1	
2	
3	
4	SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
5	JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL,
6	U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
7	WASHINGTON, D.C.
8	
9	
10	
11	INTERVIEW OF: ROBERT SINNERS
12	
13	
14	
15	Wednesday, June 15, 2022
16	
17	Washington, D.C.
18	
19	
20	The interview in the above matter was held via Webex, commencing at 10:07 a.m.

1	
2	Appearances:
3	
4	
5	For the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
6	THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL:
7	
8	INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
9	INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
10	PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER
11	CHIEF CLERK

_	
2	Good morning. This is a transcribed interview of Robert Sinners,
3	conducted by the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the
4	United States Capitol pursuant to House Resolution 503. At this time, I would like to ask
5	the witness to please state your full name and spell your last name for the record.
6	Mr. Sinners. Robert Alexander Sinners, S-i-n-n-e-r-s.
7	Thank you.
8	This will be a staff-led interview today. Members of the select committee may
9	be joining us. If they do so during the course of our discussion, they will appear on the
10	participants screen on the Webex. If any of them so choose, they, of course, may ask
11	questions as well. And we will note for you if our committee members join for your
12	awareness. I'll say that as you probably know, this is quite a busy time for the
13	committee with the hearings that we are putting on this week and this month. So I
14	don't anticipate that our members will join. But if they do, I will be sure to let you know.
15	Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> Okay.
16	My name is
17	select committee. I am joined here in the room by a couple of my colleagues from the
18	select committee, including, investigative counsel,
19	professional staff member. And with us on our virtually is our chief clerk,
20	
21	So Mr. Sinners, before we begin, I would like to go over a few ground rules. We
22	have an official reporter transcribing the record of this interview. You will have an
23	opportunity to review the transcript and suggest any corrections before it is finalized.
24	As you know, as you heard a moment ago, this proceeding through the Webex is being
25	recorded, but the court reporter's transcript is going to be the official record of our

1	interview today.
2	Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> Okay.
3	So one thing that that means is that we will ask for you to wait until
4	our questions are finished before you start your response, so that the court reporter can
5	make a clean transcript. And for the same reason, we will ask you to give verbal
6	responses as opposed to, you know, nodding or shaking your head since it is difficult for
7	the court reporter to record those nonverbal, nonaudible responses.
8	Mr. Sinners. Understood.
9	And although this is an interview, it is not a deposition, you are not
10	under oath, we want to remind you, as we remind every witness, that we have
11	interviewed, that it is unlawful to deliberately provide false information to Congress. Do
12	you understand that?
13	Mr. Sinners. I understand that completely.
14	Okay. And I note that you are here voluntarily today. We
15	appreciate your cooperation. I also note that you have informed us that you are happy
16	to appear today and proceed without counsel. Is that correct?
17	Mr. Sinners. Yes.
18	Okay.
19	So as we go through our interview today, it is important that you understand our
20	questions so that you are able to answer them to the best of your ability. So if at any
21	point there are, you know, there is anything that you need clarification, if any of our
22	questions are not clear, please don't hesitate to ask. We are happy to rephrase.
23	And similarly, if you don't know the answer to a question, you can say you don't
24	know or you don't recall. And if since you have an obligation to be truthful, if you do
25	recall the answer to the question, we hope that you will answer truthfully there.

1	Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> Absolutely.			
2	Logistically, if you need any breaks at all, please just let us know,			
3	happy to, you know, do a turn off the cameras and mute break. And like I said, we are			
4	going to hope to get through this pretty quickly and get you back to your regularly			
5	scheduled Wednesday.			
6	Mr. Sinners. Sounds good.			
7	Any questions.			
8	Mr. Sinners. Nope.			
9	Okay, great.			
10	EXAMINATION			
11	BY			
12	Q Well, Mr. Sinners, why don't you tell us just briefly a little bit about your			
13	background. Where are you from originally?			
14	A Originally I am from South Carolina. Then following college, I moved to			
15	D.C., worked in and out of politics for 10 years. Once COVID came around, you know,			
16	D.C. was a little difficult, to say the least, during COVID and I moved to Georgia to take an			
17	opportunity in a high target State. And then, you know, was witness to an interesting			
18	time in history. And following, you know, I would say following a departure from kind			
19	of what I had seen, now I am happily working in Georgia for someone I respect and			
20	admire.			
21	Q Okay. Thank you for that.			
22	So just to get a little bit more specifics, when you moved to Georgia, was			
23	that were you already working for the Trump campaign at that point?			
24	A I had been offered a campaign role in Georgia, yes.			
25	Q And what was the job that you were offered in Georgia?			

1	Α	State director of Election Day operations.		
2	Q	And how long did you serve in that role as State director of Election Day		
3	operations?			
4	А	Approximately from June until the end of the runoffs in Georgia.		
5	Q	Which would have been early January, 2021?		
6	А	Yeah, 6-ish months.		
7	Q	Okay. Had you worked in any other capacity for the Trump campaign		
8	before June 2020?			
9	А	Not for the campaign. I served as a delegate in 2016, but I was a John		
10	Kasich deleg	gate, and then an alternate I guess for the Trump campaign in 2020.		
11	Q	Okay. And then after the runoffs in early January 2021, what was your next		
12	employment after that point?			
13	Α	I became the director of constituent services for Secretary of State Brad		
14	Raffensperger.			
15	Q	Is that the job that you hold now?		
16	Α	Well, I have I am communications director currently. That started		
17	Monday of	last week. And it was an interesting week, to say the least.		
18	Q	I am sure. Well, congratulations on the new position.		
19	Α	Thank you.		
20	Q	So earlier you referred to working for somebody that I think you said you		
21	respected a	nd admire. Is that Secretary Raffensperger who you are referring to?		
22	Α	That would be.		
23	Q	Okay. And what generally let us go back to your time working for the		
24	Trump cam	paign. So when you were State director for Election Day operations in		
25	Georgia, fro	m approximately June through the end of the campaign, tell us general what		

were your duties and responsibilities?

Α

1

2

essentially, my job was volunteer recruitment, learning more about the voting process,

So I was the sole Election Day operations staffer for the State. And

- 4 recruiting attorneys to assist with precinct monitoring, you know, ballot processing, and
- 5 getting -- and training volunteers to serve, you know, as poll watchers, poll monitors,
- 6 election observers, vote review panel members, you know, adjudicators as well as -- yeah,
- 7 basically just that. The kind of election processes.
- 8 Q Okay, great. And who did you report to within the Trump campaign?
- 9 A My direct superior was a gentleman, Tom Stoner, he was with the RNC.
- And then his superior was Michael Brown, with the Trump campaign. And then his
- superior was Mike Roman with the Trump campaign.
- 12 Q And both Michael Brown and Mike Roman, were they also a part of the
- 13 Election Day operations --
- 14 A Hierarchy.
- 15 Q -- structure --
- 16 A Sure. Yeah.
- 17 Q Hierarchy, great. So help us to understand the connection between the
- 18 RNC and the Trump campaign when it came to Election Day operations. I think you said
- that, you know, your sort of direct supervisor was an RNC employee but then above that
- 20 person were Trump campaign employees?
- 21 A Yeah. I mean, I am still trying to kind of figure out. I mean, the best I can
- really offer is that campaigns, you know, I think there was a model that everybody was
- 23 kind of on one team. You know, I had a Georgia Republican Party staff badge. I
- worked out of the party. We had a mix of Senate campaign aids in the building, RNC
- staff, Georgia GOP staff, Trump campaign staff. It was kind of a mishmash. And I really

1	don't understand, you know, the logic or the reasoning behind it, but that is just how it				
2	was.				
3	I think part of it had to do with, you know, in 2018 or 2019, you know, for the sake				
4	of argument there was sunlight provisions, sunset provision of, you know, a consent				
5	decree prohibiting the RNC from engaging in Election Day operations. You know, it had				
6	to be on the local level, it couldn't be a national effort. And I think this was kind of the				
7	first step to kind of get the RNC back into that. Because now our this cycle RNC is				
8	doing a full-blown program, so I guess this was kind of a baby step.				
9	Q Okay. That is helpful. Thank you.				
10	So you said you had a badge and worked out of the Georgia Republican Party				
11	headquarters. How closely did you work with the State party chair, David Shafer, or the				
12	executive director, Stewart Bragg?				
13	A Very, very closely. They were monitoring, you know, our process. I				
14	considered myself reporting to them. They were very helpful with volunteer				
15	recruitment, getting me on calls with county party chairs, and getting that volunteer				
16	recruitment aspect really nailed down.				
17	Q Okay, great.				
18	Any other background questions?				
19	No.				
20	BY				
21	Q So Mr. Sinners, I think we are going to spend the bulk of our time today				
22	talking about the process of convening what were described as either contingent or				
23	alternate electors				
24	A Uh-huh.				
25	Q in the post-election time period after 2020. Before we dive into the				

specifics, you made a remark	when we first started this	interview that you were witness
------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

- to an interesting time following the election. And I thought I would ask you to explain to
- 3 us a little bit more what comes to mind when you are thinking about this experience.
- 4 What made you say that you were witness to an interesting time?
  - A I have been a part of campaigns for 15 years, you know, some on the proximity, some just kind of casual door knocking, and I have never seen something more disorganized in my life. It just, you know, the strategy, the operations, you know, just was truly bizarre.
  - Q Understood.

