? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | me. |
| 2 | Q. Okay. When do you first recall seeing the | 2 | Q. Mr. Garcia, I think I saw you open a binder or |
| 3 | final maps proposed by the Redistricting Commission? | 3 | flipping a binder while you answered that question. |
| 4 | A. You know, the final maps, once my Complaint was | 4 | What do you have in front of you right now? |
| 5 | put in, there was still quite a bit of -- as you can see | 5 | A. My Complaint. |
| 6 | in the Yakima Herald, still a lot of issues on | 6 | Q. Anything else? |
| 7 | determining when those maps were going to be completely | 7 | A. No. |
| 8 | adjudicated through the State. So that, you know, | 8 | Q. Okay. |
| 9 | through the -- my election process, it -- it wasn't | 9 | A. My Complaint. |
| 10 | until much later. My Complaint came first. | 10 | Q. Fair. So -- |
| 11 | Q. Had you seen the final maps then before you | 11 | A. Oh, the subpoenas. The subpoenas. Because I |
| 12 | filed your Complaint? | 12 | needed to know the location. So I just have the |
| 13 | A. They -- the -- the final maps that were | 13 | subpoenas and my Complaint and my legal letter of |
| 14 | proposed, they -- they -- you know, I had seen the final | 14 | agreement with my attorney. That is all I have. |
| 15 | maps, I guess, would be yes. | 15 | Q. Understood. |
| 16 | Q. So you had seen the final maps before you filed | 16 | So what about the shape of the district, the |
| 17 | your Complaint; is that -- I'm understanding? | 17 | lack of a freeway boundary, the things you just |
| 18 | A. Yes. Because there was -- the representative | 18 | mentioned, what about that indicated to you that this |
| 19 | for 15th District was no longer going to be running at | 19 | was a racially gerrymandered district? |
| 20 | that time, or moving to a new location. | 20 | A. Well -- |
| 21 | Q. And when do you recall seeing the final maps | 21 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection to the extent |
| 22 | for the first time? | 22 | that calls for a legal conclusion. |
| 23 | A. I want to say, oh, my goodness, in the summer | 23 | A. Well, I have seen many maps in my lifetime. |
| 24 | last year. | 24 | I've done many home loans for the federal government. |
| 25 | Q. So the summer of 2022 was the first time you | 25 | I've been trained for community facilities for the |
|  | Page 22 |  | Page 24 |
| 1 | saw the final maps? | 1 | federal government. So I have to understand boundaries. |
| 2 | A. Yeah. The final maps, yeah. | 2 | And sometimes, for whatever decision, congress can waive |
| 3 | Q. What was your impression of those maps when you | 3 | this or that for that particular city to allow loans to |
| 4 | saw them? | 4 | be done. |
| 5 | A. I was not -- I was not pleased. | 5 | And to my familiarity of growing up here and my |
| 6 | Q. And why not? | 6 | work experience, it didn't make sense to me, other than |
| 7 | A. Because it was based on racial gerrymandering | 7 | illegal racial gerrymandering, and that's just been my |
| 8 | on the legal district, in my opinion. | 8 | lifetime experience of working ten-plus years for the |
| 9 | Q. And what was the basis for your opinion? | 9 | federal government and understanding community |
| 10 | A. According to the other maps I had seen, it was | 10 | facilities. |
| 11 | just based on racial gerrymandering, illegal | 11 | And l've had to be familiarized with SEPA, NEPA |
| 12 | gerrymandering. | 12 | environmental protection acts, also understanding |
| 13 | Q. What makes you think the maps were racially | 13 | endangered species list, understanding local, federal |
| 14 | gerrymandered? | 14 | laws, and state laws on how they apply. |
| 15 | A. They were drawn up very -- | 15 | And when you have that type of experience, when |
| 16 | MR. STOKESBARY: Sorry. Objection to the | 16 | something looks wrong, and to me, racial gerrymandering |
| 17 | extent that calls for a legal conclusion. | 17 | is in this presence, in my opinion. |
| 18 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 18 | BY MR. HUGHES: |
| 19 | Q. You can answer. | 19 | Q. Do you have an understanding -- you just |
| 20 | A. Well, let me -- give me one moment. | 20 | mentioned several laws there. |
| 21 | The maps cross over from re- -- recalling three | 21 | Do you have an understanding, even a lay |
| 22 | different counties. There is no particular freeway | 22 | understanding, of any of the laws governing |
| 23 | boundary that's on there. They were very unusual than | 23 | redistricting in this state? |
| 24 | any other map. Also the large population that was drawn | 24 | A. I'm going to say no in -- in this state, other |
| 25 | was basically Hispanic, and they didn't make sense to | 25 | than what l've read in Yakima Herald or -- or other |
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | things, you know. So no. |
| 2 | Q. And what have you read in the Yakima Herald or |
| 3 | other places that you just mentioned? |
| 4 | A. I'm trying to recall, but obviously districts |
| 5 | or where you're going to go ahead and meet with people |
| 6 | are important to know, and the change of potential |
| 7 | represent- -- representation is critical to know. |
| 8 | And in this case, it seemed to be a very |
| 9 | drastic change, and I can say that with LULAC, bringing |
| 10 | up the Perry case in my Complaint seemed to fit that |
| 11 | description. |
| 12 | Q. What specifically about the map do you -- looks |
| 13 | wrong to you? And when I-- when I say that, what I |
| 14 | mean is, are there any specific geographical quirks or |
| 15 | anything like that, that you think is only explicable by |
| 16 | race? |
| 17 | A. Going through three counties is a little |
| 8 | different, and not really, like I said, you know, |
| 19 | hitting any particular landmark such as the Highway 82 |
| 20 | or other things and drastically changing it, to me |
| 21 | that's -- there was a lot of racial gerrymandering that |
| 22 | occurred, personally, in my opinion. |
| 23 | Q. Drastically changing it from what? |
| 24 | A. To -- to making sure that -- that leadership |
| 25 | changed in -- in fair elections. |

## Page 27

A. I have contacted him once before, twice before, yes.
Q. How do you know Paul Graves?
A. Paul Graves. I was given a number that speaks to Paul Graves on redistricting, and we had discussed it for a few minutes on the redistricting.
Q. And what did you discuss?
A. I could say that we agreed that -- that the redistricting seemed to be racial gerrymandering.
Q. Can you -- do you remember anything else about that discussion?
A. No. It was very brief. It was very brief. I mean, I don't recall everything. I don't recall the conversation -- all the conversation. I'm just letting you -- I don't recall the -- but it was a brief conversation.
Q. Was it a phone call? In person? Zoom?
A. No, it was a phone call. Yeah, no, it was a phone call.
Q. And about when was that conversation?
A. I want to say the winter -- early winter 2022, possibly.
Q. So approximately January, February 2022?
A. It could be. You know, I -- l've had a lot of phone calls, so I apologize.
Q. Mr. Garcia, I think I just heard you say that the legislative district was drastically changed. And what I'm asking is, drastically changed from what?
A. Well, there's no land- -- particular landmark in that case, or highway, like I said, 82. Look, most of the district was in Yakima County, most of that district on 15th, and it drastically changed to three other counties. And it's very unusual.

And you can look at the Complaint. I mean, you don't have to agree with it, but, you know, you can see in the Complaint why -- you know, how it's drastically changed. It's kind of hard to describe sometimes, but, you know, it is there for everyone to see.
Q. No, understood. I'm just trying to get a sense of your understanding of the Complaint because this is your lawsuit ultimately.
A. Uh-huh. It is.
Q. Mr. Garcia, do you know any of the redistricting commissioners?
A. Do I know any of the redistricting commissioners? No, not -- not really. I mean, the ones that determined -- I think there was seven of them.
Q. Well, let me go to -- do you know Joe Fain?
A. Not -- no.
Q. Do you know Paul Graves?
Q. Sure.
A. Running for congress, I've spoken to a lot of politicians on both ends.
Q. I can't even imagine.
A. So I know it was a brief conversation. And I don't recall everything on that conversation, so I apologize.
Q. To your memory, who was it that first suggested, in this phone call, that LD 15 was racial gerrymandering? Was it you or Mr. Graves?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You recall, though, that you both agreed with that?
A. I do -- I do recall that, yes, the sentiments were there. I mean, we didn't flat-out agree, but I had looked more into -- into things at that point.
Q. You didn't flat-out agree. What does that mean?
A. In other words, he didn't say clearly, oh, I agree that this -- you know. But we were -- we were talking in that perspective.
Q. Do you remember what he did say?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And you said you were given a number to speak with Mr. Graves. Who gave you the number?
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. That would have been Maia. | 1 | Q. And she put you in touch with Paul Graves; |
| 2 | Q. Maia Espinoza? | 2 | correct? |
| 3 | A. That's correct. | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. Okay. Would that have been in the first call | 4 | Q. What happened after you talked to Paul Graves? |
| 5 | with her? | 5 | A. I contacted -- I -- I went ahead and started |
| 6 | A. I would assume so. | 6 | looking more into the redistricting. And so, you know, |
| 7 | Q. How many phone calls did you have with | 7 | it's, like I said, a change in leadership, from Jeremie |
| 8 | Ms. Espinoza? | 8 | Dupree [sic], who was the 15th District congress -- I |
| 9 | A. I had a few because I wanted to get pamphlets | 9 | mean, representative there, and I know Jeremie because |
| 10 | and talk about the pamphlets to hand out to people to | 10 | he's also military. |
| 11 | register to vote, what their rights are, civics. It was | 11 | So I had a lot of concerns. And the fact that |
| 12 | a civics pamphlet. | 12 | the newspaper had stated that he would have to move if |
| 13 | Q. So you had a few conversations in which -- | 13 | he were going to go ahead and stay the representative |
| 14 | strike that. | 14 | for the next election. |
| 15 | Did you have a few conversations in which this | 15 | So I had looked -- I had been looking into what |
| 16 | litigation was discussed, or the possibility of -- | 16 | was happening on 15th District, not only as my |
| 17 | A. With her -- say that again? | 17 | representative, but I know Jeremie very -- I know |
| 18 | Q. Yeah. Did you have multiple conversations with | 18 | Jeremie. We served on the board together with the |
| 19 | Ms. Espinoza in which you talked about a potential | 19 | Yakima County Veterans Coalition. And so, you know, I |
| 20 | racial gerrymandering lawsuit? | 20 | was concerned about why these things were happening, you |
| 21 | A. No. No. We spoke about me wanting to see | 21 | know. |
| 22 | about the civics, getting pamphlets, and we also spoke | 22 | Q. Understood. |
| 23 | about speaking to Paul. But, you know, that -- some of | 23 | And, Mr. Garcia, when you say Jeremie Dupree, |
| 24 | the challenges to try to get a number of pamphlets, they | 24 | do you mean Jeremie Dufault? |
| 25 | cost quite a -- you know, they cost money. | 25 | A. Dufault. I'm sorry. Jeremie Dufault. Sorry. |
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| 1 | And unfortunately, I wasn't able to get my -- | 1 | Q. No worries. |
| 2 | you know, get as many as I would have wanted to pass out | 2 | When you said that you started looking into |
| 3 | to people to vote, so -- we -- we live -- I haven't | 3 | this after you spoke with Paul Graves, what did you do |
| 4 | spoken to her too much. It's been a long time. | 4 | besides speaking with Mr. Dufault? |
| 5 | Q. So let me try and get the order of events here. | 5 | A. Actually, I didn't speak with Mr. Dufault. I |
| 6 | A. Uh-huh. | 6 | know him because we -- like I said, we served on boards |
| 7 | Q. So the first time this came up for you, a | 7 | together. |
| 8 | potential racial gerrymandering lawsuit, was when Maia | 8 | Q. Okay. |
| 9 | Espinoza called you; correct? | 9 | A. And I was concerned because I believe he's a |
| 10 | A. I had -- I had contacted her before, before the | 10 | very good representative. Might not agree with |
| 11 | civics pamphlets. | 11 | everything, but certainly a representative that I think |
| 12 | Q. About a potential gerrymandering claim? | 12 | has good intentions. |
| 13 | A. No, no, no, no, no. I had contacted her | 13 | Q. Okay. So, Mr. Garcia, you were upset that |
| 14 | before, and she had been pretty politically busy. | 14 | the -- |
| 15 | But -- | 15 | A. I wasn't upset. I was concerned. |
| 16 | Q. Understood. | 16 | Q. Fair. You were concerned that the redrawn |
| 17 | A. You know, we got to talking about that during | 17 | LD 15 districted out Jeremie Dufault? |
| 18 | one of the phone conversations. | 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. So, Mr. Garcia, again, what I'm trying to do | 19 | Q. And is that part of why you were considering |
| 20 | here is just connect the dots in how you got to become a | 20 | bringing this lawsuit? |
| 21 | plaintiff in this lawsuit. | 21 | A. The reason I brought this lawsuit, after |
| 22 | So I'm just asking about that for now. So the | 22 | looking at things, and thinking about it, is, I do |
| 23 | first thing that happened was Maia Espinoza called you; | 23 | believe it is based on racial gerrymandering. That is |
| 24 | correct? | 24 | the reason. |
| 25 | A. Correct. | 25 | Irregardless if it was Jeremie that would maybe |
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1 lose the election, whoever it may be, I'm more concerned 2 about the right thing happening than anything else. 3 That is what I am concerned about.

And that is just my opinion, that it is -- this redistricting is very different than any other in the past, and that it's based on racial gerrymandering. And it is not something that's not too hard to believe. You know, you could research -- you know, I mean, the Complaint that we put on was an example of LULAC.
Q. So after you spoke with Mr. Graves, you said you looked into matters, or I don't remember the exact language, but what did you do after you spoke with Mr. Graves, specifically, in consideration of bringing this lawsuit?
A. Let me think about that. I believe I spoke to my attorney.
Q. Did Mr. Graves give you Mr. Stokesbary's contact information?
A. You know, I don't recall that, if he did.
Q. Do you recall how you decided on -- or first reached out to Mr. Stokesbary?
A. You know, I don't recall exactly how I ended up getting to speaking to my attorney. And like I said, you know, I had had a house fire. I made a lot of political phone calls.

Page 35
this lawsuit, or in considering bringing this lawsuit? Did you freeze, or am I frozen?
MR. STOKESBARY: I think he might have frozen.

Benancio, are you there?
MR. HUGHES: Could we go off the record for a second?
(Pause in proceedings.)
BY MR. HUGHES:
Q. So let me just re-ask the question, Mr. Garcia, before you froze.

So based on what you told me, it sounds like what happened was, Maia Espinoza called you, suggested you call Paul Graves. You then called Paul Graves, and the next person you talked to about this lawsuit was Drew Stokesbary. Is that right?
A. Could very well be. Could very well be. Like I said, you know, I can't exactly recall because I was talking to a lot of people, paying attention to what was going on, and concerned about the re- -- the illegal racial gerrymandering redistricting that occurred.
Q. Is there anyone else you spoke to about potentially bringing this lawsuit?
A. You know what? I -- I did bring it up at times when I was campaigning, that I was the only candidate

I was concerned about, you know, civil rights and many other things. And so to be honest, at this moment, I can't say I recall how I got to Drew's number.
But it wouldn't surprise me if I found it in research or maybe, you know, somebody had made a suggestion as I was doing political points, talking about why I'm running and whatnot. So to be honest, I can't exactly say I recall how I got to Drew's number.
Q. Did you know Mr. Stokesbary before he was your lawyer?
A. No.
Q. Did you know who he was?
A. I had heard of him because, when you're run- -being -- challenging for U.S. Congress, other people have heard about him and wanted his endorsement. So, you know, I had known of him somewhat. But I couldn't quite put a picture -- a name to, you know, a face.
Q. Had you read his Wikipedia page?
A. No, actually, I hadn't. So I apologize.
Q. So just to -- no need to apologize for that. Just to connect the dots fully then, so Maia Espinoza called you, suggested you call Paul Graves. You talked to Paul Graves. And then the next person you talked to about this was Drew Stokesbary? Is there anyone else you spoke to in consideration of bringing
that's currently running that is fighting the redistricting, yes. So there were many people, obviously, that -- that heard me say that.
Q. Aside from some public statements, have you spoken with anyone in the Republican Party about this lawsuit?
A. Well, a lot of those people were Republicans that I spoke to when I said those things.
Q. Right. So l'm asking, aside from public statements, did you ever speak with any Republican officials, or, you know, Republican --

## A. Well --

Q. -- staffers --
A. -- to many -- I mean, look, as far as when I'm out there in the 4th District, you know, if it was Benton County Republican Party or whatnot, during the vetting system, I would have made it clear that I am the only candidate that's running -- and it was a general -it didn't get into detail or anything, but it was in generality of why I feel that I want to defend this.

So I mean, I spoke to a lot of people.

