

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RUBY FREEMAN

*and*

WANDREA MOSS,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

RUDOLPH W. GIULIANI,

*Defendant.*

Civil Action No. 21-cv-3354 (BAH)

Judge Beryl A. Howell

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN ORDER PERMITTING PLAINTIFFS  
TO NOTICE FOR DEPOSITION AND DEPOSE THIRD PARTY RAY SMITH AFTER  
THE CLOSE OF FACT DISCOVERY AND FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE  
SCHEDULING ORDER**

Plaintiffs Ruby Freeman and Wandrea' ArShaye ("Shaye") Moss ("Plaintiffs") respectfully move this Court to permit Plaintiffs to conduct the deposition of third-party Ray Smith after fact discovery closes on May 22, 2023, and for clarification regarding the August 31, 2022, Scheduling Order's (the "Scheduling Order") specification that document productions be complete on May 22, 2023.<sup>1</sup>

**BACKGROUND**

As detailed in one of their most recent filings, Plaintiffs have been diligent about pursuing discovery over the past year. *See* ECF No. 58 at 1–4. Plaintiffs now seek the Court's permission

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(m), before Plaintiffs filed this motion, counsel for Plaintiffs notified counsel for Defendant of Plaintiffs' intention to file this motion. Defendant indicated that he would not oppose the motion. This is the third motion regarding the Scheduling Order, it is being filed at least four days prior to any current deadlines in the Scheduling Order, two previous motions regarding the Scheduling Order have been sought and granted, and there is good cause to support the instant request.

to notice for deposition and depose third-party Ray Smith after the close of fact discovery, and for clarification regarding one aspect of the Scheduling Order.<sup>2</sup>

**A. Plaintiffs attempted to depose Ray Smith during the fact discovery period, but his counsel refused at the eleventh hour.**

Under the current Scheduling Order, fact discovery is set to close on May 22, 2023. Plaintiffs are seeking the assistance of the Court only as a last resort, as it has become obvious that third-party Ray Smith will be obstinate and unreasonable in response to Plaintiffs' efforts to obtain his deposition under Rules 30 and 45. Plaintiffs have identified Mr. Smith as a third-party witness who might possess information relevant to their claims and reached out to Mr. Smith directly to coordinate a deposition. As detailed herein, Plaintiffs attempted to work in good faith with Mr. Smith and his counsel to schedule his deposition.

On April 19, 2023, Plaintiffs' counsel, Von A. DuBose, spoke with Ray Smith and informed him that Plaintiffs would like to take his deposition. Declaration of Von A. DuBose ("DuBose Decl.") ¶ 2. Mr. Smith responded to Plaintiffs' counsel, indicating that he would like to speak with his counsel before agreeing to sit for deposition. *Id.* ¶ 3. On April 25, 2023, Plaintiffs' counsel followed up with Mr. Smith via email, stating "Ray – I'm following up to see if you've had a chance to speak with your counsel regarding the issue of a potential deposition. Let me know if you want/need to jump on a call sometime tomorrow." *Id.* ¶ 4. Mr. Smith responded on April 25, 2023: "In process. Will have a response by weeks end." *Id.* On April 26, 2023, Mr. Smith left Plaintiffs' counsel Mr. DuBose a voice message stating that he had been

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs note that—because the Court permitted Plaintiffs to take the 30(b)(6) depositions of Giuliani Partners LLC and Giuliani Communications LLC outside of the fact discovery period (noticed for June 27 and June 29 respectively), and that the testimony from those witnesses may be critical to Plaintiffs' expert discovery—Plaintiffs may seek an extension of the expert disclosures deadline, but do not seek such an extension in this motion.

advised by counsel not to sit for deposition. DuBose Decl. ¶ 5. Mr. Smith asked Mr. DuBose to contact his counsel, Bruce Morris. *Id.*

Mr. DuBose contacted Mr. Morris on May 1, 2023, and informed Mr. Morris that he would like to depose Mr. Smith. *Id.* ¶ 6. Mr. Morris indicated that they would file a motion to quash because Mr. Smith was “something between a target and witness” in the Fulton County District Attorney’s investigation of the 2020 election. *Id.* On May 3, 2023, Plaintiffs sent Mr. Morris a copy of the subpoena and asked him to inform them by the close of business on May 4th if he was authorized to accept service. *Id.* ¶ 7. Mr. Morris did not respond to that email. *Id.* As a precaution, Mr. Smith’s subpoena package was forwarded to his place of business via Fed Ex the next day, May 5, 2023. *Id.*