- A Yeah, yeah. I am sure that the answer to that question will come out by the end of this interview just in bits and pieces as we go down that road.
- Q Okay. That makes sense. And when you are thinking about this time period where the level of, you know, sort of -- I think you said you have never seen more disorganization. Did that apply to both the pre- and post-election time period?
- 15 A Very much so, very much so.
  - Q Okay. All right. Well, let's focus on the time period after the November 3rd, 2020 Presidential election. We are going to talk to you about the concept of the alternate electors.
  - A All right.
    - Q So I would like to ask you to try to remember when was the first time you heard about the possibility of convening Trump electors in Georgia, even though the State had certified a victory for President Biden in Georgia?
    - A Yeah, if I remember correctly, the lawsuit, the election challenge was filed by the campaign on December 3rd. And as it moved into December 14th, somewhere between there, I want to say late the week before so maybe around December 10th,

1 December 11th I started hearing a buzz about this. And that first buzz came from the

2 State party. My memory serves that David Shafer called. It was either that Stewart

Bragg called me and told me to call David Shafer or that David Shafer called me, but that

4 is the first that I heard about it happening.

At that point, it was kind of an RNC, Trump campaign, you know -- what word am I looking for? Initiative. And as we kind of moved toward that, different lawyers got involved. And all, you know, the whole impetus in my understanding, and still my understanding to this day, even though I think history shows that there was something else going on outside is that, you know, because there was an election challenge filed on the 3rd, that had not yet been given a court date, it was still pending in court. And, you know, at that time and still I have -- I am not completely out there on it, but, you know, it had been called a -- the best challenge. I know that the lawyers that were involved, you know, were looking instead of moving towards some of the crazier stuff that was out there in the atmosphere. We were looking at people that weren't allowed to vote, people who were told that they had already voted, people that experienced issues at the polls. And so, I think there was a good sense that okay, you know, this should at least proceed.

And the attorneys at the time said that part of -- the court challenge would effectively be mooted unless these electors were put in place to do so. And I think part of the confidence at the time was that, you know, Georgia law required that they be certified at the State capital, I think the law says the seat of government, at a specific time, noon. And the lawyers were very specific about hitting each one of those criteria so that, you know, it would be legitimate.

You know, there was a requirement that the Governor sign off on the electors.

So, you know, unless the Governor had been compelled by a court or something like that,

- you know, that just would have been a fallback. But, yes, the first I really heard about it was late in the week before, maybe around December 10th, December 11th.
- 3 Q Okay.
- 4 A Yeah.

Q That is a very helpful explanation and overview. I would like to go back and ask you a couple of questions about some of things you said just to get a little more detail. So, I know you said that your first understanding of it when you had this phone call with Mr. Shafer and/or Mr. Bragg, was that this was an RNC and Trump campaign initiative. What can you remember about what gave you that understanding that this was an initiative by the RNC and Trump campaign?

A Well, I mean, you know, the Trump campaign was, you know, all for it. And then the RNC through our regional political director was saying, Yeah, like, you know, proceed, move forward. And, you know, I saw it. It had been explained by some people that maybe there was a strong contingent at the time the belief that there was, you know, a strong part of the base shall we say, that, you know, to see giving up on former President, or at that time, President Trump, you know, they wouldn't come out and vote.

So that, you know, creating the understanding that the RNC, the Georgia GOP, you know, the Senate candidates were fighting for the President was the message that wanted to be delivered. You know, I saw some validity to that, but I also had some concerns about that because I think Senate candidates should run independently of other political wins, but, you know, that is kind of irrelevant for the case. But yeah, you know, I had gotten the impression that all parties were at least initially really moving forward for this.

Q Okay. And did Mr. Shafer give you that impression, that the RNC and

1 Trump campaign were moving forward with this? 2 Α Yes, yes. Okay. I think -- I just want to clarify one thing that you just said. I think 3 you gave the -- I understood you to be saying that the RNC and the Trump campaign 4 5 thought it was important to be seen as continuing to fight for President Trump as a way 6 summary of what you thought? 7 I think that would be an accurate characterization. 8 9 Q Okay. And did you see the effort to convene the alternate electors as a 10 part of that? 11 Α I did, I did. Yeah, I saw -- I saw it as, you know, fighting, fighting for the President. 12 Yeah. 13 Q How did you have that impression? Did anyone say anything to you that indicated that the campaign, or the RNC, viewed the convening of alternate electors as 14 part of that kind of messaging to the base? 15 Yeah. I mean, I can't really recollect any specific instance. But it seemed 16 like everyone that was in a position of authority was on board for this, and saw it as 17 a -- you know, saw it as an avenue. 18 19 Q Okay. And I think you mentioned having some interaction with the RNC 20 regional political director about this topic. Who is that individual that you are referring 21 to there? Α His name is Brian Barrett. 22 23 Q Is that someone that you worked with during the election? 24 Α Yeah, yes.

And was he responsible for only Georgia, or other areas as well?

25

Q

- 1 A He had -- he had other States, I am not sure which.
- 2 Q Got it. But Georgia was one of them?
- 3 A Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Okay. So you said after this first call with Mr. Shafer, the lawyers got involved. Who were the lawyers that you remember becoming involved in the effort to convene these alternate electors in Georgia?
  - A Ray Smith and his associates. He was our local counsel. He was there during the -- you know, during the elector thing. Is there a better term? During the convening of the alternates, he was there. He had signed off. We had some other local counsel that was there. There were lawyers from the campaign that were cc'd on some emails, Josh Findlay was one of those. There was -- I remember kind of. I mean, not entirely sure, but that, you know, the HQ legal being involved. And it just kind of -- kind of strikes me that something --
- 14 Are you there?
- 15 Q Yeah. We might have lost our video, but we are here.
- A Yeah. It struck me that this was something that was well-known
  throughout the campaign and headquarters. It seemed like -- it seemed like it was, you
  know, something the campaign was full steam ahead on.
  - Q Okay. Thank you. You said that you thought there were some HQ level lawyers involved. Who were you thinking about then?
  - A Potentially Justin Clark, or Matt Morgan or some of the other folks that, you know. I just know judging by how the campaign operated that everything really had to go through a higher level to be cleared. But, you know, I remember that there were HQ lawyers saying -- saying, Yeah, move forward, proceed.
- Q Okay. And when say judging by how the campaign operated, is that based

1 on your experience with the campaign from June through Election Day? 2 Α Yep, absolutely. Were you aware or -- either directly or indirectly of a change in the HQ level, 3 Q sort of the leadership of the litigation efforts after the election? 4 No, no. I know -- I mean -- well, I know that Rudy Giuliani had gotten more 5 6 But, you know, there was kind of a divide, but still the kind of professional 7 lawyers I guess were, you know, still running the show. Okay, understood. Yeah that -- my question was a little unclear. But 8 9 what I was referring to was Mayor Giuliani's becoming, you know, the -- in charge of 10 litigation efforts after the election. And it seems like you perceived that the professional 11 lawyers employed by the campaign or working on the campaign through Election Day 12 remains the appropriate kind of supervisory position? 13 Yeah, because after -- afterwards, I still had conversations with people who I considered normal. I mean, this was unrelated to, you know, electors or anything. 14 But 15 I still recall hearing their names, hearing, you know -- I would get phone calls pretty frequently up until, you know, after the runoff when I just quit answering my phone 16 because, you know, I am unaffiliated with anyone at this point. So yeah, I got the sense 17 that there was still normalcy taking place from HQ. 18 19 Q Okay. Did you speak directly to Justin Clark, Matt Morgan or Josh Findlay 20 about the idea of alternate electors? 21 I am pretty sure I spoke -- I am pretty sure. I just cannot -- I can't confirm, because I spoke with them about a lot of things and I can't -- I can't say yes or no. 22 23 Q Okay. But it wouldn't surprise me if I did, it wouldn't surprise me if I didn't. 24 Α

Okay. That is helpful. What about any lawyers, either Rudy Giuliani

Q

- 1 himself, or any of the other lawyers who were working with him. Did you talk to anyone
- 2 kind of on his team, his associates about alternate electors?
  - A There had been a call with Christina Bobb from OAN. I didn't know what that was at the time or I hadn't heard of it. I didn't have cable for about a 2-year period. And I had gotten the sense that that was about publicizing, you know, the elector thing afterwards, but no one on Rudy's team directly. I remember that someone had asked me for a State senator's number because Rudy wanted to speak with them. But I don't -- I never spoke with Rudy directly. At that point, you know, I was like pretty out on Rudy. And I had never spoken with him directly, but I know he was calling anyone and everyone in Georgia around that time.
    - Q Okay. You also had described the -- earlier when you were giving us your overview, you sort of described your understanding of the meeting of the alternate electors as being connected to, preserving a remedy for litigation that was pending in Georgia.
  - A Right.

- 16 Q How did you learn -- how did you come to have that understanding? Who 17 told you that?
  - A I can't say directly, but I know that multiple lawyers had expressed that sentiment. Ray Smith, the counsel here in Georgia that the campaign hired, he's a pretty respectable lawyer. He had expressed that sentiment. The State party deputy counsel had expressed that sentiment. And there were a number of attorneys who had expressed that yes, this was ha -- that was preserving a legal -- you know, preserving legal rights for the campaign.
  - Q Okay. Any other names that come to mind of lawyers that you spoke it about that other than or in addition to Ray Smith?

1	A Ray Smith, Alex Kaufman was the deputy counsel for the State party at the
2	time. I know Cleta Mitchell was down here. And I don't remember any specific
3	conversation with her about it. But, you know, we were it was just kind of come and
1	go, you know, every 12 seconds and it was just the sense was, yeah, you know, a united
5	front, this is legal, this is what needs to happen in order for, you know, the law the
5	election challenge suit to move forward.
7	Q Okay, got it. And all these conversations with lawyers or your

Q Okay, got it. And all these conversations with lawyers or your understanding of the perspective of these lawyers, that all came to be known by you after your initial conversation with David Shafer?

