

1 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
MARGARET A. ZIEMIANEK (SBN 233418)
2 mziemianek@hansonbridgett.com
G. THOMAS RIVERA III (SBN 333556)
3 trivera@hansonbridgett.com
425 Market Street, 26th Floor
4 San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 777-3200
5 Facsimile: (415) 541-9366

6 Attorneys for Defendant
ASHLEY GORE a/k/a ILLMA GORE
7

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**

11 BRIAN WARNER, p/k/a MARILYN
12 MANSON,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 EVAN RACHEL WOOD, ASHLEY GORE
16 a/k/a ILLMA GORE,

17 Defendants.
18

Case No. 22STCV07568

**DEFENDANT ASHLEY GORE'S
APPLICATION TO FILE UNREDACTED
RECORDS UNDER SEAL;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF
MARGARET ZIEMIANEK**

Reservation No.: 107383222615

Date: January 9, 2023

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Dept. 50

Before: Hon. Teresa Beaudet

Action Filed: March 2, 2022

19
20
21
22 **"PUBLIC"**
23 (REDACTS MATERIALS FROM CONDITIONALLY SEALED RECORD)
24
25
26
27
28

1 **TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on January 9, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. in Department
3 50 of this Court,¹ located at 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012,
4 pursuant to Rules 2.550 and 2.551 of the California Rules of Court, Defendant Gore will
5 and hereby does seek an Order of the Court to file under seal certain portions of the
6 October 25, 2022 deposition transcript of Defendant Ashley Gore. Plaintiff conditionally
7 lodged portions of the transcript on November 15, 2022, concurrently with his Opposition
8 to Defendants' Special Motions to Strike ("Anti-SLAPP" motions), as Exhibit F to the
9 Declaration of Howard E. King. The portions of the lodged transcript Defendant Gore
10 moves to be filed under sealed are as follows:

- 11 • 68:11-23
- 12 • 74:4-11
- 13 • 98:22-108:17
- 14 • 122:2-24
- 15 • 123:25-126:19
- 16 • 138:10-139:6

17 The Application is based on this Application; the attached Memorandum of Points
18 and Authorities; the attached Declaration of Margaret A. Ziemianek; and all pleadings,
19 papers, records, and files in this case; and such other argument as may be presented to
20 the Court at the hearing on this Application.

21 ///
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///

26

27 ¹ Plaintiff's Application to Seal is set for hearing on January 4, 2023. Defendant
28 respectfully requests that the hearing dates for the two motions to seal be advanced to be
heard on the same date as the anti-SLAPP motions, to the extent possible.

1 DATED: November 28, 2022

HANSON BRIDGETT LLP

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

By: 

MARGARET A. ZIEMIANEK
G. THOMAS RIVERA III
Attorneys for Defendant
ASHLEY GORE a/k/a ILLMA GORE

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Defendants Evan Rachel Wood and Illma Gore filed Special Motions to Strike
4 (“Anti-SLAPP” motions) in response to Plaintiff’s complaint. On September 27, 2022, this
5 Court permitted Plaintiff to take limited discovery in the case pursuant to Section
6 425.16(g) of the California Code of Civil Procedure—specifically, Plaintiff was permitted
7 take the deposition of Defendant Gore with respect to her state of mind regarding alleged
8 statements about the “Groupie” film. See Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice
9 (“Supp. RJN”), Exhibit D at 13. Plaintiff took Gore’s deposition on October 25, 2022.
10 Pursuant to a stipulated protective order issued in this case on October 13, 2022,
11 Defendant Gore designated the entire transcript as “Confidential.” There was no objection
12 to the designation.

13 Plaintiff filed his Opposition papers to Defendants’ Anti-SLAPP motions on
14 November 15, 2022. Among Plaintiff’s exhibits are portions of Defendant Gore’s
15 deposition transcript, which Plaintiff lodged conditionally under seal as Exhibit F to the
16 Supplemental Declaration of Howard E. King. The transcript excerpts includes references
17 to third-party individuals that, if revealed, would threaten their privacy and expose them to
18 the risk of undue harassment or intimidation, and references to communications with law
19 enforcement that may prejudice an ongoing law enforcement investigation involving
20 Plaintiff (the status of which is currently unknown). See Declaration of Margaret A.
21 Ziemianek (“Ziemianek Decl.”) ¶ 4. Accordingly, Defendant Gore hereby moves to seal
22 the following portions of the October 25 deposition transcript included in Exhibit F of the
23 Supplemental King Declaration:

- 24 • 68:11-23
- 25 • 74:4-11
- 26 • 98:22-108:17
- 27 • 122:2-24
- 28 • 123:25-126:19

- 1 • 138:10-139:6

2 **II. THE COURT HAS AUTHORITY TO ORDER SEAL RECORDS FROM PUBLIC**
3 **VIEW.**

4 Courts may seal certain records if it finds that “(1) There exists an overriding
5 interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record; (2) The overriding interest
6 supports sealing the record; (3) A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest
7 will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed; (4) The proposed sealing is narrowly
8 tailored; and (5) No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.” Cal.
9 Rule Court 2.550(c)-(d). Among those “overriding interest[s]” are the “protection of
10 witnesses from [extreme] embarrassment or intimidation . . . ensuring the fair
11 administration of justice; and preservation of confidential investigative information.”
12 *McNair v. Ntl. Collegiate Athletic Ass’n.*, 234 Cal. App. 4th 25, 33 (2015) (citing *NBC*
13 *Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Sup. Ct.*, 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1222 n.46 (1999)).

14 Here, there is an overriding interest in protecting the identity of non-party
15 individuals referenced in Gore’s deposition.

16 **III. CERTAIN PORTIONS OF DEFENDANT GORE’S DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT**
17 **SHOULD BE SEALED.**

18 Each of the Rule 2.550 requirements are met in this case. First, there is an
19 “overriding interest” in sealing the specified portions of the transcript. The portions identify
20 non-party individuals by name that are not currently parties to this case or other known
21 cases involving Plaintiff. Given the public nature of the allegations against Plaintiff—and
22 his and his fans’ vehement rejection of those allegations—including non-party individual’s
23 names in the public record will expose them to unwarranted attention. Further, as noted
24 in Gore’s Anti-SLAPP motion, there appears to be an ongoing law enforcement
25 investigation into some of the allegations against Plaintiff. See Gore Mot. at 8; Gore
26 Request for Judicial Notice Exhibit 3. Revealing the identities about potential witnesses or
27 what information Gore shared with law enforcement risks compromising any outstanding
28 “investigative information” that exists. *NBC*, 20 Cal. 4th at 1215 n.34, 1222 n.46; see also

1 *McNair*, 234 Cal. App. 4th at 33 (noting the same justifications for closed courtroom
2 proceedings apply to sealing documents). Thus the first requirement for sealing portions
3 of the transcript are met. See Cal. Rule Ct. 2.550(d)(1).

4 Second, the identities of non-parties and related testimony regarding the identity of
5 those individuals and interactions with law enforcement is not relevant to the Court’s
6 adjudication of the anti-SLAPP motions. See *Ziemianek Decl.* ¶ 3. By contrast, revealing
7 their names to the public will irreparably expose those individuals to a level of scrutiny for
8 which they have neither volunteered nor consented. *Id.* There is currently no reason to
9 believe any of those individuals have information that is relevant to adjudicating
10 Defendant Gore’s Anti-SLAPP motion. *Id.* Accordingly, the second and third requirements
11 for sealing portions of the transcript are met. See Cal. Rule Ct. 2.550(d)(2)-(3).

12 Finally, the request for sealing portions of the transcript are narrowly tailored.
13 Defendant Gore specifically identified only those portions of the transcript that identify
14 third parties and subjects them to unwarranted scrutiny, or that run the risk of
15 compromising a law enforcement investigation. The list of proposed redactions to Exhibit
16 F of the Supplemental King Declaration is short, demonstrating the narrow focus of this
17 Motion. There is no other way to preserve the information from the deposition transcript
18 pages other than targeted redactions, as the parties rely on Gore’s non-confidential
19 deposition transcript in their briefing and arguments of the Anti-SLAPP motion. Thus, the
20 final requirements for sealing portions of the deposition transcript are met. See Cal. Rule
21 Ct. 2.550(d)(4)-(5).

22 **IV. GORE HAS SATISFIED THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 2.551.**

23 Rule 2.551 of the California Rules of Court require parties that seek to seal
24 documents to “file a motion or an application for an order sealing the record . . .
25 accompanied by a memorandum and a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify the
26 sealing.” *Id.* 2.551(b)(1). The moving party must serve all parties with the motion, as well
27 as “a complete, unredacted version of all papers as well as a redacted version” if they
28 “already [have] access to the records to be placed under seal.” *Id.* 2.551(b)(2). The

1 moving party need not re-lodge a record that another party has lodged conditionally
2 under seal pursuant to a protective order. *Id.* 2.551(b)(4). The lodged record remains
3 “conditionally under seal” pending the court’s ruling. *Id.*

4 Defendant Gore has complied with the procedural requirements of Rule 2.551. At
5 the time of filing this motion, counsel for Gore served counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant
6 Evan Rachel Wood with both redacted and unredacted copies of the deposition transcript
7 containing the information Defendant Gore moves to seal. Ziemianek Decl. ¶ 5.

8 **V. CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, Defendant Gore requests this Court to grant her motion
10 and seal the portions of the previously-lodged October 25, 2022 deposition transcript that
11 she identifies in this Motion.

12

13 DATED: November 28, 2022

HANSON BRIDGETT LLP

14

15

By: 

16

MARGARET A. ZIEMIANEK

17

G. THOMAS RIVERA III

18

Attorneys for Defendant

19

ASHLEY GORE a/k/a ILLMA GORE

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF MARGARET A. ZIEMIANEK

1. I am an attorney duly admitted to practice before this Court. I am a Partner of Hanson Bridgett LLP, attorneys of record for Defendant Ashley Gore (“Defendant”). I make this declaration in support of Defendant Ashley Gore’s Application to File Unredacted Records Under Seal. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein, except where stated upon information and belief. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters stated herein.

2. On September 27, 2022, in connection with Defendants’ Special Motions to Strike (“Anti-SLAPP” motions), this Court permitted Plaintiff to depose Defendant Gore on the limited topics of her state of mind regarding the alleged *Groupie* statements. On October 25, 2022, I appeared at and defended Ms. Gore in the deposition.

3. At the deposition, while on the record, I provisionally designated the entire transcript as “Confidential,” pursuant to the stipulated Protective Order entered in this action on October 13, 2022. No party objected to the designation. Defendant Gore hereby de-designates the portions of the October 25, 2022 deposition transcript that have been filed in connection with the Anti-SLAPP motions and that are not identified in this sealing Motion or its supporting documents filed concurrently herewith.

4. During the deposition, Ms. Gore testified, among other things, about the bases for her beliefs about the *Groupie* video and the fact that she provided law enforcement agencies with contact information for individuals with potential knowledge relevant to allegations of sexual abuse against Plaintiff. Various non-party individuals were mentioned and discussed during the deposition in connection with Ms. Gore’s alleged statements about *Groupie*. To the best of my knowledge, none of those individuals have voluntarily involved themselves in this case, or any other case involving Plaintiff. Nor do I have reason to believe that those individuals have information that is relevant to adjudicating the Defendants’ Anti-SLAPP motions. However, given the notoriety of this case and other pending civil actions involving Plaintiff, I believe that placing the names of these individuals in the public record risks subjecting them to

1 unwarranted public scrutiny, intimidation, and harassment from the media and members
2 of the public. Moreover, releasing portions of the transcript that identify potential
3 witnesses may jeopardize the integrity of the previously reported criminal investigation of
4 Plaintiff, the current status of which is unknown to me.

5 5. At the time of filing this motion, my office served counsel for Plaintiff and
6 counsel for Defendant Evan Rachel Wood with redacted and unredacted versions of the
7 documents containing the information Defendant Gore moves to seal.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
9 foregoing is true and correct.

10 Executed this 28th day of November, 2022 in San Francisco, California.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Margaret Ziemianek

EXHIBIT 1

1 KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & SORIANO, LLP
HOWARD E. KING, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 77012
2 JOHN G. SNOW, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 280790
JACKSON S. TRUGMAN, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 295145
3 JTRUGMAN@KHPSLAW.COM
1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, TWENTY-FIFTH FLOOR
4 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067-4506
TELEPHONE: (310) 282-8989
5 FACSIMILE: (310) 282-8903

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff Brian Warner p/k/a
Marilyn Manson
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT

10

11 BRIAN WARNER p/k/a MARILYN
MANSON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 EVAN RACHEL WOOD; ASHLEY GORE
15 a/k/a/ ILLMA GORE,

16 Defendants.
17
18

CASE NO. 22STCV07568

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
HOWARD E. KING**

[Filed concurrently with: Opposition to Gore's
anti-SLAPP Motion; Opposition to Wood's
anti-SLAPP Motion; King Declaration; Berk
Declaration; Warner Declaration; Balog
Declaration; Weiss Declaration; Meyer
Declaration; Kunkel Declaration; B. Gore
Declaration; Opposition to Gore's RJN;
Objections to Defendants' Evidence; Notice
of Lodging; Application to Seal; [Proposed]
Order Granting Sealing Application]

19 Date: December 1, 2022
20 Time: 10:00 a.m.
21 Dept.: 50

The Hon. Teresa A. Beaudet, Dept. 50

22 Action Filed: March 2, 2022
23 Trial Date: Not Set

24

25

26

27

28

EXHIBIT F

CONDITIONALLY UNDER SEAL

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT
3

4 _____
5 BRIAN WARNER, p/k/a MARILYN MANSON,
6 Plaintiff,

7 vs.

