

# **EXHIBIT A**

Judi DeMarco  
to jurors

Oct 9

Hi, all...

I have decided not to do any interviews group or individual. While I did speak to Bloomberg News and it may seem obvious why, it was an exception, my reasons are personal and private. Peace to all, j.

Philip Bump  
to me

Oct 9

I hope you're not actually reading this at 1 am. But a thought just occurred to me.

I think that, even if you don't speak, it's important for you to be with us on 20/20. The press is going to be looking for any sign of division amongst us, and I think that having all 12 of us standing together makes an important statement.

I completely get your reticence, and respect it. I would just ask that you reconsider.

OK, now I'll stop debating you on everything.

Pb

caninc  
to me

Oct 10

Good morning sunshine,

After watching 20/20 last night and hearing my voice over and over again, saying "guilty", it did occur to me that if you did one more interview with the group, on 20/20 or Nightline, that we would look stronger as a team.

It's totally up to you, but I would feel well supported if you were there. J

Have you seen my articles yet? They all keep saying I'm dressed for the gym. That must be some gym!

Kristina

Philip Bump  
to jurors

Oct 10

They saw my ding on them in the Daily Beast column and called. I gave the "frustrations rose several times, but we walked out of there united" rap. I fully expect some sort of excoriation in the Post.

Judi:

They (well, she) wanted to talk to you, so I gave her your cell phone. Just kidding! I said I'd pass on the reporter's contact to you, but not to expect to hear from you.

Stephanie Cohen  
212 930 5776

Lkaagan@aol.com  
to jurors

Oct 10

All,

For what it's worth, both the NYT (Eligon) and Meryl Gordon got almost the same verbatim from me that Philip is alluding to from him: frustrations rose, emotions soared, some sharp words may have been spoken...but nothing de-railed our process, and when we got back to the work the judge sent us back to do, we got where we were going...difficult as it often was.

-Larry

p.s. - Judi: I have been asked by interviewers, twice already, about the fate of the red snot-rag that everyone saw me give you. I said (no lie) that it was our secret, and that I had nothing further to add.

caninc  
to jurors

Oct 10

Hello all,

I just finished my interview with Meryl, and she is just the nicest woman.

Anyhoo, I followed the script of "the frustrations ran high" bit, and that the next day it was if nothing ever happened. Words misread and misunderstood, but nothing that was as damaging as Tom spilling coffee all over the table. (kidding Tom Tom) J

We chatted about some of the witnesses and the attorneys and my impressions of them all. That was the majority of my interview, and then stuff about my family background.

Hope everyone is enjoying a nice weekend!

Kristina  
|

Barbara Tomanelli  
to Jurors

Oct 10

Hi all. I also hope that everyone is having a relaxing and enjoyable weekend. Below is my response to an Associated Press telephone interview I did yesterday. No what?--I miss you all. Love Barbara

Astor juror Barbara Tomanelli won't discuss any conflicts that erupted during deliberations. She describes the process as thorough and patient, with jurors hunting through reams of notes, raising hands to speak and meticulously working through the 18 charges on a blackboard and a flip chart.

When a divide persisted, the group would review testimony, move on to another count or take a walk, she said.

Yes, it was grueling, but fascinating, and "I was very proud of the fact that we did it," the retired executive assistant said. After it was all done, "we were able to ... sit around and have beers together. And that ought to tell you something."

-----

Associated Press writer Karen Matthews and researcher Susan James contributed to this report.

Lkaagan  
to jurors

Oct 10

Like Katrina [sic] and like everyone else, I am asked about The Letter. I think we are all handling this as best we can.

I am willing to sacrifice myself on the alter. The next time somebody asks about The Letter, you can shift the focus to the nearly illegible one I wrote instead...the one that asked for clarification on the duties and obligations, as well as the powers, of the PoA. I think what the judge had to say in response to That Letter ended up having greater impact on our ability to come to consensus than what he had to say about The Letter. I doubt the deflection will work, as reporters may still sniff appeals-blood in the water...

I'm only half joking.

L

---

Philip Bump  
to Lkaagan, jurors

Oct 10

I think we're doing well. We're through the glut of requests on the issue, I'd say. I'd recommend we maintain, and blame you for something else.

---

FW: Please Forward to Judi Demarco

caninc  
to me

Oct 10

Hey there Judi,

I wouldn't give out your info, so she sent me this email to forward to you.

I had my interview with Meryl today, and she is just a wonderful and respectful person. Her style was not invasive in any way and when you say you don't wish to speak about something, she listens.

Most of my interview was about my impressions of the witnesses and attorneys.

