

Fauci Deposition - 5:1 Page-Line Summary

5:1 Page-Line Deposition Summary

Abstract

The deposition of Dr. Anthony Fauci took place on Wednesday, November 23, 2022, at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, starting at 8:08 a.m. This deposition is part of the case, The State of Missouri, et al. vs. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., et al., Case Number 3:22-CV-01213, before the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana Monroe Division. Present were attorneys from the Missouri Attorney General's Office, the Louisiana Department of Justice, and representatives from the New Civil Liberties Alliance, representing the plaintiffs. The defendants were represented by attorneys from the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services. Dr. Anthony Fauci, a defendant, was the deponent and is the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden.

During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was questioned about numerous topics, including Gain of Function (GoF) research. There were multiple exhibits, including scientific articles and email correspondences, explored during the testimony. Dr. Fauci confirmed co-authoring a 2011 op-ed about GoF research with Francis Collins and discussed the potential benefits and risks related to such research. Key points of discussion included general biosafety levels, the oversight program P3CO, and the involvement of EcoHealth Alliance in research projects like "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence." Dr. Fauci underlined the emphasis on stringent conditions for conducting potentially risky research.

Significant themes that emerged from the deposition included the oversight and ethical considerations in conducting GoF research, the alignment of Dr. Fauci's stance with previously established scientific guidelines, and scrutiny over NIH-funded projects conducted in China. The testimony highlighted nuances in scientific communication and the necessity for clear regulatory frameworks. The analysis of Dr. Fauci's statements, alongside other evidence and testimonies, might shape legal strategies concerning GoF research's implications on public health and national security.

Furthermore, Dr. Fauci's interactions with key scientific figures such as Dr. Peter Daszak and Dr. Shi Zhengli were discussed, unveiling details about international collaborations on virus

research. Dr. Fauci acknowledged his limited recollection of specific meetings and email contents but emphasized the collective scientific approach to understanding virus evolution and potential origins. These discussions are pivotal in aligning scientific findings with evidence-based arguments in the case. The divergence or concurrence of depositions like Dr. Fauci's with existing evidence could direct further legal inquiries and influence subsequent stages of litigation.

Summary for document: fauci-deposition.pdf

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
1:11-1:23	The deposition of Dr. Anthony Fauci, one of the defendants in the case, took place at the offices of National Institutes of Health, located at 31 Center Drive, Building 31, Bethesda, Maryland. The deposition was conducted on a Wednesday, November 23, 2022, commencing at 8:08 a.m. The proceedings were taken down by Stenotype by Stephanie Barnes, a Notary Public for the State of Maryland and subsequently	Deposition Venue and Time Details
2:1-3:25	The plaintiffs in the case are represented by various parties. The state of Missouri is represented by D. John Sauer, Eric S. Schmitt, and Justin D. Smith from the Missouri Attorney General's Office. The state of Louisiana has its own representation, provided by Jeffrey M. Landry, Tracy Short, and Wilbur Stiles from the Louisiana Department of Justice. Individual plaintiffs Dr. Jayanta Bhattacharya, Dr. Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Aaron Kheriaty, and Jill Hines are represented by Jenin Younes and John J. Vecchione from the New Civil Liberties Alliance.	Plaintiff Representation in the Case
3:12-3:18	Another individual plaintiff in the case has legal representation in the form of Jonathan C. Burns of the Burns Law Firm.	Individual Plaintiff's Legal Representation
3:20-4:25	The defendants are also represented by various parties. The Department of Justice is represented by Adam Kirschner, Josh Gardner, Kyla Snow, and Indraneel Sur. The Department of Health and Human Services is represented by Anant Kumar. Lastly, the National Institute of Health has its representation through Christopher	Defendant Representation in the Case

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Hammond from the Office of the General Counsel, Public Health Division, NIH Branch.	
5:1-5:4	Also present at the deposition of Dr. Anthony Fauci were Cory Dennis, Press Secretary, along with Jill Hines and James Hoft, who are plaintiffs.	Additional Attendees of the Deposition
6:1-8:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci's deposition occurred on November 23, 2022, at which multiple exhibits were presented. The exhibit list includes various emails, articles, and documents, termed 'Exhibit No. 1' through 'Exhibit No. 63.' The exhibit contents are not explicitly mentioned, making it difficult to identify specific discussion topics. However, items like 'December 30, 2011 Article,' 'NIH Record Article,' a 'podcast transcript,' and several email series indicate a likely discussion on related events or actions surrounding Dr. Fauci.	Dr. Fauci's Deposition 11/23/2022
6:1-6:25	One of the items discussed in the deposition was related to 'Gain of Function Research.' This topic was mentioned as part of the exhibits shown during the deposition, specifically referenced in 'Exhibit No. 3.' However, the contents and specifics of this discussion are not listed in the transcript, and therefore can't be detailed further.	Gain of Function Research
6:1-8:25	The deposition includes many references to articles sourced from different platforms. Examples include Nature Medicine Article, NIH Blog, Politico Article, The Lancet Article, Breitbart Article, New York Times Article, and others. The articles' specific content and their relevance to the deposition are not available from the transcript.	Reference to Various Articles
6:6-8:22	There is a reference to a series of confidential emails identified as exhibits in this deposition (Exhibit numbers 23, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58). The contents, discussions, or people involved in these emails are not specified in the provided information.	Confidential E-mails

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
6:13-8:21	A considerable number of exhibits in this deposition encompass emails. Exhibits numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 27, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44, 46, and 63 highlighted emails. The discussion around these emails, the people involved, and the context are not provided in the extract.	Email Communication
9:1-11:25	The deposition is held on November 23, 2022, taken in the case of the State of Missouri, et al, v. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., et al, Case Number 3:22-CV-01213. This case is pending before the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana Monroe Division. The deposition is recorded at 31 Center Drive in Bethesda, Maryland. Dr. Anthony Fauci is deposed in this case.	Deposition Introduction and Purpose
9:16-10:1	John Sauer from the Missouri Attorney General's Office represents all plaintiffs in the case. Adam Kirschner from the U.S. Department of Justice represents all defendants. Daniel Holmstock is the legal videographer. Stephanie Barnes is the court reporter.	Legal Representatives Introduction
9:16-10:25	Dr. Anthony S. Fauci is the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) at the National Institutes of Health and the Chief Medical Advisor to President Biden. He became the Chief Medical Advisor to the President shortly after his inauguration. Dr. Fauci has been the director of NIAID for about 38 years as of the date of the deposition.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Credentials
10:9-11:10	Dr. Anthony Fauci has previously given one deposition between 15 and 20-plus years before this deposition in 2022.	Deposition Experience of Dr. Anthony Fauci
10:13-12:8	Agreed deposition ground rules are that both the attorney and the deposed will not interrupt each other when speaking, will ask for clarifications if the question is not understood, will provide verbal responses instead of gestures, and will make an effort to speak slowly for accurate transcription.	Deposition Ground Rules

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
13:1-15:25	The session started with Dr. Anthony Fauci, the deponent, being asked whether he had reviewed any documents in preparation for the deposition. He affirmed that he had gone through a few documents. However, when asked about the specifics of these documents, attorney Mr. Kirschner objected on the basis of work product protection and instructed Dr. Fauci not to answer the question.	Discussion of Deposition Preparation
13:1-15:25	Mr. Sauer queried Dr. Fauci about a coauthored op-ed published on December 30, 2011, in the Washington Post titled 'A Flu Virus Risk Worth Taking' with Francis Collins. Dr. Fauci confirmed he coauthored it after viewing Exhibit 1, even though his memory of writing it was vague due to the length of time since its creation.	2011 Op-Ed Collaboration Confirmation
14:17-16:6	In discussing the op-ed, Mr. Sauer asked Dr. Fauci whether he still upheld the stance that important insights could be gained from generating potentially dangerous viruses in the laboratory. Dr. Fauci agreed, stating it could yield crucial information on virus transmission, which has implications for outbreak prediction, prevention, and treatment. However, he emphasized that such generation should only be performed under strict conditions given the risk.	Perspective on Generating Dangerous Viruses in Labs
14:22-16:5	Dr. Fauci further explored the conditions under which potentially harmful virus research should be conducted. He mentioned that such research is generally referred to as 'gain-of-function' research but noted the term can be misleading and was phased out by outside groups to add clarity. This was done between 2011 and 2014 but the exact year was uncertain.	Terms and Conditions for Risky Research
15:19-16:25	The discussion also touched upon the guidelines or 'guardrails' for conducting such research, including the level of biosafety required. Dr. Fauci agreed that biosafety levels should be taken into account, but it was not	Concerns about Biosafety Levels

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	clear whether this was explicitly stated in the guidelines.	
17:1-18:17	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed a scientific research oversight program referred to as P3CO (pandemic potential pathogens care and oversight) in his deposition on November 23, 2022. He explained the development of P3CO by numerous external entities, including the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and the academies of science, engineering and medicine. P3CO was developed in response to the ambiguities in the term 'gain of function,' with the goal of adding transparency to the kinds of experiments requiring additional scrutiny due to potential safety risks.	Gain of Function Research Oversight
18:1-20:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about a project titled 'Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence,' which he stated was being conducted by EcoHealth Alliance. However, he did not have details of the project's initiation in 2014 or specific approval, as grant approval at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) involves multiple levels of peer review. Dr. Fauci stated that he has met EcoHealth Alliance's Peter Daszak once or twice but did not characterize him as an	Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence Project
21:1-23:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci discusses his possible interaction with Dr. Daszak during a scientific meeting but does not specifically remember him owing to the numerous people he meets in such settings. He recalls seeing a photograph of them together. Also, he vaguely remembers receiving an email from Dr. Daszak however, he does not regularly interact with him.	Interaction with Dr. Daszak
21:21-23:22	The abstract text of a document involving an understanding of the risk of bat Coronavirus emergence is mentioned. Dr. Anthony Fauci does not recall specifically what the context of the conversation was.	Reference to Abstract Text

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
21:22-22:23	A grant is discussed, which was funded by NIAID from June 1, 2014 to May 31, 2019. Dr. Fauci became aware of NIAID's involvement in the project in early 2020 but does not recall being aware of its existence at the time when the grant was initially funded.	NIAID's Funding of Project
23:14-24:25	Dr. Fauci explains reverse genetics as a broad term, which could mean manipulating a virus, recombination, and other applications. He specifies that reverse genetics has been used in the making of vaccines, suggesting that it doesn't only refer to harmful manipulation of viruses.	Explanation of Reverse Genetics
24:1-24:25	When asked, Dr. Fauci agrees that reverse genetics could theoretically be used to make a virus more transmissible or harmful; however, he reiterates that the term encompasses a wide range of uses, not all of which are harmful.	Potential Use of Reverse Genetics for Harmful Purposes
25:1-27:25	The document Fauci was presented with related to the U.S. government's policy on 'gain-of-function' research, and specific comments made about the pause imposed on such research in 2014. Dr. Fauci confirmed his knowledge of this information; however, Mr. Kirschner objected on the grounds of mischaracterizing testimony. Fauci struggled slightly with the questioning initially, indicating a need to conceptualize the document fully.	Discussion on Gain-of-Function Research
25:2-27:25	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Fauci was presented with a document by Mr. Sauer, who questioned Fauci's recognition of it. An objection was raised by Mr. Kirschner, indicating the document should not be recognized based on work product grounds. Despite this, Dr. Fauci confirmed his general familiarity with the concept presented in the document while noting he had seen countless documents during his professional capacity.	Presentation of Documents During Dr. Fauci's Testimony
26:2-28:17	Mr. Sauer queried Dr. Fauci's understanding of the U.S government's pause in gain-of-	Pause in Gain-of-Function Research

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	function research in 2014. Dr. Fauci shared that he was aware of this policy and further noted his recollection of the pause being implemented to all research until a new policy could be created eight years ago, in 2014.	in 2014
26:13-28:25	The dialogue progressed into an exploration of existing exception clauses within the 2014 paused policy. Dr. Fauci acknowledged the clause, explaining that it allowed for exceptions in rare circumstances such as needing to urgently protect public health or national security.	Exception Clause in Research Pause Policy
27:1-28:25	When asked whether he invoked the exception clause during the years in which the pause was in effect, Dr. Fauci revealed that exceptions were provided for a few experiments. Although it is not outlined which specific experiments were exempted, Dr. Fauci confirmed that the exceptions were indeed made.	Dr. Fauci's Involvement in Invoking the Exception Clause
29:1-31:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci, in his deposition on November 23, 2022, discussed the procedure for exceptions to a research moratorium that took place eight years prior. He stated that, although it's possible, he does not recollect signing off on any such exceptions directly, suggesting that these matters were likely handled by his staff or deputy. A few cases of these exceptions were highlighted, but Dr. Fauci could not precisely recollect who authorized them or whether they involved research conducted by EcoHealth Alliance.	Dr. Fauci's Involvement in Exceptions to Research Moratorium
29:14-30:25	Dr. Fauci identified his deputy as Dr. Hugh Auchincloss, the Principal deputy director. Dr. Auchincloss, along with other potential staff members at program level or division directors, could have been responsible for authorizing the exceptions to the research moratorium that were mentioned in the deposition.	Identity of Dr. Fauci's Deputy
30:31-32:6	Dr. Fauci was asked about an article in the Nature Medicine journal titled 'A SARS-like	Discussion on Nature Medicine

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence'. Dr. Fauci stated that he was not familiar with the article when it was published in 2015 and only became aware of it while answering queries raised by Congress members about NIAID-funded experiments. His awareness of the article seems to have occurred after the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak.	Article
31:5-32:9	While discussing the timeline of his awareness of the Nature Medicine article and the COVID-19 outbreak, Dr. Fauci indicated that he was made aware of the article a few months after the outbreak began, but was not precise about it. This was discussed because of the relevance of the article's topic to understanding coronaviruses' potential for human infections.	Timeline Related to COVID-19 Outbreak
31:11-32:25	Dr. Fauci confirmed his awareness of scientist Ralph Baric's identity, as one of the authors of the discussed Nature Medicine article. Ralph Baric, based at University of North Carolina, is a long-term grantee of NIAID. However, Dr. Fauci mentioned that he likely has never met him in person.	Dr. Fauci's Familiarity with Ralph Baric
33:5-35:1	Dr. Fauci recalled when he first became aware of the new coronavirus outbreak in China around December 31, 2019, or within the first few days of 2020. He was asked whether anyone raised concerns to him around the beginning of the outbreak in January 2020 that the virus may have been genetically engineered or originated in a laboratory. In late January 2020, he attended a call involving Jeremy Farrar and another person who were studying the virus and expressed concerns about possible manipulation of its molecular makeup.	Awareness of the Outbreak
33:5-34:2	Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked about a person named Zhengli Shi, who was possibly linked to the Wuhan Institute of Virology in China. Fauci mentioned that he ran into thousands of scientists but did not remember having a	Discussion about Zhengli Shi

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	personal relationship with Shi. He confirmed that Shi could potentially be the scientist known as the 'bat woman' in media circles, who was involved in research on bat coronaviruses at the Wuhan lab. However, he wasn't 100% certain. As far as he was aware, he had not met Shi in person.	
34:9-35:15	Robert Redfield was identified as the director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention during the start of the outbreak. However, Dr. Fauci stated that, to his recollection, Redfield had not raised any concerns about the potential lab origin of the virus back in mid-January 2020.	Involvement of Robert Redfield
35:14-36:17	A query was also posed regarding whether Peter Daszak had access to the genomes of viruses Shi Zhengli had developed at the Wuhan Institute of Virology. The deposition does not provide Dr. Fauci's response to this specific question.	Peter Daszak's Access to Genomes
36:1-36:13	Dr. Fauci stated that he now knows that Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli work together on a subaward received from their original grant that goes to the Wuhan Institute of Virology. He was not aware of this relationship at the time. The funding amounts to a five-year grant averaging between \$120,000 to \$130,000 annually.	Peter Daszak's Relationship With Shi Zhengli
37:1-37:18	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned regarding whether Peter Daszak had access to data from Shi Zhengli's research, which includes the genomes of coronaviruses. While Dr. Fauci couldn't confirm it, he mentioned that it's plausible given the norms of scientific collaboration and depicted that they likely are collaborators. Further, he expressed that it is typical for a person, like Daszak, who is essentially funding a researcher via subawards to have access to their data.	Discussion on Peter Daszak's Access to Shi Zhengli's Data
38:1-39:7	Dr. Anthony Fauci provided brief descriptions of his staff members. Greg Folkers is his chief of staff, Jennifer Routh is a part of the	Roles of Fauci's Staff Members

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	communication team, and Courtney Billet is the director of the Office of Communication, Legislative Affairs, and Government Outreach. The individuals on the CC line of an email were confirmed to be part of his direct office team. Fauci also confirmed it is usual for his team to prepare talking points for him before meetings or briefings on	
38:1-40:25	Dr. Fauci clarified about an email from Greg Folkers, referring to colleagues 'on their team.' These include Peter Daszak, Ralph Baric, Ian Lipkin, possibly Vincent Munster etc., who were identified as the world's experts on nonhuman coronaviruses. Daszak and Baric were confirmed as grantees while Ian Lipkin is a scientist at the Mailman School of Public Health in New York City. Vincent was speculated to be Vincent Munster, a scientist at NIAID.	Named Colleagues and Their Roles
38:1-39:7	Fauci was questioned about the work structure and hierarchy within his office. To this, Fauci described that individuals such as Greg Folkers, Jennifer Routh, and Courtney Billet are key members in his immediate office, with varying roles. In addition, talking points are commonly developed by Chief of Staff, Folkers, ahead of his press appearances or meetings.	Workflow Structure of Dr. Fauci's Office
39:20-40:18	Dr. Fauci was asked to elaborate on the phrase 'on our team' that appeared in an email from Greg Folkers. He interpreted it as referring to a group of individuals either within their group or known colleagues in the field because of their knowledge and expertise. These individuals include grantees like Peter Daszak and Ralph Baric and employees of institutions such as NIAID.	Discussion on the Nature of Fauci's Team
41:1-43:6	Dr. Fauci acknowledged that the grant was mentioned in an email sent to him on January 27th of 2020, but he stated that it did not particularly catch his attention immediately. Upon review of the email, he noted it had been	The Mention of the Grant in an Email

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	renewed with a specific focus on identifying people in China exposed to bats and understanding if they were getting sick from COVID-19.	
41:1-43:6	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) had funded a group led by Mr. Daszak to study coronaviruses in China. This funding had been ongoing for years, following a grant titled 'Understanding the risk of bat coronavirus emergence.' The grant number given confirms a match with a grant referred to in Exhibit 2. The objective of this funding was to understand the possibility of spillover from bat viruses to humans.	Funding of Research on Coronavirus in China by NIAID
42:18-44:25	Dr. Fauci recalled the first time he was concerned about the potential origin of COVID-19 after a call from Christian Anderson and Jeremy Farrar. He mentioned that it was at this point he first heard of the possibility that the virus could have been manipulated, due to its unusual nature.	First Concern regarding the COVID-19 Virus Origin
43:17-44:17	In response to the call from Anderson and Farrar expressing concern about potential virus manipulation, Dr. Fauci described how they suggested convening a group of highly qualified international evolutionary virologists to discuss and clarify the issue, which they arranged for the following day, on February 1st.	Recall of Discussions Regarding Potential Virus Manipulation
43:18-44:25	Upon being asked about the details and participants of the call discussing potential virus manipulation, Dr. Fauci stated, from his recollection, Christian Anderson, Jeremy Farrar, and possibly Eddie Holmes were part of the call. These discussions happened a few years ago, so he could not definitively confirm all participants.	Details of the Discussion Regarding Potential Virus Manipulation
45:2-46:1	Eddie Holmes, an evolutionary virologist based in Australia, is introduced in the discussion. Dr. Anthony Fauci cannot confirm	Discussion of Eddie Holmes and Christian Anderson