Case No.:

8 22STCV07568

9 EVAN RACHEL WOOD; ASHLEY GORE,
10 a/k/a ILLMA GORE,
11 Defendants.
12 _____

13
14 CONFIDENTIAL

15
16 VIDEO-RECORDED ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF
17 ASHLEY GORE, A/K/A ILLMA GORE
18 Tuesday, October 25, 2022
19

20
21 Reported by:

22 Michelle Bulkley, CSR #13658

23 JOB No. 5520113
24

25 PAGES 1 - 153

Page 1

CONFIDENTIAL

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT
3
4 _____
5 BRIAN WARNER, p/k/a MARILYN MANSON,
6 Plaintiff,
7 vs. Case No.:
8 22STCV07568
9 EVAN RACHEL WOOD; ASHLEY GORE,
10 a/k/a ILLMA GORE,
11 Defendants.
12 _____
13
14
15
16 Confidential Video-Recorded Zoom
17 Videoconference Deposition of ASHLEY GORE, A/K/A
18 ILLMA GORE, taken on behalf of Plaintiff, beginning
19 at 12:01 p.m. EDT and ending at 3:43 p.m. EDT on
20 Tuesday, October 25, 2022, before Michelle Bulkley,
21 Certified Shorthand Reporter Number 13658.
22
23
24
25

1 INDEX TO EXAMINATION
2
3 WITNESS: ASHLEY GORE, a/k/a ILLMA GORE
EXAMINATION PAGE
4 By Mr. King 10
5
6
7 WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER
8 PAGE LINE
9 16 25
10 20 16
11 32 2
12 51 9
13 53 23
14 69 1
15 69 18
16 70 16
17 74 9
18 76 12
19 77 9
20 77 13
21 78 4
22 78 13
23 78 23
24 80 11
25 81 11
81 23
82 24
88 25
89 9
91 24

1 APPEARANCES (All via Zoom videoconference):
2
3 For Plaintiff:
4 KING HOLMES PATERNO & SORIANO
5 Howard E King, Esq
6 Jackson Trugman, Esq
7 1900 Avenue Of The Stars, 25th Floor
8 Los Angeles, California 90067
9 (310) 282-8989
10 hking@khpslaw.com
11 jtrugman@khpslaw.com
12
13 For Defendant Ashley Gore, a/k/a Illma Gore:
14 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
15 Maggie Ziemianek, Esq
16 425 Market Street, 26th Floor
17 San Francisco, California 94105
18 (415) 777-3200
19 mziemianek@hansonbridgett.com
20
21 For Defendant Evan Rachel Wood:
22 KINSELLA WEITZMAN ISER KUMP HOLLEY LLP
23 Michael J Kump, Esq
24 Katherine Kleindienst, Esq
25 808 Wilshire Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Santa Monica, California 90401
(310) 556-9855
mkump@kwikhlaw.com
kkleindienst@kwikalaw.com
and
HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
G Thomas Rivera, III, Esq
777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, California 90017
(213) 395-7620
trivera@hansonbridgett.com
Also Present:
Amanda Peterson, Videographer
Kristy Villa, Veritext Concierge
Brian Warner
Karen Sloane

1 WITNESS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER (CONTINUED)
2
3 PAGE LINE
4 96 22
5 97 14
6 105 15
7 108 15
8 108 23
9 109 5
10 119 17
11 122 4
12 131 10
13 133 3
14 133 20
15 134 7
16 134 23
17 135 18
18 137 11
19 137 17
20 137 23
21 140 3
22 140 15
23 141 16
24 143 14
25 145 18
146 1

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS</p> <p>2 MARKED DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 Exhibit 1 Tweets on Twitter of Illma Gore 17</p> <p>5 Exhibit 2 Declaration of Bryton Gore 74</p> <p>6 Exhibit 3 Instagram messages of Illma 110</p> <p>7 Gore to Katheryn McGaffigan</p> <p>8 Exhibit 4 Audio recording of phone 129</p> <p>9 conversation (snippet 105)</p> <p>10 Exhibit 5 Audio recording of phone 132</p> <p>11 conversation (snippet 105)</p> <p>12 (duplicate of Exhibit 4)</p> <p>13 Exhibit 6 Audio recording of phone 133</p> <p>14 conversation (snippet 106)</p> <p>15 Exhibit 7 Audio recording of phone 134</p> <p>16 conversation (snippet 107)</p> <p>17 Exhibit 8 Audio recording of phone 134</p> <p>18 conversation (snippet 108)</p> <p>19 Exhibit 9 Audio recording of phone 135</p> <p>20 conversation (snippet 109)</p> <p>21 (withdrawn on page 147)</p> <p>22 Exhibit 10 Audio recording of phone 135</p> <p>23 conversation (snippet 110)</p> <p>24 Exhibit 11 Audio recording of phone 137</p> <p>25 conversation (snippet 111)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 Tuesday, October 25, 2022; 12:01 p m. EDT</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We are</p> <p>4 going on the record at 12:01 p.m. on October 25,</p> <p>5 2022.</p> <p>6 Please note that this deposition is being</p> <p>7 conducted virtually. Quality of recording depends</p> <p>8 on the quality of camera and Internet connection of</p> <p>9 the participants. What is seen from the witness and</p> <p>10 heard on the screen is what will be recorded.</p> <p>11 Audio and video recording will continue to</p> <p>12 take place unless all parties agree to go off of the</p> <p>13 record.</p> <p>14 This is Media Unit Number 1 in the</p> <p>15 video-recorded deposition of Ashley Gore, a/k/a</p> <p>16 Illma Gore, taken by counsel for the plaintiff in</p> <p>17 the matter of Brian Warner, p/k/a Marilyn Manson vs.</p> <p>18 Evan Rachel Wood and Ashley Gore, a/k/a Illma Gore.</p> <p>19 This was filed in the Superior Court of</p> <p>20 the State of California, the County of Los Angeles,</p> <p>21 Central District. Our case number is 22STCV07568.</p> <p>22 My name is Amanda Peterson. I'm your</p> <p>23 videographer with Veritext Legal Solutions. Your</p> <p>24 court reporter is Michelle Bulkley with Veritext</p> <p>25 Legal Solutions.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p>
<p>1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS (CONTINUED)</p> <p>2 MARKED DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 Exhibit 12 Audio recording of phone 137</p> <p>5 conversation (snippet 112)</p> <p>6 Exhibit 13 Audio recording of phone 137</p> <p>7 conversation (snippet 113)</p> <p>8 Exhibit 14 Email from Jason Wagner at the 139</p> <p>9 Los Angeles Police Department</p> <p>10 to Tony Ciulla dated February</p> <p>11 3, 2021</p> <p>12 Exhibit 15 Handwritten Note 140</p> <p>13 Exhibit 16 Audio recording of phone 147</p> <p>14 conversation (snippet 109)</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 I am not authorized to administer the</p> <p>2 oath. I am not related to any party in this action,</p> <p>3 nor am I financially interested in the outcome.</p> <p>4 If there are any objections to proceeding,</p> <p>5 please state them at the time of your appearance.</p> <p>6 Could counsel please state their</p> <p>7 appearances and their affiliations for the record.</p> <p>8 Let's start with our noticing attorney.</p> <p>9 MR. KING: Howard King for the plaintiff.</p> <p>10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Margaret Ziemianek of</p> <p>11 Hanson Bridgett on behalf of the witness, defendant</p> <p>12 Ashley Gore.</p> <p>13 MR. KUMP: Michael Kump on behalf of</p> <p>14 defendant Evan Rachel Wood.</p> <p>15 MS. KLEINDIENST: Katherine Kleindienst on</p> <p>16 behalf of defendant Evan Rachel Wood.</p> <p>17 MR. RIVERA: Tom Rivera on behalf of</p> <p>18 defendant Illma Gore.</p> <p>19 MR. TRUGMAN: Jackson Trugman is also here</p> <p>20 for the plaintiff.</p> <p>21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Can our court</p> <p>22 reporter please swear in our witness.</p> <p>23 (Witness sworn.)</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1 ASHLEY GORE, a/k/a ILLMA GORE,
2 having been first duly sworn, was examined and
3 testified remotely as follows:
4 EXAMINATION
5 BY MR. KING: 12:04
6 Q Good morning, Ms. Gore. My name is --
7 excuse me -- Howard King. I represent Brian Warner
8 in this action.
9 A Good morning.
10 Q Good morning. I hope to get through this 12:04
11 relatively quickly, but I have to, you know, give
12 you a few instructions upfront to make sure we both
13 understand the nature of the proceeding.
14 Have you had your deposition taken before?
15 A I have not. 12:04
16 Q Okay. Have you testified under oath in a
17 court before?
18 A Yes.
19 Q Okay. In what kind of an action?
20 A A family court action. 12:04
21 Q Okay. Were you a party to that action?
22 A I'm sorry. Could you confirm what "a
23 party" means?
24 Q Were you a petitioner or a respondent, a
25 plaintiff or a defendant? 12:05

Page 10

1 A I believe I was a respondent. 12:05
2 Q Okay. I'm really not interested in
3 whatever family matters you have. I just want to
4 make sure that you understand that although you're
5 in Florida, where apparently it is just after noon, 12:05
6 we're here in California. This all seems very
7 informal, but I want you to understand that you've
8 been administered an oath obligating you to tell the
9 truth under penalty of perjury.
10 That oath that you've taken has the same 12:05
11 force and effect as though you were in a court of
12 law, and a judge or a judge's clerk had administered
13 that to you.
14 Do --
15 A Yes. 12:05
16 Q -- you understand that?
17 A Thank you. Yes. I understand.
18 Q Okay. And because we're remote and
19 there's a court reporter trying to write things
20 down, it's important that I wait for you to answer 12:05
21 before I ask the next question and you wait for me
22 to finish my sometimes meandering questions before
23 you answer, because the court reporter can't take
24 down both of us talking at the same time.
25 Do you understand that? 12:06

Page 11

1 A Of course, yes. 12:06
2 Q Good. A perfect example of me meandering
3 when it was time for you to answer.
4 I'm entitled to your best recollection of
5 events even if you don't have a perfect 12:06
6 recollection.
7 If you -- if you do not understand a
8 question of mine, please let me know, and I'll try
9 to rephrase it.
10 Does that make sense? 12:06
11 A Yes, it does.
12 Q Great. So if you don't ask me, I'm going
13 to assume that you understood my question.
14 Are you -- is there any reason that,
15 physically or mentally, you're not able to give your 12:06
16 best testimony today?
17 A No.
18 Q Are you on any medication prescribed or
19 otherwise not prescribed that might affect your
20 ability to testify today? 12:07
21 A I am not.
22 Q Is there anybody else in the room with you
23 there in Florida?
24 A There is not, no.
25 Q Do you have any documents in front of you? 12:07

Page 12

1 A I do not. 12:07
2 Q Is your phone in front of you?
3 A It is plugged in next to me. I can put it
4 to the side or away.
5 Q Well, I would just prefer that you just 12:07
6 turn it over so, you know, nobody later says, "Gee,
7 she was looking at text messages."
8 A Yeah. I'll turn it over, and it's --
9 Q Okay.
10 A -- on airplane mode. 12:07
11 Q Thank you very much.
12 Other than with your counsel, have you
13 discussed your deposition with anybody before today?
14 A I have not.
15 Q Have you reviewed any documents in 12:07
16 preparation for your testimony today?
17 A No.
18 Q You're aware that there are legal
19 pleadings that have been filed in this case that
20 include declarations of witnesses, aren't you? 12:08
21 A I -- I am, yes.
22 Q Yeah.
23 Did you review any of those documents
24 before your deposition?
25 A I didn't -- 12:08

Page 13

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection to the extent it 12:08 2 calls for attorney-client privilege and work 3 product. 4 I would instruct you not to answer as to 5 any documents you reviewed with counsel. 12:08 6 MR. KING: Okay. I'm not going to fight 7 with you, because she's testified under oath that 8 she hasn't reviewed any documents. But, otherwise, 9 I would disagree with you on the application of the 10 privilege. 12:08 11 BY MR. KING: 12 Q I am correct you have not reviewed any 13 documents; right, Ms. Gore? 14 A No, I have not. 15 Q Have you -- are you aware that your sister 12:08 16 filed a declaration in this litigation? 17 A I am aware, yes. 18 Q Have you ever read that declaration? 19 A Not in full, no. 20 Q Can you -- well, let me just ask you, have 12:09 21 you ever met Brian Warner? 22 A I have not. 23 Q Have you formed an opinion over time 24 regarding Brian Warner's character? 25 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Beyond the 12:09 Page 14</p>	<p>1 the objection every time. 12:10 2 But with each and every one of these 3 questions, will you please either instruct her not 4 to answer or let her answer? 5 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Sure. Can I hear the 12:10 6 question again? 7 MR. KING: I'll just start over again. 8 Well, I certainly don't remember the question, so it 9 will be a different question. 10 BY MR. KING: 12:11 11 Q Have you formed an opinion regarding the 12 character of Mr. Warner? 13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same objection. 14 And I'll allow you some limited leeway in 15 the interest of time, but, again, our objection 12:11 16 stands as to the irrelevance of the general opinion. 17 You can answer. 18 THE WITNESS: Not really, no. 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Q Not really. 12:11 21 Have you publicly referred to Mr. Warner 22 as a rapist pedophile motherfucker? 23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. That is beyond 24 the scope of the Court's order. 25 I'll instruct you not to answer. 12:11 Page 16</p>
<p>1 scope of the Court's order; beyond the scope of the 12:09 2 permitted issue of actual malice. You can ask 3 questions about his -- her opinion with respect to 4 the statements at issue, but the general opinion of 5 Brian Warner is irrelevant. 12:09 6 MR. KING: So I guess the protocol ought 7 to be is you decide when you want to instruct her 8 not to answer because you believe it beyond the 9 scope of the Court's order. We have a different 10 opinion, obviously, on what establishes actual 12:09 11 malice. And I'll just leave it at that. 12 So are you instructing her not to answer 13 any questions regarding her opinion of Brian Warner? 14 MS. ZIEMIANEK: No. You're permitted to 12:10 15 ask her -- ask her questions about her opinion of 16 Brian Warner as it relates to the statements at 17 issue that pertain to the "Groupie" video. 18 I think the case law for public figures is 19 clear that just generalized ill will or sentiment 20 toward the plaintiff is not relevant to her actual 12:10 21 malice. 22 MR. KING: Well, I don't really want to 23 argue with you. I think we just ought to follow the 24 protocol, but I'll ask the questions. If you want, 25 you can have a standing objection, or you can make 12:10 Page 15</p>	<p>1 MR. KING: I'd like to introduce 12:11 2 Exhibit 1, Karen, document 2. 3 (Exhibit 1 marked.) 4 BY MR. KING: 5 Q And, Ms. Gore, this is going to be, in a 12:12 6 minute, on your left screen or your Exhibit Share 7 screen. You would click under the deposition box in 8 the tree under "Brian Warner vs. Evan Rachel Wood." 9 A Is it under "Marked Exhibits"? 10 Q Yes. Yes. It should be. 12:12 11 A That file seems to be empty. 12 Q She's probably loading it up right now. I 13 don't see it either. 14 MS. SLOANE: I'm still loading. Thank 15 you. 12:12 16 Exhibit 1 has been posted. 17 (Whereupon Veritext Concierge Kristy Villa 18 exited the deposition proceedings.) 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Q So if you'd click under "Marked Exhibits," 12:13 21 it will pop up. 22 MR. KING: Karen, is she able to scroll, 23 or do I have to scroll? 24 MS. SLOANE: No. She should be able to 25 scroll. 12:13 Page 17</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1 MR. KING: Okay. 12:13
2 MS. SLOANE: There's a sidebar at the
3 right.
4 BY MR. KING:
5 Q So, Ms. Gore, scroll at your leisure. 12:13
6 A It is the tweets, correct.
7 Q Is Exhibit -- is this a -- is this a tweet
8 you posted?
9 A Yes.
10 Q And was this really probably after this 12:13
11 lawsuit that brings you here today was filed?
12 A It was when the TMZ article was released.
13 Q Which TMZ article?
14 A There was a TMZ article about the lawsuit.
15 I... 12:14
16 Q Okay. And so did you tweet, "Bring it the
17 fuck on you rapist pedophile motherfucker"?
18 A Yes.
19 Q And were you referring to Mr. Warner by
20 that comment? 12:14
21 A Yes.
22 Q And was that a true and correct recitation
23 of your feelings for Mr. Warner at the time?
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Argumentative;
25 vague. 12:14

Page 18

1 You can answer. 12:14
2 THE WITNESS: It was my feelings at the
3 time of the press release that I had seen.
4 BY MR. KING:
5 Q And before the TMZ article, had you 12:14
6 believed that Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile
7 motherfucker?
8 A I believed --
9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Beyond the
10 scope of the Court's order; irrelevant to the issue 12:15
11 of actual malice.
12 You can answer.
13 BY MR. KING:
14 Q You can answer, Ms. Gore.
15 A I believed that he was a rapist and a 12:15
16 pedophile, yes.
17 Q And you believed that -- do you know when
18 you formed that belief?
19 A I don't recall the exact date or time, no.
20 Q Was it several years before the TMZ 12:15
21 article?
22 A I can't recall the --
23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection.
24 BY MR. KING:
25 Q Was it before you became involved with the 12:15