## Q. Do you know -- sorry.

A. I spoke to a lot of people. A lot of people, you know, whether they be PCOs or whether they be chairmen at meetings and whatnot, I did bring it up,
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| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 yes. | 1 | Q. Have you ever discussed redistricting with |
| Q. Do you know Jim Troyer? | 2 | Mr. Trevino? |
| 3 A. No. I know a lot of people, but there's a lot | 3 | A. No. |
| of people you meet. And to be honest, I probably don't | 4 | Q. Have you ever talked to him about any lawsuits? |
| know him personally, but I might have ran into him as I | 5 | A. In regards to this? |
| was campaigning. So I apologize. | 6 | Q. Yeah. |
| Q. Fair. | 7 | A. No. The last time I-- I actually -- I-- I-- |
| So, Mr. Garcia, I was asking you about the | 8 | yeah. I had dinner with Mr. Trevino and his wife. This |
| commissioners and whether you'd spoken with any of them, | 9 | was at the Olive Garden about five years ago or so. But |
| 10 and I got about halfway through. So I want to return to | 10 | I do know Jose. |
| 11 that. | 11 | Q. That was the last time you met with him, |
| 12 Have you ever spoken -- do you know April Sims? | 12 | though? |
| 13 A. Not that I am aware of. | 13 | A. That I -- I would say met with him, but maybe |
| 14 Q. Do you know Brady Piñero Walkinshaw? | 14 | also at something at KDNA, which is in dis- -- where |
| 15 A. Not that I'm aware of. I'm recalling the | 15 | he's the mayor at in Granger. You know, with maybe |
| 16 Yakima Herald's pictures of the commissioners on that, | 16 | LULAC or something like that, you know. |
| 17 and how they weren't able to meet the deadline that is | 17 | Q. What's KDNA? |
| 18 the RCW in order to go ahead and finalize the -- the | 18 | A. That's the radio -- Latino radio station. |
| 19 adjudication of the commission, of that district. | 19 | Q. Okay. |
| 20 So l know they had certainly surfaced the time | 20 | A. Yeah. |
| 21 limit in which the law gives them, and their pictures | 21 | Q. Do you know Alex Ybarra? |
| 22 were put out. So putting a face to a name, you know, on | 22 | A. I've met him, yes. |
| 23 any of them, I really couldn't. But did I read about | 23 | Q. And how do you know Mr. Ybarra? |
| 24 it? Yes. | 24 | A. The first time I knew about him was at the |
| 25 Q. But you never spoke with either Ms. Sims or | 25 | event that Mr. Honeyford had mentioned, I believe that |
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| 1 Mr. Walkinshaw? | 1 | was in Bellevue, where I met Maia. It was both -- it |
| 2 A. You know, I can't say I haven't, but Sims | 2 | was an open party event, so, you know, you had a lot of |
| 3 sounds familiar. So Sims sounds familiar, but not -- | 3 | Democrats, you had a lot of Republicans who were there, |
| not that I can recall. I mean, like I said, in passing, | 4 | and he was a guest speaker. And I heard him speak, and |
| 5 because I also came up to this side of the mountains | 5 | I thought it was very nice. |
| 6 often and spoke to a lot of people. So... | 6 | Q. And you met him after he spoke? |
| 7 Q. And for the record, this side of the mountains, | 7 | A. I did. I shook hands with him. I was -- I was |
| 8 you're referring to the western side of the mountains | 8 | very pleased to know that he was from the Ephrata area. |
| 9 right now? | 9 | He's also state representative. And to hear his story |
| 10 A. Yes, the western side. Yes, yes, the western | 10 | from others working in the fields to -- you know, his |
| 11 side. | 11 | parents, I could relate to that. And working for NASA, |
| 12 Q. Do you know Sarah Augustine? | 12 | and then coming back home to want to make a difference |
| 13 A. Not -- not that I recall. | 13 | in his community. |
| 14 Q. Okay. Do you know Jose Trevino? | 14 | Q. Have you ever discussed redistricting with |
| 15 A. I do. | 15 | Representative Ybarra? |
| 16 Q. How do you know Mr. Trevino? | 16 | A. No. |
| 17 A. I've known Mr. Trevino for a number of years. | 17 | Q. Do you know Ismael Campos? |
| 18 He was -- | 18 | A. I believe so, yes. Campos family, yes. |
| 19 Q. How -- go ahead. | 19 | Q. How do you know Mr. Campos? |
| 20 A. Sorry. | 20 | A. If it's the same one I'm thinking about, he |
| $21 \quad$ Q. Go ahead. | 21 | used to be law enforcement. |
| $22 \quad$ A. Oh, he is from Sunnyside. I grew up in | 22 | Q. I believe he also goes by Mel Campos, if |
| 23 Sunnyside. I know he was a police officer at one time. | 23 | that -- |
| 24 And so l've known him a number of years, and he's also | 24 | A. I'm sorry. Say again? |
| 25 the mayor of Granger. | 25 | Q. I believe he also goes by Mel Campos, if that |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | changes anything for you. | 1 | A. I want to change the map to where I feel that |
| 2 | A. I could be mixing him up with one of his | 2 | it was probably -- its original, the way it originally |
| 3 | brothers, so I apologize if I am. There's a large | 3 | was, as I -- you know, as a voter. So hopefully it goes |
| 4 | family, and -- you know, so I -- I am -- I'm sure I know | 4 | back, but that will be up to the court system to decide |
| 5 | who you're talking about. He was former law enforcement | 5 | whether I'm right or wrong. |
| 6 | out of Wapato. | 6 | Q. So, Mr. Garcia, is your goal in this lawsuit |
| 7 | Q. Have you ever discussed redistricting with | 7 | then to have the map set back to the -- the map that was |
| 8 | Mr. Campos? | 8 | in effect from 2012 to whenever this new map came into |
| 9 | A. No. | 9 | effect? |
| 10 | Q. Do you know his brother Pablo, or Paul, Campos? | 10 | A. Well, the goal in my lawsuit is to determine |
| 11 | A. I know a few of his brothers, but the names | 11 | whether I am right in my beliefs that this was made |
| 12 | sometimes skip me, so... | 12 | illegally through racial gerrymandering for a decision |
| 13 | Q. I hear you. | 13 | to be made amongst my peers for the courts. That is my |
| 14 | MR HUGHES: This would be a good time for me | 14 | goal. Because I strongly believe in protecting our |
| 15 | to take a break, if it works for everyone else. | 15 | freedoms. |
| 16 | Do you want to take a break now? | 16 | Q. And if you are right, if the Court finds you |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: That would be fine with me. | 17 | are right, what do you want to happen? |
| 18 | (Recess from 10:00 a.m. to 10:07 a.m.) | 18 | A. Well, that we go through -- if the courts |
| 19 | EXAMINATION (Continuing) | 19 | have -- findings are that I am correct, then we go |
| 20 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 20 | through the process again to determine the map. |
| 21 | Q. Mr. Garcia, welcome back. | 21 | Q. Understood. |
| 22 | A. Thank you. | 22 | Is there any -- never mind. |
| 23 | Q. Do you believe that you were harmed by the | 23 | Mr. Garcia, do you know Nikki Torres? |
| 24 | current boundaries of LD 15? | 24 | A. I do know her, yes. |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | Q. How do you know her? |
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| 1 | Q. And how? | 1 | A. Well, running through the campaign. So you |
| 2 | A. Due to the fact it's illegal gerry- -- racial | 2 | meet a lot of people, you know. So I met her in |
| 3 | gerrymandering, that's how I'm harmed. | 3 | Tri-Cities when I was campaigning, at a parade. |
| 4 | Q. Okay. Can you say more about that? | 4 | Q. And Ms. Torres is your state senator now? |
| 5 | A. You know, I -- being part of LULAC, like I told | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | you, the United Latin American Citizens, we had gotten a | 6 | Q. Okay. So I will do her the honor of calling |
| 7 | chapter there. I was familiar with at least knowing | 7 | her Senator Torres then. |
| 8 | that LULAC, which is the oldest Hispanic organization in | 8 | A. Okay. |
| 9 | the country, had felt the same -- had the same feelings | 9 | Q. Do you like Senator Torres? |
| 10 | I did when, you know, at that time they taken Perry, | 10 | A. Well, she was fine to me, so we met. I don't |
| 11 | Governor Perry, on a civil litigation -- civil | 11 | know her personally, but she seemed like a nice person, |
| 12 | litigation, and defended the rights of American voters. | 12 | so... |
| 13 | So I feel the same way in this case. | 13 | Q. Well, I won't ask you how you voted because I |
| 14 | Q. In this -- oh, sorry. Go ahead. | 14 | think that's probably private, but do you like having |
| 15 | A. I just feel the same way. | 15 | Senator Torres as your state rep---state senator? |
| 16 | Q. What's your goal in this lawsuit? | 16 | A. You know, Ms. Torres, I am fine with. She |
| 17 | A. The goal is to have it adjudicated to determine | 17 | seems nice. |
| 18 | to the people that, you know, if I'm right or wrong on | $18$ | Q. Do you want Ms. Torres to keep representing |
| 19 | my beliefs, that this was done illegal ger- -- racial | 20 | you? |
| 20 | gerrymandering, at least I did my due diligence, and | 20 | A. Well, I will say no. |
| 21 | like I -- me protecting my country in combat, to me | 21 22 | Q. Why is that? <br> A. Because I believe the redistricting was illegal |
| 22 | protecting my rights -- voting rights. | 23 | gerrymandering. It's not on the individual themselves. |
| 23 | Q. Do you want to change the map? | 24 | It is the fact that I believe it was racially illegally |
| 24 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | gerrymandered. That's my problem. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | It's got nothing to do with any personal | 1 | no question. |
| 2 | representative, has nothing to do with the fact if | 2 | MR. STOKESBARY: Well, I -- Andrew, I |
| 3 | Jeremie Dufault is no longer so much the representative. | 3 | thought the question said, did you discuss with your |
| 4 | It's the fact that, in my core beliefs, I strongly | 4 | lawyer. That sort of is the -- the -- |
| 5 | believe in following our constitution, and I-- and I | 5 | MR. HUGHES: No. No. Let me do the |
| 6 | strongly believe in defending those rights. So it's got | 6 | question again. I apologize if I misspoke. |
| 7 | nothing to do personally with anyone. | 7 | BY MR. HUGHES: |
| 8 | Q. Understood. | 8 | Q. Mr. Garcia, did you ever agree that you would |
| 9 | I want to switch gears just a little bit. You | 9 | dismiss your lawsuit if Messrs. Trevino, Ybarra, and |
| 10 | said you're aware of the Soto Palmer v. Hobbs case; | 10 | Campos were allowed to bring racial gerrymandering |
| 11 | correct? | 11 | claims in Soto Palmer v. Hobbs? |
| 12 | A. Yes. When I got served the papers, and I mean | 12 | A. No. |
| 13 | by that is, I just read where I had to be, so I -- you | 13 | Q. Okay. I'm going to show you -- |
| 14 | know, so that's what I mean. | 14 | A. I -- |
| 15 | Q. Do you have any understanding of what the | 15 | Q. Oh, go ahead. Sorry. |
| 16 | Soto Palmer v. Hobbs case is about? | 16 | A. No. I brought this lawsuit on the fact that -- |
| 17 | A. No. | 17 | that I believe that there was racial gerrymandering |
| 18 | Q. You haven't read any news articles about it? | 18 | occurring, and that I would see this all the way |
| 19 | A. No. | 19 | through. |
| 20 | Q. Okay. I asked you earlier about Jose Trevino, | 20 | Q. That's important to you, that you -- you are |
| 21 | Alex Ybarra, and Ismael Campos, and you recall that | 21 | going to see this lawsuit all the way through? |
| 22 | discussion? | 22 | A. As important as it was for me to run for U.S. |
| 23 | A. Yes, Ido. | 23 | Congress because I believe I will do what is the best |
| 24 | Q. Are you aware that Messrs. Trevino, Ybarra, and | 24 | interests of 4th District. It's as important to me that |
| 25 | Trevino have intervened as defendants in the Soto Palmer | 25 | when I signed on to this lawsuit, that I would see to |
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| 1 | litigation? | 1 | the end what would occur. There's no wavering on my |
| 2 | A. I'm aware in the sense that I was served the | 2 | completion of this. |
| 3 | paperwork, but I -- I didn't look into -- I mean, I -- | 3 | Q. Understood. |
| 4 | all I looked at basically is where I had to be, and the | 4 | I'm going to show you a document real quick. |
| 5 | time of the deposition was going to be. I didn't look | 5 | Let me make sure I have the right one before I share my |
| 6 | into anything more than that. | 6 | screen. |
| 7 | Q. So you said you were not aware of the | 7 | A. I'm sorry. I only have cell phone, and my |
| 8 | Soto Palmer litigation until you got your subpoena; | 8 | glasses are having difficulty viewing the document. |
| 9 | correct? | 9 | Q. Okay. Do you see a document on the screen |
| 10 | A. That's correct. | 10 | right now? |
| 11 | Q. And when did you get your subpoena? | 11 | A. Yes, Ido. Well, it went off the screen. |
| 12 | A. Last week. | 12 | Q. My Zoom quit unexpectedly. Let me try this one |
| 13 | Q. Okay. So the last week of January? | 13 | more time. |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | Okay. Can you see a document on my screen, |
| 15 | Q. Did you ever agree that you would dismiss your | 15 | Mr. Garcia? |
| 16 | lawsuit if Messrs. Trevino, Ybarra, and Campos were | 16 | A. Yes, Ido. |
| 17 | allowed to bring racial gerrymandering claims in the | 17 | Q. Are you able to read it? |
| 18 | Soto Palmer case? | 18 | A. Yes. The defendants, Jose, Ismael, and Alex |
| 19 | MR. STOKESBARY: I'm going to object to the | 19 | Ybarra. |
| 20 | extent this calls for attorney-client communication, and | 20 | Q. And you see it says, 'Intervenor Defendants' |
| 21 | instruct you not to answer that question, Ben. | 21 | Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Bifurcate and |
| 22 | MR. HUGHES: I'm going to have to push back | 22 | Transfer, Strike, and/or Dismiss Intervenors' |
| 23 | on that, Drew. I don't know how him making a decision | 23 | Crossclaim"? |
| 24 | about whether he would dismiss his lawsuit is | 24 | A. I do see that. |
| 25 | necessarily attorney-client privileged. It's a yes or | 25 | Q. Have you ever seen this document before? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. I saw this document. It was served when I got | 1 | I just want to, again, apologize for the |
| 2 | my subpoena. | 2 | misunderstanding that you were under the impression you |
| 3 | Q. This particular document was served with your | 3 | needed to travel from your home. You could have done |
| 4 | subpoena? | 4 | this today from any computer anywhere. |
| 5 | A. Let me see. It might not be. Not that | 5 | So I do thank you for traveling, and hope at |
| 6 | particular document, no. | 6 | least you've had a nice visit. And I believe you're in |
| 7 | Q. Okay. So you've never seen this document | 7 | Tacoma; is that right? |
| 8 | before then? | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | A. No. | 9 | Q. And so I just want to -- I'll try not to repeat |
| 10 | Q. Okay. I want to scroll down to Page 4. Do you | 10 | anything that Mr. Hughes asked you, but it's always hard |
| 11 | see -- well, let me -- hang on. Let me -- do you see | 11 | when there's two people taking a deposition like this, |
| 12 | here -- this is actually Page 7 -- that this is signed | 12 | so if I do repeat anything, I apologize. |
| 13 | by Andrew Stokesbary? | 13 | So I just wanted to clarify. I know you said |
| 14 | A. Correct. | 14 | that you've moved a couple times. Where do you |
| 15 | Q. That's your lawyer in this case? | 15 | currently reside? |
| 16 | A. That's correct. | 16 | A. 311 Birch Avenue, Grandview, Washington 98930. |
| 17 | Q. And it says here that Mr. Stokesbary also | 17 | Q. And is that your home that had the fire? |
| 18 | represents intervenor defendants? | 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | Q. Has the -- have the fire damage been |
| 20 | Q. So you understand that he represents the | 20 | remediated? |
| 21 | intervenor defendants in the Soto Palmer case? | 21 | A. About 90 percent, somewhere around there. |
| 22 | A. Well, obviously he put it in writing, yes, that | 22 | Q. And do you intend to remain a resident there? |
| 23 | he is. | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | Q. Okay. So I want to look at Page 4 then of this | 24 | Q. Now, you mentioned that you had a conversation |
| 25 | document. | 25 | with Paul Graves. |
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| 1 | A. Uh-huh. | 1 | Had you known Paul before that conversation? |
| 2 | Q. And it says -- do you see where I'm | 2 | A. No, not that l'm aware of. |
| 3 | highlighting? 'Intervenors' counsel represents that | 3 | Q. And what do you know about Mr. Graves' |
| 4 | Garcia will be voluntarily dismissed once it is clear | 4 | involvement as -- or his work as a commissioner, as a |
| 5 | that this Court will allow Intervenors' Fourth Amendment | 5 | redistricting commissioner? |
| 6 | Crossclaim to proceed in this case"? | 6 | A. Other than he's a commissioner, that's -- |
| 7 | Do you see that? | 7 | that's it. I mean, there wasn't much discussion. |
| 8 | A. Could you highlight that again? | 8 | Q. Did you know that Mr. Graves and his staff were |
| 9 | Q. Uh-huh. | 9 | responsible for drawing District 15 in the adopted plan? |
| 10 | A. I'm trying to read it. I'm sorry. It's off a | 10 | A. I am aware of that. |
| 11 | cell phone and -- that is new news to me. | 11 | Q. Did it strike you as unusual that he was |
| 12 | Q. You never agreed to this? | 12 | contacting you to discuss that the plan he had drawn was |
| 13 | A. I will never agree to not be part -- I agreed | 13 | a racial gerrymander? |
| 14 | that I would finish this all the way through to -- | 14 | A. Well, he didn't contact me. I contacted him. |
| 15 | Q. So this representation was made without your | 15 | Q. Your understanding was that he was expecting |
| 16 | authorization then? | 16 | your phone call; is that right? |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | A. Well, I don't know if he was expecting my phone |
| 18 | MR. HUGHES: Okay. That's all I have. I'll | 18 | call. It's been a little while, so I can't recall the |
| 19 | stop screen sharing. And, Mark, the witness is yours. | 19 | whole thing. I know that Maia had given me his number. |
| 20 | MR. GABER: Thank you. | 20 | Q. Okay. |
| 21 | EXAMINATION | 21 | A. So it's been a little while, so I apologize for |
| 22 | BY MR. GABER: | 22 | that. |
| 23 | Q. Mr. Garcia, it's nice to meet you. My name is | 23 | Q. But he had a conversation with you, and you |
| 24 | Mark Gaber. I represent the plaintiffs in the | 24 | took away from it that he was sympathetic to what you |
| 25 | Soto Palmer case, and so we sent you the subpoena. And | 25 | were expressing, that you thought there was a problem |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | that District 15 was a racial gerrymander; is that -- am | 1 | BY MR. GABER: |
| 2 | I understanding that correctly? | 2 | Q. Yeah. Do you know why Ms. Espinoza suggested |
| 3 | A. Yes. | 3 | that you call Mr. Graves? |
| 4 | Q. And at the time, did you talk with him about | 4 | A. I believe that -- that she was concerned about |
| 5 | the fact that he was heavily involved in drawing | 5 | the redistricting. |
| 6 | District 15? | 6 | Q. What was the purpose of calling Mr. Graves? I |
| 7 | A. Well, obviously he was heavily involved in | 7 | mean, you had a five-minute conversation with him. |
| 8 | drawing, but I know that the committee certainly did not | 8 | Did -- do you under- -- do you have any understanding as |
| 9 | go into complete agreement. There was a lot of issues | 9 | to what was to come of that conversation? |
| 10 | on that for -- and you could look at the newspaper and | 10 | A. You know what? No. Because she was -- Maia |
| 11 | you could see that they had passed the deadline, which | 11 | was very brief about it, and I mean very brief. And |
| 12 | was state law, in which they were supposed to | 12 | like I said, you know, I thought the initial |
| 13 | adjudicate, to where it actually went to the courts. | 13 | conversation was going to be about the -- the books, |
| 14 | Q. Are you aware that Mr. Graves has testified in | 14 | pamphlets that she had for civics that I was interested |
| 15 | this litigation that he was involved in lighting the | 15 | in, because I called her, but I knew she was busy |
| 16 | fire for your lawsuit? | 16 | because she had ran for state representative for OSPI, |
| 17 | MR. HUGHES: Object. Misstates the | 17 | public school -- office of school instructions. So, you |
| 18 | evidence, misstates Mr. Graves' testimony. | 18 | know, I knew that. I was hoping she would give me a |
| 19 | A. I'm sorry. Say again? I didn't hear that | 19 | call back, and I was hoping to get a box of those |
| 20 | question. | 20 | pamphlets, you know. |
| 21 | BY MR. GABER: | 21 | Q. And I don't remember if you were asked this, so |
| 22 | Q. Are you aware that Mr. Graves has testified | 22 | I apologize if I'm repeating something. |
| 23 | that he helped light the fire for your lawsuit? | 23 | How did you first get in touch with |
| 24 | MR. HUGHES: Objection. Misstates | 24 | Mr. Stokesbary? Did you call him or did he contact you? |
| 25 | Mr. Graves' testimony. | 25 | A. No, I think it would have been -- I think -- |
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| 1 | A. No, I didn't know Mr. Graves had taken, you | 1 | well, I shouldn't say "I think," but I probably called |
| 2 | know -- had done a deposition. The same thing that, you | 2 | him, but I don't remember the mechanism of how because, |
| 3 | know -- for example, a misunderstanding, being here in | 3 | you know -- or who gave me the number or whatever the |
| 4 | Tacoma today, when I didn't have to be here. So, you | 4 | case was. That, I don't recall. |
| 5 | know, obviously there's not much communication until the | 5 | I mean, I spoke to a lot of people. I'm very |
| 6 | last minute. So... | 6 | passionate about civil rights. And, you know, I had so |
| 7 | BY MR. GABER: | 7 | many things going on other than a political -- running |
| 8 | Q. But do you understand that Mr. Graves, | 8 | for congress, you know, dealing with moving five |
| 9 | nevertheless, thinks that the plan is not, in fact, a | 9 | locations, basically, during this whole process. So I |
| 10 | racial gerrymander? | 10 | had a lot of things happening at one time. So I |
| 11 | A. He has a right to his own opinion. Sol-- I | 11 | can't -- |
| 12 | don't know what -- what he -- what he -- what he said | 12 | Q. And just to clarify on the conversation with |
| 13 | under his deposition. | 13 | Mr. Graves, was that after the map was already in place, |
| 14 | Q. Was it your impression, from your phone call | 14 | after the State Supreme Court had said, okay, that's the |
| 15 | with him, that he wanted you to file a lawsuit? | 15 | map? |
| 16 | A. I -- I won't say that that was the impression, | 16 | A. No. That -- that was before, you know, before |
| 17 | that he -- that he wanted me to file. But I was under | 17 | it went to -- way before. |
| 18 | the impression that he wasn't content with the | 18 | Q. Okay. |
| 19 | redistricting. That was just my -- from -- from -- you | 19 | A. My -- yeah, that was way before. We're talking |
| 20 | know, we spoke probably about five minutes or so. | 20 | in the wintertime. |
| 21 | Q. Do you know why Ms. Espinoza asked you to call | 21 | Q. And -- |
| 22 | him? | 22 | A. And so -- |
| 23 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. | 23 | Q. Go ahead. |
| 24 | A. Could you repeat that question again? | 24 | A. Sorry. |
| 25 | I/I/ | 25 | Q. Winter of -- so just to put a -- be more |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | specific, what -- generally what month and year? | 1 | Q. Does Dallin Holt ring a bell? |
| 2 | A. Before my Complaint was filed. It was months | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | before that. | 3 | Q. Okay. Is that one of the -- is that who you |
| 4 | Q. Would that have been in 2021 or 2022? | 4 | spoke to? |
| 5 | A. The Complaint was filed -- | 5 | A. I believe so, yes. |
| 6 | Q. I think the Complaint was in the springtime of | 6 | Q. And do you understand that he has associates |
| 7 | 2021, March maybe? | 7 | who are -- that work with him as well? Is that right? |
| 8 | A. Oh, it would have been in the wintertime. | 8 | A. That is correct. |
| 9 | Yeah. It was before the Complaint. | 9 | Q. And they became your attorneys, as you |
| 10 | Q. But it was -- am I correct that it was after | 10 | understand it, yesterday; is that right? |
| 11 | the November time period of 2021 when the commission | 11 | A. That, and Drew remains my attorney, yes. |
| 12 | approved the map, or approved the concept of the map? | 12 | Q. Now, you talked a little bit with Mr. Hughes |
| 13 | A. Probably. I would say yes, yeah. | 13 | about this, but do you understand that your attorneys |
| 14 | Q. Okay. Who are all of your attorneys in this | 14 | also represent three individuals who have intervened as |
| 15 | case? | 15 | defendants in the Soto Palmer lawsuit? |
| 16 | A. You know, be honest, I just know Drew has been | 16 | A. Yes. That was news to me that -- that -- |
| 17 | my primary contact. And I met one of the -- well, | 17 | about -- about that, that -- at this point. Yes, this |
| 18 | didn't meet, but over the phone spoke with my attorney, | 18 | was just brought up. Yes. |
| 19 | and I apologize for not knowing his name offhand, but my | 19 | Q. And when you say that was news to you, you mean |
| 20 | glasses are a little fuzzy. I should have gone with my | 20 | during Mr. Hughes' questions of you, that's when you |
| 21 | old-school glasses. So I can't read what's in front of | 21 | first learned that your attorneys also represented |
| 22 | me right now. | 22 | intervenor defendants in the Soto Palmer lawsuit? |
| 23 | Q. Okay. | 23 | A. Yes. That's also news to me. |
| 24 | A. I should just take them off. So I apologize. | 24 | Q. Are you aware of the relief that -- or the |
| 25 | Q. So do you know how many attorneys you have in | 25 | outcome that the intervenor defendants, who your counsel |
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| 1 | this case? | 1 | represent in the Soto Palmer lawsuit, are you aware of |
| 2 | A. No. | 2 | the -- what they are asking the Court to do in the |
| 3 | Q. At some point have there been attorneys other | 3 | litigation? |
| 4 | than Mr. Stokesbary who represent you? | 4 | A. I wasn't aware until it was brought up to me |
| 5 | A. Yes. I spoke with my attorney yesterday. | 5 | today that if the case were to move forward, that the |
| 6 | Q. Okay. And how did that come to be? | 6 | intervening defendants -- or intervening Jose, Alex, and |
| 7 | A. I believe it was through Drew. So my primary | 7 | Mr. Campos would be the ones moving forward on the case |
| 8 | attorney had given me notice, I believe, that another | 8 | and I would be withdrawn from the case. Is that |
| 9 | attorney would be talking to me specifically. | 9 | correct? |
| 10 | Q. But you don't -- you can't recall their names? | 10 | Q. Well, that was the representation that was made |
| 11 | A. I've got it on my phone, but l'm using that | 11 | by your counsel to the Court, so that is correct. |
| 12 | right now for -- | 12 | How does that make you feel? |
| 13 | Q. Sure. And I don't want to -- it isn't a trick | 13 | A. I got to be honest. I made it clear that, if I |
| 14 | question. Is it the law firm of Holtzman Vogel? | 14 | started this, I was going to finish to the end, and I am |
| 15 | A. It -- you know, I don't want to say yes or no | 15 | not pleased. |
| 16 | because I just got his name basically yesterday. I | 16 | Q. And you're not pleased to be learning that for |
| 17 | believe it was yesterday or day before. | 17 | the first time in this deposition; is that right? |
| 18 | Q. Okay. | 18 | A. Absolutely correct. |
| 19 | A. I'm just not -- I'm not sure of his name, and I | 19 | Q. Are you aware that the intervenor defendants, |
| 20 | apologize because I'm sure he's on here, so my sincere | 20 | in particular Mr. Ybarra and Mr. Trevino, have testified |
| 21 | apologies. I can't use my cell phone to -- to take a | 21 | in depositions in this litigation that it's their desire |
| 22 | look at his name, and my glasses, they're brand-new, and | 22 | that the map remain unchanged? |
| 23 | I just realized right now that I can't use them to read. | 23 | A. I was unaware of that. |
| 24 | Q. They're useless to you. | 24 | Q. The first time you're learning that is when I |
| 25 | A. Yeah. They're useless to me, so -- | 25 | just told you that in my question? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | MR. GABER: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm just |
| 2 | Q. And are you aware -- or strike that. | 2 | taking a moment to think. |
| 3 | Now, I understand, from your conversation with | 3 | THE WITNESS: I didn't know if something |
| 4 | Mr. Hughes, that -- am I right that you -- you want the | 4 | went wrong again, so I apologize. |
| 5 | map to be changed? | 5 | MR. GABER: No, your side's working good. |
| 6 | A. That is correct, what I stated, yes. | 6 | THE WITNESS: Am I able to get a copy of |
| 7 | Q. And so this is the first time you're learning | 7 | this deposition very soon? |
| 8 | that your attorneys are both representing intervenors in | 8 | MR. GABER: The one that you're taking right |
| 9 | the Soto Palmer case, asking that the map not be | 9 | now? |
| 10 | changed, and also representing you at the same time, | 10 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 11 | where you want the map to be changed? | 11 | MR. GABER: Yeah, you'll get a copy, and |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | your counsel will be able to order a rush copy too, if |
| 13 | Q. Do you see a problem with that? | 13 | you'd like, which would be quicker than the normal |
| 14 | A. Yes, I do. | 14 | course. |
| 15 | Q. And what is that? | 15 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 16 | A. There are conflicting reasons why the Complaint | 16 | BY MR. GABER: |
| 17 | was filed on initially why I filed it and to know that, | 17 | Q. So have you talked to Mr. Ybarra at all about |
| 18 | if this case were to be moved forward, the intervening | 18 | the -- what he would like to have happen to the map or |
| 19 | witnesses, or defendants, however you want to -- | 19 | anything about the redistricting plan? |
| 20 | plaintiffs, would go ahead and see the Complaint in a | 20 | A. No. |
| 21 | different light, opposite to what was initially filed, | 21 | Q. And what about Mr. Trevino? |
| 22 | and that I would not see this to fruition, to completion | 22 | A. No. |
| 23 | of adjudication. | 23 | Q. And Ismael Campos? |
| 24 | Q. So the problem is both that -- that your | 24 | A. No. |
| 25 | counsel was saying they would dismiss your lawsuit | 25 | Q. And just so I understand, did you speak to |
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| 1 | without your authorization -- | 1 | anyone at the Holtzman Vogel law firm, other than Dallin |
| 2 | A. Uh-huh. | 2 | Holt? |
| 3 | Q. -- but also it's a problem that they have | 3 | A. Not that I'm aware of. I don't think so. |
| 4 | clients whose interests are opposite to yours; is that | 4 | Q. Did you speak with Mr. Jason Torchinsky? |
| 5 | correct? | 5 | A. I don't think so. I mean, like I said, I -- |
| 6 | A. That's correct. | 6 | the communication was -- you know, there's -- no, not |
| 7 | Q. And I assume it was your expectation that your | 7 | that I'm aware of. |
| 8 | counsel would be representing your point of view | 8 | Q. And what about Phil Gordon? |
| 9 | exclusively; correct? | 9 | A. No. |
| 10 | A. That is correct, and under our legal | 10 | Q. And, Mr. Garcia, do you have a copy of your |
| 11 | representation agreement. | 11 | engagement letter there with you for today's deposition? |
| 12 | Q. And so your -- your written agreement with your | 12 | A. The subpoena? |
| 13 | counsel provides that they will represent your interests | 13 | Q. No. Your -- your retainer agreement with your |
| 14 | and your desires, and not be in conflict with that? | 14 | lawyer. |
| 15 | A. At free cost through the duration of this | 15 | A. Oh, do I have a copy of my -- my retainer |
| 16 | Complaint. | 16 | agreement? Yes, I do. |
| 17 | Q. And you agree with the statement I made as | 17 | Q. And that's -- that's there with you for today's |
| 18 | well? | 18 | deposition? |
| 19 | MR. STOKESBARY: Hey, I'm sorry, Mark. I | 19 | A. The agreement for legal representation? Yes. |
| 20 | couldn't find my mute button in time, but I'm going to | 20 | Q. Yes. |
| 21 | object to the extent you are asking about privileged | 21 | A. Yes. |
| 22 | communications between me and Mr. Garcia. And, Ben, I'm | 22 | MR. STOKESBARY: Yeah, again, l'm going to |
| 23 | going to ask you -- no, it's okay. I'm going to ask you | 23 | object to the extent this calls for privileged |
| 24 | not to answer questions about our engagement agreement. | 24 | attorney-client communication and, Mr. Garcia, ask you |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: Hello? | 25 | not to discuss our engagement agreement. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. GABER: | 1 | Q. But as you sit here today, I gather you're |
| 2 | Q. And my question, Mr. Garcia, is just that it's | 2 | pretty concerned about the situation? |
| 3 | there with you. You brought it with you to the | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | deposition; is that right? | 4 | Q. Okay. I want to shift gears a little bit and |
| 5 | MR. STOKESBARY: You can answer that | 5 | talk a little bit about your experience running as a |
| 6 | question, Ben. | 6 | candidate in the area and your campaign and your |
| 7 | A. Oh, yes. | 7 | familiarity with the area, if that's okay with you. |
| 8 | BY MR. GABER: | 8 | So you ran for congress in 2022; is that right? |
| 9 | Q. And have you reviewed that during the course of | 9 | A. That is correct. |
| 10 | the deposition? | 10 | Q. And was that your first time running for |
| 11 | A. No. Because my glasses -- and I apologize. I | 11 | office? |
| 12 | just got these from the VA, so I assume they were -- | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | there wasn't a problem with them, but -- | 13 | Q. And how did you decide to get involved in that |
| 14 | Q. My uncle has had the same problem with his VA | 14 | race? |
| 15 | glasses, so l understand. | 15 | A. I had helped a candidate, a fellow Republican, |
| 16 | A. I'm having a little bit of problem. | 16 | in 2016, and we got to the primary, and I felt that |
| 17 | Everything's a little fuzzy on the reading. | 17 | representation was -- was not there in -- in all |
| 18 | Q. Mr. Garcia, are you aware that Mr. Stokesbary | 18 | manners. |
| 19 | serves in the legislature? | 19 | And I wanted to reach out to as many people as |
| 20 | A. That, I didn't know, no. | 20 | possible, and to put my -- the reason why I felt I was |
| 21 | Q. You did not know that? | 21 | the best candidate to go ahead and represent the 4th |
| 22 | A. No, I did not know that. | 22 | Congressional District. |
| 23 | Q. So I gather you're not aware that he voted in | 23 | So I got an idea from, like I said, another |
| 24 | favor of the plan that you are challenging? | 24 | candidate who was involved in the race quite a bit, and |
| 25 | A. No, I was unaware of that. | 25 | seeing how the process went, so I could learn, if I were |
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| 1 | Q. How does that make you feel? | 1 | going to run, how to go about it and not just put my two |
| 2 | MR. STOKESBARY: Sorry. Once again, slow on | 2 | feet in there and pray for the best, you know. |
| 3 | the mute button, but objection that it misstates the | 3 | Q. And this was a campaign against the incumbent |
| 4 | evidence. | 4 | Republican, is it Dan Newhouse? |
| 5 | BY MR. GABER: | 5 | A. That is correct. |
| 6 | Q. And you can go ahead and answer. | 6 | Q. And how many Republican candidates were running |
| 7 | A. Not very good. | 7 | in that race? |
| 8 | Q. And you cut out a little bit. Not -- did you | 8 | A. There were a number of Republican candidates, |
| 9 | say not very good? | 9 | about five, including myself. |
| 10 | A. Not very good. | 10 | Q. And were -- you're Latino; is that right? |
| 11 | Q. Why is that? | 11 | A. That is correct. |
| 12 | A. The Complaint that was filed, I would assume | 12 | Q. And were the -- |
| 13 | that my attorney would be in line of -- of my support. | 13 | A. Well, I'm of Seminole-Negro descent and Latino. |
| 14 | Q. And to make it clear, this is the first time | 14 | Q. Were the other Republican candidates in that |
| 15 | you're learning that there was a vote taken in the | 15 | primary white? |
| 16 | legislature, that Mr. Stokesbary is a legislator, and | 16 | A. Yes, that is true. |
| 17 | that he voted in favor of the plan; is that right? | 17 | Q. All of them? |
| 18 | A. That's correct. This is the first time l've | 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | heard of it. | 19 | Q. Now, I spent some time reviewing some of your |
| 20 | Q. Given some of the things you've learned today | 20 | campaign materials and some of the videos and whatnot. |
| 21 | for the first time regarding your counsel and their | 21 | A. I hope you didn't find it offensive. Sorry. I |
| 22 | representation in the other parallel lawsuit, do you | 22 | just had to put that in there, so I apologize. |
| 23 | have any plans for how you want to proceed in this case? | 23 | Q. No, I -- I did not, and I enjoyed it. |
| 24 | A. I'll have to refer to my legal counsel and talk | 24 | One of the videos was -- you conducted it in |
| 25 | to him after. | 25 | Spanish, and said something along the lines of that you |