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	if Holmes receives funding from his agency, but acknowledges his high reputation in the field. Christian Anderson, another scientist, is also mentioned. Dr. Fauci confirms he knows Anderson, likely through professional meetings, but does not have a close relationship with him. Anderson's international renown as a scientist is mentioned by Dr. Fauci.	
45:13-47:3	The discussion moves towards why Christian Anderson would bring a particular concern to Dr. Anthony Fauci. Although an objection raises a speculation alert, Dr. Fauci explains it might be because of his recognized position and expertise in infectious diseases globally. Details regarding a conference call with numerous international scientists, including Sir Patrick Vallance, who is notable as England's chief scientist, are also provided.	Speculation on Contact from Christian Anderson
46:1-48:25	In an attempt to draw attention to Exhibit 6, Mr. Sauer directs Dr. Fauci to a section that highlights an email sent by Dr. Fauci to Jeremy and Christian on January 31, 2020. Despite objections from Mr. Kirschner, who urges the witness to familiarize himself with the document thoroughly before responding, the discussion focuses on this particular email.	Exhibit 6: Dr. Fauci's Email Reference
46:4-47:21	The questioning attorney, Mr. Sauer, asks Dr. Fauci to heed the purpose of the deposition and adhere to answering the asked questions without branching off into tangents. In response, Dr. Fauci agrees to focus his responses more directly. Mr. Kirschner, on the other hand, insists that the witness should have the freedom to provide necessary context to answers as required.	Instructions on Deposition Protocol
47:11-48:23	As Dr. Fauci is directed to refer to specific segments of the Exhibit 6 document, Mr. Kirschner interjects repeatedly, emphasizing the importance of the witness familiarizing himself with the entire document before answering any specific questions about it.	Objections Over Document Familiarization

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
49:5-50:12	During the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked about an article he possibly sent, authored by Jon Cohen in Science Magazine. The article allegedly concerns the mining of coronavirus genomes for clues about the outbreak. Although Dr. Fauci did not specifically recall the article, given its juxtaposition in Exhibit 6 to his text that said 'this just came out today', he surmised that it is probably what he forwarded. He was further questioned why it would be of interest to the current discussion, to which he hypothesized could be related to genomic makeup of SARS-CoV-2, although he wasn't certain.	Article by Jon Cohen in Science Magazine
50:13-52:19	Dr. Fauci was questioned on whether the concerns raised about the unusual features of the genome were alarming. He affirmed that they were intriguing and significant. He further noted that these concerns warranted a deeper investigation by a larger group of qualified evolutionary virologists, to determine if the suspicion was justified or if there could be another explanation. He explained the discussions sought a closer, more detailed examination of the virus over a couple of days.	Questioning on Alarming Concerns about SARS-CoV-2 Genome
50:13-52:19	Dr. Fauci was asked about an email from Dr. Anderson discussing certain unusual features of the SARS-CoV-2 genome that didn't align with evolutionary theory. Dr. Fauci confirmed that he knew some of the individuals mentioned in the emails, such as Eddie Holmes and possibly Bob Garry and Mike Larabee. He further disclosed that in a call on January 31st, the same concerns were raised. Dr. Fauci agreed that these were interesting and significant concerns, which spurred a consensus on further investigation by a larger group of qualified evolutionary virologists.	Discussion on Genetic Makeup of SARS-CoV-2
52:20-52:23	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked to stay on the same Exhibit 6 document and flip to page eight, Bates Number 2432 at the bottom. However, no further information was	Request to Review Document Exhibit 6

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	discussed on this part of the document in the provided text.	
53:1-54:25	During Dr. Anthony Fauci's deposition on November 23, 2022, there was confusion about the ordering of an exhibit's pages. Mr. Sauer, presumably an attorney, asked Dr. Fauci to turn to the eighth page of the exhibit, but Dr. Fauci initially struggled due to the inconsistent numbering and sequencing of the pages. Mr. Kirschner, also present in the deposition, echoed the same confusion and objected to the exhibit's condition, calling it misleading. As a result, a brief discussion off the record and a short recess took place.	Discussion on Exhibit Confusion
54:15-56:25	Dr. Fauci's engagement with the exhibit documents came under discussion, with particular reference to his communication with Hugh Auchincloss via email. The deposition also indicates that Dr. Fauci was asked to connect the email attachment with a previously recognized 2015 Nature Medicine article, although precise confirmation could not be established due to Fauci's lack of full recollection.	Dr. Fauci's Interaction with Exhibit Documents
54:15-56:25	In the deposition, Dr. Fauci confirmed sending an email to Hugh Auchincloss. The email is dated Saturday, February 1st, with the timestamp of 12:29 a.m. The inquiry also covered the email CC recipient(s) which Dr. Fauci could not recall. Furthermore, he denied that he regularly or ever CC'd his personal email address in work-related matters.	Mention of an E-mail to Hugh Auchincloss
54:15-56:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that an attachment titled 'Nature Medicine - SARS Gain of Function' was included in the email to Hugh Auchincloss. However, neither the attachment nor the exact identity of these documents was clarified during this portion of the deposition. Dr. Fauci suggested that the attachment could be Exhibit No. 4, based on the title and its consistency but was not able to	Exhibit Attachment: Nature Medicine

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	confirm it to be so.	
54:15-56:25	The title of the email attachment suggested that it might be a 2015 Nature Medicine article co-authored by Ralph Baric and Shi Zhengli, as pointed out by Mr. Sauer and agreed by Dr. Fauci. Although Dr. Fauci could not distinctly recall attaching this particular article to his email, he acknowledged the attachment's title, Baric, Shi, and Nature Medicine as being consistent with such an	Reference to the 2015 Nature Medicine Article
57:1-59:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked about his description of a certain article as a SARS gain-of-function piece during his deposition on 11/23/2022. Fauci verified that the article was indeed described as such, but he was uncertain whether he was the one who wrote that title. When inquired about the content of the article, he stated that he does not recall whether it referred to the gain of function.	Dr. Fauci's Recollection of SARS Gain-of-Function Article
57:17-59:25	Dr. Fauci was asked about his email to his principal deputy, Hugh, in which he attached the SARS gain-of-function article. While he could not recall the exact reason for attaching the article, he did remember wanting to know more about the scope of research that they fund in China, especially in regards to surveillance research. He wanted these details in order to have an informed meeting with a larger group of evolutionary virologists.	Discussions on Research Funding in China
57:19-59:25	Dr. Fauci wanted to understand the scope of the collaborations and the type of work being funded in China, as he was going into a phone call with a larger group of established scientists. Although he did not believe the funded work could have led to the creation of the coronavirus, he was concerned about his lack of knowledge on the totality of the work being done.	Concern about Understanding Funded Work
58:1-60:11	When asked about a 2015 article in Nature Medicine, Dr. Fauci could not recall how the article came to his attention. Additionally, he was uncertain whether the article was	Recollection of 2015 Nature Medicine Article

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	discussed in a phone call earlier with Christian Anderson or Jeremy Farrar. He also did not remember how the article was relevant at the time of the discussion.	
58:1-60:25	During the deposition, there was some confusion from Dr. Fauci regarding the questions being asked about the 2015 Shi, Baric Nature Medicine paper. The counsel was asked to repeat the question in a clearer manner. Despite the clarification, Dr. Fauci reiterated that he could not remember how he became aware of this paper at the time of discussion.	Misunderstanding of Testimony
61:1-63:1	Dr. Anthony Fauci sent an email to Hugh Auchincloss on Saturday, February 1st, 2020 at 12:29 a.m. In this email, he forwarded two articles to Auchincloss: the 'Baric, Shi Nature Medicine' article and the 'Jon Cohen Science' article. Fauci's precise reasons for forwarding these articles were unclear, though he mentioned wanting to ascertain the scope of their activities in China.	Fauci's E-mail to Hugh Auchincloss
61:1-63:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about his awareness of a scientific document referred to as 'Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine SARS gain-of-function.' Although he acknowledged being aware of it, he could not recall the specific date or details about how he came across it. This was discussed during a deposition on 11/23/2022.	Fauci's Awareness of Baric, Shi, et al., Nature Medicine SARS Gain-of-Function Document
61:7-63:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed interest in understanding the scope of their relationship involving funding of grants in China, leading to his communication with Hugh Auchincloss. However, he does not recall whether the grants in China were a topic of discussion in the call with virologists later that day.	Potential Discussions of Grants in China
62:13-64:20	Dr. Anthony Fauci was preparing for a phone call with a large group of people, including several experts in the field of virology. This motivated him to send articles to Hugh Auchincloss. During the call, he chose to	Phone Call with Virologists

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	remain relatively silent, opting to listen to the discussions about viral evolution and potential manipulation. His individual comments during the call were not detailed.	
63:13-64:20	Dr. Anthony Fauci was mainly a passive participant in the call with virologists. The topics of discussion were largely within the field of evolutionary virology, which he identified as not being his area of expertise. Hence, he focused on hearing what the other participants had to say, without engaging significantly in the conversation himself.	Evaluation of Expert Discussion
65:8-65:11	Dr. Anthony Fauci identified Lawrence Tabak, the person referenced in an email exchange, as the former deputy director and current acting director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) as of the deposition date on November 23, 2022. The nature of the email exchange remains unclear, but it is inferred to involve a shared article.	Discussion on Lawrence Tabak's Role and Connection to NIH
65:12-66:3	Dr. Fauci and the interlocutor discussed a potential discrepancy over the time a communication occurred. Despite an initial assumption that an email was sent at 1:13 in the morning, it was clarified that the actual time was 13:19, indicating the afternoon time in a 24-hour clock system.	Discrepancy over Time of Communication
65:12-67:11	Dr. Fauci verified that he forwarded a Nature Medicine article to Lawrence Tabak on February 1st. The reason behind this forwarding action wasn't clearly remembered by Dr. Fauci, but he supposed it was likely to ensure everyone was abreast of ongoing discussions, including Francis Collins, the then-director of NIH.	Communication Regarding a Nature Medicine Article
65:13-67:24	The inquisitor probed into the timing of a phone call Dr. Fauci had, possibly involving Francis Collins. Dr. Fauci was unsure of the specific time, indicating it may have been in the morning or 2:00 p.m. The presence of Lawrence Tabak on that call was also uncertain.	Questioning Around Phone Call Timing

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
66:13-68:4	The discussion turned towards a potential issue of the NIH, under Dr. Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), having funded coronavirus-related research in China. Dr. Fauci stated that he does not recall having discussed this issue with Francis Collins.	Discussion Concerning NIH Funding for Research in China
69:1-71:25	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci read an email in a deposition, sent by Hugh Auchincloss on February 1, 2020. The content of the email discussed NIH-reviewed and approved gain-of-function research before a pause was applied. Although Fauci didn't elucidate on the precise subject of the email, he inferred that the conversation was about gaining knowledge on the extent of US involvement in Chinese research funding, possibly concerning coronavirus work.	Exploration of a 2020 Email Between Dr. Fauci and Hugh Auchincloss
69:1-71:25	The deposition mentioned an email from Jeremy Farrar, with timestamp February 1, 2020, at 1524, but no details about the content or context of this email were provided in the given transcript pages.	Introduction of Jeremy Farrar
69:23-71:20	In the 2022 deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked if he had voiced concerns to Hugh Auchincloss about whether a 2015 research paper adhered to or conflicted with the 2014 gain-of-function funding research moratorium. Fauci did not verify this, repeating his interest in understanding the scope of funded research in China.	Debate on the Gain-of-Function Moratorium
70:15-72:19	Emily Erbelding, director of the Division of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), was mentioned in Auchincloss' 2020 email. It was communicated that Erbelding was certain that no coronavirus research had proceeded through the P3 framework, not requiring additional P3CO approval. Dr. Fauci stated he may have, but did not specifically recall, discussing this issue with Erbelding.	Discussion on the Involvement of Emily Erbelding

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
71:4-72:11	Dr. Fauci's response to Auchincloss' 2020 email was, 'Okay, stay tuned.' Asked during the deposition whether he communicated with Auchincloss or Erbeling about the email again, he revealed that he didn't recall any subsequent communications.	Questions Concerning Follow-up Correspondence
73:2-73:25	During the deposition with Dr. Anthony Fauci on 11/23/2022, there was a discussion about a document referenced by Mr. Kirschner. Fauci was asked to familiarize himself with a section of the document that mentioned another individual named Eddie, whom Fauci identified as Eddie Holmes, based in	Discussion about Document Familiarization
73:15-74:6	A key topic from the deposition was the level of confidentiality surrounding certain discussions and the information shared therein. The document referenced by Mr. Kirschner contained a note that the information and discussions were supposed to be kept in complete confidence. However, Dr. Fauci stated that he did not recall any discussion about confidentiality with Jeremy Farrar, who was assumed to have made the note.	Confidentiality of Information and Discussions
74:21-76:5	The deposition touched on the roles and affiliations of certain conference call participants. Dr. Fauci mentioned Patrick Vallance, the chief scientific officer reporting to the UK prime minister, and Jeremy Farrar, the head of the Wellcome Trust in the UK. He stated that, to his knowledge, none of the listed participants appeared to have a governmental affiliation.	Role and Affiliation of Participants
74:22-75:6	Dr. Fauci was asked about the selection of participants for a particular conference call. He stated that he did not hold any role in selecting the participants, and that it was predominantly Christian and Jeremy who made the selection. He did, however, recommend Francis Collins, the director of NIH, for the call.	Selection of Participants for a Conference Call
75:1-76:15	Dr. Fauci confirmed that the Wellcome Trust,	Funding Role of the

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	under the leadership of Jeremy Farrar, awards grants for scientific research. However, he did not know the specific amount awarded annually, though he surmised it would be significant given the organization's prominence in the UK.	Wellcome Trust
77:1-79:25	During a call on February 1, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci and other participants engaged in a scientific debate concerning the origin of an unnamed virus. They discussed whether the virus had originated from a laboratory or naturally. The discussions were based on respective perspectives of evolutionary virologists on the call, and concluded with an agreement for a more careful examination of the virus sequences, to steer clear from speculation, stick with evidence and data, and ascertain the truth.	Discussion on the Origin of the Virus
77:15-78:24	As per Dr. Anthony Fauci's deposition, there may have been concerns that merely the discussion of the virus being potentially manipulated or starting in a lab could spark futile discourse or conspiracy theories in media or social media platforms. However, he could not recall any specific mention of this issue during the call.	Concerns over Conspiracy Theories
78:4-80:25	According to Dr. Anthony Fauci, the consensus after the call was a need for more time to investigate the origin of the virus. The plan was to have a careful and measured approach to examining its molecular makeup, with the intent to validate or undermine the initial concerns.	Need for Further Investigation
78:10-80:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged vague recollections of concerns about attention being redirected from important public health efforts because of discussions around the virus's origin. However, he clarified that the objective of the call participants was to discern the truth and avoid baseless	Potential Distraction from Public Health Efforts
78:25-79:5	When asked about any discussions or concerns that allegations about the virus	Potential Impact on Scientific Funding

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	laboratory might undermine scientific funding projects, Dr. Anthony Fauci did not recall any such threats being discussed during the call.	Projects
81:1-82:2	Dr. Anthony Fauci discusses a review conducted by his colleagues, including Christian, that examined the initial concern regarding the molecular basis of a virus. After a close examination of the pros and cons, the team concluded that their initial concern was unwarranted. They found that what they observed was compatible and suggestive of a natural evolution of the virus. This conclusion was based on evidence and factual data. Following the review, the team put out a preprint substantiating their conclusion with an outline of the molecular basis of why they felt the virus was likely a natural evolution.	Evidence-Based Review of a Viral Molecular Basis
81:16-83:1	After the initial phone call discussing the molecular basis of the virus, Dr. Fauci remained involved in the project on a limited basis. He was, at times, included in e-mails on the subject and had communications with some of the members of the review team. This involvement extended up until the point when the team published a preprint of their study. Some of these communications were with Francis Collins and Christian and even involved discussions with select members of Congress.	Ongoing Involvement in Molecular Basis Review
82:3-84:14	During the deposition, an email sent by Dr. Fauci to Jeremy Farrar and Christian Anderson was examined. However, the contents of the email were redacted and thus remain undisclosed. Consequently, Dr. Fauci has no recollection of the subject of this	Redaction of Email Communication
82:4-84:4	A later email exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci and Jeremy Farrar on January 30 was also discussed. From this exchange, it appears the two were in contact not just about professional matters, but also held more personal exchanges. The contents of these	Further Communication with Jeremy Farrar

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	conversations aren't disclosed.	
82:19-83:10	Dr. Anthony Fauci isn't able to recall specific communications with Jeremy Farrar about the molecular basis of the virus after their initial phone call. Although he notes that it's possible he had further communications with Jeremy, he has no clear memory of it. Dr. Fauci and Jeremy Farrar are well acquainted, making further communication plausible.	Communication with Jeremy Farrar
85:1-86:17	Dr. Anthony Fauci was presented with an email from Jeremy Farrar sent on February 1st, asking if he could join a conference call scheduled for later that day. Dr. Fauci confirmed it was likely this was an invitation to join the call.	Jeremy Farrar's Email to Dr. Anthony Fauci on February 1st
85:8-85:23	On November 23rd, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked about a phone call with Patrick Vallance and Jeremy Farrar that supposedly took place approximately two days before a Saturday conference call. Dr. Fauci can only verify the call happened due to an e-mail from him to Jeremy on January 30th but did not remember details of the call.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Discussion with Patrick Vallance and Jeremy Farrar
86:20-88:5	Dr. Fauci was queried about a statement in Farrar's e-mail referring to keeping the conference call group 'tight.' Although Fauci did not have specific knowledge about Farrar's intent, he speculated that in his experience smaller groups tend to be more productive in serious discussions.	Jeremy Farrar's Preference for a Tight Group
86:22-88:25	Fauci was questioned about Farrar's request for total confidentiality in his email. Fauci inferred that Farrar perhaps wanted to limit discussions to prevent speculation on matters for which there might have been suspicions but no solid evidence.	Dr. Fauci's Interpretation on 'Total Confidence'
89:1-89:16	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about Dr. Anderson's perspective on the origins of a certain virus. There was a suggestion that Dr. Anderson might have thought the virus originated from a lab, but it was not	Concerns About Virus Origins