On May 5, 2023, Randolph Evans emailed Mr. DuBose, stating that he represents Mr. Smith and confirmed that Mr. Smith had received a subpoena package issued by this Court. Mr. Evans asked Mr. DuBose to contact him “to discuss Ray’s situation so that we can hopefully save a lot of time and expense for everyone.” *Id.* ¶ 8. Mr. DuBose spoke with Mr. Evans on May 5th and Mr. Evans informed him that Mr. Smith intends to assert his 5th amendment right against self-incrimination in response to all questions posed during Plaintiffs’ deposition. *Id.* ¶¶ 8–9. Mr. DuBose agreed to work with Mr. Evans to determine whether there was a way the two sides could streamline a deposition such that there was not a need to individually pose each question. *Id.* ¶ 10. On May 9, 2023, Mr. Evans proposed that he fly back to Atlanta (from a trial in Missouri) on May 16, 2023, and allow Mr. Smith to sit for a 4 p.m. deposition. *Id.* ¶ 11. Mr. DuBose accepted Mr. Evans’ offer to start the deposition on May 16, 2023 at 4 p.m., and arrangements were made for a court reporter and videographer. *Id.* ¶ 12.

On May 12, 2023, Mr. DuBose forwarded to Mr. Evans a revised subpoena reflecting their agreement as to the time and place of the deposition and asking him to accept service of the revised subpoena on Mr. Smith's behalf. *Id.* ¶ 13. On May 12, 2023, Mr. DuBose also informed Mr. Evans of Plaintiffs' belief that blanket assertions of the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination at deposition were improper. *Id.* ¶ 14. Mr. DuBose further stated that if the two sides do not come up with a procedurally proper way for Mr. Smith to assert his Fifth Amendment rights in response to all deposition questions, the deposition would likely need to start earlier than 4 p.m. *Id.* ¶ 15. In response, Mr. Evans asked Mr. DuBose to forward the deposition topics Plaintiffs intended to cover in Mr. Smith's deposition. *Id.* ¶ 16. Mr. Evans further responded that perhaps Mr. Morris was correct about the need to file a motion to quash and that they may need to contact Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis. *Id.* ¶ 17. Mr. DuBose complied and forwarded to Mr. Evans Plaintiffs' deposition topics. *Id.*

Mr. DuBose did not hear from Mr. Evans over the weekend and after sending Plaintiffs' deposition topics. *Id.* ¶ 18. On May 15th, Mr. DuBose contacted Mr. Evans and asked if Mr. Smith would be moving to quash the subpoena or if Plaintiffs could expect the deposition to go forward as agreed on May 16, 2023 at 4 pm. *Id.* ¶ 19. Mr. Evans responded to Mr. DuBose's text message with the email attached to the DuBose Declaration as Exhibit 1.

**B. Plaintiffs seek clarification on the Scheduling Order's specification that all document productions must be complete by the close of fact discovery.**

The Court's Scheduling Order specifies that "[b]y May 22, 2023, all fact discovery shall close (including answers to interrogatories, *document production*, requests for admission, and depositions)." (emphasis added). Defendant served his first and only discovery demands on Plaintiffs—a set of Requests for Production—on April 21, 2023, or exactly 30 days prior to the close of fact discovery. DuBose Decl. ¶ 20. Plaintiffs are endeavoring to produce documents on

May 22, 2023, but will likely need to provide additional, rolling productions of any non-privileged documents responsive to Defendant's requests, subject to Plaintiffs' objections. In addition, Plaintiffs expect that several third parties on whom Plaintiffs have served subpoenas *within* fact discovery are likely to produce documents *after* the close of fact discovery.