- A Yeah. And he had expressed that he had spoken to campaign officials. I

  don't know who. But he had given me the same rundown that this has to happen.

  This is about preserving legal rights. I assumed this is the State party chairman that, you know, he had counsel and outside counsel, you know, expressing this sentiment to him.

  I know that Ray's office had expressed the same thing. And no one that I spoke to directly had, you know, raised any red flags about this at the time.
  - Q Okay. Did you ever either interact directly or come to learn of advice given by a lawyer named Ken Chesebro?
  - A He had sent the documents to me. And I had never spoken -- or do I not recollect speaking with him directly. I really think I didn't. But I know he had sent me an email with, you know, Here's the documents we had a local attorney, take a look at them. I know they added -- they made some edits. But, yeah, he had produced the documents.
- 23 Q Okay. Who was the local attorney who took a look at those documents?
- A There were a number. I want to say that it was Kaufman, but I am not entirely sure.

1	Q	Okay.	Did you ever receive a legal memo from Ken Chesebro about the
2	concept of a	alternate	e electors?

A I don't remember, like, a memo of outlining that everything is possible, but I probably would not have read it at that point.

Q Understood. So what you remember receiving from Mr. Chesebro were the actual documents, like this is where you sign and this is where you send it, that kind of stuff?

A Right.

Q Okay. Got it. So just to be clear, I think you said that you thought that the first phone call that you had with David Shafer was around December 10th or 11th. As you said, the focus was on making sure that the electors were to meet as required by statute, which would have been the December 14th meeting. December 14th was the date to meet after the 2020 election. So all of these conversations that you are referring to I presume happened between that 3- or 4-day window. Is that right?

A That would be accurate.

Q Okay. And in your initial conversation with David Shafer, did he ask you to take specific actions to effectuate this plan of getting the electors together?

A I don't remember because it was kind of an up-in-the-air thing. I remember that one point like multiple people -- there were just so many wires being crossed, because looking back it makes sense, because I don't think this was coming from one specific person. It was kind of like a, you know, mishmash-type thing. But, you know, he was -- there was a conversation. And I got the list of electors from Stewart Bragg. And then, between he and David working the people and me following up, you know, we got most of those people agreed, you know. I explained kind of the legal aspect that had been provided to me, because there were some questions. And I think individual

- attorneys may have followed up. And you know, there were I think four people that
- 2 couldn't make it. And yeah, I -- I don't -- I am not really sure of how the delegation of
- duties came to play. I just know that, you know, in my capacity working for the Trump
- 4 campaign, I was a Trump campaign employee, you know, and it was kind of voluntold.
- And, you know, for me as long as I had multiple attorneys telling me, yeah -- multiple
- 6 attorneys that I trusted their legal background, you know, I was okay with it.
- 7 Q Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 8 A The legal rationale made sense to me.
  - Q Got it. So before we move on and I do want to ask you some questions about, you know, the logistics and, you know, find being the electors and getting them there. But before we move on, just on that point that you just raised, I want to share with you some testimony that we have received in the course of our investigation.
    - A Okay.
  - Q That -- the select committee has received testimony that indicates that the professional lawyers for the campaign that you identified earlier, Justin Clark, Matt Morgan and Josh Findlay, while they may have been involved in an earlier stage of researching and advising about the possibility of convening alternate slates of electors to preserve a litigation remedy, that that would have been earlier in December. And over that weekend, before the electors were to meet on the 14th, each of those three lawyers declined to participate any further.

So we have testimony that indicates that Justin Clark, Matt Morgan, and Josh Findlay, informed the campaign, likely the President himself, but also Rudy Giuliani and those working with him that they did not feel it was appropriate to proceed with this plan, and that they would no longer be involved. They were, at that time, told that this lawyer, Ken Chesebro, would be the point person for this campaign, or not campaign, this

effort to convene the alternate slates of electors. It doesn't sound like that was 1 2 communicated to you. Is that fair? It was not. Yeah, that was not communicated to me. 3 Q Okay. How does that affect your understanding of these events? 4 Α If I -- had I known that, you know, I would have thrown my hands up in the 5 air, because that was not communicated to me at all. 6 What do you mean by would have thrown your hands up in the air? 7 Q Would you have not wanted to participate in this any further as well? 8 9 Α I absolutely would not have. Had I known that the three main lawyers for 10 the campaign that I had spoken to in the past and were leading up were not on board, 11 veah. Q Okay. Well, let's talk a little bit about the logistics about how this all came 12 13 together, if that is okay. Α Okay. 14 15 Q So maybe we will bring up a couple of documents that you produced to us last week. And we appreciate you sending them over. 16 Α 17 Sure. if you don't mind. Let's start with exhibit 2, 18 Q 19 So Mr. Sinners, this is one of your emails, it is dated December 11th, 2020. Are 20 you able to see it on the screen with us? Α 21 I can. Q So this looks like an email that came in on Friday from Mr. Shafer, 22 23 the State party chair to yourself, with several of the individuals you have described to us earlier copied. And it describes -- I think it, you know, it looks like it is an email that 24

originally had attached the seven documents for Georgia electors, as reflected in the

1 subject line. 2 Α Right. Do you remember this email? 3 Q Α I mean, I -- yeah. Yes, I do. 4 5 Q How does it fit in the timeline that you described to us earlier from your original conversation with Mr. Shafer and the efforts to organize the electors to meet? 6 7 Α It was probably after my first phone call about it. Prob -- I would assume that the first phone call happened early on Friday, potentially -- probably not Thursday, 8 9 but Friday. And to me, that kind of reflects the whole kind of mishmash. You know, he 10 is hearing that one person's doing this, but the other person is saying that this, you know, 11 and it is -- just kind of reflects the general disorganization that was the campaign. 12 Got it. Okay. And it looks like from the second paragraph and the -- I 13 guess the second sentence of this email, it reflects that Mr. Shafer reserved a room at the capital at the request of Ray Smith. Is that right? 14 I would assume that that would be correct. 15 Α Did you have any role in reserving a room at the State capital for the 16 Q Trump electors to meet? 17 Α I did not. 18 19 Q Okay. So the individuals that are on the copy line of this email, include 20 Brian Barrett, who you identified for us earlier as the RNC political director over Georgia. 21 Did he remain involved in the effort as the weekend went on and into December 14th? 22 Α I would say that he remained notified, but he never had anything specifically, 23 you know, any tasks, any notification or anything like that, but it was, you know, keeping tabs on -- on it. 24

Okay. All right. Let's look at exhibit 3, please. So a slightly more

Q

- updated version of the same email thread. This one is Saturday, December 12th, at a
- 2 little bit before 11:00 a.m. in the morning. Same distribution group. And Mr. Shafer
- 3 writes, Josh Findlay now claims that Mike Roman is doing it. And I think the "it"
- 4 means -- refers to the earlier email about contacting electors? Is that right?
- 5 A I would assume so.
- 6 Q Okay. So tell us a little more about the involvement of Mike Roman in this
- 7 effort. Is this the first -- oh, sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Sinners.
- 8 A Sure. No. Continue.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 9 Q I was just going to ask you if this is the first time that Mr. Roman became 10 involved in this effort or if you knew he was involved before that?
  - A So I -- I knew that Mike was involved, but I only spoke with Mike probably once about it, because locally, you know, it was really handled with us on a local level. I mean, campaigns tend to have that aspect where you are only focused on the campaign and what is directly in front of you. So I understood that in the States where there were challenges this was happening. But there was one call about kind of a national, I guess, effort. But ours was very Georgia specific. It was being handled very, you know, specific to Georgia. You know, Mike Roman never reached out to any Georgia electors I would confidently say.
  - Q Got it. Okay. And did you ever have any communications with Mike Roman about the legality or sort of appropriateness of the process for convening these alternate electors?
  - A You know the same thing kind of stands, you know, discussions of yes, you know, legal counsel has reviewed this is legal, you know. Abstract conversations, but never, like, so-and-so from HQ has said that -- that, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. You know, I was kind of relying on the fact that, you know, it seemed that HQ was on board,

and that our local counsel, Ray Smith, my campaign attorney, you know, had signed off, you know, and participated.

Q Sure, understood. So one other piece of the evidence that the select committee has developed through our investigation is that there was a -- this discussion between the professional campaign lawyers Justin Clark, Matt Morgan and Josh Findlay on one side and those lawyers associated with Rudy Giuliani on the other side. In the course of the three lawyers, Mr. Clark, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Findlay, declining to proceed any further in this effort, there was a discussion of Mr. Roman, Mike Roman, and the EDO operation taking over the effort from the more, sort of, traditional political effort within the campaign. Was any of that communicated to you either by Mr. Roman or anyone else?

A I mean, I know, you know, that I was the EDO guy for Georgia. And I was asked, and I understand the other EDO directors were. I just did not see it at the time as it being, you know, I like the word foisted upon EDO for reasons that, you know, legal objected. I was not aware of that.

Q Got it. During this time period after the election, I think you already referred a little bit to what was publicly reported at the time and certainly has been confirmed by our investigation that there was a divide between the more professional campaign lawyers and staff at headquarters and the team that was working with Mayor Giuliani. Do you have a sense for where Mr. Roman fell as far as which kind of strategic direction or group within the campaign he was affiliated with during this time period?