1 were the only candidate who was running for all the 2 people, including for the Latino people. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. We are a fairly large minority district. The state -- we're the second largest state population. Latinos is second largest state population. We are 40 -- approximately 40 percent of the -- of the population in the 4th Congressional District.

None of our representatives that have been house reps truly understand the need to reach out to all the people, understand -- you know, for example, when do you ever see any of the house reps ever go to a taqueria, you know? Mingle within the -- their -- their people that they're supposed to represent, you know?

For me, there is a disconnection. Although things have gotten much better. I mean, I was Ebony Senate rep in college. I was part of LULAC, part of the Republican National Hispanic Assembly.

My desire is that all people vote, whatever that may be, but that they register to vote and that they vote. But our -- it's my personal belief that our representatives really don't understand the overall -the people in their district, and they don't reach out
to them. And that's missing. And so --
MR. GABER: He may have frozen again. Last time he worked it out and got himself back on, so maybe we take a -- go off the record for a moment.
(Recess from 10:52 a.m. to 11:06 a.m.)
MR. GABER: So I guess back on the record.
Cindy, are you able to read back -- I know we cut out as
Mr . Garcia was answering the last question. Cindy, are you able to read back my question and his answer, as far as he got?

THE COURT REPORTER: "Question: What did you mean by that?
"Answer: We are a fairly large minority district. The state -- we're the second largest state population, Latinos is second largest state population. We are 40 -- approximately 40 percent of the -- of the population in the 4th Congressional District.
"None of our representatives that have been house reps truly understand the need to reach out to all the people, understand -- you know, for example, when do you ever see any of the house reps ever go to a taqueria, you know? Mingle within the -- their -- their people that they're supposed to represent, you know?
"For me, there is a disconnection. Although things have gotten much better. I mean, I was Ebony

Senate rep in college. I was part of LULAC, part of the Republican National Hispanic Assembly.
"My desire is that all people vote, whatever that may be, but that they register to vote and that they vote. But our -- it's my personal belief that our representatives really don't understand the overall -the people in their district, and they don't reach out to them. And that's missing. And so --"

## EXAMINATION(Continuing)

BY MR. GABER:
Q. So we're waiting at the edge of our seats, Mr. Garcia, to find out what followed "and so."
A. And so that is one of the reasons why I decided to run for U.S. Congress. I've got the experience. I've done over a thousand loans for folks to be homeowners in this state, with the federal government, the GRH program. I've done AmeriCorps. I've worked in the school districts. I'm 51, so I do have a prior work background.

And I feel that there is a disconnect, but I believe that that can be changed, and that's with a sincere person who -- who has made a difference in -whether it be for my country or whether it be in my community. I have showed lifelong of making a difference.

## Q. And is it your -- from living and from working and from running as a candidate, I gather it was your impression that there -- there's a lack of attentiveness to the Latino community from our politicians? <br> MR. STOKESBARY: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal conclusion. <br> A. I think, in all perspective of our -- most of our representation, they no longer represent the average person or that of the lower class. <br> BY MR. GABER: <br> Q. And so is it your experience that, in particular, Latino voters in South Central Washington oftentimes have a lower socioeconomic status than their white counterparts?

MR. STOKESBARY: Objection. Calls for speculation.
A. I can't answer that in that sense to know -- to have the experience that I could say that, you know, a large -- the -- the -- you know, economically they're in lower class zones; in other words, their income is not as high for all people.

You know, you can take a look at Toppenish School District. You could take a look at some of the Yakima school districts. There's much poverty across the board.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. GABER: | 1 | A. Yeah, in the 4th District. |
| 2 | Q. And is that the case in the Pasco area as well? | 2 | Q. Now, I read a newspaper article about a |
| 3 | A. Tri-Cities tends to do better, but I can't say | 3 | controversy surrounding telephone messages that |
| 4 | that that is, because I wouldn't know, but I can say in | 4 | supporters of yours wanted to be put out by the State |
| 5 | Yakima, Lower Valley, free school lunch, you know. You | 5 | Republican Party, and there was an article where you |
| 6 | can see a lot of that and that purpose, but I can't say | 6 | were criticizing the party for its actions there. |
| 7 | I would -- I could say, you know, Tri-Cities itself. | 7 | Do you recall that? |
| 8 | Q. Okay. But the -- the Yakima and the Lower | 8 | A. That's correct. Absolutely. That's correct. |
| 9 | Valley, the Latino communities would share that in | 9 | Q. And one of the things that you alleged was that |
| 10 | common? | 10 | the State Republican Party was trying to suppress Latino |
| 11 | A. Yeah, most would have that in common in that | 11 | voters in the primary. |
| 12 | demographic area. | 12 | Do you recall that? |
| 13 | Q. And you were speaking in particular about how | 13 | A. Absolutely. That is correct. |
| 14 | you would be the only candidate in your primary race who | 14 | Q. Can you just talk a little bit, explain that -- |
| 15 | would be able to represent the Latino people. | 15 | that event and -- and what -- |
| 16 | Was it your impression that the candidates you | 16 | A. I will. First of all, I was one of five |
| 17 | were running against were not really campaigning for | 17 | Latinos in the nation to get supported out of Latino |
| 18 | Latino votes in the primary? | 18 | StrikeForce out of Texas. Now, the RNC was involved to |
| 19 | A. No. What I'm trying to say is that I want more | 19 | help use the -- the phone bank system of the Republican |
| 20 | participation, and it's time for -- to try to get | 20 | Party. |
| 21 | everybody registered, which is, you know, a large Latino | 21 | Now, we created our message, both in Spanish |
| 22 | population. You know, you want to see Latino | 22 | and English, and we had approval to do this. And so for |
| 23 | representation in leadership positions, but you want to | 23 | every registered 4th District Latino Republican, we put |
| 24 | make sure that you do it through a fair process under | 24 | on that phone bank. |
| 25 | our constitution. | 25 | Now, this phone bank system was to help us to |
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| 1 | So you're representing everyone. I want to | 1 | get our vote out. And so the message was changed, |
| 2 | make that clear. You're representing everyone, and -- | 2 | re- -- an RNC member who worked with the Washington |
| 3 | and you're doing what's in the best interest of your | 3 | State Republican Party, with Caleb, who's the chairman |
| 4 | district, you know, or 4th Congressional District, I | 4 | of the Washington State Republican Party and his |
| 5 | should say. So you're representing everybody. | 5 | staffing, we had to get approval to use that, and we |
| 6 | What I want to see is more inclusion across the | 6 | finally did. |
| 7 | board, you know, and that's why, when I went out there | 7 | It was greatly delayed, for about three months. |
| 8 | to try to register voters, I didn't care who you are. I | 8 | Not only was it delayed, but when we got the messaging |
| 9 | want you to register, please. It's that important. | 9 | out there for the voicemail, we had done over 10,000 |
| 10 | Q. I agree with that. I get that. | 10 | plus phone calls. |
| 11 | Is it your impression that, in particular, | 11 | And they switched the voicemail message. And |
| 12 | there's lower voter registration among Latino voters in | 12 | so it looked like Washington State Republican Party, a |
| 13 | Yakima County than is the case with the proportion of | 13 | general message, instead of saying, vote for Benancio |
| 14 | white voters who are registered to vote? | 14 | Garcia, 4th Congressional District candidate, and here's |
| 15 | A. It's been proven in the past, and you can look | 15 | the reason why. |
| 16 | at some of the news articles that Yakima Herald has put | 16 | Now, the only reason we found out about that |
| 17 | out, that, you know, even though there's a large | 17 | was because an RNC member quit. Gave me a phone call, |
| 18 | representation in the Latino population, that when it | 18 | said, Ben, I quit because the Washington Republican |
| 19 | comes time to vote, unfortunately, there hasn't been | 19 | Party switched your voicemail. That is suppressing the |
| 20 | large numbers in being able to vote for whatever | 20 | Latino vote. |
| 21 22 | candidate. | 21 | Then there is the second aspect of things, |
| 22 | Q. Right. So that's lower voter turnout among | 22 | number two. They had funds -- Washington State |
|  | Latino voters in Yakima area, as well as lower voter -- | 23 | Republican Party had funds to hire two supervisors, one |
| 25 | A. Lower turnout in overall aspects. | 24 | in Yakima and one in Wenatchee, to register Republican |
| 25 | Q. Okay. | 25 | Latinos. They hired nobody. |

Me being the only Latino representative, it would have favored. Dan Newhouse would no longer be your congressional victor. It probably would have been Culp. But they greatly affected this election, the outcome, and suppressed the Latino vote.
Q. And was it your sense that that was sort of a coordinated effort in the State Republican Party, to suppress the Latino vote in the area?
A. What I will say is this: They say it was a mistake. There's no mistakes in a congressional race like this. We have a third party out of Texas that told them there was no misunderstanding to -- and -misunderstanding about this.

As a matter of fact, you know, you probably didn't see this, since you did your research on me. Did you see the fact that I saved somebody's life in a --

## Q. I did --

A. -- mass shooting? You know?
Q. I did see that, and that was extraordinarily impressive.
A. You know, I thank God that I was there at the right place, right time. My -- my thing is like it was. I didn't change. I believe in seeing all people's rights. I believe strongly in the civil rights.

That's why I was Ebony Senate rep in college.

## Q. You said the RNC member told you he was quitting because of this; is that right? <br> A. That's my understanding. <br> Q. And that was because of the suppression of the Latino vote in your race?

A. Because of what happened in my race, yes, that's correct.
Q. Has anything been done to rectify the situation with the State Republican Party?
A. What I -- what I do want to do is go ahead, after I'm completely settled in in my home and -- and take care of other personal matters, I will go ahead and then write a letter to the RNC, write a letter to the state chairman, and write a letter to the 4th District chairmen, chairpersons, and let them know about what has occurred, what has happened.

This isn't just my word. You know, to be supported, one in five in the nation, Latinos, that's a privilege, and to know that the phone bank system does work because they have a history of getting winning candidates.

So I will be putting that out there, and I will leave it in the hands of the Republican Party on what they want to do, but I will certainly entertain the fact that I may take legal aspects on this in some manner

And I feel -- and it doesn't matter which party it is.
I will do the right thing. For our voice not to be heard and what I feel is suppression, we can disagree upon this, and I welcome a lawsuit, you know.

We did not get fair representation in this 4th Congressional District race. And it's not on the candidate. This was done -- they can say, well, Ben, you know you need to pay for that.

At no point in time, especially since I was supported by a third party who is well connected to the RNC, was that ever brought up. Why didn't you ask me, we can't do this, instead of having my volunteers phone bank, and instead of having my voice message out, it was for the Washington State Republican Party. Not acceptable.
Q. And is it the case that you didn't find out about this until after this had -- the decision had been made not to use your message?
A. It was before. It was before the decision. I found out during the campaign process, but, you know, those are -- are strong challenges when you've already committed so many hours and so much in volunteers to have to overcome. You can't take that time back.
Q. Right.
A. The impact has already been done.
because what occurred is not acceptable. And I am a fighter, you know. And if it's wrong, I will fight it.
Q. Did you hear from Latino voters who were upset that this had happened in your race?
A. A lot of people were upset. I gave a speech about it in Ellensburg -- not Ellensburg. I gave a speech about it -- oh, gosh, what district? I gave a speech about it, and some of the candidates had questions, you know, like what are you talking about exactly here? You know.

And this, like I said, was later on toward -you know, toward the end, where, you know, you had to make it clear how the facts have occurred. And the people were upset, you know.

And what was wonderful is, you know, to see some of the candidates say, what exactly are we talking about here, whether it was Culp's people or whether it was Sessler's people, you know, or it was people in general that were there asking questions, you know, "Are you saying this happened?"

I go, "Absolutely, and this is why."
And it's just not my word. You don't give us access to your phone bank system -- because they, like the Democrat Party can go ahead and say, hey, let me see -- look at your -- look at your phone system, you
know? Let me see what you got out there, you know. Obviously I had access to it. Obviously we created within our district the phone bank system and those phone numbers. And it was to go ahead and give knowledge that I am running.

And the goal was to get minimal to 50,000 phone calls, you know, which in a midyear election can turn toward -- favorable toward you. So...
Q. Did you, like, communicate with people about this issue? Did you send text messages or email with people about your concerns about the --
A. I -- I did send emails probably to some of the newspapers, you know. And really they didn't have, you know -- I shouldn't say I personally did, but some of -of the folks that my staff had, you know.

Because we're concerned. You know, we're -we're concerned, one, how our volunteers were used. We're concerned about the communications and lack of, to not be given notice that our voicemail was not done, and this is through the Washington State Republican Party. When did this change occur? Why did it occur?

Couldn't get an answer really clearly, as -- if you saw the newspaper, it was quite ambiguous, you know. But the bottom line is, you got your hand caught in the cookie jar. You didn't expect me to ever know about it,

We want to fix things. We're both military. We want to fix things. We believe in this country. We -- we, you know, put our lives out there for it. I wear the scars on my body for it, you know.

To give up a federal position because things are broken, you don't take lightly a career and throw it away. You know, I'm not here to be liked. I'm here to fight for the right thing, and that's why l'm here.
Q. Now, Mr. Hughes asked you a bit about Senator Torres, and I gathered from your answer and sort of your expression that she might not -- you might not align politically. Am I right about that?
A. Right. But it's not -- it's not necessarily, you know -- irregardless of who the candidate is, I believe the district was illegally designated, done, and at the time my lawyer did too.

And so, you know, I base it on my Complaint. It don't matter who the representative is, irregardless. I want this to go all the way through to determine whether or not -- if I'm wrong, then I am. If I'm right, then I am. But I want the right thing to happen.
Q. So my question is less about the -- like setting aside the district, and then just talk about Senator Torres in terms of, you know, her political beliefs and yours.
but I found out.
And that was because someone was being honest and decided to leave their RNC, and it just changed his life, you know, in all honesty. He's not returned back to politics.

## Q. Who is the RNC member who left?

A. Manice (phonetic) Perry. I would spell it correctly for you, but l'd have to get off-line.
Q. No, you're -- we don't expect you to try to use your phone in your current circumstance.
A. Yeah, I'm in my car right now. I didn't think this would ever be happening. Wow.

## Q. We definitely appreciate it.

Have you spoken or are you aware of any other Republican Latino candidates who have faced similar -or, you know, the same type of problem with the State Republican Party?
A. Well, I will say I was told about a situation in King County, and that was through Sea Chan, who happened to run for the 4th Congressional District, I think it's the 4th, in King County.

And so he has a -- he has a good knowledge base of -- of what occurred to a candidate who was Asian, you know. So, you know, we had quite a long discussion on things.

Is that -- is she someone who you would choose to be your representative in the state legislature?
A. You know, I believe I voted for her. I think I did. I think she is a Republican. I believe I voted for her. I spoke to her just a bit, not -- I mean, I shook her hand. That was about it.

We were busy at the event, so -- yeah, I -- I fine line item went through all the candidates, you know, and, you know, I -- I try to vote for who I think is the best option, you know.

I am Republican, but there are reasons for that. But I have a history of voting both ways. You know, I am conservative, but I want to see the people that -- that are conservative and that I think will do the best job. And if they did a good job on both ends, I wouldn't be here today.
Q. Do you know how long Senator Torres has identified as a Republican?
A. You know, I didn't even know who she was. Probably as long as she had that meeting with Jim Honeyford.
Q. Are you aware of views in the community that she might not -- her ideology may not, in fact, be Republican, but that she was run as such?
A. You know, I didn't -- to be honest, I didn't
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | stay focused on her, for a number of reasons, but on | 1 | you know, we're glad to be home. We've moved five |
| 2 | other people, because I-- I was very busy running my | 2 | times. A little exhausted, you know, putting my family |
| 3 | race, trying to make meetings, and running in -- up and | 3 | through, you know, with what occurred with the house |
| 4 | down what is our largest congressional district in the | 4 | fire, and still having to meet the requirements to get |
| 5 | state. | 5 | it all fixed. It's almost there. |
| 6 | Q. And am I right that -- | 6 | And, you know, the documents, as far as |
| 7 | A. Yakima County's pretty large. | 7 | basically talking to a couple of reporters, you know, |
| 8 | Q. Am I right that Senator Torres was the only | 8 | there was one news article that I'm aware of that they |
| 9 | Republican candidate available for you to vote for, for | 9 | put it out there, and basically they were like, "Garcia |
| 10 | that race? | 10 | was angry," you know. |
| 11 | A. She was. Yeah, she was the only one. Now, | 11 | Well, not so much angry in the sense that |
| 12 | that's after Senator Honeyford -- State Senator | 12 | you're displeased with the fact that this can occur and |
| 13 | Honeyford had decided that he wasn't going to run again, | 13 | you want fair play. And I believe -- I don't cheat, you |
| 14 | after the fact. But that's politics for you. | 14 | know. That's not who I am. |
| 15 | Q. Now, you mentioned that you had sent some | 15 | And I believe in the American dream, and I |
| 16 | emails, or you -- you or your staff had sent some emails | 16 | believe that we -- you know, that the framers of this |
| 17 | to some newspapers about the controversy with the State | 17 | country created the greatest -- second greatest document |
| 18 | Republican Party. | 18 | in the world. The first is the holy scriptures. Second |
| 19 | Did you text people about that, as well? | 19 | is our constitution. |
| 20 | A. Did I what? | 20 | Q. And so it sounds to me, at least with respect |
| 21 | Q. Did you send text messages on your phone to | 21 | to the -- to your -- the 4th District Republican primary |
| 22 | discuss that issue with friends, colleagues, anyone? | 22 | and the -- your experience with the effort to suppress |
| 23 | A. I did with the Latino StrikeForce because they | 23 | the Latino vote there, that that's an example of an |
| 24 | were the ones that endorsed me. The moment I found out | 24 | unequal electoral opportunity for Latino voters in the |
| 25 | was -- like I said, I was shocked that this would occur, | 25 | area; is that right? |
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| 1 | you know. We're talking a U.S. congressional race. | 1 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection -- |
| 2 | We're not talking -- even if it's a | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | misunderstanding, whatever race it may be, the | 3 | MR. STOKESBARY: -- as to form. |
| 4 | volunteers that put their time in, the support you got, | 4 | A. Sorry. |
| 5 | you know, it affects things, you know. So yeah. | 5 | BY MR. GABER: |
| 6 | Q. Now, you received two subpoenas; is that right? | 6 | Q. Go ahead, Mr. Garcia. |
| 7 | A. I'm sorry. | 7 | A. I agree. I agree. I think the head of |
| 8 | Q. So you're here talking to us today, or talking | 8 | Washington State Republican Party has its challenges. |
| 9 | to me, at least, because you received a subpoena to | 9 | Q. And that -- those challenges are negatively |
| 10 | testify; is that right? | 10 | affecting the Latino voters where you live; is that |
| 11 | A. Yes. There's another one, I think on Monday or | 11 | right? |
| 12 | Tuesday, via Zoom. | 12 | A. I agree. |
| 13 | Q. So that -- okay. So let me just -- how -- did | 13 | Q. Now, I understand that -- when did you -- when |
| 14 | you -- so you received two subpoenas; right? One was | 14 | did you see the -- the copy of the subpoenas for the |
| 15 | for your deposition testimony and one was for documents. | 15 | first time? |
| 16 | Do you understand that? | 16 | A. I think it was Tuesday, last Tuesday, I |
| 17 | A. Right. Right. And -- and the documents, I | 17 | believe. It was served around 7:00 in the evening, I |
| 18 | need time to get that because I still ain't moved in my | 18 | Q. So you saw those when the proces |
| 19 | house. So I have a lot of things packed away in | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | Q. So you saw those when the process server came |
| 20 | storages. And, you know, I don't even have a printer | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | A. Yes. The person serving me the documents, |
| 21 | right now. I need to go buy ink for it, but after -- | 22 | yeah. |
| 22 | you know, what l'm saying is -- because -- we barely | 23 | Q. So you didn't get those ahead of time from your |
|  | made it in time to move into our home. | 24 | counsel? |
| 24 25 | Q. Sure. Sure. And then -- A. We got construction going on still. So it's -- | 25 | A. No. |

Q. Well, I can tell you your counsel's had them for two weeks, and I understand the need for more time, particularly given the circumstance with the fire at your house.