I think it would be a much more pleasant experience talking to her, than anyone else.

Hope you're having a restful day.

Kristina

-----Original Message-----

From: meryl@mindspring.com [mailto:meryl@mindspring.com]

Sent: Saturday, October 10, 2009 3:59 PM

To: caninc

Subject: Please Forward to Judi Demarco

Dear Judi Demarco,

By way of introduction, I am the author of the book, "Mrs. Astor Regrets" and I have been covering the Astor trial for Vanity Fair. I suspect that you would recognize me from the courtroom. I sent you a copy of my book and a letter requesting an interview, but I thought I would follow up with this note. Your fellow jurors are very protective of your privacy, so I asked Kristina to forward you this email.

My goal is to reach all the jurors, and so far I have been successful in interviewing eight people. Although as jurors, you came to a unanimous verdict, everyone came to this from a different perspective. It has been fascinating for me to talk to your fellow jurors about their experiences, especially after sitting in the courtroom for six months and listening to the evidence myself.

I am also collecting stories about some of the lighter moments in the trial, like the prank to hide from the bailiff.

I'm sure that you've had reporters staking out your building and phoning you non-stop. That's not my style. But please understand, I really am eager to talk to you. I hope you will ask Kristina and others about their experiences in speaking with me, since it is my understanding that they felt comfortable doing so.

My deadline to turn this in is Monday, Columbus Day at 3 p.m. I can be reached at 212-580-4718, and I hope to hear from you.

Best regards, Meryl Gordon

---

From: caninc  
Sent: Saturday, October 10, 2009 3:13 PM  
To: jurors  
Subject: Nighline and 20/20

Hi everyone,

Both Claire Pederson(Nightline) and Eric Strauss(20/20) called me back while I was with Meryl Gordon. They will be calling me on Monday to discuss a place for all of us to meet and offer a couple of dates for that, in case some of us can't meet at one time or another. They said that they have never done a show like this, where it focuses on the jury, but are very excited to chat. Claire was calling from a wedding and couldn't talk but Eric, the sneaky devil, tried to get info about "the letter". Sounds like a movie ☺  
I just told him he could ask what he wanted when the whole group was assembled.

So I will keep you all informed of everything with these guys. I left them messages yesterday and they didn't get back to me today, so it doesn't look too urgent. Just very near future.

Best,  
Kristina

---

Tom Davey  
to jurors

Oct 10

Kristina writes:

> but Eric, the sneaky devil, tried to get info about "the letter"

That's my worry. 20/20's motives don't sound very good. I haven't talked to any reporters and I doubt I will. I have spent the day reading the news coverage of the trial over the past week. It has left me dismayed.

> I just told him he could ask what he wanted when the whole group was assembled.

No, not whatever he wants. We must go in with explicit ground rules. As we now know from reading the papers, the defense is going to try to smear the jury process. It wants to get the verdicts overturned by attacking us and our integrity.

I'm interested in appearing on 20/20 to talk about:

1. Needed reforms in the practice of trusts and estates law
2. The issue of Alzheimer's Disease and elder abuse; getting Fillit or Relkin on the show with us would be powerful

3. The way NY state treats jurors, such as the payroll screw-ups, the lack of child care, etc.

We should NOT appear on the show to talk about the deliberations themselves. The defense will be taping the show, looking for anything it can distort and exploit. I take Kenneth Warner at his word in today's Times that he is pursuing "all the avenues" to get the verdicts overturned.

I am really bummed at the turn things have taken. I fear that we, the jurors themselves, could inadvertently make things worse by talking too much.

Tom

PS I haven't seen last night's 20/20 segment but I will watch it now. Do people think it was responsible?

---

In a message dated 10/10/2009 5:15:06 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, caninc writes:

Hi all,

I just wanted to let you know what just happened to me.

I was in my neighborhood liquor store buying my doorman a bottle of wine for handling the Press so well.

In came an older man who evidently was a regular there at one point, and said hello to all the staff. The staff then introduced him to me and said I was on the jury of the Astor trial.

The man then said, "are you kidding me? Do you know who my best friend is? It's Francis Morrissey and he's coming to my house for dinner tonight."

I very cordially said that I wasn't able to talk to him about the trial and that it was over and I started to leave the store. He then said, "do you know why he couldn't have forged that signature? Because he's dyslexic." I then said, "sir, I'm not the one to tell this too."

He then said that he was going to talk to Puccio so he had something for Morrissey's appeal, and it was then that this man started to cry in the store.