A Not really, because Mike's kind of a paid operator, you know. He is kind of a hired gun. I get the sense that he was, you know -- maybe after the campaign I get the sense that he was maybe he was more tied into the rattle. But I know that my intent was never to be aligned with team crazy. But there was also kind of some things at that

- time that, you know, on the campaign you are not really paying attention to what the
- 2 media's saying. I wasn't watching the TV, you know. I didn't even realize that Rudy
- 3 Giuliani's hair dye was dripping at a press conference until a couple days later. It was
- 4 really around Christmas that, like, some time to kind of relax and breathe a little bit that it
- 5 was like, ugh, this is not -- you know, Rudy is leading us down a dangerous path.
- 6 Q Understood, okay. All right. Let's look at another document quickly,
- 7 exhibit 4, please.
- 8 So Mr. Sinners, this is another email that you shared with us, it is from Friday -- oh,
- I am sorry, it is from Saturday, December 12th, at about 5 o'clock in the evening from
- Mike Roman to yourself and Josh Findlay. And it seems to convey that Mr. Findlay
- offered to help and is from Georgia. And kind of implies that maybe that he would be
- en route to Georgia. Do you remember -- did Josh Findlay come down to Georgia during
- this December time period?
- 14 A He did, but I don't remember him being there during, like, elector. You
- 15 know, I think he came down a couple days later. I may be incorrect. But the only
- 16 conversations I remember with Findlay were that Friday, I think his -- he and I spoke
- reasonably regularly. I can say that Findlay struck me as somebody that was on kind of
- the normal aspect. I think he is a very good lawyer. I think he has a good head on his
- shoulders. And I don't remember any objections from him specifically.
- 20 Q Okay. And did you have any further conversations with him over the
- 21 weekend, so if those objections were raised on Saturday or into the weekend before the
- 22 electoral college meeting, did Mr. Findlay ever revise his statements to you about the
- 23 propriety of that process?
- A I would not recall that. I do know that had somebody like Josh said stand
- down, I would not have, you know, helped this.

1	Q Understood. So if if it had been communicated to you that continuing on				
2	the path of convening these alternate electors was a path that you would be following				
3	Rudy Giuliani down that path, as opposed to Justin Clark, Matt Morgan and Josh Findlay,				
4	is it fair to say that you wouldn't have continued?				
5	A I yeah. If I I would have been on team HQ legal for sure.				
6	Q Got it, okay. Let's look really quickly at exhibit 5, please. And if you just				
7	scroll down a little bit so we can see the email at the bottom there. Okay, great. We				
8	can continue scrolling if you would like to see the last couple of bullet points there, Mr.				
9	Sinners. But do you remember this email?				
10	A I know that it was sent, yes.				
11	Q Great, okay. So it looks like an email from you on Saturday, December				
12	12th, late in the evening, 10:41 p.m., with several of the individuals we have discussed				
13	already on the recipient list, including David Shafer, the State party chair; Mr. Bragg, the				
14	executive director; Brian Barrett from the RNC, Josh Findlay, and Mike Roman from the				
15	Trump campaign. Is that right?				
16	A Yes.				
17	Q Okay. And I just would like to talk with you a little bit about these bullet				
18	points at the bottom through which I think you are conveying the status of your outreach				
19	to the potential alternate electors in Georgia. Is that right?				
20	A Yes.				
21	Q Okay. So tell us what you remember about this, like, the first bullet point				
22	here looks like it is listing the electors who confirmed with you. Does that mean did you				
23	speak with each of these electors that are listed in that first bullet point?				
24	A I would assume that would be the case.				

Q

Okay.

1	Α	I had been directed to reach out and make sure that they were there.	And
2	so, I spoke v	with each one of them and, you know, they were on board.	

- Q Okay. And when you reached out to them, did you convey what had already been conveyed to you about the legality of the process, sort of the reason for meeting being to preserve litigation remedy?
- A I would assume so. I would assume there would have been those questions. And, you know, my response would be that State party legal counsel and Trump campaign legal counsel had, you know, assured that this was the method that, you know, had to happen. And most of these people were very, you know, very committed Trump supporters so, you know, they wanted to help.
  - Q Okay. Were any of them confused or concerned about the process?
- A I remember maybe one or two that were, you know, just had questions. I think I had let Chairman Shafer know. And, you know, he had reached out -- I know that he had reached out to a number of these people. And, you know, when I spoke to a number of these people, they had said that they'd already been contacted by Shafer or, you know, another party leader. And there were numerous, you know, outreach methods.
- Q Do you remember which ones said they had already been contacted by Chairman Shafer?
- A I think Shawn Still had, Joseph or anybody that -- I think Shawn Still or Joseph Brannan I think already knew, because most -- most of these individuals are, in some capacity, on the Georgia GOP, like, State committee or, you know, holding office within there. And I know they have group chats and, you know, other ways. But most of the people that I spoke to already knew of this.
  - Q Okay. In the second bullet point here, you note two people that had been

- 1 on the original electors list that were not going to participate. The first one is Patrick 2 Garland you describe as not able to perform his duties. Do you remember the circumstances there? 3 I think his wife had passed away, like, the day before. 4 Goodness. Well, certainly understandable absence then. What about 5 Q Representative Susan Holmes. You described her as not compliant there. What do 6 you remember about your interactions with Representative Holmes? 7 I just said, Hey, you know, this is Robert Sinners with the Trump campaign 8 9 and she hung up. And then I called her back and she hung up. And I think I texted her. 10 And, you know, it was like uh. I was, like, you know, Chairman Shafer, you can reach out. And I never really -- it was just kind of life moved on. 11 Got it. So did you have a chance to explain to her the process at all? 12 I think -- I think I did by text but, you know, she -- she had seemed -- she had 13 Α seemed, you know, just not interested. 14 15 Q Okay. Did you have any sense that her concerns were --Can I put you on mute real quick? 16 Sure. Go right ahead. Let us go off the record for a brief break. 17 18 [Recess.]
- 19 Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> I'm back.
- Thank you. Mr. Sinners --
- 21 Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> Sorry about that.
- Oh, no worries at all. I actually just had one short thing I needed to
  deal with. Can we stay off the record and we will come back? We will just take a brief
  break, come back in less than 5 minutes.
- 25 Mr. <u>Sinners.</u> Sure, sure.

1	Okay. Great. Thank you so much.										
2	[Recess.]										
3	BY										
4	Q Thanks for the quick break, Mr. Sinners.										
5	So I think right before we took a break, we were talking about your										
6	communications with potential alternate electors in Georgia. And you told us that, you										
7	know, you really hadn't had any success in talking to Ms. Holmes. So I wanted to										
8	confirm that Representative Holmes did she have any concerns about the propriety or										
9	appropriateness of the process, or was it more a matter of just not having the										
10	opportunity to have a fulsome conversation about it?										
11	A I would assume that looking back, those might have been her concerns.										
12	But, you know, she just did not want to speak with me and we left it at that. I told										
13	Chairman Shafer. I think he might have had a conversation with her. But, you know,										
14	there was just no communication or, you know, there was you know, she did not										
15	divulge much.										
16	Q Okay. Understood. And there was one other that I think I won't pull the										
17	email back up, unless it is helpful to refresh your recollection about it, but I think you also										
18	referred to John Isakson as somebody who you had also reached out to.										
19	A Yeah.										
20	Q What did you remember about your interactions with Mr. Isakson?										
21	A He was really nice. A really good guy. He just said, you know, I think I am										
22	out. I don't I think he was just really kind of moving past Trump. And I remember										
23	specifically saying, Hey, man, I can't blame you. I have to ask. And I think that, you										
24	know, if you were to speak with him, I think he might recollect the same, you know.										
25	was not pushy. I was not, like, you are not part of the team, you know, you are a but I										

1 was, like, Hey, man, I get it.

- Q Right. He is on -- somebody gave you a list. He is on the list. You are calling him and telling him the kind of plan, and what was his response?
- A Trying to sell him a time share, you know. It was, like -- he was just, like, I can't make it. This isn't something I want to be -- you know, I want to participate in.
  - Q Okay. And that last part is what I want to tease out a little bit. In your communications with Mr. Isakson, did he say that he couldn't make it because he had, you know, a dentist appointment, you know, or some other conflict that would prevent him from attending it as scheduling matter or was it more of a substantive concern?
  - A I think it was neither. He was just very much like, I don't want to be involved. And, you know, I don't think he was, like, I am concerned that this is, you know, unethical, illegal or immoral or otherwise. I think he was just, like, I don't want to be involved. And I think that -- you know, I understood where he was coming from. I think it was one of those things if I get what you are saying, that is all you need to say.
  - Q Okay. Got it.
- 16 A You know.
  - Q But you did have a phone conversation with Mr. Isakson and he -- you exchanged those words, he said back to you that he didn't want to be involved. Is that right?
    - A Right. I mean, he might have phrased it differently. But the message conveys was yeah, like, I have got other things to do, like, I don't want to be involved, you know. My fight for President Trump is done.
    - Q Got it, okay. And so what did you do -- what were you told about the implication of these electors that are on the list like Patrick Garland, Ms. Holmes, Mr. Isakson, what were you told about the implications of they're no longer participating?