I would, you know, request that we -- and would you be agreeable to maybe sit with us again if we have any questions based on what's in those documents?
A. I would. There were some text messages that were sent, and, you know, I made -- we made some phone calls to -- to the fact, you know, and it was basically one reporter that basically, you know -- and it was just a phone call.

So -- they were trying to understand how this was suppressing the vote, you know, or they wanted a complete, you know -- like, who's the one that did it? Well, you know -- evidence on that.

And I'm like, wait a minute. We've got a video on the training. We've got an email that -- from the Latino StrikeForce. We had access to their phone banking system.

We created our own district in the sense of all registered Latino voters, Republican voters. 10,000 phone calls were made and the voicemail was switched. You don't have access to all that, and not have their permission for it, and there's no misunderstanding of
why we're doing it.
So, you know, it's just not acceptable. If they wanted to say no because maybe they have a candidate dog in the fight, that they would hopefully let you know, then just say no.

But I know -- I have a hard time trusting politicians, and I have a hard time trusting lawyers, you know. Just being honest. And -- so, you know, I guess I'm the little guy fighting for the big dream, but I -- I believe that I will be where I need to be in a little while because l'm a big fighter.
Q. Well, I have no doubt about that. With respect to the -- sorry. Back to the text messages. It sounds like there's some texts that you exchanged with the Latino Task Force people; is that --
A. StrikeForce.
Q. StrikeForce?
A. Latino StrikeForce out of Texas.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes, there is, you know.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes, there is.
Q. And you still have all of those?
A. I should have the texts because, like I said, I was on the phone the moment I found out, and Manice had

Washington, down to the Columbia. Klickitat, Benton, Franklin, Adams, Grant, Okanogan, Yakima. At one point it was parts of Walla Walla, a little tiny part, you know.
Q. And so Pasco is in the district as well; right?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And Othello and Adams County?
A. Yes.
Q. And then all of -- all of Yakima. Mattawa's in the district?
A. Yes.
Q. So there's quite a bit of overlap between District 15 in the legislative map and District 4 for the congressional plan?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, I understand that you need time to look for the documents. Have you looked through them at all in response to the subpoena --
A. No.
Q. -- for today?
A. No, no.
Q. Okay.
A. And to be honest, I wasn't sure what -- what you would want from me in documents, or how the question -- you know, the -- seriously? She just banged
my car. Sorry. Anyways, I'm sorry. What was the question again?
Q. I think I had asked whether you had looked at -- looked for the documents before today.
A. No. I mean, well, I didn't simply because I wasn't sure what was going to be asked of me, you know, and having so much boxed up and five moves, I would have to find out where to look, you know.
Q. But you have your phone and, you know, that -A. Yes.
Q. -- would have the text messages and whatnot, and your email you have access to now; right? We could start with the electronic communications --
A. Yeah, my -- right. But my email for the congressional race is getting to the point to where I need to get ready to pay for another year, so I don't know if I'm going to, you know, at this point because it's just an email. But still it's a little bit of money out of the pocket, you know.
Q. So it probably makes sense to start there and collect those so that you get them before you have to pay to host that again, so that --
A. Right. And I hope to get to them by next week, you know. Like I said, I don't got my computer up yet. We still have some work to be done in the house. But I
will be getting -- I can get to them.

## Q. Okay.

A. You know, and I think basically everything was just done by phone conversation, other than a few texts, which had to do with the Latino StrikeForce and had to do with Per- -- Manice in regards to that.
Q. So I want to -- I know this is difficult for you because you're in your car on the phone, but l'm going to share my screen and see if you can see it. Just one moment.

So before I do that, so the complaint you had about -- setting aside your thought that it's a racial gerrymander, District 15 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- your geographic complaint, as I understand it, is it's stretching, you know, from Yakima County further over toward Franklin County? Is that --
A. Yes. And again, I'm seeing a little fuzzy on the reading thing, you know, because the glasses I thought that were supposed to be my prescription aren't quite -- they're -- they're not -- I'm going to have to send them back.
Q. So l've pulled up a map on the screen. Can you see that?
A. Yeah, I can see the red and -- and the lines,
but I -- I -- I'm having trouble distinguishing the lines a little bit. I apologize.
Q. No, no worries. So I can kind of explain it to you a little bit. You see the red is in the southern half of Yakima County? Can you see that?
A. Umm --
Q. Maybe -- maybe even pull the phone a little bit closer to you.
A. Well, I'm -- yeah, I mean, I'm sorry. It's -okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I'm just...
Q. So do you see where the red area is situated on the map, in -- primarily in Yakima County?
A. Yeah. I see. I see the red.
Q. Now, if the district looked something like this, would this resolve your geographic concerns?

MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form.
A. I -- you know, I got to apologize. I really can't answer that. I'm having -- I'm just having a lot of issues reading. I mean, I can't even read the -- the subpoena and stuff, so I -- I really apologize for that. I didn't think I -- these glasses -- set of glasses I brought would -- well, I thought they were meant for me. Apparently... BY MR. GABER:
Q. Okay. So you can't --
A. I'm sorry.
Q. -- see where the red is on the map?
A. No, I -- I see the red, but I'm having trouble with the lines distinguishing. They're fuzzy.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, I'm seeing everything fuzzy, and so I apologize.
Q. Okay. Well, we don't need to keep testing your eyes.
A. Yeah. Sorry.
Q. Did you -- now, earlier we talked about how this is the first time, you know, when I told you, and Mr. Hughes mentioned it as well, about the intervenors and their opposite relief that they want.

I gather you haven't signed any sort of conflict waiver?
A. No.
Q. And so no -- no conflict waiver --

MR. STOKESBARY: Hold on. Hold on, Mark. I'm going to object to this question to the extent it calls for privileged attorney-client communications, and, Ben, ask you not to discuss any conversations between us.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
MR. HUGHES: I don't think the question
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | whether there was a conflict waiver is privileged, Drew. | 1 | MR. STOKESBARY: Yes. I'm going to object |
| 2 | BY MR. GABER: | 2 | to all of your requests regarding my communication with |
| 3 | Q. Yeah. And so, Mr. Garcia, I'm not asking you | 3 | my client. |
| 4 | for any conversations with your attorneys. My question | 4 | BY MR. GABER: |
| 5 | is simply, have you signed any sort of written conflict | 5 | Q. Mr. Garcia, do you understand that you're the |
| 6 | waiver with your attorneys and with the -- with the | 6 | holder of the privilege? |
| 7 | parties in the other case? | 7 | A. Yes. |
| 8 | MR. STOKESBARY: Again, I would say that | 8 | Q. And do you understand that you have the power |
| 9 | things he's signed that exist between me and him are -- | 9 | to determine whether you want to assert that privilege |
| 10 | are the definition of privilege. | 10 | or not? |
| 11 | MR. HUGHES: Well, a conflict waiver goes to | 11 | A. Yes, I-- I will assert the privilege. I'm |
| 12 | the -- the outer bounds of the privilege relationship; | 12 | going to do what's in my best interest and why I filed |
| 13 | right? So if there is -- if there is a conflict waiver, | 13 | this lawsuit. |
| 14 | I would think that would be -- well, just sort of | 14 | Q. And -- but for the record, you were under the |
| 15 | freestyling here, I guess. I wouldn't say the existence | 15 | understanding that you were required to show up in |
| 16 | of a conflict waiver falls within the privilege, but -- | 16 | Tacoma this morning; is that -- is that fair? |
| 17 | MR. GABER: I think we have the answer on | 17 | A. Well, after -- I had already -- once I got the |
| 18 | the record. | 18 | subpoena, I had already made the decision I was coming |
| 19 | BY MR. GABER: | 19 | to Tacoma. I have family up here. I thought, honestly, |
| 20 | Q. How many times during the course -- since | 20 | I was going to be in a legal office, probably, you know, |
| 21 | you've filed the lawsuit, how frequently have you spoken | 21 | under -- not -- not in front of -- oh, my goodness. |
| 22 | with Mr. Stokesbary? | 22 | Certainly not in front of the coffee shop, Starbucks, or |
| 23 | A. Since the filing of the lawsuit, so when the | 23 | whatnot. |
| 24 | Complaint was filed, after that? Is that what you mean? | 24 | So I had already made the decision that I would |
| 25 | Q. Correct. | 25 | drive up here because it did give me the place, |
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| 1 | A. I think it was two more times last week, like | 1 | location, and it did give me the time and date that I |
| 2 | Thursday or Friday or -- or Monday. For sure Monday. | 2 | was supposed to be there, so I had already made those |
| 3 | It was late last week. | 3 | plans once I had received it. |
| 4 | Q. And so that -- between the filing of the | 4 | And I understood, under the second subpoena, |
| 5 | lawsuit and the spring of 2022, the next time you spoke | 5 | that it was requiring documents, but I was going to |
| 6 | with your attorney was last week? | 6 | request a stay for that because -- simply because I just |
| 7 | A. Yeah. | 7 | got stuff boxed up and the situation of moving five |
| 8 | Q. And did you call him -- | 8 | times, it's going to take me about a month and a half to |
| 9 | A. After I -- | 9 | get everything all straightened out, you know, for my |
| 10 | Q. -- or -- I didn't mean to interrupt. Go ahead. | 10 | family and myself, you know. We still got stuff, |
| 11 | A. No, I -- I had -- he returned my call. | 11 | clothing that's boxed here, still got to report all our |
| 12 | Q. So you reached out to him last week? | 12 | property that was damaged. So yeah. |
| 13 | A. Yeah. Yeah, I did. | 13 | MR. GABER: Okay. I'd like to take just a |
| 14 | Q. Was that after you'd received the subpoena from | 14 | five-minute break if that's okay with you. I realize -- |
| 15 | the process server? | 15 | and I don't want to make -- we're just about done, and I |
| 16 | A. Yes. | 16 | don't want to make you sit in your car like this for |
| 17 | Q. Did anyone tell you how to attend today's | 17 | longer than you need to. |
| 18 | deposition? | 18 | So on behalf of our -- you know, the plaintiffs |
| 19 | MR. STOKESBARY: Again, to the extent this | 19 | in this -- the case that you're not involved in, I want |
| 20 | calls for attorney-client communication, I'm going to | 20 | to thank you for traveling and for going out of your way |
| 21 | instruct you not to answer this, Ben. | 21 | today, and for dealing with less than ideal |
| 22 | MR. GABER: I don't think I'm asking for | 22 | circumstances. And, you know, I'm sorry that you didn't |
| 23 | legal advice. I'm asking if he was told where to show | 23 | know that that wasn't necessary. |
| 24 | up today. | 24 | But let's take a five-minute break and |
| 25 | Does your objection stand to that question? | 25 | hopefully we can wrap up pretty soon after that. |

1 Mr. Hughes might have some more questions as well, but I time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Recess from 11:54 a.m. to 12:01 p.m.) EXAMINATION(Continuing)
BY MR. GABER:
Q. Just a couple more questions for you, Mr. Garcia.

I want to ask a little bit about if you have experience with how the Republican Party operates in terms of recruiting and getting candidates to run for the state legislature in the Yakima County area.

Do you -- what are your observations about how that process works? Is it sort of a top-down effort to kind of get a slate of candidates?

MR. HUGHES: Object to form.
MR. STOKESBARY: Yeah, objection as to form. BY MR. GABER:
Q. And you can answer.
A. Oh, okay. Well, you know, pre-COVID, I would say that there was a lot of -- you know, whether it be PCOs, or whether it be top-down, say, hey, you know, we need to continue to reach out to people, to be a more -more involved.

It just has greatly affected people -- you know, more concerned about their health, fearful of things. You know, things aren't quite as normal as they used to be before the COVID pandemic. So it's a challenge across the board.
Q. Who is paying for your lawyers in this case?
A. I don't know.
Q. Is it your understanding that someone or some entity is --
A. Yes. Some -- someone or some entity is, yes.
Q. Do you know if that's a national organization or a Washington State-based organization?
A. I don't know.
Q. Is that information that you would want to know, to know, you know, where the money's coming from for your lawsuit?

MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form.
A. Sorry. I'm trying to keep this charged.

BY MR. GABER:
Q. My question was, is that information that, you know, you would kind of want to know, to know where the money that's funding the -- your counsel is coming from?
A. I will discuss that with my lawyer. I do --
you know, on that.
Q. And I asked you whether you'd spoken to

After COVID, so much has changed in people feeling safe and people wanting to participate, you know. So much has changed after that. And like I said, I was involved in a congressional race where I was helping my friend try to get elected in -- in 2015, 2016. And it's just so different nowadays.

Give me a moment. I need to plug this in.
Q. Sure.
A. All right. Hopefully it holds. Shoot. I'm going to have to go sideways. I apologize for -because I got a low battery.
Q. There won't be much more.
A. Okay. And so there -- you know, as far as recruiting, I think, you know, it's just been a struggle in -- in getting people to show up to meetings as a whole.

And really, you know, people are trying to find -- how do we get more -- more of the community to get involved in not just our party, but involved in politics as a whole.

You know, you have an event. The numbers aren't what they used to be. So more than anything, COVID's had its effect in the way our lives are, more than anything.

That has nothing do with the parties so much.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | I'm not sure. | 1 | Q. So you intend to vote in the 15th District -- |
| 2 | MR. HUGHES: I do, yeah. Just a couple. | 2 | 15th Legislative District in future elections? |
| 3 | FURTHEREXAMINATION | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 4 | Q. So in your other answers today, you have tried |
| 5 | Q. Mr. Garcia, do you know who Dr. Mark Owens is? | 5 | to answer all the questions to the best -- best of your |
| 6 | A. No. | 6 | knowledge; right? |
| 7 | Q. So you've never seen his expert report in your | 7 | A. True, yes. |
| 8 | case? | 8 | Q. But is it -- is it impossible for you to be |
| 9 | A. The which report? | 9 | 100 percent sure regarding things that happened months |
| 10 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection. Misstates the | 10 | ago? |
| 11 | record. | 11 | MR. GABER: Object to the form. |
| 12 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 12 | THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear the |
| 13 | Q. You've never an expert report from Dr. Mark | 13 | answer. I got the objection. |
| 14 | Owens? | 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | A. I didn't even know who he was. | 15 | MR. STOKESBARY: Okay. Those are the only |
| 16 | Q. You don't know that -- you didn't know that | 16 | questions I have. |
| 17 | he's been put forward as an expert in your case? | 17 | MR. GABER: I have nothing further. I just |
| 18 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection. Misstates the | 18 | want to thank you, Mr. Garcia, again, and apologize for |
| 19 | record. | 19 | the circumstances that you find yourself in. |
| 20 | BY MR. HUGHES: | 20 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 21 | Q. You can answer. | 21 | (Deposition concluded at 12:11 p.m.) |
| 22 | A. No, I didn't know. Sorry. | 22 | (Reading and signing was requested |
| 23 | Q. And you've never paid a bill of his? | 23 | pursuant to FRCP Rule 30(e).) |
| 24 | A. No. | 24 | -000- |
| 25 | Q. Do you know when trial is scheduled for this | 25 |  |
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| 1 | case? | 1 | CERTIFICATE |
| 2 | A. No. | 2 |  |
| 3 | Q. No one's told you that? | 3 | STATE OF WASHINGTON |
| 4 | A. No. | 4 | COUNTY OF PIERCE |
| 5 | MR. HUGHES: I think that's all I have. | 5 |  |
| 6 | Thank you. | 6 | I, Cindy M. Koch, a Certified Court Reporter in |
| 7 | MR. STOKESBARY: I -- can I ask just a | 7 | and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that |
| 8 | couple questions? | 8 | the foregoing transcript of the deposition of Benancio |
| 9 | MR. HUGHES: Of course. | 9 | Garcia III, having been duly sworn, on February 3, 2023, |
| 10 | EXAMINATION | 10 | is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill |
| 11 | BY MR. STOKESBARY: | 11 | and ability. |
| 12 | Q. Hey, Ben. Just a few questions for you. | 12 | Reading and signing was requested pursuant to |
| 13 | A. Yeah. | 13 | FRCP Rule 30(e). |
| 14 | Q. Did you vote in the 2022 primary and general | 14 | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand |
| 15 | elections? | 15 | and seal this 6th day of February, 2023. |
| 16 | A. Yes. | 16 |  |
| 17 | Q. Do you intend to vote in future elections? | 17 |  |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | ( 1 |
| 19 | Q. And let me back up. | 19 | Cindorm Koch |
| 20 | So you currently live in the 15th District; | 20 | CINDY M. KOCH, CCR, RPR, CRR \#2357 |
| 21 | right? | 21 | CINDYM.KOCH, CCR, RPR, CRR \#2357 |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 |  |
| 23 | Q. And you intend to stay there, as far as you | 23 | JUNE 9, 2026 |
| 24 | know? | 24 |  |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 |  |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT <br> WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON | $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | APPEARANCES: <br> (Via Zoom videoconferencing) <br> FOR THE WITNESS and INTERVENOR-DEFENDANTS: ANDREW R. STOKESBARY <br> CHALMERS \& ADAMS, LLC <br> 1003-1/2 Main Street, Suite 5 <br> Sumner, Washington 98390-1444 <br> DStokesbary@ChalmersAdams.com <br> FOR PLAINTIFFS SOTO PALMER, et al., on behalf of CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER: SIMONE LEEPER <br> ANNABELLE HARLESS <br> ASEEM MULJI <br> BEN PHILLIPS, Legal Fellow <br> CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER <br> 1101 14th Street Northwest, Suite 400 <br> Washington, DC 20005 <br> SLeeper@CampaignLegalCenter.org <br> AHarless@CampaignLegal Center.org <br> AMulji@CampaignLegal Center.org <br> BPhillips@ CampaignLegalCenter.org <br> FOR PLAINTIFFS, ON BEHALF OF MALDEF: <br> ERNEST HERRERA <br> DEYLIN THRIFT-VIVEROS <br> Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) <br> 634 South Spring Street, 11th Floor <br> Los Angeles, California 90014 <br> EHerrera@MALDEF.org <br> DThrift-Viveros@MALDEF.org <br> FOR PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of MORFIN LAW FIRM: EDWARDO MORFIN <br> MORFIN LAW FIRM, PLLC <br> 7325 West Deschutes Avenue, Suite A Kennewick, Washington 99336 <br> Eddie@MorfinLawFirm.com <br> (Continued on next page) |
| Page 3 |  | Page 4 |
| 1 APPEARANCES, continued: | 1 | October 13, 2022, Remote Proceedings: |
| 2 <br> FOR DEFENDANT STATE OF WASHINGTON: | 2 3 | PROCEEDINGS: 9:29 a.m. <br> (Discussion off the record.) |
| ANDREW R.W. HUGHES <br> KARL SMITH | 4 5 | ISMAEL G. CAMPOS, having been sworn/affirmed on oath to tell the truth, the |
| Assistant Attorneys General <br> ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON <br> Complex Litigation Division | 5 6 7 | having been sworn/affirmed on oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows: |
| 6800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 | 8 | EXAMINATION |
|  Seattle, Washington 98104 <br> 7 Andrew.Hughes@ ATG.Wa.gov <br> Karl.Smith@ ATG.Wa.gov  | 9 10 11 | BY MS. LEEPER: <br> Q Good morning, Mr. Campos. My name is Simone Leeper, and $I$ am one of the attorneys that is representing the |
| 9 ***** | 12 | plaintiffs in this case. I want to sort of introduce for |
| 10 EXAMINATION INDEX | 13 | you the other counsel that are on the phone with us. |
| 12 ISMAEL G. CAMPOS PAGE | 14 | So there's going to be Karl Smith, who represents |
| 13By Ms. Leeper 4 <br> By Mr. Stokesbary 92 | 15 16 | the Secretary of State, but he will not be speaking during today's deposition. There's Andrew Hughes, who represents |
| $\begin{array}{lr}14 & \\ 15 & \\ 16 & * * * * *\end{array}$ | 17 18 | the State of Washington. And, of course, you know your attorney, Mr. Stokesbary. |
| 17 E X H I B I T S | 19 | There's also on the line a number of other attorneys |
| 18 (None offered) | 20 | representing the plaintiffs, but they're not going to be |
| 19 20 | 21 | speaking with you today. It's just going to be a |
| 21 | 22 | conversation between the two of us. |
| 22 | 23 | I want to go over just a couple of ground rules |
| 23 24 | 24 | about how this deposition is going to go and how we can |
| 25 | 25 | make everyone's life easier, especially Jeanne's in the |


