1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS BROWNSVILLE DIVISION
3	DR. ORLY TAITZ)
5) CIVIL ACTION NO. VS.) B-14-119
6 7	JEH JOHNSON, ET AL))
8	HEARING ON TEMPORARY INJUNCTION
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANDREW S. HANEN OCTOBER 29, 2014
11	APPEARANCES:
12 13 14	For the Plaintiff: DR. ORLY TAITZ 29839 Santa Margarita, Suite 100 Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
15 16	For the Defendants: MR. DANIEL DAVID HU U.S. Attorneys Office Houston, TX
17 18	For the Defendants: MR. COLIN KISOR Office of Immigration Litigation U.S. Department of Justice
19	450 Fifth Street NW Washington, D.C. 20001
20	Transcribed by: BARBARA BARNARD Official Court Reporter
21	600 E. Harrison, Box 301 Brownsville, Texas 78520 (956)548-2591
23	
24	
25	

THE COURT: All right. Be seated.

Okay. We're here in 14-CV-119, Taitz versus Johnson, et al. Counselors, are we ready to go?

MR. KISOR: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Taitz, are you ready to go?

DR. TAITZ: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We're here on a -- basically on a temporary injunction hearing. Dr. Taitz, it's your burden as the plaintiff, so why don't we start. And if you want to make a little opening statement, that's fine. But if not, you can just proceed to call whatever witnesses you're calling.

DR. TAITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

You know, before -- before I go into the specifics of the case, I wanted to make a very short opening statement and maybe explain to Your Honor why I'm flying here two times from California and why it is so crucial for me to prove this case to you.

I was born and raised in a communist country in Moldova which was part of the Soviet Union. And I saw there situations where thousands of people have died where there were executive orders that came from above, came from the government; and the citizens did not have any meaningful right for redress of grievances, were not granted standing.

If I may bring just two small examples. We're talking here about spread of diseases. In the Soviet Union there was an

epidemic of lice. And somebody in the government found out that radiation kills lice and issued one executive order to radiate thousands of children to kill lice. Of course, ultimately those people got brain cancer. Thousands have died. I had a relative who died. And the problem was that people knew that those executive orders were wrong, but they were not granted standing. They were not allowed to do anything about it.

And if I may, just one other small example.

There was an order coming from Stalin. Stated that in the whole Soviet Union, they have to plant just one crop, wheat, which didn't grow in many cold areas. As a result, crops have failed, and 20 million people have died. And again, the citizens knew that the executive order that was coming from above was wrong, but they were not granted any standing to challenge it. And as a result, 20 million people died.

So right now this is a second hearing. Our prior hearing was in August after I have filed my case July 14th. And at that time, I actually predicted what happened recently. I predicted that we will have Ebola cases in the United States and people will get infected. And, indeed, in September, a citizen from Liberia arrived here in Texas, and he passed all the checks that were set by the government at the airport. They checked his temperature. He did not have fever. He lied on his entrance forms stating that he had no contact with Ebola.

As a result, he was allowed in, and he infected two nurses

in Dallas, Texas; infected with deadly disease, and hundreds of people were sent into quarantine and observation.

And just last week, yet another case that I have predicted. A doctor arrived in the states from Guinea where he was treating Ebola patients. He was already feeling fatigued and under the weather. In spite of that, he took four different subway trains. He went bowling. He went to restaurant. And the next morning, he was hospitalized with hundred degree fever and Ebola. Meanwhile, he exposed thousands of people to deadly disease, and we'll have to wait 21 days to see if any of them will actually -- will actually come down with the disease.

All of the things that happened recently show that what I have predicted and what I -- indeed has happened, and what I advocated is something that needs to be instituted.

Further, just in the last two days, the U.S. military has instituted a quarantine for soldiers returning from Ebola region, 21-day quarantine to be in Italy. Governors of several states have instituted similar quarantines in those states.

So Your Honor can see that indeed what I was asking in my pleadings is reasonable. This is something that is being instituted in different areas. However, there are multiple loopholes, and that is why it is so important for Your Honor to issue an injunctive relief which would help close those loopholes and protect the citizens.

And with that, I would like to invite to the stand, call to

```
the stand an expert epidemiologist, Vera Dolan, if I may.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Hold on just a second before we do that.
 3
     Mr. Kisor, do you want to respond to any of that or --
             MR. KISOR: No, Your Honor. I would like to only say
 4
 5
     that --
                          Go ahead and call your first witness.
 6
             THE COURT:
 7
             MR. KISOR:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Dr. Taitz, go ahead and call your first
 8
     witness.
 9
10
         Doctor, it may be easier for you to question from the other
11
     podium.
12
          (Witness sworn.)
13
                                VERA DOLAN,
14
     the witness, having been first duly cautioned and sworn to tell
15
     the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified
16
     as follows:
17
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
     BY DR. TAITZ:
         Ms. Dolan, can you please provide the Court with your first
19
20
     and last name and spell your last name.
         Vera Dolan, D-O-L-A-N.
21
     Α
        Ms. Dolan, what is your education? What is your
22
23
     undergraduate education?
24
     A I have a degree in public health, a bachelor's from Johns
25
     Hopkins University and a master's of science in public health in
```

- epidemiology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel
- 2 Hill.
- 3 Q And how many years have you worked in the field -- in this
- 4 | field of public health and epidemiology?
- $5 \parallel A \parallel I$ have been a practicing epidemiologist for over 30 years.
- 6 Q Have you testified in court before?
- 7 A Yes, I have.
- 8 Q Were you challenged with the *Daubert* test?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Did you pass it?
- 11 A Yes, I passed the *Daubert* challenge.
- 12 Q Were you found by judges in court, were you found to be an
- 13 expert in the field?
- 14 A Yes. I've testified in both state and federal court.
- DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, I would like to -- the Court to accept Ms. Dolan as an expert in the field of epidemiology and let her testify as an expert in the field.
- 18 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HU: Your Honor, two objections. First, we don't
- 20 believe that this testimony is necessary because of the
- 21 government's motion for standing, to dismiss based on standing,
- 22 which is still currently pending before the Court.
- THE COURT: Okay. That I'm going to overrule or at
- 24 least postpone.
- 25 MR. HU: Okay. And our second point is we do not object

that she can testify in the field of epidemiology, but at least as we understand from the report which has been provided to us, she's also going to testify about medical issues and a number of other issues which we do not believe she's qualified for. So I could either take her on voir dire now if the Court would like or raise that objection as the testimony progresses.

THE COURT: Why don't we just raise that objection. I'm going to recognize her as an expert in epidemiology.

DR. TAITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And when I do that, I'm also taking into consideration that -- her curriculum vitae which has been filed with the Court.

DR. TAITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

- Q Ms. Dolan, have you studied an issue of hemorrhagic fevers and Ebola?
- 17 A Yes, I have.
- 18 Q Do you -- can you testify to the Court how widespread Ebola
 19 is in Western Africa?
 - A The Ebola epidemic has started in West Africa and is now spreading to many countries. Mali is the latest one. It was in Guinea, in Sierra Leon and Gabon, and we've gotten more cases throughout Africa. I have not seen the very latest count available.
 - Q What is the mortality of Ebola?

- A The reported mortality for the Zaire strain of Ebola, which is the one that is the one of concern in Africa now is -- it's been estimated between 50 and 90 percent mortality.
 - Q Is there currently a vaccine to Ebola?
 - A Could you repeat the question, please?
- Q Is there currently a vaccine to Ebola? Does a vaccine exist? Do we have vaccination to Ebola?
- 8 A Vaccine, no. No vaccine exists.

4

5

19

- 9 Q Is there a known proven cure for Ebola?
- 10 A There is no proven cure. There have been patients treated
 11 in the United States who were symptomatic and have been
 12 announced as being free of virus.
- 13 Q What are the modes of transmission of Ebola?
- A The modes of transmission is direct contact and also contact with secretions and other bodily fluids from Ebola patients.
- And there has also been evidence that it may be spread by aerosols and fomites.
- 18 Q And in this court, I have submitted your --
 - THE COURT: Wait, wait just a second. Aerosols and what?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Fomites.
- 22 THE COURT: What is a fomite?
- 23 THE WITNESS: Little pieces of phlegm when you cough.
- THE COURT: Okay. And by aerosol, does that include
- 25 \parallel exhaling or sneezing or something like that?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, sneezing and coughing little droplets 2 which contain virus. 3 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Dr. Taitz. BY DR. TAITZ: 4 Here's an example. If right now an individual let's say is 5 coming in this courtroom. Let's say there is somebody who is an 6 7 illegal alien who happens to be from one of those countries. He simply wipes sweat off his forehead and touches the doorknob, 8 enters. And then somebody, one of the attorneys, the judge, one 9 of the clerks touches the same doorknob that has the sweat. 10 Will that be a mode of transmission? 11 12 That will be --13 MR. HU: Objection. Your Honor, I don't believe she's 14 She's asking for now something beyond epidemiology, 15 a medical opinion. 16 THE WITNESS: Mode of transmission --17 THE COURT: I'm going to let her answer it. 18 Go ahead with what you were saying. THE WITNESS: The mode of transmission is a critical 19 part of epidemiology and understanding the spread of illness, 20 and especially it's critical to understand how Ebola spreads. 21 22 THE COURT: Is that something you study in the field of 23 epidemiology? 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes, the transmission of disease, how it's 25 transmitted and knowing how it's transmitted is very critical to understanding how you can intervene and stop it.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Ms. Dolan, you have here with you an Anthology of Plague and Pestilence. Can you please provide to the Court excerpts that states how Ebola disease was stopped previously, specifically in the country of Zaire, and what were the CDC recommendations in Zaire when they had Ebola epidemic?

A Yes. What I have here is called the Encyclopedia of Plague and Pestilence from Ancient Times to the Present. George Kohn, K-O-H-N, is the editor.

This is a compilation of going back to antiquity various incidences and plagues where the details of those plagues are laid out and how they turned out historically. It's very informative for epidemiologists to study history to know how things happened in the past so they can apply it to new situations in the future.

And there is an entry in here for Zaire. And I'm reading from the section which talks about the Zairean Ebola epidemic of 1976. This is the first time that Ebola was even understood.

"Blood samples from a victim of the disease in Maridi in southernmost Sudan near Zaire's northeastern border were then sent to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, CDC, in Atlanta, Georgia. The Ebola virus was discovered. And shortly afterward, a member of the CDC, part of the newly formed International Medical Commission, arrived in Kinshasa to study

the Ebola infection, which had killed another nun and a native nurse there -- the former had occupied (sic) the first stricken nun to the capitol city in September.

"The main concern of the commission became the prevention of the spread of disease in Kinshasa where hospital staff and others who came into contact with the three victims there were quarantined. Ebola did not spread, and no link was found between the cases in Zaire and Sudan."

- Q So in Zaire, CDC has recommended quarantine; is that correct?
- 11 A That is correct. That was the first identification of 12 Ebola.
- Q So the best way to stop the disease, what they found in Zaire is to have quarantine?
- 15 A That's correct.

- 16 Q Can you explain to the Court what is quarantine?
 - A Quarantine is the separation from healthy people. I have a definition of quarantine from the CDC, their little bluebook, "Control of Communicable Disease" manual.
 - Okay. "Quarantine: The CDC defines quarantine as restriction of the activities of well persons or animals who have been exposed to a case of communicable disease during its period of communicability, i.e., contacts; to prevent disease transmission during the incubation period if infection should occur."

- So quarantine is different from isolation. In isolation, we Q isolate people who are sick. In quarantine, we actually 3 sequester, quarantine individuals who are not sick but were exposed to the disease; is that correct? 4
 - That's correct. Α

1

2

5

6

7

- Next, what is -- what is the incubation period for Ebola?
 - Right now it's variable. There have been estimates ranging from two to 21 days and possibly even more. There is no set
- amount of days that we know is for sure the communicable period. 9
- 10 So you believe that people who are coming from the zone,
- 11 those three countries, the recent epidemic, do you believe that
- 12 they should be quarantined for at least 21 days to make sure
- 13 that we don't spread this disease? To make sure --
- 14 Yes, I agree.
- 15 Next, are you familiar with false negative tests? Could a
- 16 person -- we had a situation where a nurse came from Sierra Leon
- 17 and she was running fever, but the test was negative. Could
- 18 there be a false negative test?
- Yes. What these tests do is test for antibodies to Ebola. 19
- 20 And the body, you know, has different times when it will
- generate sufficient antibodies to turn a test from negative to 21
- 22 positive. And with that case, it is clear that people can be
- 23 infected with Ebola, but they may not show positivity in a test.
- 24 So it is your opinion that a person who came from one of
- 25 those three Western African countries and she or he has initial

13 test negative, would it be prudent to still keep this person in 1 2 quarantine because the subsequent test would -- might be actually positive when there are more antibodies? 3 I would --4 Α MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. Again, I think now 5 6 we're getting away from epidemiology and the spread of the 7 disease to specific individuals requiring a medical opinion and knowledge. 8 9 THE COURT: Why don't you rephrase your question, Dr. 10 Taitz. BY DR. TAITZ: 11 12 Okay. I'm not asking about a specific person. In general 13 in your opinion as epidemiologist, is it possible that a person 14 can come from this area in West Africa and have originally a 15 negative test; and then few days later, a positive test after 16 the body builds more antibodies? 17 MR. HU: Same objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. I mean, I 18 19 understand Mr. Hu's objection. But, I mean, isn't that basically why you have an incubation period or an isolation 20 period? I mean, why you say 21 days, because you could have a 21 negative test on day one; but on day 18 or 19, you could have a 22

25 THE COURT: All right. I mean, I just think that's

THE WITNESS: That is correct, sir.

23

2.4

positive test? I mean that's why you have a period, right?

- obvious whether you have medical knowledge or not.
- 2 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 3 Q Ms. Dolan, as a matter of fact, isn't it the case with
- 4 Dr. Kent Brantly, the first -- the first Ebola case in this
- 5 country, that when he just got sick, the first test was
- 6 negative. And then he was still put in incubation, and few days
- 7 | later, the test, the second test was positive?
- 8 A That is the report that I've heard and --
- 9 Q Thank you.
- We were talking about, for example, a drop of sweat being on
- 11 \parallel a doorknob or lecturn or anywhere. From the reports that we
- 12 | have, how long do you think -- how long in your opinion can
- 13 Ebola virus be in those droplets?
- 14 A From what I understand, when those droplets are in colder
- 15 weather, they are more infectious. I have not seen all the
- 16 reports, but there have been reports in other secretions that
- 17 have been many, many days. I do not have those in front of me.
- 19 DR. TAITZ: May I?
- THE COURT: Go ahead. You may approach.
- 21 DR. TAITZ: May I provide?
- 22 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 23 Q Now, this is a report from British Defense Labs stating 50
- 24 | days incubation -- I'm sorry, 50 days is the time that they
- 25 \parallel measured that the virus stayed in the droplets on hard surfaces.

Would you agree with findings of British Defense Labs? 1 2 MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. Before we go there, this document that I've been handed, I guess it's not marked 3 with an exhibit number, is only pages 16 through 23. 4 DR. TAITZ: I apologize. 5 So under the rule of completeness, Your Honor, 6 MR. HU: 7 I would ask that we have the complete copy since we don't know where it's from, whether it's peer reviewed or anything like 8 that. 9 THE COURT: Do you have a complete copy of it, 10 11 Dr. Taitz? 12 DR. TAITZ: Actually it's one article. What it is, I 13 had -- all of those are articles in my documents because there 14 were many of them. It says 16, but it's one article. This is 15 one -- this is one article. These are my pages that I put, and 16 I have many articles. 17 But this is report that says -- this is the beginning, and you can see this is the end. It's an article, and it says where 18 it is from here. It's actually from article in Daily Mail where 19 they're quoting the report from British Defense Labs. 20 THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm sorry. 21 22 DR. TAITZ: Is this accepted, Your Honor? 23 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to let you, depending on 24 what question you ask. 25 BY DR. TAITZ:

- 1 Q I have just one question. Would you agree with their
- 2 | findings that -- that the Ebola virus may stay in droplets of
- 3 sweat or saliva for as long as 50 days on hard surfaces?
- 4 A I have no reason to disbelieve what the U.K.'s defense
- 5 science and technology laboratory finds.
- 6 Q Next I would like to show the report. It's just one
- 7 page report stating, "Army troops isolated after Africa duty
- 8 | tour." Again, it's only one page. This is mine.
- 9 MR. HU: For the record, Your Honor, counsel has handed
- 10 me a document that says from -- apparently from the Internet
- 11 | from the Associated Press, ABC News.go.com.
- 12 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 13 \parallel Q So this is a report from Associated Press stating that U.S.
- 14 Army has quarantined members of the U.S. military who are
- 15 returning from Ebola hot zone from West Africa.
- In your professional opinion as epidemiologist, is this the
- correct approach, to quarantine individuals who are coming from
- 18 the area?
- 19 A Yes. Quarantine had been practiced in all Ebola outbreaks,
- 20 and this is consistent with that practice.
- 21 | Q Okay.
- 22 A Let me update that. Quarantine had been practiced in the
- 23 | Ebola outbreaks in Zaire, Sudan and Gabon in previous years.
- 24 | And for those outbreaks, quarantine was practiced and was
- 25 \parallel successful. And what the Army is doing is consistent with that.

Q I would like to draw your attention to yet another article which states, "Ebola research, fever not a sure fire sign of infection."

MR. HU: Your Honor, I've been handed a document for the record that comes from www.LA Times.com/nation1012.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q So this is a report from LA Times quoting a number of researchers stating that not always individuals who have Ebola or are infectious are running fever and are stating that 13 percent of those individuals never develop fever. So what is your opinion as epidemiologist? First of all, is that a correct finding that --

A Well, it says here that the study was sponsored by the World Health Organization and published online late last month by the New England Journal of Medicine, which is a peer reviewed top authority in medicine and analyzed data on 3,343 confirmed and 666 -- 667 probable cases of Ebola.

The finding that 87 percent of those -- 87.1 percent of those infected exhibited fever, but 12.9 percent did not illustrates the challenges confronting health authorities as they struggle to contain the epidemic.

I have absolutely no reason to disbelieve or disagree with the findings of the World Health Organization published in a peer reviewed journal.

Q So in your opinion as epidemiologist, it would not be

sufficient to quarantine only people who have fever. That it would be prudent to quarantine ones who came from that region even if they do not have fever because according to this article, some 13 percent never develop fever. Would that be correct?

A It would be very prudent to quarantine all people, not just those who have fever.

Q I would like to provide you with an article. Actually it's a transcript of a 60 Minutes interview that was given by Sidia Rose, an emergency room nurse here in Dallas, Texas. And the article is titled, "ER nurse: Duncan lied about exposure to Ebola." And this article, it's from The Hill Healthcare Division.

Excuse me. So we had here in Texas recently a small outbreak of Ebola, three confirmed cases which started with individual by name Thomas Duncan who, according to this nurse, simply lied and did not disclose the fact that he had contact with people with Ebola. He actually denied it. And right away proper precautions were not taken; and as a result, two nurses have contracted Ebola.

So in your opinion as epidemiologist, do you feel that it's likely that other individuals coming from Ebola hot zone might be just like Mr. Duncan, simply lying and not disclosing the fact that they had such contact with Ebola patients?

MR. HU: Objection, speculation.

Why don't you rephrase your question because 1 THE COURT: 2 you are asking her to speculate. BY DR. TAITZ: 3 In -- as an epidemiologist, what is your opinion? Do you 4 think that we might have or had previously and have in the 5 future situations where people will not disclose their contact 6 7 with Ebola patients? THE COURT: I'm --8 MR. HU: Same objection, Your Honor. 9 10 THE COURT: I'm sustaining the objection. Let's go to 11 another question. 12 BY DR. TAITZ: 13 What would be -- do you feel as epidemiologist that it is 14 sufficient to just rely on what the person states, whether he 15 is -- that he had contact with Ebola patients or not? Can we 16 have what's called an honor system where we just honor a 17 statement by the person, or we should have mandatory quarantine? In this historical log of many plagues and outbreaks of 18 19 various diseases where there was quarantine instituted, I didn't recall seeing anyplace where guarantine was made depending on 20 what someone said or not. The quarantine was based on where the 21 person came from and who the person was, and it was not -- none 22 of the quarantines that have been done historically relied on 23

Q So, you know, we have today a situation where, on one hand,

self disclosure.

2.4

CDC is stating to the public that it is sufficient just to basically rely on checking the temperature of people who are arriving and rely on what they're saying. On the other hand, we have this whole history of epidemiology of prior outbreaks and measures that were taken by governors and by the army where they're saying regardless of whether a person is running fever, regardless of what he or she is saying, if they come from this particular area, they have to be quarantined.

So between those two approaches, which one is the correct approach in your opinion as epidemiologist?

A As an epidemiologist, it is my duty to prevent outbreaks of disease in our country. And I believe that it's the more prudent and reasonable and safe precautions should be enacted rather than ones that may not be as -- as viable.

Q I would like to draw your attention and the Court's attention to an article, and that's Newsweek article stating, "NBC's Nancy Snyderman breaks Ebola quarantine. Apologizes."

And --

MR. HU: Your Honor, I want to just object to this document. It's not even -- I don't even know where it comes from. It doesn't even say whether it comes from the Internet or any sourcing whatsoever.

DR. TAITZ: It's a Newsweek article, and --

THE COURT: Well, none of these have been offered, so I'm not concerned about that.

MR. HU: Okay.

BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

Q So are you aware of the fact that NBC correspondent Nancy Snyderman has traveled to Ebola region, and one of the members of her team did indeed contract Ebola, a cameraman? The whole team was told to be in quarantine. And then this doctor, instead of staying at home in quarantine, was seen going to a restaurant, and she later apologized for that.

And here is the discussion. She is a medical doctor. She is medical correspondent for NBC. So knowing this case and case of — current case in New York, do you feel that we can rely on doctors just self quarantining themselves, or do you believe that this Court should issue an order of mandatory quarantine for people who come from this region?

A Given the behavior by Ms. -- Dr. Snyderman and also by the other doctor who had recently returned to New York, the evidence is clear that we cannot rely on medical professionals self quarantining. So there needs to be a much more emphatic enforcement of the quarantine.

Q I would like to draw your attention and attention of the Court to an L.A. Times article stating, "CDC recommends looser Ebola monitoring than state quarantines for health workers."

Ms. Dolan, as it's stated in the article and you know, there are several states where -- several ports of entry right now to the United States where people from these West African

Countries, Liberia, Sierra Leon and Guinea, can come into the U.S. There was recently an order by Mr. Obama to limit this to just five ports of entry.

And it's not surprising that the governors, regardless of their party affiliation, Democrats and Republicans, have issued quarantine orders. We have a quarantine order in New York by governor Andrew Cuomo, a quarantine order in New Jersey by Governor Chris Christi, another in Illinois by Governor Pat Quinn. And there are kind of partial orders by Governor Nathan Deal in Georgia and other governors. I believe Governor Malley -- O'Malley in Connecticut. And we have now a situation. We have sort of a patchwork of different orders in different states.

MR. HU: Your Honor, I'm going to object to this narrative as opposed to a question.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q My question is, what is a better approach? Should we continue having a patchwork of different quarantines in different states, or whether you feel that it would be proper to close all the loopholes and to have one mandatory quarantine in the whole country?

A It would be far more effective to have a consistent, coherent, overarching single policy that determines the conditions of quarantine for the country as a policy. It would make it much more easy for people to comply and understand what

needs to be done.

Q I would like to draw your attention to yet another article which came. This is from Tea Party.org. and those reports from doctors. The article is called "Doctor: Feds "disappearing" suspected Ebola patients across U.S." And that's reports from doctors in Kansas and Missouri where they saw patients that they thought fit the description of Ebola patients, but later on those patients somehow were no longer in the hospital, and they're not sure what happened to them.

In your opinion as epidemiologist, do you feel that it will be prudent for this court to order discovery and epidemiological study and survey of those suspected Ebola cases to see what happened to those patients if indeed they were Ebola patients and where did they go, where were they transferred?

MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. I think she's asking for a legal question as to whether a court can order a study of some sort, so I think maybe the question needs to be rephrased.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Do you feel that it would be prudent to just study those cases and find out what happened to those suspected Ebola cases, whether -- where those patients were transferred and how were they treated?

A Reports of all Ebola cases should be reported and should be a matter of public knowledge. Contact tracing and knowledge by all public authorities, all medical authorities should know

where all the Ebola patients are. If we are going to contain the epidemic that is likely to occur and is already starting to occur here in our country, we need to know where all these people are. We need to know who they contact, and we need to have them in quarantine.

Q Now, I would like to draw your attention to yet another article that's actually from news max.com in regards to leaked reports that Mr. Obama is looking to bring foreign nationals who are Ebola patients to the United States. And Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman Bob Goodlatte, is looking for answers, and so far there is no definitive answer if that is true, whether indeed individuals — if there is plan to bring foreign nationals who are sick with Ebola into the U.S. I just wanted you to look at this article.

Do you feel as an epidemiologist that it would be prudent not to bring to the United States foreign nationals sick with Ebola while we don't have a vaccine and definitive cure?

A We don't have a vaccine. We don't have a definitive cure. We don't know a lot of critical information about the spread of Ebola. So to bring more sources of infection and contagion into this country does not seem a prudent move.

Q I would like to draw your attention to an article showing that Kenya has banned passengers from Ebola hit West African nations.

So are you aware that currently 30 different nations have

- 25 banned travel from Liberia, Sierra Leon and Guinea, passengers 1 2 from those countries banned entrance to their nations? I did not know that it has grown as large as 30. I knew 3 that there were many countries that did, but I accept that 30 4 countries have done so now. 5 So as an epidemiologist, do you believe that there should be 6 7 a ban to foreign nationals to travel to the United States until -- foreign nationals from Guinea, Sierra Leon and Liberia 8 until the end of deadly Ebola epidemic? 9 That would be prudent, and it would be consistent with 10 11 prior epidemics of contagion and how other countries have acted 12 in centuries past in preventing the spread of disease to their 13 shores. 14 I would like to draw your attention to yet another article. 15 And it states, "Ebola spread to U.S. is inevitable says CDC 16 chief." And that comes from AFP. It's Agence France Presse. 17 So if Thomas Frieden, Director of CDC, believes that Ebola spread to the U.S. is inevitable, do you feel that as 18 epidemiologist there should be ban to travel from those 19 20 countries to non-U.S. citizens and quarantine for detaining U.S. citizens? 21 22 Those are prudent measures that are tried and true in past
 - epidemics.

23

24

25

I have submitted already to this court with the pleadings a letter that was sent by Bob Goodlatte, Chairman of the House

Judiciary Committee, and Trey Gowdy, chairman for Subcommittee on Immigration, where they're stating that under 8 U.S.C. 1182F, there should be a ban on travel to the U.S. for citizens from Ebola affected countries.

Do you agree with this -- with this letter and this request coming from the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and Chairman of Subcommittee on Immigration?

MR. HU: I'm going to object to the question, Your Honor, to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, whether 1182F is -- even applies in this circumstance.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. You may answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question, please?

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Yes. The chairman -- the Chairman of the House of
Representatives Judiciary Committee, Bob Goodlatte, and Chairman
of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security have
submitted a letter to President Obama. In that letter they're
stating, "Therefore, we urge that you use -- your use of 8
U.S.C. 1182F cover any foreign national who has -- who has -who was present in a country with widespread and intense
transmission of Ebola within two months prior to desired travel
to the U.S. Such a travel restriction can and should be
temporary and with moratorium lifted when the Ebola outbreak in
West Africa and any other countries with a subsequent outbreak

is controlled."

2.4

Do you agree with this statement coming from the Chair of the House Judiciary Committee and Chair of House Subcommittee on Immigration?

A Yes, I do.

MR. HU: Same objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, I would like to enter into evidence as Plaintiff Exhibit 1 a letter which actually I submitted before with the pleadings, and that's the letter from the Chair of the House Judiciary Committee and Chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration urging ban on travel.

THE COURT: Mr. Hu, any objection?

MR. HU: Your Honor, I think the letter is hearsay, and I'm not sure if she's laid the foundation for how it's even relevant to the case that the Court may have standing for here.

THE COURT: What is the relevance of this, Dr. Taitz?

DR. TAITZ: This -- this letter makes it more likely and it weighs in favor of this Court granting the requested relief ban for travel of foreign nationals. It specifically states what I have stated in my pleadings, that there should be a ban on travel from those countries.

THE COURT: Dr. Taitz, let me -- I don't want to cut off your presentation and -- here's -- but I want you to keep in mind -- and I'm telling you and Mr. Kisor and Mr. Hu this

jointly, I guess. Is you need to keep in mind and Mr. Kisor and Mr. Hu need to keep in mind what is in the province of the Court versus what is in the province of Congress or what is in the province of the Executive Branch.

And so while I might agree with some of your positions

100 percent or I might disagree with them 100 percent, you know,
whether, I mean, a court can issue an order that creates a

travel ban, I mean, you may have to show me where I have the
power to do that, you know, because there's an old saying that
judges are appointed, but they're not anointed. And I don't
know that I have -- and I'll use the word power, but you can say
jurisdiction or you can say right -- I mean, you can use
whatever descriptive term you want to use -- to create my own
travel ban even if I agree with you.

And so that -- I'm not cutting you off, but I want you to keep in mind that before we're done today, if you want me to go there, which obviously you do, you're going to have to show me something that says that Judge Hanen has the right to come up with his own ban.

DR. TAITZ: Actually --

THE COURT: If I could, you know, I'd put a bubble over South Texas and protect everybody here. And for your benefit, I'd put a bubble over Southern California and protect everybody there. But I don't know that I have the right and/or the power to do that.

1 DR. TAITZ: Yes, Your Honor, you do. And you have a 2 right of issue a writ of mandamus. For example, the Secretary of Health and Human Services -- and that's something that 3 actually was in the pleadings by the defendants. Under Section 4 361, Public Health Service Act 42 U.S.C. 264. The U.S. 5 Secretary of Health and Human Services is authorized to take 6 7 measures to prevent the entry and spread of certain communicable diseases from foreign countries into the United States and 8 between states under Executive Order 13295 as amended July 31, 9 10 2014. List quarantinable communicable diseases: Cholera, 11 diphtheria, infection, tuberculosis, plague, small pox, yellow 12 fever, viral hemorrhagic fever, severe acute respiratory 13 syndromes and so forth. 14 BY DR. TAITZ: 15 Ms. Dolan, does Ebola qualify as viral hemorrhagic fever? 16 Α Yes, it does. 17 So the Secretary of Health and Human Services was supposed 18 to quarantine -- this is a clearly --19 THE COURT: It doesn't say that. I mean, I'm looking at 20 what you just read. It doesn't say "shall." It says they're authorized to. 21 DR. TAITZ: What happens where the official like 22 Secretary of Health and Human Services, that is who took an oath 23

of office to protect the health of U.S. citizens who has --

okay. Who has specific legal authority to protect by issuing

2.4

quarantine, and she's not doing it. In that specific situation, this Court can issue a writ of mandamus ordering the Secretary of Health and Human Services to — to issue an order of quarantine, which she's not issuing. Why do we have a writ of mandamus — and this is something that existed for over 200 years, where the Court have used a writ of mandamus to — ordering different government officials to do specific things in order to prevent endangering the public or hurting public like this case, infectious diseases.