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	confirmed. Dr. Fauci emphasized the need for qualified evolutionary virologists to discuss these matters before facilitating discourse with those lacking knowledge in the field.	
90:1-91:15	Dr. Fauci was asked about an email from Jeremy Farrar, indicating that he ('Farrar') would be on a call and trying to reach Francis Collins. Dr. Fauci confirmed his intention to ensure participation of the NIH Director in that call. He implied that he encouraged Collins to join the call and consult with Farrar, but he couldn't confirm if the two actually conversed.	Correspondence with Jeremy Farrar and Francis Collins
90:7-92:21	An email exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci and Jeremy Farrar about a teleconference was brought into question. Fauci confirmed the presence of an email suggesting to shut down the call temporarily and restart for only five to ten minutes. Fauci had responded affirmatively to this request, but doesn't recall if the suggestion was acted upon.	Conference Details Inquiry
90:7-92:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned on an email from Jeremy Farrar, addressed to a small group, suggesting a temporary pause of the call. The intention behind this email was not clear and Dr. Fauci couldn't recall whether this action was taken. This smaller group included individuals like Francis Collins and Patrick Vallance. Dr. Fauci was unable to provide any rationale behind this briefing.	Limited Call Group Inquiry
91:6-92:11	In the email thread, a person named Mike Ferguson was mentioned. Dr. Fauci recognized the name but admitted he was unsure of Ferguson's identity. He conjectured that Ferguson may have been part of the aforementioned call.	Introduction of Mike Ferguson
93:1-95:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned about an email chain between him, Jeremy, and Francis Collins from the year 2013. Particular attention was drawn to an email sent by Collins to both Fauci and Jeremy, but the contents of the	Dr. Fauci's Correspondence with Francis Collins and Jeremy,

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	its implication were not discussed during this part of the deposition.	
93:1-95:25	In the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci could not recall shutting down a conference call or any details related to it, including a conversation with a person named Jeremy. The witness referenced an email to Jeremy Farrar dated 1st of February, 2020, but no specific details about the contents of the email were mentioned during this part of the deposition.	Dr. Fauci on Conference Call
94:5-96:6	There were references to a planned call with 'Tedros', who Dr. Fauci identifies as the director general of the World Health Organization. While he recalled discussions about the necessity to inform Tedros and other relevant individuals about an issue being 'looked into', Dr. Fauci could not recall specific details about the plan or whose responsibility it was to reach out to Tedros.	Planned Call with Tedros
94:11-96:25	Dr. Fauci states he does not remember direct or indirect communication with Tedros, the director general of the World Health Organization. He wasn't sure if he suggested getting the World Health Organization involved regarding the issue under discussion.	Dr. Fauci Disavows Direct Communication with Tedros
94:16-96:21	An unknown document marked as 'Exhibit 8' was introduced by the counsel during Dr. Fauci's deposition. Before examining the document, Dr. Fauci maintained that he did not recall having any communication with Dr. Tedros regarding the issues raised.	Exhibit 8 and Dr. Fauci's Communication Records
97:1-98:25	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci provided deposition concerning a February 9th phone call, where the importance of alerting individuals like the director general of WHO was a key theme. During his testimony, an exhibit was presented, where Dr. Fauci acknowledged the 'To' and 'From' in German ('von an') that indicated participants of the call, though he insisted on familiarising himself with the document further.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Communication with WHO and Significance of Documents Reviewed

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
98:2-99:25	In the same deposition, Dr. Fauci discussed an email from Jeremy Farrar referencing chat on Twitter and WeChat pertaining to papers being prepared on a then-unspecified topic. While he affirmed his knowledge of Twitter, he could not comment on WeChat. Dr. Fauci, however, could not recall Farrar raising concerns about the virus's origins on these social media platforms.	Discussion on Social Media Communications and Specifically Jeremy Farrar's Email
98:10-99:9	When asked about persons discussing the virus's origin on social media platforms, Dr. Fauci refrained from commenting, stating his disassociation from such platforms. He confirmed he neither has a Twitter account nor does he use Facebook. His stance was supported by an objection from Mr. Kirschner related to the perceived ambiguity of the question.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Views on Social Media and the Virus's Origin
98:11-100:25	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci steadfastly stated that apart from Mark Zuckerberg and his daughter, he knows of no one else working in a social media platform. The precision of his knowledge about his acquaintances in the social media industry is thus established to be limited.	Confirmation of Dr. Anthony Fauci's Contacts in Social Media Industries
99:11-100:25	Dr. Fauci disclosed that he knows Mark Zuckerberg, having done at least three FaceTime discussions with him encouraging people to get vaccinated. He also disclosed that his daughter, a former software engineer at Twitter, never discussed the content of posts or the origins of the virus with him. She left Twitter over a year before the time of the deposition.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Relationship with Social Media Employees
101:1-101:8	On 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci testified that he did not work for a social media platform. He mentioned he had conducted several interviews and podcasts via Instagram. An example given was his interactions with basketball player Steph Curry. Curry called on Dr. Fauci through his Instagram reach in an effort to encourage people to get vaccinated.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Media Presence

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
101:9-102:10	During the discussion, Dr. Fauci and the legal team referred to an Exhibit 8. They struggled to locate a specific page containing an email from Jeremy Farrar. While the contents of the email aren't displayed, it's apparent that the contents may contain key information influencing the deposition discussions.	Exhibit Review in the Deposition
102:2-104:23	Dr. Fauci talked about an email from Jeremy Farrar expressing concern that people would speculate on the origins of the virus and engage in blame games, especially targeting the Chinese populace. Farrar was also concerned about the potential to increase tensions and reduce cooperation necessary for future virus prevention and preparation strategies.	Jeremy Farrar's Concern about the Virus Origin Theories
102:17-104:23	Throughout the testimony, there was a recurring conversation around the role of social media in the spread of misinformation. Whilst not subscribing to social media himself, Dr. Fauci acknowledged it as one way in which information is disseminated. He maintains he is concerned about misinformation in general, not just that which appears on social media.	Role of Social Media in Spreading Misinformation
103:18-104:17	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed concern about misinformation that can interfere with attempts to save lives globally. Particularly, Dr. Fauci mentioned unfounded claims such as the suggestion that he and Bill Gates inserted chips into vaccines. As a physician, such misinformation could potentially deter people from being vaccinated, leading to loss	Dr. Fauci's Concerns Over Misinformation
105:5-107:25	In the same email, Dr. Fauci states that it's essential to respond quickly to the situation. He further expresses a wish to have the World Health Organization (WHO) convene a group to examine the situation and establish facts, thereby countering misinformation. However, during the deposition, he admits uncertainty over whether this actually transpired.	Dr. Fauci's Call for Quick Response
105:7-107:3	Dr. Anthony Fauci discusses a concern over	Dr. Fauci's Social

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	potential distortions on social media in an email dated 2nd February 2020. During a deposition on 11/23/2022, he elaborates on his concern over wild speculations and accusations pertaining to the pandemic on social media outlets, attributing it to misinformation, such as unfounded claims concerning origins of the virus and erroneous assertions that vaccines contain tracking devices.	Media Consequences
106:1-108:24	The email conversation also references WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus and 'Bernard', a high-ranking official at WHO whose surname Dr. Fauci doesn't recall during the deposition. The pair had apparently 'gone into conclave', although Dr. Fauci does not explain what this means.	Discussion of WHO Officials Tedros and Bernard
106:16-108:23	Dr. Fauci expresses confusion over the term 'conclave' used in the email to describe WHO's Director-General and 'Bernard'. He states that he does not know what it would mean in this context, and his response to a question about its meaning prompts an objection on the grounds of speculation	Uncertainty Over 'Conclave' Reference
106:23-107:25	Dr. Fauci, in his deposition, mentioned that the World Health Organization's involvement was seen as a crucial step as this situation carries international implications. The role of WHO in convening an unbiased body of experts to thoroughly examine the situation was considered essential.	Proposal for World Health Organization Involvement
109:1-111:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci expresses a lack of knowledge regarding the subject of an email exchange dated 11/23/2022, noting that he is uncertain about what decision was supposed to be made on that date. This misunderstanding pertains to a conversation involving Jeremy Farrar and may also involve Dr. Francis Collins, although the specifics of the discussion are not clarified. Some objections were made by Mr. Kirschner regarding mischaracterization and assumptions of evidence.	Unclear Decision in Email Exchange

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
109:25-110:7	Dr. Fauci shares his understanding of Jeremy Farrar's efforts to involve the World Health Organization (WHO) and explains his own withdrawal from the process. He states that after a certain point, his involvement or input into the WHO diminished or stopped.	Involvement of WHO and Dr. Fauci's Disengagement
110:1-112:25	Dr. Fauci reviews an email from Eddie Holmes to Jeremy Farrar concerning a draft summary. This document might be related to the conference call previously discussed. However, the deposition ended before anyone could confirm the connection.	Summary Email from Eddie Holmes
110:9-111:8	An email from Jeremy Farrar, which included bullet points about gathering evidence from science literature and mainstream and social media on questions of the origins of the virus, is partially discussed. Dr. Fauci confirms seeing the email but denies having further information about Farrar's activities or communications with the WHO related to this matter.	Interest in Origin of the Virus
110:14-112:25	Dr. Fauci is shown Exhibit No. 9, the second page of which contains an email that he sent to Francis Collins and Jeremy Farrar. In the email, Fauci urges them to get the WHO to start convening. However, Fauci does not recall the specifics of the summary and analysis referred to in the email.	Exhibit No. 9 and Contents
113:1-115:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned about the discussion of virus 'anomalies' that were mentioned during a meeting that occurred on February 1. However, he seemed uncertain about the meaning of 'anomalies' in this context, suggesting that they could be synonymous with unusual observations about the virus. He did not provide specific examples or details of such anomalies.	Discussion of Virus Anomalies in a Meeting
113:1-115:7	During a deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci, a prominent figure in the American medical community, expressed uncertainty about the specifics of a summary he had previously been commenting on. He	Dr. Fauci's Uncertainty about Meeting Discussions

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	was uncertain whether the summary pertained to the content of the meeting or the subsequent deliberations. He also confirmed a statement that was made about the neutral nature of discussed scientific concepts without providing personal insight or opinion. However, he indicated that he did not fully understand a reference to 'anomalies' mentioned in that statement.	
113:4-115:7	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed during his deposition on 11/23/2022 that he received a draft manuscript from a meeting. The manuscript was of a very fundamentally evolutionary virology nature, a field which he acknowledged was outside of his professional expertise. He recalled reading the paper, but did not recall providing any substantial feedback due to his limited knowledge in the paper's field of study.	Dr. Fauci's Receipt and Review of Draft Paper
113:16-115:3	During Dr. Fauci's deposition, a number of documents were presented as exhibits. An objection was raised by Mr. Kirschner regarding the method in which the documents were compiled into a single exhibit. Kirschner believed these collated documents could potentially mischaracterize the record by grouping documents together that might not naturally belong together.	Exhibits Presentation and Objection
114:1-116:25	Dr. Fauci was queried about a phrase he used: 'serial passage in ACE2 transgenic mice'. While Fauci confirmed understanding the phrase — sequential passage of a virus in mice — he denied knowing its context at the time he used it. Further comments made by Jeremy Farrar and Francis Collins in response to Dr. Fauci's phrase remained unexplained due to the uncertain context and lack of recollection by the deponent. Dr. Fauci did not verify the implications of their responses regarding the potential virus gain or loss function or Biosafety level 2 (BLS-2) lab work.	References to Serial Passage in Mice
117:1-119:17	Dr. Fauci addressed questions regarding the performance of gain-of-function research on	Topics Surrounding Gain-of-Function

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	viruses in BSL-2 conditions. He stated that the term 'gain-of-function' has a wide range of interpretations, which could influence his response. He was asked specifically about an experiment from the 2015 Shi and Baric paper, which he admitted he was unfamiliar with and would require time to properly read and understand.	Research
117:7-119:17	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was unable to provide a definitive answer on whether the experiments referenced in the 2015 Shi and Baric paper were suitable for BSL-2 conditions. His response emphasized the importance of thoroughly reviewing the paper to make adequate determinations on the appropriate level of restrictions.	Discussion on Experiments and Safety Levels
117:7-118:14	In a deposition dated 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed the safety levels of certain types of research. There were questions about research by Peter Daszak and Shi Zhengli at the Wuhan Institute of Virology and whether it was conducted at the BSL-2 safety level. Dr. Fauci noted that typically, research involving pseudoviruses and in vitro work is done in a BSL-2 environment. However, research involving ACE2 transgenic mice could depend on each country's restrictions.	Discussion on Research Safety Levels
118:2-120:3	Dr. Fauci was questioned about an email referred to as 'Wild West'. The contents and specifics of the email were not disclosed during the deposition. Dr. Fauci clarified that he was unfamiliar with what Jeremy, the email's sender, meant by 'Wild West'. Dr. Fauci declined to speculate on the meaning of the term without more context.	Concerns over 'Wild West' Email
120:2-120:20	Dr. Fauci was questioned about an email he received from Jeremy on February 7th, 2020, which included a draft paper from Eddie Holmes. This was related to a conference call held on February 1st. Dr. Fauci stated that while he may have received the draft, he likely did not comment on it as it involved complicated evolutionary virology, which falls	Review of Jeremy's Draft Paper from Eddie Holmes

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	outside of his field of expertise.	
121:6-122:23	Further discussion occurred about Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests and Dr. Fauci's involvement in it. He mentioned that FOIA requests do not come to him directly and he does not decide which of his emails are made public. Redactions, he emphasized, are performed by sectors of the institutes at various levels, without his involvement.	FOIA Requests and Redaction Involvement
121:11-122:5	In a deposition involving Dr. Anthony Fauci on November 23, 2022, a conversation revolved around a bolded sentence within a document, stating 'Analysis of the virus genome sequences clearly demonstrates that the virus is not a laboratory construct or experimentally manipulated virus.' Dr. Fauci confirmed the sentence but clarified his role as non-qualified to make definitive determinations about whether a genome could be laboratory-constructed or manipulated. He refers to relying on highly qualified, respected evolutionary virologists for that conclusion.	Virus Genome Analysis and Expert Reliance
122:6-124:24	Highlighting Dr. Fauci's repeated mentions of his limited expertise in this subject, the deposition touched on his possible review of the drafts. While not recalling specifics, Dr. Fauci acknowledged that he may have looked at the drafts, but he couldn't have made meaningful comments due to its complicated nature outside his area of specialty.	Expertise Limitation and Document Review
122:25-124:14	A reference to a past consensus meeting in early January was discussed with Dr. Fauci who clarified confusion over the timeline. By February 4th, a rough draft of a looming publication was sent to him, as evidenced by the emails. He confirmed receiving it but emphasized his limited input due to the topic's complexity.	Consensus Timing and Email Contents
123:1-124:25	The deposition also brought to light exchanges of confidential drafts, with one such email chain involving Dr. Fauci, Jeremy	Exchange of Secret Drafts

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Francis Collins. The attachment named 'Summary.DOCX' was treated with confidence as a very rough draft from Eddie and his team, pending edited, cleaner versions. Dr. Fauci reiterated his limited involvement due to the subjects being outside	
125:2-126:18	Dr. Anthony Fauci referred to an email exchange on November 23, 2022, where an individual named Jeremy mentioned 'Pushing WHO again today'. Though Dr. Fauci acknowledges the email, he claims that he wasn't directly involved with the WHO himself. However, he did express the shared opinion amongst the team that the WHO should get involved, due to their standing and role as an international global health authority, and to ensure open and transparent discussion.	Discussion Regarding WHO Involvement
126:22-128:24	It was brought to Dr. Anthony Fauci's attention that he had received multiple drafts of a document as attachments in emails from Jeremy. Jeremy sent the first draft on February 4, with the note 'tidied up', though Fauci claims he does not recall receiving this and cannot interpret the meaning of 'tidied up'. Jeremy also sent two subsequent drafts, the second one on the same day (February 4) and the third on February 5. Fauci finds it difficult to ascertain the order and number of drafts due to the speed of questioning.	Jeremy's Multiple Draft Emails
129:1-130:5	Dr. Fauci was questioned about his role and whether he remembered details of multiple drafts regarding the origins of the virus during his deposition on 11/23/2022. Although he acknowledged the existence of more than one draft in February, Dr. Fauci did not confirm the precise number, due to the volume of information dealt with during that	Dr. Fauci's Drafts on Virus Origins
129:1-130:5	On his deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci, was questioned about his recollection of drafts sent to him. These drafts, sent around February 7th, were regarding the origins of the	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Memory of Drafts on Virus Origin

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	virus. The exact number of drafts is uncertain, at least a couple but possibly four. Dr. Fauci could not confirm the exact number, emphasizing the significant amount of information that was processed during that period.	
129:10-130:5	The deposition also covered discussions about Peter Daszak's organization of a statement for The Lancet. This letter was published in February 2020, however, Dr. Fauci was unable to definitively recall it. He reasoned that numerous items of significance come across his desk, so it's possible that he was not directly aware of or able to recall this particular event.	Peter Daszak's Effort on a Lancet Statement
130:17-132:25	During the deposition, a document was brought into question which included an email from a 'Jeremy' mentioning contact with the World Health Organization (WHO). This document revealed discussions about the work of a WHO-convened group. Dr. Fauci confirmed the discussion, however, he did not distinctly recall having a call with WHO that was suggested in Jeremy's email.	Fauci's Correspondence with WHO
131:24-132:21	Dr. Fauci was inquired about putting forward names into the WHO group, as mentioned in the e-mails. While he didn't initially recall doing so, after reviewing the emails, he remembered suggesting the name of Pardis Sabeti from the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard as an expert on Coronavirus evolution for the working group.	E-mails Regarding WHO Group Formation
133:1-135:2	Dr. Anthony Fauci, in a deposition on 11/23/2022, discussed the selection of experts to be included in the World Health Organisation's (WHO) work. He mentions the gathering of these names might have involved discussions with his institute. He indicated that he could have picked several of these names by asking members of his institute, such as the division of microbiology and infectious diseases. The reasoning was these people had	Proposal of Experts for the WHO's Work

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	fluency in molecular virology.	
133:10-135:14	There was some controversy over the inclusion of Joseph DeRisi's name on the list. Dr. Fauci explained that although the email was from him, the names, including those he couldn't recognize such as DeRisi, likely came in part from others in his institute. Dr. Fauci emphasizes the importance of context while explaining his responses.	Inclusion of DeRisi's Name in the List
133:10-134:25	Dr. Fauci explains that Joseph DeRisi was listed as part of the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, which funds research institutions at the University of California, San Francisco. Dr. Fauci does not recognize Joseph DeRisi and it's likely his name was recommended from someone in his institute.	Joseph DeRisi and the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub
134:19-136:7	Dr. Fauci mentions Pardis Sabeti, a well-known virologist, and Don Gannon. He acknowledges their inclusion in the email, but indicates that it is unlikely that he conferred with either one before sending their names to Jeremy for inclusion in the WHO group. Some names were known to him while others were provided by his staff.	Mention of Pardis Sabeti & Don Gannon
136:16-136:25	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci discusses the communication he received from Jeremy about planning a call to 'frame the work of the group'. Dr. Fauci interpreted this to mean defining the group's theme, asking relevant questions, and identifying the issue at hand to guide the group discussion.	Workflow Framing of the Group
137:1-139:25	In the deposition of Dr. Anthony Fauci taking place on November 23, 2022, the questioner asked about discussions concerning the framing of the World Health Organization (WHO) group's work. The deposition referenced possible pressure on the WHO from 'our' and Dr. Fauci's teams. Fauci denied any knowledge of these discussions or exerting any pressure on the WHO. He stated that everyone, according to his recollection and emails, wanted the WHO to be involved	Discussion About Framing World Health Organization Group's Work