I just exited the store and said, "I'm sorry for your pain, but my civic duty is done and I think it's best if we don't talk", but before I got out the door, he said "there is a reason I met you today. I'm am going to tell Francis tonight."

Ok, what the hell? What should I do, or should I not do anything?

Kristina

---

From: Lkaagan]

Sent: Saturday, October 10, 2009 5:54 PM

To: caninct; jurors

Subject: Re: Help

Kristina,

At least the guy did not identify himself as a chef / winemaker and brandish a broken decanter at you.

The dude may feel that it was fate that brought the two of you together, but that's his issue, not yours. You did and said exactly the right thing. If anything, it was a lawyer who should have known, or said, something about Morrissey and whatever exculpatory information there might have been. You are a civilian now, and nothing need be said to partisans of either side if you do not wish to say it. If you are hassled further, contact the court.

Beyond the fact that nobody outside the jury room has any idea how we addressed the issue of the forgery charge against Morrissey, this guy has nothing to say or do other than tell his dinner companion that he met a juror. Given your magnetic attraction for odd people saying and doing odd things in your vicinity, maybe you should buy your next bottle of wine at a place where nobody knows who you are.

-Larry

Oct 10

Hi Kristina,

I'm sorry to hear about such a distressing encounter. I agree with Larry that you did and said exactly the right thing.

You write:

- > The man then said, "are you kidding me? Do you know who my best friend is?"
- > It's Francis Morrissey and he's coming to my house for dinner tonight."

What an incredible coincidence. What are the chances of that? You ran into Morrissey's "best friend"?!

Larry writes:

- > Given your magnetic attraction for odd people saying
- > and doing odd things in your vicinity,

Hang on there! I happen to have spent five months in Kristina's vicinity, i.e., at her elbow. I certainly did no odd things. Oh, wait. . . . :-)

Tom

Judi DeMarco  
to Philip, jurors, caninc

Oct 10

We found him guilty of forging the instrument, not the signature. But besides that, unless you get further communications from this man or others like him, as unfortunate as what happened to you is (LOL, btw), there really isn't anything the man did wrong....

- > On Oct 10, 2009 5:23 PM, "Philip Bump" wrote:
- >
- > I think that you do nothing. If you feel you ought, yo can certainly tell Judge Bartley through Ms. Joyner.
- >
- > How awkward and unpleasant. I'm sorry.

Tom Davey  
to jurors

Oct 11

Hi folks,

See below for the email I sent Eric Strauss of ABC News. I sent a similar email to Meryl Gordon.

In short, I've decided not to speak to the media for the reasons sketched below. I'm looking into talking to a good criminal defense attorney on a one-time basis to get some clarifications. If I learn anything useful I'll pass it onto the list straightaway.

Beyond that, get home safely and enjoy the evening. :-)

Tom

--

Tom Davey  
New York NY USA

From: Tom Davey Sent: Sunday, October 11, 2009 9:35 AM  
To: 'eric.m.strauss@abc.com'  
Subject: Your requests to speak to me about the Astor trial

Dear Mr. Strauss,

Thanks for your messages to me via LinkedIn and Facebook.

Under normal circumstances I would be happy to talk to the media about the Astor trial. However, now that I've been able to read some of the press coverage, I know that the defendants plan to appeal the verdicts. What's pertinent to me as a former juror is that the defendants intend to make the jury's own conduct a basis of their appeal.

So, it makes sense for me to withhold comment until I better understand the legal issues involved. It could turn out that my caution is unwarranted, but I want to be sure about that first.

Sincerely,  
Tom Davey

---

On Oct 11, 2009 4:53 PM, caninc wrote:

Hi Judi,

I left you a phone message as well, but I wanted to let you know that several people have let me know, that following their conversations with Meryl Gordon, we can expect that her article will have more details than we'd intended to share.

This includes details of the altercation between you and Yvonne. It's up to you but you may want to share your thoughts with Meryl before her deadline tomorrow.

While I think we may all be frustrated by this, it's important to keep in mind that we all know the truth, and that the truth reflects a process that, while sometimes tense, reached a verdict we all decided on.

The aftermath of this trial has been challenging. Things haven't been perfect, but I think we've all tried to do our best.

Feel free to email or call me if you have any questions.

Best,

Kristina

Judi DeMarco  
to caninc

Oct 11

Thank you for the heads up, Kristina. I have to ask, really, after Gordon's crack research using Kim Sager as a "source" in a previous article did anyone honestly expect their "unintended details" to go unreported? She's a reporter, for God's sake. As for me feeling threatened by Yvonne, I stand by my belief as strongly now as I did that day when she went crazy. I don't have anything to add, except I am not surprised by any of this.