Page 19

1 Phoenix Act? 12:15
2 A I can't recall the exact date and time.
3 Q Do you know how -- I'm sorry.
4 Do you know what information you received
5 that caused you to conclude that Mr. Warner was a 12:15
6 rapist pedophile motherfucker?
7 A At the time, I was -- I supported the
8 people who were around me.
9 Q Who are those people?
10 A Victim -- alleged victims who had reached 12:16
11 out.
12 Q Can you name those people?
13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: No. Objection. This is
14 beyond the scope of the Court order. It's
15 irrelevant to the issue of actual malice. 12:16
16 I'm going to instruct her not to answer.
17 This has nothing to do with the "Groupie"
18 statements.
19 BY MR. KING:
20 Q Well, when did you first tell people that 12:16
21 the "Groupie" video that Mr. Warner had made
22 involved pedophilia -- let's just stop there.
23 When did you first tell people that the
24 "Groupie" video involved pedophilia?
25 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:16

Page 20

1 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence. 12:16
2 MR. KING: Well, let me rephrase it to be
3 clear.
4 BY MR. KING:
5 Q At some point in time, you started telling 12:16
6 people that Mr. Warner had made the "Groupie" video,
7 and it included at least simulated sex with an
8 underage actress; right?
9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
10 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence. 12:17
11 BY MR. KING:
12 Q Do you need help with the question,
13 Ms. Gore?
14 A Yes. Could you please rephrase it?
15 Q Right. At some point, did you start 12:17
16 telling people -- and we'll get to those people --
17 that Mr. Warner had made a film called "Groupie"
18 using an underage actress in a simulated or actual
19 sex scene?
20 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:17
21 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence.
22 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Can I answer the
23 question?
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Yes. You can answer if
25 you -- if you can. 12:17

Page 21

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the exact 12:18 2 time that I started speaking of the film in that 3 way. 4 BY MR. KING: 5 Q Can you give me a year? 12:18 6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 7 foundation; misstates her testimony. 8 Go ahead. 9 THE WITNESS: I -- probably around 2016, 10 '17 when I saw the Andy Dick "Dinner For Five" 12:18 11 video. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 Q And what about the "Dinner For Five" video 14 caused you to start telling people that Mr. Warner 15 had used an underage actress in a sex scene in the 12:18 16 film "Groupie"? 17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 18 foundation. 19 You can answer. 20 THE WITNESS: It was around that time when 12:19 21 someone had reached out claiming to be a relative of 22 the person in the film. 23 BY MR. KING: 24 Q Reached out to you? 25 A Correct, yes. 12:19</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 BY MR. KING: 12:20 2 Q And this unidentified sender claimed she 3 was a relative of the actress who was in the film 4 "Groupie." Do I have that right? 5 A Yes. 12:20 6 Q And you've never learned the name of the 7 person who sent you that tweet; correct? 8 A No. 9 Q Well, am I correct that you never learned 10 the name of who sent that to you? 12:20 11 A Yes. 12 Q Can you -- do you still have a copy of 13 that DM? 14 A I had, at one point, saved it. I do not 15 at this time. 12:21 16 Q What happened to it? 17 A I do not have access to it. 18 Q Why not? 19 A Because my iCloud was deleted. 20 Q Okay. Do you have any other recollection 12:21 21 of what that DM said? 22 A Shortly after, we had a phone call. 23 Q Did you call this person, or did this 24 person call you? 25 A This person called me. 12:21</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p>
<p>1 Q And who was that someone? 12:19 2 A They didn't identify themselves by name 3 but as a relative. 4 Q And how did you receive this 5 communication? 12:19 6 A Through social media. 7 Q Which social media? 8 A I believe it was Twitter. 9 Q So your first communication that caused 10 you to later repeat these things about "Groupie" 12:19 11 came in an unidentified tweet? 12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates 13 testimony; lacks foundation. 14 MR. KING: Well, I'm just asking her if 15 I've got it correct so I can move on. 12:20 16 THE WITNESS: It was a private message, 17 but yes. 18 BY MR. KING: 19 Q Okay. I just want to make sure. 20 So sometimes in 2016 or 2017, you received 12:20 21 a private message from an unidentified sender -- 22 A Yes. 23 Q -- correct? 24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I thought you were about 25 to misstate her testimony. I will withdraw that. 12:20</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 Q And is it a man or a woman? 12:21 2 A I believe it was a woman. 3 Q You're not sure? 4 A I can't be sure, no. 5 Q Okay. So someone called you. Do you know 12:22 6 how they got your phone number? 7 A No. 8 Q Did you DM them your phone number and ask 9 them to call you? 10 A I don't recall. 12:22 11 Q Okay. So you get a phone call. How long 12 after you got the DM did the phone call take place? 13 A Very shortly after. 14 Q And how long was the phone call? 15 A About -- I would say about 45 minutes to 12:22 16 an hour. 17 Q At the time of this 45-minute-to-an-hour 18 phone call, did you know who you were speaking to? 19 A I did not. 20 Q Did you ask the person's name? 12:22 21 A No. My feeling was that they were scared. 22 Q Why did you reach the conclusion that they 23 were scared? 24 A Because they wanted anonymity. 25 Q Did they tell you that? 12:23</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1 A I don't recall exactly. 12:23
2 Q Did you have -- now, I want to make sure.
3 In 2016, '17 or anytime thereafter, you --
4 I'm sorry. You've never had any relationship with
5 Mr. Warner; correct? 12:23
6 A Correct, yes.
7 Q Do you -- did you have any idea why, in
8 2016 or 2017, somebody was reaching out to you with
9 respect to the "Groupie" video?
10 A I believe they reached out to me in 2018, 12:23
11 '19 during the Phoenix Act.
12 Q Okay. Long after you saw the Andy Dick
13 "Dinner For Five" video?
14 A Yes.
15 Q So let's go back then to the Andy Dick 12:23
16 "Dinner For Five" video. I think you told me
17 that -- I might be wrong -- that's the first time
18 you heard something that caused you to conclude that
19 Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile?
20 A Yes. 12:24
21 Q And what is it about the "Dinner For Five"
22 video that caused you to conclude that Mr. Warner
23 was a rapist pedophile?
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Argumentative.
25 Go ahead. 12:24

Page 26

1 THE WITNESS: In the video, the age of the 12:24
2 participant is mentioned, and Brian Warner himself
3 talks about potentially being prosecuted or indicted
4 because of the film.
5 BY MR. KING: 12:24
6 Q What do you recall him saying that caused
7 you to conclude he was a rapist pedophile?
8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Argumentative;
9 misstates testimony.
10 THE WITNESS: That he could be prosecuted 12:24
11 if the film was released and that it was generally
12 funny that his manager didn't want him to release
13 it.
14 BY MR. KING:
15 Q And did you know anything about Mr. Warner 12:25
16 before you watched "Dinner For Five"?
17 A Not very much other than pop culture and
18 growing up in the '90s era.
19 Q By the time you watched "Dinner For Five,"
20 did you have some understanding that Mr. Warner was 12:25
21 considered to be a rather provocative artist?
22 A Vaguely. I wasn't -- I wasn't someone who
23 followed his work.
24 Q Right. Understanding that, did you have,
25 though, an understanding that he was known for 12:25

Page 27

1 taking provocative positions, often poking at 12:25
2 various social mores?
3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
4 foundation; vague.
5 THE WITNESS: I was aware of the 12:25
6 objectification of women and violence and
7 provocation, yes.
8 BY MR. KING:
9 Q Okay. And were you aware that there's --
10 at the time, were you aware that there's a 12:26
11 difference between image and reality sometimes when
12 it comes to professional actors or musicians or
13 artists?
14 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
15 foundation; argumentative. 12:26
16 You can answer if you understand the
17 question.
18 THE WITNESS: Could you please rephrase
19 the question?
20 BY MR. KING: 12:26
21 Q 2016 to 2017, did you believe everything
22 you heard when an artist started talking about what
23 it is they were doing?
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Overbroad;
25 argumentative. 12:26

Page 28

1 THE WITNESS: Could you potentially please 12:26
2 be more specific or --
3 BY MR. KING:
4 Q Sure.
5 A I'm confused about -- 12:26
6 Q It's not my goal to confuse you, so let me
7 just try it from a different angle.
8 A Thank you.
9 Q You understood in 2016 and 2017 that
10 Mr. Warner had a reputation as an artist that tended 12:26
11 to provoke people; is that correct?
12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
13 foundation; misstates testimony.
14 THE WITNESS: I -- I don't believe I knew
15 about -- enough about Mr. Warner's career to make 12:27
16 that general conclusion.
17 BY MR. KING:
18 Q Okay. But something about the "Dinner For
19 Five" video convinced you that Mr. Warner was a
20 rapist pedophile? 12:27
21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
22 foundation; argumentative; misstates testimony.
23 THE WITNESS: It led me to look into more
24 videos about -- more interviews about the subject.
25 BY MR. KING: 12:27