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	because of its credibility and convening power.	
137:13-139:20	In the same deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked about a WHO-sponsored trip to China to investigate the origins of a virus. While Dr. Fauci stressed that he could not remember details at the time of the discussion, he did acknowledge that a WHO group was eventually sent to China. However, he could not recall specifics about the discussions leading to the creation of this group.	World Health Organization Sponsored Trip to China
138:13-140:13	Dr. Anthony Fauci indicated during his deposition that he likely recommended Dr. Clifford Lane for the World Health Organization's investigation trip to China in February 2020. He praised Dr. Lane's extensive experience at the international level and confirmed that Dr. Lane did attend the trip. However, Fauci did not recall why he received an email entitled 'WHO advance team on way to China, Tedros tweet'.	Recommendation for WHO's China Trip
138:14-140:23	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked if he made any public statements about the origins of the virus in February 2020 and if he had any communications with Peter Daszak on the same topic. While he did not recall specific details about such statements or communications, he acknowledged that he might have had such interactions.	Fauci's Public Statements and Contacts Regarding Virus Origin
139:20-140:25	In response to questions about his relationship with Peter Daszak, Dr. Fauci testified that he did not know him well. He did not clearly remember having any specific conversations or contacts with Daszak about the origins of the virus.	Fauci's Relationship with Peter Daszak
141:1-143:25	In his deposition on November 23rd, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed his extensive experience appearing as a guest on several hundred podcasts over the past years. He noted that he does not remember all the podcasts he attended due to the sheer volume. It is highlighted that he couldn't recall	Dr. Fauci's Participation in Podcasts

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	participating in a specific podcast with Newt Gingrich and Peter Daszak on February 9th, 2020, until shown an advertisement of the said podcast.	
141:2-143:25	At different points in the deposition on November 23rd, 2022, there were objections from an unseen individual, identified as Mr. Kirschner, on the grounds of 'lack of foundation'. The objections were made when Dr. Fauci was asked about purported comments he made during a podcast with Newt Gingrich.	Testimony Objection on the Deposition
141:9-142:17	Dr. Fauci explained the concept of the 'Director's Page' on the websites of the National Institute of Health (NIH) and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). This virtual page is a repository for media events, podcasts, or papers from NIAID that are considered significant. When Dr. Fauci participates in these media events, the links are sometimes made available on this page for wider public access.	The Director's Page at NIAID
142:5-144:20	Although he did not recall making specific comments, Dr. Fauci acknowledged he likely spoke about COVID-19 being from an 'animal reservoir' on Newt Gingrich's podcast, according to a transcript presented during the deposition. This was in response to Gingrich bringing up an 'urban legend' about the virus escaping from a biological warfare center in Wuhan.	Remarks on Newt Gingrich's Podcast
142:13-144:19	Dr. Fauci, despite not remembering his exact words in the podcast, explains his thought process during the time. He stated that evidence and past precedent implied that the novel coronavirus most likely came from an animal reservoir. He cited the example of SARS-CoV-1, which was found to have originated from a bat, then spread to a civet cat, and subsequently to humans.	Understanding of Coronavirus Origin
145:1-147:25	During a deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr.	Dr. Fauci's Response

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Anthony Fauci was questioned by attorney Mr. Sauer about his statement surrounding the origins of viruses from animal reservoirs. Dr. Fauci stated that his comments were based on historical experiences, which suggest that diseases often emerge from animal reservoirs. He sought to clarify this historical context about disease origins.	on Animal Reservoir Origins of Viruses
145:1-147:25	Mr. Sauer brought up speculation that the coronavirus might have emerged from a biological weapons laboratory in Wuhan, China, or from a local wet market. Quoting from a transcript, Mr. Sauer asked Dr. Fauci about his views on the issue. Dr. Fauci acknowledged the statements documented in the transcript but did not recall specifics of the interview or the conversation.	Discussion on the Rumors Regarding Coronavirus Origin
145:14-147:14	Mr. Sauer questioned Dr. Fauci about his interactions with Dr. Daszak, especially concerning discussions on the origins of the virus. Dr. Fauci admitted he had possibly conversed with Daszak, but could not recall specifics of the conversation or the context, since he participates in many podcasts.	Dr. Fauci's Recall of Interactions with Dr. Daszak
146:15-148:25	Mr. Sauer presented Exhibit 17, a page from Dr. Fauci's official Outlook calendar dated February 11, 2020, which marked a meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric at 2:30 pm. Dr. Fauci affirmed the content of the exhibit but did not give further comments or details about the meeting.	Evidence of Meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric
146:15-148:3	When inquired about his personal encounters with renowned scientist Dr. Ralph Baric, Dr. Fauci admitted to knowing of him but had no clear memory of any direct discussion or meeting. He did not deny the probability, as he meets numerous scientists due to his professional position.	Enquiry about Dr. Fauci's Interaction with Dr. Ralph Baric
149:5-149:23	It was discussed whether Dr. Anthony Fauci and Emily Erbelding had a meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric on February 11th, 2020. Dr. Fauci confirmed that according to his calendar, the	Meeting with Dr. Ralph Baric

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	meeting was scheduled, but he did not recall the occurrence of this meeting or its contents. The meeting was said to have taken place in the conference room, 7A-18, at NIH, where Dr. Fauci has numerous meetings.	
150:11-152:6	Dr. Fauci agreed with the assertion that misinformation and disinformation can lead to the loss of life. He highlighted that it is particularly dangerous when it discourages people from getting vaccinated. Despite acknowledging its danger, he emphasized that it was not within his area of expertise to suggest steps to curb dissemination of misinformation or disinformation, and he respects the rights to freedom of speech.	Effects of Misinformation and Disinformation
150:17-152:25	An e-mail from Ian Lipkin dated February 11th, 2020, was introduced as Exhibit 18. However, the details of this correspondence were not disclosed in the discussed section of the deposition.	Exhibit 18: E-mail from Ian Lipkin
150:21-152:15	Dr. Fauci stated he had not contacted any social media company to request the removal of misinformation. The nature of his discussions with Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg, according to him, was focused primarily on encouraging people to get vaccinated. To his knowledge, no one from his staff at NIAID has ever contacted a social media platform to either take down or block content.	Contact with Social Media over Misinformation
153:3-154:1	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was unable to confirm whether he was copied on an email from an individual named Ian. Fauci explained that he typically receives thousands of emails a day and thus, does not specifically recall receiving the email in question. However, he did remark that he regularly had communications with Ian, though he does not recall the specific email being discussed.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Receipt of Emails
153:21-155:25	When asked about the content of Ian's email, specifically a phrase mentioning 'a nightmare of circumstantial evidence,' Dr. Anthony Fauci	Inquiry on Quote from Ian's Email

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	stated he was unsure of the exact context. The email mentioned 'bat CO research' pursued at the institute in Wuhan, highlighting it as the site of the first human cases. Fauci suggested that Ian may be referring to the tendency of people to draw conclusions between research and outbreak locations, but could not	
154:7-156:25	When asked about the hypothetical situation of the virus having escaped from a research lab in Wuhan, Dr. Fauci reiterated the need for context. If such an event had occurred, he explained that the focus should remain on how to prevent future incidents. He also emphasized the necessity of good surveillance between humans and animals, regardless of whether the cause was natural or man-made.	Considerations of Escaped Virus
154:25-156:3	Fauci stated he does not tend to think in terms of circumstantial evidence. Instead, he expressed greater interest in understanding the origin of an outbreak to ensure prevention in the future. While he affirmed the importance of keeping an open mind about the etiology, Fauci leaned towards a natural occurrence for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, based on the evidence available to him.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's View on Circumstantial Evidence
155:10-156:25	When asked about a scenario in which the research that had created the virus was partially funded by NIAID, Dr. Fauci explained the context. He described the molecular makeup of SARS-CoV-2 and the viruses studied under the subaward to the Wuhan Institute. He clarified that given the disparity in their molecular structures, it would require a reasonable acquaintance with evolutionary virology to conclude that the SARS-CoV-2 virus could have resulted from the research done at the Wuhan Institute.	Role of NIAID in Research
157:1-158:19	Dr Anthony Fauci, speaking on November 23, 2022, stated that it would be 'molecularly impossible' for any manipulated variants of SARS-CoV-2 to become SARS-CoV-2 itself. He elaborated that such transformation can't	Potential of SARS-CoV-2 Manipulation

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	occur, even if people tried to manipulate it intentionally. He further explained that it is inappropriate for people to conflate laboratory leaks and the research funded by the NIH. Additionally, he kept open the possibility of a leak out of a Chinese lab, but insisted it couldn't have been from experiments funded by the NIH.	
157:25-158:16	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was questioned about the awareness of a large number of genomic sequences being pulled down from the Wuhan Institute of Virology's website in September 2019. Dr. Fauci confirmed his awareness and stated that even though these sequences were removed, they were still published in the academic literature.	Removal of Genomic Sequences from Database
158:2-159:7	Dr. Fauci was presented with a preprint version of the Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2 dating February 17, 2020. He acknowledged the document, stating it looked like the preprint that antedated the full papers published in peer-reviewed literature, but indicated uncertainty as to whether he fully reviewed it upon its release.	Presentation and Recognition of Preprint Version of the Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2
159:13-160:25	During the deposition, it was discussed that drafts of a scientific paper were sent to Dr. Fauci by Jeremy Farrar, possibly written up by Eddie Holmes. Though he was unsure of the exact details, Dr. Fauci confirmed that he did receive correspondence regarding these drafts and acknowledged the names mentioned.	Confirmation of Correspondence Regarding Drafts
159:25-160:12	Fauci confirmed he had been involved in discussing four drafts of a paper related to SARS-CoV-2. These drafts were sent to him on February 4th, 5th, and 7th. He acknowledged receipt of these drafts but attested that he made no substantive comments nor fully understood it as he's not an evolutionary virologist.	Reviewing Nature of Dr. Fauci's Involvement in Paper Drafts
161:1-163:6	The discussion involves a paper whose authors include Eddie Holmes and Jeremy Farrar. The paper in question has five authors, all of	Discussion on the Authorship of a Paper

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	were apparently part of a call organized by Jeremy Farrar on February 1. The exact participation of each author in the call is not conclusively confirmed. The name Ian Lipkin is also brought up, apparently connected to an email mentioning circumstantial evidence, but any significant details remain unclear.	
161:1-163:6	Dr. Fauci confirmed his awareness of the paper's conclusion but his interaction with the authors regarding it remains uncertain. The most likely instances of discussion would have been with co-authors Francis Collins and Jeremy Farrar, but exact details of such discussions are not provided.	Dr. Fauci's Personal Connection with the Paper's Co-Authors
161:13-162:22	The name Ian Lipkin is mentioned in the discussion, suggesting a possible connection to an email about circumstantial evidence that's being examined. However, the extent of his involvement is not established in the provided transcript.	Ian Lipkin's Possible Involvement
162:1-163:6	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed a sentence from a paper that stated, 'SARS-CoV-2 is not a laboratory construct nor a purposely manipulated virus.' He confirmed he was aware of this conclusion but couldn't recall whether he had any discussions with the authors about the conclusion. Furthermore, he possibly discussed the conclusion of the paper with Francis Collins, Director of NIH, and perhaps with Jeremy Farrar, but no definite confirmation of these discussions is provided.	Interpretation of a Paper's Conclusion
162:7-164:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci was presented with Exhibit 20, an article from the NIH record titled 'NIAID's Lane Discusses WHO COVID-19 Mission to China', featuring Dr. Cliff Lane. The document quotes Dr. Lane as stating, after his return from a trip, that the Chinese were 'managing this in a very structured, organized way' when it came to controlling the outbreak. He also noted that the measures China implemented appeared to be successful.	Exhibit 20 and Dr. Cliff Lane's Statement

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
165:2-167:2	In a discussion with Dr. Anthony Fauci, Dr. Lane shared his observations from his trip to China under WHO. He was impressed by the structured and organized approach taken by the Chinese authorities in handling the outbreak, particularly their methods of isolation, contact tracing, and facility establishment for medical care. This conversation took place after Dr. Lane's return, with the precise date unclear from the transcript.	Dr. Lane's Observations from WHO Trip to China
165:2-167:12	Questions were raised about whether Dr. Lane was in contact with Chinese officials during his visit and whether Dr. Fauci knew about it. However, Dr. Fauci's testimony is inconclusive, as he stated he wasn't sure about Dr. Lane's communications with Chinese officials during his trip.	Dr. Lane's Communication with Chinese Officials
165:2-167:1	During the deposition, it was discussed that Dr. Lane concluded from his trip that extreme social distancing measures might be necessary to control the outbreak. The exact discussion with Dr. Fauci about this conclusion is not explicitly recalled by Dr. Fauci in the deposition, dated 11/23/2022. However, Dr. Fauci did affirm his trust in Dr. Lane's astute clinical sense and therefore accepted the validity of his evaluation.	Dr. Lane's Conclusion About Measures to Control Outbreak
166:16-168:25	When asked whether he believed that extreme measures, similar to those implemented by China, would be required to control the spread of the virus in the United States, Dr. Fauci stated that his view was that social distancing could indeed be effective.	Dr. Fauci's Views on Extreme Measures to Control Virus Spread
167:14-168:25	Dr. Fauci was shown an email from Dr. Lane dated February 22, 2020, in which Dr. Lane asserted that China had demonstrated that the infection could be controlled at 'great cost.' Dr. Fauci interpreted 'great cost' as referring to the extremeness of the methods employed by the Chinese authorities, including	Dr. Lane's Email on Infection Control at Great Cost

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	lockdowns.	
169:1-170:7	Dr. Anthony Fauci asserts the importance of social distancing measures adopted early on in the epidemic, specifically mentioning the extraordinary level of suffering and death seen when the virus hit New York hard. He explains this control measure being imperative to prevent overwhelming healthcare infrastructure and having to resort to triage actions. He mentions that social distancing, though it may be implemented by difficult means, is necessary to save lives in extreme conditions.	Discussion on imperative nature of social distancing
169:1-170:7	Dr. Anthony Fauci and the attorney discuss on the scope of social distancing. Questions were raised if it should only include high-risk individuals or society as a whole. Fauci argued that in order to interrupt a significant explosion of infections, one must involve the entire community.	Debate around the scope of social distancing
170:13-172:25	An email thread involving Dr. Anthony Fauci, Christian Anderson, Jeremy Farrar, and Francis Collins is handed to Dr. Fauci for review. It also includes the authors of a paper on the 'Proximal Origins of COVID-19' that they looked at earlier in the preprint version.	Introduction to Fauci Exhibit No. 22
170:13-172:23	Dr. Fauci states that while he was thanked in an email from Christian Anderson for his advice and leadership, his contribution to the development of the 'Proximal Origins of COVID-19' paper was negligible. He suggests that the acknowledgment may have been more related to general leadership and advice rather than to specific input on the paper.	Clarification on Fauci's role in the paper preparation
170:13-172:23	Questions were directed to Dr. Fauci about comments he might have made on the paper. Fauci indicated that he remembers no substantive comments he made on the paper and he didn't make any substantial contribution to it, possibly except for general courtesy comments like 'nice job'.	Discussion on Dr. Fauci's comments on the research paper

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
173:13-175:25	During the deposition, an email exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci and Mark Zuckerberg was discussed. The first noted email was sent on February 27, 2020, from Zuckerberg to Dr. Fauci regarding the COVID-19 vaccine. Questions were raised concerning Dr. Fauci's relationship with Zuckerberg, with Dr. Fauci noting that the first time he could recall meeting Zuckerberg was likely over a Zoom call and in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.	Dr. Fauci's Email Exchange with Mark Zuckerberg
174:1-176:25	Questions were raised regarding Dr. Fauci's familiarity and relationship with Mark Zuckerberg. Dr. Fauci confirmed that while many people who haven't met him call him by his first name, he couldn't recall the first time he met Zuckerberg, possibly being through virtual means. It is uncertain whether they have ever personally met.	Dr. Fauci's Familiarity with Mark Zuckerberg
174:1-176:1	Dr. Fauci confirmed that he has had multiple interactions with Mark Zuckerberg, primarily through Zoom and Facebook events. He could not definitively confirm if he'd ever physically met with Zuckerberg or if these interactions predated the outbreak of COVID-	Dr. Fauci's Interactions with Mark Zuckerberg
174:6-175:9	Dr. Fauci was asked about his relations with researchers at the Chan Zuckerberg Institute. He clarified that he is aware of the institute's support to the San Francisco General Hospital, as well as the University of California, San Francisco General Hospital and has interactions with researchers from the San Francisco General Hospital. It is not clear what those relationships entail beyond general familiarity.	Dr. Fauci's Relationship with the Chan Zuckerberg Institute
176:1-176:25	The deposition mentioned an email from Zuckerberg to Dr. Fauci dated March 15, 2020, present in the document. An invitation by Zuckerberg for Dr. Fauci to participate in a live-stream Q and A session was discussed, although it's unclear from the transcript whether this event took place.	Email from Mark Zuckerberg on March 15, 2020

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
177:2-178:4	On 23rd November 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci testified about his involvement in three Facebook livestream Q&A sessions, where he was asked various questions pertaining to public health measures and the virus. The topics discussed included the nature of the virus, how it spreads and the importance of precautionary measures.	Dr. Fauci's Livestream Q&A Sessions
177:6-178:16	During the proceedings, attention was drawn to a phone number found in one of the exhibits, believed to belong to Mark Zuckerberg. It was noted by counsel for the defense that the document is confidential and that precaution should be taken to redact the information before it becomes a public record. Both parties agreed to maintain the confidentiality of this information.	Discussion on Redacting Personal Information
177:10-178:4	Dr. Fauci testified that Facebook had offered millions of dollars of free ad credits to the U.S. government for public service announcements (PSAs). However, he stated that he did not have the authority to accept such an offer, and that it would have to go through another channel. The specific details on whether the offer was accepted and utilized were unclear, as Dr. Fauci mentioned that he did not have certain knowledge about any money being given for PSAs.	Facebook's Offer of Free Ad Credits
178:21-180:25	Another point of discussion was about the published version of a scientific paper titled 'Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2'. The document that had been published online on March 17th, 2020 was reviewed where it was concluded that the virus was neither a laboratory construct nor purposely manipulated. The extent of Dr. Fauci's involvement in formulating this conclusion was queried.	Examination of COVID-19 Related Scientific Paper
178:21-180:25	Dr. Fauci clarified that his input into the formulation of the conclusion featured in the 'Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2' paper was minimal, if there was any at all. The conclusion was based on the analysis by the	Dr. Fauci's Input on Scientific Conclusion

