

CHRIS KISE ASKS AILEEN CANNON TO SANCTION JACK SMITH BECAUSE CHRIS KISE DOCTORED A FILING

After Jay Bratt asked Aileen Cannon to modify Donald Trump's bail conditions to prevent him from making up claims that the FBI tried to assassinate him, Trump's team has not responded. Instead, they filed a motion to strike the request and impose sanctions because – they claim – Bratt did not meet and confer before filing the motion.

The motion, like most other ones these guys have filed, is largely manufactured. They're pissy that Bratt filed this on a Friday before Memorial Day, they're pissy that Bratt refused to wait until Monday to submit the filing, they're pissy that Bratt summarized their objection rather than quoting a long complaint verbatim.

There are rules. You guys violated them. I appreciate the attempted explanation, but it does not in any way pacify us. I am beyond amazed that the government would misrepresent facts to the Court about what happened. You did not even bother to inform the Court that you reached out to us for a "meet and confer" at 5:30 p.m. on Friday night of Memorial Day weekend before filing the motion at 8 p.m. I'm confused as to why you think we could not meaningfully meet and confer about a path forward short of a motion. You did not even bother to inform us of the posts/fundraising emails that gave you all concern until 20 minutes before you filed the motion. We would have been more than willing to discuss with you your concerns prior to

filing the motion. You had an agenda and you stuck to that agenda. It is not surprising, but still disappointing. The Court may agree with you that the path you chose was the right one. I do not know.

But please do not try to justify a blatant violation of the rules (and beyond the Local Rules, Judge Cannon's admonition to all of us last summer). You all made a decision tonight to file this motion without complying with the rules (Local Rules and Judge Cannon). That is your decision.

Nowhere do they address the underlying complaint: that Trump was ginning up false claims of assassination attempts based off Trump's own lawyers doctoring of the Use of Force Form.

They even claim that Trump's Truth Social claims are alleged, perhaps blaming Natalie Harp again for authoritarian games.

But that, of course, means it's likely to work perfectly for Judge Cannon, who otherwise was stuck with a choice of preventing Trump from making false claims or being appealed.

Update: Cannon catered to Trump, once again.

PAPERLESS ORDER denying without prejudice for lack of meaningful conferral 581 the Special Counsel's Motion to Modify Conditions of Release. Upon review of the Motion 581 [581-1], Defendant Trump's procedural opposition 583, and the attached email correspondence between counsel [583-1], the Court finds the Special Counsel's pro forma "conferral" to be wholly lacking in substance and professional courtesy. It should go without saying that meaningful conferral is not a perfunctory exercise. Sufficient time needs to be afforded to permit

reasonable evaluation of the requested relief by opposing counsel and to allow for adequate follow-up discussion as necessary about the specific factual and legal basis underlying the motion. This is so even when a party “assume[s]” the opposing party will oppose the proposed motion [583-1], and it applies with additional force when the relief sought – at issue for the first time in this proceeding and raised in a procedurally distinct manner than in cited cases – implicates substantive and/or Constitutional questions. Because the filing of the Special Counsel’s Motion did not adhere to these basic requirements, it is due to be denied without prejudice. Any future, non-emergency motion brought in this case – whether on the topic of release conditions or anything else – shall not be filed absent meaningful, timely, and professional conferral. S.D. Fla. L.R. 88.9, 7.1(a)(3); see ECF No. 28 p. 2; ECF No. 82. Moreover, all certificates of conference going forward shall (1) appear in a separate section at the end of the motion, not embedded in editorialized footnotes; (2) specify, in objective terms, the exact timing, method, and substance of the conferral conducted; and (3) include, if requested by opposing counsel, no more than 200 words verbatim from the opposing side on the subject of conferral, again in objective terms. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in sanctions. In light of this Order, the Court determines to deny without prejudice Defendant Trump’s Motion to Strike and for Sanctions 583 . Signed by Judge Aileen M. Cannon on 5/28/2024. (jff01) (Entered: 05/28/2024)