Page 29

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 Q About Mr. Warner? 12:27</p> <p>2 A About the "Groupie" video, yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And so what did you do to research</p> <p>4 the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>5 A I did a general Google search. 12:27</p> <p>6 Q What did you search for?</p> <p>7 A The "Groupie" video specifically and</p> <p>8 Marilyn Manson.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Did you ever see the "Groupie"</p> <p>10 video? 12:28</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q What results of your search confirmed your</p> <p>13 opinion that Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile?</p> <p>14 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>15 testimony; argumentative. 12:28</p> <p>16 Howard, I'm trying to give you some leeway</p> <p>17 here, but you continue to misstate her testimony as</p> <p>18 to her characterization of Mr. Warner. So please</p> <p>19 rephrase your question.</p> <p>20 BY MR. KING: 12:28</p> <p>21 Q Are you able to answer the question,</p> <p>22 Ms. Gore?</p> <p>23 A Could you please rephrase it?</p> <p>24 Q Let's go back.</p> <p>25 At or about the time you watched the 12:28</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 lacks foundation. 12:29</p> <p>2 Instruct you not to answer.</p> <p>3 If you want to reframe it to be tailored</p> <p>4 to the "Groupie" video, then I'll allow it, but</p> <p>5 generalized questioning is outside the scope of the 12:29</p> <p>6 order.</p> <p>7 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>8 Q Well, you've told people -- you've told</p> <p>9 many people that the "Groupie" video showed that</p> <p>10 Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile; is that correct? 12:29</p> <p>11 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>12 foundation; misstates testimony.</p> <p>13 You can answer.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat</p> <p>15 the question? 12:30</p> <p>16 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>17 Q You've told many people that the "Groupie"</p> <p>18 video demonstrates that Mr. Warner is a rapist</p> <p>19 pedophile, or words to that effect; correct?</p> <p>20 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:30</p> <p>21 foundation; misstates testimony; assumes facts not</p> <p>22 in evidence.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I believed the information</p> <p>24 that was relayed to me from the relative.</p> <p>25 BY MR. KING: 12:30</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>
<p>1 "Dinner For Five" video, you concluded that 12:28</p> <p>2 Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile; correct?</p> <p>3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Misstates testimony.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>5 BY MR. KING: 12:28</p> <p>6 Q When did you conclude that Mr. Warner was</p> <p>7 a rapist pedophile?</p> <p>8 A I don't --</p> <p>9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>10 testimony. 12:28</p> <p>11 Go ahead.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the exact</p> <p>13 date.</p> <p>14 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>15 Q Can you give me the year? 12:28</p> <p>16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>17 testimony.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I just supported the</p> <p>19 experience of anyone who reached out to me and</p> <p>20 stated that. I don't recall the exact date. 12:29</p> <p>21 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>22 Q Well, who reached out to you and told you</p> <p>23 that Mr. Warner was a rapist pedophile?</p> <p>24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the</p> <p>25 scope of the discovery order; misstates testimony; 12:29</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 Q I'll get to that. I just -- your lawyer 12:30</p> <p>2 has raised a good objection, foundation. That means</p> <p>3 I have to start with the first brick before I put</p> <p>4 the second brick on. So I just want to make sure</p> <p>5 we're here on the same page. 12:30</p> <p>6 For whatever reason -- and we'll get into</p> <p>7 those reasons -- you've told many people that the</p> <p>8 "Groupie" video demonstrates that Mr. Warner is a</p> <p>9 rapist or a pedophile; correct?</p> <p>10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates 12:31</p> <p>11 testimony; assumes facts not in evidence; lacks</p> <p>12 foundation.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I don't believe that it has</p> <p>14 been many. I have told people.</p> <p>15 BY MR. KING: 12:31</p> <p>16 Q So you have told people that the "Groupie"</p> <p>17 video shows that Mr. Warner is a rapist or a</p> <p>18 pedophile; correct?</p> <p>19 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>20 foundation; misstates testimony; assumes facts not 12:31</p> <p>21 in evidence.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I have not told anyone that</p> <p>23 I believe "Groupie" includes rape.</p> <p>24 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>25 Q Okay. What have you told people -- I'm 12:31</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 sorry. 12:31 2 You've told people that the "Groupie" 3 video shows that Mr. Warner is a pedophile; correct? 4 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 5 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence; misstates 12:31 6 testimony. 7 THE WITNESS: I've told people that I 8 believed the participant in the video was underage. 9 BY MR. KING: 10 Q Right. Who have you told that to? 12:32 11 A I said that to Kathryn McGaffigan. 12 Q We'll get to her. 13 Who else? 14 A I believe Evan Rachel Wood and 15 Esmé Bianco. 12:32 16 Q Who else? 17 A I don't recall anyone else. 18 Q Your sister Bryton Gore? 19 A I did not talk to Bryton about 20 Brian Warner. 12:32 21 Q At all? 22 A No. 23 Q And when did you tell Kathryn McGaffigan 24 that the actress in "Groupie" was a minor? 25 A Around -- I believe it was around October 12:33 Page 34</p>	<p>1 Jeanette Polard who was in the film? 12:35 2 A From the relative that had reached out to 3 me. 4 Q The unidentified alleged relative? 5 A Yes. 12:35 6 Q Any other reason you thought Jeanette -- 7 is it Jeanette Polard? Is -- 8 A Yes, I believe so. 9 Q Any other reason you thought the actress 10 in the "Groupie" video was Jeanette Polard? 12:35 11 A Yes. 12 Q What other reasons? 13 A Jeanette Polard was in the -- I believe it 14 was the Dead to the World tour, VHS, and had 15 followed the band, as one of the Slasher sisters, as 12:35 16 a teenager. And Jeanette, in the film, had the same 17 jewelry on as the -- at least the visuals that were 18 shown of "Groupie" at the end of the VHS. 19 Q Okay. I just want to -- you've never seen 20 the "Groupie" video? 12:36 21 A No. 22 Q I'm correct that you have never seen the 23 "Groupie" video; right? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Did you ever make any attempts to see the 12:36 Page 36</p>
<p>1 2020. 12:33 2 Q Okay. And when did you tell Evan Rachel 3 Wood that the actress was a minor? 4 A I don't recall the exact date. 5 Q Was it before you told Kathryn? 12:33 6 A I don't recall. Sorry. 7 Q And when did you tell -- when did you tell 8 Esmé Bianco? 9 A I don't recall that either. Sorry. 10 Q So between the time you saw "Dinner For 12:33 11 Five" and when you told at least these three people 12 that Mr. Warner had filmed -- I'm sorry. Let me 13 step back and lay a foundation. 14 What do you recall telling each of these 15 people, in as much detail as you can, about the 12:34 16 "Groupie" video? So let's start with Kathryn. 17 What did you tell Kathryn, in as much 18 detail as you can recall, about the "Groupie" video? 19 A I can't recall exactly. I told her that I 20 said I believed that the participant was a minor, 12:34 21 and I repeated Brian Warner's own words from videos 22 about the film. And I would have generally asked -- 23 I believe asked if she could confirm whether or not 24 Jeanette Polard who was in the film. 25 Q And why did you believe it was 12:35 Page 35</p>	<p>1 "Groupie" video? 12:36 2 A I looked for it online. 3 Q What did you do to look for it online? 4 A I looked at web archive. 5 Q So any other steps you took, between the 12:36 6 "Dinner For Five" video viewing and talking to 7 Kathryn McGaffigan, that led you to conclude the 8 actress was Jeanette Polard? 9 A Yes. 10 Q What did you do? 12:37 11 A I searched online on social media. 12 Q What searches did you undertake? 13 A The people generally talking on social 14 media about who the actress in the film could be. 15 Q Did you look at Ms. Polard's IMDb? Do you 12:37 16 know what IM -- you know what IMDb is; right? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Did you -- that's a resume, basically; 19 right? 20 A It generally shows -- my belief is that it 12:37 21 shows a -- kind of a discography of what people did 22 in films or productions. 23 Q Did you check her IMDb? 24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Vague as to 25 time. 12:38 Page 37</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MR. KING: 12:38</p> <p>2 Q Anytime, as part of your investigation</p> <p>3 into the "Groupie" video.</p> <p>4 A I do not recall doing that.</p> <p>5 Q You did understand, at the times you were 12:38</p> <p>6 telling people that Mr. Warner had used an underage</p> <p>7 actress in a simulated sex scene, that that was a</p> <p>8 rather serious allegation; right?</p> <p>9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>10 foundation; argumentative; misstates prior 12:38</p> <p>11 testimony.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I understand that that is</p> <p>13 serious, yes.</p> <p>14 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>15 Q Okay. That that's a derogatory comment 12:38</p> <p>16 about Mr. Warner; right?</p> <p>17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Argumentative;</p> <p>18 lacks foundation.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I disagree that it's</p> <p>20 derogatory. 12:38</p> <p>21 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>22 Q You disagree that it's derogatory?</p> <p>23 A Yeah.</p> <p>24 Q Do you believe that stating that someone</p> <p>25 has used an underage actress in a simulated sex 12:39</p> <p align="right">Page 38</p>	<p>1 underage actress in a simulated sex scene in a film 12:40</p> <p>2 is an indication of pedophilia; right?</p> <p>3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>4 testimony.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Could you repeat 12:40</p> <p>6 that?</p> <p>7 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>8 Q Right. Before we get to the truth or</p> <p>9 falsity of what actually happened, would you agree</p> <p>10 with me that accusing someone of using an underage 12:40</p> <p>11 actress in a simulated sex scene in a film is</p> <p>12 tantamount to an accusation of pedophilia?</p> <p>13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>14 foundation; argumentative.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12:41</p> <p>16 MR. KUMP: I'm also -- this is Mr. Kump.</p> <p>17 I'm also going to interpose an objection</p> <p>18 because you've just been mischaracterizing the</p> <p>19 witness's testimony. There's no testimony from this</p> <p>20 witness that she ever made a statement that there 12:41</p> <p>21 was an underage actress used in a sexual scene.</p> <p>22 That's not her testimony.</p> <p>23 So I object to mischaracterizing the</p> <p>24 testimony.</p> <p>25 MR. KING: Can you read the question back? 12:41</p> <p align="right">Page 40</p>
<p>1 scene is basically a claim that someone is a 12:39</p> <p>2 pedophile?</p> <p>3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>4 foundation; argumentative.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12:39</p> <p>6 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>7 Q And you don't think that's derogatory?</p> <p>8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Argumentative;</p> <p>9 misstates testimony.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I don't believe it is if it 12:39</p> <p>11 is the truth.</p> <p>12 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>13 Q Okay. But if it's -- would you agree with</p> <p>14 me that that's a derogatory statement if it turns</p> <p>15 out to be false? 12:39</p> <p>16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Do you mean in</p> <p>18 the context of "Groupie"?</p> <p>19 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>20 Q Yes. 12:40</p> <p>21 A Because I have not seen the film, I don't</p> <p>22 know that I can answer.</p> <p>23 Q Well, let me try to break it down because</p> <p>24 I haven't seen the film either. I believe you've</p> <p>25 acknowledged that saying that Mr. Warner used an 12:40</p> <p align="right">Page 39</p>	<p>1 MR. KUMP: Well, I understand you put that 12:41</p> <p>2 in the question, but I'm saying that the witness has</p> <p>3 never said the only allegation in the complaint is</p> <p>4 that there was a statement that the person in the</p> <p>5 shoot was underage or a minor. 12:41</p> <p>6 MR. KING: Okay. Mike, really, we don't</p> <p>7 need to make speaking objections. Your objection is</p> <p>8 noted. I've asked the court reporter to repeat the</p> <p>9 question for the witness.</p> <p>10 (Whereupon the record was read as follows: 12:42</p> <p>11 "Question: Before we get to the truth or</p> <p>12 falsity of what actually happened, would you</p> <p>13 agree with me that accusing someone of using</p> <p>14 an underage actress in a simulated sex scene</p> <p>15 in a film is tantamount to an accusation of 12:42</p> <p>16 pedophilia?")</p> <p>17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I again object that you're</p> <p>18 misstating prior testimony and mischaracterizing the</p> <p>19 witness's testimony.</p> <p>20 BY MR. KING: 12:42</p> <p>21 Q Are you able to answer that question,</p> <p>22 Ms. Gore?</p> <p>23 A Am I correct in saying that you are</p> <p>24 comparing any film and a sexual act with a minor to</p> <p>25 pedophilia? 12:42</p> <p align="right">Page 41</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MR. KING: 12:47</p> <p>2 Q Do you recall telling people that based</p> <p>3 upon what you knew of "Groupie," that Mr. Warner was</p> <p>4 a pedophile?</p> <p>5 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:47</p> <p>6 foundation; argumentative; misstates testimony.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I don't recall doing that.</p> <p>8 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>9 Q Well, have you ever told anybody that</p> <p>10 Mr. Warner is a pedophile? 12:48</p> <p>11 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the</p> <p>12 scope's order -- scope of the Court's order;</p> <p>13 argumentative; lacks foundation.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: No. I don't recall ever</p> <p>15 stating to people specifically that he was a 12:48</p> <p>16 pedophile.</p> <p>17 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So you never told anybody that</p> <p>19 Mr. Warner is a pedophile; right?</p> <p>20 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. 12:48</p> <p>21 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>22 Q Or you don't remember.</p> <p>23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>24 foundation. This is well beyond -- and this is well</p> <p>25 beyond the scope of the Court's order. 12:48</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 A Yes. 12:50</p> <p>2 Q And what was that?</p> <p>3 A That she had committed suicide.</p> <p>4 Q Anything else?</p> <p>5 A Not that I recall. 12:50</p> <p>6 Q By the way, have you now learned that</p> <p>7 every one of those statements is false?</p> <p>8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>9 foundation; misstates -- assumes facts not in</p> <p>10 evidence; misstates the record. 12:50</p> <p>11 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>12 Q Let me rephrase it.</p> <p>13 Have you now learned that Jeanette Polard</p> <p>14 was not in "Groupie"?</p> <p>15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:50</p> <p>16 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>18 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>19 Q So as you sit here today, based upon</p> <p>20 anything you've learned, you still believe the 12:51</p> <p>21 statements given to you by the alleged unidentified</p> <p>22 relative of Jeanette Polard are true?</p> <p>23 A I have no reason not to believe them.</p> <p>24 Q Well, you've heard, right, since this</p> <p>25 litigation started, that, in fact, the actress in 12:51</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I don't recall doing that, 12:48</p> <p>2 no.</p> <p>3 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And do you recall ever actually</p> <p>5 telling people that Mr. Warner committed a crime in 12:48</p> <p>6 the way he used an actress in "Groupie"?</p> <p>7 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>8 answered several times now.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I recall repeating</p> <p>10 Brian Warner's words and the words from the 12:49</p> <p>11 relative.</p> <p>12 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>13 Q Well, what words from the unidentified</p> <p>14 alleged relative did you repeat to anybody on this</p> <p>15 topic? 12:49</p> <p>16 A I repeated that the worry that</p> <p>17 Jeanette Polard was underage had been -- the police</p> <p>18 had been involved at one point in the -- I believe</p> <p>19 it was the Dead to the World tour, VHS, in</p> <p>20 retrieving her as a teenager and that they were 12:49</p> <p>21 worried that she was the star of the film and was</p> <p>22 underage.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Is there anything else that you</p> <p>24 recall learning from the unidentified alleged</p> <p>25 relative of Jeanette Polard? 12:50</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 "Groupie" was a woman named Pola Weiss; correct? 12:51</p> <p>2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection.</p> <p>3 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>4 Q Have you learned that? Have you ever</p> <p>5 heard that? 12:51</p> <p>6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Lacks foundation; assumes</p> <p>7 facts not in evidence.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>9 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>10 Q Have you done any investigation whatsoever 12:51</p> <p>11 to see if the previous statements you've made about</p> <p>12 the actress in "Groupie" were false?</p> <p>13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the</p> <p>14 scope of the Court's order; argumentative; lacks --</p> <p>15 and also assumes facts not in evidence. 12:52</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Not -- not recently, no.</p> <p>17 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>18 Q Well, how about ever? Have you ever done</p> <p>19 any investigation into whether you were mistaken by</p> <p>20 claiming that Jeanette Polard was the actress in 12:52</p> <p>21 "Groupie" and had committed suicide?</p> <p>22 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Compound;</p> <p>23 lacks foundation; assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>24 MR. KING: Well, it is compound, so let me</p> <p>25 break it down. 12:52</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1 BY MR. KING: 12:52
2 Q Have you ever done any investigation into
3 whether or not you were incorrect in claiming that
4 Jeanette Polard was the actress in "Groupie"?"
5 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates -- 12:52
6 or assumes facts not in evidence; lacks foundation.
7 THE WITNESS: That was my intent in any
8 investigation.
9 BY MR. KING:
10 Q Did you do any investigation? 12:53
11 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and
12 answered; vague as to time. The Court's order would
13 limit the scope of this inquiry to investigation
14 prior to making any statements.
15 You can answer in that context. 12:53
16 MR. KING: I'm not limiting the question
17 in any way, shape, or form to that.
18 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Well, I'll instruct you to
19 answer only as to investigation that you did prior
20 to making statements because that's consistent with 12:53
21 the Court's order.
22 THE WITNESS: No. My -- no, I have not.
23 Then really my investigation was to understand the
24 film and if we could identify any part of the film
25 or anyone in it. 12:53

Page 50

1 BY MR. KING: 12:53
2 Q What do you mean by "we"?
3 A I meant "I."
4 Q Well, you're working with others on claims
5 against Mr. Warner, aren't you? 12:54
6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates --
7 or lacks foundation; assumes facts not in evidence;
8 outside the scope.
9 I'll instruct you not to answer.
10 BY MR. KING: 12:54
11 Q Have you ever made any retraction of false
12 statements you've previously made about the
13 "Groupie" video?
14 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Assumes not --
15 facts not in evidence that there were any false 12:54
16 statements; argumentative.
17 THE WITNESS: I don't believe my
18 statements were false.
19 BY MR. KING:
20 Q My question was: Have you ever made any 12:54
21 retraction of any of the statements you've made
22 about the "Groupie" video?
23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same objections.
24 THE WITNESS: No.
25 BY MR. KING: 12:54

Page 51

1 Q Okay. So I want to make sure I have 12:55
2 exhausted the sources of your information that there
3 was a minor in the "Groupie" video.
4 You've said the "Dinner For Five" video,
5 statements made by Warner, statements made by Ciulla 12:55
6 and one or more communications with an unidentified
7 alleged relative of an actress named
8 Jeanette Polard.
9 Can you identify any other sources of the
10 information you relied upon in forming the opinion 12:55
11 that you communicated to third parties that the
12 "Groupie" video included an underage actress?
13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Compound;
14 lacks foundation as to the statements.
15 You can answer. 12:55
16 THE WITNESS: I don't recall at this time.
17 I believe that is correct.
18 BY MR. KING:
19 Q And the phone call from the unidentified
20 alleged relative came at or around the time that you 12:56
21 were working on the Phoenix Act?
22 A Correct, yes.
23 Q So I know you gave me the year, and I
24 didn't write it down. When did you start working on
25 the Phoenix Act? 12:56

Page 52

1 A 2018. 12:56
2 Q And you think the call came in 2018, or
3 could it have been later?
4 A It could have been later.
5 Q Okay. How much later could it have been? 12:56
6 A I believe it was within a 12-month scope.
7 Q And what is the Phoenix Act?
8 A The Phoenix Act is domestic violence
9 advocacy.
10 Q Is it an organization? 12:56
11 A It was a not-for-profit.
12 Q Does it still exist?
13 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope
14 of the Court's order.
15 MR. KING: I'll withdraw the question. 12:57
16 It's not --
17 Yeah. Fair enough, Mike.
18 BY MR. KING:
19 Q Did you have a position with the Phoenix
20 Act? 12:57
21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the
22 scope of the Court's order.
23 Instruct you not to answer.
24 MR. KING: Well, I disagree with you
25 because we're getting into -- I mean, I realize 12:57

Page 53

CONFIDENTIAL

1 you're trying to limit malice to before the 12:57
2 statement, and I don't think malice is limited -- I
3 don't think the malice inquiry cuts off as to the
4 date of the statement.
5 But the statements apparently were made 12:57
6 while she was working for the Phoenix Act, so I
7 think they're very relevant as to her motive and
8 state of mind.
9 But if you want to -- if you want to just
10 say she's not going to answer questions about the 12:57
11 Phoenix Act, we'll just reserve that for argument
12 later, or I'll ask the question. So your choice.
13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Well, I think the case law
14 is clear that the inquiry on malice is limited to
15 the statements in the time period that the 12:58
16 statements were made, not any generalized inquiry.
17 So I am instructing her not to answer. I
18 don't see any basis for inquiring into her position
19 for the Phoenix Act or anything related to the
20 Phoenix Act unless you're going to tie the questions 12:58
21 back to "Groupie" somehow.
22 BY MR. KING:
23 Q Okay. Well, in your role, which I don't
24 know what it is yet because your lawyer hasn't
25 allowed me to -- hasn't allowed you to answer. In 12:58
Page 54

1 your role as part of the Phoenix Act, did you 12:58
2 communicate with alleged accusers of Mr. Warner that
3 he had participated in the use of a minor actress in
4 a video called "Groupie"?
5 A Sorry. I don't understand the question. 12:58
6 Can you rephrase?
7 Q Was Esmé Bianco one of the accusers of
8 Mr. Warner, accusing him of sexual assault?
9 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope
10 of the Court's order. 12:59
11 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join.
12 THE WITNESS: Esmé Bianco is -- is an
13 alleged victim of Brian Warner's, yes.
14 BY MR. KING:
15 Q And you discussed the "Groupie" video with 12:59
16 Esmé Bianco; correct?
17 A I believe so.
18 Q And that was at a time you were working
19 for the Phoenix Act; correct?
20 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 12:59
21 foundation.
22 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so.
23 BY MR. KING:
24 Q Was it before you were working for the
25 Phoenix Act? 12:59
Page 55

1 A No. 12:59
2 Q Was it after?
3 Well, when did you -- when did you stop
4 working for the Phoenix Act?
5 A I volunteered my time with the Phoenix 01:00
6 Act. It was primarily a lobbyist effort. So it was
7 on and off.
8 Q When did you have the conversation with
9 Esmé Bianco where you communicated your beliefs on
10 "Groupie"? 01:00
11 A I believe I would have communicated it
12 in -- around 2020.
13 Q And did you have one or more than one
14 conversation with Esmé regarding -- where you
15 mentioned the "Groupie" video in 2020 or any other 01:00
16 time?
17 A Not more than one.
18 Q And who else was present for that
19 conversation?
20 A No one. 01:00
21 Q Where was it at? Was it on the phone? In
22 person?
23 A I don't recall.
24 Q You don't recall if it was on the phone or
25 in person? 01:00
Page 56