### LEGAL STANDARD

A court may modify a scheduling order for good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); *Chen v. Fed. Bureau of Investigation*, No. 22-MC-0074 (CRC), 2022 WL 17851618, at \*2 (D.D.C. Oct. 18, 2022) (granting motion to reopen deposition for limited purpose where good cause was shown). In assessing whether "good cause" exists, courts in this Circuit consider "whether the request is opposed; [] whether the non-moving party would be prejudiced; [] whether the moving party was diligent in obtaining discovery within the guidelines established by the court; [] the foreseeability of the need for additional discovery in light of the time allotted by the district court; and [] the likelihood that discovery will lead to relevant evidence." *2910 Ga. Ave. LLC v. District of Columbia*, 312 F.R.D. 205, 208 (D.D.C. 2015) (quoting *In re Rail Freight Fuel Surcharge Antitrust Litig.*, 281 F.R.D. 12, 14 (D.D.C. 2011)). The decision whether to modify a scheduling order is ultimately "within the sound discretion of the trial court." *Barnes v. District of Columbia*, 289 F.R.D. 1, 7 (D.D.C. 2012).

#### **I. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO PERMIT PLAINTIFFS TO SERVE A DEPOSITION NOTICE AND DEPOSE THIRD-PARTY RAY SMITH AFTER THE CLOSE OF DISCOVERY.<sup>3</sup>**

As detailed above, Plaintiffs have made reasonable, diligent efforts to conduct Mr. Smith's deposition prior to the close of discovery. Indeed, Plaintiffs' counsel engaged Mr. Smith directly

---

<sup>3</sup> It is Plaintiffs' understanding that they may not serve Mr. Smith with a deposition subpoena at this point in time until after the Court grants this motion, given the requirement that the deponent be given reasonable notice of the deposition.

and two of his attorneys on multiple occasions. Both of Mr. Smith's attorneys were presented with copies of the subpoena and they each refused to accept service. Mr. Evans even refused to accept service after he and Mr. Smith agreed to conduct the deposition on a specific date and time. It has now become apparent that Plaintiffs will need to serve Mr. Smith personally with the subpoena with sufficient time for him to appear or otherwise object. Of course, Plaintiffs will continue to confer in good faith with Mr. Smith's counsel notwithstanding his recent conduct.

Good cause exists to permit Plaintiffs to serve a deposition subpoena and conduct Mr. Smith's deposition after the close of discovery. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). Per this District's local rules (and those of many other districts), Plaintiffs intend to provide Mr. Smith with at least 14 days of notice because the "deposition is to be taken at a place more than 50 miles from the District of Columbia." U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia LCvR 30.1. As such, even if this Motion were to be granted today and personal service was effectuated tomorrow, Plaintiffs—in keeping in line with the 14-day notice requirement, Plaintiffs would be unable to depose Mr. Smith until at least June 1, 2023, nearly two weeks after discovery is set to close in this case.

## **II. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO CLARIFY THAT DOCUMENT PRODUCTIONS MAY CONTINUE AFTER CLOSE OF FACT DISCOVERY FOR REQUESTS AND SUBPOENAS PROPERLY SERVED WITHIN FACT DISCOVERY.**

As noted above, Defendant propounded his first and only discovery demands—a set of requests for production—on April 21, 2023. In addition, Plaintiffs have been diligent in pursuing fact discovery in this case, and have served numerous third-party subpoenas within fact discovery. Plaintiffs are engaged in constructive conversations with many of those third parties, and anticipate that some of those third parties will produce documents after the close of fact discovery. Defendant is not opposed to an order clarifying that under the Scheduling Order document productions may continue after the close of fact discovery for requests and subpoenas properly propounded and

served within fact discovery. Neither party will be prejudiced by such productions and all of the requests and outstanding subpoenas seek relevant evidence. At this time, Plaintiffs do not anticipate the need for additional fact discovery, but reserve the right to ask for additional discovery based on any new information gleaned from additional document productions.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court issue an order permitting Plaintiffs to notice for deposition and to take the deposition of Mr. Smith, and any related relief, outside the fact discovery period. In addition, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court issue an order clarifying the Scheduling Order's specification that all document productions must be complete by the close of fact discovery.