|  | Page 5 |  | Page 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | process; but before I do that, have you ever been deposed | 1 | Something else just to keep in mind is that if you |
| 2 | before? | 2 | don't understand any of the questions that I ask you today |
| 3 | A No, ma'am. | 3 | at any point in time, that's okay. You should just ask me |
| 4 | Q Okay. Thanks for letting me know that. | 4 | for clarification about the question, and I can rephrase |
| 5 | So one of the things that's going to make Jeanne's | 5 | it or explain it again. But if you do answer a question |
| 6 | life easier is if we do not talk over one another. And | 6 | that I ask, I'm going to assume that you understood the |
| 7 | she covered this a bit off the record, but just to | 7 | question and are able to answer it. |
| 8 | reiterate, if I can get my full question out, and then | 8 | Does that make sense to you? |
| 9 | I'll be sure to make sure that I let you get your full | 9 | A Yes. Yes. |
| 10 | answer out; and if we try our best not to overlap with one | 10 | Q Okay. This is hopefully not going to be too, too |
| 11 | another, that will just make for a much cleaner record and | 11 | long today; but if at any point you find yourself needing |
| 12 | make Jeanne's life a little bit easier. | 12 | to take a break to go to the restroom or get a drink of |
| 13 | Something else is that this is obviously going to be | 13 | water, or if you're just a little bit tired, that's |
| 14 | a written transcript, so we need to keep our responses | 14 | totally okay. |
| 15 | verbal. So I know it's an inclination I have to nod or | 15 | All I would ask is that you don't ask to take a |
| 16 | shake my head, or to say things like uh-uh or um-hmm to | 16 | break when a question is still pending, and just maybe |
| 17 | answer a question. That's not very clear on the record; | 17 | give me a little bit of notice, and we'll be sure that we |
| 18 | so if you could keep it to yes or no answers and keep | 18 | take a break at a time that works for you and we get |
| 19 | everything out loud, that will be sure that we record your | 19 | through the line of questioning we're in. |
| 20 | full testimony. | 20 | Does that make sense? |
| 21 | Do you understand that? | 21 | A Um-hmm; yes. |
| 22 | A Yes, I do. I'm sorry. I have a fly flying around | 22 | Q Okay. And then one last thing is that the way |
| 23 | here. | 23 | depositions work is that some of the attorneys present |
| 24 | Q Don't worry, if you have to swat a fly, I promise I | 24 | might object to the form of some of the questions that I |
| 25 | won't let it break up our momentum. | 25 | ask. If that happens, that objection is going to be noted |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | for the record, but you still must answer the question | 1 | A I'm sorry, I was hearing a T at the end. |
| 2 | that I asked. | 2 | Q I'll be sure to enunciate. |
| 3 | Does that make sense to you? | 3 | So in today's deposition I'm going to be using the |
| 4 | A Yes. Yes. | 4 | terms Hispanic and Latino interchangeably, and when I |
| 5 | Q Okay. All right. Mr. Campos, could you please | 5 | refer to white residents I'm going to be referring to |
| 6 | state and spell your full name for the record? | 6 | white residents who do not identify as Hispanic or Latino. |
| 7 | A Ismael G. Campos. I-S-M-A-E-L, G, Campos, | 7 | Do you understand that? |
| 8 | C-A-M-P-O-S. | 8 | A Um-hmm; yes. |
| 9 | Q And it seems you broke up a little bit. Could you | 9 | Q Mel, do you understand that you're under oath today? |
| 10 | say your middle initial again one more time? | 10 | A Yes, Ido. |
| 11 | A That's G like in George, Gonzalez. | 11 | Q Is there any reason why you can't give truthful |
| 12 | Q Okay. Great. Thank you. | 12 | answers to my questions? |
| 13 | And is there anything in particular that you prefer | 13 | A No reason. |
| 14 | I call you today during the deposition? | 14 | Q Are you taking any medications that might impair |
| 15 | A Mel is good. | 15 | your memory? |
| 16 | Q Okay. Great. Thanks, Mel. You can call me Simone. | 16 | A No. |
| 17 | So what is your address? | 17 | Q And do you have any conditions that might impair |
| 18 | A 9008 West Rio Grande, Kennewick, Washington. | 18 | your memory? |
| 19 | Q And also for the record what is your race? | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | A My what? | 20 | Q Okay. So part of the oath that you took today was |
| 21 | Q Your race. | 21 | to tell the whole truth, and so what that means in the |
| 22 | A Myrate? | 22 | context of this deposition is that you need to provide |
| 23 | Q Race, like ethnicity. | 23 | full and complete answers to the questions that I ask. |
| 24 | A Oh, race. Okay. I'm Mexican. | 24 | Do you understand that? |
| 25 | Q All right. | 25 | A Yes. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Sometimes it might happen that later on in the | 1 | sure that I'm not apprehensive or anything like that, you |
| 2 | deposition you might remember some additional details or | 2 | know, that was it. |
| 3 | clarification to an answer that you gave to a previous | 3 | Q Okay. And how many times did you meet with Drew -- |
| 4 | question that I had. If that happens, you should say so | 4 | and that's Drew Stokesbary, your attorney -- to prepare |
| 5 | at the time and let me know that you want to add to or | 5 | for this deposition? |
| 6 | clarify a previous answer that you gave, and we'll go | 6 | A Just that one time, yeah. |
| 7 | ahead and do that right then when it's still fresh on your | 7 | Q Okay. And was anyone other than yourself and Drew |
| 8 | mind. | 8 | present for that meeting? |
| 9 | Does that work for you? | 9 | A I can't remember what his name was, but there was |
| 10 | A Yes. | 10 | another person there. |
| 11 | Q Okay. And finally, is there any reason why you | 11 | Q And was that an attorney or someone who wasn't an |
| 12 | cannot give full, complete and accurate testimony today? | 12 | attorney? |
| 13 | A Nope. | 13 | A I think it was an attorney, yes. |
| 14 | Q Mel, have you ever been a party to a lawsuit? | 14 | Q Okay. About how long did that meeting last? |
| 15 | A No. | 15 | A Fifteen, 20 minutes. |
| 16 | Q Okay. So I want to talk a little bit about how you | 16 | Q Did you review any documents during that meeting? |
| 17 | prepared for this deposition today. Did you meet with | 17 | A No. |
| 18 | anyone in person, by phone, by Zoom, or in any other way | 18 | Q Did you take any notes during the meeting? |
| 19 | to prepare for this deposition? | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | A Nope. | 20 | Q Other than your attorneys, did you discuss this |
| 21 | Q I'm going to ask you this and be very clear, I'm not | 21 | deposition with anyone else? |
| 22 | asking about the content of any of your conversations, but | 22 | A Nope. |
| 23 | did you have any meetings with an attorney to prepare for | 23 | Q You didn't discuss it with any commissioners from |
| 24 | this deposition? | 24 | the Redistricting Commission? |
| 25 | A Other than with Drew the other day as far as making | 25 | A No. I didn't talk to anybody, no. |
|  | Page 11 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | Q How about any of the commission staff? | 1 | A Yes. |
| 2 | A No. | 2 | Q Okay. Did you discuss this deposition with your |
| 3 | Q Any members or representatives of a political party? | 3 | brother? |
| 4 | A Nope. | 4 | A No, other than -- Well, no. |
| 5 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form, | 5 | Q You said "other than." What was that that you were |
| 6 | vague. | 6 | thinking there? |
| 7 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Did you discuss this deposition with | 7 | A When this process started they were asking for |
| 8 | any legislators? | 8 | documentation, or I forget what the wording was, but |
| 9 | A No. | 9 | communications or whatever; and in that I got -- I said, |
| 10 | Q Mel, are you familiar with an individual named | 10 | "Hey, Paul, did we ever discuss the redistricting process |
| 11 | Paul Campos? | 11 | that you're in, and as far as the 15th District? And did |
| 12 | A Oh, yes, ma'am. He's my brother. | 12 | we send anything?" And he said, "No, we haven't discussed |
| 13 | Q And your brother was employed by the Senate | 13 |  |
| 14 | Republican Caucus working on the 2021 redistricting | 14 | Other than the political conversation we had with |
| 15 | process; is that right? | 15 | politics, we never remembered or recalled any |
| 16 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection -- | 16 | communications per this redistricting issue. |
| 17 | A Yes. | 17 | Q Okay. So I want to dive into sort of some subparts |
| 18 | MR. STOKESBARY: -- as to form. | 18 | there just to get some clarification. |
| 19 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) I'm sorry, your answer got cut off, | 19 | Who was asking for that documentation? |
| 20 | Mel. What was your answer? | 20 | A I'm thinking Drew. |
| 21 | A No. Sorry. What was the question? I'm sorry, it | 21 | Q Okay. And you said that you spoke with Paul about |
| 22 | was jumping around. | 22 | how you guys hadn't talked about redistricting outside of |
| 23 | Q Yeah, of course. The question was whether your | 23 | I think you said the political parts of it. |
| 24 | brother was employed by the Senate Republican Caucus | 24 | What did you mean by that? |
| 25 | working for the 2021 redistricting process. | 25 | A Oh. We're Republicans, and we discuss politics. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Okay. And did you talk about that sort of in the | 1 | besides your counsel to prepare for this deposition? |
| 2 | context of redistricting? | 2 | A Nope. |
| 3 | A No, no, no. Just politics in general. That's what | 3 | Q Did you review any documents in preparation for this |
| 4 | we do. We're Republicans. We discuss everything from -- | 4 | deposition? |
| 5 | just stuff. | 5 | A Just the document that Drew sent me as far as the -- |
| 6 | Q Okay. And did you ever talk about politics in the | 6 | What's it called? The -- I don't know what the document |
| 7 | context of Legislative District 15? | 7 | is called. The -- Where it explains what the plaintiffs |
| 8 | A No. Well, -- | 8 | are doing and this stuff, and that I'm the intervenor and |
| 9 | Q And did you -- | 9 | yada yada. |
| 10 | A Hold on. | 10 | Q Okay. Was that to your knowledge like a legal |
| 11 | Q Sorry. Please continue. | 11 | filing in this case? |
| 12 | A Other than the fact that I was considering running | 12 | A What's that? |
| 13 | there, and I asked what his opinion would be; but as far | 13 | Q Was that a legal filing in this case that you |
| 14 | as the redistricting itself, no. I'm sorry. | 14 | reviewed? |
| 15 | Q Okay. I'll probably ask you some more questions | 15 | A Yeah, I'm assuming. Yeah. |
| 16 | about that later on, but right now just a few more | 16 | Q Okay. Did you receive a copy of that document from |
| 17 | questions on this point. | 17 | Mr. Stokesbary? |
| 18 | Did you ever have discussions with your brother | 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | about how redistricting might impact sort of Republicans | 19 | Q And do you have that document with you today? |
| 20 | in Washington? | 20 | A Well, it's on my screen behind your -- that -- this |
| 21 | A No. | 21 | Zoom meeting. |
| 22 | Q Okay. Is there anyone else that you spoke with | 22 | Q Okay. So on that note, what do you have open on |
| 23 | about this deposition? | 23 | your browser right now? |
| 24 | A Nope. | 24 | A Actually, I think it's where Drew sent me the phone |
| 25 | Q Have you had any written communications with anyone | 25 | for this. Actually, I don't have it up. |
|  | Page 15 |  | Page 16 |
| 1 | Q Okay. And is there anything else, any other windows | 1 | much for doing that. I appreciate it. |
| 2 | visible for you right now? | 2 | So even if not in preparation for this deposition, |
| 3 | A My calendar, Zoom meeting, my email, and then that's | 3 | have you reviewed any documents filed in this case? |
| 4 | it. | 4 | A No. |
| 5 | Q Okay. And any papers in front of you? | 5 | Q Have you reviewed the Complaint in the case? |
| 6 | A No. It's just a lot of stuff. | 6 | A I don't know the document that Drew sent me to, you |
| 7 | Q Okay. So just for the purposes of while we're in | 7 | know, explain that I'm an intervenor and that kind of |
| 8 | this deposition, it's sort of a closed room. So if you | 8 | thing. I don't know what, if that's a Complaint or not. |
| 9 | could go ahead and close your email; and if you have like | 9 | Q Okay. So besides the meeting that we already |
| 10 | a Mac and you're able to see your texts and things coming | 10 | discussed with Drew, what else did you do to prepare for |
| 11 | up on your screen, if you could go ahead and close that | 11 | this deposition? |
| 12 | out, too, that would be appreciated. | 12 | A Prayed. That was it. Nothing. |
| 13 | A Close my email is what you're asking? | 13 | Q Okay. It's never bad to have God on your side. |
| 14 | Q Yes, please. | 14 | A There you go. |
| 15 | A If I hit the post-attendee Zoom, would that kick you | 15 | Q About how long in total do you think that you spent |
| 16 | guys out? | 16 | preparing for this deposition? |
| 17 | Q No, it won't. If that's your web browser that's | 17 | A Fifteen minutes reading that document, 20. |
| 18 | open and it says post-attendee Zoom, it's sort of like -- | 18 | Q Okay. So earlier we touched on the fact that your |
| 19 | There's a blue button in the middle usually. If you can X | 19 | brother, Paul Campos, was a staffer for the House |
| 20 | out of that, there's no problem there. | 20 | Republican Caucus during the 2021 redistricting process; |
| 21 | A Microsoft Home, if I X out of that it won't kick you | 21 | correct? |
| 22 | out? | 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q It will not. | 23 | Q Have you ever discussed anything related to this |
| 24 | A All right. It's the computer screen with clouds. | 24 | case with him? |
| 25 | Q Okay. Great. It's just us now. Thank you very | 25 | A Nope. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Did you speak with your brother regarding the 2021 | 1 | Q Do you know Jim Honeyford? |
| 2 | redistricting process in Washington state? | 2 | A Jim? |
| 3 | A No. | 3 | Q Yes. |
| 4 | Q What do you know about your brother's work related | 4 | A Yeah, I -- Yes. |
| 5 | to redistricting in Washington? | 5 | Q How do you know him? |
| 6 | A Only that he is the Republican side of | 6 | A He was a senator from Yakima. Years ago we met at a |
| 7 | redistricting. | 7 | coffee shop for discussing -- oh, I can't remember what. |
| 8 | Q Do you know anything about what he does in the | 8 | I met him at different meetings with the representatives |
| 9 | context of his job? | 9 | and politicians there in Yakima, just off and on meetings, |
| 10 | A I mean, he's a -- What's it called? Ops manager or | 10 | situations like that. |
| 11 | something like that at the capitol, or -- I forget what | 11 | Q And when you met with him was that in your personal |
| 12 | his title is, but I know he works there. And he gives us | 12 | capacity or in connection with some group that you're a |
| 13 | tours, and I think he runs errands for the senators, I | 13 | part of? |
| 14 | think, stuff like that. | 14 | A Well, I'm part of -- was part of the Yakima/Morelia |
| 15 | Oh, he manages the office, where the offices go for | 15 | Sister City organization there in Yakima, and we'd go -- |
| 16 | the senators. He has to do with the Historic Society | 16 | (Court reporter request for clarification.) |
| 17 | because I guess you can bring back and forth old stuff | 17 | A Morelia, sister city. |
| 18 | from years ago from the historic room and put it outside | 18 | Q And could you spell that for Jeanne? She is, I |
| 19 | for people to see. I'm sorry. I mean, that's -- | 19 | think, certified only in English, and that sounds like it |
| 20 | Q No, don't be sorry at all. | 20 | might be a Spanish word. |
| 21 | Is there anything specifically as it relates to | 21 | A Morelia is the capitol of Michoacán, M-O-R-E-L-I-A. |
| 22 | redistricting that you know about -- | 22 | THE REPORTER: Thank you. |
| 23 | A Oh. | 23 | Q Thanks, Mel. |
| 24 | Q -- the sort of job duties that your brother has? | 24 | And you were explaining sort of what that group |
| 25 | A No. | 25 | entails. Could you let me know? |
|  | Page 19 |  | Page 20 |
| 1 | A Well, we establish cultural connections, business | 1 | meetings that I went to with the other senators, I went |
| 2 | connections with the capitol in Morelia, in Michoacán | 2 | there as an interested party, as a Republican, just kind |
| 3 | there, Morelia. The organization donated several fire | 3 | of support. |
| 4 | engine trucks. We've donated wheelchairs. And me and my | 4 | Q And did Senator Honeyford start coming to those |
| 5 | wife ended up going down there to Morelia to visit their | 5 | meetings? |
| 6 | facilities there. | 6 | A He was there at that meeting. Well, not to our |
| 7 | The mayor and council people have come to Yakima, | 7 | Morelia Sister City meetings at all. I went there, you |
| 8 | and we toured them Yakima. We toured the capitol there, | 8 | know, representing not only myself but the organization. |
| 9 | and Paul gave us a tour of the whole capitol. And for | 9 | Q Okay. Have you ever met with Senator Honeyford |
| 10 | that occasion, since Paul is my brother, we mentioned that | 10 | about anything else? |
| 11 | we were coming by, and they -- What's it called? The | 11 | A Nope. |
| 12 | people that came over, the committee that came over were | 12 | Q Have you ever discussed anything related to this |
| 13 | really impressed that the Mexican flag was at the same | 13 | lawsuit with Jim Honeyford? |
| 14 | height as the American flag, and they were pretty | 14 | A Oh, not at all. I haven't talked to Jim in two |
| 15 | impressed with that. | 15 | years, three years. I don't know. |
| 16 | You know, most of the times other flags are below | 16 | Q Have you discussed -- Have you ever discussed |
| 17 | the U.S., but this time they were equal there. They | 17 | redistricting with him? |
| 18 | thought it was cool and took pictures of it and all, but | 18 | A No, not at all. |
| 19 | anyway. But yeah, that's what we did. | 19 | Q Did you know that Senator Honeyford was retiring? |
| 20 | Q Okay. And so that was when you were meeting with | 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Senator Honeyford, it was sort of about that, I guess sort | 21 | Q And how did you find that out? |
| 22 | of a sister city program? | 22 | A I didn't know he was retiring. I know he retired. |
| 23 | A Yeah. When we were there I went there, yeah, and | 23 | Q Okay. And when did you find out that he was |
| 24 | just, you know, encouraged him to join our -- not join, | 24 | retiring? |
| 25 | but be aware of our meetings. And, of course, the | 25 | A I knew he retired after he announced it. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Okay. So did you find out from the announcement? | 1 | A No. No. It's just the fact that she was on the |
| 2 | A That he had retired, yes. | 2 | Chamber. I don't know what affiliation she was, whether |
| 3 | Q And what do you recall -- | 3 | she was Democrat or Republican, I guess, kind of thing, |
| 4 | A Not before. | 4 | but yeah, no. |
| 5 | Q -- hearing about it? | 5 | Q Okay. I just want to jump back a bit. So we were |
| 6 | A I heard after, after he retired that he -- Senator | 6 | talking about the sister cities program; and I wanted to |
| 7 | Honeyford retired and -- Yeah. | 7 | sort of ask you, I guess it seems like you think that work |
| 8 | Q Okay. Do you know Nicki Torres? | 8 | is important since you're involved in it, and I just |
| 9 | A Yes, I do. | 9 | wanted to know why. |
| 10 | Q How do you know her? | 10 | A Which program? |
| 11 | A Well, she lived in Pasco, and she was president of | 11 | Q The sister cities program with Morelia. |
| 12 | the Chamber. I forget what the title is, the Latino or | 12 | A Oh, okay. Yeah. What about it? |
| 13 | Hispanic Chamber. And so I'd go to the meetings, and | 13 | Q I guess why do you think it's important, if you do? |
| 14 | she'd be there. And we know her, as far as | 14 | A Oh, just because I like their -- what would you call |
| 15 | professionally, like the luncheons and the Hispanic | 15 | it -- their mission of establishing connections -- |
| 16 | Chamber meetings and stuff like that. | 16 | business, cultural, educational connections between Sister |
| 17 | Q And have you ever discussed anything related to | 17 | City Morelia and Yakima. I think it's a great |
| 18 | redistricting with Nicki Torres? | 18 | opportunity, and if we can help, you know, more power to |
| 19 | A Oh, no. I haven't talked to her since before COVID. | 19 | the organization. |
| 20 | Q How about this lawsuit then? | 20 | Q Okay, Mel, I just want to ask you some questions now |
| 21 | A No. | 21 | focusing in a bit on this case. |
| 22 | Q Are you aware of Nicki Torres's political | 22 | How did you come to be involved in this case? |
| 23 | affiliation? | 23 | A Well, the -- I got talking to Jim Troyer about |
| 24 | A No. No. Yeah. | 24 | possibly running for office, and then in the conversation |
| 25 | Q Did you have a thought there? | 25 | mentioned that this redistricting issue had come up with |
|  | Page 23 |  | Page 24 |
| 1 | the redistricting being -- what's the right word -- | 1 | A Oh, I don't know. Whoever the powers would be that |
| 2 | racially redrawn, and if I'd like to be a part of this. I | 2 | redrew the district. |
| 3 | guess you want to call it a lawsuit. | 3 | Q Am I understanding you to say that the redistricting |
| 4 | And because I'm Republican and I thought that it's a | 4 | issue that you saw at the center of this case was the way |
| 5 | legitimate position, I said yes. | 5 | that those lines had been drawn? |
| 6 | Q Okay. So a couple of questions about that. You | 6 | A Right. |
| 7 | said than the redistricting issue was sort of about the | 7 | Q Okay. So you said that sort of because you're |
| 8 | map being racially redrawn. | 8 | Republican and you thought that it was a legitimate |
| 9 | What do you understand racially redrawn to mean? | 9 | position, you decided to jump in. |
| 10 | A Just that it was redrawn to the effect that it was | 10 | In your words how would you encapsulate that |
| 11 | redrawn based on the population of the Hispanic community. | 11 | legitimate position? |
| 12 | Q Okay. And how would you identify that as being | 12 | A Because it's assumed that Latinos vote Democrat, if |
| 13 | connected to the redistricting issue that's at the center | 13 | you overweight the Latino community in that district, |
| 14 | of this case? | 14 | you're -- what's the right word -- loading the district in |
| 15 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection, calls for a | 15 | a Democrat position based on the fact that it's Latinos. |
| 16 | legal conclusion. | 16 | And so anyways, that to me is kind of like a racial |
| 17 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) You can answer, Mel. | 17 | weighting. |
| 18 | A I'm sorry. Let me hang up. I'm getting a call over | 18 | Q Okay. So I'll get back into later we might have a |
| 19 | here. Let me -- It's beeping here. It's a client. | 19 | discussion about sort of how Latinos vote and things that |
| 20 | I'm sorry. Ask the question again. | 20 | might dig into a little bit more of your views on that |
| 21 | Q Yes. How would you see that issue of the map being | 21 | issue, but for now I just want to go back to specifically |
| 22 | racially -- Actually, let me break this question down into | 22 | talking about sort of the origins of coming into this |
| 23 | parts. | 23 | lawsuit. |
| 24 | When you say that the map was racially redrawn, who | 24 | You said that you spoke with I believe it was |
| 25 | are you referring to doing that drawing? | 25 | Jim Troyer about running for office; is that correct? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Correct. | 1 | candidates that you provided to him? |
| 2 | Q And who is Jim Troyer? | 2 | A Saul Martinez would be one. Oh, gosh. I think in |
| 3 | A I don't know exactly his position, but he's -- every | 3 | Sunnyside, I think -- I want to say his name is Almeida. |
| 4 | now and then will call me to ask me for possible electable | 4 | Raul Almeida I think is his first name. Yeah, I don't |
| 5 | Hispanic candidates. | 5 | remember. I'm trying to think of others. |
| 6 | Q Okay. And do you know if Mr. Troyer is an employee | 6 | Angel Garza from Othello. Yeah. |
| 7 | of the state Republican party? | 7 | Q And when you've spoken with Mr. Troyer, has he been |
| 8 | A I don't know if he's an employee of the party. I | 8 | seeking electable candidates for any particular political |
| 9 | don't know. | 9 | offices? |
| 10 | Q Is he to your understanding affiliated with the | 10 | A No, no, just electable for -- to have in his book of |
| 11 | Republican party? | 11 | reference, I guess, for positions that may be coming up in |
| 12 | A Oh, yes. | 12 | the different districts here in our area. |
| 13 | Q And do you know if he's an elected official? | 13 | Q And has he ever spoken to you about sort of |
| 14 | A He is not an elected official as far as I know. | 14 | specifically looking for electoral candidates who might be |
| 15 | Q How long have you been in contact with Mr. Troyer? | 15 | from the Hispanic community? |
| 16 | A Oh, gosh. I don't know. It's been years. I want | 16 | A Yeah. |
| 17 | to say probably six years maybe, five, six years, maybe | 17 | Q And is that mainly what he's been asking? Those are |
| 18 | longer. | 18 | the sorts of candidates that he has been talking to you |
| 19 | Q Okay. And you -- | 19 | about? |
| 20 | A He will call me every now and then. I'm sorry. Go | 20 | A Ask the question again. You were kind of mumbled. |
| 21 | ahead. | 21 | Q Yeah. Has he mainly come to you to ask for Hispanic |
| 22 | Q No, please continue. | 22 | electable candidates? |
| 23 | A Yeah, he just calls me now and then, again to ask me | 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | for electable candidates. | 24 | Q Have you had any conversations about why those are |
| 25 | Q And can you remember any of the names of electable | 25 | the candidates he has been seeking? |
|  | Page 27 |  | Page 28 |
| 1 | A Probably more because I might have gotten in touch | 1 | A In general we are pro life, pro normal marriage. |
| 2 | with him because I think Latinos should be more prominent | 2 | Q And sort of what's the basis for your understanding |
| 3 | in the political scene, and I think, you know, Latinos | 3 | of those issues as the issues of Latino voters? |
| 4 | should be elected. | 4 | A Say again? What's the issue? |
| 5 | Q Can I ask why? | 5 | Q What's the basis of your understanding or belief |
| 6 | A Well, because we're a significant portion of the | 6 | that those are the main issues that Latino voters care |
| 7 | community here, and I think we should have more | 7 | about? |
| 8 | representation. | 8 | A Well, I mean, I wouldn't necessarily say that |
| 9 | Q And why is that representation important? | 9 | they're the main issues because Latinos are very business |
| 10 | A Well, because everybody needs representation in | 10 | oriented, so -- and I think the Republican party mirrors |
| 11 | the -- in the offices. | 11 | the importance of businesses. And added to that, the fact |
| 12 | Q And having the representation for the Latino | 12 | that the values of Latinos are generally conservative. |
| 13 | community of specifically Latinos in office, would you say | 13 | Q Okay. And just to be clear, I'm asking sort of the |
| 14 | that is important? | 14 | basis of your understanding. I'm talking sort of about if |
| 15 | A Well, yes. | 15 | this is coming from surveys or if it's coming from |
| 16 | Q Why is having Latinos in office representing Latinos | 16 | conversations you've had, or from looking at data. |
| 17 | important in particular? Why would Latinos, if you think | 17 | So with that understanding, I'm going to ask again |
| 18 | so, be well suited to that role? | 18 | sort of what's the basis of your belief that those are |
| 19 | A Well, for one I think the Republican party values | 19 | important issues to the Latino community? |
| 20 | mirror our values, you know, as much. | 20 | A The most important factor is the fact that I'm |
| 21 | Q So do you think that Latinos are more likely to | 21 | Latino. I mean, I don't need surveys to understand my |
| 22 | share values with other Latinos? | 22 | community. And most of us are Catholic or evangelical, |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | and those are pretty important values that mirror pro |
| 24 | Q What are some of the main values that you would say | 24 | life, you know, pro marriage. |
| 25 | Latinos have? | 25 | And so I don't necessarily base it on any surveys, |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | other than the fact that I've been Latino all my life, and | 1 | Q And when did that conversation happen with Jim |
| 2 | most of my association has been with the Latino community. | 2 | Troyer? |
| 3 | Church, I'm a devout churchgoer. Based on that. | 3 | A Oh, jeez. Well, this conversation started I'm going |
| 4 | Q Okay. So sort of your lived experience and the | 4 | to say probably last November as far as, you know, when it |
| 5 | religious values that you hold is the basis. | 5 | first came up. |
| 6 | Is that a good summation? | 6 | Q And is that the first time that you'd spoken with |
| 7 | A Yeah. | 7 | Mr. Troyer about running for office in LD 15? |
| 8 | Q Okay. | 8 | A No. In the past bunch of years the idea of running |
| 9 | A Yes. Sorry. | 9 | for office has been mentioned, you know, me and my wife |
| 10 | Q Don't worry. Yeah is okay. As long as it's not a | 10 | and so on. |
| 11 | nod, yeah is perfectly fine. You don't -- I'm not going | 11 | Q And apart from discussions between you and your |
| 12 | to police the formality of the affirmative. | 12 | wife, who else has mentioned the idea of you running for |
| 13 | Okay. So I'm going to loop back a little bit and | 13 | office in LD 15? |
| 14 | talk about your first becoming involved in this case. You | 14 | A I don't know that me and my wife discussed running |
| 15 | said that it was originally brought up to you by | 15 | for office in 15, just in general running for office in |
| 16 | Jim Troyer when you were just having a discussion with him | 16 | the past years, you know. |
| 17 | about running for office; is that correct? | 17 | I've always thought that she's very likeable and |
| 18 | A Correct. | 18 | outgoing, and she's pretty well known in the community. |
| 19 | Q And what office were you discussing running for? | 19 | So I've always thought she would be. She's never been |
| 20 | A The -- Senator Jim's office. | 20 | receptive to the idea, anyway, but yeah. |
| 21 | Q And would that be Legislative District 15? | 21 | Q Well, outside of the specific district, is the |
| 22 | A Yes, but add to that the fact that running here in | 22 | office that you discussed running for, that you discussed |
| 23 | my 8th district, also. | 23 | your wife running for, has that pretty much always been a |
| 24 | Q And what Legislative District are you in? | 24 | legislative office, or have there been other offices? |
| 25 | A Eighth, as far as I know. | 25 | A Any office, yeah. |
|  | Page 31 |  | Page 32 |
| 1 | Q Local office? | 1 | Q I'm sure you appreciate the honesty. |
| 2 | A Just running in general. I'm sorry. | 2 | Have you ever spoken with your brother about running |
| 3 | Q Any particular offices that you guys have talked | 3 | for office? |
| 4 | about? | 4 | A Yeah. I mean, I'm sure I have. |
| 5 | A No. No, just running for office. | 5 | Q Has he ever expressed to you any particular office |
| 6 | Actually, Sharon Brown, Senator Sharon Brown, you | 6 | that he thinks you'd be good to run for? |
| 7 | know, we -- Her and my wife kind of got to be not good | 7 | A Oh, no, not as far as specifics, but he says, "Hey, |
| 8 | friends but, you know, friends via Facebook and stuff. | 8 | Mel," -- You know, I've always felt a little not -- |
| 9 | And years ago Senator Sharon suggested Gracie kind of -- | 9 | underqualified, I guess, for running for senator or, you |
| 10 | what's the word when you follow the person around at | 10 | know, representative, and he goes, "Mel, you're probably |
| 11 | work -- shadow, I think. | 11 | overqualified." |
| 12 | Yeah, but Gracie was never receptive to that. She | 12 | But anyways, just generally stuff like that. |
| 13 | said, "Mel, I don't want to run." Okay. So anyway. | 13 | Q Okay. And so we've talked about it sort of in |
| 14 | Q Okay. And Senator Sharon Brown, do you know what | 14 | general terms, but I want to go back to the conversation |
| 15 | district she represents or represented? | 15 | that you had with Jim Troyer. |
| 16 | A I want to say the 8th, I think. We've lived in | 16 | What specifically did you discuss about running? |
| 17 | Pasco, Kennewick and Richland, so whatever district she | 17 | And I think that conversation you said was LD 15. |
| 18 | was representing. We got to know her fairly well -- not | 18 | A Well, in our discussions I've always felt that |
| 19 | fairly well, you know, just got to know her. | 19 | Gracie, my wife, would make a better candidate. And so |
| 20 | Q Okay. And so you've mentioned Jim Troyer and | 20 | he's asking me for, you know, candidates and stuff. |
| 21 | Sharon Brown. Who else have you spoken with about you | 21 | And he's always kind of suggested that I could run, |
| 22 | running for office? | 22 | and so in that conversation back in November, whenever it |
| 23 | A Oh, friends at work. I mean, a couple of them are | 23 | was, I go, "Well, how do you feel about myself?" And |
| 24 | Democrats, and they've told me would never vote for me. | 24 | Gracie didn't want to. And he said, "I'm not calling you |
| 25 | We're good friends, but anyway. | 25 | just because. I think that you would be a great |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | candidate." So that was the gist of it all, I guess. | 1 | Q You mentioned that you live in Legislative District |
| 2 | Q And if you don't mind me asking, what is your wife's | 2 | 8 ; is that correct? |
| 3 | race? | 3 | A Yes. Yes. |
| 4 | A My wife's what? | 4 | Q And was that one of the reasons why you couldn't run |
| 5 | Q Race. | 5 | in Legislative District 15? |
| 6 | A Race? Mexican. I mean Latino or Hispanic. | 6 | A Right. Yeah. And I looked into the possibility of |
| 7 | Jalapeño is pretty good, too. | 7 | moving over in time so that, you know, it wouldn't be an |
| 8 | Q There's a lot of terms, I know. Yeah, I know. I | 8 | issue into the 15th District, by in the end because of |
| 9 | prefer Latino, but my mom prefers Hispanic. It's like a | 9 | my -- I inherited a ranch in Mexico, and so in the end we |
| 10 | very personal thing, I know. | 10 | concluded that I was going to be spending the winters over |
| 11 | A Yes, either one. And, of course, I'm proud to be | 11 | there. And so that's when the legislature is in session, |
| 12 | Mexican, so I'm definitely comfortable being called a | 12 | so I kind of thought well, maybe that's not such a good |
| 13 | Mexican. | 13 | idea. |
| 14 | Q I love that. | 14 | Q Okay. And if the lines were to be redrawn at some |
| 15 | Okay. Did you suggest any other candidates to | 15 | point in time, in a decade or something like that, and you |
| 16 | Jim Troyer for LD 15? | 16 | were to be placed in Legislative District 15 instead of |
| 17 | A Yes. Angel Garza. I think I suggested -- I want to | 17 | Legislative District 8, do you think that that would lead |
| 18 | say his first name is Raul Almeida. I think Hector Garza | 18 | to any sort of harm to you? |
| 19 | from Wapato, if I remember. | 19 | A Well, if the Latino community is just generally |
| 20 | Oh, gosh. I might have suggested my brothers | 20 | thought to vote Democrat and I'm running as a Republican, |
| 21 | because they're down there in Yakima, but neither of them | 21 | then yeah. I mean, I would think that that would affect |
| 22 | are interested in it. But that's all I can remember, | 22 | me. |
| 23 | really. I don't remember. | 23 | Q Okay. So that's the way it would affect you might |
| 24 | Q Okay. And you said that you live in LD 8; correct? | 24 | be in the partisan lean of a particular district; is that |
| 25 | A I'm sorry? | 25 | correct? |
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| 1 | A Correct. Yeah. | 1 | Q Did you raise the -- |
| 2 | Q And do you think that a district that might have | 2 | A Time. Time, also, as far as campaigning, in |
| 3 | sort of a larger quantity of Latinos in it might be less | 3 | which -- Again, because of my personal commitment to spend |
| 4 | likely to elect a Republican? | 4 | more time at Grandpa's ranch, that might affect |
| 5 | A Oh, I don't know. Again, I get back to the idea | 5 | campaigning, raising campaign funds. |
| 6 | that Republicans are conservative. Most Hispanics are | 6 | Q And did you have any discussion about sort of how |
| 7 | conservative, and I think that -- I quote President Reagan | 7 | much money is typically needed to launch a campaign? |
| 8 | where he would say, "Most Latinos are Republican. They | 8 | A He -- Yeah. He said it could entail nothing, again |
| 9 | just aren't aware of it yet," so -- | 9 | because I would raise the funds for it. And there have |
| 10 | So I think hopefully I would have the character and | 10 | been candidates that have put money out of their pockets, |
| 11 | the ability to convince them that we are a conservative | 11 | so -- |
| 12 | party. | 12 | Q And whether it comes from your pocket or from a |
| 13 | Q But so the potential harm that would come, though, | 13 | funder, you know, raising money, did he say sort of how |
| 14 | would be because of the potential partisan differences in | 14 | much these things tend to cost? |
| 15 | that district; is that correct? | 15 | A I don't remember a specific amount. |
| 16 | A Correct. Yeah. | 16 | Q Do you recall like a ballpark? |
| 17 | Q Have you ever spoken with Jim Troyer when you talked | 17 | A Somehow a hundred thousand rings a bell, but again, |
| 18 | about running for Legislative District 15, did you talk | 18 | I don't know. |
| 19 | about what running for that district might entail? | 19 | Q Okay. Besides fundraising, what else did you |
| 20 | A Oh, yes. Yeah. | 20 | discuss that running for office might entail? |
| 21 | Q And what did that discussion include? | 21 | A The time. The time, again. Also the fact that -- |
| 22 | A Well, my biggest concern was how much out-of-pocket | 22 | Of course, I didn't care because I think I'm a pretty open |
| 23 | money it would take, and he would say it just depends on | 23 | book -- the fact that it could get -- what's the right |
| 24 | if I can raise enough campaign funds to pay for the | 24 | word? Where the people dig up dirt and stuff like that, |
| 25 | campaign, so -- | 25 | which that to me was a lesser concern, but yeah. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Do you see the financial cost of campaigns as a | 1 | concept of what he thought about having intervenors in |
| 2 | barrier for people running for office? | 2 | this case? |
| 3 | A Well, in my case -- Well, yeah. I mean, I think -- | 3 | A I don't think he even knew what an intervenor was, |
| 4 | I think if it takes out-of-pocket expense, then yeah, it | 4 | but he said if I was going to be involved in any -- he |
| 5 | could be a hindrance for people. | 5 | didn't say -- in any things to do with redistricting and |
| 6 | Q Um-hmm. Do you think that that might be one factor | 6 | that, because he does that, we probably shouldn't discuss |
| 7 | that leads to less Latinos running for office? | 7 | anything about it. |
| 8 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection, calls for | 8 | Q Okay. Why didn't you ultimately run for LD 15? |
| 9 | speculation. | 9 | A Why would I ultimately run? |
| 10 | A Oh, I don't know. | 10 | Q Why did you not ultimately run this cycle? |
| 11 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Okay. Were you familiar -- | 11 | A Oh, because of my commitments to my Grandpa's ranch, |
| 12 | Actually, did you talk with your brother at all about the | 12 | spending more time in Mexico. Especially during the |
| 13 | decision to become an intervenor in this case? | 13 | session portion of it because again, I have been and would |
| 14 | A Yes. And he said, "If you're going to do that, we | 14 | like to continue to spend the winters down there, which |
| 15 | should probably not discuss anything from" -- you know, | 15 | includes January, February, which is when Olympia is in |
| 16 | "about this." | 16 | session, so -- |
| 17 | Q Outside of the content of redistricting, but just in | 17 | Q Did you have any discussions with anyone about Nicki |
| 18 | general about the concept of being an intervenor, did your | 18 | Torres running for LD 15 ? |
| 19 | brother encourage you to be an intervenor in the case when | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | you discussed it with him? | 20 | Q Did Jim Troyer ever ask you about Nicki Torres? |
| 21 | A Oh, no, not at all. No. | 21 | A Yes, he might have. And I think because one of |
| 22 | Q Did he express any kind of opinion about whether or | 22 | the -- In our discussions as far as candidates, Nicki |
| 23 | not you should intervene in the case? | 23 | hadn't come up. And so I was surprised that when she did |
| 24 | A No, not at all. | 24 | decide to run that she ran, because I didn't think she was |
| 25 | Q Did he discuss with you anything about the general | 25 | a Republican; but I never really had gotten to know her |
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| 1 | well enough to make that assumption, I guess is the right | 1 | A Not at all. |
| 2 | word. | 2 | Q How did you first come into contact with |
| 3 | Q I guess why did you think that she wasn't a | 3 | Mr. Stokesbary? |
| 4 | Republican? | 4 | A I think Drew called me because of being named as an |
| 5 | A Well, again, because most of the political -- and I | 5 | intervenor. |
| 6 | shouldn't say political. The assumption that being | 6 | THE WITNESS: Am I correct, Drew? |
| 7 | involved in the Hispanic Chamber and the leanings towards | 7 | A I don't remember. |
| 8 | the Chamber just seemed to be liberal. | 8 | Q Oh, so just for your purposes, so that you know that |
| 9 | Q And is there -- Was there anything else that | 9 | Drew is not being rude. For purposes of the deposition |
| 10 | surprised you about Nicki Torres running? | 10 | Drew can issue objections, but sort of can't -- |
| 11 | A No, just surprised that -- again, that it was on the | 11 | A Oh. |
| 12 | Republican side, which, you know, I was pleasantly | 12 | Q -- enter the conversation. So he's not being rude. |
| 13 | surprised. I mean, I'm glad. I mean, I think she's a | 13 | He's just respecting the platform we're in. |
| 14 | great lady from what I know of her, and I think she'll | 14 | MR. STOKESBARY: Thanks, Simone. |
| 15 | make a great candidate. | 15 | A Okay. Sorry. |
| 16 | Q And did Jim Troyer tell you sort of how Nicki Torres | 16 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) No problem. |
| 17 | came to run? He didn't get the name from you. | 17 | A Sorry. |
| 18 | Did he tell you anything about sort of how she had | 18 | Q It's all very formal and silly sometimes. So I just |
| 19 | come into the mix? | 19 | thought I'd let you know. |
| 20 | A No. | 20 | A Yeah. |
| 21 | Q Okay. Were you familiar with Drew Stokesbary prior | 21 | Q Okay. |
| 22 | to this case? | 22 | A I just -- I just don't remember how we came in |
| 23 | A No. I gotta make sure that was his last name, but | 23 | contact. |
| 24 | yes. | 24 | Q Okay. And do you recall how Mr. Stokesbary got your |
| 25 | Q Yeah. | 25 | phone number? Did he tell you? |