1 A No. 01:00
2 Q Okay. What do you recall of the
3 conversation?
4 A I believe I repeated the words from the
5 relative. 01:01
6 Q What words did you communicate to
7 Esmé Bianco?
8 A The worry that the relative had for
9 Jeanette Polard.
10 (Simultaneous speakers.) 01:01
11 A I don't recall --
12 Q I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off.
13 A I don't recall the exact words.
14 Q Well, give me the general content of what
15 you communicated to her that you had heard from the 01:01
16 alleged relative.
17 A The relative stated that they believed
18 that Jeanette Polard was in the "Groupie" film and
19 that she was underage at the time of filming.
20 Q Do you know what year the "Groupie" film 01:02
21 was made?
22 A Not off the top of my head, no.
23 Q Many years before 2020; right?
24 A Yes, I believe so, yes.
25 Q And why were you bringing this up to 01:02
Page 57

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 Esmé Bianco? 01:02</p> <p>2 A Probably because it disturbed me.</p> <p>3 Q Five, six, seven years later, you were</p> <p>4 still disturbed by what you had heard from this</p> <p>5 relative in 2018? 01:02</p> <p>6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>7 foundation. You've got your time wrong there.</p> <p>8 MR. KING: Well, maybe I did.</p> <p>9 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>10 Q You heard from the relative, if I wrote it 01:02</p> <p>11 down correctly, after the Phoenix Act started;</p> <p>12 right?</p> <p>13 A Yes. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And when did the Phoenix Act start?</p> <p>15 A In [inaudible]. 01:03</p> <p>16 Q So --</p> <p>17 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: '18. I believe it started</p> <p>19 late 2018. It could have been 2019.</p> <p>20 BY MR. KING: 01:03</p> <p>21 Q All right. So let's make sure that Maggie</p> <p>22 and I are on the same timeline.</p> <p>23 The first time you heard from this alleged</p> <p>24 relative was 2018 or 2019 after you had started</p> <p>25 working with the Phoenix Act; correct? 01:03</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 Q Did she say that she had been involved in 01:05</p> <p>2 sex with Brian Warner/Marilyn Manson or somebody</p> <p>3 else in the band, or was she no more specific than</p> <p>4 the Marilyn Manson band?</p> <p>5 A I don't recall exactly who. It was 01:05</p> <p>6 just -- it was the band in general.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So no one has ever told you that</p> <p>8 Brian Warner had sex with this alleged underage</p> <p>9 actress; correct?</p> <p>10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 01:05</p> <p>11 foundation.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: They -- no. They just</p> <p>13 worried that that is what happened.</p> <p>14 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>15 Q So from that -- have we exhausted your 01:06</p> <p>16 knowledge on what this alleged relative told you</p> <p>17 about the actress?</p> <p>18 And let me --</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q -- let me just compound the question. 01:06</p> <p>21 I want to make sure I've heard from you</p> <p>22 everything you learned from this relative that</p> <p>23 caused you such concern that a year or two later,</p> <p>24 you had to bring it up with Esmé Bianco.</p> <p>25 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 01:06</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p>
<p>1 A Yes. 01:03</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And this is many years after the</p> <p>3 "Groupie" video was made; correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And the alleged relative communicated to 01:03</p> <p>6 you that Jeanette Polard was a minor at the time she</p> <p>7 participated in the filming of "Groupie"; right?</p> <p>8 A Correct, yes.</p> <p>9 Q And did she tell you that this</p> <p>10 Jeanette Polard was engaged in any simulated sex 01:04</p> <p>11 scene in the film?</p> <p>12 A She -- no. That the -- I don't believe</p> <p>13 so. I don't recall, but no.</p> <p>14 Q What did this alleged relative tell you,</p> <p>15 beyond that her relative had been an underage 01:04</p> <p>16 actress in a film, that caused you concern?</p> <p>17 A That Jeanette Polard had been involved</p> <p>18 sexually with the Marilyn Manson band.</p> <p>19 Q In the film?</p> <p>20 A I don't recall the film because I 01:05</p> <p>21 haven't -- no one has seen it.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. So she told you -- he or she told</p> <p>23 you that her relative had been involved in sex with</p> <p>24 the Marilyn Manson band. Did I hear you correctly?</p> <p>25 A Yes. 01:05</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 foundation; misstates testimony. 01:06</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Could you repeat the</p> <p>3 question?</p> <p>4 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>5 Q Sure. 01:06</p> <p>6 A few minutes ago you testified that you</p> <p>7 brought up the "Groupie" video with Esmé Bianco in</p> <p>8 2020 based upon the worries that had been</p> <p>9 communicated to you by the alleged relative of the</p> <p>10 actress. 01:07</p> <p>11 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>12 testimony; lacks foundation.</p> <p>13 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>14 Q Well, let's see if I've misstated your</p> <p>15 testimony. 01:07</p> <p>16 Am I accurate so far in what I've said?</p> <p>17 A I believe so.</p> <p>18 Q So a year or two later, there must have</p> <p>19 been something about that conversation with the</p> <p>20 alleged relative that caused you to bring it up with 01:07</p> <p>21 Esmé Bianco, a woman who was accusing Mr. Warner of</p> <p>22 sexual assault.</p> <p>23 I'm just trying to find out if there's</p> <p>24 anything else from that conversation you had with</p> <p>25 the alleged relative that caused you to convey the 01:07</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 information to Ms. Bianco. 01:07</p> <p>2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>3 foundation as to the reason it came up in the</p> <p>4 conversation; argumentative.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the reason 01:08</p> <p>6 why I brought it up to Esmé Bianco, but that -- the</p> <p>7 information did disturb me, yes.</p> <p>8 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>9 Q Which information? The information that</p> <p>10 the actress was having sex with the Marilyn Manson 01:08</p> <p>11 band or that the actress was in a film?</p> <p>12 A That a relative felt the need to</p> <p>13 communicate with me about the film.</p> <p>14 Q What about the film was communicated to</p> <p>15 you by the alleged relative that caused you concern? 01:08</p> <p>16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>17 answered several times now.</p> <p>18 MR. KUMP: Join in that.</p> <p>19 I know you don't like the answer so you</p> <p>20 want to ask the question again, but this is getting 01:09</p> <p>21 abusive.</p> <p>22 MR. KING: Okay.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: After seeing the "Dinner For</p> <p>24 Five" interview and the interviews with Brian Warner</p> <p>25 where he talks about potential prosecution, having a 01:09</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 whether underage actresses should be in films? 01:10</p> <p>2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Overbroad;</p> <p>3 vague; outside the scope.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I have never had experiences</p> <p>5 of minors, that I know, or being a minor in the film 01:10</p> <p>6 industry, so I don't have much of an opinion on it.</p> <p>7 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Howard, when you get to a</p> <p>8 good stopping point, we've been going over an hour</p> <p>9 and could just use a quick break to --</p> <p>10 MR. KING: Yeah. Just give me a couple 01:11</p> <p>11 minutes, and we'll -- that's good.</p> <p>12 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>13 Q So what illegal activities did you believe</p> <p>14 were shown in the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>15 A I -- I'm not sure. I just know what 01:11</p> <p>16 Brian Warner spoke about in interviews, from his own</p> <p>17 words, that he could be prosecuted or indicted.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So other than Mr. Warner or</p> <p>19 Mr. Ciulla commenting on the film generally that</p> <p>20 they could be indicted or prosecuted for the film, 01:11</p> <p>21 you have never had any other knowledge of what</p> <p>22 illegal activities, if any, were shown in the</p> <p>23 "Groupie" video; correct?</p> <p>24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>25 foundation. 01:11</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>
<p>1 relative of someone whose name had come up in 01:09</p> <p>2 research about "Groupie" reach out and say that</p> <p>3 Jeanette had been involved in films with</p> <p>4 Brian Warner underage, it generally disturbed me</p> <p>5 that they believed that Jeanette Polard was in the 01:09</p> <p>6 "Groupie" film.</p> <p>7 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>8 Q I mean, do you have a general opinion that</p> <p>9 underage actresses should not appear in films?</p> <p>10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the 01:09</p> <p>11 scope; vague.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase the</p> <p>13 question, please?</p> <p>14 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>15 Q Do you have a general opinion that 01:10</p> <p>16 underage actresses should not be in films?</p> <p>17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the</p> <p>18 scope of the Court's order.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I believe it would depend on</p> <p>20 the context of the film. 01:10</p> <p>21 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>22 Q What do you mean by that?</p> <p>23 A If it involved illegal activities.</p> <p>24 Q Anything else about the context -- context</p> <p>25 of the film that would affect your opinion on 01:10</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: The "Groupie" film has not 01:11</p> <p>2 been released publicly; so, no, I don't know.</p> <p>3 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And nothing that the unidentified</p> <p>5 alleged relative told you gave you any information 01:12</p> <p>6 about any particular possible illegal activities in</p> <p>7 the "Groupie" film; correct?</p> <p>8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>9 testimony; lacks foundation.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No. That's incorrect. 01:12</p> <p>11 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>12 Q Okay. What did the unidentified alleged</p> <p>13 relative tell you that caused you to believe that</p> <p>14 illegal activities occurred in the "Groupie" film?</p> <p>15 A That Jeanette had been filmed underage on 01:12</p> <p>16 multiple occasions with Brian Warner.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Other than Jeanette or the actress</p> <p>18 being underage, was there anything else that you</p> <p>19 were told by the alleged relative that caused you to</p> <p>20 conclude there were illegal activities in connection 01:12</p> <p>21 with the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>22 A No. It was just my general feeling that</p> <p>23 she was quite disturbed and upset and believed that</p> <p>24 something illegal had happened.</p> <p>25 Q But did you ask her what illegal might 01:13</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1 have happened in the "Groupie" video? 01:13
2 A I don't recall.
3 Q Did she tell you what potential illegal
4 activity had so disturbed her in connection with the
5 "Groupie" film? 01:13
6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and
7 answered several times now.
8 THE WITNESS: She repeated Brian Warner's
9 words about the "Groupie" film and that it was
10 disturbing, that she worried for her relative. 01:13
11 BY MR. KING:
12 Q And that's it; that's the sole
13 recollection you have of what she told you about
14 potential illegal activity?
15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates 01:13
16 testimony.
17 THE WITNESS: That's -- from what I
18 recall, yes.
19 MR. KING: You want to take ten, Maggie?
20 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Sure. 01:13
21 MR. KING: Okay. We'll go off the record
22 for ten minutes.
23 And, by the way, before we go off the
24 record, the first question I'm going to ask you,
25 Ms. Gore, is, "Did you discuss your testimony with 01:14
Page 66

1 anybody during the break?" So -- 01:14
2 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
3 MR. KING: Fair enough. Okay.
4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Time on the
5 monitor is 1:14 p.m., and we are off of the record. 01:14
6 (Recess.)
7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time on the monitor is
8 1:29 p.m., and we are on the record.
9 BY MR. KING:
10 Q Ms. Gore, who, if anybody, did you speak 01:29
11 with or communicate with during our break?
12 A I did not communicate with anyone.
13 Q Thank you. I warned you.
14 So you told me that you discussed the
15 "Groupie" video with Kathryn McGaffigan, Evan 01:29
16 Rachel Wood, and Esmé Bianco. You said you didn't
17 discuss it with Bryton Gore. Is there anybody else
18 you discussed it with at any time prior to the
19 institution of this litigation?
20 A Not that I can recall at this time 01:30
21 specifically.
22 Q Okay. Who's Michelle Meyer?
23 A Michelle Meyer is a victim of
24 Brian Warner.
25 Q Okay. And you do communicate with her 01:30
Page 67

1 from time to time? 01:30
2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
3 foundation.
4 MR. KING: I'm sorry, Maggie. Did you say
5 something? 01:30
6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I said, "Objection. Lacks
7 foundation."
8 You can answer.
9 THE WITNESS: I have spoken to
10 Michelle Meyer before, yes. 01:30
11 REDACTED
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Beyond the
25 scope of the Court's order. 01:31
Page 68

1 Instruct you not to answer. 01:31
2 BY MR. KING:
3 Q Didn't you discuss the "Groupie" video
4 with Ms. Meyer?
5 A I don't believe so. I don't recall. 01:31
6 Q Did you tell -- did you speak with
7 Ms. Meyer several times in October of 2020?
8 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope
9 of the Court's order.
10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 01:32
11 THE WITNESS: I don't recall. I believe
12 potentially, yes, but I don't recall.
13 BY MR. KING:
14 Q Did you tell Ms. Meyer that Mr. Warner was
15 being investigated for child pornography? 01:32
16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Beyond the
17 scope of the Court's order.
18 I'll instruct you not to answer.
19 You've already asked her if she discussed
20 "Groupie" with Ms. Meyer. She said she didn't 01:32
21 recall doing so.
22 MR. KING: Well, I'm going to ask her the
23 questions and try to refresh her recollection, but
24 if you're instructing her not to answer, I'm not
25 going to get very far. 01:32
Page 69

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 So do you want to reconsider that 01:32 2 instruction or just we'll move on? 3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Do you want to ask her 4 again if she discussed "Groupie" with Ms. Meyer? 5 She -- 01:32 6 MR. KING: No. I've already asked that 7 question. 8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Okay. So you have not 9 established a foundation that this line of inquiry 10 is within the scope of the Court's order about the 01:32 11 "Groupie" video. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 Q Have you ever told Ms. Meyer that 14 Mr. Warner was being investigated for child 15 pornography? 01:33 16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same instruction. 17 BY MR. KING: 18 Q No answer? 19 A No answer. 20 Q Did you tell Mr. -- Ms. Meyer at any time 01:33 21 that the girl in the "Groupie" video was underage? 22 A I don't recall my conversation with 23 Ms. Meyer. 24 Q Did you ever tell Ms. Meyer that the girl 25 in the "Groupie" video was 16 years old when it was 01:33 Page 70</p>	<p>1 do that. I'm going to ask my questions. 01:34 2 So are you instructing her not to answer? 3 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I'd like to hear the 4 question again. 5 MR. KING: Could you read the question 01:34 6 back, please. 7 (Whereupon the record was read as follows: 8 "Question: Did you ever tell Ms. Meyer 9 that the girl in the 'Groupie' video did not 10 consent to everything that happened during 01:34 11 filming?") 12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Object that it's asked and 13 answered. 14 You can answer. 15 THE WITNESS: I don't recall a 01:35 16 conversation with Ms. Meyer. 17 BY MR. KING: 18 Q Did you ever tell Ms. Meyers that the 19 "Groupie" was child -- Ms. Meyer that the "Groupie" 20 film was child pornography? 01:35 21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and 22 answered; harassing. 23 THE WITNESS: I don't recall any of my 24 conversation with Michelle Meyers. 25 BY MR. KING: 01:35 Page 72</p>
<p>1 filmed? 01:33 2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and 3 answered. 4 THE WITNESS: I don't recall my 5 conversation with Ms. Meyer. 01:33 6 BY MR. KING: 7 Q So when you say you don't recall the 8 conversation with Ms. Meyer, it could be true; it 9 could be false; you have no idea; right? 10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates 01:33 11 testimony. 12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall at all, so. 13 BY MR. KING: 14 Q Did you ever tell Ms. Meyer that the girl 15 in the "Groupie" video did not consent to everything 01:34 16 that happened during filming? 17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and 18 answered. 19 Howard, this is getting badgering. You've 20 asked her several times if she recalls having a 01:34 21 conversation with Ms. Meyer about "Groupie." She 22 clearly said every single time that she doesn't 23 recall that, so it seems like -- 24 MR. KING: I'm going to ask my questions. 25 If you want to instruct her not to answer, you can 01:34 Page 71</p>	<p>1 Q Well, do you recall that the conversations 01:35 2 took place two years ago, approximately? 3 A I believe so. I can't recall the exact 4 date. 5 Q You have no recollection of anything that 01:35 6 was discussed during these conversations? 7 A Vague, very vague information. What I 8 previously stated about Michelle Meyers being a 9 victim, that is what I can recall at this time. 10 Q Did you tell Ms. Meyer that you would talk 01:36 11 to the actress's family members about the filming of 12 "Groupie" and the girl's suicide? 13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and 14 answered. 15 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the 01:36 16 conversation with Michelle Meyers. 17 BY MR. KING: 18 Q Did you tell Ms. Meyer that the "Groupie" 19 video contained evidence of felonies for which 20 Mr. Warner would be indicted? 01:36 21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Asked and 22 answered; lacks foundation. 23 THE WITNESS: I do not recall this 24 conversation. 25 BY MR. KING: 01:36 Page 73</p>