DATED: May 17, 2023

/s/ John Langford

**UNITED TO PROTECT DEMOCRACY**

John Langford\*  
Rachel Goodman\*  
82 Nassau Street, #601  
New York, NY 10038  
Tel: (202) 579-4582  
john.langford@protectdemocracy.org  
rachel.goodman@protectdemocracy.org

**DUBOSE MILLER LLC**

Von A. DuBose\*  
75 14th Street NE  
Suite 2110  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
Tel: (404) 720-8111  
dubose@dubosemiller.com

Christine Kwon\*  
555 W. 5<sup>th</sup> St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Tel: (919) 619-9819  
Christine.kwon@protectdemocracy.org

**WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**

Michael J. Gottlieb (974960)  
Meryl C. Goverski (1023549)  
J. Tyler Knoblett (1672514)  
1875 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: (202) 303-1000  
Fax: (202) 303-2000  
mgottlieb@willkie.com  
mgoverski@willkie.com

**WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**

M. Annie Houghton-Larsen\*  
787 7th Avenue  
New York, New York  
Tel: (212) 728-8164  
Fax: (212) 728-9164  
mhoughton-larsen@willkie.com

Sara Chimene-Weiss\*  
7000 N 16th Street Ste. 120, #430  
Phoenix, AZ 85020  
Tel: (202) 579-4582  
sara.chimene-weiss@protectdemocracy.org

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Ruby Freeman and  
Wandrea' Moss*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 17, 2023, this document was filed with the Clerk of the Court of the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia by using the CM/ECF system, which will automatically generate and serve notices of this filing to all counsel of record. I hereby certify that on May 17, 2023, a courtesy copy of the foregoing document was emailed to Ray Smith's counsel at [randy.evans@squirepb.com](mailto:randy.evans@squirepb.com).

Dated: May 17, 2023

/s/ John Langford

**UNITED TO PROTECT DEMOCRACY**

John Langford\*

82 Nassau Street, #601

New York, NY 10038

Tel: (202) 579-4582

[john.langford@protectdemocracy.org](mailto:john.langford@protectdemocracy.org)

\*Admitted *pro hac vice*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RUBY FREEMAN

*and*

WANDREA MOSS,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

RUDOLPH W. GIULIANI,

*Defendant.*

Civil Action No. 21-cv-3354 (BAH)

Judge Beryl A. Howell

**DECLARATION OF VON A. DUBOSE**

I, Von A. Dubose, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct:

1. My name is Von A. DuBose. I am over the age of 18 years of age and competent to make this declaration. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and know them to be true.

2. On April 19, 2023, I spoke with Ray Smith and informed him that Plaintiffs would like to take his deposition.

3. Mr. Smith responded that he would like to speak with his counsel before agreeing to sit for deposition.

4. On April 25, 2023, I followed up with Mr. Smith via email, stating “Ray – I’m following up to see if you’ve had a chance to speak with your counsel regarding the issue of a potential deposition. Let me know if you want/need to jump on a call sometime tomorrow.” Mr. Smith responded on April 25, 2023: “In process. Will have a response by weeks end.”

5. On April 26, 2023, Ray Smith left me a voice message stating that he had been advised by counsel not to sit for deposition. Mr. Smith asked me to contact his counsel, Bruce Morris.

6. I contacted Bruce Morris on May 1, 2023 at 5:20 p.m. I informed Mr. Morris that we would like to depose Mr. Smith, and Mr. Morris indicated that they would file a motion to quash because Mr. Smith was “something between a target and witness” in the Fulton County District Attorney’s investigation of the 2020 election.

7. On May 3, 2023, I sent Mr. Morris a copy of the subpoena and asked him to inform me by the close of business on May 4, 2023, if he was authorized to accept service. Mr. Morris did not respond to that email. As a precaution, Mr. Smith’s subpoena package was forwarded to his place of business via Fed Ex the next day, May 5, 2023.

8. On May 5, 2023, Randolph Evans emailed me, stating that he represents Mr. Smith and confirmed that Mr. Smith has received a subpoena package issued by this Court. Mr. Evans asked me to contact him “to discuss Ray’s situation so that we can hopefully save a lot of time and expense for everyone.”

9. I spoke with Mr. Evans on May 5, 2023 and he informed me that Mr. Smith intends to assert his Fifth Amendment right against incrimination in response to all questions posed during a deposition.

10. I agreed to work with Mr. Evans to determine whether there was a way the two sides could streamline a deposition such that there was not a need to individually pose each question.

11. On May 9, 2023, Mr. Evans proposed that he fly back to Atlanta on May 16, 2023, and allow Mr. Smith to sit for a 4 p.m. deposition.

12. I accepted Mr. Evans' offer to start the deposition on May 16, 2023 at 4 p.m. and arrangements were made for a court reporter and videographer.