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	paper. He further testified that he did not recall having any communication regarding the conclusion within the timeframe of March 8th to March 17th.	
181:1-182:21	On November 23rd, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci's deposition included a discussion about a preprint he had previously read. Although Dr. Fauci could not recall specific conversations, he noted that the preprint's conclusion, asserting that the virus in question was not a laboratory construct or purposely manipulated, was widely discussed. Dr. Fauci expected to have discussed this conclusion with others following its release in the public knowledge, but could not specifically remember with whom these conversations might have taken place.	Discussion on Conclusion of a Preprint
182:5-184:25	The NIH Director Francis Collins' blog, dated March 26, 2020, was discussed. In the blog, Collins refuted the claim that the new coronavirus was engineered in a lab by referencing a study providing scientific evidence for the natural origin of the virus. The blog also referred to the Nature Medicine article 'Proximal Origins of COVID-19' as possessing reassuring findings. Dr. Fauci could not recall whether he had discussed this blog with Collins beforehand.	Francis Collins' Blog on 'Proximal Origins of COVID-19'
182:5-184:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned about Exhibit No. 25, which was a copy of a blog published on March 26, 2020 by Francis Collins, the NIH director. The cover page of the blog indicated that it was posted by Dr. Collins. Dr. Fauci was asked to confirm the contents on the second page of the document, particularly Director Collins' rebuttal of claims that the novel coronavirus causing the pandemic was engineered in a lab. This claim was refuted by scientific evidence showing that the virus arose naturally.	Exhibit No. 25: NIH Director's Blog
182:25-184:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned whether he was aware that Francis Collins was publishing a blog addressing the Nature Medicine article	Uncertainty of Prior Knowledge About Francis Collins'

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	'Proximal Origins of COVID-19'. Although he did not recall being aware that Dr. Collins was preparing this blog, he suggested that it was likely that someone would have brought this to his attention. He could not recollect reading this specific blog, but mentioned that he probably saw it considering he frequently read the NIH director's blogs.	Blog
184:1-184:25	When asked if he recalled discussing with Francis Collins about the blog before it was published, Dr. Fauci stated that such a conversation may have taken place but he could not specifically remember. He noted that he does not find it surprising if he had discussed it with Francis Collins, given the number of discussions they likely have, but he doesn't have a specific memory of this particular conversation.	No Clear Recollection on Conversation with Francis Collins About Blog
185:20-186:10	During the deposition dated 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was presented with and acknowledged an ABC News article titled 'Sorry, conspiracy theorists. Study concludes COVID-19 is not a laboratory construct' dated March 27, 2020. Dr. Fauci confirmed he was aware of the article but did not recall specifically communicating with the media regarding this.	Dr. Fauci's Acknowledgement of Nature Medicine Article Media Coverage
186:8-188:6	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was presented with an email, indexed as Exhibit No. 27, dated April 14th, 2020 from Dr. Francis Collins. He confirmed reading it but could not recall receiving it, elaborating that the email was several years old which might have led to lack of specific memory.	Email Correspondence with Dr. Francis Collins
186:14-186:18	Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked during the deposition whether any staff member from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), the organization he oversees, had communicated with the media about the Nature Medicine article. Dr. Fauci stated that he did not recall if they did.	Discussion on Involvement of NIAID Staff in Media Communication
186:19-187:6	Dr. Anthony Fauci, during the deposition, was	Communication

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	asked if he had any communication with Dr. Francis Collins regarding the Nature Medicine article post Dr. Collins' March 26th blog. Dr. Fauci expressed that he doesn't remember any specific conversation, although he wouldn't be surprised if there was some communication.	with Dr. Francis Collins
187:16-188:19	According to the email shown during the deposition, Dr. Francis Collins seemed concerned about the spread of 'destructive conspiracy' and contemplated whether there was anything the NIH could do to curtail it. Despite not remembering receiving the email, Dr. Fauci acknowledged that Dr. Collins had a clear intent to address misinformation.	Dr. Collins' Concern Over Misinformation
189:1-191:25	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discusses an interaction regarding a Nature Medicine article on the genomic sequence of a virus, which was hoped to settle debates about the virus' origin. However, the article didn't achieve much visibility, leading to a discussion on ways to increase its outreach. The discussion involved Francis (full-name not provided) who appeared unsettled by claims of the virus being a deliberate development. Fauci interprets Francis' email, suggesting that Francis believes in the scientific data pointing towards the virus' natural emergence rather than unsupported	Discussion on Origin of Virus and Nature Medicine Article
189:1-190:3	In the discussions, the veracity and intention of Dr. Collins' email and statements were questioned, but Fauci suggested asking Dr. Collins directly for accurate interpretation. This response met an objection from Mr. Kirschner, claiming it mischaracterizes the evidence.	Questions over Dr. Collins' Inference
189:1-191:25	The discussion includes the possibility of asking the National Academy to review the evidence, which could help make the Nature Medicine article and its conclusion more visible and thereby counteract destructive conspiracy theories. However, Dr. Fauci couldn't recall whether this plan was initiated.	Consideration of External Review

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
191:10-192:25	Dr. Fauci's response to the initial email was that he believed the Nature Medicine article should speak for itself and didn't see the need to take further action to increase its visibility. He referred to the conspiracy theories as a 'shiny object' that would eventually lose public interest.	Fauci's Response to Email
192:13-192:25	In the discussion, Dr. Fauci refers to conspiracy theories about the virus, potentially of it being manufactured intentionally, as a 'shiny object' - a temporary attraction that the public might find intriguing, but which he considers will eventually fade away.	Referring to Conspiracy Theories as a 'Shiny Object'
193:1-195:17	Fauci expressed uncertainty regarding his efforts to promote or increase the visibility of the Nature Medicine article, citing his busy schedule. He indicated that while he likely discussed the article since it was a topic of considerable concern, he did not prioritize propagating it.	Fauci's Role and Involvement in Promoting Information
193:1-195:7	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed the theory that COVID-19 was intentionally created by the Chinese and released into society. Fauci referred to this theory as a 'shiny object' - something with no evidence backing it but garnering attention nonetheless. He emphasized his inclination to stick with science and let data, like that published in Nature Medicine, drive conclusions.	Fauci's Opinion on COVID-19 Origin Theory
193:1-195:25	Fauci argued that spreading misinformation and disinformation could have negative impacts, such as diverting efforts from pursuing accurate information. This could indirectly lead to loss of life since resources would be wasted on following up on false leads instead of focusing on scientifically valid paths.	Consequences of Disinformation
193:15-194:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci distinguished between misinformation and disinformation during the deposition, noting that misinformation	Misinformation Vs. Disinformation

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	pertains to untrue statements potentially propagated unknowingly, while disinformation is knowingly spreading false information. Fauci considered the theory about the origin of COVID-19 potentially being a lab in China as misinformation, given the absence of corroborative evidence at the time of the deposition.	
194:1-196:19	The discussion also touched upon a specific article from Nature Medicine with Christian Anderson as the corresponding author. Fauci recognized the article but downplayed his role in its creation, despite acknowledging the receipt of several drafts via email. The article, titled 'Proximal Origins of COVID-19', became a subject of concern, likely due to its relevance to the COVID-19 origin discussion.	Nature Medicine Article
197:1-199:8	Dr. Fauci confirmed that on the same day as the press conference held on April 17, 2020, he had communicated with Dr. Collins via email. The content or purpose of the email was not described in detail in the deposition transcript.	Dr. Fauci's Correspondence with Dr. Collins
197:1-198:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed that on April 17th, 2020, he was a member of the Coronavirus Task Force and participated in a briefing with President Trump and Vice President Pence. A transcript of the briefing introduced into evidence showed that Dr. Fauci did participate in the conference, as indicated by his quoted remarks.	Dr. Fauci's Involvement in Coronavirus Task Force
198:1-200:25	Dr. Fauci acknowledged through the transcript provided that he addressed a question from the media concerning suggestions that the virus was manmade or possibly emerged from a laboratory in China. Fauci did not recall the specifics of his statements due to the numerous White House press conferences he attended.	Questions Regarding Virus Origin
198:1-200:25	The deposition transcript cites Dr. Fauci's response to a media question about virus evolution. He referred to a recent study by	Dr. Fauci's Explanation of Virus Evolution

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	evolutionary virologists examining the virus sequences in bats. He suggested that evidence showed the virus's evolution was consistent with a species jump from an animal to a human.	
198:1-200:25	The transcript suggests that Dr. Fauci referred to a research paper in his response to the media question about the virus's origin. He assured that it would be made available, although he didn't remember the authors at that time. It is suggested that this is the same paper he discussed with Dr. Collins via email.	Discussion on Research Paper
201:1-203:17	Dr. Anthony Fauci clarified the source of a scientific paper he referenced during a White House task force briefing on April 17th, 2022. It is assumed to be the Nature Medicine paper regarding the origin of the coronavirus. Although Dr. Fauci did not make the paper available to reporters, he identified that he might have shared the links discussed during the meeting with the vice president's press person, Katie Miller. These links pertain to scientific papers and commentary about the coronavirus.	Fauci Clarifies Source of COVID-19 Information
201:16-203:14	Dr. Fauci addresses an instance from a coronavirus task force press conference where he mentioned sharing a scientific paper with the press. It was later confirmed that he didn't directly share the paper with reporters, but sent links regarding the subject to the vice president's press person, Katie Miller, which may have included the desired scientific papers.	Discussion on Press Conference and Information Sharing
201:20-203:16	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledged an April 19th, 2020, email from a reporter named Bill Gertz, facilitated by Katie Miller, the press person for Vice President Pence. The email requested a copy of the referenced scientific paper from the Nature Medicine publication, 'Proximal Origin of SARS-CoV-2'. Dr. Fauci also sent links to two other citations both authored by Eddie Holmes, who was involved in the drafting of the	Fauci's Email Interaction with Member of Press

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	paper.	
203:14-204:25	Dr. Fauci confirmed an email exchange with Peter Daszak dated April 18-19, 2020. The written conversation took place after the coronavirus task force press conference. It appears that Dr. Fauci was asked to pass information to another individual, David. Here, Fauci clarified that David was a reference to David Morens, a scientist at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). It was suggested that Morens knew Peter Daszak, but no direct connection was confirmed in the deposition.	Email Exchange with Peter Daszak
203:19-204:23	Dr. Fauci identified David Morens as a scientist at NIAID who has been with the organization for a long time. In the email exchange with Peter Daszak, Fauci confirms it as true that Daszak intended to send information to Morens for further actions. The content of the information or relevance was not clarified in the deposition.	Identification of David Morens and Relation to the Issue
205:1-207:15	Dr. Anthony Fauci revealed that he receives hundreds to two thousand emails every day. While not every email receives a response, those that are deemed relevant by his team, often originating from legitimate scientists, are brought to his attention and often get responses.	Daily Email Volume and Response Practice
205:1-207:22	Dr. Anthony Fauci testified on 11/23/2022 regarding his relationship with Peter Daszak. Fauci clarified that he knows Daszak but does not have a direct relationship or friendship with him, affirming that he has seen Daszak a few times and once participated in a podcast with him. Daszak is a grantee of NIAID, making it appropriate for Fauci to receive email correspondence from him.	Dr. Fauci's Relation with Peter Daszak
205:14-206:3	During the deposition, Fauci confirmed that Erik Stemmy and Emily Erbeling, who were copied in certain email correspondence, are members of his staff at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). He	NIAID Staff Correspondence

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	also believes Aleksei Chmura, another person copied in correspondence, is part of NIAID but was not 100% certain.	
205:24-206:19	In response to queries about the accessibility of his email address, Dr. Fauci explained that his email address is publicly available through the global National Institute of Health (NIH) website. He clarified that no redaction is applicable for such public information.	Dr. Fauci's Public Email Details
207:24-208:25	Dr. Fauci was asked about his awareness of censorship on social media, specifically the removal of content suggesting the coronavirus might have escaped from a lab after his April 17 speech at the White House Coronavirus Task Force briefing. Fauci stated that he was not aware of any such censorship or suppression of speech, neither on social media in general, nor specifically on Twitter.	Censorship of Lab Leak Hypothesis Discussion on Social Media
209:1-211:25	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci highlighted his minimal engagement with social media platforms. These platforms were discussed in the context of contradictory claims about the origin of the COVID-19 virus being posted and subsequently removed. Despite being a central figure in the coronavirus response, Dr. Fauci emphasized that he does not use platforms like Twitter or Facebook, limiting his direct exposure to such incidents.	Dr. Fauci's Engagement with Social Media
209:1-211:25	A recurring theme throughout the deposition was the issue of the origin of the coronavirus. A Chinese virologist's Twitter account suspension occurred in the context of her claim that the virus was manmade. Also, Meta's update highlighted their policy of challenging consequential misinformation about the coronavirus, including claims about its artificial origin. These issues underline the spread of misinformation and the response of social media platforms.	Discussion on the Origin of the COVID-19 Virus
209:7-210:8	In the deposition dated 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about his knowledge of certain incidents involving	Dr. Fauci's Awareness of Social Media Actions

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	media companies. He was asked about Twitter's suspension of a Chinese virologist's account, which was allegedly due to the virologist's claim that the coronavirus was manmade. Dr. Fauci stated that while the incident might have been brought to his attention, he did not clearly recall it. He emphasized that he does not have a Twitter or Facebook account and doesn't pay attention to social media.	
210:15-212:25	Mr. Sauer presented an exhibit discussing Facebook's alleged censorship of an award-winning journalist who had criticized the World Health Organization (WHO). The journalist was identified as a man named Ian Birrell. Despite being asked, Dr. Fauci claimed that he had not heard of Birrell.	Facebook's Alleged Censorship
210:15-212:14	Dr. Fauci was shown a document from Meta, entitled 'Update on our work to keep people informed and limit misinformation about COVID-19'. A key point discussed was Meta's policy to remove debunked claims about the coronavirus being manmade or manufactured. Dr. Fauci suggested that he might have been informally informed about Meta's actions, but didn't explicitly recall being aware of such policies.	Meta's Work on COVID-19 Misinformation
213:1-213:6	Deposition for Dr. Anthony Fauci held on 11/23/2022 reveals that Dr. Fauci does not recall any knowledge about Ian Birrel, a multi-award winning investigative reporter. He stated that if the transcript hadn't mentioned Ian's credentials, he wouldn't have identified him.	Knowledge about Ian Birrel
213:9-214:15	During the deposition held on 11/23/2022, Dr Fauci affirms that he has no direct involvement with the social media conversations regarding the removal of discussions about the lab-leak theory of Covid-19 origins. He mentioned he has almost zero association with social media, without any account or activity on such platforms.	Involvement in Social Media Interaction

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
214:1-216:25	The issue of hydroxychloroquine's efficacy or lack of it against coronavirus was a topic for on-and-off discussions both within National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and the scientific community. Dr Fauci recalls discussing the matter with a number of individuals, including particularly Dr. Cliff Lane, Clinical Director of Dr Fauci's institute. Discussion on the topic with people outside NIAID is also likely, given the importance and controversy of the subject.	Interactions regarding Hydroxychloroquine Efficacy
214:1-215:25	Dr Fauci acknowledges the controversy surrounding the 2020 claims of the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in treating COVID-19. His disagreement with these claims were based on the lack of concrete evidence- an assertion backed by clinical studies and guideline groups asserting no proof of hydroxychloroquine working effectively against coronavirus.	Controversy of Hydroxychloroquine for COVID-19 Treatment
214:8-215:19	Dr. Fauci clarified that he did not personally conduct the research on drug efficacy, including hydroxychloroquine. The referenced studies were conducted by other researchers and published in peer-reviewed journals. This information is regarded as applicable in the real world scenario.	Research on Efficacy of Drugs
217:1-219:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci, in a deposition on November 23, 2022, spoke on the risks of the unfounded claims about hydroxychloroquine. He highlighted that the drug, often propagated as a treatment option for COVID-19, could lead to harm, particularly if used based on misinformation. He further stated that he made public statements about the inefficacy of hydroxychloroquine, including at a White House press conference, confirming these were based on more than just anecdotal data.	Dr. Anthony Fauci's Statement on Hydroxychloroquine
217:1-219:25	The deposition mentioned The Lancet's study, published a few days before Fauci's comment, which concluded that hydroxychloroquine has no effect on COVID-	Fauci's Reference to The Lancet Study

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	harm. Despite not being certain it was the specific study he had referred to, Fauci acknowledged that this study was consistent with his statement about hydroxychloroquine's lack of efficacy.	
217:4-218:15	Fauci confirmed that a Politico article titled 'Fauci: Hydroxychloroquine not effective against coronavirus' accurately quoted his statements. He noted the article, from May 22nd, 2020, quoted him saying 'The scientific data is really quite evident now about lack of efficacy', implying hydroxychloroquine's ineffectiveness against COVID-19.	Fauci's Comments on Politico Article
218:1-220:25	Dr. Fauci mentioned the FDA's Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for hydroxychloroquine issued in March 2020. However, he didn't provide an accurate recall about when the FDA issued the EUA or when it was subsequently pulled back.	FDA's Initial EUA on Hydroxychloroquine
218:1-220:25	Dr. Fauci discussed the revocation of the FDA's EUA for hydroxychloroquine, which granted emergency use of the drug. The deposition's details surrounding this event were limited, with Fauci unable to recall his level of involvement or the exact reasons behind the withdrawal of the emergency status.	Revocation of FDA's Hydroxychloroquine EUA
221:1-221:9	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed the Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) process on 11/23/2022. He explained that an unproven drug could be granted an EUA if the potential benefits of the drug might outweigh the risks. However, if incoming data shows no benefits of the drug, it could be grounds for revoking the EUA.	Emergency Use Authorization Criteria for Unproven Drugs
221:14-223:7	There was an examination of a study published in The Lancet journal. Although Dr. Fauci was unable to confirm if it was the same publication referred to in an earlier-discussed Politico article, a marked date of May 22nd, 2020 and the mention of a survey involving 96,032 patients corresponded to Politico's	Discussion on The Lancet Study

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	had, however, been retracted, which Dr. Fauci did not recall being aware of.	
222:12-224:3	Dr. Fauci stated that his opinion of hydroxychloroquine was based on data from numerous studies, apart from the retracted one from The Lancet. He asserted evidence accumulated suggesting hydroxychloroquine was not effective, though acknowledging that not all doctors agreed, and some continued prescribing it for COVID-19 patients.	Dr. Fauci's Opinion on Hydroxychloroquine
223:10-224:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned about his qualifications to question clinical judgments. In particular, he was asked about his capacity to question the decision of a doctor to prescribe hydroxychloroquine to their COVID-19 patients. Dr. Fauci appeared to be uncertain about the intended meaning of 'qualification' in the context of the enquiry.	Questioning of Dr. Fauci's Qualification to Evaluate Doctors' Clinical Judgements
223:19-224:3	The examination highlighted that some doctors disagreed with Dr. Fauci's negative view on hydroxychloroquine and continued to prescribe it for their COVID-19 patients. Dr. Fauci accepted that not every doctor would always concur on every issue.	Divergent Medical Opinions on Hydroxychloroquine
225:1-226:22	Dr. Anthony Fauci, during his deposition on November 23, 2022, affirmed his belief that physicians prescribing a medication with clear potential toxicity and no proven efficacy should be questioned. Although he did not specify the drug, the context suggests that he was referring to the use of hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19 patients. Dr. Fauci expressed concern about this issue, stating that as a physician, he would never want to see a patient harmed by an intervention that has no initial benefit.	Dr. Fauci's Comments on Hydroxychloroquine
225:15-227:25	Dr. Fauci was asked about his knowledge of a video from July 2020, where a group of doctors were touting the supposed benefits of hydroxychloroquine in front of the Supreme Court. Dr. Fauci suggested that he vaguely remembered the event but expressed some	Reference to a Group of Doctors Advocating Hydroxychloroquine