1	A That there were no implications. That you could just the a document, you										
2	know, a replacement document. That is all that was really conveyed to me.										
3	Q Okay. And who gave you that impression that there were no implications if										
4	the original electors couldn't participate?										
5	A I mean, it had come from the Chesebro documents. There was one, like a										
6	notification. I think you have got to notify, like, the Governor's office or something like										
7	that. And, you know, local counsel. Again, the same kind of thing, our local counsel										
8	had, you know, that that was the case that this document was, you know, the										
9	mechanism for doing that.										
10	Q Okay. Did they tell you anything about the implication of the Governor,										
11	you know was it just a matter of notifying the Governor? Did they tell you that they										
12	needed the Governor to approve the sign off on the replacement electors?										
13	A I am not entirely sure. But, you know, at the time, I remembered that as										
14	kind of a, in the plus category that for this to actually have an effect, the Governor would										
15	have to sign off. And I knew that if the Governor had signed off, then there would have										
16	been a court judgment or something substantive in that regard that, you know, that										
17	almost mitigated any sort of red flag or anything like that.										
18	Q Okay. So it was your under you understood that the Governor had										
19	certified a slate of electors for Biden, right?										
20	A Yes, yeah.										

1												
2	[11:12 p.m.]	]										
3		ВҮ										
4	Q	And so	it was you	ur und	derstanding t	hat fo	r the Gov	ernor t	o take s	ome actio	on	
5	to certify th	o certify the Trump slate, that										
6	Α	Right. That something would have to that some something substantive										
7	would have to change, right.											
8	Q	Okay.	Okay.	And v	vhat impressi	on we	ere you gi	iven abo	out wha	t might		
9	happen with these certificates or the slate of electors if the Governor didn't sign off on											
10	them?											
11	Α	Likely th	nat, you k	now,	it would just	be an	other kin	nd of pie	ece of pa	aper that		
12	has no effect, you know, kind of kind of thing. That, you know, if the challenge failed,											
13	then there wouldn't be any recourse for the campaign; that the, you know, election											
14	challenge would be mooted; that, you know, life would go on and President Biden would									ıld		
15	be Presiden	it.										
16	Q	Okay.	Did you	ever h	near of any di	iscussi	ion, eithe	r befor	e the ele	ectors me	et	
17	or after it, about getting trying to get the State legislature to take some action with											
18	regard to the Trump electors?											
19	Α	I know t	that there	e had	been some d	liscuss	sion of fili	ng like	some sc	ort of laws	suit	
20	for that earlier on, but I wasn't really sure of the mechanics of that. I know, you know,									٧,		
21	there was ju	ust a lot c	of talk abo	out op	otions, but I d	lon't t	hink that	there v	vas I v	vas not		
22	aware of any substantive effort to put pressure on the State legislature. I know that,											
23	you know, people were saying, call a special session, there were chain letters going out,									·,		
24	you know, a	all of that	sort of st	uff.	I never gave	any,	you know	v, two c	ents to	that.		

Okay. Did you see those efforts to, you know, encourage the Georgia

25

Q

- 1 legislature to convene a special session as connected to this issue of naming Trump
- 2 electors instead of Biden electors?
- 3 A I did not.
- 4 Q Okay.

- A I did not see those connected. Or I can say that I was not aware of any effort by the campaign to do that. Because, you know, at the time, and this is something that as we've moved past, you know, I kind of thought that my position where I was, that I was getting a sense, the pulse of where all the pieces were moving, but, you know, I had learned that there were some other things happening around me that I was not aware of.
  - Q What are some of those things that you learned about later?
- A People trying to get into voting machines. People, you know, I would say, coordinated harassment campaigns of elections officials. Efforts to get, you know, State legislatures -- State legislators to call a special session. There were other things going on that I was not aware of at the time. And, you know, I think incorrectly I thought that I had a solid kind of holistic pulse of what was happening in Georgia at the time.
- Q Okay. What did you -- you mentioned that you learned later of what I think you described as a coordinated harassment campaign of election officials. Tell me what you're referring to there.
- A There were just, I want to say, activists that were really taking on this idea that, you know, election officials in their capacity had acted -- had willingly violated the law to benefit President Biden. It's not real -- it's not something that I agree with. You know, I think an example is I didn't realize that Kanye West's publicist had gone down and chased down, you know, a woman that had been incorrectly, you know, outed or incorrectly, you know, fingered as, you know, some great perpetrator of election fraud.

- 1 That had to have come from people, you know, in, I would say, in an official capac- -- I
- don't know how to phrase it. But that isn't just something that happens organically.
- And I had no clue about that. And as history moved on, there were other things, but,
- 4 you know, I was like, I had -- that was happening right under my thumb and I had no idea.
  - Q Any other things that you learned about that gave you that reaction?

- A I mean, you know, that people were kind of hunting down election machines and trying to take copies of the EMS, and stuff like that. You know, I had thought a lot of that was just like kind of crazy talk. But then, you know, I think there's more and more evidence that -- that that may have occurred. And I can't say for sure, but I know that those efforts were happening, and, you know, at the time, I didn't realize that that was the case.
- Q Okay. Anything that -- for this sort of conduct that you're describing here, did you learn about that through public reporting, through the media, or did any of it come from your own, you know, contacts in the Republican Party and the former Trump campaign?
- A I'd say -- I'd say a mix of all of the above. I mean, over the past 18 months, I've kind of been one of our experts on election disinformation, and as I've researched media reports, talked to people on the ground who have kind of come to similar kind of, you know, conclusions as I have about the validity of what was happening post-election, I've realized that, yeah, there was a lot of stuff happening that no one really had the full, full picture of.
- Q Okay. And not to get too far afield, but just, generally, based on your understanding of these issues and the disinformation that you've been working on in your new role, in your current role, what do you think the impact is on election workers as a -- sort of as individuals or as a group and on kind of the safe functioning of our

democracy from this type of disinformation?

- 2 A I think it's the number one issue facing our civil society today. I do.
- Q And have you seen -- do you think we're going -- do you think we're trending in the right direction or the wrong direction when it comes to that?

A A mix of both. Something that I continue to remind myself is that the loudest -- there's a great quote out there and I can't remember it, but to paraphrase, you know, the loudest voices are the -- just because there's a loud voice out there does not mean that it is reflective of the majority. I think you have a very vocal minority leading and continuously just looking for every single nook and cranny and every opportunity to undermine, you know, the official narrative. I think it comes from -- from decades of people losing faith in the institutions of democracy, combined with inflamed rhetoric that kind of takes advantage of those seeds of doubt and really nurtures them like a plant into, you know, a mix of a grift and a mix of a cult.

Q Okay. And based on your experience with the Trump campaign after the election and now in your new role at the Secretary of State's office, you know, as it is as you have just said, a vocal minority, what do you think the impact is or has been of that type of disinformation having the power of the sort of the voice and the Office of the Presidency connected to promoting some of the disinformation?

A Yeah. I mean, that was -- that was kind of my break during the campaign was because, specifically going back to -- we kind of broached over the topic. But I remember I was sitting there in our war room -- I always call it a war room, even though that term has become bastardized -- and, you know, someone's playing this clip of an election worker at the State Farm Arena, and it was like, look at what's going around the internet. And I remember looking at it and going, okay, like, I can see she's there.

Okay. She's scanning ballots. Okay. She's pressing buttons on the machine after

each batch is scanned and then re-scanning the same ballots.

You know, to them that was like, okay, she's typing in some special code and hacking it. To me that said, okay, she's clearing out the totals because I can see that ballots are getting spit back, or something's happening. This is completely normal.

And it was stuff like that I was battling on the campaign. You know, I was still really, you know, keeping this -- the faith alive that we'd win these runoffs, that there may be some legal opportunities. Because, you know, in other States, you had margins of 100,000. We did have a 10,000 margin. So that, you know, to me -- especially after finding a recounts and an audit where there's ballots found in like three or four different counties that are, you know, over 1,000 ballots in just about every case. You know, there was some kind of, you know, okay, maybe there's something here, but a lot of what was pushing that was complete, just hot garbage. It was just complete hot garbage. Everything from, you know, the Dominion stuff. I mean, I was even looking through some of my emails, and thankfully, you know, even at that time, I'm going, you know, these allegations are not confirmed. These allegations have not been shown substantial, proved, or anything. You know, please go vote.

And I think that's the biggest challenge is that, you know, while these kind of allegations coming from a place of, I guess, authority are harmful, one of the biggest things it does is it depresses turnout. And I think for, you know, as me, a Republican, that's bad, because it hurts -- it only hurts our team. But I think in a larger scale, it does hurt the larger functioning of democracy, without a doubt. Without a doubt.

Q Thanks for that. Yeah, absolutely.

So you're recalling the State Farm video allegations and the, what's that, the suitcases allegations, and the Dominion ones. At the time when you were working on the Trump campaign, did you tell anyone -- you know, I think you were remembering

some emails about saying, you know, this Dominion stuff hasn't been verified. Who did
you communicate with about that on the campaign?

A I don't specifically remember speaking with anyone on the campaign about these sorts -- because this sort of stuff was not coming from the campaign, per se, but you had kind of your, I guess, you'd say surrogates that were really pushing a lot of this sort of stuff. So I don't remember any specific discussions about, you know, this sort of stuff with anyone on the campaign, per se.

But I know that, you know, locally, I had some concerns because, you know, during Senate hearings and stuff like that, you know, I had pushed for like, you know, bring this witness forth because he was a poll watcher and he witnessed an actual, tangible error. You know, a poll worker made an error right in front of him, you know, da, da, da, da, you know, something that -- there was a decimal place missing, and instead of 1,000 votes, it got 10,000 votes. You know, it was corrected and these sorts of things, but, you know, to highlight the actual things that need to be worked out in election administration.

And then meanwhile, you know, unbeknownst to me, you know, folks parade in and say, you know, shredding trucks are, you know, shredding ballots, and stuff like that.

And I remember chasing those down at the time and going, no, those are envelopes.

Like, those are ballot envelopes. Those are innocuous pieces of paper, and stuff like that. So, I mean, it was a lot of frustration.