|  | Page 41 |  | Page 42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A I don't remember. | 1 | A I don't know. I'm assuming it could be. I just |
| 2 | Q Okay. And so to your knowledge did anyone refer | 2 | know him as Jim. |
| 3 | Mr. Stokesbary to you? | 3 | Q But you just know him as Jim? |
| 4 | A I don't know how the process works. I don't | 4 | A Yeah. |
| 5 | remember. | 5 | Q Got it. |
| 6 | Q Okay. And other than the conversation that you've | 6 | Okay. Are you familiar with an individual named |
| 7 | mentioned with Jim Troyer, did you have any discussions | 7 | José Trevino? |
| 8 | with anyone where they mentioned that they might refer you | 8 | A I know he's the representative, I think, in Quincy. |
| 9 | to be an intervenor in this case? | 9 | Q Okay. |
| 10 | A No. | 10 | A I -- There's two others. There's two others that |
| 11 | Q Okay. Have you ever discussed -- | 11 | are involved in this; and one is a representative in |
| 12 | A I don't recall. That I recall, I haven't talked to | 12 | Quincy, and the other is a resident in Yakima, I think. I |
| 13 | anybody about this, about anything. | 13 | didn't read the specifics of it. |
| 14 | Q Okay. Have you ever discussed anything related to | 14 | Q Okay. And the other individual, would that be |
| 15 | the Garcia v. Hobbs case with Mr. Stokesbary? | 15 | Alex Ybarra? |
| 16 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection, attorney-client | 16 | A Yeah, I think. I'm pretty sure, yes, that's the |
| 17 | privilege. | 17 | name. |
| 18 | Mel, I'm going to instruct you not to answer that | 18 | Q Do you personally know Mr. Trevino? |
| 19 | question because it inquires about our communications with | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | each other. | 20 | Q And how about -- |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. | 21 | A Okay. He might have been at one of the previous |
| 22 | MS. LEEPER: We can go ahead and move on. | 22 | Republican meetings, like in Yakima and, you know, in the |
| 23 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) One clarifying question I just want | 23 | years past. I haven't had any Republican meetings or |
| 24 | to ask for purposes of the record. Jim Troyer, his full | 24 | dinners or anything like that since pre COVID. |
| 25 | name is James Troyer; is that correct? | 25 | Q Okay. But you don't recall sort of having a |
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| 1 | personal acquaintanceship with Mr. Trevino? | 1 | Q And have you heard of an organization called the |
| 2 | A No. | 2 | Southcentral Coalition of People of Color for |
| 3 | Q How about with Alex Ybarra? | 3 | Redistricting? |
| 4 | A No. | 4 | A No. |
| 5 | Q Okay. So I'm going to ask if you know any of the | 5 | Q Okay. Mel, I know this is a bit far in advance, but |
| 6 | plaintiffs in the lawsuit; and I'm going to assume that | 6 | it's when our trial is scheduled, which is why I'm asking |
| 7 | you don't know their names by heart, so I'll just go down | 7 | you this. Is there any reason that you can think of that |
| 8 | the list and ask. | 8 | you would be unavailable the weeks of May 1st and May 8h, |
| 9 | Do you know Susan Soto Palmer? | 9 | 2023? |
| 10 | A No. | 10 | A Only if I got delayed at the ranch in Mexico, you |
| 11 | Q How about Alberto Isaac Macias? | 11 | know. As far as I know, we have been there May up to |
| 12 | A No. | 12 | June, you know, some of our trips. So no, and I couldn't |
| 13 | Q Faviola Lopez? | 13 | tell that far in advance, but I'm hoping that I can be |
| 14 | A No. | 14 | back by March/April timeframe. |
| 15 | Q Caty Padilla? | 15 | Q Okay. But there's a potential that you might be at |
| 16 | A No. | 16 | your -- was it grandfather's ranch in Mexico? |
| 17 | Q Evangelina Aguilar? She goes by Benji. | 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | A No. | 18 | Q Okay. Now, I have some more questions for you, but |
| 19 | Q Lizette Parra? | 19 | I'm wondering if now might be a good time for a quick |
| 20 | A No. | 20 | break. |
| 21 | Q How about Heliodora Morfin? | 21 | MS. LEEPER: Could we go off the record, |
| 22 | A I didn't hear the name, but it doesn't sound -- Say | 22 | Jeanne. |
| 23 | the name again. It doesn't -- | 23 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 24 | Q Heliodora Morfin. | 24 | (Break 10:29 a.m. to 10:42 a.m.) |
| 25 | A No. | 25 | MS. LEEPER: Okay. Let's go back on the |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | record. | 1 | using all the names. |
| 2 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Okay. We are back on the record | 2 | Are you familiar with a case that's separate from |
| 3 | now, and so we're going to get back into it. I have a few | 3 | this case that is challenging Legislative District 15 as |
| 4 | more questions for you about sort of specific individuals. | 4 | being a racial gerrymander? |
| 5 | Do you know Benancio Garcia, III? | 5 | A I want to say in the conversations with I want to |
| 6 | A I didn't hear the first name, but I don't know. | 6 | say Drew, something about a case in -- Oh, no, and it |
| 7 | Q Okay. I'll say it one more time just to be sure, | 7 | might have been in an email, this one here, where -- |
| 8 | Benancio Garcia. | 8 | MR. STOKESBARY: Hey, Mel -- Mel, I'm just |
| 9 | A No. | 9 | going to jump in and say that I've got to instruct you not |
| 10 | Q Okay. And do you know anything about the Garcia v. | 10 | to talk about any conversations you've had with me or |
| 11 | Hobbs case challenging Legislative District 15? | 11 | emails you've exchanged with me, -- |
| 12 | A I don't know the names, but I'm assuming they're on | 12 | THE WITNESS: Oh. |
| 13 | the paperwork that Drew or paper -- whatever email that | 13 | MR. STOKESBARY: -- on the basis of |
| 14 | Drew sent me as far as the Complaint, or whatever it is. | 14 | attorney-client privilege. |
| 15 | Q Okay. And that is, just to be clear, this case is | 15 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 16 | the Soto Palmer v. Hobbs case. That's a separate case. | 16 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Yeah. And so basically I'm asking |
| 17 | That's Garcia v. Hobbs. | 17 | about the knowledge that you have, not about the specific |
| 18 | A Oh. | 18 | content of any conversations you've had with your |
| 19 | Q So are you familiar with that? | 19 | attorney, but sort of the knowledge that you do have |
| 20 | A Not that I'm aware of, no. Again, I'm not -- | 20 | about that case, which is challenging Legislative |
| 21 | Q Okay. | 21 | District 15 as a racial gerrymander. |
| 22 | A -- a person that details that kind of -- or pays | 22 | So what knowledge do you have about that? |
| 23 | attention to the detail very much. So yeah, I don't know. | 23 | A About 15? |
| 24 | Q Okay. And I will just ask it one more way that | 24 | Q About the case that is challenging that district as |
| 25 | might, you know, sort of help shed some light without | 25 | a racial gerrymander. |
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| 1 | A Louisiana or Mississippi or something is challenging | 1 | basics, Mel. We're going to talk a little bit about your |
| 2 | in court that may have an effect on this case, that maybe | 2 | educational and work background. |
| 3 | this case could be a midpoint, I guess is basically the | 3 | Where did you go to high school? |
| 4 | gist of what I'm getting from that. | 4 | A White Swan High School, on the Reservation. |
| 5 | Q Okay. And is that sort of about the challenging of | 5 | Q And did you -- |
| 6 | Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act; is that right? | 6 | A Yakama Reservation. |
| 7 | A Again, I don't know the details. Sorry. | 7 | Q Did you live in that area, you know, the whole time |
| 8 | Q Okay. And just again, not asking about the content | 8 | you were growing up? |
| 9 | of the conversation, but when have you talked with | 9 | A Pretty much, yeah. I was born in '56 in Mexico. Dad |
| 10 | Mr. Stokesbary about that case? | 10 | brought us to Washington around about '58. I graduated |
| 11 | A Again, I don't know necessarily that it was Drew. | 11 | from White Swan and then lived there until I was about 24, |
| 12 | Q Or one of your attorneys. | 12 | off and on, because I went to college in California for a |
| 13 | A Yeah. Yeah. It was in the process of being asked | 13 | while, came back. |
| 14 | whether I wanted to do this because in the end it may be | 14 | So yeah, that's where I was raised. |
| 15 | not even come to fruition if that case is decided by the | 15 | Q Okay. I think that you just said this, but where |
| 16 | court, whatever court that is, whether it's the Supreme | 16 | did you go to college? |
| 17 | Court, or whatever. | 17 | A I went to college at Bethany Bible College in |
| 18 | Q Okay. And was anyone else other than one of your | 18 | California for a year and a half. Oh, gosh. '79 and '80, |
| 19 | attorneys present for that conversation? | 19 | I think. Sorry. |
| 20 | A Oh, no. No, I-- | 20 | Q Okay. And what did you study while you were in |
| 21 | Q Okay. And how many -- | 21 | college? |
| 22 | A Again, I don't -- Yeah, I don't even know that -- | 22 | A Well, I was going to take the basics to end up with |
| 23 | I can't remember who told me about that, honestly. I | 23 | a counseling degree, but I ran out of money and had to |
| 24 | mean, I don't remember. | 24 | come home with a tail between my legs. Sorry. |
| 25 | Q Okay. All right. We're going to bring you back to | 25 | Q I don't think there's anything to be -- have the |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And, of course, California being so expensive, I'm aware | 1 | workforce here is I don't think it exists in the sense |
| 2 | of at least two people that have sold their properties in | 2 | that we're not -- You know, we're not going to give you |
| 3 | California -- Latinos, Hispanic, that sold their | 3 | this job based on your race. Most of the time it was |
| 4 | properties in California and moved over here. | 4 | pretty acceptable. |
| 5 | Q Okay. Do you agree that members of the Latino | 5 | Q Would you define prejudice differently than you |
| 6 | community have historically experienced discrimination in | 6 | would define discrimination? |
| 7 | Southcentral Washington? | 7 | A I don't know necessarily prejudice. I think |
| 8 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. | 8 | profiling is a different -- would be a different word, and |
| 9 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) You can answer. | 9 | I do that myself. I mean, you know, just profile people |
| 10 | A Okay. I don't know if you necessarily want to call | 10 | based on the fact that, you know, they're Mexican and, you |
| 11 | it discrimination. I mean, as far as how are you trying | 11 | know, most likely Catholic. I mean, you know, that kind |
| 12 | to -- What would be an example, I mean? | 12 | of -- I don't know if you want to call it prejudice, but |
| 13 | Q I guess I'll ask you how would you define | 13 | yeah. |
| 14 | discrimination? | 14 | Q What kind of profiling do you think that the Latino |
| 15 | A Being denied something based on race. If we're | 15 | community in Southcentral Washington has faced? |
| 16 | looking at race discrimination, you know, Hispanics or | 16 | A Just that, that kind of -- Again, my experience in |
| 17 | whatever. | 17 | working in the farms, the farmers were great to us. You |
| 18 | Q So with your understanding of the meaning of | 18 | know, the non -- the white farmers. You know, I've got no |
| 19 | discrimination, do you agree that members of the Latino | 19 | complaints. I loved my -- my farmer bosses. |
| 20 | community have historically faced discrimination in | 20 | And school, I think the biggest thing that I can |
| 21 | Southcentral Washington? | 21 | remember from high school as far as discrimination, if you |
| 22 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. | 22 | want to call it, was the fact that I would take my |
| 23 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) You can answer. | 23 | homemade these days they're called ricos -- we called them |
| 24 | A I don't -- I don't think so. | 24 | tacos -- you know, to school, and they'd make fun of us -- |
| 25 | My experience as far as discrimination goes in the | 25 | you know, at school, kid stuff. |
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| 1 | At work I don't think I was ever denied a position | 1 | the farmers in the mornings, and then after school I |
| 2 | necessarily because of my race or anything like that. So | 2 | worked -- I worked for them. I was their ranch hand. |
| 3 | I don't -- I don't see anything like that. I don't know. | 3 | Q Okay. And have you ever personally experienced any |
| 4 | Q Okay. Just a few more questions. One is so you | 4 | instances besides the one we sort of discussed at school |
| 5 | mentioned sort of just, you know, I guess bullying based | 5 | of, I guess, sort of negative stereotyping or making fun, |
| 6 | on sort of race-based stuff at school. | 6 | either in person or online, based on the fact that you are |
| 7 | Did you experience teachers intervening to stop | 7 | Mexican? |
| 8 | that? | 8 | A No. No, not from -- I mean, we kid ourselves, you |
| 9 | A Oh, jeez. I don't remember. I don't -- I don't | 9 | know, but -- Yeah, no. Other than that, no, not from |
| 10 | remember. | 10 | other people that were non-Latinos. |
| 11 | Q Okay. And you mentioned your farm owner bosses. In | 11 | Q Okay. Do you have any knowledge about the voting |
| 12 | what capacity have you done that work? | 12 | patterns of Latino voters in the state of Washington? |
| 13 | A I was a ranch hand, tractor driver, drive truck, you | 13 | A No. |
| 14 | know, change the water lines in the morning before school, | 14 | Q Do you have any knowledge about the voting patterns |
| 15 | water lines after school. You know, hoed the beets and | 15 | of Latino voters specifically in Southcentral Washington? |
| 16 | thinned the mint and just the regular farmwork for the | 16 | A No. |
| 17 | farmer. | 17 | Q Do you have any knowledge about the voting patterns |
| 18 | Q Okay. And what age sort of did you do that kind of | 18 | of white voters in Southcentral Washington? |
| 19 | work? | 19 | A Well, I'm kind of assuming because of the fact that |
| 20 | A Oh, gee. Probably since I was -- the day I was | 20 | Republicans, you know, tend to win here that that would be |
| 21 | born, except -- of course, I was born in '56. | 21 | the pattern. I guess on the reverse, the other side -- |
| 22 | I would say probably -- oh, gee, I remember Dad | 22 | and I don't know the percentage of Latino/Hispanic voters, |
| 23 | coming picking us up after school in 6th, 7th grade to go | 23 | but I think that might make a difference. I mean, I don't |
| 24 | do hoe beets in the afternoon. And then, of course, | 24 | know. |
| 25 | through high school I'd again go change water lines for | 25 | Q Okay. So just to be clear, what you're saying is |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | that based on the results of the elections you see where Republicans tend to win and the white voters make up a majority, you are assuming that then the white voters are voting for Republicans; is that correct? | 1 |  | publican. |
| 2 |  | 2 |  | My ques |
| 3 |  | 3 |  | you've r |
| 4 |  | 4 |  | mocrat, |
| 5 | A That's kind of the assumption, that Latinos are not | 5 |  | ing that |
| 6 | necessarily voting. And again, I don't know their patterns, but the assumption is Latinos mostly vote | 6 |  | Oh, just |
| 7 |  | 7 |  | ths the in |
| 8 | Democrat and so, you know, that's what I would think. | 8 |  | comment |
| 9 | Q Okay. And you say the assumption is. Where have | 9 |  | for som |
| 10 | you heard that assumption, or where are you getting that assumption from? | 10 |  | ty of the |
| 11 |  | 11 | Q | And so |
| 12 | A Oh, when I was involved in the -- There's an organization that just popped up. I used to be a member | 12 | the | y were say |
| 13 |  | 13 |  | ty was a |
| 14 | of the -- oh, gosh, what is it? It's an acronym. | 14 |  | Is that w |
| 15 | National Hispanic Republican Conference or Mission, or something like that. And we would have -- | 15 | A | Yeah, pr |
| 16 |  | 16 |  | sers go -- |
| 17 | We would have booths. We would have booths at the park, the baseball park and stuff like that. And it was | 17 |  | mocrat or |
| 18 |  | 18 |  | y have of |
| 19 | pretty noticeable that Latinos were not Democrats, everything from saying the party of the rich and that kind | 19 |  | umption th |
| 20 |  | 20 | Q | Okay. |
| 21 | of thing. I mean, personal I guess you would call it | 21 |  | Have yo |
| 22 | experience, or whatever. | 22 |  | ing patte |
| 23 | Q Okay. So I think my question was a little bit | 23 |  | slative r |
| 24 | different than what you answered there. So that's your experience of meeting Latinos who might be | 24 | A | No. |
| 25 |  | 25 |  | Have y |
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| 1 | voting patterns broken down by race for Washington state legislative races specifically in Southcentral Washington? | 1 |  | Okay. |
| 2 |  | 2 |  | ike -- |
| 3 | A No. | 3 | Q | It's a lo |
| 4 | Q Have you reviewed or conducted any statistica | 4 | tim |  |
| 5 | analysis to determine the breakdown of votes by race for | 5 |  | Do you h |
| 6 | seats in the state legislature? | 6 | vo | ers and w |
| 7 | A No. | 7 |  | erent ca |
| 8 | Q Have you studied any opinion polls focused on Latino | 8 |  | thcentra |
| 9 | voters in Southcentral Washington? | 9 | A | Again, |
| 10 | A No. | 10 | q | stion. |
| 11 | Q How about the state of Washington more broadly? | 11 |  | stion? I |
| 12 | A No. | 12 | Q | Absolut |
| 13 | Q Do you know what the term racially polarized voting means? | 13 | rep | hrase. It's |
| 14 |  | 14 |  | positional |
| 15 | A No, but -- | 15 |  | So I gue |
| 16 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection. | 16 |  | have any |
| 17 | A Okay. | 17 |  | white and |
| 18 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) You can go ahead and answer. | 18 |  | islative r |
| 19 | A Yeah, I don't. I'm kind of guessing because of the | 19 |  | Yeah, |
| 20 | term, but -- you know, polarizing the races. I mean, I | 20 |  | k I want |
| 21 | don't know. | 21 |  | ing for a |
| 22 | Q Okay. And do you have any knowledge about whether | 22 |  | Um-h |
| 23 | Latino voters and white voters prefer the same candidates | 23 |  | -- wheth |
| 24 | or different candidates for state legislative races in | 24 |  | Oh, no |
| 25 | Southcentral Washington? | 25 |  | I'm askin |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | whether white voters and the group Latino voters tend to | 1 | changed in a particular area, they might redistrict. |
| 2 | in these state legislative races in Southcentral | 2 | That's basically about the extent of it all. |
| 3 | Washington vote for the same candidates or different | 3 | Q Okay. And what do you know about the process of |
| 4 | candidates. | 4 | redistricting state legislative districts in the state of |
| 5 | A No, I don't have any knowledge of it, but I would | 5 | Washington? |
| 6 | assume that if there is a Hispanic who is having to vote | 6 | A The same thing, I would assume. If there's |
| 7 | between a Hispanic conservative and a white conservative, | 7 | population changes, there might be movement of the |
| 8 | I'm kind of assuming because of the familiarity would vote | 8 | district. |
| 9 | for a Hispanic. | 9 | Q Okay. And do you have any additional information |
| 10 | Q Can you tell me a little bit more? Do you mean by | 10 | that you know about the process of how that redistricting |
| 11 | the familiarity that a Hispanic voter might feel with a | 11 | occurs? |
| 12 | Hispanic candidate? | 12 | A No. I haven't really delved into that. I suppose I |
| 13 | A Oh, in the sense of the cultural, I would assume the | 13 | should have asked Paul, but never did. |
| 14 | relationship that a -- if I'm Mexican and he's Mexican and | 14 | Q Mel, what do you know about the Federal Voting |
| 15 | he's conservative, then there would be more connection, so | 15 | Rights Act? |
| 16 | to speak. | 16 | A Oh, gosh. Without a refresher I have no -- |
| 17 | You know, again, depending on the policies that the | 17 | MR. STOKESBARY: Objection as to form. |
| 18 | guy is campaigning on, all given the same, I would assume | 18 | Sorry, Mel. Objection as to form. |
| 19 | he'd probably vote Latino. I mean, I'm just kind of | 19 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) And you can go ahead and answer. |
| 20 | generalizing that. | 20 | A Yeah, without a refresher in what is it, civic law |
| 21 | Q Okay. Thank you. | 21 | or whatever it's called, I don't -- I don't remember. |
| 22 | So could you tell me what you know about the process | 22 | Q Okay. You mentioned earlier that you currently live |
| 23 | of redistricting in general? | 23 | in Legislative District 8; is that right? |
| 24 | A Oh, gosh. In general, every ten years they do the | 24 | A Correct. |
| 25 | census, and depending on how much of the population | 25 | Q Do you feel any particular connection to Legislative |
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| 1 | District 8 ? | 1 | commissioner, I think. |
| 2 | A Any particular what connection? | 2 | Of course, I don't know if Sharon Brown is still |
| 3 | Q Connection to that, the community of Legislative | 3 | there or not. We haven't talked to her in quite a while. |
| 4 | District 8. | 4 | She might still be a senator. |
| 5 | A No, other than the fact that with Senator Sharon we | 5 | Yeah. Who else did I mention? |
| 6 | were pretty well acquainted with. | 6 | Q You also mentioned Sharon. |
| 7 | In Benton County -- and I don't know if it's the | 7 | A Yeah, Sharon Brown. Yeah. Yeah, I don't -- |
| 8 | same district, or -- Jerome Delvin was a good, you know, | 8 | Q I think -- |
| 9 | fairly good friend because of our intercommunity meetings | 9 | A -- know if she's -- Go ahead. |
| 10 | and stuff. | 10 | Q No, please go ahead. I apologize. |
| 11 | Oh, gosh. Years ago Shirley Hankins was pretty | 11 | A Yeah, I don't know if she's running or is still a |
| 12 | popular with us, and I want to say that was when I lived | 12 | senator. I know she was thinking of running for judge, |
| 13 | in Pasco, in Franklin County. Oh, gosh. That -- You | 13 | and she might have run for judge. I don't know if she got |
| 14 | know, other than that, the fact that I lived in those | 14 | the judge position and was elected or if she is still a |
| 15 | cities and towns, no particular connection. | 15 | senator. I haven't kept up. |
| 16 | Q Okay. And you mentioned three, I think, different | 16 | Q What interest do you have in the boundaries of the |
| 17 | elected officials. Are any of those people still in | 17 | current Legislative District 15? |
| 18 | office? And I can go through them one by one. | 18 | A Well, other than the fact that they might be |
| 19 | A Well, Shirley -- | 19 | racially redrawn, but the district is not that important. |
| 20 | Q I think -- | 20 | I mean, so long as it's fair and equitable, I mean. |
| 21 | A Yeah, Shirley Hankins isn't -- | 21 | Q Okay. And I'm going to ask it again and ask about |
| 22 | Q -- I got their names. | 22 | sort of your personal interest. So do you have any |
| 23 | A -- isn't there anymore from what I -- Excuse me, but | 23 | personal interest in boundaries of Legislative District |
| 24 | I don't even know if she's alive. She's pretty old. | 24 | 15? |
| 25 | Jerome Delvin is -- I want to say is now a | 25 | A No, not personal, other than when I was thinking of |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | running; but other than that, yeah, no. | 1 | hearings that were held by the 2021 Washington |
| 2 | Q Okay. As far as you know, is the current | 2 | Redistricting Commission? |
| 3 | Legislative District 15 majority Latino by citizen voting | 3 | A No, I've never testified in anything. |
| 4 | age population? | 4 | Q Did you ever submit any written testimony to the |
| 5 | A Oh, I don't know. The -- Okay. The current one or | 5 | 2021 Washington Redistricting Commission? |
| 6 | the redrawn one? I guess actually I don't know of either, | 6 | A No. |
| 7 | so -- | 7 | Q Why not? Why did you not submit either kind of |
| 8 | Q So I do want to be -- I'll just be clear in this | 8 | testimony? |
| 9 | point. When we talk about Legislative District 15 and the | 9 | A I really didn't have a part of this. And again, |
| 10 | current version, I'm referring to the version that was | 10 | because as an intervenor, you know, I can do this. |
| 11 | approved by the legislature at the beginning of this year, | 11 | Q Were you aware that there were public hearings being |
| 12 | 2022, so just so you know how to understand that term. | 12 | held by the 2021 Washington Redistricting Commission? |
| 13 | A (Nodded.) | 13 | A Not that I'm aware of, no. There might have been a |
| 14 | Q And so what is your understanding of the current | 14 | media reporting or something, but I didn't pay attention |
| 15 | partisan leaning of the Legislative District 15 that was | 15 | to that. I don't know. |
| 16 | approved at the beginning of 2022? | 16 | Q Okay. I'll go back one different way to see if we |
| 17 | A My understanding of this new district, of why I'm | 17 | can get to it, so -- |
| 18 | involved in this is that it was redrawn based on racial | 18 | A Okay. |
| 19 | population, Latino, and so that's the extent of it. | 19 | Q -- we'll give it a fresh try here. Does that work |
| 20 | Q Okay. And do you have any understanding of the | 20 | for you? |
| 21 | partisan lean of that district? | 21 | A Sure. Go ahead. |
| 22 | A Well, that would be -- I mean, if I'm -- If I | 22 | Q Okay. Putting aside the race of the candidates that |
| 23 | understand the question, it is now, supposedly because | 23 | are running, as far as you know do white voters as a group |
| 24 | it's a majority Latino, would be leaning Democrat. | 24 | tend to vote for and prefer the same candidates as Latino |
| 25 | Q Okay. Did you ever testify at any of the public | 25 | voters as a group? |
|  | Page 75 |  | Page 76 |
| 1 | A Within their own party or, you know, policies, or | 1 |  |
| 2 | however you phrase it, values. | 2 | MS. LEEPER: Okay. Thank you. Let's go |
| 3 | Q Yeah, so thanks for setting aside the party issue. | 3 | back on the record. |
| 4 | We're really focusing on the group that matters that we're | 4 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Okay. Mel, I want us to take a look |
| 5 | talking about is white voters and Latino voters, and we're | 5 | at just a few documents in this case. So procedure-wise |
| 6 | talking across parties, just in general. When they sit | 6 | what I'm going to do is I'm going to drop it into the chat |
| 7 | down in a general election and vote, you know, in the | 7 | box so that all the attorneys that are here have a chance |
| 8 | ballot box. | 8 | to look at it, but I'm also going to be screen sharing the |
| 9 | So again, putting aside the race of the candidates, | 9 | document. |
| 10 | as far as you know do white voters tend to prefer the same | 9 | document. |
| 11 | candidates or different candidates than Latino voters as a | 10 | So if you just want to go ahead and look at the |
| 12 | group do? | 11 | screen, you should be able to see it just fine. So |
| 13 | A Again, I think I would say depending on their -- | 12 | everyone should have that first one. |
| 14 | more or less their values, not necessarily their race. | 13 | A Do I click on it, or what -- what happens? |
| 15 | So, you know, would I vote for a Hispanic liberal? | 14 | (Document displayed.) |
| 16 | Probably not. It goes against my values. I would | 15 | Q Well, can you see that okay? |
| 17 | assume -- I would hope -- that most races, most people | 16 | A Okay. Yeah, I see it. |
| 18 | would vote their values and not necessarily the race. So | 17 | Q Okay. Great. Then let's go ahead and do this. All |
| 19 | I'm not aware of anybody that doesn't do that. | 18 | right. So I'm going to go ahead and just scroll down to |
| 20 | MS. LEEPER: Okay. And I just -- Could we | 19 | give you a chance to look at the document, and you can get |
| 21 | go off the record for a quick moment? | 20 | a sense of it. |
| 22 | (Discussion off the record.) (Zoom technical difficulty, mestion lost by Court | 21 | And if you do want to open it in your own browser |
| 23 | (Zoom technical difficulty, connection lost by Court Reporter.) | 22 | and scroll at your own time, you should feel free to do |
| 24 |  | 23 | that as well. |
|  | (Break 11:30 a.m. to 11:34 a.m.) | 24 | A My phone clicked in again, but I'm plugged in. |
| 25 |  | 25 | Q Okay. Mr. Campos, have you had a chance to review |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | that document? | 1 | documents or communications in your possession that might |
| 2 | A Yes. Is that -- | 2 | be responsive to these requests? |
| 3 | Q And have you -- | 3 | A Yes. This is where it's asking me for documents |
| 4 | A Is that -- | 4 | from the Redistricting Commission and documents -- Yeah. |
| 5 | Q Have you -- | 5 | Yeah, I did a search for that. |
| 6 | A Is that the one where -- I'm sorry. Is that the one | 6 | Q How did you conduct that search? |
| 7 | that's relating to this? Yeah, I see it. | 7 | A Memory. |
| 8 | Q Yeah. So I guess my question to you is have you | 8 | Q Did you use any search terms through -- to do that |
| 9 | seen this document before? | 9 | search? |
| 10 | A Yes. I'm thinking yes. | 10 | A No. Again, I'm not very tech savvy as far as |
| 11 | Q And what do you understand it to be? | 11 | computers go. So I just -- From memory, anybody from the |
| 12 | A The response to the lawsuit of this issue. | 12 | commission that might have sent me something. It would |
| 13 | Q Okay. So I'm going to represent to you that this | 13 | have been my brother Paul, and I go, "Hey, Paul" -- I |
| 14 | is, as you see in the caption here, Plaintiffs' First Set | 14 | think I called him or texted him -- and said, "Have you |
| 15 | of Requests for Production to the Intervenor Defendants. | 15 | ever sent me any documents? Because these people are |
| 16 | That's you. | 16 | requesting it." |
| 17 | When did you first see this document? | 17 | And he goes, "No, I have no documents. We never |
| 18 | A I don't remember. | 18 | sent anything like that." |
| 19 | Q Do you have an estimate? | 19 | Okay. And then when I was a part of that is when he |
| 20 | A Well, since -- I'm assuming this is part of the two | 20 | mentioned, "We probably shouldn't discuss this anymore if |
| 21 | documents or whatever that -- I think there's two of them. | 21 | you're a part of that." Okay. |
| 22 | It might be the same one. I don't know. The -- When | 22 | Q Okay. And did you search through any texts on your |
| 23 | they -- I became or selected to volunteer to be part of | 23 | phone to find any communications that might be relevant? |
| 24 | this lawsuit, that this was sent to me. | 24 | A Well, yeah. Yeah. With Jim, Paul. I think that's |
| 25 | Q Okay. Did you conduct any searches to find any | 25 | it. Other than that, there was no document or |
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| 1 | communication, other than the request if I wanted to be a | 1 | went back as far as when any communications might have |
| 2 | part of this. | 2 | come up from this. |
| 3 | Q And you say you looked through your communications | 3 | Q But you didn't conduct any word searches; is that |
| 4 | with Jim and Paul. How did you look through your text | 4 | correct? |
| 5 | messages? | 5 | A No. |
| 6 | A Just scrolling. | 6 | Q Did your attorneys provide you with any search terms |
| 7 | Q Okay. And did you find any texts that you thought | 7 | that you should use to conduct this search? |
| 8 | might be relevant? | 8 | MR. STOKESBARY: I'm going to -- |
| 9 | A No. | 9 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) And I'm not asking what those terms |
| 10 | Q How about your email, did you search through your | 10 | are. I'm just asking if they were provided. |
| 11 | email to find anything that might be relevant? | 11 | MR. STOKESBARY: I'm still going to object |
| 12 | A Yeah. Yeah. I mean, as far back as I could go, and | 12 | on the basis of attorney-client privilege and instruct you |
| 13 | up until whenever this issue came up, there was no -- | 13 | not to answer that question, Mel. |
| 14 | there was nothing there. | 14 | Q (By Ms. Leeper) Okay. Did you end up producing any |
| 15 | Q Okay. And you say "whenever this issue came up." | 15 | documents or text messages to your counsel? |
| 16 | Did you search through when you became involved in | 16 | A No. |
| 17 | the lawsuit? | 17 | Q Okay. I'm going to exit out of this document. |
| 18 | A Well, I probably went further than that, just | 18 | A Okay. |
| 19 | because I -- Personal satisfaction. I want to say -- When | 19 | Q I'm going to send another one. I think what might |
| 20 | did this come up? And I want to say that I went back to | 20 | be easiest is if you can open the chat there, do you see |
| 21 | maybe -- oh, gosh, before January, February when we | 21 | where I sent it? |
| 22 | started talking about candidates with Jim and stuff like | 22 | A I didn't see anything. Something came up and went |
| 23 | that, and I didn't find anything. | 23 | away. |
| 24 | Q Did you go back as far as January of 2021? | 24 | Q Okay. So at the bottom of your screen do you see |
| 25 | A No. Well, I mean, maybe. I don't know. I just | 25 | where it says chat? |
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|  | Page 5 |  | Page 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. LEEPER: We are. | 1 | this? |
| 2 | MR. HUGHES: Yes. | 2 | A I don't believe so. |
| 3 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you. | 3 | Q No? Okay. And I know that Zoom has a mute |
| 4 | EXAMINATION | 4 | function. I'm going to ask that during our deposition |
| 5 | BY MR. BOWEN: | 5 | that you don't use that unless it's clear that we're |
| 6 | Q Well, good morning, Ms. Morfin. My name is | 6 | taking a break or doing something like that. Okay? |
| 7 | Brennan Bowen. I'm an associate with Holtzman Vogel, and | 7 | A Okay. |
| 8 | we represent the Intervenor-Defendants in this matter. | 8 | Q Is there anyone in the room with you who is not on |
| 9 | I just wanted to thank you for your time today, and | 9 | camera? |
| 10 | I'm going to try to keep this as short and as painless as | 10 | MR. MORFIN: Just me. Edwardo Morfin, |
| 11 | possible. My plan is to start off with some general | 11 | Morfin Law Firm. |
| 12 | questions about your background and yourself, and then I'm | 12 | MR. BOWEN: Edwardo, good to meet you. |
| 13 | going to discuss the specifics of this case. | 13 | Q (By Mr. Bowen) Do you have any applications open on |
| 14 | Could you please state your full name on the record | 14 | your computer that someone could use to communicate with |
| 15 | for me? | 15 | you during the deposition, aside from Zoom? |
| 16 | A Yes. Heliodora Morfin. | 16 | A No. |
| 17 | Q Okay. And is there anything you prefer to be | 17 | Q Okay. Do you have any phones, tablets, any things |
| 18 | called? | 18 | like that that are within eyesight that someone could use |
| 19 | A Dora. | 19 | to communicate with you during the deposition? |
| 20 | Q Dora. All right, Dora. Have you ever been deposed | 20 | A No, I don't. |
| 21 | before, Dora? | 21 | Q Okay. Since we're on Zoom I'm going to be |
| 22 | A No. | 22 | especially cautious not to talk over you or anyone else, |
| 23 | Q Okay. I'm just going to lay out some ground rules | 23 | and I ask that you do the same. We'll give each other a |
| 24 | before we get started. First, I know we have a | 24 | couple seconds pause in between asking and answering |
| 25 | stenographer here, but is there anyone else recording | 25 | questions. It will help the court reporter get everything |
|  | Page 7 |  | Page 8 |
| 1 | down. It will also give anybody time for objections. | 1 | Does that make sense? |
| 2 | Much as I would love it if there were none, I'm sure we'll | 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | have objections today, so we'll let them voice the | 3 | Q Okay. If you need to take a break at any time, just |
| 4 | objections. | 4 | let me know. Like I said, I'm hoping this isn't going to |
| 5 | All responses are going to have to be audible. So I | 5 | be a super long thing, but I understand stuff comes up. |
| 6 | know in a normal conversation we shake and nod our heads, | 6 | If you need a break, I totally get it. The only thing I |
| 7 | and there's hand gestures. None of that is getting into | 7 | would ask is that you finish answering whatever question |
| 8 | the record. So even if it's just a simple yes or no, just | 8 | we were in the middle of answering. Any pending questions |
| 9 | make sure to say it as opposed to nodding or shaking your | 9 | I would like to have resolved before we go to break. |
| 10 | head. | 10 | Does that work? |
| 11 | Do you understand that you are under oath today? | 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | A Yes. | 12 | Q Okay. And finally, are you on any medication today |
| 13 | Q Okay. And that oath has the same effect as if you | 13 | that could affect your ability to fully answer or |
| 14 | were in court. Do you understand that as well? | 14 | truthfully answer any of these questions, or are you |
| 15 | A Yes. | 15 | otherwise aware of any reason you couldn't fully and |
| 16 | Q Okay. If my questions are unclear, then please let | 16 | truthfully answer questions today? |
| 17 | me know and I'll try to clarify them. If you answer, I'm | 17 | A I'm not under any medication. |
| 18 | going to assume that you understood them. | 18 | Q Okay. All right. Thank you. |
| 19 | Does that make sense? | 19 | Now, other than conversations with your attorneys, |
| 20 | A Yes. | 20 | did you do anything to prepare for today's deposition? |
| 21 | Q Okay. If your attorney objects today, those are for | 21 | A No, I did not. |
| 22 | later proceedings. Unless your attorney specifically | 22 | Q Okay. Did you review anything, any documents? |
| 23 | instructs you not to answer, I'm going to ask that you let | 23 | A Just through the time that we have been talking to |
| 24 | your attorney object, and then you continue to answer my | 24 | our attorneys. |
| 25 | question after that objection. | 25 | Q Okay. So you have reviewed the Complaint at some |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | point since filing it? | 1 | again, please? |
| 2 | A Yes. | 2 | THE WITNESS: Yes. Irving, I-R-V-I-N-G, |
| 3 | Q Okay. Do you know when about that was? | 3 | Street, Pasco, Washington, 99301. |
| 4 | A I got a set of documents in July, and we reviewed | 4 | Q Okay. So if I understand this correct, you were in |
| 5 | them between July and August. And then I got another set | 5 | Pasco, and then Seattle, Tri-Cities area, and then back |
| 6 | of documents within the last few weeks, and we reviewed | 6 | to -- or Tri-Cities area and back in Pasco; is that |
| 7 | them within the last weeks or so -- so last week. | 7 | correct? |
| 8 | Q Okay. And have you spoken to anyone besides your | 8 | A Yes. I currently live in Pasco. |
| 9 | attorney about the deposition today? | 9 | Q Okay. Do you recall your address when you were in |
| 10 | A I have not. | 10 | the Seattle area? |
| 11 | Q Okay. Would you briefly walk me through where you | 11 | A I don't recall my address, no. I just recall the |
| 12 | have lived for the past ten years or so? I know it's a | 12 | nearby streets. |
| 13 | long time, so if you have to take time to think, but just | 13 | Q Okay. What about when you were previously in Pasco, |
| 14 | like general vicinities of where you've lived. | 14 | do you recall your address then? |
| 15 | A Yes. I've lived in Pasco, in Pasco, Washington. | 15 | A Yes. 816 South Fourth Lane, Apartment B as in boy, |
| 16 | And I moved to the Seattle area on and off for ten years, | 16 | Pasco, Washington, 99301. |
| 17 | and back in the Tri-Cities for the last few years. | 17 | Q That's a good memory. |
| 18 | Q Okay. And when you say Tri-Cities, what area would | 18 | A Thank you. |
| 19 | that be? | 19 | Q You're welcome. Your current address then, under |
| 20 | A Pasco. | 20 | your current address what legislative district do you live |
| 21 | Q Pasco? | 21 | in? |
| 22 | A Yes. | 22 | A Legislative District No. 15. |
| 23 | Q Okay. And what is your current address? | 23 | Q No. 15. Okay. |
| 24 | A 1115 West Irving Street, Pasco, Washington, 99301. | 24 | And where did you go to high school? |
| 25 | THE REPORTER: Could you say the street | 25 | A I went to Pasco High, Pasco, Washington. |
|  | Page 11 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | Q Okay. What year did you graduate? | 1 | or since? |
| 2 | A 1993. | 2 | A Not -- not currently, no. |
| 3 | Q And then after that did you do any college or | 3 | Q Okay. What about any other political engagement, |
| 4 | vocational training? | 4 | any other groups you've been involved with? |
| 5 | A Yes. I did Lake Washington Technical College in the | 5 | A No, not -- nothing I can think of. |
| 6 | Seattle area, and I went to Columbia Basin College and got | 6 | Q Okay. Have you had any professional training or |
| 7 | an accounting degree and business degree. | 7 | education about redistricting specifically? |
| 8 | Q All right. And then after you got your accounting | 8 | A No, not really. |
| 9 | and business degree what did you do professionally? | 9 | Q And have you ever worked in government, either state |
| 10 | A I worked in office management, with accounting. | 10 | or local government? |
| 11 | Q Okay. And is that what you do right now? | 11 | A I worked for a local municipality. |
| 12 | A No, I don't. I'm not doing that now. | 12 | Q What were you -- What municipality were you working |
| 13 | Q What do you right now? | 13 | for? |
| 14 | A I'm a caregiver. | 14 | A For Clean Air. |
| 15 | Q And how long have you been doing caregiving for? | 15 | Q Okay. And what was your role there? |
| 16 | A About two years. | 16 | A I did front office, customer service and accounting. |
| 17 | Q About two years. At any point in time have you had | 17 | Q Okay. I'm going to switch a little bit from work |
| 18 | involvement in the political arena, either like as a | 18 | experience to just some personal background information. |
| 19 | volunteer or doing anything like that for a political | 19 | Could you identify your race for me? |
| 20 | campaign? | 20 | A Other. |
| 21 | A I have volunteered with Latino Civic Alliance in the | 21 | Q Other. Could you let me know how you identify your |
| 22 | past. | 22 | ethnicity? |
| 23 | Q Okay. And when was that? | 23 | A Mexican. |
| 24 | A That was back in around 2009. | 24 | Q Mexican. And just to confirm, I think we talked |
| 25 | Q Okay. And have you done anything with them before | 25 | about this before when he introduced himself, but the |