THE COURT: Well, do I have the power to authorize some -- I mean, to order somebody to do something just because I don't agree with their decision? So if I -- if the secretary has looked at this, studied the issue and decided that it's -- it's not in the best interests of the country. And I'll assume for the minute that they're acting in the best interests of the country, which may or may not be a good assumption. Why do I have the right as a judge just to second guess them?

Now, I agree that I can order -- I can mandamus someone to do something that the law commands them to do. But is authorized to do it gives the Secretary of Homeland -- of Health and Human Services the ability to do it, but it doesn't command them to do it, does it?

DR. TAITZ: Well, according to her oath of office, she took an oath of office to protect the constitution and protect the health of the citizens of this country. That is her

```
position. And this is something that she is not doing, not the
 1
 2
     Secretary of Health and Human Services, not Secretary of
     Homeland Security. They're not protecting the citizens.
 3
         So -- and this is the situation where the courts should be
 4
     stepping in, stating you have an ability to issue a quarantine,
 5
     and you are ordered to exercise your power to quarantine against
 6
 7
     communicable diseases. If the Court --
             THE COURT: Let me go on and let you -- let's finish the
 8
     testimony because what we're going into now is a legal argument
 9
10
     of whether I can or whether I should do something. Let's finish
     our witnesses and then come back to -- I want to come back to
11
12
     this, but this started by an objection to a document.
13
         I'm going to allow the document into evidence. This is not
14
     a jury trial, and I can give it the weight it deserves at the
15
     time I make a decision.
16
             DR. TAITZ: Moreover, Your Honor --
17
             THE COURT: So I'm admitting the document as Exhibit 1.
     You'll have to give the copy to Cristi.
18
19
             DR. TAITZ:
                         Sorry? Excuse me?
20
             THE COURT: Okay. I'm admitting 1. Go ahead,
     Dr. Taitz.
21
             DR. TAITZ: Another option, Your Honor, under 8 U.S.C.
22
     1182 --
23
24
             THE COURT: Wait, wait. Let's come back to that.
25
     ahead and let's do -- you know, finish questioning of the
```

witness. I'm going to allow both sides to put on whatever 1 2 witnesses they do, and then I want to argue. I got you off track by asking you that. Let's finish with the witnesses 3 first. 4 DR. TAITZ: Well, let -- if I might ask for 5 clarification. Your Honor, if you feel that there is nothing 6 7 you can do in this case, why are we even here? THE COURT: We're here because you filed a lawsuit. 8 DR. TAITZ: No, I understand. But the case -- if you 9 10 felt that there is nothing you can do and you cannot issue a 11 writ of mandamus ordering the defendants to follow existing 12 laws, for example, as I stated, 8 U.S.C. 1182 that forbids 13 entrance to individuals with communicable diseases, we have --14 THE COURT: That might be a different story, because 1182 uses the word "shall." That's a command. That's a 15 16 different statute. 17 DR. TAITZ: Okay. So does Your Honor feel that Your Honor has an ability to issue a writ of mandamus under --18 19 THE COURT: I'll let you question the witness, Dr. Taitz, but not me. 20 DR. TAITZ: Okay. So then I'm urging Your Honor to 21 issue a writ of mandamus under --22 23 THE COURT: No, I understand. But let's talk about that 24 when we're done with the witness. I want you to finish with the

witness or any other witnesses. I'm going to let Mr. Kisor and

Mr. Hu put on whatever witnesses they want to put on, and then we'll argue about where we are. The witnesses may have other schedules that they need to --

DR. TAITZ: Sure.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q I'm bringing forward a letter that was signed by members of the U.S. -- United States Senate Judiciary Committee, and it requires under Section 212F of Immigration and Nationality Act to suspend entry of all aliens or any class of aliens as immigrants and nonimmigrants who are detrimental to the interests of the United States. And specifically they're seeking to ban entrance for individuals who are coming from Ebola region.

Would you agree with this letter coming from the Senate

Judiciary Committee stating that there should be ban to entrance
to the U.S. of individuals coming from those countries?

MR. HU: Your Honor, object again. She's calling for a legal conclusion now under, of all things, immigration laws.

And I think as an epidemiologist, Ms. Dolan has no qualification to opine on immigration law.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to let her answer this question whether she personally agrees with it.

THE WITNESS: As an epidemiologist, do I agree with a ban on entry into the United States of people from Ebola countries? Yes, I do. It's the same kind of treatment like

quarantine. I think a ban is even better than a quarantine. If we could have both, that would be sufficient. I do not know how it would be administered.

But I feel as an epidemiologist and it is my opinion as an epidemiologist that the most prudent, strict measures be put in place against a disease that has no certain cure, no vaccine, and is reminiscent of the kind of epidemics that we -- our country experienced with small pox before small pox had a vaccine or a -- and there was no known cure for it.

DR. TAITZ: I would like to enter as an Exhibit 2 a letter from the Senate Judiciary Committee urging the president to ban travel.

MR. HU: Objection, irrelevant.

THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. Again, I'm admitting it for whatever weight it may have.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q I would like to draw your attention to one more letter, and this is the letter that was signed by multiple members of the U.S. Congress who are also healthcare providers, doctors, dentists and nurses who are urging the President of the United States to ban travel and also quarantine for 21 days individuals who come from Ebola hot zone. And I would like your opinion as epidemiologist if you agree with that letter.

A Again, it's the same sentiment that I had expressed before.

The ban would be wonderful. A quarantine would be essential for

```
keeping people who are infected with a disease that we have no
 1
 2
     vaccine for, has a very high case fatality rate, that does
     spread through contagion, it would be very prudent to do that.
 3
     And I agree with that, with the statement.
 4
             DR. TAITZ: I would like to enter this as Exhibit 3,
 5
     Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.
 6
 7
             MR. HU: Objection, irrelevant.
             THE COURT: What is that one?
 8
 9
             DR. TAITZ: This is the letter signed by 16 members of
     the U.S. Congress who are not just members of Congress, but who
10
11
     are also healthcare providers, doctors, dentists, and nurses,
12
     urging the President of the United States to issue ban on travel
13
     and quarantine.
14
             THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule the
15
     objection.
16
             DR. TAITZ: Thank you.
17
             THE COURT: It's admitted as Exhibit 3.
18
     BY DR. TAITZ:
         Are you aware of the fact that other nations have suspended
19
20
     issuing visas to their countries? For example, Australia just
     recently suspended issuing visas to individuals from Liberia,
21
22
     Sierra Leon and Guinea to travel to their nations until the end
23
     of the epidemic.
2.4
         Do you -- as an epidemiologist, do you feel that it would be
```

a prudent measure for the Court to issue a writ of mandamus to

the defendants to suspend issuing such visas in order to prevent endangering of the public?

MR. HU: Objection. I don't think this witness would have a basis to answer that question as an epidemiologist. It's calling for a conclusion about whether a country issues a visa or not. I agree that an epidemiologist can talk about travel bans, isolation, quarantine type issues, but now we're getting into the legal issue of visas.

THE COURT: Rephrase your question, Dr. Taitz.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q If a country stop issuing visas, individuals from the area where there is a raging epidemic cannot enter the country, as an epidemiologist, do you believe that it would be a prudent and a necessary measure to suspend issuing visas to individuals from specific countries until the end of the epidemic in order to stop spread of the disease?

MR. HU: Same objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: It would be prudent, and it's also been successfully practiced in the past.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Thank you. Excuse me one second.

You have written in your sworn affidavits that you have submitted to this court and you have described a spread of diseases such as enterovirus D68 and your opinion that this

```
epidemic of enterovirus is -- is related to transportation of
 1
 2
     minor illegal aliens from the border to the rest of the country.
     And I wanted you to elaborate on that.
 3
         Do you believe that indeed this outbreak of enterovirus D68,
 4
     in your opinion as an epidemiologist, is related to -- is
 5
     related to this transportation of illegal alien children from
 6
 7
     the border that we've seen recently?
         The enterovirus D68 --
 8
 9
             THE COURT: Tell me what the first word you're saying
10
          Spell that, please.
11
             THE WITNESS: Enterovirus. E-N-T-E-R-O-V-I-R-U-S.
12
             THE COURT: Entero.
13
             THE WITNESS: Entero.
14
             THE COURT: Translate that for me into nonscientific
15
     terms.
16
             THE WITNESS: It's a respiratory virus.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. And D68 is the strain?
18
             THE WITNESS: D68 is the particular strain.
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
19
20
         I'm sorry, Dr. Taitz. You may have to reask your question.
     BY DR. TAITZ:
21
         So in your opinion, if those individuals who are crossing
22
     the border are placed into a quarantine to check for infectious
23
2.4
     diseases and provide them with necessary treatment while they're
25
     in quarantine, in your opinion will that either stop epidemic or
```

at least lower the likelihood of such epidemics continuing?

A Quarantine is a standard building block in preventing disease from spreading that's been traditionally used for centuries, if not millennia. It absolutely has a place in preventing disease crossing our border from Mexico into this country. Allowing free access of people who are not screened for communicable disease and allowing them into our country without quarantine promotes the spread of communicable disease

You have studied my case where I have been -- I have been infected with upper respiratory disease several times, and you did not examine me. You are not a doctor. But just as an epidemiologist who studied the timing of -- of this upper respiratory disease that I have contracted, considering in relation to timings of epidemics that happen typically in U.S. and this transportation of a number of illegal aliens, do you feel that that's something that -- this transportation of minor illegal alien children was the cause of the respiratory disease that I have contracted?

MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond the field of epidemiology. She's asking for a specific cause for a specific individual for a specific symptom.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

in our country.

Q How epidemiologist find out the source of the disease? Do

epidemiologists working for CDC or NIH, do they actually examine any of the patients?

A CDC has reportable diseases. Certain categories of diseases are reportable by the treating provider to the CDC and to the local — the state agencies and local agencies which then forward that information to the CDC. Those — the CDC is ultimately responsible for reporting and keeping track of the reporting of such diseases.

Since these are reported diseases, then for those that are serious and require contact tracing, public health authorities now and in the past do the contact tracing and find out where the source of these, you know, diseases are. And it is their job to control them by using the information in a way that would prevent more cases from developing.

Q So when CDC comes up with measures stating we should take temperature of all the people coming from Liberia, let's say, it doesn't mean that CDC doctors, they actually check each and every person, but they just look at the trend; and based on that trend, they come up with their recommendations and policies; is that correct?

A Yeah. CDC doctors are not there at the airport taking temperature. They're not there at the hospitals or in the doctors' waiting rooms examining cases. What they do is they take the case reports from these health professionals, from these individuals, and then they use that information to further

do their work.

2.4

Q So if we're talking about a healthcare provider like myself who is providing care to new immigrants, what is your recommendation as epidemiologist? What would be the proper redress of the problem of contracting infectious diseases? What do you see is a measure that can be taken in order to stop the threat of diseases to myself and other healthcare providers and make sure that myself and other healthcare providers do not contract infectious diseases from those immigrants?

A The most prudent action that can be taken for communicable diseases from people outside our country seeking to get in is to first of all screen and identify these people; figure out if they are diseased or not.

Those that are not -- beyond that, there needs to be a quarantine to make sure that the serious diseases that we are concerned about like enterovirus D68, which has already had some case fatalities in our country. Ebola. We already have some case fatalities in our country.

We want to make sure that our borders are secure, that the people that come through our borders are healthy and so they do not advance their contagion into the general population, particularly the healthcare providers who would be most at risk, who are at imminent risk of getting such infections.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, if I may note, and I wanted to provide you with a letter that actually was sent to me by Mr. Hu

in what -- I have requested specific information of individuals that were transported to my area to see which of those individuals that were transported to my area came to my office to see if they had specific diseases, if they were specific causes, sources of the infection. And the defendants refused to provide any such information until Your Honor rules on their 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) motion and until we have 26(f) case management conference.

So at this point I cannot provide Your Honor with specific information, with specific names of the patients from whom I contracted upper respiratory disease simply because the defense refused to provide any such information.

But after Your Honor rules on their 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) motion and we have 26(f) case management conference, I would be able to obtain from the defendants specific names of the specific immigrants who were transferred, who came to my office and who were sources of the diseases. So I just wanted --

DR. TAITZ: No, but I do not know because of their privacy. First of all, they have -- I have the names of people who came to my office.

THE COURT: Dr. Taitz, you have the names, don't you?

THE COURT: That's what I'm asking.

DR. TAITZ: However, because there are so many of them, I don't know which ones specifically were transported by the government, were transported from the border, which ones were

infected.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. You can give -- assuming I order it, you could give the defendants a list of names, and they could provide you with the medical records for those individuals.

DR. TAITZ: Well, what I asked is for the list of names of individuals who were transported to Southern California. So I would like to offer Mr. Hu's letter. Is it Who or Hu?

MR. HU: Hu.

DR. TAITZ: I apologize. Mr. Hu's letter as Exhibit 4 explaining that at this point, I cannot provide any specific names because I was prevented from getting this information by the defendants.

THE COURT: All right. It will be admitted as Exhibit 4.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Now, on August 27th, we had here a -- actually Mr. Oaks who testified that the healthcare releases for illegal aliens who are transported from Texas border further to California and other areas are signed by Border Patrol agents. In your opinion as an epidemiologist, do you believe that it would be prudent and necessary for those individuals to be checked by a medical doctor and a healthcare release to be signed by a doctor and not by the Border Patrol agent?

MR. HU: Objection. I think this is again beyond the

field of epidemiology. It goes to medical necessity. 1 2 DR. TAITZ: I would rephrase the question. BY DR. TAITZ: 3 Now, certain diseases, in order to examine and diagnose 4 certain diseases, you need to have specific knowledge that you 5 get as a medical doctor. Would that be correct? 6 7 Yes, I agree. So in your opinion as epidemiologist who is seeking --8 looking for causes of diseases and the ways to prevent spread of 9 10 diseases, do you feel that situations like myself of being --11 being infected by upper respiratory disease that necessitated for me to use oxygen for the rest of my life, is that something 12 that can be redressed and alleviated if those individuals who 13 14 are released from the custody of immigration are checked by 15 doctors who have knowledge, who can diagnose different diseases, 16 and therefore the spread of diseases would be minimized? 17 MR. HU: Objection. Again, beyond the field of epidemiology. She's asking about her specific ailment that may 18 19 somehow be related to --THE COURT: Setting aside the parts of the question that 20 pertain to Dr. Taitz, you can answer that question. 21 THE WITNESS: As an epidemiologist, I care about disease 22 transmission. And if we are supposed to halt disease 23 24 transmission and propagation through our population, then we

need to have people -- if you are going to be admitting people

into this country and they have to undergo medical screening, you need to make sure that that medical screening is adequate. And there is a likelihood that if you have screening done by lay people who do not have medical or health training, it is possible that people who should be identified and monitored and quarantined are let loose into the population. And by having a weak screen, which would be Border Patrol people as opposed to a stronger, more thorough screen by a medical person, our country would be much better protected having a stronger screen than a weak screen.

BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

Q So we have here an expert in tuberculosis. And if you could maybe read from your CDC Manual and in relation to release of individuals with tuberculosis and need for quarantining the ones who were in contact with tuberculosis and the ones who have not just positive, but negative, initially negative TB tests.

A I'm reading from the tuberculosis section under the section of control of patients, contacts and immediate environment.

Under management of contacts, the CDC states, "In the USA, preventative treatment for three months is recommended for skin test negative close contacts. The skin test should then be repeated to determine the need for additional preventative therapy. BCG immunization of tuberculin negative household contacts may be warranted under special circumstances."

When it goes -- discussing investigation of contacts and

source of infection, the CDC states that, "PPD testing of all members of the household," that's the skin test, "and other close contacts is recommended in the USA. If negative, a repeat skin test should be performed two to three months after exposure has ended. Chest radiographs should be obtained on positive reactors when they are identified. Preventative treatment is indicated for contacts who are positive reactors and for some initially negative reactors at high risk of developing active disease, especially young, five-years-old or younger, and HIV infected close contacts at least until the repeat skin test is shown to remain negative."

Q So is that your opinion as epidemiologist that individuals who were in contact with ones that have tuberculosis have to be quarantined? And actually it's your opinion and opinion of CDC; is that correct?

A They didn't discuss quarantine in here, but what they did say is that even if you are negative, you still need to follow up contacts for at least two to three months after exposure has ended.

What this means is that just because you test negative doesn't mean that you're clear and that you can't come down and display disease later.

Q So it is your opinion that those individuals should be quarantined before they are released in general public?

A If the -- if you are talking about people who are coming

into the U.S. who have tuberculosis or have been in contact with people with tuberculosis, it would be prudent to quarantine them rather than allow them into this country and then invest all kinds of resources monitoring them and treating them.

Q So also as an epidemiologist, do you believe that it would

be necessary for the defendants to also provide notification to schools and also to healthcare — to schools where illegal children will be enrolled or to healthcare — and also to healthcare providers like myself all of the contacts of those individuals? For example, the fact that those individuals were exposed to tuberculosis or were in contact with individuals with tuberculosis?

A Are you saying with or without a quarantine in effect?

Q Well, what is your opinion? Do you feel that -- first of all, should there be notification? Should the schools be notified, and should the healthcare providers be notified?

THE COURT: Noticed of what?

DR. TAITZ: Of the fact that this person was exposed to tuberculosis and it needs to be tested repeatedly.

THE WITNESS: My understanding is for the American public, in order to enroll in school, you have to be vaccinated, and you have to be tuberculosis free. You have to have cards.

And I did that for my kids. I did that -- I had that for myself.

In the absence of such documentation for school officials,

there needs to be some medical notification to school officials, and there needs to be notification to health providers of the status of these people that come across the border that have not been subjected to the same rigorous public health measures that our own school children have been subjected to.

DR. TAITZ: If I may?

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q There was recently an article stating -- by Todd Starnes,
"Immigration Crisis: Tuberculosis Spreading at Camps." And
there were reports that in those camps that are around -- camps
for minor illegal aliens, alien children that are run by HHS and
DHS, there was -- there was an outbreak of tuberculosis.

In your opinion as an epidemiologist, do you believe that in situations where there was tuberculosis, those individuals should be quarantined before they're being transported to other areas in the country?

- A If that tuberculosis is not being treated and not being taken care of, these people should not be transported and let out of government control.
- Q Do you believe that there is a possibility of bio terrorism in terms of individuals who are infected, deadly Ebola virus coming from -- from Guinea, Sierra Leon, and Liberia and using those pathogens in the form of bio terrorism?

MR. HU: Again, objection. Beyond the field of epidemiology.

1 THE COURT: Sustained. 2 DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, that would be it for now. would like to reserve the right to call Ms. Dolan as a rebuttal 3 witness in case there will be a difference in opinion with the 4 defendant's witness. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hu, how long do you think 7 you're going to be. MR. HU: Difficult question, Your Honor. Probably about 8 30 minutes to an hour. 9 THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and -- it's 10 11 11:55 now. Let's go ahead and break for lunch, and let's be 12 back at 12:45 to start. (Recess taken from 11:54 to 12:50.) 13 14 THE COURT: Be seated. 15 Ms. Dolan, if you would come back and assume the witness chair. 16 17 Go ahead and be seated. MR. HU: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. HU: Ms. Dolan, I know you alluded to this during your prior 21 testimony, but I don't think it's in the record. I'd like to 22 have marked as Government Exhibit No. 12 --23 2.4 MR. HU: May I approach, Your Honor? 25 THE COURT: You may.

- 1 BY MR. HU:
- 2 | Q I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit No. 12. This
- 3 is your CV, isn't it?
- 4 A Yes, sir.
- 5 DR. TAITZ: Excuse me, Your Honor. I don't have an
- 6 Exhibit 12.
- 7 BY MR. HU:
- 8 Q And in looking at your CV, first this was previously filed
- 9 with the court on September 11th. Is everything in this CV true
- 10 and correct?
- 11 A There may have been some additions since then, either
- 12 clients or publications.
- 13 Q Okay. Now, you are not a physician; is that correct?
- 14 A That is correct.
- 15 Q So you're not qualified to do a differential diagnosis based
- on symptoms then; is that correct?
- 17 A I do not provide diagnoses. I rely on the diagnoses
- 18 \parallel provided to me by qualified medical professionals.
- 19 Q So then you can't go ahead and diagnose TB based on a set of
- 20 symptoms given to you, correct?
- 21 A As I said before, sir, I do not perform diagnoses. I work
- 22 with the diagnoses as provided to me by medical providers.
- DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. The
- 24 epidemiologist --
- THE COURT: You need to get near a microphone, Dr.

- 50 1 Taitz. I can't hear you. 2 DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. An epidemiologist does know --3 THE COURT: Wait, wait. You can't object to her 4 5 answer. But I object to the question. 6 DR. TAITZ: 7 THE COURT: All right. I'm overruling the objection. DR. TAITZ: The question is misleading. 8 BY MR. HU: 9 Now, Ms. Dolan, you're not qualified to decide who should be 10 11 prescribed a C-pap, letter C dash P-A-P, machine or not get one 12 of those machines, correct? 13 Yes, sir. I am not qualified to do that. 14 Now, your specialty, based on Exhibit No. 12, appears to be 15 essentially life expectancy, right? 16 No. Life expectancy is one of the expertises that I offer 17 as an expert. But in looking at where you've testified, it looks to be --18 the bulk, almost over 90 percent of your testimony has been in 19 the area of life expectancy; is that right? 20 Yes, because I have written reports in life expectancy 21 22 because those are the cases that have come to me.
- 24 A If I had more epidemiology cases, then I would do more of those.

Q

Okay.

- And as best I can tell, this is the first case -- infectious 1 Q
- 2 disease case you've testified in; isn't that correct?
 - This is the first -- that is correct.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Now, would you agree with me that epidemiology is a study of 4 disease trends in a population? 5
- Let's see. The definition of epidemiology, I believe I had 6 7 that in my second -- please bear with me. I'm looking for my affidavit where I have a definition of epidemiology.
 - In my affidavit dated October 10th, 2014, I have a paragraph on page 2. According to Kenneth J. Rothman, professor of epidemiology at Boston University School of Public Health in his introductory textbook on epidemiology, quote, often considered the core science of public health, epidemiology involves study and determinants of disease frequency; or put even more simply, the study of the occurrence of illness, unquote.
 - So epidemiology is not the science of diagnosing whether someone has a particular disease or does not have a particular It's just -- it deals with the numbers and frequencies; is that correct?
 - It takes the diagnoses and goes on from there to see what they imply.
- So what trend -- you look for trends and things like that? 22
 - That's one of the things that we look for, yes.
- So when we're talking about Ebola, you're not going to tell 24 25 us what the trend -- you're not able to diagnose whether someone

- 1 has Ebola or not. You rely on other medical data, right?
- 2 A I rely on other people to indicate whether they are
- 3 seropositive for Ebola, whether they have symptoms for Ebola,
- 4 where they -- who they've had contact with, who may or may not
- 5 have Ebola. Yes, all those factors are the things that I as an
- 6 epidemiologist have to take into account.
- 7 Q And then you take that data and predict trends and things of
- 8 that nature, correct?
- 9 A It's -- it's a matter of evaluating what the actual causal
- 10 relationships, what the factors are. And then once we have
- 11 enough information and enough data, then we can start looking at
- 12 trends and what they are.
- 13 \parallel Q So you can't tell the Court with any certainty that
- epidemiologists would how Ebola is transmitted, correct?
- 15 A No, sir. That's not the case at all. There's plenty of
- 16 | information out there in the medical literature about
- 17 | transmission: A lot of case studies, a lot of peer reviewed
- 18 | medical literature about that, a lot of information that is
- 19 reported constantly.
- 20 Q But you're just relying on that other data and that other
- 21 | information. You can't make that independent judgment call, can
- 22 you?
- 23 A Sir, I have to work with the data that I have, okay? And
- 24 | that data comes from other people. If I were put in the
- 25 position in the CDC where all that information was coming in to

- me, then I would be able to do exactly the same thing as your
- 2 CDC epidemiologists do.
- 3 Q So when you're -- when you testified earlier that Ebola is
- 4 transmitted through aerosols, essentially you're relying solely
- 5 on two articles that appear in your report; is that correct?
- 6 A I am -- I am relying on that, but there is other information
- 7 in the literature that also talks about aerosols, and there are
- 8 also other reports in the news talking about the possibility of
- 9 aerosols.
- 10 Q But you only cited two journal articles in your report,
- 11 correct?
- 12 A That's correct.
- 13 | Q Let's talk about those two articles. Let's look first at
- 14 \parallel the Weingartl, W-E-I-N-G-A-R-T-L, report, and I'll have that
- 15 marked as Government Exhibit No. 13. Showing you what's been
- 16 marked as 13.
- 17 A Yes, sir.
- 18 Q Okay. Great.
- 19 A I have my own copy.
- 20 | Q You already have a copy?
- 21 A I have my own copy.
- 22 | Q Now, this article is entitled, "Transmission of Ebola Virus
- 23 | from Pigs to Non-human Primates"; is that right?
- 24 A That's correct.
- 25 \parallel Q Now, in your experience as an epidemiologist, you know that

Ebola is a disease that's transmitted in humans through the 1 2 gastrointestinal tract and blood, correct? I don't know -- where did you --3 DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. 4 THE WITNESS: Are you saying that --5 6 DR. TAITZ: Objection. 7 BY MR. HU: No. I'm asking you in your experience --8 THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. 9 10 DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. Mr. Hu misstated 11 what was stated by the witness in his question. 12 THE COURT: Well, she can correct him. 13 Go ahead, doctor. 14 BY MR. HU: 15 Is it your understanding that Ebola is transmitted in humans 16 through the gastrointestinal tract and blood? 17 Ebola is transmitted through more than just that. Ebola is transmitted through personal contact with secretions and with 18 contact with aerosols, and that is the information available. 19 And that's what you're relying on in what's been marked as 20 Exhibit 13 here, this --21 22 This is not the only one that I am relying on, sir. Ms. Dolan, I'm asking you about this one, though. 23 24 Α Okay. 25 So it's your understanding that among other things, the

- 1 | human transmission is through the gastrointestinal tract and the
- 2 blood, correct?
- 3 A If you are quoting from some place, sir, can you indicate
- 4 for me --
- 5 Q I'm not quoting. I'm asking a general question.
- 6 A Okay. Because you are looking at that paper as if you are
- 7 reading.
- 8 DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, objection. Asked and answered.
- 9 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sir, are you asking me a question
- 11 | from this article? Or are you asking me a question that is not
- 12 | from this article?
- 13 BY MR. HU:
- 14 \square Q I'm not asking you a question from the article.
- 15 A Oh, okay. Since you were looking at the paper and asking me
- 16 the question, it --
- 17 Q My notes are on the paper.
- 18 \blacksquare A -- sounded like you were reading from it, sir.
- 19 Q Is it transmitted in humans from the gastrointestinal tract
- 20 and blood?
- 21 A It is more than just the, you know, blood. It's secretions,
- 22 | it's vomit, it's sweat, it's direct skin contact, it's aerosols
- 23 from coughing and sneezing, fomites from coughing and sneezing.
- It's more than just what you are indicating, sir.
- 25 \parallel Q Now, in pigs, which is the topic of Exhibit No. 13, Ebola is

- 1 | transmitted in the respiratory tract; is that correct?
- 2 A From what they're saying is that it appears that these
- 3 aerosols entered into the respiratory tract. In the article
- 4 itself, they talked about, you know, lesions in the lungs which
- 5 | indicate to the investigators that the entry was through the
- 6 respiratory tract. That is what they led to conclude, that
- 7 | that's what happened, that there were aerosolized particles that
- 8 came in through the respiratory tract.
- 9 Q And that's different than the transmission mechanism in
- 10 human beings, correct?
- DR. TAITZ: Excuse me. I didn't hear.
- 12 BY MR. HU:
- 13 \parallel Q That is different than the transmission mechanism in human
- 14 beings; is that correct?
- 15 A I do not find that, sir. There is nothing that says that
- 16 that is not true.
- 17 Q The article I'm showing you, Exhibit 13, is about pigs.
- 18 A The article is about non-human primates being infected with
- 19 Ebola from pigs housed in the same room, and there's no contact
- 20 between the pigs and the -- and the non-human primates except
- 21 aerosol transmission.
- 22 Q But the transmission is between pigs and non-human primates,
- 23 not human beings; is that correct?
- 24 A That was this. And the understanding and the implication is
- 25 | that if it can be transferred to non-human primates through

- aerosol, one cannot rule out that it cannot be transmitted
 through aerosol to humans, sir.
- Q Yes/no question. This article was about pig trans -transmission from pigs to non-human primates, correct?
- 5 A That's right. The non-human primates are a substitute for 6 human experimentation.
- 7 MR. HU: I'm going to object to everything after "yes," 8 Your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: Okay.
- 10 BY MR. HU:
- 11 Q Showing you what's been marked or what will be marked as
 12 Exhibit No. 14.
- MR. HU: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 14 BY MR. HU:
- Q Exhibit No. 14 is an article entitled "Ebola Hemorrhagic

 Fever, Kikwit, Democratic Republic of the Congo."
- Is this another article which you relied upon in generating your report and opinions about aerosol transmission of Ebola?
- 19 A Yes, I did, sir.
- 20 Q Now, let's -- let's talk about the terminology here. When
- 21 | you talk about airborne transmission, we're talking about
- 22 particles suspended in the air like tuberculosis; is that right?
- 23 A That's correct. I can read to you the definition of
- 24 airborne from the CDC.