1 Q How many conversations do you believe you 01:36
2 had with Ms. Meyer in 2020?
3 A I can't be sure. I'm sorry.
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 BY MR. KING:
13 Q You don't have to answer. Your lawyer
14 told you -- directed you not to answer, but thank
15 you. 01:37
16 MR. KING: I'm going to introduce as
17 Exhibit 2 a Declaration of Bryton Gore.
18 Karen, it's document 10.
19 (Exhibit 2 marked.)
20 MS. SLOANE: Exhibit 2 has been posted. 01:38
21 BY MR. KING:
22 Q Exhibit 2 is a declaration of Bryton Gore
23 that's been filed in this pending action. I think
24 I've asked you -- I think you said you read parts of
25 this; you haven't read the whole thing. Is that -- 01:39
Page 74

1 did I recall your testimony correctly? 01:39
2 A Yes, you did.
3 Q Okay. Who is Bryton Gore?
4 A Bryton Gore is my identical twin sister.
5 Q And looking at this second page, you know, 01:39
6 the numbered paragraphs of her declaration, I'm
7 going to ask you about some of her sworn statements.
8 In paragraph 3, she says: She, referring
9 to you, told her that you were dating actress Evan
10 Rachel Wood. 01:39
11 Was that an accurate statement?
12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I'm going to object that
13 this is beyond the scope of the Court's order.
14 You can go ahead and answer.
15 MR. KUMP: Objection. Objection. It's 01:40
16 outside the scope of the Court's order, and I think
17 the witness should be instructed not to answer.
18 I mean, Howard, this is just -- you know,
19 you're just blatantly disregarding the Court's order
20 as you go along, and I think that that's wholly 01:40
21 improper.
22 MR. KING: Well, I disagree with you. I
23 think the fact of her relationship with Ms. Wood,
24 given that they communicated regarding the "Groupie"
25 video and the public statements made with respect to 01:40
Page 75

1 same, is highly relevant. 01:40
2 But, you know, again, we can agree to
3 disagree. You can -- you know, you're welcome to
4 instruct her on any of these. We'll take our list
5 to the judge. It's okay. 01:40
6 MS. ZIEMIANEK: You've already asked her
7 if she had any discussions with Ms. Gore about the
8 "Groupie" video. She said no.
9 So I don't see that you've established any
10 foundation why this line of inquiry would be proper 01:41
11 or within the scope of the Court's order.
12 So I will instruct her not to answer.
13 MR. KING: Well, the question was, was
14 that statement accurate that she was dating Evan
15 Rachel Wood. That's the -- that's the question 01:41
16 pending.
17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: If that's your only
18 question, I believe that's public information, and
19 she can answer that one question but --
20 MR. KING: Thank you, your Honor. It's 01:41
21 not my only question, but let's answer the
22 questions. You can object question by question.
23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: You can answer that one
24 question.
25 THE WITNESS: At the time of being in 01:41
Page 76

1 Australia, when I would have spoken to my sister, 01:41
2 Ms. Wood and I were not dating.
3 BY MR. KING:
4 Q Okay. Over what period of time were you
5 and Ms. Wood dating? 01:41
6 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope
7 of the Court's order.
8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join.
9 And I'll instruct you not to answer.
10 BY MR. KING: 01:41
11 Q Were you ever dating Evan Rachel Wood?
12 MR. KUMP: Same question; same objection.
13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same instruction.
14 MR. KING: So no answers -- there will be
15 no answers allowed regarding Ms. Gore's relationship 01:42
16 with Ms. Wood, just so I understand and I can move
17 on; is that right, Maggie?
18 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Unless you can somehow tie
19 it to the "Groupie" statements on which the Court
20 allowed you discovery, no, there will be no general 01:42
21 inquiry about their relationship.
22 MR. KING: Okay.
23 BY MR. KING:
24 Q Who is Alabama?
25 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 01:42
Page 77

CONFIDENTIAL

1 of the Court's order. 01:42
2 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same, yes. It's outside
3 the scope of the order.
4 And I'll instruct you not to answer.
5 BY MR. KING: 01:43
6 Q Given whatever feelings you have for
7 Mr. Warner, have you purposely tried to publicly
8 harass him?
9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
10 foundation as to any feelings she has about 01:43
11 Mr. Warner; misstates prior testimony; and outside
12 the scope of the Court's order.
13 I'll instruct you not to answer.
14 BY MR. KING:
15 Q Because of your feelings for Mr. Warner, 01:43
16 did you call the Los Angeles Police Department and
17 report that they should investigate Mr. Warner's
18 welfare at his home?
19 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks
20 foundation as to any feelings about Mr. Warner and 01:44
21 clearly within the scope of discovery that the Court
22 prohibited.
23 I'll instruct you not to answer.
24 MR. KUMP: Yeah. This -- yeah. Howard,
25 this is just -- this is just a complete violation of 01:44
Page 78

1 the Court's order, and now you're just going to run 01:44
2 the table and try to go through the allegations in
3 the complaint. It's just totally improper. You
4 know better than to try to do that.
5 MR. KING: Well, I don't need to be 01:44
6 educated by either of you. I'm saying that we
7 have -- we're entitled to discovery on her state of
8 mind for the intentional, quote/unquote, infliction
9 of emotional distress, and as we've put forth in our
10 papers, we think, you know, making the phone call 01:44
11 that resulted in a swatting incident is an
12 indication of that.
13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Well, that's an entirely
14 inaccurate representation of the briefing and the
15 Court's order. The Court's order allowed limited 01:44
16 discovery into the emotion -- intentional infliction
17 of emotional distress allegations solely as they
18 related to the "Groupie" video.
19 So I will instruct her not to answer
20 anything outside the scope of the Court's order. 01:45
21 MR. KING: So just to be clear, she will
22 not answer any questions regarding what we claim was
23 a swatting incident at Mr. Warner's house; right?
24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Correct.
25 MR. KING: Okay. 01:45
Page 79

1 BY MR. KING: 01:45
2 Q Who's Ashley Smithline?
3 A Ashley Smithline, I believe, has a case
4 against Brian Warner.
5 Q And you communicated with her in 01:45
6 connection with her claims; correct?
7 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the
8 scope of the Court's order. It's, again, within the
9 scope of discovery that was specifically --
10 specifically prohibited. 01:45
11 I'll instruct you not to answer.
12 MR. KING: You're going to have her not
13 answer the foundational question if she ever
14 communicated with Smithline?
15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: No. You asked if she has 01:46
16 communicated with Ms. Smithline about her claims.
17 If you want to ask her if she communicated with
18 Ms. Smithline regarding "Groupie," I have no
19 objection to that because that would be within the
20 scope of the Court's order. But right now you're 01:46
21 just on a fishing expedition for the remaining
22 claims as to which discovery was specifically
23 prohibited.
24 MR. KING: Well, fair enough.
25 BY MR. KING: 01:46
Page 80

1 Q Have you ever had a conversation or 01:46
2 communication with Ashley Smithline?
3 A Yes.
4 Q And have you ever told her about what you
5 had learned about the "Groupie" video? 01:46
6 A I do not believe so.
7 Q Did you tell her that Mr. Manson was a
8 pedophile -- Mr. Warner was a pedophile?
9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Outside the
10 scope of the Court's order. 01:46
11 I'll instruct you not to answer.
12 BY MR. KING:
13 Q Did you ever instruct Ms. Smithline to lie
14 about the claims against Mr. Warner?
15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. 01:47
16 Howard, this is just getting completely
17 harassing. Do we need to get the Court involved?
18 This is completely beyond the scope of the discovery
19 that the Court permitted. It is squarely within the
20 scope of discovery you requested, that the Court 01:47
21 denied. We're not going to waste a whole day of
22 questioning that you know is improper.
23 So I'll instruct her not to answer, and I
24 encourage you to move on to something related to the
25 "Groupie" video. 01:47
Page 81