But I think at the time I kept a lot of that kind of internally to the Georgia team, and then kept a lot -- kept some of it to myself. Because, you know, there was kind of a spirit decor, which is, you know, focus on what we can actually find and ignore the BS. Because people are going to say whatever they're going to say. And, you know, misled activists are a dime a dozen sometimes.

- 1 Q Okay. Understood.
- The other thing I wanted address with you -- I do want to go back and just ask you a couple more kind of, you know, factual questions about --
- 4 A Yeah.
- 5 Q -- the phone calls and everything leading up to the 14th. But --
- 6 A Yeah.

- Q -- on the big picture, you know, you said that in this category of things that you learned about later were going on that you didn't know at the time, in addition to the kind of coordinated harassment that you identified and the campaign to get the State legislature to convene a special session, did you ever learn about a connection between January 6th and the Joint Session of Congress and these alternate slates of electors?
- A I did. After the campaign, it became clear to me -- and I will say this unabashedly -- it became to me clear to me afterwards that I don't think Rudy Giuliani's intent was ever about legal challenges. It was clear to me that he was working with folks like John Eastman and wanted to put pressure on the Vice President to accept these slates of electors just regardless, without any approval from a governor, without any approval from, you know, the voters or a court, or anything like that. But that was, you know, afterwards, for sure.
  - Q What gave you that impression?
- A I mean, connecting dots and kind of seeing. I mean, you know, there were unscrupulous actors that I met on the campaign. I've met them in every campaign.

  And, you know, I've been following this for 18 months, and it's clear to me that there was some people that had some crazy, crazy theories. But, you know, I had never really -- I'd never heard of John Eastman. I remember he testified at a Senate hearing. I just thought he was kind of weird. He had some weird background, like, fake background,

- and had an earpiece in, and I was just kind of like, who is this clown? But, you know, as far as like getting an Eastman memo or anything like that prior, no.
- Q When you -- those Eastman memos, when they came out publicly after, you know, January 6th, did you read them?
- 5 A I did. I did.

- Q And what did you think -- particular to this issue of the alternate or contingent slates of electors, when you read those Eastman memos, did you see a connection between what you had been asked to do convening these electors and what he had recommended?
- A I thought that it was -- that there certainly was a connection. I don't know if at the time that had been the kind of shadow, if you will, strategy. And we were just, you know, kind of useful idiots or rubes at that point. You know, just kind of do it and get -- I don't know if that had been done.
- Part of me -- you know, a strong part of me really feels that it's just kind of, as the road continued and as it was failure, failure, failure, that that got formulated as what do we have on the table, let's just do it. I don't know if I think or believe that the strategy on December 14th was the same as the strategy, at least in their eyes, on January 6th. But seeing that link was pretty obvious to me afterwards.
- Q And how did that make you feel about your having been involved in the alternate electors meeting in Georgia once you saw those memos and thought that there was a link?
- 22 A I was ashamed. I was ashamed.
  - Q And now after what we've told you today about the select committee's investigation about the conclusion of the professional lawyers on the campaign staff,

    Justin Clark, Matt Morgan, and Josh Findlay, about their unwillingness to participate in

the convening of these electors, how does that contribute to your understanding of these issues?

A I'm angry. I am angry because I think -- I think in a sense, you know, no one really cared if -- if people were potentially putting themselves in jeopardy. I think that there should have been a -- you know, I remember towards the end of the campaign getting HQ legal memos, you know, preserve these documents related to Dominion.

Preserve this. You know, don't do this. Don't go -- I wish there would have been one put out that said, hey, just in case you're asked about electors, just say no. I feel like that should have happened. And part of it is because that didn't happen. I was relying on the advice from people on the ground here in Georgia saying this is kosher, proceed.

Q All right. And what do you think about the electors themselves who, you know, were given documents to sign on the 14th? How did -- your understanding of these issues now in hindsight, how does that make you feel about that process?

A I would feel cheated, but also, you know, some of those people are hoorah (ph). Some of those people I feel like would -- there's some -- and I don't mean this in a disparaging sense towards them, but I think that there are some people that would not care, that, you know, wanted to ride that and support their President, you know, to the very end. But I would feel that if I had signed them, that I did not have the complete piece of -- the complete picture, and I would be -- I would -- I would be angry.

Q Understood. On the topic -- you know, our investigation has also uncovered information -- documents that indicate that in other States where Trump electors were being convened, that electors requested indemnification for potential legal challenges. And in at least two instances requested changes to the language on the certificate so that the certificate that they were signing would reflect the fact that their -- the vote was contingent in some manner, rather than a document that says, we

1	are the duly elected electors			
2	A Yeah.			
3	Q from the State. Did anyone share any of those communications about			
4	those issues with you about indemnification or about potential changes to the language			
5	of the certificate to make the contingent nature clear on its face?			
6	A No, those concerns were never raised, but I passed the documents to the			
7	State party. And I know that the change was suggested of putting, you know,			
8	Republican Party, making it clear that this was a Georgia Republican Party thing. I think			
9	that that may have come from Alex Kaufman. I'm not sure, but I know that that			
10	discussion was had to make it clearly identified as Republican.			
11	Q Okay. Do you know if that was implemented in the documents that were			
12	signed in Georgia?			
13	A I know that it said, you know, David Shafer, chairman, Georgia Republican			
14	Party, and then there is the electoral college.			
15	Q Okay. Okay. Thanks.			
16	So there's one other kind of issue or, you know, discussion in advance of the			
17	electors meeting that I wanted to raise with you that has, particularly of late, become a			
18	focus of some of the media reporting around this issue involving yourself, and that is the			
19	request for this process to be conducted in secrecy.			
20	So tell us I can pull up a document if it's helpful, but I think you would			
21	A I know that you don't need to. I know the email well.			
22	Q You know the document quite well at this point. I understand that.			
23	So as has been recently reported, you sent an email that included a request for			
24	this process to occur in, you know, complete secrecy. And I wanted to ask you to give us			

your understanding of what you were told about that and what you meant when you

- 1 wrote that.
- 2 A Yeah. I mean, it is quite innocuous. The secrecy element simply was
- 3 because with everything happening around the Capitol -- I don't know this to be a
- 4 hundred percent true or not -- but we were under the impression that the Capitol's
- 5 access was limited due to COVID, as well as it being the certification, you know, on
- 6 December 14th that the Capitol was closed. And just about every day there had been
- 7 protests and counterprotests around the Capitol. I mean, people were open carrying
- 8 firearms from both sides.
- I remember specifically there was a group called the Not Fucking Around Coalition,
- which is kind of a -- kind of leftist organization, as well as your armed Stop the Stealers.
- And there had been some -- I mean, you know, officials were getting death threats. It
- was not great at the Capitol.
- But, again, going back to what we had seen that we had to be in the Capitol at this
- time, and the concern was that, you know, had a bunch of Republicans shown up, that
- this would not be allowed to proceed. That there would be, you know, interruptions,
- protests, you know, people just like haranguing us so -- you know, to meet in secret.
- And then, you know, I know that I proposed a press release following it. I know
- 18 Chairman Shafer had opened it up to media, and it had been well reported on. But the
- secrecy element was simply get the people on the bus and make sure that they're there.
- 20 Q Okay. Got it. Do you remember -- I think you referred earlier to
- 21 participating in one phone call with electors from other States. Is that right?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Do you remember when that occurred?
- A Sometime over the weekend, perhaps.
- Q Over the weekend. Okay. Let's see, I just wanted to bring up an email to

I think

There

1 ask about that. 2 So it's exhibit 17, I believe, with if you can pull it up. So, Mr. Sinners, again, this is one of the emails that you shared with us. This one 3 is from Sunday, December 13th, from Ken Chesebro to yourself and to Mike Roman. 4 5 And this is Mr. Chesebro conveying to you that, quote, The mayor wants to keep this quiet until after all voting is done. 6 Α 7 Uh-huh. Q Do you remember this? Did you have a conversation around here that 8 9 would give you an understanding of what it was that Mayor Giuliani was asking here? 10 Α Not particularly. As you may have heard -- I guess that's just -- I mean, 11 there was a lot of chatter. My understanding was there were multiple people, you 12 know, calling from D.C. about this, a lot of wires getting crossed. 
It was kind of -- we had 13 a phone call with the lawyer/reporter Christina Bobb. And my understanding was that was, you know, to get some media coverage. Again, going back to what I didn't really 14 15 understand what OAN was at that point. But we had had a call about that. And I understood her to be working with the mayor, with Mayor Giuliani. And, yeah, I mean, 16 there were -- there was different -- diff- -- the situation was fluid would be the best --17 Is the phone call that you had with Ms. Bobb, is that the same one that you 18 Q 19 were referring to that had other States' electors on it, or is it --Α [Inaudible.] 20 21 Q Same one. Okay. I don't know if it was States' electors, but, like, either the campaign staff or 22 Α 23 the State party staff that was shepherding in each State.

Yeah, thanks for that clarification. That's what I meant. I agree.

it was a meeting that was of the organizers rather than the electors themselves.

24

25

Q

might be some overlap there between folks that were involved as, you know, on both sides.

3 A Right.

Q Do you remember Mayor Giuliani speaking on that call?

A I don't, solely because I don't remember ever speaking or hearing from him.

I mean, it's possible. I just know that I was -- you know, a lot of friends were asking me about what -- you know, what is going on in Georgia, da, da, da. And just looking through my texts and my communication, I feel like I would have said to somebody, uh, guys, I just got off a conference call with Rudy Giuliani, or some -- and I don't have any of that. So I don't -- I don't -- I don't think so. I just don't recall any phone call where Rudy was a part.