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	the claims made by the group, known as America's Frontline Doctors. He stated that observers at the time were also uncertain about the veracity of the information provided.	
225:15-227:25	Dr. Fauci confirmed that his comments on Good Morning America about the ineffectiveness of hydroxychloroquine were in response to the claims made by America's Frontline Doctors at a gathering in front of the Supreme Court. Although he couldn't recall the exact content of their statements, he did remember that there was criticism about the accuracy of their claims.	Dr. Fauci and America's Frontline Doctors Connection.
226:13-227:13	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was presented with a transcript from an appearance he made on 'Good Morning America' around July 27th or 28th of 2020. The document contained his statement that clinical trials had shown hydroxychloroquine to be ineffective in treating COVID-19. Dr. Fauci acknowledged this statement during the deposition, confirming his position on the issue.	Dr. Fauci's Good Morning America Appearance
228:16-228:17	Dr. Fauci was shown Exhibit No. 37, referred to as a 'Bret Baier article with the headline 'Fauci uncensored.' The document was marked for identification, but its content was not discussed in this part.	Reference to a Removed Bret Baier Article
229:1-231:23	Dr. Fauci suggested that the overwhelmingly negative response to the hydroxychloroquine video came from professionals in established medical centers nationwide. While he didn't conduct a formal poll, he expressed confidence in the general sentiment within his community, stating that many who viewed the video were perplexed by the statements broadly promoting the drug as a treatment for coronavirus.	Medical Community's Reaction to Hydroxychloroquine Video
229:1-231:25	The deposition reveals that Dr. Anthony Fauci, during the time of his testimony on November 23, 2022, questioned the	Dr. Fauci's Stance on Hydroxychloroquine Video

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	reportedly retweeted by President Trump promoting hydroxychloroquine as a coronavirus treatment. Dr. Fauci stated that the claims made in the video didn't make much medical sense to him and others in the medical community. However, he was unable to recall specific details without reviewing the content of the video again.	
230:1-232:25	At a point in the deposition, Dr. Fauci was presented with a Breitbart report detailing a censoring event involving a viral video of doctors at a Capitol Hill Coronavirus press conference. The exact contents of this report or Dr. Fauci's response to it were not detailed in the provided deposition transcript.	Censorship Report on Doctors' Press Conference
230:25-231:23	Dr. Fauci confirmed that he had discussions about hydroxychloroquine's efficacy with numerous people in the medical community. He pointed specifically to the NIH Treatment Guidelines Panel, which comprises leading physicians and healthcare providers specializing in infectious diseases. The panel reviewed existing literature and determined that there was no evidence to support the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine as a treatment for COVID-19.	Discussion on Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine
230:25-232:4	Dr. Fauci was unable to provide an exact date for when the NIH Treatment Guidelines Panel concluded their findings on hydroxychloroquine. However, he affirmed that their determination was clear and could be easily confirmed by referring to the group's public record.	Hydroxychloroquine Determination Timeline
233:1-235:26	There was some confusion on the timeline of Dr. Anthony Fauci's comments to Good Morning America and Andrea Mitchell. The date in question is July 27, 2020. However, difficulty arises in confirming whether the statements were made on the 27th, or reported on the 28th due to inconsistencies about the actual date of the mentioned news article.	Timeline Discrepancies

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
234:1-236:25	A video was posted by Breitbart News on Facebook regarding a press conference in DC held by America's Frontline Doctors. There was a suggestion that they were the group Dr. Fauci was disagreeing with in his statements. It was further noted that the video attracted over 17 million views during the eight hours it was hosted on Facebook.	Facebook Video Sharing Event
234:15-236:25	Dr. Fauci indicated he would be troubled if a large number of people were given information not based on data or contrary to existing data. This was in response to a hypothetical scenario about the widely-viewed video which touted the benefits of hydroxychloroquine as a Covid-19 treatment.	Concern Regarding Misinformation
234:19-236:7	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed indifference towards the number of views the video garnered. He explained that he does not engage in social media, and that he wouldn't even know how to track the number of views of a video on such platforms.	Fauci's Remarks on the Shared Video
235:1-236:11	Dr. Fauci conveyed his uncertainty about what 17 million views imply. He didn't know if it represented a large or small view count as he isn't involved in social media.	Clarification on View Counts
237:1-237:8	Dr. Anthony Fauci commented on his stance against spreading false information concerning patient health, particularly when it's not based on data. He declared his disapproval for such falseness during his deposition on 11/23/2022, though he stated this wouldn't necessarily prompt him to take any specific action.	Dr. Fauci on Spreading False Information
238:1-240:25	In response to queries regarding Twitter following Facebook and YouTube's decision and also removing the video, Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he could have simply overlooked the matter without much consideration, given his primary medical responsibilities and lack of involvement in these social media operations.	Video Removal from Twitter

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
238:1-239:7	Dr. Fauci stated he has no recollection of any communication from NIAID or the federal government with social media companies regarding what can or can't be posted on their platforms. However, he did not rule out the possibility that such communication may have occurred, as he doesn't oversee everything these entities do.	Government and NIAID Communication with Social Media
238:1-240:3	On being asked to comment on the removal of a video from Facebook for 'spreading false information about cures and treatment for COVID-19', Dr. Fauci acknowledged the stated reason. However, he had no memory of anyone communicating with Facebook about their decision to remove that video, at least from prior recall.	Removal of a Misinformative Video from Facebook
238:14-240:3	Dr. Fauci was asked about his awareness regarding the removal of a video about hydroxychloroquine from Google-owned YouTube. In reply, Dr. Fauci stated that while he might have been casually informed of this when it happened, his primary focus is not on what social media organizations are doing, possibly leading such information to go unnoticed by him.	Awareness Regarding Video Removal from Youtube and Google
241:1-242:3	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he does not engage with social media. He reported that he doesn't have any social media accounts and generally does not pay attention to content on these platforms. He stated that he does not know about the terms of service or content moderation policies of social media platforms.	Dr. Fauci's engagement with social media
241:1-243:18	Dr. Fauci was asked about the shutdown of the 'America's Frontline Doctors' website on August 1, 2020. Dr. Fauci stated he may have been made aware of this event, but it was not something that would have caught his attention or interest.	Discussion of 'America's Frontline Doctors' website shutdown
242:13-244:14	According to Dr. Fauci, the 'gold standard' for study design is a randomized, double-blind, placebo-based study. He suggested that such	Dr. Fauci on study design standards

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	design is not always necessary but is often the best approach.	
242:20-244:25	Dr. Fauci reiterated his position on the lack of evidence regarding the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine. He maintained this stance despite discussing the existence of some global metaanalyses on the subject.	Views on the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine
244:15-244:25	Dr. Fauci did not recall criticizing a real-time study by the Henry Ford Medical Center, which involved about a thousand participants and found an observational benefit to hydroxychloroquine. He noted that he reviews hundreds of studies.	Recollection of study by Henry Ford Medical Center
246:1-248:12	Dr. Fauci cautioned about jumping to conclusions based on the presented document, emphasizing that understanding the design of control groups and the nature of the study are crucial. He reflected that the study review would need to be extensive, analyzing each 'control group', the randomization processes and assessing the meta-analysis overall. This detailed evaluation would significantly influence the understanding of the study's validity and the interpretation of its results.	Speculations on Efficacy of Hydroxychloroquine Treatment Study Validity
246:1-248:4	Throughout the examination, Dr. Anthony Fauci was presented with what appeared to be the first page of a meta-analysis of studies addressing the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) for COVID-19 treatments. The document referenced 449 HCQ studies, 351 of which were peer-reviewed. Some studies suggested that late treatment in high dosages might be harmful, while early treatment consistently showed positive results. However, Dr. Fauci emphasized the importance of the design of control groups and the potential issues with non-randomized control groups. He affirmed that a lack of randomization often led to confusing, if not inaccurate, results. He underscored that top infectious disease physicians across the country have concluded	Examination of Meta-Analysis of Hydroxychloroquine Studies

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	that there is no evidence that HCQ works, and warned that it can potentially cause harm.	
246:1-248:4	In response to the claim that a significant number of studies showed positive results from early hydroxychloroquine treatment, Dr. Fauci cautioned that the study in question would need a detailed review, including consultation with statisticians. The guidelines panel, which consists of 30-40 top infectious disease physicians, overall has concluded that there is no evidence that hydroxychloroquine works against COVID-19 and could, in fact, be harmful.	Statistical Validity of Hydroxychloroquine Studies
246:11-247:9	Dr. Fauci was asked to consider a line in the analyzed document that stated 371 studies had compared treatment and control groups. He pointed out that the semantics in this phrase were unclear, as there is a significant difference between a 'treatment and control group' and a 'randomized placebo control group.' A study's results' validity can be markedly affected by the control group's structure, with non-randomized control groups often leading to unclear or incorrect results.	Drawing a Distinction Between Control and Treatment Groups
246:13-248:24	Dr. Fauci confirmed his familiarity with the Great Barrington Declaration, a proposal signed by numerous individuals suggesting that the COVID-19 virus should circulate freely. Their assertion was that this would lead to 'herd immunity,' thereby decreasing the virus's impact and prevalence. The specifics of this declaration were not further discussed.	Discussion on the Great Barrington Declaration
249:10-250:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked to review Exhibit 41, which is a copy of the Great Barrington Declaration. Dr. Fauci confirmed that he has read this document previously but was unable to verify if the date of publication was October 4, 2020. The Great Barrington Declaration proposes a method of 'focused protection', which Dr. Fauci interpreted to mean providing targeted protection for more vulnerable	Examination of the Great Barrington Declaration

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	populations while allowing the virus to circulate among less vulnerable groups.	
250:15-252:5	Dr. Fauci was asked about his familiarity with the authors of the Great Barrington Declaration, specifically Dr. Martin Kulldorff, Dr. Sunetra Gupta, and Dr. Jay Bhattacharya. Dr. Fauci indicated that while he knows of them due to the circulation of their names, he does not personally know them or have knowledge of their reputations.	Knowledge of the Authors of the Great Barrington Declaration
250:20-252:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned on when he became aware of the publication of the Great Barrington Declaration. Dr. Fauci could not provide a specific date or context in which he came across the document. It remained unclear from his deposition on whether he came across it soon after its alleged publication on October 4, 2020.	Awareness of the Great Barrington Declaration
251:8-252:15	Dr. Fauci confirmed that Nobel Prize winner Dr. Michael Levitt, based at Stanford, was one of the individuals who joined in support of the Great Barrington Declaration. However, Dr. Fauci clarified that although he has heard of Dr. Levitt, he does not know him either.	Dr. Michael Levitt's Participation in the Great Barrington Declaration
253:3-253:12	A break was requested during the deposition by Mr. Sauer. They then took a recess at around 2:17 PM. After the granting of this request, the proceedings of the deposition were resumed at around 2:28 PM.	Recess Announcements and Reconvene
253:14-254:1	Exhibit 42 was introduced by Mr. Sauer. This was an email dated October 8, 2020, sent by Francis Collins to Dr. Anthony Fauci and Cliff Lane, copying Larry Tabak. Dr. Fauci acknowledged the email was in front of him but did not distinctly remember it.	Exhibit 42 Introduction & Recognizability
254:1-256:23	Dr. Fauci briefly discusses the wording of the email, which referred to the authors of the Great Barrington Declaration as 'three fringe epidemiologists'. He couldn't definitively recall a previous conversation about these epidemiologists with Dr. Collins or being	Acknowledgement of 'Fringe Epidemiologists'

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	aware of their meeting with the Secretary.	
254:1-255:11	Mr. Sauer mentions an email wherein Dr. Fauci was sent a link to the Great Barrington Declaration by Dr. Francis Collins, on October 8th, 2020, four days after the declaration was made. Dr. Fauci could not recall whether he accessed the link when he received the email or if it was the first time he read the declaration.	Discussion about Great Barrington Declaration
254:2-256:20	When Mr. Sauer discussed the awareness and attention Dr. Fauci may have given to the email and the Great Barrington Declaration, Dr. Fauci noted that he was heavily invested in vaccine development at the time, which could have obscured his attention to this matter.	Fauci's Role During the Declaration
257:1-259:15	In the deposition conducted on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed an email he received from Dr. Francis Collins. The email was said to have been co-signed by Mike Levitt, a Nobel Prize winner at Stanford University. Although Dr. Fauci was unsure of his exact response to the email, he commented that it sought a 'quick and devastating take down' of a certain premise, possibly in reference to the Great Barrington Declaration. Dr. Fauci speculated that Dr. Collins, being a scholar, may have wanted to write a counter argument to challenge certain premises in a scholarly manner.	Dr. Fauci's Perception on an Email from Dr. Francis
257:1-259:25	Throughout the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about the inclusion of Cliff Lane in Dr. Collins' email. He expressed uncertainty about why Lane was copied in, but mentioned that Lane held a significant clinical director role. Objections on grounds of speculation were raised in response to various questions aimed to clarify the context or implications of Dr. Collins' email.	Discussion Over Email Recipients
257:15-259:15	During the deposition, there was discussion around an apparently controversial premise, presumably mentioned in the Great Barrington Declaration. Dr. Fauci alluded to	Discussion About An Unknown Premise

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	the premise being about selective targeting of susceptible individuals and letting the virus spread without causing significant damage. Due to Dr. Francis Collins' suggestion of a take down, it can be inferred that he believed the premise to be invalid, a point Fauci further speculated on during the deposition.	
257:18-259:4	During the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci was asked about his possible role in drafting or implementing a 'swift and devastating takedown' of the aforementioned premises. Dr. Fauci denied any involvement, stating that his main job was to manage a \$6.4 billion institute, leaving him no time to engage in such activities.	Questioning of Dr. Fauci's Role in Any Potential Counterarguments
257:23-259:15	Dr. Anthony Fauci affirmed his lack of knowledge regarding Dr. Francis Collins' exact intentions conveyed in the email. Fauci speculated that Collins was likely referring to writing a scholarly article to contest some premises. Fauci credited his speculations to his familiarity with Collins' scholarly nature and approach to disagreement.	Dr. Fauci's Speculation on Dr. Collins' Intentions
261:1-263:6	Dr. Anthony Fauci testifies about his professional relationship with Francis Collins, director of the institute, and Cliff Lane, deputy director for clinical research. He mentions that it would not be unusual for Francis to communicate with him via email and simultaneously copy Cliff Lane due to his important role. The fact that Cliff Lane participated in a WHO-sponsored trip to China in February 2020, discussed earlier in the deposition, makes him a well-respected and knowledgeable figure in his field.	Dr. Fauci's Relationship with Francis and Cliff Lane
261:10-262:8	Dr. Anthony Fauci confirms that Cliff Lane is an advocate for social distancing measures in controlling the spread of viral diseases. According to Dr. Fauci, these principles were especially highlighted following Lane's return from a WHO-sponsored trip to China, where he had observed the effectiveness of such	Cliff Lane's Visit to China and Effectiveness of Social Distancing

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	measures.	
261:25-263:6	When asked if, upon Cliff Lane's return from China, there were discussions between Francis Collins, Lane, and himself about extreme social distancing measures, Dr. Fauci indicates that it's possible. However, he does not recall specific conversations. Their interest in China's experience suggests they were seeking lessons to apply to their own responses to viral outbreaks.	Discussion Regarding Effectiveness of Social Distancing
263:7-263:22	Among the thousands of emails Dr. Fauci receives, there's an email dated October 8, 2020, sent by him to Francis Collins. The email contains an article from Wired magazine that aims to debunk certain theories about the virus. While Dr. Fauci doesn't remember the specific email or how he came across the article, he confirms the accuracy of the transcript record.	Communication with Francis Collins Regarding Virus Debunking Theory
263:10-264:23	The email exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci and Francis Collins contains a discussion on the Great Barrington Declaration, though exact details of their opinions are not provided in the transcript. Fauci shares an article written by Matt Reynolds, although he cannot recall the specifics of how he found the article or if he	Introduction and Discussion of the Great Barrington Declaration
265:7-266:3	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledges his association with Gregg Gonsalves, a faculty member of Yale School of Public Health and former member of the AIDS activist group ACT UP and its treatment action group (TAG). Fauci has known Gonsalves since the late 1980s to early 1990s, describing him as an associate and acknowledging that he has interacted with him a fair amount throughout the years.	Dr. Fauci's Association with Gregg Gonsalves
266:8-268:25	The deposition features discussion around the Great Barrington Declaration and its approach to herd immunity. This is in context of an email chain involving Dr. Fauci and others, where an article by Gonsalves refuting the	Discussion of the Great Barrington Declaration

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Declaration's strategy is forwarded. The Great Barrington Declaration is associated with the concept of 'focus protection'.	
266:8-268:19	Dr. Fauci asserts that he does not recall having any specific communication with Gonsalves before the latter wrote his refutation of the Great Barrington Declaration. He cannot remember any consultation between Gonsalves and any member of the NIAID staff about the article either.	Dr. Fauci's Communication with Gonsalves Prior to the Article
266:18-268:7	During the deposition, the Gonsalves article references Martin Kulldorff of Harvard, Dr. Jay Bhattacharya from Stanford University, and Sunetra Gupta from the University of Oxford as the people behind the Great Barrington Declaration who were in DC promoting their 'focus protection' strategy.	Reference to 'Herders' of the Great Barrington Declaration
267:20-268:25	The deposition reveals uncertainty about what Francis Collins planned to do with the information Dr. Fauci sent him regarding refutations of the Great Barrington Declaration. Dr. Fauci is unable to provide a definite answer to this question.	Uncertainty about Francis Collins' Use of Information
269:1-270:4	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed an email he had received regarding the general community's response to the Great Barrington Declaration. In this email, the sender was questioning whether anyone is contesting the premises of the declaration. Dr. Fauci surmises that he had forwarded information to Francis Collins in response to this inquiry on October 8th, including a statement that he perceived as a refutation of the premise.	Discussion on the Great Barrington Declaration Refutation
269:16-270:4	During the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci received questions about Francis Collins' connections to any social media companies. Although there was an objection on the grounds of speculation, Dr. Fauci responded that he did not have knowledge of any such connections. Dr. Fauci also confirmed that while he had heard that Collins' office has	Inquiry into Francis Collins' Ties with Social Media