|  | Page 13 |  | Page 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | attorney for plaintiffs' counsel here, Eddie Morfin, that | 1 | A I just really follow what the information we were |
| 2 | is your husband? | 2 | learning about. |
| 3 | A No. He's part of the attorneys. | 3 | Q Okay. So did you, for example, attend any of the |
| 4 | Q He's just part of the attorneys. No relation? | 4 | public hearings that the Commission held? |
| 5 | A No. | 5 | A I did not. |
| 6 | Q Okay. And when did you become aware of the | 6 | Q Okay. Did you review any of the publicly released |
| 7 | Redistricting Commission's existence? | 7 | information that the Commission put out? |
| 8 | A I heard about it through previous information in | 8 | A Just the information that was provided by our |
| 9 | Pasco, I would say about five years ago. | 9 | attorneys. |
| 10 | Q And did you attend -- I guess what was the previous | 10 | Q Okay. During the process of the Redistricting |
| 11 | information you had heard about the Commission? | 11 | Commission did you submit anything to them, any comments |
| 12 | A The City of Pasco was being involved in a lawsuit | 12 | or questions about the process? |
| 13 | for redistricting. | 13 | A Personally, no. |
| 14 | Q Okay. And that previous commission you heard about, | 14 | Q No. Okay. Could you maybe explain to me how you |
| 15 | was that specific to the City of Pasco, or was that the | 15 | understand the redistricting process to work in the State |
| 16 | State Redistricting Commission? | 16 | of Washington? |
| 17 | A I really don't know because it's -- It was -- I was | 17 | A I believe it's chosen by the legislative, certain |
| 18 | not informed of -- How can I explain it? I really don't | 18 | maps; and the people that are within those boundaries |
| 19 | know at what level it was. | 19 | vote, and it gets either approved or denied. |
| 20 | Q Okay. That's fine. | 20 | Q And do you know how many commissioners were on the |
| 21 | For this Redistricting Commission, the one that drew | 21 | Commission? |
| 22 | the state maps this go-around, when did you first hear | 22 | A I don't know. |
| 23 | about that Commission? | 23 | Q Okay. Do you recall maybe some of the names of the |
| 24 | A I don't remember the exact time, honestly. | 24 | commissioners? |
| 25 | Q Okay. Did you follow what the Commission was doing? | 25 | A I do not. |
|  | Page 15 |  | Page 16 |
| 1 | Q Okay. Would you happen to know how many were say | 1 | A I honestly don't remember exactly how I got |
| 2 | Republican versus Democrat? | 2 | involved, but once I learned about -- about it, then I |
| 3 | A I would not know. | 3 | just became involved. |
| 4 | Q What about the number of nonpartisan chairs on the | 4 | Q Okay. Do you remember was there an attorney who |
| 5 | Commission, do you know how many there were? | 5 | approached you, or was it a friend? |
| 6 | A I don't. | 6 | A I really don't remember. |
| 7 | Q Or any of their names? | 7 | Q Okay. So if I understand right, the Commission |
| 8 | A No, I don't. I'm sorry. | 8 | passed a map. The lawsuit started, and you became |
| 9 | Q That's okay. No need to apologize. | 9 | involved. And at that point you saw the map for the first |
| 10 | Did you review the final map that the Commission | 10 | time; is that right? |
| 11 | passed? | 11 | A I don't know that it happened in that order. It |
| 12 | A The current map? Yes. | 12 | honestly was a long time ago, and I truly don't remember. |
| 13 | Q Okay. What was your first impression when you saw | 13 | Q Okay. But you hadn't seen the final map until this |
| 14 | that map? | 14 | lawsuit was already going and the attorneys approached |
| 15 | A That it's not the map that we proposed. | 15 | you? |
| 16 | Q When you say we, who is we? | 16 | A I don't believe that's how it happened. I honestly |
| 17 | A Just our group that we suggested. | 17 | would have to go back and think more about it on how it |
| 18 | Q So there was a group that had suggested a different | 18 | happened. |
| 19 | map to the Commission? | 19 | Q Okay. No rush, but if you just want to take a |
| 20 | A That the attorneys suggested for us, with us. | 20 | minute to think about it right now, -- |
| 21 | Q Okay. So had you seen the Commission's map before | 21 | A I need more time. |
| 22 | this lawsuit was started? | 22 | Q -- maybe you can try to -- |
| 23 | A No, I did not. | 23 | Okay. Did you review the maps that -- |
| 24 | Q Okay. So how did you come to be involved in the | 24 | Oh, I saw your hand. |
| 25 | lawsuit? | 25 | A Yeah, I would like to take a small break, please. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Go ahead. A five-minute | 1 | A No, I'm not. |
| 2 | break, does that work? | 2 | Q Okay. So is it fair to say then that you wouldn't |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, that would be great. | 3 | have an opinion about what I'm going to call the CVAP, the |
| 4 | MR. BOWEN: Thanks. | 4 | citizen voting age population, the CVAP for Legislative |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. | 5 | District 15? |
| 6 | MR. BOWEN: So we'll reconvene in five | 6 | A I'm not understanding your question. |
| 7 | minutes. | 7 | Q Okay. Let me try to rephrase. There's a percentage |
| 8 | (Break 9:25 a.m. to 9:37 a.m.) | 8 | that tells us how many citizens of voting age in the |
| 9 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Back on the record. | 9 | population have any given characteristics. So when I say |
| 10 | Q (By Mr. Bowen) When we left off we were talking | 10 | Hispanic citizen voting age population, it means how many |
| 11 | about the final map proposed by the Commission. Before | 11 | people in that population who can vote identify as |
| 12 | the Commission had proposed a final map the individual | 12 | Hispanic. |
| 13 | commissioners proposed their own maps. | 13 | Does that make sense? |
| 14 | Were you able to look at any of the individual | 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | commissioners' proposed maps? | 15 | Q Are you aware of what that percentage was for the |
| 16 | A I don't remember. | 16 | 15th Legislative District? |
| 17 | Q Okay. Do you know how many maps each commissioner | 17 | A I don't know. |
| 18 | proposed? | 18 | Q Okay. In your Amended Complaint you asserted two |
| 19 | A No, I don't. | 19 | different claims. Could you just tell me about them? |
| 20 | Q Could you tell me what the Hispanic citizen voting | 20 | A I'm not really sure exactly what you're asking me. |
| 21 | age population percentage was in the final map for the | 21 | Q Yes. So you guys sued the -- You sued the State of |
| 22 | 15th Legislative District? | 22 | Washington and Secretary Hobbs. In that lawsuit, the |
| 23 | A I don't know that answer. | 23 | Complaint that was filed, there are two different claims |
| 24 | Q Okay. Are you familiar with the term citizen voting | 24 | you make against them. I was just wondering if you could |
| 25 | age population? | 25 | tell me in your own words what you think those are about |
|  | Page 19 |  | Page 20 |
| 1 | or what you think this case is about. | 1 | Q Okay. But you did not vote in the 2022 midterm? |
| 2 | A I believe that I would like to be represented in my | 2 | A I did not. |
| 3 | district by a person that represents my values. | 3 | Q Had you voted could you tell me which of the two |
| 4 | Q Okay. And you think the current map does not do | 4 | candidates would have been representative of your choice? |
| 5 | that? | 5 | A In the ballot there was only one representative. |
| 6 | A Correct. | 6 | (Court reporter request to repeat.) |
| 7 | Q Can you explain how the map as it's drawn prevents | 7 | MR. BOWEN: I'm sorry. What, Jeanne? |
| 8 | you from electing someone who represents your values? | 8 | THE REPORTER: I just wanted her to repeat |
| 9 | A I wouldn't be able to explain all that. | 9 | her answer. It wasn't clear to me. |
| 10 | Q Okay. What are the values that you're looking for | 10 | MR. BOWEN: Oh, okay. |
| 11 | in an individual to represent you? | 11 | A In my ballot there was only one representative |
| 12 | A I would just like the opportunity to have the | 12 | choice. |
| 13 | representative of my choice that aligns within the | 13 | Q For the state senate race in Legislative District 15 |
| 14 | boundaries of where I'm at, where I live. | 14 | you only had one representative? |
| 15 | Q Okay. And talking about a representative of your | 15 | A In my November ballot, yes. |
| 16 | choice, did you vote in this last election that just | 16 | Q Okay. I'm going to -- |
| 17 | happened a few weeks back, the 2022 midterms? | 17 | (Website displayed.) |
| 18 | A Yes. | 18 | MR. BOWEN: Jeanne, are you capable of |
| 19 | Q Did you vote for a state senator from Legislative | 19 | taking a screenshot to send as an exhibit, or would I have |
| 20 | District 15? Did you vote in that race? | 20 | to do that? |
| 21 | A I did not. | 21 | THE REPORTER: I can take a screenshot. |
| 22 | Q You did not. Have you previously voted in | 22 | (Screenshot taken.) |
| 23 | legislative district -- or legislative races for your | 23 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. I'd like to admit this |
| 24 | district? | 24 | as Exhibit 1. Let me screen share real quick. |
| 25 | A Yes, I have. | 25 | (Morfin Exhibit No. 1 identified and displayed.) |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Is this coming through | 1 | District 15, this first race. |
| 2 | for everybody? | 2 | Do you see that? |
| 3 | MS. LEEPER: Yes. | 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | THE REPORTER: Yes. And I just took a | 4 | Q And how many candidates do you see under that race? |
| 5 | screenshot. | 5 | A Two. |
| 6 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Thank you, Jeanne. | 6 | Q Two. And you currently reside in Legislative |
| 7 | Could you put that -- Just so everyone has that, could you | 7 | District 15; correct? |
| 8 | put that in the chat as well when you have a minute? | 8 | A That's correct. |
| 9 | THE REPORTER: Yes. Do you want me to do | 9 | Q Okay. Did you see these two candidates on your |
| 10 | that right now? | 10 | ballot for this state senate seat? |
| 11 | MR. BOWEN: Sure. I guess no, we'll wait | 11 | A I honestly don't remember because I didn't vote for |
| 12 | until the end you can send it, just because everyone can | 12 | the state senator. |
| 13 | see my screen right now. | 13 | Q Okay. I'm going to stop screen sharing here, if I |
| 14 | THE REPORTER: Okay. | 14 | can figure it out. Okay. |
| 15 | Q (By Mr. Bowen) Dora, I'm on the Secretary of State's | 15 | Did you vote for any of the state level candidates |
| 16 | website. Is that what you're seeing as well? | 16 | in Legislative District 15? Let me -- Strike that. Let |
| 17 | A Yes. | 17 | me rephrase. |
| 18 | Q Okay. And can you see right here, this says | 18 | Did you vote -- Strike that. I'm going to leave it |
| 19 | Legislative District 15; correct? | 19 | alone. |
| 20 | A Yes. | 20 | How many races would you say that you did not vote |
| 21 | Q And this is for the November 8th, 2022 general | 21 | for on your ballot? |
| 22 | election? | 22 | A I don't remember. |
| 23 | A Yes, I see that. | 23 | Q Okay. Going back to you telling me what this case |
| 24 | Q Is that right? Okay. And right here what I'm | 24 | is about, you had said that you felt you couldn't elect |
| 25 | highlighting, this says State Senator for Legislative | 25 | candidates of your choice; is that right? |
|  | Page 23 |  | Page 24 |
| 1 | A I don't remember exactly verbatim what I said, but I | 1 | CERTIFICATE STATE OF WASHINGTON ) |
| 2 | would like to have the opportunity to have a |  | ) SS |
| 3 | representative -- | 4 | County of King ) <br> I, the undersigned Washington Certified Court |
| 4 | Q Okay. | 5 | Reporter, pursuant to RCW 5.28.010 authorized to administer oaths and affirmations in and for the State of |
| 5 | A -- of my choice. | 6 | Washington, do hereby certify: <br> That the annexed and foregoing deposition of the |
| 6 | Q Do you have that opportunity right now? | 7 | witness named herein was taken stenographically before me and reduced to typewritten form under my direction. |
| 7 | A No. |  | I further certify that the witness examined will be |
| 8 | Q Why do you say that? | 8 | given an opportunity to review and sign their deposition after the same is transcribed, unless indicated in the |
| 9 | A Because the way that the legislative is set up. | 9 | record that the parties and witness waived the signing. I further certify that all objections made at the |
| 10 | Q Could you explain more about that? | 10 | time of said examination to my qualifications or the manner of taking the deposition or to the conduct of any |
| 11 | MS. LEEPER: Object. That was asked and | 11 | party have been noted by me upon the deposition. I further certify that I am not a relative or an |
| 12 | answered. | 12 | employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties to |
| 13 | Q (By Mr. Bowen) Dora, as we're going through the | 13 | said action, or a relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially |
| 14 | deposition today, is there anything you wish I had asked | 14 | interested in the said action or the outcome thereof. I further certify that the witness before examination |
| 15 | you that you want to talk about? | 15 | was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. |
| 16 | A No. | 16 | I further certify that the deposition, as transcribed, is a full, true and correct transcript of the |
| 17 | MR. BOWEN: Okay. Does anyone else have |  | testimony, including questions and answers and all |
| 18 | any questions? | 17 | objections, motions and exceptions of counsel made and taken at the time of the foregoing examination and was |
| 19 | (No audible response.) | 18 | prepared pursuant to Washington Administrative Code 308-14-135, the transcript preparation format guideline. |
| 20 | MR. BOWEN: Not hearing any, I am going to | 19 | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my haî |
| 21 | end the deposition. And Dora, I thank you for your time. | $20$ | 11th day of December, 2022. |
| 22 | And Jeanne, I think we're good to go off the record |  | Pune M crser |
| 23 | now. | 22 | Jeanne M. Gersten, RDR, CCR Registered Diplomate Reporter |
|  | (Deposition concluded at 9.49 am ) | 23 | Washington CCR No. 2711 |
| 24 | (Deposition concluded at 9:49 a.m.) |  | License effective until Aprii 2, 2023 |
| 25 | (Signature reserved.) | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | Residing at Seattle, Washington |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The State is undoubtedly in a tactical catch-22 between the Garcia and Palmer lawsuits. As discovery has made clear, the Commission considered race when drawing the Legislative Map because some members believed (without a strong basis) that doing so was necessary to comply with the VRA. So, if the State (with undersigned counsel's help) succeeds in defending against a Section 2 claim in Palmer-by showing that no majority-minority district is required in LD 15-then the State has doomed its case in Garcia, where the State must show (in opposition to undersigned counsel) that the boundaries of LD 15 were drawn without consideration of race. The easiest solution for the State? Benefit from undersigned counsel's already-provided help in Palmer, and attempt to get undersigned counsel removed from both cases before their presence becomes a problem for the State in Garcia. In short, the State must find a more meritorious method to defend the Palmer and Garcia suits.
    ${ }^{2}$ While a motion as frivolous as this does not warrant the time or effort of a separate motion for sanctions, Palmer Intervenors and Mr. Garcia note that the Court may issue such sanctions against the State and/or its lead counsel Mr. Hughes should it so decide. See, e.g., Perez v. Jie, No. C13-877-RSL, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45001, at *7 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 31, 2014) ("Under its inherent power, a court may sanction an attorney or party who has acted . . . in bad faith...." (citing Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 45-46 (1991))); Ortego v. Lummi Island Scenic Estates Cmty. Club, Inc., No. C14-1840-RSL, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50645, at *9 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 3, 2017) ("One facet of a federal court's inherent power is that it may assess attorney's fees when a party has 'acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons."" (citing F.D. Rich Co., Inc. v. U.S. for Use of Indus. Lumber Co., Inc., 417 U.S. 116, 129 (1974))); accord LCR 11 ("An attorney or party who . . presents to the court unnecessary motions . . or who otherwise so multiplies or obstructs the proceedings in a case may, in addition to or in lieu of the sanctions and penalties provided elsewhere in these rules, be required by the court to satisfy personally such excess costs and may be subject to such other sanctions as the court may deem appropriate."). Indeed, "[w]here disqualification motions are meritless and brought solely for tactical reasons, the Ninth Circuit has upheld the award of costs and attorney's fees as a sanction under Section 1927." United States Fire Ins. Co. v. Icicle Seafoods, 523 F. Supp. 3d 1262, 1270 (W.D. Wash. 2021) (citing Optyl Eyewear Fashion Int'l Corp. v. Style Companies, Ltd., 760 F.2d 1045, 1050 (9th Cir. 1985)).