- 1 | like tuberculosis, in the air; is that correct?
- 2 A That's right. It's micro -- aerosols that carry infectious
- 3 particles.
- 4 Q If you'll look with me at this Exhibit No. 14 and turn with
- 5 me to the very last page. I think at the top it's marked page 6
- 6 of 8, and start -- read along with me the paragraph starting
- 7 | with, "Our investigation had several limitations." Are you with
- 8 me?
- 9 A Do you want me to read this or you to read this?
- 10 Q I'll read it, and tell me if you agree.
- "The team had to frequently rely on surrogates to provide
- 12 | answers for patients who died." So there was some inaccuracies
- 13 based on that, correct?
- 14 A That's correct.
- 15 Q "Second, the interviewers may have been aggressive in
- 16 | attempting to establish contacts or risk factors." In other
- words, it was investigator bias here; is that correct?
- 18 A They're raising the possibility that there might be
- 19 investigator bias.
- 20 \parallel Q "Third, the serologic confirmation of all cases would have
- 21 been preferable, but here there was only 11 of 44 cases provided
- 22 sera for confirmation." In other words, blood or some other
- 23 | bodily fluid to confirm Ebola; is that correct?
- 24 A That is what they're stating, sir.
- 25 Q And, "Fourth, the interval between the period of interest

- and the date these interviews was actually conducted was fairly substantial"; is that right?
 - A That's what the investigators are saying, sir.

- Q So would you agree with me then that the reliability that -where the article suggests perhaps, perhaps 12 people may have
 had some sort of airborne transmission of Ebola is pretty
 speculative because of all of these limiting factors?
- A As investigators, they are required to point out the -- any deficiencies in the study. And that does not mean that the study is worthless, and it doesn't mean that the conclusions are nonexistent. It just shows that when you evaluate this information, you have to take these into account. It's still very possible that aerosol transmission is a reality.
- Q But would it appear, based on all of these risk factors, to you that it is -- should be given -- this study should be given less weight perhaps than other data because of all the frailties which I've pointed out in the study?
- A This should be given the weight that it deserves because you have the laboratory conditions where you don't have such, you know, problems and such. You know, it's a laboratory experiment. In fact, the transmission through aerosol between pigs and non-human primates, it is very possible that even though the epidemic that was in the Republic of the Congo, they weren't able to do the same experimental verification that we were able to do in the laboratory. That doesn't mean that it

- 1 weighs less. It means that, you know, there are some things in
- 2 the study to keep in mind, but it doesn't mean that aerosol
- 3 transmission doesn't exist.
- 4 Q But you would agree with me there are some problems with the
- 5 study?
- 6 A Whenever you do stuff in the field, yeah. It's not like a
- 7 laboratory.
- 8 Q Now, you would agree as an expert witness that reasonable
- 9 minds do disagree, and there may be other peer reviewed
- 10 | literature that goes contrary to the view that you've just
- 11 espoused here?
- 12 | A There's always that possibility. You know, it's always
- whatever facts are observed.
- MR. HU: Your Honor, may I approach?
- THE COURT: You may.
- 16 BY MR. HU:
- 17 Q I'm showing you what's been marked as Defendant's Exhibit
- 18 No. 15. Have you seen this article before?
- 19 A It's very possible that I have.
- 20 Q And would you agree with me that the gist of this article is
- 21 | that -- well, there's twofold. First, would you -- this is from
- 22 a journal by the name of -- where is it? Journal of Infectious
- 23 Diseases; is that right? JID?
- 24 A Can you repeat the question, sir?
- 25 Q This is from the Journal of Infectious Diseases; is that

- 1 correct?
- 2 A Yes, that's what it says.
- 3 | Q And that's a peer reviewed journal, right?
- 4 A Yes, sir.
- Q And that's reasonably relied upon by experts in the field of
- 6 epidemiology in expressing their opinions, correct?
- 7 A Yes. This is one article out of many, yes, that people rely
- 8 on.
- 9 Q But it is one that is peer reviewed and relied on, people in
- 10 your field?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And would you agree with me that the conclusion of the
- 13 \parallel article is that Ebola is shed in a wide variety of bodily fluids
- 14 | during the acute period of illness, but the risk of transmission
- 15 | from fomites in an isolation ward is low when currently
- 16 recommended infection control guidelines are followed.
- 17 Is that the essential conclusion of this article?
- 18 A I'm reading the same sentence that you are in the abstract
- 19 of the article. And, yes, they're saying that these people are
- 20 monitored. These people have infection control. And the risk
- 21 | from -- is low when you have infection control procedures in
- 22 place. They didn't say it was nonexistent, but they said it was
- 23 | low when you actually work to prevent this kind of transmission
- 24 from happening.
- 25 Q And fomites are things like furniture, clothing, and things

- 1 | like that?
- 2 A Fomites would be, you know, pieces of infectious material,
- 3 yes, on --
- 4 | Q Like furniture that someone has touched or clothing, things
- 5 like that, right?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
- 7 Q Flip with me to -- I think it's page S-145 under discussion.
- 8 Do you see where I am?
- 9 A Under discussion, yes, I found it.
- 10 \parallel Q And you see the sentence, oh, about ten lines down,
- 11 However, the isolation of EBOV, Ebola, from only one saliva
- 12 | specimen in contrast to eight that were RT-PCR positive could
- 13 | suggest the virus is rapidly inactivated by salivary enzymes or
- 14 other factors in the oral cavity that are unfavorable to virus
- 15 persistence and replication."
- 16 \blacksquare A I see that sentence. And I also see the second sentence,
- 17 | "EBOV had been previously documented in saliva by RT-PCR, but no
- 18 | attempt was made to culture virus or to explore the temporal
- 19 dynamics of viral shedding in that study."
- 20 Q Correct. But from this, I think one could easily conclude
- 21 | that Ebola is not transmitted by airborne particles like
- 22 | tuberculosis, correct?
- 23 A Sir, if you see the word "could suggest," that doesn't mean
- 24 that it's -- it's an absolute positive proof from this. "Could
- 25 | suggest" means a whole lot of things, but it's not definitive

proof.

- 2 Q But it's also -- but this is a peer reviewed journal article
- 3 suggesting that aerosol transmission is not a method of
- 4 transmitting the Ebola virus, correct?
- 5 A All it says is that they could not find virus in one out of
- 6 seven and eight, okay? So it means in their particular study,
- 7 | they could not isolate virus in the saliva.
- 8 Q Flip to the next page with me, please. Second column, first
- 9 | full paragraph. This is the conclusion. "Taken together, our
- 10 | results support the conventional assumptions and field
- 11 | observations that most Ebola transmission comes from direct
- 12 | contact with blood or bodily fluids of an infected patient
- 13 during the acute phase of the illness. The risk of casual
- 14 contacts with the skin such as shaking hands is likely to be
- 15 low."
- 16 A Well, I think that these conclusions are the same as the one
- 17 | that I cited, that most of the transmission was definitely
- 18 \parallel through the conventional assumptions and field observations,
- 19 ₩ which was true. But there was a minority of cases where, you
- 20 know, that kind of conventional assumption did not hold.
- 21 Q But --
- 22 A So this is consistent with the other study.
- 23 | Q But this is also consistent with the low risk of aerosol
- 24 transmission; is that correct?
- 25 \blacksquare A low risk is not the same as a nonexistent risk.

- 1 Q My question is low risk.
- 2 A Low risk.
- 3 Q Yes or no?
- 4 A I don't know what you mean by low, but it means that there
- 5 is some risk.
- 6 MR. HU: Your Honor, the government moves admission of
- 7 Exhibits 12 through 15. That would be her CV and the journal
- 8 articles.
- 9 THE COURT: All right. They're admitted.
- 10 BY MR. HU:
- 11 Q Let's talk about enterovirus D68. Are you aware that
- 12 | it's -- that enterovirus is prevalent in almost every state in
- 13 the United States?
- 14 ■ A I am aware that -- are you talking about D68 or --
- 15 0 D68. Enterovirus D68 and D68-like illnesses.
- 16 A Has been found in all states in this country, that's -- I
- 17 will accept that statement.
- 18 Q Especially elevated in California where you live.
- 19 A Okay.
- 20 0 Is that correct?
- 21 A I did not look that up. I did not research that. If you
- 22 state that to me as fact with -- you know, with solid basis, I
- 23 will accept that.
- 24 MR. HU: We're up to 16.
- 25 BY MR. HU:

- 1 Q I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit No. 16. This
- 2 is from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website.
- 3 Would you agree with me that the CDC website is an authoritative
- 4 website used by epidemiologists such as you?
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q Relied upon pretty frequently by epidemiologists, correct?
- 7 A It's relied on as a authoritative source, yes.
- 8 Q So from this authoritative source, you can see on Exhibit 15
- 9 California is colored with elevated four activity of enterovirus
- 10 D68-like illnesses, correct?
- 11 A I see that, sir.
- 12 Q So if someone has -- okay. Are you aware of the prevalence
- 13 | of enterovirus D68 in Mexico or Central America?
- 14 A I did not study that. I did not prepare that information
- 15 for my testimony today, sir.
- 16 Q Would it surprise you if we present testimony later today
- 17 | that enterovirus D68 is not found in Mexico?
- 18 A I would have to see proof of that, sir.
- 19 \blacksquare Q But if that were the case, would you agree with me that
- 20 there's no need to quarantine or isolate people along the border
- 21 | to prevent the spread of enterovirus D68, which is already
- 22 throughout the United States, coming in from Mexico?
- 23 A Sir, there are other people besides Mexicans coming across
- 24 the border. Just because the Mexican people themselves may not
- 25 | have D68 among them, there's so many other kinds of people

- 1 crossing the border, we don't know whether those people crossing
- 2 | the border might have been infected by others who were not
- 3 Mexicans traveling with them.
- 4 Q Are you aware of the prevalence of enterovirus D68 in
- 5 Central America, specifically the countries where many families
- 6 came in during the surge: El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras?
- 7 A Sir, I did not prepare that for my testimony today. I did
- 8 not investigate that.
- 9 Q In preparing your testimony today, did you have the
- 10 opportunity to review Chief Oaks' testimony from the last
- 11 hearing?
- 12 A No, I did not.
- 13 Q So then you're unaware of what he testified at the last
- 14 hearing with respect to screening that is done by his Border
- 15 Patrol agents?
- 16 \blacksquare A Sir, I -- all that was available to me were the reports that
- 17 I cited in my affidavit. I did not have access to anything
- 18 other than that.
- 19 \blacksquare Q So the reports that you mean are the peer review articles
- 20 that we just talked about?
- 21 A When you talk about what the Border Patrol was doing and
- 22 what the Border Patrol found, the only documents that I reviewed
- 23 for that were the ones that I cited in my first affidavit.
- Q Right. And those were the documents provided to you by
- 25 Dr. Taitz?

- A That is correct.
- 2 Q So you didn't go out and do any independent research. You
- 3 simply relied on what Dr. Taitz sent you.
- 4 A Sir, when it comes to statements by the Border Patrol,
- 5 documents provided to -- by the federal government, I do not
- 6 have access to those kind of documents regularly. I have access
- 7 | to peer reviewed literature. I have access to, you know,
- 8 | whatever I can get on the web. But actual statements from the
- 9 Border Patrol, those are not things that I have access to
- 10 normally.

- 11 Q So then are you aware of the Border Patrol protocols which
- 12 | allow them at any time to call CDC for advice about someone who
- 13 may be exhibiting some disease symptoms?
- 14 A I would hope that they would consult with the CDC if any
- 15 symptoms appear and if they needed guidance.
- 16 \parallel Q In the documents that you reviewed, did you see the 1-866
- 17 | number that Border Patrol agents can call 24/7 to get CDC
- 18 medical advice?
- 19 A I would hope that they would have some sort of access like
- 20 that. I am glad that they do.
- 21 Q But you didn't actually review that in preparing for your
- 22 testimony today, did you?
- DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Hu is
- 24 \parallel badgering the witness. She already testified, and the issue
- 25 with Mr. Oaks was that he signed the releases instead of the

And she already stated her opinion that it's preferable that the doctor signs.

At this point it's just -- she's just being badgered about something that she already testified to. She already said it's preferable that the doctor signs the release instead of a Border Patrol agent. So what's the relevance of having an 800 number? THE COURT: Okay. Overruled.

BY MR. HU:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Are you aware of a whooping cough outbreak in Southern California right now?
- I have not investigated that, sir. I did not prepare that 11 12 for my testimony today.
- 13 Right. But as an epidemiologist, don't you like to keep 14 current in various disease trends in your field?
- 15 Sir, whooping cough is -- has not been on my radar lately. 16 Ebola has been on my radar lately, so I've directed my attention
- 17 to Ebola.
 - In your experience as an epidemiologist, have you made recommendations to healthcare professionals such as dentists regarding protective gear to prevent transmission of diseases such as whooping cough?
 - Sir, I am not in a position like that. My day job involves work in the life insurance industry. And as such, what I did as a life insurance professional has been to advise my employers or clients about dealing with infectious diseases.

- I was in the underwriting research department in the 1980s when HIV came on the scene, and I became an expert for my company on HIV. I also -- when the bird flu pandemic came up, I became an expert in the bird flu pandemic and made presentations to the Society of Actuaries.
- I do not make recommendations to healthcare officials. I have not been in that position to do so.
- Q So you just mentioned that you report -- so you're aware of bird flu, H1N1, right?
- A Yes. When that issue came up, I investigated that, and I came up to speed, became an expert resource for the life insurance industry about that, yes.
- Q So you know H1N1 is a reportable illness; has to be reported to the various state health authorities.
- 15 A Yes, sir.
- Q And you're aware, of course, that TB is a similar reportable incident?
- 18 A Yes.

2

3

4

- Q So then you're also aware that upper respiratory ailments in general are not reportable.
- 21 A I need to review the list. I -- of what is reportable to 22 the CDC. I do not have that in my mind right now.
- Q You just -- you don't know off the top of your head is what you're telling me?
- 25 A I do not know off the top of my head.

- 1 Q Let's talk about tuberculosis for a moment. On the witness
- 2 stand in front of you is a -- what should be a white binder.
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 4 Q Look with me at Exhibits 4 through 9.
- 5 A These are --
- 6 Q Have you seen these documents before?
- 7 A No, sir. I am not in the position to see these documents in
- 8 the course of my normal business.
- 9 Q Okay. Working for life insurance companies, actuarial
- 10 things and all that, you don't review the various documents that
- 11 \parallel go between HHS and state health authorities on tuberculosis is
- 12 what you're telling us?
- 13 | A That's correct, sir. Not unless they become an issue of
- 14 public, you know, concern.
- 15 Q Okay. What's the difference between active TB and TB
- 16 infection?
- 17 A I did not prepare that today.
- 18 Q So you don't know?
- 19 \blacksquare A I do not know off the top of my head. I can find out in
- 20 | five minutes what the difference is.
- 21 \blacksquare Q Now, TB infection, does that mean -- if someone has a TB
- 22 infection, does that mean they can transmit the disease?
- 23 THE COURT: If you don't know, just tell him you don't
- 24 know.
- 25 | THE WITNESS: I'm trying to see if I want to give a

blanket answer or a conditioned answer. People who transmit and 1 2 who are infected with tuberculosis do transmit diseases. can transmit tuberculosis to other people. The conditions under 3 which they would be infected and not transmit diseases, I 4 have --5 You don't know? 6 7 I do not know. Okay. Just so I want to clear on the terminology used in 8 your earlier testimony. A cough is a symptom of something. 9 10 It's not a diagnosis in and of itself; is that correct? A cough, yes. A cough is a symptom, yes. 11 12 And it's a symptom --13 It's not a disease -- it's not a diagnosis like tuberculosis 14 is a diagnosis. 15 Okay. And cough would be simply a component of a 16 tuberculosis diagnosis or a whooping cough diagnosis or 17 something like that; is that correct? Yes, sir, I agree. 18 19 MR. HU: Your Honor, can I have a moment? 20 I have no further questions, Your Honor. 21 DR. TAITZ: Redirect, Your Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 22 BY DR. TAITZ: 23 2.4

25

Ms. Dolan, in regards to -- we were talking about aerosol infection in Ebola. The articles that you quoted, those

- articles were not given to you by me. Those are articles that
 you found through your own research; is that correct?
 - A That is correct.

- 4 \blacksquare Q Now, in the article, the -- in regards to transmission
- 5 where -- of several animals, pigs and primates, their finding
- 6 was that it can be trans -- I'm trying to qualify -- clarify.
- 7 The transmission was from different species, from -- for
- 8 example, from pigs to primates through aerosols because there
- 9 was no contact between the animals; is that correct?
- 10 A That's correct.
- 11 Q And they used primates because clearly they would not infect
- 12 | human beings with Ebola; is that correct?
- 13 A That's correct.
- 14 Q So typically -- excuse me. I think maybe I should stay
- 15 here. Is that better? Sorry.
- 16 So typically in research, humans are being substituted by
- 17 primates, by monkeys, by chimpanzees to see if there can be
- 18 | transmission to humans through several ways; is that correct?
- 19 A That's right. They're not doing human experimentation.
- 20 Q So if they found that Ebola can be transmitted to primates,
- 21 monkeys and chimpanzees by air through aerosols, through
- 22 droplets of sweat or saliva or anything that's in the air that
- 23 contains virus, that meant that this is the same pattern by
- which it can be transmitted to humans; is that correct?
- 25 \parallel A Yes. If there had been no transmission whatsoever, that

would be very strong evidence that there is no aerosol transmission.

Q Now, in Africa, there were 450 healthcare providers, doctors and nurses that contracted Ebola, and 232 of them have died in spite of the fact that they were wearing those hazmat suits or PPE, protective equipment, personal protective equipment.

When you have this information that 232 doctors and nurses have died even though they were wearing all this protective gear head to toe, is that an indication to you that there might have been aerosol transmission?

MR. HU: Objection, speculation.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection, but I want to know the basis of the answer.

BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

Q When there are doctors -- you can answer.

A Oh. Well, we can rule out the obvious contact between patients and healthcare provider because they were protected to the extent that they thought that they should, given what they expected. But they became infected anyway, which means that a means of transmission beyond just plain contact, you know, made them sick.

And so aerosol transmission is a very top candidate for how they became sick, even though they took all those contact precautions.

Q So it can be aerosols or it can be just objects like

- 74 doorknob, like objects of clothing, anything that would have the 1 2 droplets of sweat or --3 Yeah. Something that --MR. HU: Objection, speculation. 4 BY DR. TAITZ: 5 Well, how could they get infected? Here there are 450 6 7 doctors and nurses who are covered head to toe in this hazmat gear. How did they -- it's not one or two. 450 got infected; 8 9 half of them, 232, died. How did -- in your opinion as epidemiologist, what do you believe is the likely cause for 10
- MR. HU: Objection, speculation.

the -- for this infection and death?

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. Here's what -- that is speculation. I'm going to let Ms. Dolan answer what are the possible ways based on her training as an epidemiologist, but -- BY DR. TAITZ:

- Q In what possible aways could they get infected? That's what the judge said.
- A Well, first of all, since they were protected against direct physical contact and their protocols were very strict, that they could not have then contact -- you know, contracted the disease through physical contact, so it must have been other means beyond physical contact that got them infected. And the most likely means of them getting infected --

25 THE COURT: Hold on. That's what I said you couldn't

answer.

2.4

2 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Just state possible ways they could get infected.

A It could be aerosol. It could be contact with materials after they get out of their suits or when they're not in their suits. That there's other ways that, you know, infected substances got to them that was -- had nothing to do with their protective gear.

Q So we know that Judge Clay Jenkins here in Dallas, Texas, has ordered a quarantine; quarantine for individuals who had contact, for example, with Thomas Duncan, or ones who had contact with those nurses. Those people were ordered to be in quarantine, and hazmat team has disinfected those — their apartments.

So my question is what if individuals are not somewhere in an apartment complex in Dallas? What if they are in the station, Border Patrol station when they're illegally crossing the border? Let's say in people who are from Liberia, people who are from Sierra Leon, they're in front of Officer Oaks.

They're -- just crossed the border.

Judge Jenkins, who is a state judge, has no jurisdiction to order quarantine there on a federal property. So what would — in your opinion, what should be done there? Do you think there should be a quarantine, some type of a federally ordered

```
quarantine in this?
 1
 2
         Whatever court --
                      Objection, Your Honor. It's beyond the scope
 3
             MR. HU:
     of cross and is pure speculation.
 4
             THE COURT: I'll overrule that. But Judge Jenkins is
 5
     not a state judge, just for your -- he's a county judge.
 6
 7
             DR. TAITZ:
                          He's what?
             THE COURT:
                          He's a county judge.
 8
 9
             DR. TAITZ:
                          Oh, I apologize, Your Honor.
                          There's a difference in Texas.
10
             THE COURT:
11
             DR. TAITZ:
                          I apologize.
12
     BY DR. TAITZ:
13
         So what happens -- as an epidemiologist in your opinion,
14
     what should be done if, for example, individuals are crossing
15
     the border and they're located in a Border Patrol facility or
16
     HHS facility or DHS facility? They cross the border. They're
17
     from Liberia, from Sierra Leon, from Guinea, and they're caught
     by Mr. Oaks and they're in his facility. In your opinion, what
18
     should be done in terms of epidemiology to stop spread,
19
     potential spread of diseases?
20
         Well, first of all, the movement of these people should be
21
22
     stopped so they do not progress further into the country until
     they are identified and assessed medically. So that's the first
23
2.4
     thing that absolutely must be done.
25
         And if they are found to be from Ebola infected countries,
```

- 1 it is very prudent, as we discussed before in my prior 2 testimony, that these people be put in quarantine.
 - Q I have another question in regards to D68 since Mr. Hu has mentioned it. As an epidemiologist, until now, until the last couple months when we had this big outbreak, are you aware of any large outbreaks of D6 -- enterovirus D68 in United States of America, a large -- large outbreaks that would cover the whole country? Are you aware of any such large outbreaks before?
- 9 A Before this summer?

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

- 10 Q Before this summer.
- A From what I have read before, D68 is not very common. It's very unusual, and that this outbreak is a very surprising one.
 - Q So when you as epidemiologist receive information that children who came here illegally, thousands of children were transported all over the country, and in and around the same time suddenly there is an outbreak of a disease like enterovirus D68, as an epidemiologist who studies causation, in your opinion, could that be a causation for this outbreak?
- 19 A It could be.
- 20 MR. HU: Objection, speculation.
- 21 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 22 BY DR. TAITZ:
- Q Okay. What -- what could be the reasons and causations for this outbreak in your opinion?
- 25 A For D68?

Q Yeah.

- 2 A Well, we know that it's a respiratory illness that arised --
- 3 arose during summer, so it's not like the flu which usually
- 4 | happens in winter, and it's not -- could not be confused with
- 5 allergies which happens in the springtime. The timing of the
- 6 epidemic is coincidal -- coincident with the arrival of large
- 7 | numbers of illegal, you know, immigrant children.
- 8 Q I wanted to also redirect and clarify a couple of other
- 9 | issues that Mr. Hu touched upon, and one had to do with standard
- 10 and technique that was used in a study. Typically when there
- 11 are studies with infectious diseases like Ebola and individuals
- 12 | are asked -- questioned about their symptoms, is it common to
- 13 have some discrepancies?
- 14 A Always.
- 15 Q So if this particular study states that there were some
- 16 discrepancies, it's not something unusual, is it?
- 17 A What you are describing as discrepancies, they described as
- 18 some of the shortcomings of the study. This is not a precise
- 19 study like the laboratory study done between the monkeys and the
- 20 pigs. These -- this is out in the field talking to people,
- 21 | gathering as much information as possible. And these
- 22 investigators did have an obligation to point out if there were
- any shortcomings of the study, which they did.
- 24 Q So the fact that they stated that Ebola can be transmitted
- 25 \parallel through aerosols, by air in some cases, and the fact that there

are some discrepancies or questions about the study, it's not unusual. It's something that you would typically see in many studies. It does not question the main premise of the article; is that correct?

A Every honest investigator, as part of their report, always points out any weaknesses in the study. That's part of the peer — you know, writing for a peer reviewed journal. You don't want to just put out your facts. You want to have a well-rounded view of the study and inform the reader of the things that the reader has to keep in mind when deciding how much to rely on that study.

Q Recently there was -- actually there were reports by

Dr. David Sanders, a virologist, his studies showing that there

can be lesions in pulmonary tissue from Ebola, which is a chest

air transmission. And I'm wondering if the study that you

talked about that had to do with lesions, lesions in the lungs,

would that be consistent with the study?

A That would be consistent with that study.

Q And the last question I had in regards to tuberculosis, can you please — the question was in regards to infection of tuberculosis. What — what needs to be done and what are the actions that need to be taken if a person — and you read about — you read from the CDC Handbook earlier before the break. I just wanted to kind of reiterate that and clarify that.

If a person was exposed to tuberculosis, what is supposed to be done in this situation? Can you just put him on a bus and tell him go somewhere?

A No. No. In the USA, preventative treatment for three months is recommended for skin test negative close contacts.

The skin test should then be repeated to determine the need for additional preventative therapy.

So yes, they need to be watched and --

Q So the reason -- the basis for transporting all of those illegal alien children all over the country was this agreement, Flores v. Reno, which states that children should not be released from custody unless they are a danger for themselves -- to themselves and others.

So if a child is exposed to tuberculosis, in your opinion as an epidemiologist, should this child be kept in the custody — in the custody because somebody who is exposed to tuberculosis might be danger to himself and others?

MR. HU: Objection, speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: If anyone has been exposed to tuberculosis and, you know, health authorities know about it and do not do treatment, do not do follow-up as the CD guidelines, it is irresponsible to let, you know, that kind of infected person out into the general population without being followed up.

25 BY DR. TAITZ:

2.4

Q Thank you.

- 2 A And I have one more thing. In the article that we were
- 3 talking about with the pigs and monkeys on page 3, there is a
- 4 sentence, "The pattern of lesions and immunostainings for EBOV,"
- 5 which is Ebola virus, "antigen in lungs suggests infection of
- 6 the lungs both via respiratory epithelium and due to viremic
- 7 spread of the virus."
- 8 Q So in terms -- so in regards to Ebola, what you're saying,
- 9 that would suggest aerial transmission. If a person is coming
- 10 from Liberia, Sierra Leon, one of those countries, and he is
- 11 located in custody, federal custody, be it Border Patrol custody
- 12 \parallel or DHS custody or HHS custody, one of those, so in terms of
- 13 protecting the public and protecting this person, do you believe
- 14 that this person should be kept in the custody, or you as an
- 15 pepidemiologist believe that it would be beneficial to release
- 16 \parallel him? What is the best way to prevent the spread of disease?
- 17 A The way to best prevent spread of disease is to not let an
- 18 | infected person go wandering around in the population. You want
- 19 \parallel that person to be monitored and checked and followed up and
- 20 treated.
- 21 Q So quarantined?
- 22 A Quarantine is a good, solid foundation of public health.
- 23 Q So as epidemiologist, you feel that if a person is in
- 24 | federal custody and he comes from those countries where he was
- 25 | exposed to Ebola, quarantine would be a prudent way; quarantine

for 21 days would be a prudent way --1 2 Α Yes --3 -- to prevent disease? -- quarantine is a prudent way to prevent Ebola from 4 spreading within the population. 5 6 DR. TAITZ: Thank you, Ms. Dolan. THE COURT: Recross, Mr. Hu? 7 MR. HU: Nothing, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Ms. Dolan, let me ask you a follow-up on 10 what Dr. Taitz just asked you. I assume if you are charged with protecting the United 11 12 States and the citizens of the United States from Ebola, let's 13 say, the most -- the safest course of action, the course that 14 would be calculated to prevent or to be most effective in 15 preventing the spread of Ebola into the United States and among 16 the citizens of the United States would be a travel ban from 17 those countries that have it. 18 THE WITNESS: I would agree, sir. THE COURT: All right. Then the next most effective, if 19 20 you're not going to have a travel ban, would be the quarantine 21 suggestion that Dr. Taitz just suggested. 22 THE WITNESS: That would be a good second choice. 23 THE COURT: All right. But in terms of if you were 2.4 trying to go from most effective to least effective, the travel 25 ban would be first, I assume.

THE WITNESS: It would be preferable, sir.

THE COURT: Because they have, for lack of a better way of saying it just in the laymen's terms, there's Ebola in Africa. There's not Ebola here. If you isolate it there, no one in the United States is going to get it.

THE WITNESS: That would be the point, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Then if you're going to allow people to come into the United States who have been exposed to Ebola in Africa, the next -- the least risky or the next least risky manner of dealing with it would be the quarantine to isolate those people here in the United States that have actually been exposed to Ebola.

THE WITNESS: I agree.

THE COURT: All right. And then the least effective or the most riskiest to the citizens of the United States is to leave things the way they are and not have a travel ban or a quarantine.

THE WITNESS: I agree.

THE COURT: All right. Are those -- I mean, are those basically the three options on the table? Are there others?

THE WITNESS: I would need to think and study that, sir. Investigate that further.

THE COURT: All right. By "on the table," I did not necessarily mean that I'm agreeing with Dr. Taitz that I have the power to do that. I'm just asking you about what are the

options, okay?

2.4

All right. You may step down. Thank you, ma'am.

Dr. Taitz, I did not mean to correct you, but both for your benefit and to the effect that Mr. Kisor may or may not know this -- I can't remember where Mr. Kisor went to law school -- but the judge you referred to, he is a judge, but he's a county judge. And in Texas, a county judge is not a judicial officer. They're the executive officer of a county, so they're like the mayor of a city. They would be the county counterpart. They would be the mayor of the county. They would be the head executive officer of a county. And that's what I think, unless I'm mistaken, Mr. Jenkins is in Dallas.

Neither here nor there, but -- but he didn't take judicial action. He took some kind of executive action.

All right. Any more witnesses, Dr. Taitz, from your side of the "V"?

DR. TAITZ: No, Your Honor, but I might just redirect on the witnesses.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Kisor, you or Mr. Hu wish to present any evidence?

MR. HU: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, in -- we have listed as an exhibit and I assume the Court will take notice of the prior testimony from the TRO hearing, so I don't want to have to put those witnesses back on and rehash it all.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. I will take cognizance

of that.

2.4

MR. HU: Then, Your Honor, we would recall Chief Oaks for very limited additional supplemental testimony.

THE COURT: All right.

(Witness sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated, sir.

KEVIN OAKS,

the witness, having been first duly cautioned and sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HU:

Q Chief Oaks, since you last testified approximately 60 days ago here in this court, can you update the Court on whether the surge of families and aliens from Mexico and Central America continues, or what have been the trends in the last 60 days?

A Well, since the end of summer, the end of fiscal year is how we calculate all of our apprehensions, and there were approximately 260,000 apprehensions in FY14. And so far this year from the beginning of the fiscal year, which was October 1st to present, we're about just under 11,000 apprehensions, which is about 20 percent under what we were this time last year. And the custody of juveniles and family units is pretty much ongoing, and so those two populations are almost minimal compared to what they were previously.