Q Got it. And just now with the benefit of hindsight, so both your own impressions and conversations after January 6th, plus our discussion here today, do you have any different view about Mayor Giuliani asking for this to take place in secret, keep it quiet until after all the voting is done? Any different view today than you did at the time?

A Not particularly. I mean, I feel like every conversation I had was basically like, you know -- this is not my opinion per se. But like, you know, if the Democrats find out about this, they will try to shut it down, or if the protesters find out, you know, they will try to shut it down. And I feel like, you know, there was validity to that. But I don't think the -- I don't think the keeping it quiet until after voting is done was, you know, let's hide this, let's operate in secrecy, no one can find out type thing.

Because, again, you know, we'd had a call with -- about getting the press out for this. You know, press releases were discussed. So I don't really -- you know, I don't think that there was a real secrecy element in the sense of something's off here, we have

- to be quiet about it, per se. | don't --
- 2 Q Yeah. So, yeah, is it fair to say that you think that the secrecy, you keep it
- quiet until after the voting is done, that that was less motivated by, you know, wanting to
- 4 hide something that -- from view entirely because there's some concern about --
- 5 A Right.
- 6 Q -- what we were doing but rather, instead, a concern that we don't want
- 7 anything --
- 8 A Right.
- 9 Q Yeah. -- we don't want anything to interfere with our ability to complete
- this task. And once we have, we are okay with it being public. But until we do, we
- want it to -- until we get in there and get the votes cast, we don't want anyone to know
- 12 about it. Is that fair?
- 13 A Yeah, that's fair.
- 14 Q Okay. This is consistent with some information that the committee has
- received about other States, one in particular where the electors had concerns about
- obtaining access to the Capitol and -- a different State -- and considered sleeping
- overnight in the Capitol so that they would not be prevented from entry. Any reaction
- 18 to that?
- 19 A I mean, that's dedication, I guess.
- 20 Q It ultimately was a plan that was not carried to fruition, but nonetheless
- 21 discussed.
- 22 A Yeah.
- Q Okay. So I think -- let me check my notes real quick, but I think that's all I
- have for you about this.
- 25 I think you said this earlier, Mr. Sinners, that you had a brief interaction with Mr.

- Eastman in connection with his testimony in the Georgia State Senate committee hearing
- in December. Did you have any other substantive conversations with him?
- A That would be incorrect. I did not have -- I never had an interaction with
- 4 him. I was simply cc'd on an email that, looking back, I realized it was from him. I
- 5 never spoke with him directly or had any communication with him.
- 6 Q Oh, thanks for the clarification. It was the email that I was referring to. I
- 7 should have been more clear, so --
- 8 A Right.
- 9 Q Yes.
- 10 A I was just cc'd on that. And, you know, looking back at the significance of
- it, you know, I felt that it was -- it was unrelated to the electors, but I felt that it was
- important to include to you.
- 13 Q Okay. Yeah, I appreciate that. Okay.
- Mr. Sinners, there were a couple of other things that came up in our conversation,
- our informal conversation last week, that I wanted to discuss with you on the record, if
- 16 you're amenable to that. One was an interaction that you described having with a staff
- member for Representative Hice related to some, you know, election-related mis- or
- 18 disinformation. Do you remember that?
- 19 A I do.
- 20 Q All right. Can you describe briefly for us what occurred and what the
- relevance was to you?
- A Sure. The relevance was, to me, that I had -- it was one of those cases
- 23 where -- you know, a big part of what my job was, at least in my opinion, following the
- election was trying to keep things together, trying to influence some order. Because
- 25 post-election, there were so many factions. No one trusted one another, room to room

within the building. And, you know, I was whispering between a number of different, shall we say, camps.

And one of the camps that, you know, I really came to -- I don't want to say despise -- came to resent was that, you know, when we latch on to something that is patently false, it hurts actual evidence from being -- you know, it hurts correcting actual failures in election administration. Election administration is very fluid, and you identify mistakes, you identify irregularities. But when someone comes out and says something just wild-eyed and knowingly false, something that can be disproven just like that, it makes me angry.

And I remember an interaction -- you know, in our call center, our war room, we had everybody from people who had just gotten involved with elections, you know, because of a guy that's running, they felt really passionate, to people who were elected officials coming out, to people that had -- you know, were financiers and bank rollers that wanted to help. So you had this kind of unique blend coming in and people with various connections.

I don't remember specifically who it was, but someone had approached me and said, would you be willing to take a phone call from a Member of Congress? And I said sure. Absolutely. Like, yes. And it was Jody Hice's office, and I believe it was their communications director, I don't remember their name, but I know that it was a staffer in D.C. for Congressman Hice. And they were asking me about a Gateway Pundit article that had come out saying that there was a forensic audit, quote/unquote, of a voting machine in Ware County, and is there any validity to this.

And I remember -- I want to say that I reached out directly to the election supervisor of Ware County. I remember his name is Carlos Nelson. And I was like, is there any truth to this? And he's like, absolutely not. And, you know, doing due

- diligence, I looked at the audit file. And basically what the article was alleging was, for
- the sake of argument, let's say 27 votes showed up for Biden, and then after the recount
- or hand audit, or however you want to phrase it, those 27 votes had been put in the
- 4 Trump column. And that the people at the Gateway Pundit were saying this is evidence
- of the Dominion vote system flipping votes.
- 6 Well, I mean, you can have just a basic -- a basic rudimentary knowledge of
- 7 election administration to understand that that is not evidence of vote flipping. That is
- 8 evidence of human error, our human diligence correcting -- correcting something in an
- 9 audit; 27 votes moving from one column -- it means someone counted differently or the
- machine count may have been off.
- Voting machines do come up with slightly different numbers. It's just a fact of
- life. It's how you feed the ballots. It's if the ballots can be read properly. I mean, it
- is -- but, you know, they're within a 99.99999 percent degree of accuracy. And I had
- explained that to the staffer that, no, this was not evidence of a vote flipping, da, da, da,
- da, da. You know, this is a huge nothing burger. And I remember, you know, an hour
- later, I started hearing about this more because the Congressman had tweeted out that
- article, following me essentially saying, no, do not run for this.
- 18 Q Okay. Understood. Thank you.
- And do you remember approximately when that conversation took place?
- 20 A I cannot even give you a date or a -- I mean, it was just a blur. I cannot -- I
- assume that it would be whatever date that tweet was sent.
- 22 Q Yeah. We could --
- A Yeah. I assume it would be within 24 hours. And my recollection serves
- 24 me that I was like, I had just gotten off the phone with this guy. So within -- within the
- 25 proximate.

- 1 Q Got it. Okay. But it was in the time period between the election and
- 2 January 6th. Is that fair?
- 3 A I would have to -- yes. Yes.
- 4 Q Okay, Okay, Thank you.
- 5 Check my notes real quickly here. I am cognizant of the time.
  - Oh, there is one other small detail about the electors process that you mentioned to me informally, Mr. Sinners, that I just wanted to touch base on. We had talked earlier about Mr. Barrett, the RNC political director, being somewhat aware of the process, but it doesn't sound like much involved. You mentioned something about him giving you a token of his appreciation for having participated in the process afterwards.
- 11 Is that something -- have I described it fairly to you?
- 12 A That's fair.
- 13 Q Yeah.

- A I would say this about Brian that, you know, his knowledge had reinforced the notion to me that this was something the RNC wanted to do quietly. He did give me a bottle of liquor. I felt like at the time -- and still feel that way -- I don't think there was an ulterior motive of like, hey, you know, you're going to need this, you poor schmuck, but it was more of like a, you know, this was such a nightmare. You know, as you can see, all the wires were just crossed, and it's like, you know, you pulled it out, you got it done.
- And I think there was also some guilt on his aspect, because, you know, simply put, Brian had kind of thrown me under the bus a little bit. Well, I don't want to say a little bit, a lot of bit, just with moving toward the runoff and my position. There had -- you know, as we explained informally, there was, you know, some discussion among higher party officials that basically my EDO operation was the reason why we lost

- Georgia, which, you know, you hear that enough and you start believing it. Although, I
- 2 completely laugh at that, and I say, hey, I actually recruited the most poll watchers and
- 3 volunteer attorneys in the history of the State, and I was the only guy doing it. Whereas
- 4 the other team probably had about 15 to 20 full-time staffers doing the same thing I was
- 5 doing myself.

- But, yeah, I mean, Barrett was not involved. We reported to him, we gave him
- status updates, but he was not intimately involved, to say the least.
- 8 Q Okay. Okay. Thanks for that.
- 9 Mr. Sinners, there was one other vignette that you shared with we informally
- about a senior kind of figure from the Trump campaign coming to Georgia and taking a
- meeting in the headquarters that you were not a part of, but that you learned about the
- content. Is that something that you're willing to discuss with us today?
- 13 A Yeah, I'd be happy to.
- 14 Q Okay. All right. So tell me -- informally you recounted to me a story
- about a meeting that Donald Trump, Jr., had in Georgia shortly after the election. Can
- you tell us more of what you remember about that?
- 17 A I was not there, but I think it sets the tone for kind of understanding where
- the leadership of the State party was mentally and strategically. Again, I was not there,
- so I cannot confirm the details. But it is my understanding that Don Jr. came down a
- couple days after the election. And there was a big divide between, do we latch on to
- Trump or do we run these Senate races independently? And there was a huge divide, a
- huge schism. And it divided room by room to room. Again, you know, there's
- 23 probably 10 different camps within that building, each with their own opinion, and I was
- kind of trying to kind of circumnavigate the politics and keep my head down.
  - But it is my understanding that there was a threat made by Don Jr., you know, that

if you abandon my dad and do not, you know, say he won the election -- this goes into calling, you know, for the Secretary of State to resign, this goes into calling -- to teaming up with, you know, the Lin Woods of the world, and stuff like that. -- that if you do not support my dad 100 percent, we are going to tank your Senate races.