13. On May 12, 2023, I forwarded to Mr. Evans a revised subpoena reflecting their agreement as to time and place of the deposition and asking him to accept service of the revised subpoena on Mr. Smith's behalf.

14. On May 12, 2023, I also informed Mr. Evans of Plaintiffs' belief that blanket assertions of the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination at deposition were improper.

15. I further stated that if the two sides do not come up with a procedurally proper way for Mr. Smith to assert his Fifth Amendment rights in response to all deposition questions, the deposition would likely need to start earlier than 4 p.m.

16. In response, Mr. Evans asked me to forward the deposition topics Plaintiffs intended to cover in Mr. Smith's deposition.

17. Mr. Evans further responded that perhaps Mr. Morris was correct about the need to file a motion to quash and that they may need to contact Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis. I complied and forwarded to Mr. Evans Plaintiffs' deposition topics.

18. I did not hear from Mr. Evans over the weekend and after sending Plaintiffs' deposition topics.

19. On May 15, 2023, I contacted Mr. Evans and asked if Mr. Smith would be moving to quash the subpoena or if Plaintiffs could expect the deposition to go forward as agreed on May 16, 2023 at 4 p.m.

20. On April 21, 2023, Defendant Giuliani served his First Set of Requests for Production on Plaintiffs' Counsel.

21. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of an email from Mr. Randy Evans to me, dated May 15, 2023.

Executed: May 17, 2023.  
Atlanta, GA

By: /s/ Von A. DuBose  
Von A. DuBose

# EXHIBIT 1

---

**From:** Evans, J. Randolph (Randy) <randy.evans@squirepb.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 15, 2023 10:06 AM  
**To:** Von DuBose <dubose@Dubosemiller.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Smith Deposition Topics

Von,

Candidly, I am confused. Since this is likely to be an exhibit to something the Court will read, I wanted to set out some historical context.

When we first spoke, I understood that you wanted a deposition for defensive purposes to make sure that your clients were not ambushed at trial by Ray Smith's testimony. I had advised you that Ray Smith's deposition implicated several issues including the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the attorney-client privilege, and work product doctrine among others. However, I indicated that we would work with you to assure you that Ray Smith would not be offering testimony and we could confirm it in one of several ways.

Notwithstanding our conversations, an initial subpoena was issued but not served and the date for that deposition has since lapse rendering it moot. In addition, I confirmed that I was in the middle of three trials in Kansas City with pretrial conferences the last two weeks and the trial to start on Monday with final preparations for the second trial (and any related hearings) this week. Nonetheless, I was willing to fly back to do a quick deposition and return to Kansas City.

Based on my schedule, I indicated that I could try to do tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. for a short deposition (15-20 minutes) to confirm Ray Smith's assertion of the privileges so that you could be assured he would not be offering testimony in your case. You then sent a revised subpoena to me at 5:39 on Friday May 12 for a May 16 deposition including the production of documents. You requested I accept service of the subpoena. Since it is completely inconsistent with what we discussed and is facially invalid, I cannot do so.

Certainly, I must view your subpoena in the context of your email at 2:45 p.m. also on Friday which lists a series of topics for the deposition far exceeding anything we have previously discussed. Indeed, rather than a defensive deposition to protect your client from ambush, the list of topics clearly demonstrates an offensive use of the deposition which directly implicates the privileges that we have previously discuss.

As you know, the subpoena that you emailed me after the close of business on Friday of Mother's Day weekend is facially defective. Aside from lack of service, the subpoena does not, as issued, allow a reasonable time to comply under any standard, specifically including the standards applied in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. One business day is never enough – even if considered served on Friday, which it was not since I have declined service. There are many other deficiencies which we can discuss at a future date or in appropriate court filings.

Your email seems to be inviting a motion to quash which is, quite frankly, inconsistent with the burdens imposed in our federal courts (and which I have tried to abide by) to try to work these things out. For the deposition we discussed tomorrow, it is now clear that it will not happen notwithstanding my best efforts.

Based on these facts and circumstances, it would appear that we have two options. First, I am happy to work with you to sort this out as best as possible so that Ray Smith's rights are protected, his clients' privileges are maintained, and there is sufficient opportunity to review the documents you want to see if any can be produced at deposition. Quite frankly, this is a far cry from what we have discussed from the first time we spoke until Friday afternoon.