- 1 Q Just year to year, how far has it dropped, year-to-year comparison?
 - A It's about 20 percent from last year.
- Q Okay. And because of this drop in the volume, are most people who are apprehended remained in custody, or are we having the scenario like we talked about this past summer where adults and certain family units were simply being released on their own
- 8 recognizance with notices to appear into the community?
- 9 A In terms of family units and unaccompanied juveniles, the
 10 majority of them are all remanded into custody of either HHS-ORR
 11 or ICE ERO.
- Q And in your -- and folks that are remanded into custody get detailed health screening; is that right?
- 14 A Yes, sir, they do.

3

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Can you give us just a capsule of the kind of health screening they get?
 - A In terms of the juveniles, we opened up a new facility very near the McAllen station that was opened specifically for unaccompanied juveniles. And we let a contract, a government contract for medical professionals to do 100 percent screening of all the children before they even get in HHS and ORR's custody.
 - And similarly, all the other bodies that are apprehended within that -- in the western corridor are all medically screened as well, particularly the family units and any of those

other high risk people that are determined, you know, based on what we find in the field, if there's field injuries or they're showing any symptoms or sign of any sort of -- you know, all the things that we catch. Most recently the other day we had a guy that was bit by a rattlesnake. And so, you know, we'll pull them from the field, provide them to EMS or directed towards the nearest medical facility.

Q Now, let's talk about the medical screening that's done by your agents when folks are apprehended in the field. Are your agents trained to identify airborne and blood borne pathogens?

A Yes. For years, you know, we have an annual recertification process that we do, you know, and it goes back to H1N1 and HIV and all the other sort of similar issues that we've addressed over the years when they crop up. So the agents are trained in the academy. They're given post academy instruction. There's an annual -- we do a lot of virtual learning center off the web to recertify and train on many of those issues.

THE COURT: Are agents trained to identify people with Ebola?

THE WITNESS: Well, so most recently from guidance from CDC and DHS headquarters and working with the state and local officials, we have been specifically identifying the symptoms and what to look for if we encounter people from those four particular countries and if they show any of those signs. So yes, sir.

BY MR. HU:

2.4

Q Now you have jurisdiction --

THE COURT: Let me just -- excuse me, Mr. Hu.

Once you've encountered those people and you've identified them, I assume you then have at least instructions or some kind of protocol you would then follow.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: And the --

THE COURT: Once you've identified them -- let me ask you this. Before those protocols are instituted, whatever Border Patrol officer that's made the arrest and whatever -- and I say arrest. It may not be an arrest. It may just be, you know, taking into some kind of custody. I mean, they are then thereby unprotected and exposed to whatever they're -- the risk of getting Ebola, whether it's airborne or physical contact or whatever.

THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, that holds true with all the populations.

THE COURT: So there's -- that -- except with Ebola, the chances of somebody dying are above 50 percent; whereas with some other disease, they're not. So the man on the street, so to speak, the officer, the Border Patrol officer that's out in the field, he's -- he's basically got no defense to that, does he?

THE WITNESS: Well, they wear -- all the agents are provided protective gear. They don't necessarily wear it 24/7. You know, considering the volume of traffic that -- you know, that we encounter, if they do encounter people with those symptoms, you know, that's a situation where they would have to be isolated and directed in the field per the instructions that we're providing to our agents based on policy from DHS and CDC about, you know, identifying those people and isolating them in the field and then following up with the managerial decisions whether to transport them to many of the facilities in the Valley that are set up to address that. And/or there is, you know, a level of risk that agents do assume.

2.4

THE COURT: Okay. And then even if it's not Ebola, let's say it's TB, for instance, I mean, there are instances where that goes undiagnosed throughout the whole process, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of any cases, but -
THE COURT: Let me -- we have had people with active TB

in this courtroom, which I assume since they were arrested and

gone through various -- you know, according to what you're

telling me, medical screenings and been in jail for a while

before they ever get to us, I mean, we've had active TB people,

immigrants in this courtroom. In this courtroom. You know, I

mean, exposed Cristi and our interpreter and Barbara exposed to

it. I'm, of course, hiding behind these screens up here so I'm

okay. But, I mean, how does someone like that get in this courtroom with active TB?

2.4

THE WITNESS: If they're remanded for a criminal situation, then the marshals would have to medically accept them into their custody for them to be in here, sir.

THE COURT: But they get arrested by you guys.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And if we're aware of any of those situations, we will -- the marshals will not accept them from us if they're not medically screened. So if we have any indication that there are any communicable diseases, we'll address that, you know, on a case-by-case basis.

THE COURT: All right. And then the -- you said the majority of unaccompanied juveniles or family units, which I assume is juveniles with one parent or the other.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Get referred to HHS or ORR. What percentage don't?

THE WITNESS: I have -- it's -- you know, I don't have those facts and figures, but we rarely release anybody, any family units as we were previously during the summer. So the majority of all the family units are being detained because they opened up additional bed space throughout the nation. And then ICE ERO is opening up a new facility here quickly near Karnes which will house about 3600 family units and other populations.

THE COURT: All right. And if they don't get referred

```
to one of those, what's happened -- even if you don't know the
 1
 2
     percentage, what happens to those people? Do they get released
     with a order to come back?
 3
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Generally speaking, if they're
 4
     released on their own recognizance, there's a date in front of
 5
     the immigration judge to be determined.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Okay. And then what's considered a
     juvenile?
 8
 9
             THE WITNESS: A juvenile is 17 and under, sir.
             THE COURT: Okay. So if -- so if you have 14,
10
11
     15-year-olds unaccompanied, they get treated like an eight or
12
     nine-year-old?
13
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. All juveniles are treated
14
     generally the same except for the ones that are of tender years
15
     which, you know, require a little bit different treatment.
16
     They're not fingerprinted.
17
             THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Hu.
18
     BY MR. HU:
         What's a kilo unit?
19
20
        A kilo unit?
     Α
21
        Yeah.
        A kilo unit is -- it's a very large truck with a -- with
22
     a -- sort of a screened in detention module inserted in the bed
23
24
     of the pickup. I think it's like a three-quarter ton Ford or
25
     Chevy truck.
```

- Q In your procedures, is that what's used if you have an alien that you suspect has a contagious disease? Do you put them in a
- A Yes. And the reason for that is the cell, the way it was
 designed, has a separate air system, and it's isolated from the
 interior of the cab so you get some semblance of, you know, for

lack of a better word, containment of that person.

- Q So the agents driving the vehicle -- I assume you don't put other people in there in the back with them. But the agents driving the vehicle are thus protected from whatever contagious disease this person might have?
- 12 A Yes, sir.

kilo unit?

3

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q As part of the training you provide to your agents, are they given a 1-800 number at CDC to call if they have any medical questions?
 - A They do. And the supervisors are all trained, and they generally have discussions about these issues at all the musters. And there's protocols that are set up and trained in place. Currently like I was discussing, you know, this the new protocols are addressing the guidance that we've gotten from DHS and CDC on field identification of, you know, blood borne pathogens and some of these other issues that we're dealing with.
- Q Now, as I understand it, the sector that you supervise is
 312 miles of operational border and a couple of airports?

Yes, sir. It's 312 miles of Rio Grande from Falcon Lake to 1 2 Brazos y Santiago. And then from there up to Sabine Pass. that's about 317 miles of coastline. Roughly the area of 3 operation is the size of South Carolina. 4 5 And in all of this area and operations in fiscal year '14, how many aliens did you detain from the African nations of 6 7 Guinea, Sierra Leon, and Liberia? In FY14? 8 Α 9 Yes, sir. 10 There were 16 -- there was -- I think we had 16 11 apprehensions from the continent of Africa, and from those four 12 who -- I think we did have one. 13 One person? 14 Yes, sir. 15 And when you say the continent of Africa, that would include 16 people from South Africa, Eritrea, Egypt, the whole continent? 17 Α Yes, sir. MR. HU: That's all I have, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Cross-examination, Dr. Taitz? 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY DR. TAITZ: 21 Good day, Chief Oaks. 22 23 Α Good afternoon. How are you? 24 Good afternoon. Okay. How are you? 0 25 I have a question. How long do those individuals stay in

your custody?

- 2 A Which individuals? Which ones?
- 3 Q Individuals apprehended by you. How long do they stay in
- 4 your custody?
- 5 A It depends upon the population or demographic you're talking
- 6 about. If it's -- and you're aware of the Reno versus, you
- 7 know --
- 8 Q Flores?
- 9 A -- Flores, you know, with the juveniles and the family units
- 10 and then Mexican Nationals and then OTMs all have, you know,
- 11 sort of different requirements based on, you know, what the
- 12 situation is and then if they're going to be charged, you know,
- 13 | with a criminal violation or sometimes we turn them over to
- 14 state, so if --
- 15 Q Approximately. One day, three days, ten days, a month?
- 16 A Generally speaking, we try to get them out, all populations,
- 17 within 24 hours.
- 18 Q Okay. So we were talking -- I have requested some
- documents, and I did not get them yet before this hearing. So I
- 20 would like to know in this whole region, for example, you said
- 21 in the last months, there were 22,000 people. We know there is
- 22 tuberculosis. How many tuberculosis tests were done, if any?
- 23 Did you do any TB tests?
- 24 A On all the people?
- 25 Q On any, yeah.

- 1 A From the beginning, from October 1st to the present?
- 2 Q Yeah.
- \blacksquare A 11,000 apprehensions?
- 4 Q Yeah.
- 5 A No, I didn't do any.
- 6 Q Zero?

- 7 A No, ma'am.
 - Q So we know that there is tuberculosis in Mexico and Central America, so there were zero TB tests done, and those individuals were transported further on.
 - In your opinion -- and you stated that you got some training. Do you feel that it would be beneficial to do TB tests first before you transport those people, release them, transport them, and so forth to see if they're not carrying deadly tuberculosis?
 - A Well, so TB testing is done in the custody of the people that we turn them over to. So, for example, the way I understand it, ICE ERO, which would encompass anybody that's not released in the population, there's mandatory chest x-ray for all people coming into their custody.
 - Q But, for example, at the last hearing, you testified that you -- let's ask another question.
 - You already testified last time in July that you're aware of individuals with scabies --
- 25 A Yes, sir.

Q -- being transported. So when you transport those people, for example, when you charter a plane and people with scabies get on this plane, the scabies can get on the upholstery of the plane. You transport them to California, so Border Patrol agents like you in California can get infected.

So in your opinion as somebody who is protecting our borders, do you feel that it would be beneficial to do tests right away, for example, a TB test? And if somebody has it, quarantine him right away versus transporting him to California and New York or anywhere? Do you feel it would be beneficial? Well, if we're talking about the population where they were -- some of the juvenile and family units --Anybody. Anybody who you get into Border Patrol facilities. You said there is a new Border Patrol facility. You got them. You apprehended them. Do you feel it will benefit you, your staff and the population at large to do TB test right away and see if they have tuberculosis, to quarantine them right away versus transporting them all over the country? Well, I think our screening process does cover that because anybody that shows any kind of symptoms of something that -- you know, and then also, you know, they're -- there's self

Q But --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A And so this goes back to how I answered last time. We're

background and information on what they have.

declaration, because a lot of the aliens will provide a lot of

- talking about a population of 260,000 apprehensions in FY14. 1 2 And if you're talking about doing a TB test for 260,000 people in Border Patrol custody, I don't know how we would even do 3 4 that. Well, maybe by court order from Judge Hanen. 5 But in terms of protecting the public, an order like this 6 7 would protect the public better than transporting them all over the country and then school officials or doctors somewhere in 8 California or New York or anywhere else suddenly seeing symptoms 9 10 and sending them for tests when they already exposed God knows 11 how many people. Do you feel that would be beneficial? 12 MR. HU: Objection, argumentative. 13 THE COURT: Overruled. 14 THE WITNESS: You know, so within the purview of what I 15 do and the quidelines and policy and law, we do the best job 16 that we can --17 BY DR. TAITZ: 18 No, I understand. -- with the resources that we have. We medically screen all 19 populations of everybody we have. And so for me to speculate 20 21 which would be better for the population is, you know, outside 22 my purview. But, Chief Oaks, you -- okay. You said -- you said that, 23
- for example, in October there were 22,000 people that you apprehended and you did zero, zero TB tests. So what kind of

- 1 | medical screening is it? Do you feel it's sufficient?
- 2 A It was 11,000 from October 1st to present.
- 3 Q Okay, 11. Okay. There were 11,000 people coming from
- 4 | areas, Mexico, Central America where there is a lot of
- 5 tuberculosis which can be a deadly disease. And you did zero,
- 6 zero tuberculosis tests?
- 7 A No, I did not do any tests.
- 8 Q Yeah. Okay. So you feel that maybe this is not sufficient?
- 9 Maybe there is a need to do -- to do this testing in order to
- 10 protect the public?
- 11 A Well, how I feel is --
- 12 Q What is your opinion as somebody who is entrusted in
- 13 protecting us?
- 14 A Well, I'm responding on behalf of DHS and CBP and the Border
- 15 Patrol. And what I'm telling you is the policies and protocols
- 16 | and everything we have in place is what we're supposed to do.
- 17 Q What you have.
- 18 Another question, there were reports that actually this
- 19 | year, this whole year, not just October, there were over 500
- 20 people who crossed the U.S. border from Mexico coming from
- 21 | Sierra Leon, Liberia and Guinea. And I'm surprised that you
- 22 stated that you saw only one because reports are that there were
- 23 ver 500, and it is reported actually. I believe I already
- 24 submitted it to this court.
- So when those individuals are crossing the border, have you

ever done any Ebola tests? Have you ever sent anybody for an Ebola test?

A Well, I'm not sure what border you're talking about. But my testimony was that within the Rio Grande Valley sector area of operation in FY14, we made 1600 -- or 16 arrests from folks that originated from the continent of Africa, one of which was from the red zone where you're talking about, those four countries. And from October 1st to present, we've arrested three people from the continent of Africa and not one from any one of those four countries.

So the 500 apprehensions, I'm not sure if you're -- you're talking about between the ports of entry or at the ports of entry because I don't have that information.

- Q Chief, when you said that they came from Africa, do they show you the passports? How do you know where are they from?
- A How do we know where they're from?
- 17 Q Yeah.

- A Well, so part of the process and arrest procedure is to establish alienage. And so we arrest people from 142 different countries, and the majority of the people that we arrest are self declared that they're from, you know, those particular countries.
- Q Okay. So basically you rely on what they say. They self declare, right? Whatever they tell, that's what you believe, right? That's what you rely upon. That's right?

- 1 A Right.
- 2 | Q Well, we have a situation where there's a gentleman, Thomas
- 3 Duncan, who said that he had no contact with Ebola, and then we
- 4 | found out that he lied and infected two nurses in Dallas. Could
- 5 | it be that people who are coming from Africa are telling you
- 6 that they're from Nigeria while they're from Liberia because
- 7 | they don't want to be deported?
- 8 A I have no idea. We didn't arrest him, so I wouldn't have
- 9 any information about what he did or didn't do.
- 10 Q So the 16 people came from Africa. Did you do any Ebola
- 11 tests?
- 12 A I don't even know what an Ebola test is, ma'am.
- 13 Q Okay. But you said that you have this 800 number. And, for
- 14 | example, you had a person from red zone. So did you call that
- 15 number or not?
- 16 A From -- that I don't know.
- 17 Q No. But you said that you apprehended somebody from red
- 18 zone. Did you -- when you apprehended this person -- and Mr. Hu
- 19 | talked about 800 number -- did you call this 800 number?
- 20 A I did not call the number.
- 21 Q Okay. So the fact that you had the number, it doesn't help
- 22 us much, right?
- 23 | A Well, I didn't arrest him, so -- the question was did I call
- 24 | the number, and I said no, I didn't.
- 25 | Q Okay.

- 1 A But whomever on my staff of the 3200 agents arrested him,
- 2 I'm not -- I don't know if he actually called that number or
- 3 not, so I can't testify about it.
- 4 Q What happened to this person?
- 5 \parallel A He was remanded into custody as far as I know, ICE ERO.
- Q So we don't know if this person has any disease or exposed
- 7 | to disease. We don't know that.
- 8 A Post arrest? What happens to them post arrest after they're
- 9 out of Border Patrol custody, I have no idea what happens to
- 10 them.
- 11 THE COURT: For the benefit of the record, Chief, ICE
- 12 | ERO is?
- 13 THE WITNESS: Oh, it's -- I'm sorry. My apologies.
- 14 | Immigration and Customs Service, Enforcement and Removal
- 15 Operations. That body within DHS is responsible for detention
- 16 \parallel and removal of all non-U.S. citizens within the United States.
- 17 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 18 Q Now, last time you were here when a representative from ICE
- 19 \blacksquare ERO stated they basically give the person just money for a bus
- 20 | ticket, and they go further to different places in the U.S. You
- 21 were present here when he testified, right?
- 22 A Yes, ma'am.
- 23 | Q So we don't get actually protection against infectious
- 24 diseases, because you transfer to ICE ERO, they give him money
- 25 \parallel for the bus ticket, and he gets on the bus and goes to

California, New York or wherever, right?

A Well, everybody that goes into ICE ERO custody, ICE ERO has a complete medical staff, and they screen every single person that comes into their custody. I mean, medical doctors on staff. At the PIDC, which is just down the road where the ICE ERO facility is, they have a complete medical stuff. And so anybody that goes from Border Patrol custody into ICE ERO, ICE ERO has to agree to accept them, meaning that they're in a condition in which they can be accepted into custody; and if they're not, then it's Border Patrol's responsibility.

And typically if it's a medical issue, they would have been screened by one of our medical staff or EMTs or paramedics, or they would have come from the doctor or a hospital before we can remand them into ICE ERO custody, and then ICE will do an additional screening including TB tests. And the same thing holds true when we prosecute people here criminally here in this federal court. They have to be accepted by the U.S. Marshals, medically cleared first before they will take them.

Q Well, but medically cleared. You're stating basically if you don't see something obvious. But if the person is in incubation period and he is carrying a disease, you don't do any tests, any blood tests, right? Just if you personally see that he's bleeding or he is coughing, then you might do something about it. But if he is carrying a deadly disease like Ebola coming from Liberia, you don't -- you haven't done any blood

- 1 tests to check if he has this disease. You just transfer him
 2 further on; is that correct?
- 3 A Border Patrol doesn't have the authority to draw blood.
 - Q Okay. Thank you. No further questions.
- 5 A Yes, ma'am.

4

8

- 6 MR. HU: Your Honor, may I have a quick redirect?
- 7 THE COURT: Uh-huh.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

- 9 BY MR. HU:
- 10 Q Chief Oaks, there should be a white binder on the witness
- 11 | stand there, and if you could flip with me to Government
- 12 Exhibit No. 11, please.
- 13 Let me represent to you this is an official document from
- 14 the Centers for Disease Control about TB elimination. On the
- 15 second column, you see where it says, "Tests for TB infection"?
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- 17 Q So you see -- it says, "The test is read within 48 to 72
- 18 hours by a trained healthcare worker." Do you see that?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q So my question is after someone is apprehended here in the
- 21 | Rio Grande Valley, are they typically still in Border Patrol
- custody 48 to 72 hours after apprehension?
- 23 A Generally not.
- 25 be gone by the time the results came back.

- A That is correct. And we wouldn't.
- 2 | Q It just wouldn't work. Is that right?
- 3 A Yes, sir.

- 4 Q Second thing is Dr. Taitz was talking to you about ICE ERO
- 5 and releasing folks at the bus station. Is it your
- 6 understanding that that's still occurring today; or now that the
- 7 surge is over, has that practice stopped?
- 8 A That practice -- I can't say absolutely that every single
- 9 person has been remanded into custody, but I can say with
- 10 certainty that the majority of everybody that we're apprehending
- 11 | and arresting is going into the custody of ICE ERO, the United
- 12 | States Marshal Service, Health and Human Services, ORR, or being
- 13 voluntarily returned back to Mexico and/or turned over to
- 14 another federal, state, or county person having jurisdiction if
- 15 there was a crime committed.
- 16 \parallel Q And finally, the national from Sierra Leon that we had
- 17 talked about earlier, that person could have been apprehended
- 18 | much earlier in the fiscal year of '14, well before all this
- 19 Ebola thing came up; is that right?
- 20 A It's feasible, sir.
- 21 | Q Yeah, because we just don't have that data.
- 22 A I don't have that information.
- MR. HU: Nothing further, Your Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Chief, let me ask you. In -- I'm looking at
- 25 \parallel the immigration and nationality statute, and it says that an

alien is inadmissible if he's failed to present documentation of having received vaccination against vaccine preventable diseases which include at least polio, tetanus, diphtheria, toxins, pertussis, influenza B, hepatitis B and other vaccinations.

When -- let's say we have an 18-year-old from El Salvador and he presents himself, and so he's not a family, and he's a person of majority. He's not considered a minor. What happens to him when he gets arrested? Let's assume for a minute he doesn't have any criminal history here in the United States.

THE WITNESS: If he's from El Salvador and he's, you know, considered an adult in this country at 18-years-old, he would be processed and then turned over to ICE ERO, and then they would dispose of him. He would get an immigration hearing, have a right to have an attorney, et cetera.

THE COURT: He would be given a slip of paper that says return in six months for your hearing?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. He would be remanded into custody. Because if he's from El Salvador, it's not a contiguous country; i.e., Canada or Mexico, so he has to be remanded into custody since he's -- because he --

THE COURT: So all these people that came, all these individuals that came from El Salvador got put into custody?

THE WITNESS: Generally the majority of them all did, yes, sir.

THE COURT: I'm talking about this last year.

```
1
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 2
                         They all got put into custody?
             THE WITNESS: Most of them did.
 3
             THE COURT: We heard your own people testify that they
 4
     got put on buses and taken out and released.
 5
             THE WITNESS: Some of the family units were released,
 6
 7
     yes, sir.
             THE COURT: But individuals -- all 17 and above
 8
     individuals from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, they were all
 9
10
     taken in custody and kept in custody?
             THE WITNESS: Not -- I can't say absolutely every single
11
     one of them. No, sir, I couldn't say that.
12
13
             THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about the family
     units that you told me have then -- were then released.
14
15
     evidence did they show of having all these vaccinations?
16
             THE WITNESS: None that I'm aware of, sir.
17
             THE COURT: Okay. Then why is -- why are you not
18
     following the law?
19
             THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what statute, if you're
20
     referring to T12F. I think that's in reference to presenting --
21
     presenting themselves at the port of entry.
22
             THE COURT: Okay. But -- so not only did they come in
23
     the country illegally, they didn't present themselves at the
2.4
     port of entry, but they don't have any of the documentation that
25
     the law requires, so they're really violating two different
```

provisions, and we're just turning them loose? So we're harder on people that come legally than we are on people that come illegally is what you're telling me, right?

THE WITNESS: I don't even know how to respond to that, sir.

THE COURT: Well, if I come and present myself at the port of entry and say, "Let me in. I want to come in. I want to be in the United States. I want to be a legal permanent resident. You know, I want to do it the right way." And we have hundreds of thousands of people that have done that, and many of them live in this community who have done it the right way and have waited years to be here. They have to -- one of the things they have to do is present evidence of all these vaccinations I just read to you, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But if I come illegally and violate the rules about entering the country and I don't have any evidence of any of these vaccinations, in fact, I could have every one of these diseases, not only am I not required to do this, but I get a ticket that basically says come back and see us in six months, and I'm turned loose on an unsuspecting American public, right?

THE WITNESS: In terms of what you're talking about in the Rio Grande Valley, I can testify to the fact that we did release some family units into the population, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And now is it true -- and I don't

```
1
     know this. I'm asking you -- that recently that the government
 2
     has taken the position that these children, if they're going to
     public schools, do not need any of these vaccinations?
 3
             THE WITNESS: I don't have that information, sir.
 4
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. All right. Thank you,
 5
     Chief.
 6
 7
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 8
             MR. HU: Nothing further, Your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: You can step down.
10
             THE WITNESS: Thank you.
             THE COURT: Who's next, Mr. Hu?
11
12
             MR. HU: United States calls Dr. Miguel Escobedo.
13
             THE COURT: Dr. Escobedo, if you will assume the
14
     position, please, sir.
15
          (Witness sworn.)
16
             THE COURT: Be seated, sir.
17
                            DR. MIGUEL ESCOBEDO,
     the witness, having been first duly cautioned and sworn to tell
18
     the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified
19
     as follows:
20
21
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
22
     BY MR. HU:
23
         Please state your name.
2.4
        I am Dr. Miguel Escobedo.
     Α
25
        How are you employed, sir?
```

- 1 A I am the quarantine medical officer for the Centers for
- 2 Disease Control and Prevention Field Office out of El Paso,
- 3 Texas.
- 4 Q How many quarantine medical officers are there at the field
- 5 office in El Paso, Texas?
- 6 A Just one. Myself.
- 7 | Q What's your jurisdiction? In other words, what territory do
- 8 | you cover as being the medical officer in that office?
- 9 A We cover all international ports of entry, land, air, and
- 10 seaports of entry in South Texas, West Texas, and Southern New
- 11 Mexico.
- 12 \parallel Q So you -- essentially from the mouth of the Rio Grande all
- 13 | the way up to what, around Las Cruces?
- 14 A Yes, sir, Dona Ana County, Santa Teresa port of entry. But
- 15 we work in concert with our sister quarantine station in San
- 16 Diego so that we share jurisdictional duties.
- 17 Q Turn with me to Government Exhibit No. 2 in that white
- 18 binder in front of you, please.
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q Okay. What is that document?
- 21 A This is my curriculum vitae.
- 22 Q Okay. Just very briefly, go over your education and
- 23 | experience leading up to today as a quarantine medical officer.
- 24 | A Yes, sir. I'm a graduate of New Mexico State University. I
- 25 \parallel attended Stanford Medical School where I got my medical degree

and a concurrent master's in public health from the University of California at Berkeley. Subsequent to that, I completed a family medicine residency and worked in community health centers and -- for about a year. And then after that I became the Communicable Disease Director, TB Control Officer for the City/County of El Paso. I did that for ten years. And then after that I became the Regional Public Health Medical Director, Health Authority for Regions 9/10 for the Texas Department of Health. I did that for ten years. And then I came into CDC as Quarantine Medical Officer almost ten years ago. So I have a 30-year collective experience of border public health. So you're responsible for helping develop screening protocols for people entering at both land and airports? That is correct. The CDC considers me a subject matter expert in those areas, and I do help with developing some of those procedures. What was your role in the unaccompanied minor surge this past summer? What role did you play in that? Our role was basically to work together with our experts at CDC to provide guidance to our federal agencies, to our communities, to our local health departments and also to enhance our illness response guidance for field agents for Customs and Border Protection officers at the ports of entry so that we can provide guidance regarding some of the children that were coming in with possible diseases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And what has been your role recently in CDC's response to
- 2 the Ebola outbreak?
- 3 A I was the -- one of three Quarantine Medical Officers that
- 4 was deployed to JFK Airport in New York where I helped establish
- 5 the entry screening from travelers that were coming in from West
- 6 Africa.
- 7 | Q Okay. In addition to these roles, I understand you have a
- 8 research interest specialty in tuberculosis?
- 9 A Yes. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q And as that, you are -- not only are you a medical expert,
- 11 you are subject matter expert within CDC on tuberculosis?
- 12 A That is correct. In fact, I served on the advisory council
- 13 for TB elimination, which is a national body that advises the
- 14 Secretary of Health on tuberculosis control and recommendations.
- MR. HU: So, Your Honor, Dr. Escobedo is being offered
- 16 as an expert -- oh, wait a minute.
- 17 BY MR. HU:
- 18 Q Let me ask you one more qualification question. You have a
- 19 master's degree in epidemiology also?
- 20 A That's correct.
- 21 \square Q Tell us what sort of epidemiologic work you do with the CDC.
- 22 A We basically conduct studies to document disease trends. We
- 23 develop surveillance systems along with Mexico to study some of
- 24 the disease trends as they affect travelers that are coming into
- 25 | the United States. And based on this, we provide

```
1
     recommendations to both the U.S. and Mexico on disease
 2
     prevention.
             MR. HU: Your Honor, the government is offering
 3
     Dr. Escobedo not only as a medical witness, but also as a
 4
     witness in the field of epidemiology.
 5
 6
             DR. TAITZ:
                         I object, Your Honor, with all due respect.
 7
     The doctor does not have any degree in epidemiology, so I would
     object to that. His only degree is in medicine, not
 8
     epidemiology.
 9
10
             THE COURT: What's your master's in?
11
             THE WITNESS: Master's is in master's of public health,
12
     University of California at Berkeley.
13
             THE COURT: We'll take it on a question by question.
14
     he gets -- if you think he gets outside his expertise,
15
     Dr. Taitz, object. But right now I'm recognizing him as at
16
     least an expert in public health and as an M.D.
17
     BY MR. HU:
         Before we turn to the -- some of the issues brought up by
18
19
     Ms. Dolan, let me just ask you some questions about Dr. Taitz's
20
     personal complaints. Now, you've reviewed the amended
21
     complaint, right?
22
         Yes, sir, I did, uh-huh.
23
         Okay. As a medical doctor based on what you -- what's been
24
     presented to you, can you figure out what the source of her
25
     cough is?
```

- A I'm afraid I can't. I don't think I have enough information.
 - Q Okay. Do you see any causal link between her cough and treatment of illegal aliens?

DR. TAITZ: Objection, Your Honor. Dr. Escobedo has no degree in epidemiology. He cannot testify to this question.

THE COURT: Overruled.

2.4

THE WITNESS: Well, I see a report that reveals that she has cough at the same time that she was treating undocumented children. And as a medical person who's treated many respiratory illnesses, over a thousand TB cases, I can tell you that I can derive no conclusion as to what her diagnosis might be other than she has the symptom of cough.

THE COURT: And, doctor --

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- to the -- the standpoint is, I mean as you sit here today, she could have caught her cough and upper respiratory problem from one of the children she was treating or not. You just can't tell.