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 BY MR. KING: 01:47 2 Q When did you first tell Evan Rachel Wood 3 your feelings about the "Groupie" video? 4 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 5 foundation; misstates prior testimony. 01:47 6 THE WITNESS: I don't recall. 7 BY MR. KING: 8 Q Can you give me a year? 9 A No. I'm sorry. I don't recall. 10 Q Was it before or after you became involved 01:48 11 with the Phoenix Act? 12 A Could you please repeat the question? 13 Q Was it before or after you became involved 14 with the Phoenix Act? 15 A Sorry. The one before that. 01:48 16 Q When did you first discuss the "Groupie" 17 video with Ms. Wood? 18 A I believe it was in 2016. 19 Q Was that before or after you started 20 dating her? 01:48 21 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 22 of the Court's order. 23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 24 I'll instruct you not to answer. 25 BY MR. KING: 01:48 Page 82</p>	<p>1 Q Okay. So your first with communication 01:50 2 with the alleged relative was 2018 or 2019. Is that 3 an accurate statement? 4 A Yes, I believe so, yes. 5 Q Thank you. 01:50 6 Two or three years earlier, you raised the 7 "Groupie" video with Ms. Wood for the first time. 8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 9 foundation; misstates testimony. 10 BY MR. KING: 01:50 11 Q That's not correct? 12 A No. 13 Q When is the first time you communicated 14 with Ms. Wood regarding the "Groupie" video? 15 A It was, I believe, around 2016. 01:51 16 Q Okay. So at the time you first 17 communicated with Ms. Wood about the "Groupie" 18 video, everything you knew about the "Groupie" video 19 was based on comments you heard from Brian Warner 20 and Tony Ciulla; correct? 01:51 21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 22 foundation; misstates testimony. 23 You haven't established any foundation as 24 to what was discussed in the conversation and what 25 she knew before that conversation. All you've asked 01:51 Page 84</p>
<p>1 Q Where did this communication take place? 01:48 2 A I don't recall the exact place. I believe 3 it was in person. 4 Q So this is several years before the 5 Phoenix Act was formed? 01:49 6 A Yes. 7 Q And this is several years before you 8 talked to the alleged unidentified relative of the 9 actress; correct? 10 MR. KUMP: Objection to the term 01:49 11 "several." Everybody has a different meaning of 12 what that means. 13 THE WITNESS: Could you please repeat the 14 question? 15 BY MR. KING: 01:49 16 Q Well, I'll help Mike out. 17 You first discussed "Groupie" with 18 Ms. Wood in 2016. Your first communication with the 19 alleged unidentified relative of the actress was 20 2018; correct? Do I have those two dates correct? 01:50 21 A I -- no. It was approximately 2018 within 22 a 12-month period. 23 Q Okay. It could have been earlier; it 24 could have been later? 25 A I believe it -- later. 01:50 Page 83</p>	<p>1 her so far is when she first discussed it. 01:51 2 BY MR. KING: 3 Q Do you need to hear the question back, 4 Ms. Gore? 5 A Yes, please. 01:51 6 MR. KING: Could you read the question 7 back, please. 8 (Whereupon the record was read as follows: 9 "Question: So at the time you first 10 communicated with Ms. Wood about the 'Groupie' 01:51 11 video, everything you knew about the 'Groupie' 12 video was based on comments you heard from 13 Brian Warner and Tony Ciulla; correct?") 14 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 15 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence. 01:52 16 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I knew 17 anything about the "Groupie" video before that 18 conversation. 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Q Before the conversation in 2016 with 01:52 21 Ms. Wood? 22 A Correct. 23 Q Okay. So what did you discuss with 24 Ms. Wood in the first conversation regarding the 25 "Groupie" video? 01:52 Page 85</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 01:52 2 of the Court's order. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. It was 4 around 2016. 5 BY MR. KING: 01:52 6 Q Did you tell Ms. Wood that Mr. Warner had 7 used an underage actress in a film? 8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 9 foundation; misstates prior testimony. 10 She just said she didn't know anything 01:53 11 about the "Groupie" video before that conversation. 12 THE WITNESS: I did not know anything 13 about the "Groupie" film before that conversation. 14 BY MR. KING: 15 Q Did Evan Wood bring it to your attention 01:53 16 in that conversation? 17 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 18 of the Court's order. 19 THE WITNESS: I believe so. 20 BY MR. KING: 01:53 21 Q What did she tell you about the "Groupie" 22 film? 23 MR. KUMP: Same objection. Outside the 24 scope of the Court's order. 25 THE WITNESS: I do not recall other than 01:53 Page 86</p>	<p>1 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Misstates 01:54 2 testimony. 3 THE WITNESS: My concern about the video 4 was not Ms. Wood's words but Brian Warner's. 5 BY MR. KING: 01:55 6 Q Well, how did you locate Mr. Warner's 7 words regarding the video? 8 A The "Dinner For Five" interview. 9 Q And how did you come to see the "Dinner 10 For Five" video? 01:55 11 A I believe Ms. Wood showed it to me. 12 Q And did she tell you why she was showing 13 it to you? 14 A I do not recall why. At the time, I was 15 sharing my own -- my -- 01:55 16 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I believe you've answered 17 his question. 18 MR. KING: Well, I'm going to get there 19 one way or another, Maggie, but okay. 20 BY MR. KING: 01:55 21 Q Were you dating Ms. Wood at this time? 22 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 23 of the Court's order. 24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 25 Instruct you not to answer. 01:56 Page 88</p>
<p>1 it was disturbing. 01:53 2 BY MR. KING: 3 Q What did she say that indicated to you it 4 was disturbing? 5 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 01:53 6 of the Court's order. 7 THE WITNESS: I believe that's when I 8 became aware of the "Dinner For Five" video with 9 Andy Dick. 10 BY MR. KING: 01:53 11 Q She brought that to your attention? 12 A I believe so. 13 Q So just so I'm clear, because your lawyers 14 are all right. I was -- I had an incorrect 15 assumption. Before talking with Evan Rachel Wood in 01:54 16 2016, you had never heard of the "Groupie" video; 17 right? 18 A I believe that is correct, yes. 19 Q And something in the conversation with 20 Evan Rachel Wood brought the "Groupie" video to your 01:54 21 attention; correct? 22 A I'm sorry. Could you clarify "something"? 23 Q What in the conversation with Evan Rachel 24 Wood in 2016 caused you to be concerned about the 25 "Groupie" video? 01:54 Page 87</p>	<p>1 BY MR. KING: 01:56 2 Q Were you in a romantic relationship with 3 Ms. Wood at the time she brought to your attention 4 the "Dinner For Five" video? 5 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I -- 01:56 6 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 7 the scope's -- outside the scope of the Court's 8 order. 9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Same objection; same 10 instruction. 01:56 11 BY MR. KING: 12 Q During this first conversation, did she 13 take some steps to show you the "Dinner For Five" 14 video? 15 A I'm sure, but I do not recall what. 01:56 16 Q Did she tell you, during these initial 17 communications, that the actress in the video was a 18 minor? 19 A No. 20 Q Did she tell you that there was something 01:56 21 immoral, illegal, or wrong with the "Groupie" video? 22 A No. Just Brian's own words about 23 potential prosecution and indictment. 24 Q So she brought to your attention Brian's 25 own words about potential prosecution? 01:57 Page 89</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 A No. 01:57</p> <p>2 Q Did she say anything, or did she just</p> <p>3 throw the video up on whatever screen she showed it</p> <p>4 on? Did she tell you why she was showing the video?</p> <p>5 MR. KUMP: Objection. Assumes facts not 01:57</p> <p>6 in evidence.</p> <p>7 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>8 Q Let's rephrase it. Let's respect</p> <p>9 Mr. Kump's objection.</p> <p>10 Did you watch the video for the first time 01:57</p> <p>11 with her?</p> <p>12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection.</p> <p>13 Which video? Are you talking about the</p> <p>14 "Dinner For Five" video?</p> <p>15 MR. KING: Yes. 01:57</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I believe so.</p> <p>17 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>18 Q And where did you watch it at?</p> <p>19 A I don't recall the specifics.</p> <p>20 Q But she loaded it up so you could see it? 01:57</p> <p>21 A I don't recall it.</p> <p>22 Q Do you recall anything she said about why</p> <p>23 she was going to show you this video?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q As you watched the video, did you have any 01:58</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 Q Well, okay. 01:59</p> <p>2 At some point in time, you formed the</p> <p>3 opinion that Mr. Warner had done something wrong</p> <p>4 with respect to the "Groupie" video; right?</p> <p>5 And maybe I'm wrong. Maybe you've never 01:59</p> <p>6 formed that opinion. Have you -- step back. Let's</p> <p>7 start over.</p> <p>8 Have you ever formed the opinion that</p> <p>9 Mr. Warner did something wrong with respect to the</p> <p>10 "Groupie" video? 01:59</p> <p>11 A I had no reason not to believe</p> <p>12 Mr. Warner's own words from the "Dinner For Five"</p> <p>13 interview where he said he could be indicted.</p> <p>14 Q So at the first time you heard those</p> <p>15 words, did you form the opinion that Mr. Warner had 02:00</p> <p>16 done something wrong with respect to the "Groupie"</p> <p>17 video?</p> <p>18 A No. I just assumed that there was</p> <p>19 something that he could be indicted on.</p> <p>20 Q Did you have any -- have you ever formed 02:00</p> <p>21 the opinion on what he could be indicted for</p> <p>22 regarding the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>23 A I believe that would have been the</p> <p>24 relative explaining worry about an underage</p> <p>25 Jeanette Polard. 02:00</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p>
<p>1 discussions with her about the video? 01:58</p> <p>2 A It was quite a long time ago. I don't</p> <p>3 recall the specifics of the conversation,</p> <p>4 unfortunately.</p> <p>5 Q Well, based upon whatever happened that 01:58</p> <p>6 day, you formed the opinion that Mr. Warner had done</p> <p>7 something wrong with respect to this video; correct?</p> <p>8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>9 foundation; misstates testimony.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: That is incorrect. 01:58</p> <p>11 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>12 Q When did you first form the opinion that</p> <p>13 Mr. Warner had done something wrong with respect to</p> <p>14 the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>15 A I don't recall forming an opinion on 01:58</p> <p>16 Brian Warner.</p> <p>17 Q Ever?</p> <p>18 A Not specifically, no.</p> <p>19 Q Well, at some point, you formed the</p> <p>20 opinion that he was a rapist pedophile; right? 01:59</p> <p>21 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks</p> <p>22 foundation; argumentative; assumes facts not in</p> <p>23 evidence.</p> <p>24 Instruct you not to answer.</p> <p>25 BY MR. KING: 01:59</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 Q Well, my question was, have you ever 02:00</p> <p>2 formed the opinion that Mr. Warner did something</p> <p>3 wrong with respect to the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>4 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Asked and answered.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Just in his words of 02:01</p> <p>6 potential prosecution and indictment.</p> <p>7 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>8 Q Is that when you formed the opinion that</p> <p>9 Mr. Warner had done something wrong with the</p> <p>10 "Groupie" video? 02:01</p> <p>11 A I have not seen the "Groupie" video.</p> <p>12 Q I'm just trying to get a chronology down.</p> <p>13 When did you first conclude that</p> <p>14 Mr. Warner had done something wrong with respect to</p> <p>15 the "Groupie" video? 02:01</p> <p>16 MR. KUMP: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. Also lacks</p> <p>18 foundation.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I do not recall</p> <p>20 an exact date. 02:01</p> <p>21 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>22 Q How about a year? In what year did you</p> <p>23 form the opinion that Mr. Warner had done something</p> <p>24 wrong with respect to the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>25 A I don't recall the exact year. Just 02:01</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 general worry from Mr. Warner's own words and then 02:01 2 the communication with the relative. 3 Q So going back to the meeting with Ms. Wood 4 where you watched the "Dinner For Five" video, you 5 have no recollection of any conversation you had 02:02 6 with Ms. Wood at that time regarding anything that 7 Mr. Warner may have done with respect to the video? 8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. 9 MR. KUMP: Asked and answered. 10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Asked and answered. 02:02 11 THE WITNESS: No. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 Q Did you have a discussion with Ms. Wood 14 about the comments Mr. Warner made during the 15 "Dinner For Five" video about fear of indictment? 02:02 16 MR. KUMP: Objection. Asked and answered. 17 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 18 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the specifics 19 of the conversation with Ms. Wood. 20 BY MR. KING: 02:03 21 Q Have you ever had any conversation with 22 Ms. Wood about the "Groupie" video other than 23 whatever conversation that you don't remember from 24 the time you watched the "Dinner For Five" video? 25 A I don't remember specifics, but, yes, 02:03</p>	<p>1 Jeanette Polard was the actress -- the allegedly 02:04 2 underage actress in the video? 3 A I don't recall the specifics of the 4 conversation with Ms. Wood. 5 Q Well, did you generally discuss with her 02:04 6 the identity of the allegedly underage actress? 7 MR. KUMP: Objection. Asked and answered. 8 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 9 THE WITNESS: Potentially, but I do not 10 recall the specifics of the conversation with 02:05 11 Ms. Wood. 12 BY MR. KING: 13 Q Did you ever discuss with Ms. Wood whether 14 or not the actress was in a simulated sex scene? 15 A No, I don't believe so, no. 02:05 16 Q Did you ever discuss with Ms. Wood how you 17 could use the "Groupie" video as part of a campaign 18 to recruit potential accusers of Mr. Warner? 19 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 20 foundation; assumes facts not in evidence; well 02:05 21 outside the scope of the Court's order. 22 I'll instruct you not to answer. 23 BY MR. KING: 24 Q After you received the disturbing phone 25 call from the unidentified alleged relative of the 02:05</p>
<p>1 probably. 02:03 2 Q How many conversations have you had with 3 Ms. Wood regarding the "Dinner For Five" video? 4 A Not many. I don't remember -- I don't -- 5 I can't recall an exact number, but it is not many. 02:03 6 Q Do you recall the contents of any of those 7 conversations? 8 A No. 9 Q Do you recall ever discussing with 10 Ms. Wood -- let me strike back -- step back. 02:03 11 Did Ms. Wood ever tell you she had seen 12 the video? 13 A Yes. 14 Q And did she tell you that the actress in 15 the video was underage? 02:04 16 MR. KUMP: Objection. Asked and answered. 17 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the specifics 18 of the conversations about "Groupie" with Ms. Wood. 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Q Did Ms. Wood tell you she was physically 02:04 21 present for the filming of "Groupie"? 22 A No. 23 Q Did she tell you when she saw the video? 24 A No, I don't believe so. 25 Q Did you ever ask Ms. Wood if 02:04</p>	<p>1 actress, did you communicate to Ms. Wood what you 02:05 2 had learned during that phone call? 3 A I don't recall the specifics of what I -- 4 if I relayed anything to Ms. Wood in regards to the 5 relative. 02:06 6 Q At the time of the phone call from the 7 relative, were you still in a romantic relationship 8 with Ms. Wood? 9 MR. KUMP: Objection. Outside the scope 10 of the Court's order. 02:06 11 This is like the eighth time you've tried 12 to get that answer. Howard, come on. 13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Join. 14 And I'll instruct you not to answer. 15 MR. KING: You know, one more time here as 02:06 16 why it's relevant as opposed to having any other 17 motive. She's got this distressing phone call based 18 upon which she took many actions. It would seem 19 likely that she would tell her girlfriend about 20 that, if she was her girlfriend at the time, 02:06 21 especially since they were both in the Phoenix Act 22 trying to promote certain legislation. 23 That's my showing of relevance, and unless 24 you're going to withdraw your instruction, I'll just 25 move on. 02:07</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 A I don't know. I don't recall. 02:21</p> <p>2 Q Did you exchange Instagram messages with</p> <p>3 Katheryn McGaffigan in September and October of</p> <p>4 2020?</p> <p>5 A Yes. I believe I did, yes. 02:21</p> <p>6 MR. KING: I'm going to mark as Exhibit 3</p> <p>7 some -- which I believe are Instagram messages.</p> <p>8 It's document 3, Karen.</p> <p>9 (Exhibit 3 marked.)</p> <p>10 MS. SLOANE: Exhibit 3 has been posted. 02:22</p> <p>11 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>12 Q I'll give you a chance to scroll through</p> <p>13 that, Ms. Gore.</p> <p>14 A Thank you.</p> <p>15 (Reviewing document.) 02:22</p> <p>16 Do you, by any chance, have the full</p> <p>17 document with Katheryn's responses?</p> <p>18 Q No. This is what I have.</p> <p>19 A Okay.</p> <p>20 Q And I'll give you a chance, but the first 02:23</p> <p>21 one is September 30, and the other two look like</p> <p>22 they're October 3rd. But let me know when you're</p> <p>23 ready to answer questions about them.</p> <p>24 A Sure.</p> <p>25 (Reviewing document.) 02:23</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 video said it was shown to them to torture them. 02:24</p> <p>2 Q That's something that you had direct --</p> <p>3 you have direct knowledge of or that you heard from</p> <p>4 somebody?</p> <p>5 A Could you rephrase the question? Sorry. 02:25</p> <p>6 Q All right. Who told you that they had</p> <p>7 seen the "Groupie" video?</p> <p>8 A Many people.</p> <p>9 Q Can you list them for me?</p> <p>10 A I couldn't recall a full, accurate list 02:25</p> <p>11 off the top of my head. I don't want to misspeak.</p> <p>12 Q Just as best you can, who, of these many</p> <p>13 people, can you recall telling you they had seen the</p> <p>14 "Groupie" video?</p> <p>15 A Almost everyone who had been in Warner's 02:25</p> <p>16 presence. I recall Evan, Ms. Wood; and Ms. Bianco;</p> <p>17 Ms. Walters, I believe; and Jane Doe, one of them.</p> <p>18 I don't -- I can't recall off the top of my head.</p> <p>19 It was many people.</p> <p>20 Q Any others you can think of? 02:26</p> <p>21 A Not at this time. I'm sorry.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. So many people had talked to you</p> <p>23 about the "Groupie" video in addition to the ones</p> <p>24 you previously described; right?</p> <p>25 You had previously described Katheryn, 02:26</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p>
<p>1 I'm ready when you are. 02:23</p> <p>2 Q Okay. The top communication is</p> <p>3 September 30, 2020. Is this a IG or other DM or</p> <p>4 message you sent to Katheryn McGaffigan?</p> <p>5 A Yes. I believe it was on Instagram. 02:23</p> <p>6 Q Instagram. And was this just you reaching</p> <p>7 out to introduce yourself, let you know you were</p> <p>8 part of the Phoenix Act and willing to talk to her</p> <p>9 if she wanted to talk?</p> <p>10 A Yes. 02:24</p> <p>11 Q And if you go to the second page, it's, I</p> <p>12 think, three pages of messages dated October 3,</p> <p>13 2020. Are these messages you sent to</p> <p>14 Katheryn McGaffigan?</p> <p>15 A Yes, I believe so. 02:24</p> <p>16 Q And in the first paragraph, you say:</p> <p>17 "We ran into lots of teenagers being</p> <p>18 groomed by adults in the music industry."</p> <p>19 Was that an accurate statement?</p> <p>20 A Yes, that is accurate. 02:24</p> <p>21 Q The next sentence, you say:</p> <p>22 "Evan, ex staff and others speak about the</p> <p>23 'Groupie' video."</p> <p>24 What did you mean by that communication?</p> <p>25 A Many people who encountered the "Groupie" 02:24</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p>	<p>1 Evan, Esmé. 02:26</p> <p>2 A Sorry. Not -- not Katheryn. I don't</p> <p>3 think Katheryn had seen the "Groupie" video. I</p> <p>4 don't recall her ever talking to me about it.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Sorry about that. 02:26</p> <p>6 But Ashley Walters and Jane Doe and Evan</p> <p>7 had told you they had seen the video?</p> <p>8 A Yes. I believe that is correct.</p> <p>9 Q Who else told you they saw the video, if</p> <p>10 you -- to the extent you can remember? 02:27</p> <p>11 A I'm sorry. I don't want to misspeak, and</p> <p>12 I don't recall the exact names.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And then you say:</p> <p>14 "We know it isn't released because the</p> <p>15 girl was underage. And the content that 02:27</p> <p>16 is in it horrifies people."</p> <p>17 Was that an accurate statement that you</p> <p>18 made to Ms. McGaffigan?</p> <p>19 A Yes. Based on the Brian Warner's</p> <p>20 interviews and the relative, that is accurate. 02:27</p> <p>21 Q What content of the "Groupie" video</p> <p>22 horrifies people?</p> <p>23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>24 speculation.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I have never seen the film, 02:28</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p>

1 A Yes. 02:49
 2 REDACTED
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 Q Okay. And when did you discuss the 02:50
 Page 122

1 REDACTED
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 02:53
 Page 124

1 "Groupie" video with Jane Doe? 02:50
 2 A I don't -- I don't believe I initiated the
 3 conversation, and I don't recall the date.
 4 Q Well, Jane Doe is somebody you identified
 5 as -- you identified as a person who had told you 02:51
 6 they had seen the "Groupie" video, I believe.
 7 A Correct.
 8 Q And so what did they tell you, if
 9 anything, about having seen the "Groupie" video?
 10 A I don't recall the specifics of the 02:51
 11 conversation.
 12 Q Well, did they tell you they were
 13 horrified by the "Groupie" video?
 14 A Yes. That was the general idea from most,
 15 if not everyone I spoke to. 02:51
 16 Q I'm talking about Jane Doe right now. Do
 17 you recall Jane Doe telling you that she was
 18 horrified by the "Groupie" video?
 19 A I do not recall the specifics of that
 20 conversation. 02:51
 21 Q Okay. So you don't recall one way or
 22 another whether Jane Doe told you she was horrified
 23 by the "Groupie" video. Would that be accurate?
 24 A Yes, that would be accurate.
 25 Q REDACTED 02:52
 Page 123