Or, you can issue a subpoena that allows Ray Smith a sufficient opportunity to comply with both the deposition notice and the accompanying request for documents in accordance with the standards in our District, and (apparently as you prefer), if necessary, we will file the appropriate motion to quash – unnecessarily taking up the Court's time and unduly burdening Ray Smith with excessive expense and time.

Since what you say and what you write seem to be quite different, please just respond by email or letter. I do want whichever Judge we draw to see the full context and background.

To be clear, your request that I accept service of an untimely deposition notice and subpoena is denied. There will be no deposition tomorrow. If you prefer, you may serve a rule compliant subpoena which you can send to me and if it does afford a reasonable time to comply, and otherwise complies with the applicable statutes and rules, I will accept service. From there, we will take whatever action is appropriate under the federal rules.

The goal is not to unnecessarily drag things out. But, I cannot jeopardize my client's interests or his clients' interest when I am provided "inaccurate, unreliable and incomplete" information. It is indeed unfortunate that we could not comply with what our federal judges expect and work this out. But, sometimes counsel need to hear it from the judge rather than counsel. This may be one of those cases.

**Randy Evans**

**Ambassador J. Randolph Evans (Retired)**



Partner  
Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP  
One Atlantic Center  
1201 W. Peachtree Street, NW  
Suite 3150  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
T +1 678 272 3215  
O +1 678 272 3200  
F +1 678 272 3211  
[randy.evans@squirepb.com](mailto:randy.evans@squirepb.com) | [squirepattonboggs.com](http://squirepattonboggs.com)  
Find Us: [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

---

**From:** Von DuBose <dubose@Dubosemiller.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 12, 2023 2:45 PM  
**To:** Evans, J. Randolph (Randy) <randy.evans@squirepb.com>  
**Subject:** [EXT] Smith Deposition Topics

DEPOSITION BASICS  
PREPARATION FOR DEPOSITION

TRUMP V RAFFENSPERGER & SMITH & LISS VOLUNTEERS  
HARRISON AND BRANSON AFFIDAVITS  
OBTAINING THE STATE FARM ARENA SECURITY FOOTAGE  
PRESENTING THE SFA VIDEO AT THE DEC 3 HEARING  
PRE-HEARING CONVERSATIONS  
DECEMBER 3, 2020 – GEORGIA HEARING  
SOS’S INVESTIGATION AND RESULTS REPORTED  
“USB DRIVE” FOOTAGE/VIDEO  
EVENTS OF DECEMBER 10, 2020  
CLAIMS THAT RUBY FREEMAN HAS A CRIMINAL RECORD  
GIULIANI STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Over 40 Offices across 4 Continents

This message is confidential and may be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone or email the sender and delete this message and any attachment from your system; you must not copy or disclose the contents of this message or any attachment to any other person.

For information about how Squire Patton Boggs processes UK and EU personal data that is subject to the requirements of applicable data protection laws, please see our Privacy Notice regarding the processing of UK and EU personal data about clients and other business contacts at [www.squirepattonboggs.com](http://www.squirepattonboggs.com).

Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP is part of the international legal practice Squire Patton Boggs, which operates worldwide through a number of separate legal entities. Please visit [www.squirepattonboggs.com](http://www.squirepattonboggs.com) for more information.

#US

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RUBY FREEMAN

*and*

WANDREA MOSS,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

RUDOLPH W. GIULIANI,

*Defendant.*

Civil Action No. 21-3354 (BAH)

Judge Beryl A. Howell

**[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN  
ORDER PERMITTING PLAINTIFFS TO NOTICE FOR DEPOSITION AND DEPOSE  
THIRD PARTY RAY SMITH AFTER THE CLOSE OF FACT DISCOVERY AND FOR  
CLARIFICATION OF THE SCHEDULING ORDER**

Upon consideration of the Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for an Order Permitting Plaintiffs to notice for deposition and depose third-party Ray Smith after the close of fact discovery and for clarification of the Court's August 31, 2022 Scheduling Order (the "Motion"), it is hereby:

**ORDERED** that the Motion be **GRANTED**; and it is further

**ORDERED** and clarified that the Scheduling Order permits documents to be produced outside of the fact discovery period so long as the requests and subpoenas were properly propounded and served within the fact discovery period.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Beryl A. Howell, Judge  
United States District Court for the District of Columbia