THE WITNESS: Well, it -- it's likely that -- I'm sure

Dr. Taitz treats other children. We know there's an outbreak of

whooping cough. We know that, you know, children, when they

come back to school, they come in with all sorts of bugs. So

it's conceivable she could have caught a flu or a cold or

something from other children. So the fact that it occurred at

```
the same time is not necessarily cause and effect.
 1
 2
         And I think the other problem, Your Honor, if I --
                         What I'm asking you is from the information
 3
             THE COURT:
     you have, you can't tell one way or the other?
 4
             THE WITNESS: I can't. I honestly can't tell.
 5
 6
             THE COURT: That's what I was asking.
 7
             THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Hu.
 8
     BY MR. HU:
 9
10
         And, Dr. Escobedo, do you also treat patients in addition to
     serving in your role as a quarantine medical officer?
11
         Yes, sir. I volunteer at a homeless clinic where I treat
12
13
     patients.
14
         And it's my understanding you used to be a family medicine
15
     physician for a while as well?
16
         That is correct.
17
         Okay. Why do -- why do people get the C-pap machines?
     are they used for? What's the medical indication for a C-pap
18
     machine?
19
20
         Well, they're usually indicated in someone that is having
     inadequate oxygen due to obstruction problems or airway disease,
21
     usually in the setting of lifestyle diseases. For example,
22
     someone that smokes a lot and develops chronic obstructive
23
2.4
     pulmonary disease, emphysema, asthma, it can be used to help
25
     those individuals to supplement their oxygen levels.
```

Q Sleep apnea?

1

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 2 A Sleep apnea could be an obstructive disease, yes.
- Q All right. Now I want to turn to your role as a CDC

 physician in assessing crossing -- helping assess the health of

 people crossing our southwest border. Tell us about what role

you play, the partnership between CDC and Border Patrol in terms

of establishing guidelines for folks crossing the border.

surveillance detection system.

- A Right. We basically establish the guidance, the training
 manuals that Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border Protection
 officers use. And we also established a consultation service to
 reinforce what I consider to be a very robust illness
 - And by that, what I mean is every officer is given our CDC card, which is called a RING card: Recognizing illness, isolate and notify. And based on that 24/7 consultation, I can get on my Blackberry 24/7 hours a day and consult with either the agent or the nurse practitioner and provide specific guidance on what to do if they encounter an illness that could be of public health significance, including infectious diseases.
 - Q So like during the surge this past summer, did you get any calls?
- 22 A Oh, yes, I was very busy. I got a lot of calls, yes, sir.
- Q Well, just give us sort of a general snapshot of the type of calls you would get from Border Patrol agents.
- 25 A Well, I would get calls about people with rash. And then

the question would become: I've got some children. They have scattered rash. You know, this could be possibly chicken pox. It could be varicella, or it could be other diseases.

So following the training, the officer would immediately isolate the child. And then what I would do is I would question the mother, if she was available, or the child to try and get a complete medical history. I would have the agent send us pictures so that we can try to determine whether this was chicken pox or whether it was insect, mosquito bites, which are also very common.

And then based on that assessment, we made a decision whether the child needs to be transported to an emergency room to be isolated and fully diagnosed and treated.

- Q So did you get any calls for TB?
- 15 A We get a lot of calls from TB, yes, sir.
- 16 Q Anyone positive this summer?
 - A We didn't get any positives from children, although we had a mother of a child that was hospitalized in El Paso that had a very, very early, early case of TB, but this was after she had been appropriately evaluated and referred to the hospital.
- 21 Q Now, when you get these calls, you're bilingual in Spanish 22 and English, right?
- 23 A Yes, sir, I am.

- 24 Q So you'll typically speak to the family in Spanish?
- \parallel A I can speak to the family in Spanish. And if I might add,

- 1 Judge, with my experience with TB, I feel very, very comfortable
- asking a few critical questions that will help us determine if
- 3 someone is likely to be infectious.
- 4 Q So there's like four critical questions, right?
- 5 | A There's four critical questions: Chronic cough, weight
- 6 loss, night sweats, chest pain. A few others, but with those
- 7 critical questions, we can pretty much tell with great
- 8 certainitude if someone is likely to be infectious and therefore
- 9 needs isolation and referral.
- 10 Q Now, what's a communicable disease?
- 11 A A communicable disease is an infectious disease that can be
- 12 transmitted between individuals and therefore could be a problem
- in the community.
- 14 Q Okay. So scabies, for example, is a communicable disease?
- 15 A Well, it's communicable because, yes, it can be transmitted
- 16 between individuals.
- 17 | Q I'm showing you -- oh, before I forget.
- 18 MR. HU: Your Honor, I move admission of Government
- 19 Exhibit No. 2, his CV.
- THE COURT: It's admitted.
- 21 BY MR. HU:
- 22 Q Okay. I'm showing you what's been marked as Government
- 23 | Exhibit 3, if you could turn to that. Do you recognize this
- 24 document?
- 25 A Yes, I do.

- Q What is it?
- 2 A This is basically a letter that was sent to Health
- 3 Department, TB controllers, advising them about the screening
- 4 guidance that was in place for screening the children that were
- 5 coming in.

- 6 Q Hold on. I think you're at the wrong exhibit. I'm looking
- 7 at 3. That's 4 you're looking at. We're talking about scabies.
- 8 A Oh, yes, sir. Yes, sir. Okay. I have it.
- 9 Q You recognize this document?
- 10 A Yes, I do.
- 11 | Q Did you help draft it?
- 12 A Yes. We provided guidance to the Office of Health Affairs.
- 13 | Q So scabies is a communicable disease that we have here in
- 14 the United States?
- 15 A It's basically all over the world, you know, and not just in
- 16 the U.S. All over the world.
- 17 Q So do you think it's appropriate to quarantine or isolate
- 18 | aliens crossing the southwest border because they may have
- 19 scabies?
- 20 A Well, scabies is not on our list of quarantinable diseases,
- 21 | and it's not reportable to the Health Department. I do think
- 22 that it's important to identify if someone has rash and get it
- 23 | treated. You know, treatment is very effective, and clean their
- 24 clothing. And by doing that, you render the person's situation
- 25 not a infectious threat.

```
119
                      I move admission of Government Exhibit No. 3.
 1
             MR. HU:
 2
             THE COURT:
                          It's admitted.
     BY MR. HU:
 3
         Okay. Let's talk about tuberculosis. Would you flip with
 4
     me, please, to Government Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11? Do you
 5
     recognize this series of documents?
 6
 7
         Yes, sir, I do.
         What are they?
 8
 9
         This is basically quidance documents that are designed to
     tell providers, TB controllers, and people who are working with
10
11
     unaccompanied minors on the guidelines that exist to screen
12
     children that are coming in into ORR custody on ways to screen
13
     them and prevent tuberculosis to other children and healthcare
14
     workers.
15
         So if I get this correct, Government Exhibit 4 is an
     overview of the control efforts, correct?
16
17
     Α
         That is correct.
         Government Exhibit 5 is a letter that's sent out to, I
18
     assume, state officials?
19
20
         Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
     Α
21
         Okay. Government Exhibit 6 is the protocol that ORR is
     supposed to follow?
22
23
     Α
         Uh-huh, yes.
```

25 A Right, that summarizes, uh-huh.

Government Exhibit 7 is a flowchart?

2.4

- 1 Q Right. Government Exhibit 8 is the State of Texas
- 2 instructions for reporting tuberculosis. And the second page is
- 3 the ten questions that you ask people?
- 4 A Right, exactly.
- 5 Q Government Exhibit 9 is the guidelines for preventing
- 6 transmission of tuberculosis in healthcare settings, you know,
- 7 | things like dentist's office, things like that?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q And Government Exhibit 11 is a -- just an overview of the TB
- 10 program?
- 11 A Right, diagnosis and tuberculosis.
- 12 Q Can you just summarize for the Court, rather than go through
- 13 | all these documents in detail, the protocol that's used by ORR
- 14 for screening children for tuberculosis after they're taken into
- 15 ORR custody?
- 16 A Yes, sir. It's a three-level screening process. The first
- 17 process is that all children are carefully screened by asking
- 18 | the critical questions, you know, about the cough, the weight
- 19 loss.
- 20 The second level of screening is doing testing for TB
- 21 infection, not active disease, TB infection in children that are
- 22 two to 14 years of age.
- 23 \blacksquare And the last level of screening is doing an x-ray on
- 24 children that are 14 to 17 years of age and doing a complete
- 25 \parallel chest x-ray and workup on anyone, any of the children that said

- 1 they had any symptoms.
- 2 Q Are similar protocols done for adults in custody and family
- 3 units in custody?
- 4 A The only difference is that in adults, you do an automatic
- 5 chest x-ray without even doing symptoms or even doing a skin
- 6 test.
- 7 Q Where do they get the x-ray?
- 8 A The x-ray can be done on site, or usually they send them to
- 9 a facility that is nearby.
- 10 Q Is there like an x-ray machine at the Port Isabel Detention
- 11 Center?
- 12 A There is a very sophisticated machine at the Port Isabel
- 13 Center, yes.
- 14 Q So they can do it out at Port Isabel, for example?
- 15 A Yes, sir.
- 16 THE COURT: And everybody gets that?
- 17 THE WITNESS: Every adult gets it within 48 hours, yes,
- 18 sir. Every --
- 19 THE COURT: Every adult that comes in the United States
- 20 illegally?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Well, Your Honor, if they're retained in
- 22 custody, yes, they get screened with an x-ray.
- 23 THE COURT: But if they're released, they don't get it.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Well, if -- by the time they get to the
- 25 | ICE detention facility, they do get the screening before they're

released. In other words, they don't come in and then they're released promptly. They are generally x-rayed because it's a very effective way to screen for active disease.

THE COURT: And every adult that comes, comes and gets a chest x-ray, who reads that? Is there a radiologist out there who reads that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. This is all digital. They basically do the x-ray, send it off to a radiologist and get a report back within a day.

THE COURT: Really.

BY MR. HU:

Q Now, to just rephrase the Court's question a little. If someone is caught and then released with the notice to appear, they never get into ORR, ICE or other custody, Marshal Service, then they wouldn't get the chest x-ray, as I understand it?

A They wouldn't get a chest x-ray, but it -- they would get a screening questionnaire, a symptoms questionnaire which, if done properly, can identify potentially infectious persons. And once you do that, if someone gives you a positive on any of those questions, you can then take them to a hospital emergency room and then do the x-ray. So if they're symptomatic, you can get an xray, even if they don't end up in ICE custody.

Q Now, during the surge, things were a little bit busier. Was everyone getting screened during the surge as well this past summer, or did we have a few that just didn't --

```
Well, I think, you know, quite realistically, the surge was
 1
     Α
 2
     taxing on everybody. But my understanding is that everybody was
     being screened or attempts were being made either before or
 3
     right after they were transported to another processing center.
 4
         So what if some -- an alien has the symptoms of TB before
 5
     they get into ICE or ORR custody where there's an x-ray or other
 6
 7
     screening taken? You know, they look like they're emaciated,
     they're coughing a lot, maybe they're complaining of night
 8
 9
     sweats. What's the protocol then?
         The protocol in following the RING card is that the agent or
10
     the processing officer immediately isolates the patient in a
11
     separate room, then calls CDC, calls us via the 24/7 EOC number.
12
     We then respond. We do an assessment and interview the
13
14
     detainee, if needed, and then make a decision if the person
15
     needs to be sent immediately to the hospital for -- for further
     diagnostic testing and isolation. Or as it sometimes happens,
16
17
     you know, we feel comfortable that this is not about TB and they
     can be released.
18
19
             MR. HU: The government moves admission in evidence of
     Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11, all the tuberculosis
20
     documents.
21
             DR. TAITZ: No objection.
22
                         They're admitted.
23
             THE COURT:
24
     BY MR. HU:
25
         Doctor, during Ms. Dolan's testimony, she spoke about this
```

- 1 enterovirus D68. Do you recall that? It is prevalent
- 2 | throughout the U.S. Is that your understanding?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 5 A To be honest with you, I don't have the most recent
- 6 information on Central America. But for Mexico I personally
- 7 checked with the state epidemiologist of Chihuahua. I looked at
- 8 their web link for reportable diseases, (Speaking Spanish), and
- 9 I know they've had an alert since August the 27th, but there
- 10 | have been no cases reported in Mexico or diagnosed.
- 11 | Q What's the name of the gentleman you spoke with in Mexico?
- 12 A His name is Eduardo Suarez, Dr. Eduardo Suarez. He's the
- 13 epidemiologist.
- 14 Q And so he tells me there's -- he has told you, and as an
- 15 epidemiologist, you typically rely on this sort of data, that
- 16 there is no D68 reported in Mexico?
- 17 A That is correct.
- 18 Q What about Ebola? Is there Ebola in Mexico?
- 19 A No, sir, there is no Ebola in Mexico.
- 20 Q Why is that?
- 21 A Well, because the -- the outbreak of the epidemic originated
- 22 | in West Africa, and travel is -- and again, this is when I
- 23 | talked to the epidemiologist and Dr. Elisa Aguilar of the
- 24 U.S.-Mexican Border Health Commission, travel from West Africa
- 25 to Mexico is very minimal.

- Q And why is that?
- 2 A Because for starters, Mexico, it is my understanding,
- 3 doesn't have consulates or embassies in these countries. There
- 4 are no trade relations, so traditionally there has been no
- 5 | migration into Mexico. It's really to the U.S., not Mexico.
- 6 Q So there's been this argument at least posed in this case
- 7 | that people should be screened for Ebola crossing the land
- 8 border here in South Texas because people come from Liberia,
- 9 Sierra Leon or Guinea by air to Mexico, make their way to the
- 10 border and then cross. As an epidemiologist, is that a likely
- 11 event?

- DR. TAITZ: Objection, argumentative.
- 13 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 14 THE WITNESS: No. I can tell you that, you know, I've
- been quarantine officer for over ten years. I've never gotten
- 16 calls about people from West Africa. And I know that Mexico has
- 17 very strict travel visa requirements. We do get calls about
- 18 | migrants from West Africa that have come in, not directly to
- 19 Mexico, but they usually travel through Brazil or Ecuador and
- 20 then make their way by land to Mexico, through Mexico, and then
- 21 show up requesting asylum or refugee status usually after a
- 22 month of travel.
- 23 BY MR. HU:
- Q So those people couldn't bring Ebola into the United States?
- 25 \blacksquare A No, because they're not from Ebola affected countries. And

- by the time they get to the port of entry, the 21-day incubation period has elapsed.
 - THE COURT: So it's much more likely for Americans to be exposed to Ebola for someone to fly in directly to the United States?
- THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. That is very well stated.
- 8 BY MR. HU:

4

- 9 Q And along those lines, it's my understanding that people
 10 flying directly to the United States are being funneled to
 11 certain ports of entry?
- 12 A That is correct. We have five airports of entry.
- 13 Q What are the five ports?
- 14 A It is JFK, where I served. It is Dulles in Washington, D.C.
- 15 It is Atlanta, Georgia. It's Newark Liberty. And Chicago,
- 16 Chicago, Illinois.
- Q And you personally have handled the inbound traveler screening for people from Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leon at
- 19 JFK?
- 20 A Yes. As a quarantine medical officer, I was present during
- 21 the assessment, evaluation, and follow-up recommendations.
- 22 Q When's the last time you screened a passenger at JFK?
- 23 A week ago as we speak.
- Q One week ago today?
- 25 A Yes, sir.

Q Can you brief the Court just a capsule about the kind of procedures you followed to screen inbound travelers at JFK from those three African countries?

A Right. There's a multi-level tier system. First of all, operators of the airlines, the pilot and flight attendants, are advised that they should notify CDC if they detect an illness amongst passengers that are — that carry passengers that are originated in this country.

Secondly, once the passengers deplane, CBP, Customs and Border Protection carefully screens them. And they have TSA information, and they know ahead of time, you know, when someone originated travel in that country. Then they're taken to a separate isolated area where a CBP officer goes through a very careful questionnaire that assesses their risk for exposure either by taking care of a relative, participating in a funeral rite, and also if they have any symptoms such as fever, vomiting, diarrhea, and persistent headaches, and then a temperature is taken.

If any of those variables are positive, then they are sent to tertiary screening, and that's where CDC, where we come in.

We then take the person into a second unit. I don my protective equipment, and together with another public health officer, we go through an extensive questionnaire of the patient to ascertain the nature of the exposure and whether or not the person had personal protective equipment. And then we take the

temperature twice.

And again, if any of those risk assessment variables are positive, we either release the individual with instructions to self monitor, with instructions to call their health department, and we also notify the health department that this person came in.

And then the person gets what we call a CDC care kit, which is a list of information about Ebola, encouraging them to go to their local health department, call their local health department or medical provider and provide information about their travel and their symptoms. And then they also get a thermometer so that they can self monitor their temperature.

If someone has a high risk, we have the authority to issue a conditional release, which means that they would have to be monitored very, very closely. And potentially if the risk is high and they have symptoms, we could even issue an isolation order.

- Q Where would you isolate them?
- 19 | A I'm sorry?
 - Q Where would they go if they're under an isolation order?
- 21 A If there's a need to -- well, if someone has symptoms and/or
- 22 risk factors, we immediately activate EMS. We notify the New
- 23 York City Department of Health. We notify the receiving
- 24 hospitals, and there's two in New York City, and we also notify
- \parallel the ambulance so that they -- operators so that they can take

precautions when transporting the patients.

2.4

And most of the time, in fact, all of the time that I was there, there was no need to issue an isolation order because most people would go voluntarily. It's only if individuals refuse to comply with our health recommendations.

THE COURT: How many did you have that you had to refer?

THE WITNESS: I had -- Your Honor, I had three

individuals. There were two NIH scientists, and there was a

nurse that had taken care of Ebola patients. All of them

fortunately were afebrile, asymptomatic. They wore full

protective equipment.

In the case of the NIH scientists, all of their work was done in an enclosed bio safety hood, so there was no contact between the samples and themselves. And so all of those individuals were released with instructions.

I notified the receiving health department. They visited them the following day to make sure that they were self monitoring and avoiding travel and mingling with the community.

BY MR. HU:

Q In your experience at JFK, were most of the people that you looked at, not you, but just generally the CDC personnel there, U.S. citizens or resident aliens returning, or were they immigrants from the three countries in question?

A It was a mix of all of the above. There were healthcare

workers returning. There were tourists, usually business

owners, operators of mines. And then very interestingly there were also U.S. citizens that had family over there or legal permanent residents that were coming back. Or in one case, 3 there was a child, a nine-year-old little girl that was a U.S. 4 citizen that had spent time with her -- with her parents, and 5 she was coming back to be with her grandparents in the U.S. 6 7 Why is CDC not establishing a full quarantine for everyone coming in from those three countries? Well, in essence -- and again, we're revamping the system. 10 But in essence, we are, because we are providing the care kits. 11 We are notifying the receiving health departments. 12 receiving health departments are taking action by visiting and monitoring and making sure that all of these individuals limit 13 14 their travel, that they take their temperatures daily. 15 So in a sense, that fits very nicely the definition of 16 quarantine. It may not be mandated quarantine, but it is 17 quarantine. THE COURT: Dr. Escobedo, in the meantime, though, 18 aren't they walking around and talking to people, being with 19 their families, going to the store, going to the mall? Aren't 20 they doing all those things? 21 22

1

2

8

9

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, that is correct. But again, keep in mind that these individuals are not symptomatic. are not infectious. And I would say that 99.9 percent of them, assuming that they told the truth on their entry survey, had no

```
exposure to Ebola.
 1
 2
                         That's one, assuming they told the truth.
             THE COURT:
             THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?
 3
             THE COURT: You're assuming they told you the truth.
 4
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I fully appreciate the quantum
 5
 6
     there, yes. We're basing it on an honor system. That is
 7
     correct, Your Honor.
     BY MR. HU:
 8
 9
         Now --
10
                         Mr. Hu, are you at a stopping point?
11
                      Sure. This would be a good place.
12
             THE COURT: All right. Let's take ten minutes.
13
             THE WITNESS: And, Your Honor, if I may. They're also
14
     screened before they depart the countries, okay? So it's exit
15
     and entry screening.
16
             THE COURT: Who screens them in all the African
17
     countries?
             THE WITNESS: In those countries we have deployed CDC
18
     experts to train and to implement protocols so that their own
19
20
     healthcare workers are doing similar surveys to what we're doing
21
     and then doing the temperature check before they board the
22
     flight.
23
             THE COURT: Okay. Let's take ten minutes.
2.4
          (Recess taken from 2:54 to 3:12.)
25
             THE COURT: Be seated. Doctor, if you will.
```

```
Sorry that took so long, but I'm trying to iron out this
 1
 2
     month's trial schedule.
         Go ahead, Mr. Hu.
 3
     BY MR. HU:
 4
         Doctor, when we last left off, we were talking about --
 5
     about the JFK Airport. Why is there no CDC imposed travel ban
 6
 7
     for people coming from Liberia, Sierra Leon and Guinea?
         Well, when you talk about a travel ban, it is something that
 8
     is really restrictive in the sense that it would be difficult.
 9
     And as we said before, there are U.S. citizens, legal permanent
10
11
     residents, healthcare workers who are fighting the Ebola
12
     epidemic. Those would need to come in.
13
         And I believe that with the quarantine restrictions that we
14
     have in place and that have been improved, it should be
15
     sufficient to address the problem of detection and follow-up.
             THE COURT: Would a travel ban be safer?
16
17
             THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?
                         If you had a travel ban, there wouldn't be
18
             THE COURT:
19
     anybody you would have to worry about.
20
             THE WITNESS: That is correct, Your Honor. If we had a
     travel ban, it would be like a bubble. So you would be right in
21
22
     that sense.
     BY MR. HU:
23
24
         But I guess in terms -- speaking of travel bans, you've
     seen -- I guess there's really essentially a ban on travel for
25
```

- 1 | all these unaccompanied minors coming up from Honduras and
- 2 Guatemala and El Salvador and -- but they show up here on the
- 3 southwest border anyway, right?
- 4 A Well, that is correct, yes, sir.
- 5 Q Now, Ebola is characterized as a highly pathogenic disease;
- 6 is that right?
- 7 A Yes, it is high path --
- 8 \parallel Q And define that for us. What does highly pathogenic mean?
- 9 A It means that it has the potential to cause extensive damage
- 10 | to the human body, to spread and cause death, yeah. High degree
- 11 of mortality.
- 12 Q But there is an effective test for the Ebola virus; is that
- 13 right?
- 14 A That is correct, yes.
- 15 Q Tell us briefly, how does that test work? Is it based on an
- 16 | antigen, or is it actually looking for the virus itself?
- 17 A You can have both. You can have rapid test antibody, PCR
- 18 \parallel detection method, and you can actually look for viral particles.
- 19 Q What's the turn time on a test?
- 20 A It can be in as little as 24 hours under emergency
- 21 situations.
- 22 Q Does it have to go to a specialized lab, or can it be done
- 23 in a number of different lab settings?
- 24 | A No, it's a specialized lab, usually in large state health
- 25 \parallel department health labs or at the CDC reference lab.

- Q So like if you have to take samples at JFK Airport, where do
- 2 you send them?
- 3 A Well, those samples are actually collected once the person
- 4 gets to the hospital. They are collected and sent through the
- 5 New York City laboratory, and from there repackaged and sent to
- 6 CDC overnight with all the precautions that are needed.
- 7 Q Okay. Now, what about if you need to take a sample here in
- 8 the Rio Grande Valley? Where does the sample go?
- 9 A Well, theoretically it could go to the Department of State
- 10 | Health Services Lab in Austin. But I think the more important
- 11 question is why would you want to take a sample and under what
- 12 circumstances?
- 13 Q Just assume with me hypothetically there was a need to take
- 14 a sample here in the Valley for whatever reason.
- 15 A Okay. Well, in that situation, if we have a person that,
- 16 you know, we're concerned that might have Ebola, they would, of
- 17 course, be isolated, take extreme precautions to protect our
- 18 | agents, to protect the healthcare workers, notify the hospital.
- 19 And then the hospital would, in turn, notify probably CDC and
- 20 Texas Department of State Health Services to make arrangements
- 21 | for collection and submittal of the laboratory sample.
- Q Now, during Dr. Dolan's testimony, Mrs. Dolan's testimony,
- 23 \parallel we talked about double false negative. Do you recall that
- 24 testimony?
- 25 A Yes, I do.

- Q Do you see false negatives in these tests for Ebola?
- 2 A Well, I don't know specifically what she was talking about,
- 3 the false negatives, but I do know that early on during the
- 4 incubation period, the tests may initially be negative. I
- 5 wouldn't characterize it as a false negative. It's a true
- 6 negative in the sense that the body is building up the
- 7 | appropriate antibodies so that eventually it will become
- 8 positive.

- 9 But once it's positive and the person's body has been
- 10 ravaged by the virus, then it stays positive. In other words,
- 11 | it doesn't go negative, positive and then negative again.
- 12 Q Okay. So in other words, a test may be initially negative
- 13 because the antibodies simply aren't present in the bloodstream?
- 14 A They're not detectable.
- 15 Q But then you wouldn't -- it wouldn't go back and forth.
- 16 | Once it's positive, it's always going to be positive?
- 17 A Right, assuming that the laboratory technique is
- 18 appropriate, yeah.
- 19 Q Does everyone get a fever at some point?
- 20 A Ebola is such a virulent pathogenic disease, that yes, just
- 21 about everybody who is breathing and alive and has a reasonable
- 22 immune system, and that's 99.9 percent of us, will get a fever,
- 23 | high fever.
- 24 Q How high is high?
- 25 A I'm talking about 103 plus.

THE COURT: Why not do a blood test on everybody that travels in from one of the countries that's affected?

THE WITNESS: Well, Your Honor, that could be possible. I suppose it would be a logistical issue and, you know, some policy considerations, but you could. In public health we're trained to think about risk; and if someone has never been in any of these countries, has no risk factors --

THE COURT: No, I'm talking about people that have been in there.

THE WITNESS: Oh, people that have been in there?

THE COURT: I mean, wouldn't that -- wouldn't that be

the safest thing for everybody? You just take a little bit of

blood, test it; 24 hours later we would know. Everybody would be happy.

THE WITNESS: Well, it would, Your Honor, but then we get into the issue that we're talking about that it's going to take a little bit of time to build up the antibodies. So you could get a blood test, and maybe the antibodies haven't gotten to that critical period of detection.

But, yeah, you're right in that sense, that, you know, you would capture most people.

22 BY MR. HU:

- Q What's incubation period?
- A 21 days maximum; two to 21 days. Eight to ten days is -- is the usual period between exposure and manifestation of disease.

- 1 Q So I guess the Court's question was if everyone gets a blood
- 2 test and someone was exposed the day before and you're taking a
- 3 | blood sample at day one and a half, the test would come out
- 4 negative because there simply wouldn't be enough antibodies in
- 5 the blood stream.
- 6 A That's correct. In fact, we had travelers that, you know,
- 7 may have been exposed like the day before and they come in.
- 8 They would be initially negative.
- 9 Q I want to return for a moment to ask a couple questions I
- 10 kind of forgot to ask you about TB. First off, is TB testing
- 11 required for kids to go to school in Texas?
- 12 A No, it is not.
- 13 | Q Okay.
- 14 A It is required in some situations if kids come from certain
- 15 | high risk countries. And Mexico, by the way, is not considered
- 16 \parallel a high risk country by the World Health Organization.
- 17 Q Is Moldavia a high risk country?
- 18 A Yes, it is.
- 19 Q Okay. Now, what is the difference between active TB and TB
- 20 infection? I know I had asked Dr. Dolan -- Ms. Dolan that, and
- 21 I didn't get an answer, so can you tell us what that --
- 22 A TB infection basically means that you have been exposed to
- 23 | TB and you have the TB germs inside of your body but they're
- 24 dormant. They're not doing anything. You don't have symptoms.
- 25 You're not infectious. You cannot give the TB to anyone, so

- 1 it's not infectious. It's just a dormant infection.
- 2 Q So if I am TB -- if I have a TB infection, I'm here in this
- 3 courtroom, there's no -- since I don't have any of the
- 4 manifested symptoms, you're saying that I can't give it to
- 5 anybody else?
- 6 A Absolutely not. You cannot give it to anyone. But you do
- 7 have the risk of getting progression at any point throughout
- 8 your life. It could be two weeks, a year, ten years, 20 years.
- 9 Most likely as you get older or if your system is -- immune
- 10 system diminishes.
- 11 | Q So if I have a TB infection, you still want to treat it
- 12 generally?
- 13 A Generally you do because by treating it, you kill the
- 14 dormant germs and you prevent them from potentially waking up
- and giving you the active form of the disease which is the
- 16 \parallel disease we worry about for communication purposes.
- 17 Q Active -- okay. And that's what the difference is. So
- 18 active TB is active, and --
- 19 A Active TB, you're coughing, you've got lung lesions, you've
- 20 got cavities, you're losing weight. That is the type of TB that
- 21 \parallel is infectious, not the dormant latent TB or the TB infection.
- 22 Q So that's the kind of TB you really have to watch out for
- 23 when you're apprehending folks, aliens, for example, here in the
- 24 Rio Grande Valley. You're looking for active TB. It's good to
- 25 know about TB infection, but active TB is critical?

1 Right, right. In fact, some authorities would recommend Α 2 against doing the TB test because there you're testing for infection which is not infectious. Rather you should be testing 3 for active disease. That's where you're going to prevent the TB 4 5 cases. So how do you test for active disease? 6 7 The most rapid screening method would be a simple chest x-ray, taking an x-ray and see if there are findings that are 8 consistent with active TB, and then followed up by a careful 9 exam. And ultimately the ultimate proof would be to obtain 10 11 respiratory secretions and look for the germ, for the bug that 12 causes TB. 13 What's the quickest and easiest way, though? 14 Chest x-ray. 15 MR. HU: That's all the questions I have, Your Honor. 16 DR. TAITZ: Redirect, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: That's our microphone, or was. 18 DR. TAITZ: Sorry. 19 THE COURT: Why don't you use the other -- go that way. 20 There you go. That looked like a good idea when they installed it, but 21 everybody does that. They immediately set their file on top of 22 it. 23

CROSS-EXAMINATION

2.4

25

Go ahead, doctor.