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	social media accounts and tweets, he had never seen these posts as he does not have a Twitter account himself.	
270:9-272:19	Dr. Fauci was queried about Dr. Collins' comments on a proposal being 'fringe and dangerous.' He hinted that the direct origin of this comment was unclear, and that it could have been a reported statement from other sources rather than a direct comment to the Washington Post. This ambiguity complicates determining if prior consultations with Dr. Fauci occurred before Dr. Collins made the statement.	Discussion on Dr. Collins' 'Fringe and Dangerous' Statement
270:10-272:18	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was presented with a Washington Post article dated October 14, 2020, in which Dr. Collins was quoted denouncing a proposed strategy as 'fringe and dangerous.' It was uncertain whether this quotation was made directly to the reporter or was a relayed statement. Dr. Fauci was asked if he had consulted with Dr. Collins before he gave this statement, but no concrete answer emerged.	Examination of Washington Post Article Quoting Dr. Collins
270:11-271:1	Questions were raised about whether Dr. Collins has ever discussed the content of posts on social media with Dr. Fauci. Despite objections to the ambiguity of the question, Dr. Fauci responded that he was unsure. When asked about Collins' communications with social media companies, no specific instances came to Dr. Fauci's mind.	Investigation into Social Media Content Discussions
273:1-275:4	On 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about an unnamed major alternative view, presented as popular among the scientific community but described as ill-founded. Described as a 'fringe component of epidemiology', the view was believed by Dr. Collins to be dangerous, potentially leading to unnecessary infection and death if it led to a relaxed response to virus control, especially if information related to it circulated freely on social media platforms.	Discussion on an Unnamed Alternative View

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
273:17-275:5	Later in the session, Dr. Fauci was questioned about the role of social media in spreading the alternative view. He stated that he was uncertain whether Dr. Collins had any specific concerns about the circulation of the view on social media. Fauci revealed that they had had past discussions regarding these issues but could not remember if they addressed the potential impact of social media.	Discussion on the Influence of Social Media
273:18-274:7	Dr. Fauci was asked whether he was consulted by Dr. Collins before the latter made his statements to the Washington Post. Fauci could not confidently confirm that he was, but he did acknowledge that Collins' opposition to the fringe scientific view was clear, seemingly aligning with Fauci's own	Interaction with Dr. Collins Concerning the Alternative View
274:14-276:7	Further on, Dr. Fauci confirmed receipt of a link, sent on 10/13, to a Washington Post article that quoted Dr. Collins. Collins purportedly expressed concern that his remarks would not be 'appreciated in the White House.' Fauci was unclear if the White House had explicitly voiced disapproval of Collins' commentary on the 'Great Barrington Declaration'	Correspondence Regarding Quotation in Washington Post Article
275:17-276:25	Towards the end of his deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked about his opinion of the Great Barrington Declaration. While hesitant to describe it as 'fringe' and 'dangerous,' he did declare that he regarded the premise of the declaration as invalid, particularly referencing the impact of one million deaths in the country as evidence that against allowing the virus to freely circulate.	Views on the Great Barrington Declaration
277:1-279:10	When asked about his qualifications, Dr. Anthony Fauci stated that he is an 'infectious disease person' with substantial experience in epidemiology. He was also asked about Dr. Bhattacharya and Dr. Kulldorff, two names presumably related to the Great Barrington Declaration, but Dr. Fauci said he was not familiar with their qualifications.	Fauci's Qualifications and Knowledge of Other Epidemiologists

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
277:1-279:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his disagreement with the Great Barrington Declaration during a deposition on 11/23/2022. He argued that the premise of allowing the virus to freely circulate is invalid as it is not possible to selectively protect all vulnerable people. Fauci called this approach 'nonsense' and 'dangerous', and noted that he was supported in his views by the majority of physicians, public health officials, and epidemiologists. He referred to an NBC News article dated October 15, 2020, that quoted him making similar statements.	Fauci's Disagreement with the Great Barrington Declaration
278:16-279:24	Dr. Anthony Fauci affirmed that his criticism of the Great Barrington Declaration was independent of Dr. Collins' similar critical statement. He explained that it's not their style to coordinate statements, although they may have discussed it.	Fauci's Independence from Dr. Collins
279:25-280:25	Dr. Fauci was questioned about a Spiked online article titled, 'Why has Google censored the Great Barrington Declaration?'. The interviewer asked if Fauci was aware of reports that Google had deboosted the Declaration in search results. However, Fauci re-iterated his statement that he does not pay attention to such matters.	Questioning on Google's Alleged Censorship of the Great Barrington Declaration
280:1-280:7	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci claimed he was unaware of any reports that the Great Barrington Declaration was being censored on social media. He asserted that he does not pay attention to social media censoring or	Fauci's Lack of Awareness on Social Media Censorship
281:5-282:23	Dr. Fauci was asked about his familiarity with several social media platforms, including Google, Reddit, and YouTube. While he confirmed he had heard of YouTube and Reddit, he reiterated that he does not pay close attention to activities on these platforms, particularly in respect to censorship decisions.	Introduction of Various Social Media Platforms to Dr. Fauci
281:8-283:10	During his deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci stated he was not likely aware	Dr. Fauci's Awareness about

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	of the Great Barrington Declaration being deboosted in search results or censored on social media, including Google and Reddit. He clarified that he generally does not pay attention to social media censorship and does not have a deep familiarity with certain social media platforms, such as Reddit.	the Great Barrington Declaration
282:5-284:23	Exhibits were presented to Dr. Fauci during his deposition, including a copy of YouTube's site admissions policy (Exhibit 49) and YouTube's COVID-19 misinformation policy (Exhibit 50). When asked if he had seen these documents before, Dr. Fauci confirmed that he had not. The inclusion of the Great Barrington Declaration in these policies was not explicitly discussed.	Exhibit Presentation during Dr. Fauci's Deposition
282:21-284:23	Dr. Fauci examined an Exhibit which illustrated YouTube's COVID-19 misinformation policy and its update in October 2020. He acknowledged seeing the update information but clarified he had not seen this detailed version of the policy before.	Discussion of YouTube's COVID-19 Misinformation Policy
282:22-283:10	Dr. Fauci was asked whether he was aware that YouTube updated its terms of service in October of 2020 to remove content related to the Great Barrington Declaration. While he acknowledged his knowledge of the platform, he expressed uncertainty about whether he knew of this specific action by YouTube.	Dr. Fauci's Knowledge about YouTube's Actions on the Great Barrington Declaration
285:1-286:2	Dr. Anthony Fauci discusses YouTube's terms of service, which bans claims that herd immunity through natural infection is safer than vaccinations. During the deposition, Dr. Fauci asserts he does not recall whether the Great Barrington Declaration recommended that natural herd immunity was a safer approach than vaccinations. When asked if he had been aware of any updates to YouTube's policies regarding these sorts of claims in October 2020, he states that he did not have any such knowledge. Dr. Fauci also claims to be unaware of anyone who communicated with YouTube about this	YouTube Misinformation Policy

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	topic.	
286:7-288:25	In Meta's misinformation policy, it is mentioned that the company removes vaccine-related misinformation when public health authorities conclude that information is false and could lead directly to imminent vaccine refusal. When asked if he is one of the public health authorities Meta relies upon for such conclusions, Dr. Fauci does not provide a clear answer in the transcript.	Claims of Public Health Authority Influence
286:7-288:25	The conversation then moves to Meta's online misinformation policy. Dr. Fauci identifies Meta as the company that owns Facebook and Instagram. It is revealed that Dr. Fauci had worked on public service announcements encouraging vaccination with Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Meta. The exact date of these collaborations is unclear.	Meta's Online Misinformation Policy
286:11-288:7	Dr. Fauci's interactions with Mark Zuckerberg are scrutinized. Mr. Sauer suggests that Dr. Fauci communicated with Zuckerberg 13 times during 2020, involving a mix of emails and phone calls. Dr. Fauci challenges the assertion due to lack of clarity surrounding the term 'interrogatory' and requests evidence. He does not deny multiple interactions with Zuckerberg, but clarifies that they were part of thousands of his emails that were subjected to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests.	Dr. Fauci's Interaction with Mark Zuckerberg
289:1-290:9	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about any role he might have had influencing content moderation on social media platforms such as Meta and Facebook. He reiterated that he had never been identified as a public health authority that these platforms would rely on for moderating content. His interactions with Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Facebook, were primarily confined to the PSAs they had together with no substantial dialogue in emails or phone calls.	Dr. Fauci's Relation with Social Media Platforms

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
290:10-291:15	Dr. Fauci was asked about his communications regarding the Great Barrington Declaration—a proposal advocating a different approach to handling the pandemic. He did not recall specifically speaking with anyone outside of the government and the press about the declaration. The doctor responded that while he made thousands of phone calls and emails, he doubted he communicated with anyone at	Communication about the Great Barrington Declaration
290:11-292:24	Throughout his deposition, Dr. Fauci expressed uncertainty over whether specific discussions about the Great Barrington Declaration, focused protection, or herd immunity approaches had taken place with several named individuals. While he didn't rule out that such discussions may have occurred, he did not have specific recollections of them.	Lack of Specific Recollection on Discussions
290:22-292:25	Dr. Fauci confirmed his professional relationships with several Stanford scientists including Dr. Phil Pizzo, a pediatric infectious disease expert and former dean at the School of Medicine at Stanford. He was unfamiliar with the connection between himself and Dr. Lloyd Minor but recognized Dr. Harry Greenberg as a current scientist at Stanford and former NIH colleague. However, he did not recall discussing the Great Barrington Declaration, focused protection, or herd immunity strategies with them.	Professional Relations with Stanford Scientists
292:1-292:16	Dr. Fauci acknowledged his acquaintance with Mark Tessier-Lavigne, the current president of Stanford. He mentioned they had professional talks when Tessier-Lavigne was at the Rockefeller Institution. However, he did not recall discussing the Great Barrington Declaration or other pandemic-related approaches with him.	Relationship with Mark Tessier-Lavigne
293:1-294:12	In the deposition of Dr. Anthony Fauci on 11/23/2022, he is questioned about his familiarity with Jack Rowe and a scientist	Dr. Fauci's Knowledge of Jack Rowe and Ioannides

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	named Ioannides. Fauci acknowledges knowing Jack Rowe, who he identifies as possibly being a former CEO of a medical center in New York. He does not have direct knowledge of Ioannides but recognizes the name.	
293:7-293:24	Dr. Fauci is quizzed about a serial prevalence study conducted in Santa Clara County in March 2020, allegedly authored by Ioannides and others. Despite the question being deemed vague by Mr. Kirschner, Dr. Fauci responds he does not recall the study, explaining that he receives hundreds of studies and can't specifically recall that one.	Inquiry on Santa Clara County Prevalence Study
294:9-295:4	Discussion then turns to Exhibit 52, an email chain between Greg Folkers and Dr. Fauci from November 2020. In these emails, Folkers sent Dr. Fauci a list of articles, notably three specific ones. The email chain appears to concern the topic of herd immunity.	Examination of Fauci Exhibit No. 52
294:9-296:5	Dr. Fauci confirms that the articles sent by Folkers were critical of the herd immunity approach of the Great Barrington Declaration. He presumes he must have requested this information, however, he does not recall if these articles were passed onto Francis Collins or whether he communicated with the authors about the topic.	Discussion on Herd Immunity Approach Critiques
296:1-296:21	In this section, Dr. Fauci identifies people he knows out of a provided list. He mentions knowing John Barry, and being interviewed by Apoorva Mandavilli and Sheryl Stolberg from the New York Times. He also acknowledges knowing Mark Lipschitz, Gregg Gonsalves, Carlos del Rio, and Rochelle Walensky. However, he does not recall communicating with them about the Great Barrington Declaration.	Dr. Fauci's Communication with Certain Individuals
297:5-298:16	Dr. Anthony Fauci expressed his personal view on the Great Barrington Declaration during a deposition on November 23, 2022, stating that he believed it was misguided and could lead	Dr. Anthony Fauci's View on the Great Barrington Declaration

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	unnecessary infection, hospitalization, and death of individuals. He stated that he did not recall actively influencing online criticism of the Declaration and that his opinion was well known and shared by many scientists, though he could not quantify it. When queried about the 15,000 scientists who had signed the Declaration, he noted that he had not looked at the list of signatories and suggested that not all were fully aware of the implications of the Declaration.	
298:21-300:25	The deposition discussion revealed that there was a fake Twitter account under Dr. Fauci's name. The account was reported to team members at Twitter by Carol Crawford in March 2020 and was verified as fraudulent by Scott Prince, Deputy Director for Public Information at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Dr. Fauci admitted a vague recollection of the fake account but was unclear about actions taken to remove it. He confirmed that he did not know Scott Prince personally but stated that he likely worked in another department at NIH.	Exchange About the Existence of Imposter Twitter Accounts
301:1-303:25	During the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci indicated that he views the creation of imposter accounts impersonating him as potentially harmful. While his communications team handles these issues, he does acknowledge the disquiet it provokes in his staff.	Fauci's Perception of Impersonation
301:1-303:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci, in his deposition on November 23, 2022, discussed his approach towards misinformation spread via social media. He clarified that while he does not personally spend his time addressing misleading content, he has a communication staff to manage such issues. However, specifics about the processes or contacts with social media platforms were not actively handled by Dr. Fauci.	Fauci's Approach to Social Media Misinformation
301:1-302:25	Dr. Fauci's communications staff, led by Courtney Billet, handles misinformation	Role of Fauci's Communications

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	spread about him on social media. The team is responsible for identifying and addressing false and misleading content. While their precise course of action in these situations remains unclear, Dr. Fauci suggested that his team would likely aim for the removal of such unauthorized accounts.	Staff
301:1-303:9	Dr. Fauci revealed that he was previously unaware of what an imposter account was. His communication staff would apparently handle such issues without his involvement, occasionally updating him on notable incidents regarding imposter accounts.	Fauci's Awareness of Imposter Social Media Accounts
302:1-303:8	When alerted about the presence of imposter accounts, Dr. Fauci's communication team would take action, as demonstrated by an account highlighted by an individual named Lauren Duvall. However, Dr. Fauci neither adamantly follows this situation nor understands the technical implications of actions such as freezing handles.	Addressing Imposter Accounts
305:1-307:11	Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned about an email from Nicole Berkowitz, a name he did not recognize. The email was sent to the NIH.gov list, a term which Dr. Fauci was not familiar with. The email contained a request to look into a misleading YouTube video titled 'How to Kill Coronavirus'. The content of the video was described as 'incredibly dangerous information'. Berkowitz is identified as a communications lead for the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). Dr. Fauci did not recall any knowledge of someone from the EPA consulting with an NIH list to address misleading content on social media.	Discussion of an Email from Nicole Berkowitz
305:1-307:25	Following a lengthy discussion involving a look into an email from Nicole Berkowitz and subsequent emails from Judith Lavelle, Dr. Fauci states that he lacks the context or recollection surrounding these email chains. Further clarification and context were needed for Dr. Fauci to fully understand and provide meaningful comments on the emails and	Missing Context of Email Discussion

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	circumstances.	
305:1-307:14	Dr. Fauci was presented with an email from Nicole Berkowitz addressing a misleading YouTube video titled 'How to Kill Coronavirus'. The email described the video's content and its potentially harmful information. Due to unclear ad placement and algorithm repercussions, the video was wrongly perceived as a CDC-backed video. However, Dr. Fauci expressed confusion about the email and its background, lacking any immediate recollection of this issue.	Discussion of a YouTube Video
307:18-308:24	In an email chain from April 2020, discussed was an interaction involving Judith Lavelle of NIAID and Facebook. Dr. Fauci, being the director of NIAID, noted that he may not necessarily know all staff within the multi-thousand-person institute. Judith's role is shown as a technical writer editor, located at Fishers Lane, distinct from the building where Dr. Fauci is based. Judith appeared to be in the institute's communication staff along with another pointed out individual, Jennifer Routh.	Discussion of Facebook Email from Judith Lavelle
307:19-308:23	Dr. Fauci discussed his familiarity with two NIAID staff members, Judith Lavelle and Jennifer Routh. Judith Lavelle, a technical writer and editor, works at Fishers Lane, a different location than Dr. Fauci. He infers that, given her role, Lavelle likely belongs to the communication staff of the NIAID. Another NIAID member, Jennifer Routh, whom Dr. Fauci recognized as part of his communication staff, is also discussed.	Understanding the Role of NIAID Staff
309:1-311:25	During the deposition, it was discussed that Dr. Fauci's communications staff, under Courtney Billet, had been reporting fake accounts impersonating Dr. Fauci on Facebook and Instagram. According to the documentation presented, about eight accounts had been flagged. A particular account named 'Dr. Fauci the hero' was also pointed out. However, Dr. Fauci was not fully	Flagging of Fake Dr. Fauci Social Media Accounts

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	flagging such a large number of fake	
309:1-311:25	Dr. Fauci's views on impersonation on social media and its impacts were discussed. Dr. Fauci mentioned that fake accounts are bad, particularly when they entail someone impersonating him and performing activities like selling masks. His team had successfully flagged these impersonating accounts to be removed, except for two, which the Facebook team decided to keep.	Concerns Over Impersonation on Social Media Platforms
309:3-310:5	Dr. Fauci highlighted that his communication staff does not typically influence social media but takes it upon themselves to handle issues relating to impersonation of Dr. Fauci on such platforms. They find it crucial to flag any account posing as Dr. Fauci to protect the doctor's identity and prevent misinformation.	Communication Team's Role in Handling Fake Accounts
309:4-311:9	During the deposition, questions were raised about whether any of the fake accounts flagged were intended to be parody accounts, theatrically impersonating Dr. Fauci in an ironic manner. Unable to comment, Dr. Fauci claimed he did not understand the nature of these accounts as he was only provided links and lacked additional context.	Interrogation Over Parody Social Media Accounts
310:14-312:9	Dr. Fauci expressed that he does not concern himself with social media issues, making it clear that while his team addresses impersonations, he does not get involved in handling problems related to other false statements on social media. The handling of such issues is not part of his responsibilities.	Dr. Fauci's Lack of Personal Involvement in Social Media Issues
313:6-315:19	Dr. Anthony Fauci acknowledges knowing Sylvia Burwell, the former Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the current president of American University. He confirms that over the years, she has regularly reached out to him for advice regarding personal safety during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Knowledge and Interaction with Sylvia Burwell
313:6-315:7	In a deposition on November 23, 2022, Dr.	Communication

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Fauci vaguely recalls communicating with Ms. Burwell about mask usage during the early stages of the pandemic. In response to a query regarding a specific email from February 2020, where she asked about the need to wear a mask at an airport, Dr. Fauci says he can't recall the specific conversation, but confirms the existence of such communications.	with Sylvia Burwell on Mask Usage
314:9-316:25	In the early stages of COVID-19, neither Dr. Fauci, nor the CDC, nor the surgeon general recommended mask-wearing, primarily due to shortage concerns, lack of evidence regarding their effectiveness outside a medical environment, and unknown symptomatic transmission percentages. This guidance changed due to the resolution of medical supply shortages, recognition of asymptomatic spread, and new research on mask effectiveness.	Early COVID-19 Public Health Guidance
314:9-316:25	While Dr. Fauci may have made statements against wearing masks in the early stages of the pandemic due to the limited understanding of the virus, he explains that this stance changed as more information became available. Factors causing this shift included resolving shortages for medical staff, recognizing asymptomatic spread, and new studies proving the effectiveness of masks outside hospitals.	Change in Mask Recommendations
314:9-316:25	According to a presented email, Dr. Fauci advised Ms. Burwell that masks were primarily for preventing infected individuals from spreading the infection and may provide slight protection against gross droplets from coughs or sneezes. He also allegedly recommended not wearing a mask for travel to a low-risk location, as masks bought in drug stores were not effective in keeping out the virus.	Mask Recommendations during Early Pandemic
317:1-318:3	Dr. Fauci noted that one of the reasons for his initial recommendation against widespread mask usage was to prevent shortages. He wanted to ensure that healthcare providers,	Previous Masking Recommendations to Preserve Supply for Healthcare