1 REDACTED
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 02:54
 Page 125

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>20 the contact people -- contact information for the 02:56</p> <p>21 people who might have more information on the video.</p> <p>22 A I do not believe that I discussed the</p> <p>23 content of the video. I believe I did share the</p> <p>24 contact information.</p> <p>25 Q For who? 02:56</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 A No. 02:58</p> <p>2 Q Why did you do it?</p> <p>3 A I don't -- sorry. Could you clarify what</p> <p>4 you mean by releasing the video -- releasing the</p> <p>5 information? Do you mean to specific people or -- 02:58</p> <p>6 Q Right. So all these -- to the various</p> <p>7 people that you expressed your belief that there was</p> <p>8 an underage actress in this video, what were your</p> <p>9 intentions, if not to harm Mr. Warner?</p> <p>10 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Compound; 02:58</p> <p>11 argumentative; vague as to which conversations</p> <p>12 you're referring to.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I was concerned about the</p> <p>14 harm that others had expressed receiving from</p> <p>15 Mr. Warner, as well as Mr. Warner himself. There 02:58</p> <p>16 was no intent for harm.</p> <p>17 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>18 Q What do you mean "there was no intent for</p> <p>19 harm"?</p> <p>20 A To harm Mr. Warner. 02:59</p> <p>21 Q You had no intent to harm Mr. Warner?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q No intent to cause him any mental</p> <p>24 distress?</p> <p>25 A No. 02:59</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p>
<p>1 A In regard to -- sorry. In regards to 02:56</p> <p>2 "Groupie"?</p> <p>3 Q Yes.</p> <p>4 A The relative I spoke about earlier. And I</p> <p>5 believe I provided, also, Kathryn McGaffigan's 02:56</p> <p>6 number.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Anybody -- any other information</p> <p>8 you shared with them?</p> <p>9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Object to the extent</p> <p>10 you're asking for anything beyond information 02:56</p> <p>11 related to the "Groupie" video.</p> <p>12 I'm going to instruct you to limit your</p> <p>13 answer to the "Groupie" video.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I don't recall a lot more</p> <p>15 in -- specific to the "Groupie" video. 02:57</p> <p>16 BY MR. KING:</p> <p>17 Q And when was this communication with the</p> <p>18 sheriff's department?</p> <p>19 A It would have been in 2021.</p> <p>20 Q In disseminating this information to 02:57</p> <p>21 various people that we've discussed regarding the</p> <p>22 "Groupie" video, did you intend to harm Mr. Warner?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q Did you have any intentions whatsoever in</p> <p>25 releasing this information? 02:57</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p>	<p>1 Q I'm going to play for you some snippets of 02:59</p> <p>2 some telephone calls.</p> <p>3 MR. KING: The first one I'll mark as</p> <p>4 Exhibit 4.</p> <p>5 (Exhibit 4 marked.) 02:59</p> <p>6 MR. KING: Can you play 105, please,</p> <p>7 Karen.</p> <p>8 MR. KUMP: Howard, who are these calls</p> <p>9 with?</p> <p>10 MR. KING: Well, I'm going to ask her, but 02:59</p> <p>11 the preview is, it's between her and Michelle Meyer,</p> <p>12 but I'll have her verify it.</p> <p>13 MR. KUMP: Who were these recorded by?</p> <p>14 MR. KING: Let me just play them and ask</p> <p>15 the questions. 03:00</p> <p>16 MR. KUMP: Well, I'm just trying to find</p> <p>17 out if these were illegally taped, in which case</p> <p>18 they shouldn't be played.</p> <p>19 Are these tapes in which Michelle Meyer</p> <p>20 illegally taped a conversation with Ms. Gore? Do 03:00</p> <p>21 you know, Howard?</p> <p>22 MR. KING: Let's just go through the</p> <p>23 clips.</p> <p>24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Are you going to establish</p> <p>25 a foundation as to whether or not consent was 03:00</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p>

1 obtained. 03:12
 2 MR. KING: Okay. And, Karen, we're not
 3 going to be able to play Exhibit 9; is that right?
 4 MS. SLOANE: I'm going to re- -- I can
 5 reload right now. 03:12
 6 MR. KING: Okay. Well, why don't I move
 7 on and we'll come back, since I have an idea of what
 8 the objection is going to be.
 9 BY MR. KING:
 10 REDACTED
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 03:13

Page 138

1 the grounds that it's specifically outside the scope 03:16
 2 of the Court's order.
 3 I'll instruct the witness not to answer
 4 any questions about it unless you can somehow tie
 5 them to "Groupie." 03:16
 6 BY MR. KING:
 7 Q Well, as of February 3, 2021, did you
 8 harbor any intention to harm Mr. Warner in any way?
 9 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Object that it's outside
 10 the scope of the Court's order. Unless you want to 03:16
 11 tie it to "Groupie" in some way, this is
 12 specifically prohibited.
 13 MR. KING: Are you instructing her not to
 14 answer the question?
 15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: As it was phrased, yes. 03:16
 16 If you'd like to tie it to some "Groupie" statement,
 17 then I would allow it.
 18 MR. KING: I just -- you and I are just
 19 reading the Court's -- the transcript and the order
 20 differently. So we'll just take that up with Her 03:16
 21 Honor.
 22 Could you please publish document 5 as
 23 Exhibit 15.
 24 (Exhibit 15 marked.)
 25 MS. SLOANE: Exhibit 15 has been posted. 03:17

Page 140

1 REDACTED
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7 MR. KING: Karen, are you unable to load
 8 other exhibits while you're trying to reload that
 9 one?
 10 MS. SLOANE: I'm busy doing -- yeah, 03:14
 11 getting --
 12 MR. KING: Okay. So I'll tell you what.
 13 Forget this other audio clip. Let's just move on --
 14 MS. SLOANE: Okay.
 15 MR. KING: -- please. 03:14
 16 MS. SLOANE: I'm available.
 17 MR. KING: Okay. Can you please mark as
 18 Exhibit 14 and put up document 4.
 19 (Exhibit 14 marked.)
 20 MS. SLOANE: Exhibit 14 has been posted. 03:15
 21 BY MR. KING:
 22 Q This is an email from the Los Angeles
 23 Police Department to Tony Ciulla.
 24 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Object to this exhibit and
 25 any line of questioning regarding this exhibit on 03:15

Page 139


1 BY MR. KING: 03:17
 2 Q Do you recognize the handwriting on
 3 Exhibit 15?
 4 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I'll object to this
 5 exhibit as well on the grounds that it's outside the 03:17
 6 scope of the order. Unless you can make a
 7 foundational showing that this somehow pertains to
 8 "Groupie," then I would instruct her not to answer.
 9 MR. KING: Well, right now I just want to
 10 know if it's her handwriting. We can fight about 03:17
 11 the questions after we verify that one way or the
 12 other.
 13 MS. ZIEMIANEK: You haven't made any
 14 foundational showing that it pertains in any way to
 15 "Groupie." I don't see anything on this sheet about 03:18
 16 "Groupie," so I'm going to instruct her not to
 17 answer.
 18 MR. KING: Well, you keep referring to
 19 "Groupie," and I keep referring to intentional
 20 infliction of emotional distress and the elements 03:18
 21 that that relates to.
 22 But rather than have that fight again on
 23 the record, can you just ask her to verify whether
 24 or not this is her handwriting?
 25 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I will instruct her not to 03:18

Page 141

CONFIDENTIAL

<p>1 answer. 03:18 2 Again, Howard, you are not permitted broad 3 discovery about the intentional infliction of 4 emotional distress claim. You specifically 5 requested discovery about intentional infliction of 03:18 6 emotional distress as it pertains to your client's 7 allegations of coercion of accusers, and that 8 discovery was specifically denied. 9 You were allowed limited discovery as to 10 intentional infliction of emotional distress as it 03:18 11 pertained to the statements concerning the "Groupie" 12 video. 13 So, again, unless you can make some 14 threshold showing that there's some reference to 15 "Groupie" here that I'm not seeing, I'm instructing 03:18 16 her not to answer. 17 MR. KING: Okay. Well, we don't have to 18 argue it again and again. We can do that later. 19 All right. Give me -- can we go off the 20 record for five minutes, and I'll see if there's any 03:19 21 questions that I can find that fit within your 22 definition of what's appropriate? 23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Sure. 24 MR. KING: Okay. Thank you. 25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time on the monitor is 03:19 Page 142</p>	<p>1 left-hand column, "underage," it mentions 03:28 2 Jeanette Polard. That's the actress who you 3 believed was in the "Groupie" video; correct? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Is this your handwriting on Exhibit 15? 03:28 6 A Yes, I believe it is. 7 Q And why were you including Jeanette Polard 8 under the category of "underage"? 9 A Jeanette Polard was -- the police had been 10 involved in getting Jeanette Polard out from a 03:28 11 situation with Mr. Warner's band in New York when 12 she was a teenager. 13 Q Before or after the "Groupie" video was 14 made? 15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Calls for 03:28 16 speculation. 17 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure the exact date 18 of when "Groupie" was made, and I cannot recall the 19 date of when the police were involved. 20 BY MR. KING: 03:29 21 Q Well, how did you learn that 22 Jeanette Polard was taken out of some situation by 23 the police? 24 A A video interview with Jeordie White and 25 the police report. 03:29 Page 144</p>
<p>1 3:19 p m., and we are off of the record. 03:19 2 (Recess.) 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time on the monitor is 4 3:26 p m., and we are on the record. 5 MR. KING: I'm going to ask Karen to 03:26 6 reload Exhibit 9. It's one of the audio clips that 7 we couldn't play. We should be able to play it now, 8 and then we'll hear the objections. 9 (Audio recording played.) 10 BY MR. KING: 03:27 11 Q Is that your voice, Ms. Gore? 12 MS. ZIEMIANEK: I'll object on the grounds 13 that there's no foundation laid that this is not an 14 illegally obtained recording and instruct you not to 15 answer. 03:27 16 MR. KING: And then I'm going to ask Karen 17 to reload the last exhibit, which I think is our 18 document 5, Karen. 19 MS. SLOANE: I believe everybody has 20 access to Exhibit 15. 03:27 21 MR. KING: Thank you. Exhibit 15. 22 BY MR. KING: 23 Q Your counsel previously objected and 24 instructed you not to answer, but we took a look 25 during the break, and we see that under the 03:28 Page 143</p>	<p>1 Q You have the police report? 03:29 2 A It was posted online. 3 Q And under "Jeanette Polard," you've 4 written something with an arrow that I can't -- is 5 that a name before the word "witness"? Alison Buffy 03:29 6 maybe? Duffy? 7 A Alison Duffy, I believe, yes. 8 Q And who's that? 9 A That would be her friend, who is a runaway 10 teen with her. She was also involved in the police 03:29 11 incident, I believe. 12 Q Was Exhibit 15 basically your creation of 13 lists of all of the potential witnesses against 14 Brian Warner? 15 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 03:30 16 foundation; argumentative; outside the scope of the 17 Court's order. 18 I'll instruct you not to answer. 19 BY MR. KING: 20 Q Well, let me ask it differently. 03:30 21 What was Exhibit 15, and why did you 22 prepare it? 23 MS. ZIEMIANEK: Objection. Lacks 24 foundation that it's within the scope of the Court's 25 order. 03:30 Page 145</p>

CONFIDENTIAL

1	I'll instruct you not to answer.	03:30	1	MR. KING: Mike, A-OK?	03:34
2	MR. KING: That's a fine way to end. I		2	MR. KUMP: Yes. Yes. That is fine.	
3	have no further questions.		3	Thank you.	
4	Which stipulation, if any, would you like,		4	MR. KING: Okay. Ms. Gore, thank you for	
5	Maggie?	03:30	5	your time. I hope it wasn't so bad.	03:34
6	MS. ZIEMIANEK: Do you have one to		6	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. King.	
7	propose?		7	MR. KING: And see everybody else later.	
8	MR. KING: Do you know offhand when our		8	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record	
9	further briefing is due?		9	at 3:34 p.m. This concludes testimony given by	
10	MS. ZIEMIANEK: I do not recall offhand.	03:30	10	Ashley Gore a/k Illma Gore. Total number of media	03:34
11	MR. KING: When's our briefing due?		11	units was five and will be retained by Veritext	
12	MS. ZIEMIANEK: Do you want to go off the		12	Legal Solutions.	
13	record for a minute?		13	(Deposition concluded at 3:34 p.m. EDT.)	
14	MR. KING: Yeah. Let's go off the record		14		
15	for a minute.	03:31	15		
16	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time on the monitor		16		
17	is 3:31 p m., and we are off of the record.		17		
18	(Discussion off the record.)		18		
19	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Time on the monitor is		19		
20	3:32 p m., and we are on the record.	03:32	20		
21	MR. KING: Okay. First, I need to correct		21		
22	the exhibits. So Exhibit [sic] 109, what we		22		
23	couldn't load up, should just be stricken, and 116		23		
24	is its replacement.		24		
25	MS. ZIEMIANEK: I'm sorry. 116 or 16?	03:33	25		
		Page 146			Page 148
1	MR. KING: Yeah. 16. I'm sorry. Thank	03:33	1	I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand	
2	you.		2	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby	
3	(Exhibit 9 withdrawn.)		3	certify:	
4	(Exhibit 16 marked.)		4	That the foregoing proceedings were taken	
5	MR. KING: So 109 is stricken, and 16	03:33	5	before me at the time and place herein set forth;	
6	replaces it. I think Karen has already taken it off		6	that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings,	
7	of the exhibits, but we just have to make sure that		7	prior to testifying, were administered an oath; that	
8	there's no further confusion.		8	a record of the proceedings was made by me using	
9	Karen, correct me if I'm wrong on that.		9	machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed	
10	MS. SLOANE: That would be correct.	03:33	10	under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is	
11	MR. KING: Is that acceptable to		11	a true record of the testimony given.	
12	everybody?		12	I further certify that I am neither	
13	MS. ZIEMIANEK: That's fine.		13	financially interested in the action nor a relative	
14	MR. KING: We're going to request an		14	or employee of any attorney or any party to this	
15	expedited transcript, and we've stipulated that the	03:33	15	action.	
16	witness will have seven days, after receipt of same,		16	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date	
17	to review it, to make any changes, sign it under		17	subscribed my name this 27th day of October, 2022.	
18	penalty of perjury and arrange for any such		18		
19	corrections to be returned to me.		19		
20	If within those seven days, we don't	03:34	20		
21	receive confirmation that it's been signed and		21		
22	notice of any changes, then we can use the certified		22	MICHELLE BULKLEY	
23	copy of an unsigned transcript as though it were an		23	CSR No. 13658	
24	original signed under penalty of perjury.		24	The dismantling of transcript will void Reporter's	
25	MS. ZIEMIANEK: That's fine.	03:34	25	certificate.	
		Page 147			Page 149

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DECLARATION OF PENALTY OF PERJURY

I, ASHLEY GORE, a/k/a ILLMA GORE, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition taken on Tuesday, October 25, 2022; that I have made such corrections as appear noted herein; that my testimony as contained herein, as corrected, is true and correct.

DATED this 03 day of November, 2022,
at Orlando, Florida, California.

Ashley Illma Gore

ASHLEY GORE, a/k/a

ILLMA GORE

1 RE: WARNER vs. WOOD

2 ASHLEY GORE, A/K/A ILLMA GORE (JOB NO. 5520113)

3

4 E R R A T A S H E E T

5 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

6

7 REASON _____

8 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

9

10 REASON _____

11 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

12

13 REASON _____

14 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

15

16 REASON _____

17 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

18

19 REASON _____

20 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

21

22 REASON _____

23

24 _____

25 ASHLEY GORE, A/K/A ILLMA GORE Date



Public - View a Reservation

Reservation
Reservation ID: 107383222615
Reservation Type: Motion to Seal (Motion to Seal under California Rules of Court 2.550 & 2.551)
Case Number: 22STCV07568
Case Title: BRIAN WARNER, P/K/A MARILYN MANSON vs EVAN RACHEL WOOD, et al.
Filing Party: Ashley Gore (Defendant)
Location: Stanley Mosk Courthouse - Department 50
Date/Time: January 9th 2023, 10:00AM
Status: RESERVED
Number of Motions: 1

Motions
Motion to Seal (Motion to Seal under California Rules of Court 2.550 & 2.551)

Reservation History	
Status Date	Status
11/22/2022 10:03AM	Reserved by User Date: January 9th 2023, 10:00AM Location: Stanley Mosk Courthouse - Department 50 Motions: 1

[← Back to Search](#)