- 1 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 2 Q Good day, Dr. Escobedo.
- 3 A Good day.
- 4 Q First of all, I wanted to ask you about the process of
- 5 quarantine. You are the quarantine officer.
- 6 A Yes, ma'am.
- 7 Q Let's say you decide to quarantine somebody. Can you please
- 8 walk us through the process? How do you do it?
- 9 A Okay. Well, the first thing is we evaluate the case
- 10 | situation, and we have to make sure that the individual, first
- of all, has a condition that is quarantinable under the list of
- 12 executive quarantinable diseases.
- 13 And if that's the case, we try to gather information as to
- 14 | why the -- and we say quarantine, but really a more proper term
- 15 \parallel might be isolation, wide isolation, legal isolation would be
- 16 needed, okay?
- 17 Q No, I understood all that. You testified to that. My
- 18 question is who -- is there an order? Let's say you decide this
- 19 person needs to be quarantined. Is there paper that is being
- 20 signed? How does that work?
- 21 A My apologies. Yes, ma'am. What we would do is our division
- 22 director, our leadership in Atlanta, he is the -- the authority
- 23 | to quarantine someone is delegated to him. It is really the
- 24 Health and Human Services secretary, but it is delegated to our
- 25 \parallel division director. He would review the legal document and then

- 1 would sign off on it.
- 2 Q But you said that actually it's under the name of Secretary
- 3 of Health and Human Services; is that correct?
- 4 A The authority. The authority to isolate.
- $5 \parallel Q$ Does it state a specific law or statute under which this
- 6 person is being quarantined?
- 7 A You mean the states as in U.S. states or --
- 8 | Q Well, I mean, yeah, in United States, of course.
- 9 A Well, there are two levels. You have a federal quarantine
- 10 isolation order.
- 11 Q Yes. That's what I'm talking about, federal --
- 12 A You have the state's --
- 13 Q Of course.
- 14 A The states can issue their own orders.
- 15 Q No, no. I meant if under the authority of Sylvia Burwell,
- 16 who is a defendant here in this case, Secretary of Health and
- 17 Human Services, the order, the quarantine order comes from
- 19 Services. It is signed on her behalf by a director of a
- 20 division. But do they state a specific law or statute under
- 21 \parallel which -- under which law they -- this quarantine is done?
- 22 A Yes, ma'am. All that is spelled out because the individual
- 23 has to -- you know, when --
- 24 Q What law is that?
- 25 ■ A I can't -- you know, I'm not a lawyer, and I can't cite to

- 1 you the exact FFCR, but it's in there. I'm not a lawyer.
- 2 Q Can it be provided for the Court, for the judge to see this
- 3 order, the quarantine order or a form at least?
- 4 A It -- well, again, the legal statute is there, you know, for
- 5 your review. You can get it on the Internet. The actual forms
- 6 are -- you know, there's no form per se. I mean, we -- they are
- 7 developed on a case-by-case basis as needed.
- 8 Q Did you -- did you ever quarantine anybody?
- 9 A I haven't quarantined anyone. We have issued orders of
- 10 isolation on a couple of our cases, yes.
- 11 Q So the way it was done, you contacted the chair of the
- 12 division, and he signed the order and where the person went from
- 13 there?
- 14 A Depending on the case situation. We had one situation in
- 15 which we actually picked up the gentleman at a port of entry and
- 16 | then we took him to a local hospital. We have agreements with
- 17 local hospitals.
- 18 Q And what was wrong with this person, TB?
- 19 A He had TB. And if I may, ma'am, in the other situation, it
- 20 was someone that was already in a hospital facility, and then we
- 21 went to the hospital and issued the order.
- 22 Q And what happens if a person refuses to be isolated or
- 23 | quarantined? What do you do then?
- 24 A Well, part of the provision for issuing an isolation order
- 25 | is to ensure law enforcement, you know. You have law

- enforcement officer surveillance to ensure that the order is carried out.
- Q Have you ever had situations where a person was quarantined
 by your order or somebody in your department, and the person
 challenged this order in court?
 - A No, ma'am. We haven't had situations.
 - Q It never happened. But you do -- now, you stated that a person would be quarantined if he is a danger, right, to himself and others, right? In that situation under the authority of Secretary of Health and Human Services, the person is quarantined, right?
- 12 A They can be, yes, ma'am.

- Q So, for example, if this court finds that people coming from Ebola hot zone represent a danger to themselves and others, then they could issue a writ of mandamus or an order to Sylvia Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Services, to issue those isolation or quarantine orders that are typically issued, right? A No, ma'am.
- MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. I think we're getting into legal conclusions here.
- THE COURT: If he knows the answer, I'm going to let him answer, and he's answered.
- 23 THE WITNESS: No, ma'am, because a person, by the mere
 24 fact of coming from that country, you know, doesn't necessarily
 25 have a condition that meets the quarantinable list. They could

have never been in contact. So there's no -- we wouldn't be 1 2 able to. BY DR. TAITZ: 3 But if the person, let's say, wasn't -- we have -- I mean, 4 you stated that you do proper exam of individuals coming through 5 our borders. You were talking about JFK. But isn't it true, 6 7 doctor, that you have missed Dr. Craig Spencer who passed through your enhanced screening and passed it through flying 8 colors, had no fever; and then few days later, he was traveling 9 10 on four different subways, he went bowling, he went to 11 restaurants, and then he was hospitalized with Ebola. So how 12 did that happen? Can you explain this? 13 Α Well, he was --14 I'm going to object to the form of the question 15 just because it contains a lot of facts not in evidence and --16 DR. TAITZ: Let me rephrase it. 17 BY DR. TAITZ: Are you aware of Dr. Craig Spencer, a doctor in New York, 18 who is now hospitalized with Ebola? 19 20 Yes, ma'am. Α So how did you miss him? 21 22 No, we did not miss him. He came through our entry screening. He was assessed, identified, and advised on self 23 24 monitoring. The New York Health Department was advised. He had 25 been under orders from Medicines and Frontiers, the Doctors

145 Without Borders, to self monitor, and he was essentially picked 1 2 up and detected in that manner. So he doesn't fit my definition 3 of being missed. THE COURT: Well, if he's not missed, though, doctor, 4 didn't he walk around exposing thousands of people to Ebola 5 while y'all were tracking him then? 6 7 THE WITNESS: No, that's correct. The question is if we missed him. We hadn't missed him. But you're right. I mean, 8 9 he did travel in the subway and went bowling. You're right about that, absolutely. 10 BY DR. TAITZ: 11 12 So wouldn't you agree, doctor, that it would be --13 THE COURT: That's why you always bring your own bowling 14 shoes. 15 BY DR. TAITZ: 16 Wouldn't you agree, doctor, that it would be prudent and 17 beneficial to have one order of isolation and -- for anybody who 18 is coming from those countries so they don't expose thousands of 19 people? Well, that could be an effective strategy. But as I said, I 20 feel that the system that we have in place -- this is after this 21 22 doctor came through -- where we actually notify the states.

They send healthcare workers on a daily basis. They monitor.

They track, can be effective. And if at any point they refuse

or even before we end up there, if we say you're going to be

23

24

closely monitored and they refuse to do that, then the state themselves could mandate their isolation order.

Q Well, let me ask you in regards to Thomas Duncan. Don't you feel that this case was missed? He went through airport screening and then later on developed Ebola and infected two nurses right here in Dallas, Texas.

So do you feel that if this person would have been given, right as he gets off the plane, one of those isolation orders that you -- you stated that your chief of the department gives on behalf of Sylvia Burwell, we could have prevented infection of those two nurses?

- A Well, as I said earlier, when he came in, he was -- he didn't have any fever. He denied any symptoms, so he didn't meet our criteria for being able to issue an isolation order.
- Q So wouldn't you agree with me, doctor, that knowing that we had this case with Dr. Craig Spencer and this case with Thomas Duncan, maybe there is a need to change the requirements and indeed put people give each person who arrives, give such orders that you have. Or maybe you stated that you don't have with you the form, but you have specific forms, order from Department of Health and Human Services for person to be in isolation for three weeks. Do you feel that it would help to protect the public?
- A It would be a strategy, one of several strategies that I think would help.

And if I may, with the information, ma'am, on Mr. Duncan's case, I think if he had come in through our screening at JFK, he would have gotten the care package so that he would have been educated, monitored. And when he presented to the hospital, he would have presented the information that I think would have triggered earlier detection at the hospital level. Well, I understand he went through New Jersey, which is one of those five airports where they have enhanced screening, and it did not help. So you agree with me that giving everyone an order of isolation, orders that you routinely give that you have in Department of Health and Human Services would help to protect the public better than today? Well, it would help, but I think those are policy considerations that exceed my level of authority and expertise. Doctor, I mean, you give people orders to be quarantined. And I wanted to check -- and that's something that the judge just touched upon. There are specific laws, for example 8 U.S.C. 1182 and INA 212F that state that people who have infectious diseases should not be admitted. Have you ever used any of those laws to deport people or not allow them in? My understanding, ma'am, is that those laws are designed to ensure that legal permanent residents that are -- and refugees that are being screened for admission into the U.S. don't have any of the communicable diseases; that they're not necessarily, my understanding, designed to screen undocumented migrants in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- border settings. It's a very different situation.
- 2 Q Well, the judge just read from those orders. And those
- 3 orders state that if a person has those diseases of public
- 4 | importance like Ebola, tuberculosis, they shouldn't be even
- 5 allowed in. So what -- and you are the -- you are the
- 6 quarantine officer.
- 7 A Uh-huh.

- 8 Q And you never used this law to prevent people with
- 9 communicable diseases from entering; is that correct?
- 10 A No, that is not correct, ma'am. If I may, with all due
- 11 \parallel respect, the way it works is that we oversee panel physicians,
- 12 | for example, in Mexico who screen for all these conditions who
- 13 | make sure that people have vaccines. And if those people don't
- 14 meet the criteria -- and by the way, one of the criteria is that
- 15 they must be free of TB, you're absolutely right on that one,
- 16 | that they're not allowed to come in; that they are prevented.
- 17 Q Well, yeah, I understand. Those people who are coming
- 18 legally.
- 19 A Right.
- 20 \blacksquare Q But what about -- you testified just now that there was a
- 21 | surge of people coming illegally, and you were called, and
- 22 sometimes cases where they had tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is a
- 23 disease of public significance; communicable disease of public
- 24 \parallel significance. They were supposed to be not even allowed in.
- 25 So from your experience, this is not being done. Those

people, in spite of the fact that by law, they shouldn't have 1 2 been allowed in, they're in, right? MR. HU: Objection, Your Honor. I think she's misstated 3 some of the facts that are already in evidence. 4 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Mr. Hu. 5 I think Dr. Taitz has misstated some of the 6 MR. HU: 7 facts in evidence. He's talking about some apprehensions during the surge and not being allowed in, and I believe she's 8 misstated them. 9 THE COURT: Well, I think they're two different 10 situations. The people that came in the surge obviously were 11 12 allowed in, so... BY DR. TAITZ: 13 14 So -- but you said that during the surge, there were 15 people -- people with tuberculosis, that you personally know 16 about those cases. So by law, they shouldn't have been allowed 17 in. They should have been right away turned away. But that 18 didn't happen; is that correct? They were sent to hospitals in 19 the states. Well, first of all, just to -- and please forgive me for not 20 saying this apparently. Those two cases were not connected with 21 22 the surge. Those were adult cases. And the way we dealt with 23 them as one was a legal permanent resident. The other one was 24 an undocumented migrant. And, you know, I guess part of the

problem is when they come in, they don't ask for permission.

mean, if they -- and we do, in fact, have restrictions where you're citing where let's say a tourist or a laser visa card holder wants to come in and we feel they might have TB, absolutely we say no. You know, we can't -- you know, you're not eligible to come in because you have tuberculosis. So we do exercise that authority more frequently than people realize.

But it's just that people are detected after they get in, what are you going to do? Well, what we do is we, as I said before, isolate them, treat them. And the other thing is if they're going to be going to a specific jurisdiction, let's say they go to your community, we notify your local health department, you know, this is the situation that we inherited, and we want you to follow-up and make sure that this individual gets treatment and follow-up and therefore is subject to whatever state requirements for ensuring that he doesn't -- he or she doesn't spread the disease.

THE COURT: Well, doctor, you say you notify the local -- I mean, I can recall more than one, at least several where mayors and other local officials said no one notified us about anything, and all of a sudden we had bus or planeloads of illegal immigrants dumped on our doorstep. So they weren't -- not only were they not notified about any medical conditions, they weren't even notified about the immigrants.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor, for offering that.

I was referring to specific individual cases that have an

infectious condition that relocate to a community. We 1 2 personally let the health authority of that community know that this person is in the community so they can take proper follow 3 up and precautions to protect their citizens. 4 THE COURT: So you're relocating people that you know 5 have infections? 6 7 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, we -- we don't relocate. We -- they're relocated by proper law enforcement authorities. 8 All we do is we notify health departments and public health so 9 10 they can take adequate precautions. THE COURT: I mean, the problem, Dr. Escobedo, and I 11 12 think it's one of the problems Dr. Taitz has is -- and I have it 13 too is -- and it's not just your testimony. It was the chief's 14 testimony. You know, you say: Well, did you do that? 15 "Well, no, I didn't do it. Somebody else did it." But it's 16 still the government. It's still the federal government that's 17 doing it. So when you say, "No, I didn't do it, " some other law 18 enforcement, I mean, it's all the federal government. I mean, 19 20 you know, and that's -- that's the problem here. I mean, you 21 can't just keep -- and I don't mean you. 22 THE WITNESS: No, I understand, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: But, I mean, somebody has to take 24 responsibility for something somewhere. I mean, right now with

the government the way it is, the buck never stops anywhere.

1 Go ahead, Dr. Taitz. 2 BY DR. TAITZ: Doctor, I wanted to point to a document that actually was 3 submitted to this court on August the 7th, and that's actually a 4 report from Office of Intelligence and Investigative Liaison of 5 the Border Patrol that showed that there were over 500 6 7 individuals from Ebola hot zone that illegally crossed our borders. You mentioned that it's not happening. Could it be 8 9 that you just don't have all the information? 10 Well, again, I don't know the source of your report. 11 Personally from my field experience, I find it very hard to 12 believe. 13 But you don't get documents --14 All I can tell you is that we work very closely with Customs and Border Protection, with Border Patrol, and I've never had 15 16 reports with such high numbers come to me. Now, granted, I'm 17 just a medical officer. And please forgive me, Judge, you know, but I don't -- you know, I'm not involved in tracking the number 18 19 of crossings. So it's simply you don't get reports of how many people 20 cross the border. You only get, you know, questions when --21 when there is a medical question, somebody wants to hear 22 something else. But you don't actually get those reports? 23 2.4 A No, let me -- forgive me. Let me rephrase it. I get

reports. I can tell you that there's 27 million border

crossings across the El Paso sector, and I can tell you that we admit 100,000 legal immigrants from Mexico. What I'm telling you is I've never ran into reports such as the one you cite that states that there's an alarming number of immigrants from those countries. It seems exaggerated to me, with all due respect.

Q Well, in terms of the reports, the defense actually did not provide me with any reports because the case just started. But what I looked at -- excuse me -- are documents that you have entered into evidence. And I looked at the dates. I have filed this case on July the 14th. So document which is Exhibit No. 4, Defense No. 4 was issued only on August 7, 2014, after all -- I already filed this lawsuit, you guys created this document with directions in regards to tuberculosis.

Other documents either have no dates. For example, Document No. 5, it has no date. Typically, you know, when -- this is a Department of Health and Human Services. When you have important documents, you would have a date when was it created. And from all we know, it could have been created two days ago right before this hearing. So there is no date at all on Document No. 5.

Now I'm looking Document No. 6. One second. There is no date.

Document No. 7, the only thing that there is, it's on the bottom date, October 24, 2014. So with all due respect, this is something that was created just couple days ago to prepare for

this hearing in this court and so forth.

So my concern is you stated that those are guidelines, but we don't know if any of those guidelines ever being followed because the documents were just prepared now in preparation for this hearing. Isn't that correct, doctor?

- A Well, Dr. Taitz, you know, those documents were developed during the summer, I can assure you. And I can -- if the Court will allow me, I can give you specific evidence that they were created to help with the surge.
- Q Well, I understand that the one document was created August 7th after I already filed the lawsuit. But then there are others that were created now in October. So until we get actual documents showing how many people, you know, crossed the border with TB, how many with Ebola, what was done, we don't really know if there is any value in those documents in terms of whether if anybody ever follows them, anybody even looks at them, do we?
- A Well, the reason why -- and again, I can't speak for Mr. Hu, but I was retained as an expert witness, you know, after the August 7th hearing or whatever, you know, so I'm a latecomer. And so all I can do is that I provided those documents, and that they were, in fact, developed and they are official documents that have been in existence, many of them, you know, during or before the summer.
- Q We were talking about the temperature, and I have actually

provided a document, a study that was done in England showing that 13 to 14 percent of individuals who have Ebola do not have high fever. So have you ever read this study? Are you familiar with this?

A I haven't read the study. I'm familiar with what you're saying. My question to you is it would depend on your case definition for Ebola or what this document is saying what Ebola consists of.

What I can tell you is that during the development of the disease, you are, in fact, going to have periods of time where you go from afebrile to low fever to high fever, and I believe that that could explain the discrepancies. But I can assure you that if someone is being invaded by the virus and they have healthy immune systems, reasonably healthy, they will have high fever at some point.

Q I have here a report that was given me by another doctor,
Dr. Heinrich, and this doctor is a surgeon also in California.

And he's stating that he, an anesthesiologist, and the whole staff of nurses have -- were infected with virulent tuberculosis from a person who was illegal alien from Mexico.

So as a doctor, one question that I have, how did that happen?

And, two, wouldn't you agree that if we were to quarantine people who are crossing illegally, we could have caught this so that this doctor and nurses would not get infected?

Objection, Your Honor. It's speculation. 1 MR. HU: 2 THE COURT: Hold on just a second. I'm reading it. I don't think it's speculation to say if they 3 never saw the patient, they wouldn't have caught a disease from 4 them, but --5 6 BY DR. TAITZ: 7 But in your opinion as a medical doctor who works with tuberculosis, wouldn't you feel that quarantine of people who 8 cross the border illegally for a period of let's say three weeks 9 would help identify individuals with those diseases and give 10 them treatment so that we don't have doctors like myself or this 11 12 doctor, Dr. Heinrich, getting infected? 13 Well, I -- again, I really -- to tell you from the bottom of 14 my heart, I can't really honestly can't give you a blanket 15 answer. I mean, it would have to depend on specific diseases or 16 conditions. If it's TB infection, for example, you're referring 17 to, why would you want to quarantine someone that has dormant germs that is not going to pose a risk to anyone? I mean, what 18 you do is you take measures to refer them and get them checked, 19 but they don't pose a threat. 20 Well, this person had active TB, and the doctor --21 On this situation right here? 22 Α 23 Q Yeah. 24 Well, first of all, let me, again, with all due respect, Α 25 tell you that the situation that you're -- that this declaration

is citing is very hypothetical. It doesn't fit the natural 1 2 course of infection. And I would dare say that based on the limited information, I find it hard to believe that a whole team 3 of health professionals, you know, would come down from TB from 4 an individual who is under anesthesia. He's not coughing. 5 Everybody is wearing masks. And the natural course of disease 6 7 is that even in a household setting, one in four individuals is going to get a dormant TB infection reactivate sometime during 8 their life. And I'm being presented here with a situation in 9 10 which dozens of people get immediately infected in situations in 11 which infection control measures should have been in place. 12 There's a lot of discrepancy here. Well, here's another question, doctor. We have this case of 13 14 Thomas Duncan, and we have two nurses at the Texas Health 15 Presbyterian Hospital where they were wearing full protective gear, and they both caught Ebola. So you can't -- you can't 16 17 question that. This was on the news. Well, we're comparing apples and oranges here, okay? Ebola 18 is a very unforgiving disease. If you get exposed, it's very 19 virulent. You're going to get it, and you stand a high chance 20 21 of dying. Excuse me. TB is a very forgiving disease from a transmission 22 standpoint because it's not as contagious as Ebola. And then 23 secondly, you have a long window to do something about it. 24 other words, if -- forgive me, Judge. The judge just coughed. 25

I'm here. I get exposed. Okay. Assuming that he had TB, you know, it's going to take me six weeks to detect my positive TB skin test. I have a few more weeks, even a year so that I can take the preventive therapy.

So there's plenty, plenty of opportunities to prevent someone. I mean, if this situation is real, as it states, you know, I'm wondering where's the health department? Why wasn't this reported to the health department? You know, why weren't appropriate infection control measures? This is — this is very serious if it really did happen. There's a lot of violations in infection control measures.

Q Well, it did happen. I talked to the doctor. He submitted the sworn declaration. It did happen.

And my question is what can be done to prevent this from happening? And that's what I'm asking the judge, is to issue some orders which would prevent this from happening.

Here's another --

A Well, that's --

Q If I may, doctor. Here's another question that I have.

Right now it was reported that there are 10,000 cases of Ebola in Western Africa. We have 10,000 cases, and four people in United States already got infected. We have Thomas Duncan, we have Craig Spencer, and two nurses here in Dallas, Amber Vinson and Nina Pham, out of 10,000. WHO predicts that by January, they will have one and a half million cases.

So I made a small calculation. If 10,000 there are four, one and a half million, we're going to have 600 people with Ebola in United States of America by January unless we do something. Wouldn't you agree with me that considering the fact that Ebola is raging and exploding in Africa, we would have many more cases. That one. Would you agree with me on that? Well, I think it's -- as I first started testifying, yeah, we are likely to continue to see cases. No, that's not what I asked. Wouldn't you agree that if there is an explosion of Ebola in Western Africa where instead of 10,000 cases they have now, they will have one and a half million cases. Wouldn't you agree that it is likely that we will have many more cases coming to United States of America? Is that correct? Yes, ma'am. That is more cases, yes. So as a quarantine officer who has those documents and has powers on behalf of Secretary of Health and Human Services to quarantine people, wouldn't -- don't you feel that it will be imperative to take action to prevent this from happening, like ban for travel or having -- having quarantine of everybody who comes in; or at the very minimum, as the judge, Judge Hanen suggested, doing blood tests, maybe two tests, because one can be false negative. Would that be correct? Well, logistical challenges aside, I think those could be actions. I don't think it should be the only actions that are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- taken because, you know, we've been talking a lot about 1 2 quarantine, about isolation. But there's education. contact tracing. There's a whole host of public actions which, 3 taken together, by the way, because quarantine is not going to 4 solve it all, everything. And I might add, the problem is not 5 so much, as I view it, having or not having quarantine. 6 7 problem is in West Africa, that we should be doing more to control the outbreak. 8
- 9 **W**ell, I --
- 10 A Yeah, I know you agree.
- 11 Q I agree with you, but I just wanted -- here's another
 12 question. It was reported --
- 13 A Before, let me --
- 14 Q Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 15 A Thank you. You're very kind.
 - What I was going to say is that it's not like we don't have a quarantine. We have a quarantine in place, as I explained to you. This is a voluntary quarantine where patients, people that arrive are referred. They're monitored. They are asked to stay home. So we do. It's not involuntary, but there is a degree of quarantine that can be scaled up if needed.
 - Q Now, it was reported that just the case of Thomas Duncan cost American taxpayers about half a million dollars, his case. He infected two nurses. Each other case, because of all this equipment, gear and so forth, it's expensive treatment. It's

another half a million. So we have one and a half million just on one Thomas Duncan.

Plus we have, you know, those investigators from CDC.

They're paid salaries. They go to investigate. They
investigate hundreds of people. Go, take their temperature.

We're taking millions of dollars of taxpayers. As a quarantine officer, don't you feel that it would make more sense to have quarantine or ban of travel or have those people do the tests?

Each test costs between 60 to \$200.

So if we tell them to take two tests in the span of 21 days to make sure that false negative doesn't work, that would help us and would protect us better and would cost much less than spending half a million dollars on each case that slipped through. Would that be correct?

MR. HU: Again, Your Honor, I need to object. Dr. Taitz put a number of facts not in evidence into this rather long question.

DR. TAITZ: Let me --

THE COURT: Assuming hypothetically those facts are correct, doctor, you can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think it could be one of several tools that would help. But again, the logistics and the policy considerations are beyond my level of expertise and authority.

BY DR. TAITZ:

Q Now, in terms of people who are hospitalized with Ebola, can

- 1 | you state the court what level of risk are those units?
- 2 A For the healthcare workers?
- 3 Q Yes.
- 4 A Well, assuming that the hospitals and the infection control
- 5 measures that are being followed by our expert hospitals, NIH
- 6 and so forth, that the risk is -- is low, but --
- 7 Q No, no, no. That's not what I said. You just said Ebola is
- 8 an unforgiving disease. The doctors who treat Ebola patients --
- 9 A You're talking in West Africa?
- 10 Q In the unit. No, no, here or West Africa.
- 11 A No, in the U.S. or --
- 12 THE COURT: She's talking about what level of care do
- 13 they get here in terms --
- 14 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay, okay.
- 15 BY DR. TAITZ:
- 16 Q Level of risk.
- 17 A Level of risk for transmission?
- 18 Q Yes.
- 19 A It's low because they wear personal protective equipment.
- 20 Very low.
- 21 Q Doctor, with all due respect, all the literature states that
- 22 Ebola is the highest level of risk. It's level four. And,
- 23 | therefore, the doctors are covered head to toe; and also, often
- 24 they have separate air -- oxygen supply; is that correct?
- 25 A I don't know about the oxygen supply, but they're covered

head to toe. But -- and forgive me, doctor. I may have 1 misunderstood your question. What I meant is that if you have a 2 person in the hospital and you're wearing full protection, that 3 the risk in that scenario is low. The risk if someone shows up 4 unannounced without that protection, then you're right, the 5 scenario --6 Doctor, then how do you expect -- if you are saying now that 7 this risk is low, how come 450 doctors and nurses who were 8 covered head to toe got infected with Ebola and 233 died? 9 10 do you explain this? Well, I think you have to take that in the context of the 11 12 number of health professionals that served, what they were 13 doing, the encounters. So taking that into consideration, as I 14 said, you know, it's not zero. It is low. But if you multiple 15 it times the times of encounter, yeah, it's going to build up, 16 so I think we're saying the same thing. 17 So it is high when the doctors are --18 Well, the risk is low, but it accumulates, and then you are 19 going to get, you know, a few more cases. 20 Well, isn't there a reason why those people are sent to CDC headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia, or NIH headquarters in 21 22 Bethesda, Maryland? Isn't it because there are special units? 23 There are special units. And I think, for example, in our

25 those -- those same infection control criteria.

State of Texas, there are units that have been scaled up to meet

- 1 Q Doctor, do you know how many beds do we have in special
- 2 | level -- risk four units altogether in the whole country?
- 3 A I know they're limited.
- 4 | Q Limited. Would you be surprised to find out that there are
- 5 only 22 beds?
- 6 A No, I'm not surprised.
- 7 \blacksquare Q So you feel this is a reasonable number. So right now --
- 8 A No, I didn't say that was reasonable. I'm saying that --
- 9 Q You're not surprised?
- 10 A -- they're limited, but that states and other people are
- 11 gearing up to create more beds.
- 12 Q But now we have only four Ebola patients, when the epidemic,
- 13 \parallel according to WHO, is going to reach one and a half million in
- 14 | Africa, we might have several hundred cases. So that means we
- wouldn't have enough beds in specialized units to treat those
- 16 people, would we?
- 17 A Well, you're assuming that we're going to have X number of
- 18 cases. I, you know, am not a statistician per se. I can
- 19 predict some modeling. I think we are going to get additional
- 20 cases. My own assessment is that with the readiness and the
- 21 | attention that our country has given this disease, that the
- 22 medical community will be able to meet that demand.
- 23 Q Now, I'm a doctor of dental surgery. I work with patients,
- 24 and routinely I deal with blood, saliva and so forth. If a
- 25 person comes with Ebola, do you feel it would be a high -- I

- would be in a high risk category to catch a disease from a
 patient?

 A Well, that's a big "if," but, yeah, I suppose. My que
 - A Well, that's a big "if," but, yeah, I suppose. My question would be -- and I'm thinking out loud -- hey, why would someone from West Africa show up in your clinic?
 - Q Because they get free medical and dental care through the Medicaid, and I'm a provider with Medicaid. I work with a lot of immigrants, and they come from everywhere: Central America, Africa, Mexico, anywhere.
 - So my question is if somebody -- if an immigrant like this shows up and he happens to have Ebola, I would be in a high risk category, right?
 - A Well, no, because I can assure you, doctor, that person would have no business showing up unannounced in your clinic.

 That person would have been screened, would have been under close monitoring. Even our land border ports of entries have been screened, so that person would be miles away from your practice.
 - THE COURT: What if he's an illegal alien and he's not getting screened for that stuff?
- 21 BY DR. TAITZ:

- 22 Q Is that correct?
- A My understanding is that Border Patrol agents -- I mean, theoretically someone could cross through without detection.
- 25 And if they could get to your clinic, it's a remote possibility,

1 I suppose. But Border Patrol agents, Customs and Border 2 Protection are 100 percent screened, and I know for a fact, because they call us, and we take them through the risk 3 assessment questionnaire. 4 THE COURT: Screening for Ebola? 5 6 THE WITNESS: If needed, Your Honor, yes. If needed. 7 BY DR. TAITZ: Doctor, Mr. Oaks just testified that they did zero tests. 8 They don't do any tests, not for Ebola and not for tuberculosis. 9 10 So -- and he stated that they don't do any tests. So how are they screened? 11 12 Well, the zero Ebola tests wasn't done because it was not 13 indicated. The TB test was not done because why would you want 14 to test for a dormant infection that poses no risk? And as 15 Mr. Hu pointed out, it takes 48 to 72 hours to read a skin test, 16 so it's impossible. 17 Doctor, I mean --THE COURT: Well, in theory, if they're illegal aliens, 18 shouldn't they be in custody for 48 to 72 hours anyway so you 19 would have plenty of time to get the results and read the test 20 results? They would be right there in your cell, wouldn't they? 21 22 THE WITNESS: If they are, I suppose so. Most of them are deported faster than that. 23 24 THE COURT: None of these people were deported. They're 25 all still here in the United States.

```
1
             DR. TAITZ:
                         Nobody --
 2
             THE WITNESS: Okay. But --
             THE COURT: Hundreds of thousands of them.
 3
             THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you for correcting me,
 4
     Your Honor. But to the point of indication, like I said, if
 5
     you're going to do skin tests, you're looking for infection.
 6
 7
     This is not a public health threat. This is not reportable.
     makes no sense from a public health, from a medical perspective
 8
 9
     to screen for a dormant infection that doesn't pose a threat.
10
     It makes no sense.
     BY DR. TAITZ:
11
12
         Really? Would you like to tell it to Nina Pham and Amber
     Vinson?
13
14
        No, no --
         Two nurses in Dallas --
15
16
             THE COURT: That's an inappropriate question.
17
             THE WITNESS: I'm talking about TB. I'm not talking
     about Ebola.
18
19
             THE COURT: Wait, wait. Doctor?
20
             THE WITNESS: Forgive me.
21
             THE COURT: That's -- Dr. Taitz, go on to your next
22
     question. That's -- that's -- let's not attack the witness.
     He's not on trial.
23
2.4
     BY DR. TAITZ:
25
         Doctor, you stated that people are properly screened.
```

```
However, when you screen those people, you just check the
 1
 2
     temperature. And we know that if people are in incubation
     period, the temperature would not be high. You don't do any
 3
     tests, so they all pass through the screening, right? So the
 4
     screening doesn't help at all; isn't that true?
 5
         Well, we do more than take the temperature, as I explained
 6
 7
     in great detail. We perform three levels of risk assessment.
     We educate, we provide thermometers, and we notify local and
 8
     state health departments so that they can go the following day,
 9
10
     check up on them, make sure that they are adhering to all the
11
     recommendations, making sure that they are taking their
12
     temperatures twice a day. So from a public health perspective,
13
     that's pretty comprehensive.
14
         But wouldn't you agree with me, doctor, that people -- that
15
     the screening does not catch Ebola cases because we have Thomas
16
     Duncan who passed through screening and later died of Ebola,
17
     infected two nurses, and we have Craig Spencer who went through
     screening, went bowling and so forth, and then next day had
18
     hundred and three fever. So this screening is not sufficient;
19
     is that correct?
20
21
             MR. HU: Objection. Again, misstating some of the facts
22
     in evidence.
23
             THE COURT: Well --
24
             THE WITNESS: Well, I -- I think all of us do agree that
25
     there's a period of latency where the disease manifests itself.
```

And I think the judge was pointing out, you know, sometimes we rely on people to be truthful.