And I know that this exchange happened because, you know, it was discussed -- I'm not sure who was in the room, but, you know, the way I like to put it is that if someone used too much coffee creamer one morning on the first floor, the fifth floor would know about it by lunch. It was just one of those things that it was common knowledge that, yes, like, the neutering was -- well, I don't -- let's not say that -- but it was the understanding that Georgia is going to double down on whatever is said, however it's said, or suffer the consequences.

Q Okay. Thanks for that.

And you've told us that you just generally knew this to be the case. Do you have any memories of specific individuals that you talked to that -- from whom you learned about the contents of this meeting?

A I don't -- I don't really recollect specifics. During that time, everybody was going out -- and, you know, the stress was real. We were going out every night drinking, you know, blowing off steam. And it was kind of like a daily recap of what's happening in the world, what's going on. And I just remember that as being one of the things that's like, wow.

And I'll say this, that I saw that meeting happen. It happened in a room that was directly across from the call center. And I remember seeing both of them walk in and both of them walk out. And the facial expressions of both told me everything that I needed to know about what happened.

Q Understood. So who were the individuals that you saw go into the

- 1 meeting?
- 2 A I mean, I remember Chairman Shafer, I remember Don Jr. Kim Guilfoyle
- was there. I don't know if she was in the meeting. And then a couple people I didn't
- 4 know. I'd be speculating at this point. Yeah, I'd be speculating at this point.
- 5 Q Okay. But you certainly remember Donald Trump, Jr., and David Shafer.
- 6 Is that right?

that meeting?

- 7 A I certainly remember. Yeah.
- Q Okay. And when you were remembering the facial expressions, you said, of both people when they left the room, were you referring to Don Jr. and Mr. Shafer?
- 10 A Shafer looked like he'd seen a ghost.
- Q Okay. Were there representatives of the Senate campaigns present for
- 13 A It is possible. There is another meeting that happened, I want to say Friday
- morning. I want to say this might have been Thursday night following the election or
- 15 Friday night. Thursday -- there was -- there was a -- whenever there was a press
- 16 conference in the parking lot with -- featuring Don Jr., that was the night. And then I
- want to say the next morning there was like an all-hands meeting between -- I mean, it
- 18 was just a complete mess. I was not a part of that. It was happening next door. I
- 19 was taking calls at that point. And that was like an all hands -- I mean, anybody and
- 20 everybody was there, and it was just a complete nightmare. They'd even opted to move
- and have a select group of people offsite meet because it just became such a -- such a
- 22 zoo.

- Q Okay. So just so I understand the events, the order of them, you're
- remembering that Donald Trump, Jr., gave a press conference in the parking lot outside of
- the Georgia GOP headquarters. Is that right?

- 1 A Yes. That is correct.
- Q And that was the same day that you remember him having the meeting with David Shafer that you've described to us?
- A Within the same -- I want to say it was before the press conference, and it
  was, you know, within a 30-minute window. And, you know, if I had to speculate and
  characterize how it was, it was, I'm giving you a message, you got the message, all right,
  let's go out on camera and do it.
  - Q So Mr. Shafer was there with Donald Trump, Jr., at the press conference. Is that right?
- 10 A I believe that to be the case.

- Q Okay. And then the all-hands meeting that you referred to taking place the next day, that included the representatives of the Senate campaigns, and you described it as a complete mess. Was that related to the kind of directive that you've described Donald Trump, Jr., conveying?
- A I think that there were some people that were probably on board with that directive, but then there were people that were, you know, kind of rightly focused on the runoffs. That meeting is extensively reported in a Greg Bluestein's book "Flipped." And I can say that, you know, I was not a part of that meeting. I just know a couple excerpts of what I've been told. But it was, you know, you kind of had your establishment, and then you had, you know, some of your more, shall we say, interesting, you know, Members of Congress, shall we say, like the Marjorie Greene types, and, you know, your people that were, you know, dispatched by the White House, kind of coming -- coming to head.
- Q Okay. Great. And my colleague very helpfully confirmed for us while we've been talking that the press conference you're referring to took place on Thursday,

- 1 November 5th, just 2 days after the election. Is that --
- 2 A That would make perfect sense. Yeah.
- Q Okay. Okay. Got it. I don't have it at my fingertips, but hearing you

  describe this reminded me of another circumstance in Georgia that I remember that

  there was a story, some reporting that, after the Senate candidates, Senators Purdue and
- 6 Loeffler had called for the resignation of Secretary of State Raffensperger. And I think
- 7 there was some reporting around there that it was connected --
- 8 A Right.
- 9 Q -- to some encouragement or direction from outside of Georgia from political, you know, sort of --
- 11 A Right.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 12 Q -- chapters in D.C. Do you remember that?
  - A I remember it, but I do not have any specific recollection. One of the things that I will say kind of put me in a bad spot is I -- you know, I was the guy in charge of voting for the campaign. So, naturally, I'm going to speak to the voting people from the State of my same political party pretty regularly. And I'd found the Secretary of State's staff that I interacted with to be attentive. There were some, you know, hang-ups.

    There were some things that we -- that we the campaign or we the Georgia GOP wanted

done that did not happen that kind of angered, especially Chairman Shafer.

But I was -- I was just not -- I was just not there as far as seeing this direct -- you know, maybe as somebody who was scapegoated, maybe I didn't like scapegoating. I don't know. But I had felt that a lot of this was scapegoating. Because there was definitely a sense of lining up and putting the loss on the heels of decisions made by the Secretary of State that ultimately, you know, I think benefited Republicans and had been spun in a way to suggest that there was some corruption or some malfeasance otherwise.

Q Okay.

- A But I was not aware of those conversations. I know where they were coming from. You know, Chairman Shafer did not like the secretary, I think for political reasons, I think reasons going back before this election. I know that some of the Trump advisers from Georgia did not -- you know, had a icy relationship at best, and so I think there was some tension there, for sure.
- Q Okay. So I just wanted to clarify one thing about the -- what you described as the threat that was conveyed by Donald Trump, Jr., just a couple of days after the election. I think you said that if -- that the message was if you abandon President Trump and don't say that he won the election or don't support him, then we are going to tank your Senate races. Is that an accurate summary?
  - A I would say that is an accurate summary of my understanding.
- Q Okay. And what did you understand the practical effect of them asking for not abandoning President Trump and saying -- continuing to say that he won the election? What did you see after that point that either confirmed or disputed whether the Georgia Republican Party and the Senate candidates followed that directive?
- A I mean, it seemed to me that the Senate candidates largely chose to double down rather than, you know, suggest any sort of independence. And, you know, it became clear to me after a while that this was not going to be a winning strategy. But they were doubling down. They were really trying to quirk that base that believed this, and I think through other avenues had just been spoon-fed just ridiculous conspiracy theories.
- You know, I still speak to people who I know that believe just bonkers stuff. And, yeah, I mean, I think that that was part of that. I think the Senators, you know, had gotten the memo that this was the way the campaign was going to go, and they feared

1	Trump.		
2	Okay. Anything?		
3	I do not have any other questions for you, Mr. Sinners. Is there anything else		
4	that you would like to say or address?		
5	Mr. Sinners. You know, just that when this is all over, I hope that I get you		
6	know, I feel like I'm one of the good guys. You know, I might have had a moment of,		
7	shall we say, a moment of muddled judgment, but if I can be of any help, this is important		
8	to me, the work you're doing is important to this country, and I'm happy to help in the		
9	future any way that I'm needed.		
10	Well, first of all, thank you very much for accommodating us, for		
11	taking the time to speak with us today. Thank you for those kind words, which are		
12	always helpful to hear. But most importantly		
13	Mr. Sinners. Sometimes you hear a whole lot and you start doubting yourself.		
14	Thank you. Seems like you have been in those shoes.		
15	But I just want to say too, I mean, our committee is putting on its public		
16	presentation this month, and I think you will continue to see something that has already		
17	emerged in the presentation, and that is that the select committee believes that we came		
18	very close to a precipice for our democracy. But one of the things that held or one of		
19	the most important factors in holding our democracy together were courageous officials.		
20	And because this was a Republican campaign, you know, almost all of them were		
21	Republicans. And we will be highlighting several people that the committee believes are		
22	heroes, that are Republican officials, that stood up for their oath and for democracy and		

And, in general, I mean, that has been a real theme of our investigation. These are -- you know, oftentimes, and I think I would say this about you, you know, people

what, you know, we think did the right thing.

1 doing their jobs, put in very difficult circumstances. And I think what is clear from our 2 conversation today, didn't have the full picture of what was going on with the campaign. 3 So we, again, really appreciate your cooperation and your willingness to assist the committee. Thank you for your time today. And I hope we will not interrupt your 4 5 regularly scheduled June or summer any further, but I will give you a call if we need to. Mr. Sinners. Absolutely. Are we off record now? 6 7 Oh, yes. Let's go off the record now. 8 [Whereupon, at 12:12 p.m., the interview was adjourned, subject to the call of the

9

chair.]

1	Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee			
2				
3				
4	I have read the foregoing	_ pages, which contain the correct t	ranscript of the	
5	answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.			
6				
7				
8				
9				
10		Witness Name		
11				
12				
13				
14		Date		
15				