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	at higher risk, had sufficient access to masks. It was one of the main reasons he recommended against general masking in February 2020.	Providers
317:1-318:19	In the deposition given on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci describes how his position on mask wearing evolved over time. Initially, he had suggested that masks are not required, especially in low risk situations. However, as evidence emerged supporting the efficacy of masks in preventing transmission and cases of asymptomatic spread, his stance shifted. Dr. Fauci became a vocal proponent of mask wearing, endorsing universal masking as early as April 3rd, 2020.	Adjustment of Masking Recommendations
317:5-319:25	Dr. Fauci referenced debates about the effectiveness of masks during the early stages of the pandemic. He mentioned that he may have forwarded conflicting studies, one suggesting masks were ineffective, though he could not recall specific details. Accessibility to both sides of the debate was noted as important, allowing for informed decisions based on the weight of the evidence and correct data.	Debates about Efficacy of Masking
317:5-319:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci's stance on masks was influenced by accumulating scientific evidence. Although he did not recall the specific studies conducted between February 2020 and April 3rd, 2020 about the efficacy of masks against COVID-19, he confirmed that his opinion changed based on new information and evidence. He acknowledged the importance of having access to both sides of the scientific debate and making a judgment based on the preponderance of the correct data.	Influence of Scientific Evidence on Masking Guidelines
318:11-320:17	Dr. Fauci indicated in the deposition the importance of critical analysis when reviewing and interpreting scientific studies. Deducing correct data involves proper physical statistical analysis. He emphasized the need for caution, as some studies might not stand up to	Critical Analysis of Studies

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	statistical analysis or may lack proper design, distorting conclusions.	
321:1-322:1	During a deposition with Dr. Anthony Fauci on November 23, 2022, discussion arose around the shortage of masks which served to influence public health recommendations regarding mask usage. The coronavirus task force allegedly warned of an acute shortage, impacting medical workers and general public alike. The task force's hesitance to openly promote mask wearing was due to concerns of draining the already scarce resource. Emergency measures were engaged, aiming to boost the supply of masks through increases in domestic production, importation, and the proposal of alternatives, such as cloth masks.	Shortage of Masks During COVID-19
321:1-323:17	Dr. Fauci referenced several studies, but could not recall specific instances of placebo-based, randomized, double-blind studies between February and April 2020. Early studies suggested mask inefficacy, yet were challenged for inadequate statistical scrutiny. Further studies reinforced the notion that masks mitigated virus spread. Fauci also highlighted the importance of facilitating access to all available information and emphasized the self-correcting nature of science, where flawed studies and data are critically analyzed to establish truth.	Efficacy of Masks and Scientific Studies
323:16-324:22	This email thread sheds light on Sandra Sitar's role within the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). Although Dr. Fauci could not specifically remember who Sandra was, the email revealed she served as a Director of Communications for Clinical Trials Program under the Vaccine Research Center (VRC) at NIAID.	Role of Sandra Sitar within NIAID
323:25-324:12	An edifying email chain from October 30, 2020, was also discussed wherein Jen Routh, part of Dr. Anthony Fauci's communications team, was seen to have corresponded with Google participants. Courtney Billet, head of the communications team, was	Jen Routh's Role and email Communication

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	copied.	
324:23-324:25	In the email thread, Sandra Sitar mentions that 'Jan and the Google team' were looking to engage in discussions regarding vaccine communications. Though more information was not revealed in this excerpt, this topic suggests a collaboration between NIAID and Google for disseminating vaccine information.	Communication on Vaccine Information
325:7-327:22	The proceedings referenced an email from a Google representative expressing the intention to organize a call regarding vaccine communications. The exact date of the proposed call was in question, presumed to be around October 30th, 2020. Dr. Fauci claimed no knowledge of whether such a call took place.	Proposed Communications Call with Google
325:7-327:22	The deposition also focused on Courtney Billet, the Director of the Office of Communications and Government Relations at NIAID and a member of Dr. Fauci's team. It was noted that Billet was looped into an email chain discussing vaccine communications. Dr. Fauci confirmed that he did not have specific discussions with Billet about communicating with Google.	Involvement of Courtney Billet in Communications with Google
325:7-327:22	During a deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci was questioned regarding the interactions of his communication team with Google's team, particularly concerning vaccine misinformation. The inquiry was based on an email suggesting a pending connection between Sandra, Jen and the Google team on said topic. Dr. Fauci stated that he had no knowledge of such communication and noted that it is unlikely he would have authorized such a discussion. It was clarified, however, that his communication team does not typically require his permission to communicate on salient issues as it's part of their role.	Engagement of Dr. Fauci's Communication Team with Google and YouTube
327:1-328:25	The deposition discussed an Instagram	Unverified Anthony

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	account presumably impersonating Dr. Fauci, which prompted a request for account deactivation from Clarke Humphrey of the White House. Though Dr. Fauci was somewhat aware of incidents of impersonation, he was unsure if the 'IG' reference in the email was about Instagram.	Fauci Instagram Account
328:1-328:25	An email from Clarke Humphrey, a White House communications staff, was brought up. Dated July 2021, Humphrey reached out to Facebook to request the removal of an unauthorized account posing as Dr. Fauci. Dr. Fauci had vague awareness of 'fake stuff impersonating him' but did not recall specific interactions with Facebook.	Clarke Humphrey's Requests to Facebook
329:1-330:3	Dr. Anthony Fauci, in his deposition on 11/23/2022, discussed the issue of individuals impersonating him on social media. There was mention of a fake Instagram account falsely portraying Dr. Fauci. With communication from the White House's digital director, Clarke Humphrey, the impersonating account was successfully deactivated. However, Dr. Fauci did not provide any specific details about who was impersonating him or how many accounts were involved.	Impersonation of Dr. Anthony Fauci on Social Media
330:1-332:25	The testimony on 11/23/2022 by Dr. Fauci brought to light that in their communication to Facebook, CDC officials cited the National Institutes of Health's (NIH) treatment guidelines. Specifically, they were addressing and debunking claims about the effectiveness of ivermectin in treating COVID-19, countering these claims with NIH recommendations.	References to NIH Guidelines in CDC's Communication About Ivermectin
330:10-332:25	According to Dr. Fauci's deposition on 11/23/2022, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) engaged in online communication with various platforms including Facebook. This included sending emails and engaging in conversations about	Involvement of CDC in Social Media Communication

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	important health issues. One notable conversation involved Catherine Jamal of the CDC and Carol Crawford, discussing the role of ivermectin in COVID-19 treatment.	
330:10-332:9	In the deposition from 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci brought up an email chain where Catherine Jamal of the CDC communicated with individuals at Facebook. The subject of the communication was 'Ivermectin questions for the CDC'. Ms. Jamal put forward the CDC's position that claims about ivermectin's effectiveness in treating COVID-19 were not accurate.	CDC's Communication with Facebook Regarding Ivermectin
331:5-332:25	Despite being a leading figure in the U.S. public health infrastructure, Dr. Anthony Fauci stated during his 11/23/2022 deposition that he was not aware of the CDC citing NIH-provided information to debunk claims about the efficacy of ivermectin to Facebook. However, he found it unsurprising as institutions including the CDC would likely refer to NIH guidelines which includes contributions from infectious disease experts from across the country.	Dr. Fauci's Unawareness About CDC's Communication with Facebook
333:4-334:1	The conversation indicated that it would not be surprising if social media platforms rely on the public statements by Dr. Fauci on matters of health policy and the NIH guidelines for their decisions. However, Dr. Fauci highlighted that statements by an individual physician or scientist may not carry as much weight as the measured, scholarly analysis of articles by a treatment guideline panel of 30 to 40 infectious diseases experts.	Reliance on NIH Guidelines and Public Statements by Dr. Fauci
334:23-336:4	Dr. Fauci clarified his lack of interest and attention to social media censorship issues. This came after a discussion about Alex Berenson, a known critic of vaccines, who was allegedly banned from Twitter - an issue Dr. Fauci revealed he was aware of but didn't know the specifics.	Comments on Social Media Censorship
334:23-336:4	Dr. Fauci expressed he didn't specifically	Questioning on Dr.

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	who Alex Berenson was when questioned if he had heard about him complaining about being censored on Twitter. A document referring to Berenson's claims about being kicked off Twitter after a White House meeting was mentioned, but Dr. Fauci maintained his lack of awareness on the matter.	Fauci's Knowledge about Alex Berenson
334:24-336:4	Confirmed he was the White House Chief medical advisor in April of 2021. However, he expressed no recollection of discussions about Alex Berenson, a vaccine critic, being on or booted off Twitter.	Dr. Fauci's Role as White House Chief Medical Advisor
335:23-336:25	Dr. Fauci was asked about his awareness of a meeting between the White House's Andy Slavitt, Rob Flaherty, and Twitter representatives in April 2021 to discuss vaccine misinformation. He confirmed knowing Slavitt, who was part of the coronavirus team, but denied knowledge of Flaherty, the alleged Digital Director at the White House. He also claimed no knowledge of such a meeting.	Inquiry into Possible White House Meeting
337:14-338:8	In the deposition, Dr. Anthony Fauci was queried about his knowledge of someone on Twitter who was allegedly spreading disinformation about vaccines to the public. A Twitter employee Slack message thread was cited, indicating that Andy Slavitt believed Alex Berenson was the source of this misinformation. Dr. Fauci stated he does not recall being aware of any direct connections or specific instances related to this.	Awareness of Alleged Misinformation Epicenter
338:1-340:21	While Dr. Fauci acknowledged the issues of misinformation and disinformation, he denied any involvement in attempts to halt or block the spread of such information. He expressed distress over the proliferation of disinformation but stated that he had not held discussions about proactively stopping it or interfered with its dissemination.	Fauci's Non-Involvement in Mitigating Disinformation
338:1-340:25	During the deposition, Exhibit 60 was	Fauci Exhibit No. 60

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	introduced for identification. However, the content or relevance of this exhibit was not further discussed or expounded in the provided transcript, leaving its significance unclear.	Introduction
338:1-340:21	Dr. Fauci expressed his recognition of the prevalence of misinformation and disinformation surrounding vaccines, although he did not specify its origins. His comments indicated that he views the situation as a broad, complex problem without direct links to specific discussions or individuals on social media.	Ambience of Misinformation and Disinformation
338:22-339:19	To expound his understanding of disinformation, Dr. Fauci provided an example where he and Bill Gates were falsely accused of implanting chips in vaccines to track people. He categorizes this as disinformation because it intentionally disseminates a false narrative.	Example of Vaccine Disinformation
341:1-343:23	Dr. Anthony Fauci recalls a public back and forth with conservative author Alex Berenson, who had spoken at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) in July 2021. Fauci commented on Berenson's remarks during an appearance on CNN's State of the Union. Berenson is quoted as saying that the government was hoping 90% of the population would get vaccinated and that it was not happening, while Fauci is quoted as saying that it was horrifying and almost frightening that people don't want health officials to save their lives. Fauci does not recall making any pre-determined statements to criticize Berenson.	Dr. Fauci Discusses Alex Berenson's Remarks at CPAC
341:15-343:23	Dr. Fauci does not remember any discussions with government officials about the conservative author Alex Berenson before his comments made on the CNN show. He believes his remarks were based on the evidence of higher hospitalization and death rates among unvaccinated individuals.	Dr. Fauci Cannot Recall Discussions with Government on Berenson

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
342:14-344:25	During the deposition, reference is made to a New York Times article from July 16, 2021 about President Biden's accusations towards social media platforms. The President said they were 'killing people' by allowing the spread of misinformation about the coronavirus vaccine. Dr. Fauci admits that while he does not recall the specific comment, he does not deny that President Biden could have made such a statement.	Conversation on Vaccine Misinformation
345:3-346:3	Dr. Anthony Fauci discussed his belief that misinformation and disinformation, particularly when they deter individuals from lifesaving interventions, are contributors to unnecessary deaths. He emphatically stressed that he sees such manipulation of facts as enemies of public health. He was asked if he had discussed this stand with anyone in government though his answer wasn't explicit. He stated he might have done so since he regularly expounded on the topic. The dialogue occurred during a deposition on November 23, 2022.	Discussion on the Impact of Misinformation on Public Health
345:9-346:13	Dr. Fauci was asked to confirm his position on whether misinformation and disinformation remain a danger to public health when spread through social media platforms. He asserted that if they lead to the avoidance of vital treatments, it opposes public health.	Social Media's Role in Spreading Misinformation
346:14-348:25	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked to interpret a conversation captured in Exhibit 62. The documented exchange was a forwarding of a derogatory tweet by Alex Berenson about Dr. Fauci sent by Dr. Gottlieb to someone at Twitter. Dr. Fauci inferred from the context of the conversation that Scott's forwarding of the tweet to Twitter might have been to illustrate why he (Dr. Fauci) needed a security detail.	Discussion and Interpretation of Exhibit 62
346:21-347:14	Dr. Fauci revealed that while he might have been in communication with Dr. Gottlieb in the summer of 2021, he was not certain due to the hundreds of people he communicates	Possible Communication with Dr. Scott Gottlieb in Summer

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	with. His response was in reply to a question about whether they had dialogued about vaccines or misinformation.	2021
346:21-347:3	During the deposition, Dr. Fauci identified Dr. Scott Gottlieb as a former FDA Commissioner who regularly comments on COVID-19 related matters on CBS Sunday Morning shows. He, however, stated that his interactions with Dr. Gottlieb are not of a social nature.	Identification and Inference of Dr. Scott Gottlieb
349:7-349:19	In the deposition, a discussion with Dr. Anthony Fauci on November 23, 2022, turns to the topic of his personal security. It is suggested that Fauci may need a security detail due to threats made against him that surfaced on the internet. However, Fauci does not recall having detailed conversations about his security needs with others, such as Scott Gottlieb.	Potential Threats and Security Details for Dr. Anthony Fauci
349:24-350:23	Fauci is questioned about his connections, if any, with individuals at Twitter. He confirms he is not on a first-name basis with anyone at Twitter presently, although he was when his daughter used to work there. It is unclear whether his daughter was working at Twitter as of August 24, 2021. Fauci dismisses any other presumed affiliations with Twitter personnel.	Dr. Fauci's Connection with Twitter
350:11-352:3	Dr. Fauci is asked about his communications with Scott Gottlieb, a board member of Pfizer. While he affirms that vaccine development was a frequent discussion topic, he does not recall any specific conversations related to that or about online discourse leading to vaccine hesitancy with Gottlieb.	Fauci's Interaction with Pfizer's Board Member
352:12-352:18	Alex Berenson is brought up in the deposition – a person Fauci does not recall discussing with Gottlieb or having any memory of. The context or significance of Berenson in relation to Fauci's deposition is not specified.	Discussion about Alex Berenson
352:23-352:25	Towards the end of the deposition, Ezekiel J.	Introduction of

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	Emmanuel, known as Zeke Emmanuel, is mentioned. Fauci identifies Emmanuel as a vice provost at the University of Pennsylvania. However, the underlying context or relevance of Emmanuel to the conversation is not elaborated upon.	Ezekiel J. Emmanuel
353:13-354:17	During the deposition on 11/23/2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci confirmed his initial endorsement of the antiviral drug remdesivir for the treatment of COVID-19. This endorsement took place during a time when there were no other known good treatment drugs for COVID-19. The endorsement was based on data from a clinical trial showing a modest but clear effect of the drug on treating the disease. However, a professional from the University of Pennsylvania, interpreted the data as weak, questioning the endorsement. Dr. Fauci clarified that he endorsed remdesivir not as a major breakthrough but as an important step in the right direction for developing more and effective drugs against COVID-19.	Dr. Fauci's Endorsement of Remdesivir for COVID-19
354:1-356:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci on 11/23/2022 acknowledged that he made several strong public statements on varied subjects related to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as hydroxychloroquine, masks' effectiveness, origins of COVID-19, vaccines, and herd immunity. He described his language as measured and disagreed with characterization of it as strong. Instances of disagreements comprised Dr. Fauci firmly dismissing the premise of herd immunity, which he believes resulted in unnecessary deaths.	Discussion on Multiple Opinions Regarding COVID-19 Pandemic
354:1-356:6	Over the course of his vice, Dr. Anthony Fauci faced strong disagreement too, as confirmed in his deposition on 11/23/2022. Individuals such as Alex Berenson have publicly described Dr. Fauci's approach as arrogant.	Public Reaction to Dr. Fauci's Statements
354:1-356:25	Dr. Fauci during his deposition on 11/23/2022 discussed several contentious COVID-19	Dr. Fauci's Stance on Controversial

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	related topics including the anti-malarial drug hydroxychloroquine, the origins of the virus, vaccines' efficacy, and herd immunity. While he has robustly dismissed notions such as the premise of reaching herd immunity naturally, he acknowledges the rights of individuals to share contrary opinions, despite his own dissent.	Therapies for COVID-19
355:6-356:25	Dr. Anthony Fauci stated during the 11/23/2022 deposition that while he is not an expert on social media, he believes individuals should be able to express their opinions. He refrained from commenting on the boundaries of those expressions on social media, especially when they could potentially lead to dangerous outcomes or loss of life, stating he is not knowledgeable enough about legal or First Amendment issues.	Dr. Fauci's Views on Posting Opinions on Social Media
357:1-359:10	On November 23, 2022, Dr. Anthony Fauci emphasized his dedication to fighting misinformation and disinformation in the area of public health. As a physician, scientist, and public health expert, he expressed concern over potentially dangerous misinformation that could cause people to avoid lifesaving interventions. To counter this issue, Dr. Fauci stated that he attempts 'to flood the system with correct information' rather than limit people's ability to voice their opinions, confirming that he has taken this approach multiple times.	Handling Misinformation and Disinformation
357:11-359:10	Detailing his recent efforts, Dr. Anthony Fauci mentioned his final press conference at the White House before this deposition in which he urged people to update their COVID-19 vaccinations for their safety and community. He identified these activities as ongoing attempts to counter misinformation and disinformation about COVID-19 and its vaccination.	Dr. Fauci's Public Health Advocacy
357:11-359:10	Responding to the question about his steps to mitigate against misinformation in the past two and a half years, Dr. Fauci reiterated that	Mitigation Steps Against

PAGE/LINE	SUMMARY	SUBJECT
	he believes in countering false information by flooding the system with correct facts. He stated his routine involvement with different media outlets to disseminate the proper information and encourage people to get vaccinated.	Misinformation
357:14-359:11	In the deposition, Dr. Fauci was asked about the importance of allowing open debates on heavily disputed issues such as the efficacy of hydroxychloroquine or the origins of the COVID-19 virus. While he considered honest debate significant, he also voiced his concern where discussions lead those unaware about such matters to make decisions detrimental to their health and safety.	Open Debate on Controversial Subjects
357:19-358:4	When asked whether social media platforms should be held accountable for dangerous misinformation posted on their sites, Dr. Fauci explained that he was not an expert in the legal aspects of such matters and would defer to those who are. He acknowledged that he did not have substantial knowledge or opinions on what content should or should not be allowed on social media platforms.	Responsibility of Social Media Platforms