So you're right. I mean, there -- there's a level of unpredictability that exceeds our ability to detect. But as I said before, the fact that we're continuing to monitor through the incubation period together with the local health department and the public outreach workers, that I feel comfortable that with the reinforced recommendations, that we would be able to catch someone like Mr. Duncan.

And as I said before, with the travel kit that we're giving, he would have been able to notify the hospital as soon as he got there that he was a high risk person.

- Q Are you -- isn't it true that antibiotic resistent tuberculosis, it costs about quarter of a million dollars to treat this disease?
- 16 A Yes, or more.

- Q Or more. And with Ebola, it's about half a million dollars;
 is that correct?
- A I don't know for a fact, but it is expensive, yes, with ICU care, yeah.
 - Q So wouldn't you agree with me, doctor, that it will make sense in terms of protecting the public to do the TB tests as people cross the border and to do those Ebola tests at a very minimum in order to better protect the public and for the taxpayers not to spend millions of dollars on those treatments?

Would you agree with me?

2.4

A Well, let me separate. With TB, I said earlier, testing for dormant disease makes no sense, so I would say no on that one.

For Ebola, I think we need to have very active, careful surveillance, and it would be up to policymakers to decide on the issue of testing. Medically I could tell you that it's not indicated, you know, unless person had specific high risk exposure or is manifesting symptoms. But just because a person comes from one of these countries, let's say a businessman who worked on mines as a U.S. citizen coming back and careful screening is negative, he'll be followed up, monitored carefully, I don't think testing is indicated in that scenario.

ordered quarantine of all members of the U.S. military who are coming from Ebola zone? They're being monitored and quarantined for 21 days in Vicenza, Italy. Have you heard this?

Now, have you heard that just couple days ago, U.S. military

A I spoke to the command officer that was involved in that decision, so I'm familiar.

Q So do you feel he made a correct decision?

A Well, I think he made an appropriate decision for his population. We're talking about military troops that are under a different set of orders, controlled. So to apply the same rules and regulations to civilians I think would be very difficult. You're comparing apples and oranges in that sense.

Q But if the federal government can order 4,000 members of the

- U.S. military to spend three weeks in -- in quarantine, the same federal government can order other people who are coming from this area to spend three weeks in quarantine too. Would that be
 - A Well, in theory, yes. But if you consider that we're getting 70 to a hundred passengers a day, multiply that times 365, you know, from these countries, are you suggesting -- I mean, it would be a logistical challenge. And so I think the way to do this is to escalate it based on proper risk.
 - I do agree with you that some people who are misbehaving and, you know, have high risk, absolutely they should be under mandated quarantine, but -- but that's very different than people who have very, very low risk.
 - Q May I ask, who's the chief, division chief that signs those quarantine orders?
- 16 A His name?
- 17 Q Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

correct?

- A He's our -- Marty Cetron, who is our division director for Global Migration and Quarantine.
- 20 | Q I'm sorry. What is the spelling?
- 21 A Cetron, C-E-T-R-O-N. Dr. Martin Cetron.
- Q So hypothetically speaking, if this case continues, this is a person that could appear here, or this is a person that could give this order, prepared order to any person coming from the region. Or if the court orders him, that's --

```
I -- you know, I don't -- I mean, I think that would be up
 1
 2
     to our CDC Director, Dr. Tom Frieden, to decide on who can or
 3
     cannot. I cannot answer that for you.
         But you stated that at the top of the chain, it's the
 4
     Secretary of Health and Human Services, Sylvia Burwell. From
 5
     there those papers are given, and they're given and signed by
 6
 7
     Marty Cetron, right?
         The authority is delegated to CDC and ultimate authority to
 8
     our division director.
 9
10
         Thank you, doctor.
11
         Thank you.
12
             THE COURT: Mr. Hu, any redirect?
13
             MR. HU: No redirect, Your Honor.
14
             THE COURT: All right. Doctor, you're done.
                                                            Thank you.
15
             THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Dr.
16
     Taitz.
17
             MR. HU: Your Honor, may the witness be excused? He has
     a flight to catch actually.
18
19
             THE COURT: He may be.
20
             THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. It's an honor to
21
     have been with you.
22
             THE COURT: Glad to have you.
             THE WITNESS: Thank you for all you do.
23
24
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kisor, anyone else from the
```

25

government's standpoint?

```
1
                         Your Honor, I don't believe we have any
             MR. KISOR:
 2
     further witnesses.
                         I have a couple questions that I need to ask
 3
             THE COURT:
     the chief, and he can answer them just right here from the
 4
 5
     podium is fine.
 6
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 7
             THE COURT: Chief, when you first -- the very first part
     of your testimony -- I know that was hours ago, so you may or
 8
     may not remember it -- you basically were recounting the numbers
 9
10
     from 2014, year end 2014. And by my notes, you put it at like
     260,000 apprehensions.
11
12
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, for the Rio Grande Valley.
13
             THE COURT: Right. And then you gave us a snapshot of
14
     October 1st through today of about 11,000.
15
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, that's correct.
16
             THE COURT: And it was your estimate, as I understand
17
     it, that the numbers are down about 20 percent, or at least as
18
     far as you could tell.
19
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
20
             THE COURT: Okay. Now, has -- has the Border Patrol,
21
     Department of Homeland Security, whichever title you want to
22
     use, have they made any plans for any further surges?
             THE WITNESS: We have, Your Honor. And doing our
23
24
     predictive analysis based on what we're training right now,
```

we're looking at about 220,000 arrests for next year, but also

planning in the event that honestly taking into consideration midterm elections, any statements that are made after midterm elections, any things that are uncalculated and, you know, world crisis and all those other things, based on the lessons that we learned last year in terms of what we learned about logistics and what we learned about bed space and interaction with HHS and ERO and building operation centers and looking at all of our failures — well, not necessarily failures, but gaps in our capability, we've made adjustments for those and requested the required material and people and everything that we need we think to be able to address any future surges.

THE COURT: Well, and I -- let me preface this by saying I don't know if this is true or not. It has been reported in the Washington Post, so for whatever, you know, veracity you want to give that or not give it. It's been reported that the administration is soliciting bids for ID cards.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And that the vendors from whom they're soliciting to have to be able to handle a surge of requests for those ID cards. So somebody in the administration thinks there's going to be a surge of immigration. And I guess I'm asking you, are you planning for that same surge?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, sir. We look at all the threats and risks; and, you know, Ebola is a risk that we address. Any kind of contagious disease is a risk. We look at,

```
you know, guns going south into Mexico as a risk. We look at
 1
 2
     all those factors, because from an enforcement standpoint within
     the Rio Grande Valley, you know, we're looking at the highest
 3
     possible risk and threat, and then we design and plan around all
 4
     the other federal, state and local agencies.
 5
             THE COURT: And I'm not just talking about dangerous
 6
 7
     things like guns and --
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: -- diseases. But if --
10
             THE WITNESS: There's non -- there's nonmaterial threats
11
     too.
12
             THE COURT: I'm just talking about numbers.
13
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And numbers, you know,
14
     potentially could surge --
15
             THE COURT: Well --
16
             THE WITNESS: -- actually more than what they were last
17
     year.
             THE COURT: For instance, it's been stated in this
18
     court, not necessarily in this hearing, that the clear
19
20
     implication that one of the causes of this surge was the fact
     that these illegal immigrants were counting on the fact that if
21
     they got here, they got to stay here. I mean, that's -- has
22
     that been your experience?
23
24
             THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. I mean, when you take a look at
25
     police science and when you take a look at immigration and how
```

you control these factors, of consequence is, you know, recidivism rates. All those kind of things are taken into account. And if you look at the history over the last three or four administrations — I came in during the Reagan administration. You know, when there are gaps in capabilities within immigration law and they're taken advantage of, then people will exploit those, much like they do with gaps in terms of, you know, exploiting, you know, any other law that you'll find.

THE COURT: Well, if the administration was to -- and I use the -- if the government. I'm not playing politics here.

But if the government was to allow or make some kind of ruling, whether it be amnesty or some other effect, don't you think, chief, that that will have the effect of encouraging a lot more people to try to get here?

THE WITNESS: Based on what I've seen since coming in the Reagan administration with various -- you know, there was AM Act 90 and there were other various sort of similar amnesty things that transpired within the United States Government. And then there was previous surges. There were changes in immigration policy and immigration law that had an effect on enforcement operations.

THE COURT: Okay. So the answer to my question is yes.

THE WITNESS: Generally, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Because I'm just reading -- I'm

2.4

holding what I think is the -- it's a document from the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, which I know is not necessarily you.

THE WITNESS: No, sir.

THE COURT: But when it talks about the cards and what the contractor — the solicitation has to deliver, it says, "In addition, the contractor should demonstrate the capability to support potential surge." That's the word the actual bid uses. And so I guess my question to you is, is that something you're anticipating?

THE WITNESS: Well, we have looked at that, and we're anticipating all future surges, including children or family units or whatever else the case may be. And I don't have any specific insider information on the cards that they're referring to, but those are open bids and solicitations, much like some of the information that you read by the number — the quantity of ammunition that DHS bought previously.

You know, and as I explained to several people before in terms of that, it was the government leveraging its buying power, because there are a lot of gun toters within DHS and the federal government. Most of us qualify four times a year, which is about 72 rounds each. You multiply that, and that equates for the, you know, several million rounds that you have to purchase to be able to maintain the quality and standard of training that you're looking for.

1 THE COURT: Yeah. And I'm not suggesting -- as I said, 2 you know, I don't -- my source for this was the Washington Post. 3 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Although Katie just did hand me the U.S. 4 Citizenship and Immigration Services document. But your 5 testimony about the numbers, about the 260 and the fact that 6 7 it's 20 percent down, I guess what I'm asking you is the fact that it's 20 percent down say from October 1 to October 31, that 8 9 could change overnight if some immigration announcement was 10 made. 11 THE WITNESS: It could absolutely change. And, you 12 know, our parallel planning efforts, we're planning for what 13 predictive analysis shows without any external factors. 14 then we're also planning for those external factors. 15 a political statement that changes dynamics of what we're all 16 talking about here right now, then we're planning for that, and 17 we know what we need to do to address that. 18 THE COURT: Because regardless of what the politics are, 19 I mean, you guys, just like the Court system, whatever they are, we have to deal with them. 20 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: That's all I have. 23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Let's talk law for a while. 25 Mr. Kisor has been chomping at the bit to talk law.

MR. KISOR: One of my favorite subjects, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's actually one of mine when I get to do it.

All right. Let's -- we're here on the temporary injunction, so I'm going to let Dr. Taitz start. And, Dr. Taitz, if you will, tell me why you think the Court should enter a temporary injunction both legally and factually. But you need to include in there -- obviously the government has a motion to dismiss it filed about three weeks ago, and a lot of it is addressed to jurisdiction. It's addressed to legal points, not just factual points, although some of them are factual.

So I don't care if you address those now in your presentation, because I'm then going to let Mr. Kisor respond, but you'll need to be prepared to announce or talk about those after Mr. Kisor. One way or the other, I'm not letting you out of here without you addressing those, okay?

DR. TAITZ: Well, first of all, I would like to incorporate by reference everything that I included in my pleadings in opposition to motion to dismiss and complaint because all of the points are already there.

In order to issue a temporary injunction, one needs to show that the person is likely to prevail on the merits, that there is irreparable harm or threat of irreparable harm which outweighs the harm to the non-moving party and that it is in public interest.

And there are a number of issues where I'm seeking injunctive relief. And I would like to know, Your Honor, if today, are you -- are you preparing to render a decision today, or are you prepared to render decision on, for example, just injunction on the issue of Ebola, or only on Flores v Reno?

THE COURT: Well, I probably won't render any decision today, although I do plan to get it out as quickly as possible.

DR. TAITZ: So in terms of factually --

So I don't know if that is an answer to you or not.

THE COURT: But let -- if you want to talk -- here's -- let me give you -- let me share with you a little of my thinking on this, if this helps you shape your argument.

I am interested in the safety of the United States and the citizens of the United States, just as anyone in my position would be generally. In deciding lawsuits, I've got to decide what's before me. And so you may want to address this, because if you want me to go where you -- I think you want me to go on Ebola, you're going to have to show me why that's before me.

DR. TAITZ: Well --

THE COURT: I mean -- hold on. Let me finish. I mean,
I could think, as I do quite frequently, and it's not just about
the current administration. I think sometimes about the other
side. And I don't know that anybody sometimes has the right
answer or at least -- and a lot of times maybe I'm wrong, and
what I think is the right answer isn't the right answer.

But what you need to convince me is that I have a judicable interest in that issue. I mean, I don't want Ebola here in the United States. I don't want Ebola in Africa. I mean, I wish we would find a cure and be able to, you know, vaccinate everyone on all seven continents. But do I have an Ebola case in front of me?

Now, I let you put on the testimony because I want you to have your day in court on that. And, quite frankly, it's -- you know, it's interesting. It's front page news regardless of where you are. But is it something a judge can decide? So go ahead.

DR. TAITZ: Well, first of all, in terms of likelihood of prevailing on the merits and standing, that's something that Mr. Kisor has addressed. And there are a number of bases for finding standing.

One of them is via APA, and Mr. Kisor has in his pleadings stated that I would not have standing because I did not exhaust all of -- all of the remedies through APA. And specifically I did not exhaust 180 day that typically the government is given.

However, I brought the case of *Darby v Cisneros*. And this is the case that went up to the Supreme Court of the United States. And, as a matter of fact, should Your Honor find standing and grant a stay, one of the justices who actually penned the decision in *Darby v Cisneros*, Antonin Scalia, would be the judge deciding the stay, as stays — typical when it goes

through the courts and reaches the Supreme Court, applications for stays are ruled upon by one justice; not nine, but just one. So the justice that already found standing in *Darby v Cisneros*, that -- that's Justice Antonin Scalia, who will be deciding this particular case. And what --

THE COURT: Wait, wait. Let me make sure you and I are on the same -- I mean, you're right that a -- there are various justices assigned to the various circuits, and Judge Scalia is our justice, and he does decide stays. But that's not the same thing as an injunction.

DR. TAITZ: I filed an --

THE COURT: What he would decide is whether something is stayed before the Supreme Court actually addressed it. I mean, if he was for it or against it, one way or the other, it kind of doesn't matter. I mean, he might stay the effect of an order, but eventually the entire Supreme Court decides a case.

DR. TAITZ: Well, however, there are a number of stays that are before this court. One is stay of allowing into this country individuals from Ebola hot zone: Liberia, Sierra Leon and Guinea.

THE COURT: Why is that -- help me there. Why is that in front of me? I mean, I don't have a -- we don't have a reported case. And while we may suspect -- the chief testified that there was only one individual in the last year that was captured from one of those countries or maybe from the whole

```
continent -- I can't remember. I'll look at the testimony
 1
 2
     before I decide the case. But that individual -- there's no
     testimony that that individual had Ebola.
 3
             DR. TAITZ: As a matter of fact, this -- this testimony
 4
     is not correct. And I have provided this court, as I said, with
 5
     information from the Border Patrol Intelligence Unit stating
 6
 7
     that there were over 500 individuals who crossed the border from
     Ebola affected areas, Ebola affected nations.
 8
 9
             THE COURT:
                         Okay. But -- and that was they crossed
10
     illegally, right?
11
             DR. TAITZ: They did cross illegally, and they were
12
     apprehended.
13
             THE COURT: Okay.
14
             DR. TAITZ: And while those people were apprehended,
15
     they were not quarantined. They were not tested. They were
16
     just released. So if those people are carrying a deadly
17
     disease, they would carry it, and it would be transferred to the
     population in general.
18
19
             THE COURT: Okay. But they're already breaking the law
20
     by coming in illegally.
21
             DR. TAITZ: What --
22
             THE COURT:
                         I mean, I don't need an order to say you
     can't come in the country illegally. We have a statute that
23
24
     says that.
```

DR. TAITZ: However, we -- some of those people are

25

coming illegally. Other people are coming legally. And until and unless there is an order addressing this, an order staying the travel stay or ban of travel as it is done in 30 other nations around the world in order to stop influx of people with a deadly disease and not endangering the healthcare providers like myself and other population, that's reasonable. This is in public interest.

THE COURT: Let me -- let me refer you back to a question that I actually think Mr. Hu objected to, but I let the doctor answer it, Dr. Escobedo answer it. And it was a question where you addressed him as to the cost of curing it. And you basically were saying: Look, every Ebola patient costs this great amount. Wouldn't it be better for us to do it this way? Remember that question? I mean, I'm paraphrasing it. And you suggested to him -- and while I don't think he agreed with you, I mean, he -- he basically said that would be one way of doing it.

And here's the reason I'm bringing this up. I mean, just the tenor of that question and answer, doesn't that really say, hey, this is a political issue to be decided by the legislature, not by a judge? I mean, because — because decisions like that are not — I mean, are not necessarily supposed to be made by judges, are they?

DR. TAITZ: Well, Your Honor, I would like to bring an example which I actually brought in the original complaint. One

```
judge in California issued an order staying implementation of
 1
 2
     don't ask, don't tell in the military. And all the members of
     the U.S. military were affected by an order coming from one
 3
     judge in California. And in that case, you know, how badly were
 4
     those members of the military affected? Maybe psychologically,
 5
     but here --
 6
 7
             THE COURT: But wasn't somebody -- in that case wasn't
     there somebody, a litigated issue there, whose rights were maybe
 8
     being violated?
 9
10
             DR. TAITZ: But what rights, Your Honor? The right for
11
     what?
12
             THE COURT:
                         The right to serve in the military.
13
             DR. TAITZ:
                         Well, the -- from what I understand,
14
     people --
15
             THE COURT:
                         The right to tell or the right to ask.
16
     don't know.
17
             DR. TAITZ: But what is here -- let's compare those two
18
     cases. Here is a don't ask, don't tell case. And a person can
     say: Well, I'm emotionally affected because I cannot tell that
19
20
     I'm gay.
         On the other hand, here is a situation where people like
21
     myself who are healthcare providers, who are doctors, I am
22
     indeed affected because we're in constant threat of being
23
24
     infected with deadly diseases.
25
             THE COURT: Okay. But here's -- and here's my problem
```

with what you're saying, at least with respect to Ebola. One, you don't have Ebola. Two, you don't know any doctor other than the ones that we're reading about in the New York Times or Post or whatever, the guy that rode around the subway and went bowling, we don't know any other doctor that has it, and we don't know any other doctor that's got it -- ever got it in the way you're suggesting they could. And I'm not arguing with you about whether it could happen because I think it probably could happen the way you suggest it.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, if I may. It actually happened right here in Texas in Dallas where two healthcare providers, two nurses were indeed infected with Ebola, and they wore full protective gear. As a doctor of dental surgery --

THE COURT: I know, but they don't have anything to do -- I mean, the defendants in this case, the Department of Homeland Security, the Border Patrol, the people involved in this didn't have anything to do with that. That wasn't their --

DR. TAITZ: However, Your Honor, this is a case where, as Dr. Escobedo has stated, the defendant herein, Secretary of Health and Human Services, has powers. One of those powers is to issue a quarantine. And in her name it is being used and it is being signed by one of her employees, Mr. Marty Cetron.

THE COURT: And I don't -- I'm going to concede with you that's right. I mean, I haven't researched it, but Dr. Escobedo did say that, and he's probably right about it. I mean, we

could research it. But let me -- here's my problem, and it was my problem six weeks ago when we met the first time.

You may be 100 percent right. But do you, Dr. Taitz, do you have the right to bring this action?

DR. TAITZ: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Why? You need to help me there, because I got hung up on that early on, and I'm still hung. I mean, that's why I'm telling you this so you have time to respond to me.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, because I am in a special category, a category of healthcare providers who are on the first line, and particularly healthcare providers who routinely work with new immigrants. I see new immigrants on daily basis. And therefore, I am on the first line of defense against those diseases; and therefore, I am under imminent threat of being infected, either Ebola or tuberculosis or enterovirus or actually being reinfected because I still don't know what caused persistent cough that happened in the past several months. I suspect that it was —

THE COURT: Well, the cough I'm putting in a different issue for right now because that's something you actually got, and so you are a person that can seek -- I'm not -- not necessarily in this case. We'll have to work our way through that, but that obviously directly affected you. If you catch a disease, it directly affects you.

DR. TAITZ: But it's not only the fact that I was already infected. Standing constitutes not only injury that was already sustained, but also a threat of injury. And I am under an imminent threat of reinfection on a daily basis. Every day that I'm working with patients, I am under an imminent threat which gives me double standing, additional standing to bring an action and seek a redress.

THE COURT: This action, at least originally, concerned the children contained in the surge or part of the surge that the Border Patrol was just shipping across the nation. And part of the worry was they were shipping ill children across the nation, and they were causing people like you to catch a disease. Ebola doesn't have anything to do with that, does it?

DR. TAITZ: Well, actually this is -- even though people were not infected with Ebola through somebody crossing the border, it is only the matter of time. This is an imminent threat of injury.

And as I stated back in August, Your Honor, as I predicted, that we will have Ebola cases. We will have people infected. I am predicting that we will have more infections, and I will be one of them, because some 500 people crossed the U.S. border illegally. And as Ebola -- Ebola is surging in Africa. And as Dr. Dolan stated in her affidavit, as it is happening, as this disease is exploding, more and more people will be running away from Ebola, and they will be coming to this country, either

legally, or if they cannot come legally, they will be coming illegally right here crossing the border.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm not -- I'm not disagreeing with any assertion you just made. And while the government may not agree with it, they may -- they may, for hypothetical purposes, agree with it. But if you look at the case law, is there -- most cases say an individual citizen of the United States has no right to bring that action.

DR. TAITZ: Well, actually the cases that I quoted in all of my pleadings, as I said, one of them was Darby v Cisneros. And that's the case that states that the individual does not have to wait for a final determination with the APA, does not need to wait the 180 days, can bring a case.

I also brought the case of *Flast v Cohen*. And this case was indirectly or improperly classified as only establishment clause case, which is not the case. This is a case where the Supreme Court have found that as long as the government is acting within its taxing and spending powers and those — and the actions by the government are illegal, in those cases the taxpayers have standing.

I have here the actual decision of the Supreme Court in -
THE COURT: And I'm not -- I'm not -- I don't doubt

that's the case. But what has the government in this case done that was illegal?

DR. TAITZ: Well, when we're talking about the surge,

this surge was done under Flores v Reno. There is a clear violation of Flores v Reno which states that individuals who are a threat to themselves, who are a threat to others and who are not likely to return for their deportation hearing are not to be released. And the government has flagrantly violated all three. They are releasing individuals who have medical problems, who have infectious diseases; and therefore, they're a threat to themselves and others. And we know that some 90 percent of them don't show up for their deportation hearings, so they know that those individuals are not likely to come back.

Further on, the government is flagrantly violating 8 USC 1182 which states that individuals that were not vaccinated should not be admitted. Those people — those people should have been turned around right away. Yet the government is flagrantly violating that and is admitting hundreds of thousands of individuals who did not have vaccinations, and they represent a threat to myself as a doctor who is working with them on a daily basis in close proximity dealing with blood and saliva and other doctors who are similarly situated. Clear violation.

Further on, with actually *Flores v Reno*, there was -- this case, according to an agreement there, they -- that agreement actually was supposed to expire within five years, and there was supposed to be a publication of the -- of the agreement and measures taken which was supposed to be done over ten years ago, and that -- and that was supposed to expire. The government

violated this agreement. They never done this publication. And what they're doing, they're using *Flores v Reno* to transport, to traffic hundreds of thousands of individuals. So they're violating the letter and -- and the intent of *Flores v Reno*.

Intent in that case was simply to allow better conditions for illegal alien minors while they're incarcerating -- incarcerated and allow other relatives but parents to post bail and have them released on bail until they're awaiting their deportation hearing.

Instead the government completely violating -- violated the intent and the letter of *Flores v Reno*. As Ms. Teresa Brooks stated, they're not collecting any bail. As a matter of fact, they told the employees that they're forbidden from collecting bail. And they're trafficking those individuals with orders to appear sometimes four years from now, three years from now, four years from now.

So basically it's -- this agreement is being violated and abused and used for -- for transporting hundreds of thousands of individuals. It provides cheap labor, but this is something that also provides exposure to dangerous diseases.

Further on, in terms of DACA, DACA represents a clear violation, and I have quoted the statutes for Your Honor.

THE COURT: DACA doesn't apply to this at all, does it?

DR. TAITZ: Well, DACA does apply, because as you were telling just a few minutes ago, any amnesty is a magnet for more

```
violations and more illegal border crossings. What DACA is,
 1
 2
     it's an illegal amnesty. And if -- and I provided information
     that DACA -- through DACA, individuals are told that they are to
 3
     receive -- illegal aliens are given work permits which they are
 4
     not allowed to receive. And I have provided statutes.
 5
             THE COURT: Okay. But again, we're talking about the
 6
 7
     surge that happened last year.
             DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, I believe --
 8
             THE COURT: Not this year, depending on whether you're
 9
     on a government calendar or a calendar calendar, but none of
10
     those people qualified under DACA because you got to be here
11
12
     five years.
13
             DR. TAITZ: Actually what they're doing with DACA, not
14
     only they're giving amnesty and giving illegal work permits and
15
     health insurance to illegal aliens if --
16
             THE COURT: I don't have any evidence of that, do I?
17
             DR. TAITZ:
                         I have provided -- I have provided Your
     Honor with statutes and with excerpts of -- from Medicaid
18
     showing that illegal aliens are getting health insurance,
19
     getting Medicaid, which is supposed to be given only to the U.S.
20
     citizens.
21
             THE COURT: Okay. But that's -- back up. They're
22
     getting that because of DACA?
23
24
             DR. TAITZ: Well, through DACA they're giving all of the
25
     benefits that they --
```

```
1
             THE COURT:
                         Okay. Wait, wait. How do you know
     it's through DACA? That's what I want to know. Why are you
 2
 3
     saying that?
             DR. TAITZ: For example, when you go -- and I believe I
 4
     quoted it in my pleadings. When you go on the website for DACA,
 5
     it states there that those people are eligible to receive work
 6
 7
     permits. Clear violation of the existing statutes. They're
 8
     not.
 9
             THE COURT: It may be. But do I -- but I don't have --
     why do you get to complain about that?
10
11
             DR. TAITZ: Because --
12
             THE COURT: As opposed to any other of the 300 million
13
     people that live here in the United States?
14
             DR. TAITZ: Because as you stated, Your Honor, each and
15
     every amnesty is a magnet. And the surge that we have happened
16
     because of DACA. There was DACA decision 2012. We see surge in
17
     2013 and 2014. As a matter of fact, in 2014, DACA was re-signed
     second time by Mr. Jeh Johnson. First one was signed by Janet
18
19
     Napolitano. And I suspect --
20
             THE COURT: There's already been a court that's probably
     said that that's illegal.
21
22
             DR. TAITZ: And what is --
             THE COURT: But -- but what does that have to do with
23
24
     this case?
25
             DR. TAITZ: What it does, DACA, as I stated, provides --
```

creates a surge of illegal immigration. And with this 1 2 illegal -- with this surge of illegal immigration, there is a surge of infectious diseases. 3 THE COURT: So let me --4 DR. TAITZ: As a matter of fact --5 If they're getting Medicaid and all the 6 THE COURT: 7 federal benefits, aren't they getting medical treatment? DR. TAITZ: Yes, and they are sent to offices. They are 8 sent to offices who work with Medicaid, and mine is one of those 9 10 offices. They're legally receiving healthcare on taxpayers' 11 expense. 12 THE COURT: Okay. But aren't you getting paid then? 13 DR. TAITZ: I'm getting paid. That's not the issue. 14 The issue is that I am being exposed to infectious diseases. 15 THE COURT: Well, the DACA eligible people have been 16 here five years. 17 DR. TAITZ: Actually, Your Honor, you -- maybe you haven't read yet my first amended complaint and opposition to 18 motion to dismiss. What's happening with DACA, not only it is 19 given to ones who are here illegally, they -- actually the U.S. 20 Government is advertising on Spanish language TV, advertising 21 in -- advertising south of the border and telling people who are 22 currently now in Mexico that if they're stating that they were 23 here at some point few years ago before 2012, if they claim that 24 they were brought here as children before 2012 and they self 25

deported, went back to Mexico, then they can come back and qualify under DACA.

So keep in mind that not only people who are already here are receiving free --

THE COURT: I don't have any evidence of that.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, there is a lawsuit. I quoted actually a lawsuit.

THE COURT: I know. But evidence is something I get from the witness stand or it's an exhibit admitted at a hearing. I don't have anything on that.

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, I quoted a legal action. As a matter of fact, this action was brought by ACLU against the Department of -- I believe it was Department of --

THE COURT: I know the one you're talking about.

DR. TAITZ: And according to that lawsuit, the government is now obligated to advertise in Mexico. So they're currently advertising in Mexico and telling people who -- that if they state that they've been here before, were brought here as children and they self deported, they can come back.

THE COURT: But again, doctor, that doesn't have anything to do with this. I mean, look. Here's my point. And maybe you and I will disagree on it, and perhaps there are things I agree with you privately on. And maybe Mr. Kisor or Mr. Hu might agree with you privately with a lot of what you're saying.