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ As the Motion before the Court is simply one to decide if the Court should convene an inquiry, it would be premature and inappropriate for Palmer Intervenors and Mr. Garcia to present evidence opposing an inquiry or motion for disqualification that has not yet been filed.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ For example, the State contends that Mr. Trevino testified in his deposition that he did not believe the map to be a racial gerrymander, (Dkt. \# 150 at 9), but the terms "racial gerrymander" or "gerrymander" were never used in Mr. Trevino's deposition, (see generally Dkt. \# 127-2), and the citation the State provides does not suggest otherwise. The State similarly misleads when it contends that Mr. Ybarra does not want the Legislative Map lines to change, (Dkt. \# 150 at 4), as Mr. Ybarra's deposition testimony was clearly more equivocal than the absolute position presented by the State. (See Dkt. \# 127-1 at 30.) Likewise, the State portrays Mr. Garcia's goals in a more absolute light than Mr. Garcia himself has done. (Exhibit A at 42:16-43:21.)
    ${ }^{5}$ For example, Plaintiffs' counsel asked Mr. Garcia if he knew that Mr. Stokesbary, in his capacity as a state legislator, "voted in favor of the plan that you are challenging." (Exhibit A at 65:23-24.) As a lawyer attempting to practice redistricting law in Washington, counsel knows (or should know) that such a question is misleading at best. Under the Washington Constitution, the Commission passes the redistricting plan, and the state legislature may amend-not approve-that plan. Wash. Const. Art. II, § 43(6). Notably, the legislature's amendment authority is limited, as it "may not include more than two percent of the population of any legislative or congressional district." Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 44.05.100. Thus, as a matter of law, the Washington Legislature does not vote to approve the Commission's map but, instead, votes to amend it and only in a limited capacity. Consequently, misleadingly framing the question as counsel being opposed to his client's legal perspective-and then asking how the client feels-is designed only to drive a wedge between counsel and client, and the State now attempts (unsuccessfully) to drive that wedge further here.
    ${ }^{6}$ Indeed, Mr. Garcia himself admitted that he does not even have a "lay understanding" of redistricting law. (Exhibit A at 24:19-25:1.) And Garcia, Campos, and Ybarra have admitted to getting the Garcia and Palmer cases confused. (See Exhibit A 20:6-10; Dkt. \# 127-1 at 14; Exhibit B at 45:10-47:7.) Moreover, if a lay client's lack of legal understanding about a case should serve as a basis for disqualifying counsel, it is notable that the State has not made a similar motion regarding Palmer Plaintiffs, who also lack a sophisticated legal understanding of their case. (See, e.g., Exhibit C at 14-15.)

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ For example, the State contends that Mr. Campos does not know who is paying for this litigation. (Dkt. \# 150 at 10.) However, when asked, " $[\mathrm{H}]$ as anyone told you who is paying for the attorneys in this case," Mr. Campos replied, "Not that I recall. If they did, I didn't pay attention because it wasn't coming out of my pocket. So yeah, I guess it doesn't -- Yeah, I don't know." (Exhibit B at 84:25-85:15) (emphasis added). Mr. Garcia also testified that he knew that a third party was paying for this suit and that-although he didn't know the name of the entity during the deposition-he would discuss it later with his lawyer. (Exhibit A at 103:6-24)

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ These communications, like many of the communications that would go to a response to a disqualification motion (or inquiry by the Court should it be ordered) are protected by privileges which are not undersigned counsels to waive and are in fact not waived by Intervenor-Defendants.