But just because you don't like -- and by -- and I don't mean you, Dr. Taitz. I mean any public citizen. You don't like a law that's passed or you don't like immigration policy or you don't like the way that the Department of Justice settled a lawsuit, that doesn't give you the right to sue the federal government because you don't like it. I mean, if that were true, everybody in the United States could be having a lawsuit suing somebody over something.

DR. TAITZ: Well, Your Honor, it's not a matter of me liking or not liking. What I am stating is that I have incurred injury being infected while treating those individuals.

THE COURT: And I'm okay with that. That I'll listen to because then you have been injured. And that's my point. You haven't been injured by the fact that the U.S. Government is advertising DACA in Mexico or El Salvador or wherever they're doing it. I mean, do I think they should do it? Doesn't matter what I think.

But if you're -- if you're suing over some way that you've been injured, then you might have standing. And that's -- now, Mr. Kisor may disagree that you've been injured or that you have standing, that you have enough or that you've exhausted all your remedies or whatever, but an individual does have a right to bring a lawsuit if they're being hurt.

And so let's -- I guess what I'm trying to get you to focus on is that, because I -- and I -- if you can convince me that

you somehow have standing to contest the Ebola thing, I'll look at it. But I'm doubtful because I've looked at the case law on this. And you and I may agree. I mean, we had the witness' testimony saying wouldn't the United States be better off if we had a travel ban. I mean, Dr. Escobedo said yes. It would be safer.

DR. TAITZ: But, Your Honor, the injury. You're going back to injury that occurred, which is true. But also for some reason, you're refusing to consider the fact that threat of injury is standing.

THE COURT: No, and I -- if you can show me some case law that says that, I want to see it. That's what I want to see. Because that's -- that's what's important to me.

Now, because, I mean, I can make your argument for you.

Because, I mean, I could sit there and say: Well, Judge, are
you saying that I have to get Ebola before I can sue?

That doesn't seem right. So I get a deadly disease now instead of preventing it or you could have prevented it? I mean, there's a lot of equity in that argument, but does the case law support that?

DR. TAITZ: I have provided you with a case of forest workers, and it's an immigration case. And I provided you with citation. That in that case, the Supreme Court has found standing for an organization that represented forest workers.

You have it in the pleadings stating that just because the

government is granting additional permits for work -- work

permits for people in the industry of -- forest workers

industry, that actually -- that organization has standing

because there is an imminent injury. The injury is economic.

The injury is demographic. The injury is ecologic. So this is

a case that shows that there is a potential injury, and a

standing was found when --

DR. TAITZ: So if you compare those two cases, one case in forest workers, a potential injury that maybe their salaries are going to go down. There will be a flood of cheap labor, and their salaries will go down. That's their potential injury.

THE COURT: And how are you like that organization?

On the other hand, the fact that the government is bringing -- bringing thousands of people who carry a deadly disease like Ebola, the injury is much stronger here, much stronger than --

THE COURT: What is the likelihood that it would happen?

Don't I have to -- don't I have to -- I mean, in the forestry

workers' case, didn't the Court -- and I don't remember the

phraseology exactly, but didn't they say that the injury had to

be imminent or certainly imminent? Or there was some standard

they used to say if a group is about to get run over by a truck

and it's a certainty it's going to happen, then the Court has

standing.

But there's no certainty with Ebola, No. 1, having the

effect you're suggesting, although I may or may not agree with you. And there's certainly no suggestion that you would be affected by it.

DR. TAITZ: The question is, is there a threat? If there is — if there is a reasonable threat of injury, if there is a legally cognizable threat of injury. And in this case, yes, because I live in a border state. I live in California. And with Ebola raging in Africa, we know that as the number of cases there goes up from 10,000 to one and a half million, we will have more cases, people who are coming legally through the ports of entry and people who are coming illegally through the Mexican border.

And healthcare providers like myself, doctors who are participating in programs working with immigrants, there is a very high threat of injury. And as you stated, I should not have to contract a deadly disease, Ebola, for the Court to grant me standing. Just as I started this case by saying that in the Soviet Union, they issued an order where the kids had to have radiation for lice. Well, you know, children and parents should have been able to go to court and say this order can affect us. My child might not get lice -- might not have lice today, but it's very likely, and my child should not get radiation treatment.

THE COURT: Well, I think, for instance, a school district or a -- an individual school that was suing the

government over the fact that -- and I don't know if this is true or not. This is again something I read in the lay press, that the children that came in on the surge do not have to have the same inoculations that every other school children does, child does, they might have standing because they would be immediately -- here's what -- here's what -- let me quote you a Fifth Circuit case.

"An injury, in fact, is an invasion of a legally protected interest which is, "A," concrete and particularized." And that's A. And B, "Actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical." And aren't you talking to me about hypothetical injuries?

DR. TAITZ: Well --

THE COURT: Other than -- other than your respiratory problem.

DR. TAITZ: Well, Your Honor, when you talk, for example, with forest workers, in that particular case, each worker did not have an imminent injury stating that tomorrow his salary will go down. He did not have an imminent injury where he knew that tomorrow he is going to be fired because there is a surge of temporary visas and temporary workers.

However, the Court, looking at all of the factors, has found and has granted standing to this organization saying that when you have a flood of those temporary workers getting visas from the government, yes, it is a threat to individuals who are

working in this industry.

This is very similar, Your Honor, and threat is much, much more severe. This is much more dangerous because this is not a threat that I might lose a job or my income is going to go down.

THE COURT: You don't have to convince me on that. I mean, I'm convinced about how serious the threat -- how serious the injury or the possible consequences are. I'm there. You've got me there.

But what I -- what you don't have me or where I want you to get me if you want me to rule in your favor is you're going to have to show me how it's not a hypothetical injury. How it's -- that you are in danger of impending injury.

DR. TAITZ: Well, as I stated, Your Honor, all of those individuals are currently getting healthcare through Medicaid.

I am a provider. Many of those people who come from Africa, they immediately get their healthcare through the federal government. They're being transported all over.

We're seeing now reduction in the surge only because of the election, and I believe there was an understanding with the government of Mexico to kind of lay down, be quiet for a while until after the election. But we will see a surge again after the election is over. That's one.

There are reports that actually there are 35 million green cards and permanent visas that are being prepared which, as you rightfully stated, will be a magnet for a big surge because

they're saying, well, 34 million are getting their green cards. We'll be the next in line.

So with such as surge, just as it was with those workers in Oregon in forest workers case, when the Court saw that there is a surge of individuals, they felt that even though each forest worker could not say with a hundred percent certainty tomorrow my salary will go down, tomorrow I'm going to lose my job, they couldn't. But when they took the totality of circumstances, they — the Court decided that when there is a flood of those temporary workers, it is likely that there will be an injury. There is a threat of injury; and therefore, standing was granted.

Very similar here. There is a flood, on one hand, people coming from Mexico. And it's not just Ebola, but it's also tuberculosis, it's enterovirus and other infectious diseases.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. We don't know that. We have no testimony that there's ever been an Ebola case come through Mexico, have we?

DR. TAITZ: We did not have an Ebola case coming through Mexico yet. However, according to their -- this intelligence status of the Border Patrol, over 500 people from West Africa have crossed the border, so it is only the matter of time.

Moreover, when we look in the long run that World Health
Organization is stating that by January, we have one and a half
million Ebola cases in West Africa, I just looked at the same

proportion. If now with 10,000 cases in Africa, we already have 1 2 four cases in America. THE COURT: No, I understand your math, and I'm not --3 DR. TAITZ: 4 Yeah. 5 THE COURT: Again, you might have me convinced on that fact, that sooner or later, one is bound to happen. But that 6 7 doesn't make it impending. DR. TAITZ: Moreover --8 THE COURT: Mr. Kisor -- let me let Mr. Kisor talk. 9 10 He's been patiently standing. Go ahead, Mr. Kisor. What's the government's position? 11 MR. KISOR: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 13 Your Honor is correct. Ebola is not before you. This case 14 has nothing to do with Ebola. What Dr. Taitz is asking you to 15 do is to substitute your judgment for that of the executive 16 branch and to govern the border yourself. 17 The government has not done anything illegal here that she's attempting to enjoin. Her arguments related to the don't ask, 18 don't tell are misplaced because that federal judge concluded 19 20 that the government was acting unconstitutionally, violating the equal protection clause with respect to a specific statute or 21 22 policy. But what I'd really like to talk for a few minutes about is 23 24 Dr. Taitz's standing or lack of standing to bring a personal 25 injury case here for her cough, because in order to demonstrate

standing, she would have to demonstrate the three basic prongs of the standing test from the Lujan versus Defenders of Wildlife in the Supreme Court case and the 5th Circuit progeny, which is the injury that has to be actual and concrete causation and redressability for those three things. And she can't demonstrate any of them. Her own — her own epidemiologist expert testified that she had a symptom. Didn't have a disease. She had a symptom.

Dr. Taitz just said a few minutes ago, and I wrote it down,
"I still don't know what caused it." She can't prove it was
caused by the government, by any of the defendants here today,
by an illegal alien. And even if she could show that it was
caused by an illegal alien, she hasn't shown that that illegal
alien didn't get it while in the United States; that it came
from a particular illegal alien; that she didn't get it from
some other place; that she didn't get it at a baseball game or
walking around or from --

of the complaints Dr. Taitz has made is that you haven't given her the information that would allow her to do that. Now, if she gave you the names, "Here are the immigrant children that I treated during this two-week period when I got sick," and you gave her the medical records, that might give her the means to prove just that.

MR. KISOR: It might give her some guess as to where she

got a cough.

2.4

THE COURT: It might give a doctor reasonable medical probability.

MR. KISOR: Your Honor, the government disagrees with that in the sense that even if she were to submit a list of her patients to us from a two-week period and we were to say, okay, and we were to identify one of those that perhaps came through the southern border and ended up in her dental practice, there wouldn't be any proof that the government — that the government caused the injury, for one. And there wouldn't be any proof at all that that particular patient gave her the cough, although it might be —— even if it were likely, what could the Court do about it? She's asked for damages, but she hasn't filed a federal tort claim with anybody. So the Court has to dismiss it based on that.

But -- so she -- but you'd have to conclude that a cough was a legally protected interest or freedom from cough was a legally protected interest.

THE COURT: Isn't it?

MR. KISOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's not free to be safe in your person?

MR. KISOR: It is -- the government is responsible for safety but can't guarantee 100 percent of everybody's safety.

For example, not all 300 million people in the United States can go sue the government when they get a cough because they think

they got it from someone who was here illegally, because that's not the government's --

THE COURT: Okay. But the government knew somebody had a disease. For instance, tuberculosis. And I'm not suggesting this is the facts, but this is hypothetical. And I've got Joe Blow in my facility with -- and I say, okay. Here's an easy way to get rid of Joe Blow. I'll put him on a bus and send him to Southern California. And then Mr. Blow shows up at Dr. Taitz's office and exhales; and all of a sudden, she comes down with tuberculosis. Isn't the government liable for that?

MR. KISOR: Well, that -- what I think you're describing would be the tort of negligence, right? And if that's the case, there is a statute, the Federal Tort Claims Act, that lays out procedures by which someone who believes that the government has committed a tortious act against them, be it negligence or false imprisonment or any --

THE COURT: Couldn't she enjoin -- file suit enjoining the government from sending sick people all around the nation and possibly injuring other people like she was injured?

MR. KISOR: No, Your Honor, because that would be --

THE COURT: Why?

MR. KISOR: That would be standing for injunctive relief, and you would have to go back to Lyons versus City of Los Angeles. And the Supreme Court in that case ruled that Mr. Lyons didn't have standing because he had been -- even when

he was -- proven that he had been choked by a Los Angeles police officer, because he couldn't prove that he was going to be choked again by a Los Angeles police officer. And it's exactly the same here. Because even if Dr. Taitz could prove to a medical certainty that she got a -- a cough from an illegal alien, she'd also have to prove that she was likely to get another cough from either the same or a different alien.

THE COURT: Wouldn't the fact that the government was sending sick people around the nation be proof enough of that instance?

MR. KISOR: It might not be, and I don't think that there would be --

THE COURT: If the government had a practice -- and I'm not suggesting it does at the moment. But if they had a practice of, hey -- and it could be an innocent practice. I mean, we just got too many kids. We don't know what to do with them. We got to put them somewhere. Let's send them to Southern California. And half of them are sick, half of them are well, but we're not going to tell anybody about it. I'd have a hard time with that.

MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor. And that certainly wasn't what was happening. But the government, with respect to the southern border surge, was enforcing the immigration law consistent with the INA and the TVPRA and the Flores versus settlement -- Flores versus Reno settlement.

```
1
             THE COURT:
                          Well, let me ask you about Flores.
 2
     Flores alive?
 3
                          Yes, Your Honor, Flores is alive and --
             MR. KISOR:
             THE COURT:
 4
                         Why?
 5
             MR. KISOR:
                         -- has class counsel.
 6
             THE COURT:
                         Why?
 7
             MR. KISOR:
                         Because there was a --
 8
             THE COURT: I mean, I've read what you've given me on
     Flores, and it's expired as far as I can tell.
 9
10
                         It was -- it was renewed, and I believe we
             MR. KISOR:
11
     filed that with the Court, the renewal of the settlement
12
     agreement which was going to remain in force until the INS
13
     implemented some regulations. The INS doesn't exist anymore,
14
     and DHS hasn't implemented any regulations consistent with that,
15
     so --
16
             THE COURT: All right. Would you send me that? Because
17
     if you have filed it, I've missed it.
18
             MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. So do you have to then abide by
19
20
     Flores?
21
             MR. KISOR:
                         The position of the government is that we do
22
     and that --
23
             THE COURT: Okay. What about --
24
             MR. KISOR: Flores currently has class counsel, Your
25
     Honor, and we're in negotiations with the Flores class counsel.
```

But that's a case that's in the Central District of California 1 2 and not here, and their counsel --THE COURT: No, I understand that. But if you're 3 abiding by all the aliens that you cut loose, you complied with 4 all the -- all the requirements of Flores? Because Flores has a 5 lot of things that you have to comply with. You have to go 6 7 interview the people they're going to be staying with. got to assure they're going to show up for their hearings. 8 9 MR. KISOR: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. The Flores 10 settlement also says that it doesn't apply during a surge of 11 more than -- some low number of people, for example. I think it 12 was eight or 20 or something like that. And I believe that we filed that as a attachment to our original --13 14 THE COURT: Well, then, Flores never applies. 15 MR. KISOR: Well, when it was --16 THE COURT: I mean, we have eight people crossing 17 Cameron County every hour probably. It might not be eight or 20. It might be a 18 MR. KISOR: hundred, but it's not more than a couple hundred. But that 19 was -- that settlement was done in the '90s before there was --20 while there was an INS before there was any of this. 21 22 THE COURT: I know, but you're just telling me you 23 renewed it. I mean, you can't have your cake and eat it too.

MR. KISOR: The government remains bound by it, and it's

You're either bound by it or you're not bound by it.

24

25

enforced by the Central District of California. 1 2 THE COURT: Well, but I'm not accepting -- I mean, you can't have your cake and eat it too. Are you telling me I can't 3 look at Flores even though you agree you're bound by it? 4 Wouldn't that be a factor of likelihood of success if you're 5 violating Flores? 6 7 MR. KISOR: No. Now I'm dissecting your question in my mind. So you'd have to set aside the ruling of a Central 8 District of California judge. 9 THE COURT: No. I'm saying you have -- I'm not setting 10 aside anything. I'm saying you have to follow it. 11 12 MR. KISOR: Right, and I think --13 THE COURT: And you're not. 14 MR. KISOR: I think that enforcement of it is vested in 15 the Central District of California. 16 THE COURT: I know. But one of the factors Dr. Taitz 17 has to show is likelihood of success. And if you're violating a federal court order, you don't think that enhances her 18 likelihood of success? 19 20 MR. KISOR: If we were violating a court order, that would enhance --21 22 THE COURT: A court order you just reupped. 23 MR. KISOR: Right, Your Honor. Fair point. However, 24 that still doesn't give Dr. Taitz standing. Because the remedy 25 that she's seeking here or one of the remedies, at least two of

her requests for relief are for damages. And in order for this Court to award her money, she would have to exhaust the proper administrative remedies and file a claim. And we've attached a declaration saying she hasn't filed one, and she hasn't asserted today that she has filed one.

THE COURT: For money damages.

MR. KISOR: For money damages.

So with respect for injunctive relief, she also fails on prudential standing because she is asserting that there is a -- prospectively she and everybody else who's a healthcare provider or comes into contact with an illegal alien may catch a disease from an illegal alien or one that we've admitted into the country. And that very well may be true. But that's a political question vested in the policymaking branches of the government of how the INA is to be enforced and how it's to be interpreted and how it's in accordance with the regulations. And there's abundant testimony about what -- the various checks and screenings.

So what she's asking you to do is to quarantine all of the illegal aliens or the legal aliens or anyone who presents themselves at any border, any airport, and basically run the immigration practices in this country yourself, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Doesn't Flores suggest you have to do that?

MR. KISOR: Does Flores suggest that we have to

25 screen --

1 THE COURT: If some minor is sick, that you have to give 2 them appropriate medical care? MR. KISOR: Absolutely, Your Honor. And that's what 3 Dr. Escobedo testified to and the HHS witness that we had 4 last -- this past August testified to all of the screenings and 5 6 care and medical treatment. 7 Bear in mind that Dr. Taitz hasn't identified any disease or diagnosis that she has. She has identified a symptom. She 8 doesn't know what caused it, and she doesn't know what it is. 9 10 She knows she has to use a C-pap machine at intervals, I suppose, but she hasn't identified what the diagnosis is that 11 12 she thinks that she caught from somebody. And the government --13 discovery against the government isn't going to shed any light 14 on that. 15 THE COURT: How can you say that? 16 MR. KISOR: Well, unless she's going to come for a --17 some sort of a governmental medical examination to determine 18 what it is that she has. I mean, it's not tuberculosis. 19 know that because she's been tested for that. 20 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you this. Let's assume 21 she's got --22 DR. TAITZ: Enterovirus. 23 THE COURT: You know, pick a disease. Pleurisy. 24 DR. TAITZ: Well, I suspect that it's actually one of

the cases of enterovirus D68 because it, you know, was at the

25

beginning, and my doctor did not check on that.

THE COURT: Well, in that case, do not exhale for the rest of this hearing.

But, no. If she's got pleurisy and she got it during a period where she was treating illegal immigrant children sent to her by the United States government and her pulmonologist says, "Ooh, that kid has the same thing you got," why wouldn't that be proof?

MR. KISOR: Well, first she would have to identify in a complaint what it was that she had before she could trace it back to somebody, to one of her patients or somebody else. So the first step is on Dr. Taitz to identify what is her injury. And she's identified a symptom and has apparently taken some steps to consult with a doctor to rule out tuberculosis and other things, but hasn't been diagnosed. Or the complaint doesn't say that she was diagnosed with anything particular that we could meaningfully try to trace back to anyone.

And now she can hire an epidemiologist to do that, and apparently she has, and Dr. -- or Ms. Dolan testified that she thought it came from an illegal alien, but she doesn't know what it is, nor does she know anybody's immigration status, I would assume, but she didn't testify one way or the other as to that.

DR. TAITZ: Might I interject, Your Honor? I have provided the Court with a statement by the Inspector General of Department of Homeland Security, his statement and his report.

And that was a report from July the 30th. It stated that upon their inspection, they found multiple illegal alien children that have upper respiratory tract diseases.

We know that those children were transported to California. There were planeloads of them that were sent to California. I work with those immigrant children; and in and around the same time, I got upper -- repeated upper respiratory tract infections.

THE COURT: That may all be true. But unless you have qualified medical testimony that suggests that, then it's all coincidental as far as the law is concerned. I mean, one of us -- I'm not agreeing with everything Mr. Kisor is saying, but one of the things he's saying is you got to -- one, you got to plead the dots. And two, you then have to connect them with proof.

MR. KISOR: Dr. Taitz also had the opportunity to testify here today and could have submitted evidence in the form of her own testimony and opted not to do that. I have several pages of questions I would have asked her that would have sort of clarified what she knows and what she doesn't know about causation and damages and redressability, but -- so she fails on the preliminary injunction test, partly for likelihood of success on the merits, but partly for public interest prong of the test. Because Dr. Taitz has a cough, she's asking Your Honor to close the borders essentially.

PR. TAITZ: May I respond, Your Honor? I'm not asking Your Honor to close the borders. What I'm asking is to prevent reinfection, prevent the threat of injury and exposure to deadly infectious diseases. I'm not asking to close the border, but I do -- I am asking for the Court just to ask -- I mean, it is shocking. In *Flores v Reno*, here there were illegal aliens that shouldn't have been here. They were asking for -- for the Court to provide some kind of resolution to help with their condition. They were incarcerated, and they wanted better conditions. They wanted other relatives to bail them out. They wanted books and so forth.

2.4

Here I am a U.S. citizen. I'm a healthcare provider who is working with those immigrants, and I already was infected with upper respiratory disease during the surge. I am in imminent threat of being infected again, be it enterovirus, be it tuberculosis, be it Ebola. And I'm asking the Court to provide some type of relief in order to lessen the threat of reinfection.

And there are multiple things that could be done. One is testing those individuals. As Chief Oaks stated, none of them is getting any tests. Not for tuberculosis, not for Ebola.

They're not getting any blood tests. They just look. They look healthy, go. That's not sufficient. That puts me at risk, and it puts other health providers at risk.

Another thing is a quarantine. I'm not saying close the

borders. But if there are people who are coming from a region like West Africa where there is a deadly disease, and I'm a healthcare provider and I'm at the front line and I can catch this deadly disease, then it is not unreasonable to ask Mr. Cetron, right? Marty Cetron, who is signing those orders, to provide this Court with -- with relief. Ms. Burwell, Mr. Cetron, some type of relief. If the Court does not want to issue a ban, then provide each and every individual who are entering this country with the same order stating you have to be let's say in voluntary quarantine for three weeks and not infect Dr. Taitz and not infect Dr. Heinrich and not infect other doctors.

This is not unreasonable. This is something that will give relief to me, and it is in the best of the public, and it is in the interest of public policy to provide such relief, absolutely.

Imminent threat. Another thing that I have asked Your Honor was allow me standing, allow class action, allow this case to proceed as a class action because I provided you with information from Dr. Heinrich, myself. There are multiple individuals in my position, healthcare providers who are on the front line, and --

THE COURT: Dr. Taitz, for this to be a class action, you would have to be the class plaintiff, the lead plaintiff.

And in order for you to be a lead plaintiff, you have to have

standing.

2.4

DR. TAITZ: Well, I believe I do have standing, not only in terms of injury that was already sustained, but also the threat of injury.

I wanted to bring Your Honor another case for your attention. And this was Akins case which I quoted in my pleadings.

This is a case where an organization was granted standing to question providing -- providing class exempt status to AIPAC.

And what is the impending injury there? They were granting -- they were granted standing, and the injury was is that they wouldn't know what is the spending of AIPAC. It seems to be a very minor injury in comparison to injury that -- impending injury for myself.

I also quoted last time Hawaii Orchid Growers Association versus U.S. Department of Agriculture where -- and that's -- the case is from year 2000 436F.

This is a case where those orchid growers were stating that the orchids that were brought from aboard, moss of those orchids contained some kind of a pest that might affect their plants.

Now, when you compare this with my case, what is the threat to them? That they might lose some plants. They might lose some orchids. And U.S. District Court Judge Royce C. Lamberth has granted them standing, even though in comparison to me catching a deadly disease Ebola, their injury, their potential

injury, a threat of injury that a few of their orchids are going to die from some pest is minor.

So if standing was granted in a case like this where a person can lose a couple of orchids, surely standing should be granted in a case like mine, where I'm a healthcare provider working with those immigrants, and I have a threat of catching a deadly disease.

THE COURT: Mr. Kisor, you want to finish?

MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor. So I have here the Flores v Reno extension agreement. May I pass it up? And I'll pass a copy to Dr. Taitz.

THE COURT: And you may have already done that, and I just haven't focused on it.

MR. KISOR: And, Your Honor, I would like to say for the Court that the Justice Department is in discussions with class counsel regarding either updating or modifying this. So although this remains in force today, you know, I don't know that it will be enforced a month from now if it was supplanted by something else.

DR. TAITZ: In regards to -- if I might respond. In regards to Flores v Reno, and I quoted this in my first amended complaint and my opposition to a motion to dismiss. They have specific -- specific agreements and qualifications where those minor illegal alien children should not be released from federal custody if they are a threat to themselves, if they're a threat

to others, and if they are not likely to return for their deportation hearing.

And the government has violated all three. They are releasing those minor children, even though we have here -- and I provided Your Honor this report from Inspector General stating that many of them have upper respiratory tract diseases, they have tuberculosis, they have infectious diseases. They are being released even though they are threat to themselves because they have all those diseases. They are threat to individuals like myself because we get infected. And also by changing the rules, by releasing them without collecting any bail, they de facto assured that they will not show up for deportation hearings. And, in fact, 90 percent of them don't show up.

So the government is clearly violating this agreement, which gives me standing. It gives me standing as a taxpayer under Flast v Cohen because they're using their taxing and spending power, and they're engaging in illegal activity because they're violating an express agreement.

But moreover, in order -- if Your Honor wants to limit the surge of illegal aliens and a surge of infectious diseases, all Your Honor has to do is seek from the government to do the publication that they were supposed to do ten years ago. They was -- all they had to do ten years ago was publish the agreement and publish what is the implementation. If that would have been published, the case would have expired.

So if Your Honor does just that, and the judge who was -who presided over that case passed away. He was 93-years-old.

He passed away, and a new judge was not assigned. So if Your
Honor just does only one thing, one injunctive relief in
ordering Mr. Kisor to do the publication. Takes five minutes to
do the publication. Just put it online. That would be the end
of it.

2.4

THE COURT: Do I have standing to order that?

DR. TAITZ: I believe you do, Your Honor, because this agreement right now, it has no home. It has no judge. The individuals who were incarcerated when this case was filed in 1990s, they're no longer minors. They're no longer incarcerated, so you have no plaintiffs. You have no judge. You have nothing. You have just an agreement that should have expired and -- but -- and -- but the fact that the government just didn't take five minutes to put online those provisions, it is still active, and it is being used to traffic hundreds of thousands of children all over the country.

If Your Honor does just that one thing, telling Mr. Kisor he was supposed to do the publication, take five minutes, put it online, that would help thousands of people.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kisor, were you done with your argument?

MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. What happens if

President Obama grants amnesty?

MR. KISOR: Can you ask me a more narrow question?

THE COURT: Well, let's say he grants amnesty. That makes -- doesn't that bring in -- doesn't that make these individuals subject to Title 8, United States Code, Section 1182 which mandates all these health things?

MR. KISOR: So I'm not aware of any amnesty, so I'll just say that I only know what I read in the newspapers which is --

THE COURT: That's all I know too.

MR. KISOR: -- the same thing you've read, that they've purchased a contract for various green cards. So I can't really comment on the contours or qualifications of whatever the amnesty should be.

But to respond to your hypothetical as best as I can about would it make people that were inadmissible before admissible, and then would they be subject to 1182? Without -- without knowing, I would imagine so, unless there was a waiver under Section B. But I think that once people are identified and brought into the system, it would seem to me that then the normal laws would govern unless there was some reason why they didn't.

THE COURT: The normal laws would make sure they had the proper medical care in order not to infect not only healthcare providers, but other individuals.

MR. KISOR: Well, to the extent that an amnesty would bring people out of the woodwork to get the vaccinations that they needed, I mean, I suppose that would be a good thing.

2.4

DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, if I might suggest one other thing. In $Flores\ v\ Reno$, there was an agreement. There was, I believe, a mediated agreement.

Another way to resolve this issue and help the public to avoid those diseases is maybe Your Honor to order mediation. For example, there are a number of steps the defendants can take in order to alleviate. For example, Ms. Burwell can issue an order requiring all individuals coming here from West Africa to do two Ebola tests in the span of 21 days. If they would be willing to enter mediation and bring this provision, that would help me, and that would help others.

They could hand each and every individual who are coming from this Ebola region where there's quarantine order that Mr. Escobedo was talking about. Would you be willing to do that?

THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to decide what's in front of the Court, which is the temporary injunction hearing, and I'm going to issue a written order on this. The temporary restraining order I denied from the bench, but I'm not going to deny or grant this from the bench. I'm going to actually write an order.

And in doing so, I'm going to address the government's

```
standing arguments, because obviously if Dr. Taitz has no
 1
 2
     standing at all, that would end the case. If she has standing
     as to some or standing as -- not standing as to other claims,
 3
     that might change, but it would at least narrow the case.
 4
     I'm going to do those together in one order.
 5
 6
             MR. KISOR: Did you say you were going to deny the
 7
     preliminary injunction?
             THE COURT: No, I didn't -- I said I was going to rule
 8
     on it. I haven't ruled on it.
 9
10
             MR. KISOR:
                         Oh, I'm sorry. I misheard.
                         No. I said I'm not going to rule from the
11
             THE COURT:
12
     bench.
13
             MR. KISOR:
                         Okay.
14
             THE COURT:
                         I denied the temporary restraining order six
15
     weeks ago.
16
             MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor. I understand.
17
             THE COURT: But if -- if there's anything either side
     wants me to look at, you need to get it to me ASAP because I'm
18
     not -- I'm going to try to do this. I have something personally
19
20
     going on right now that is going to divide my attention a little
     bit, but I'm going to try to do this as fast as I can.
21
22
             MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor.
             DR. TAITZ: Your Honor, ASAP means one day, two days?
23
24
     What exactly does ASAP mean? I'm sorry.
25
             THE COURT: I would say in the next week.
```

```
1
             MR. KISOR:
                         The government -- the government doesn't
 2
     have anything else that it would like to file. Perhaps if
     Dr. Taitz could have a week to file whatever she would like and
 3
     we could have a week to respond to it. As I stand here right
 4
     now, I don't think that I've missed any arguments.
 5
         We didn't address RICO or any of those kinds of things, but
 6
 7
     I think those are adequately covered in the pleadings.
             THE COURT: All right. Dr. Taitz, you can have until --
 8
     today is the 29th? You can have until the 7th to file anything
 9
10
     you want to file that you need me to look at. And, counsel, you
11
     have until the 14th --
12
             MR. KISOR: Yes, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: -- to respond to it.
14
         All right. Thank y'all.
15
             DR. TAITZ:
                         Thank you.
16
          (Court adjourned.)
17
18
          (End of requested transcript)
19
                                   -000-
20
         I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
     the record of proceedings in the above matter.
21
22
     Date: December 24, 2014
23
2.4
25
                                        Signature of Court Reporter
                                        Barbara Barnard
```