---

On Oct 11, 2009 7:43 PM, "caninc" wrote:

Hey Judi, this is what I sent to Meryl after I spoke with you. Keep it for your records. Have a good night sleep and let's get together soon.

Hi Meryl,

I'm sorry to bother you again.

I just got off the phone with Judi and she said she may contact you but wouldn't guarantee it, only because she wants to move on. She appreciates your work but is worn out by it all and must get back to work.

A crucial point though, with the note to the judge, it said she "felt threatened" not that she "was threatened". She hopes that the article will be tasteful and not hurt her image, as she never meant to cause any trouble. It was just a stressful moment that actually helped her in the long run.

I'm not sure if that is of any help, but I wanted to keep you in the loop.

Have a nice evening,

Kristina Jezycki

---

Judi DeMarco  
to caninc

Oct 11

Hi, Kristina -

You forgot to tell Ms. Gordon the part about me hating Yvonne's guts and thinking she's an attention-seeking psychotic nut-job. Beyond that (to quote our favorite judge), thank you for running interference on my behalf. I truly dread the media... and lawyers get the shitty rap....go figure...

xo Drinks sooner rather than later, I hope.

Warmly, Judi

---

From: Tom Davey  
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 7:45 PM  
To: jurors  
Subject: RE: For those interested

Hi Kristina,

Thanks for the update. I also just received an email from Strauss (enclosed below).

Meryl Gordon wrote me back too. Unlike Eric, she didn't take my polite "no" for answer. She said she needed my help to resolve "differing memories" among the eight jurors she's talked to. I didn't bite and haven't replied. But the "differing memories" part was vaguely disconcerting. I think it would be unhelpful if differing memories were captured on TV.

Today I spoke to an attorney about my "post-juror" situation. She told me that if I passed on the advice she gave me, for example to this list, then our conversation would lose its confidential privilege. Suffice to say, though, that I still don't feel comfortable going on TV.

BTGHS AETE,

Tom

==== From Strauss ====

From: Strauss, Eric M [mailto:Eric.M.Strauss@abc.com]  
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 5:58 PM  
To: tom  
Subject: RE: Your requests to speak to me about the Astor trial

Thank you for your nice note. I understand how you feel.

I will be in touch in the near future to see if you still feel the same way.

-EMS

From: Tom Davey  
Sent: Sunday, October 11, 2009 9:35 AM  
To: Strauss, Eric M.  
Subject: Your requests to speak to me about the Astor trial

Dear Mr. Strauss,

Thanks for your messages to me via LinkedIn and Facebook.

Under normal circumstances I would be happy to talk to the media about the Astor trial. However, now that I've been able to read some of the press coverage, I know that the defendants plan to appeal the verdicts. What's pertinent to me as a former juror is that the defendants intend to make the jury's own conduct a basis of their appeal.

So, it makes sense for me to withhold comment until I better understand the legal issues involved. It could turn out that my caution is unwarranted, but I want to be sure about that first.

Sincerely,

Tom Davey

caninc  
to jurors

Oct 12

Hi All,

I meant to send this yesterday to everyone but got caught up in other things.

I wanted to let everyone know that several people have let me know that, following their conversations with Meryl Gordon, we can expect that her article will have more details than we'd intended to share.

This includes details of the altercation between Judi and Yvonne. I've let Judi know so that she can share her take with Meryl if she wishes.

While I think we may all be frustrated by this, it's important to keep in mind that we all know the truth, and that the truth reflects a process that, while sometimes tense, reached a verdict we all decided on.

The aftermath of this trial has been challenging. Things haven't been perfect, but I think we've all tried to do our best.

Feel free to email me if you have any questions.

Best,

Kristina

On Mon, Oct 12, 2009 at 10:21 PM, Philip Bump wrote:

Good evening, everyone except Karu, who is now my mortal enemy! I hope you are all well (except Karu).

We'd discussed suggesting to ABC that we have certain ground rules for our participation in any interviews. To get the ball rolling, I propose the following.

1. We will answer one question about any conflicts between jurors, but will not make any disagreements a focus of conversation.

(The idea here is that we get asked and then can use the 'Frustrations rose on occasion, but we always moved past it,' perhaps including the 'everyone kissed and made up after.')

2. The presence or absence of any jurors reflects nothing more or less than the interest of that juror in sharing his or her story. It is not a reflection of inter-jury relationships, and should not be presented as though it is.

3. Specifics about deliberative decisions that we made are, understandably, not intended to be public. If a participant inadvertently makes a statement that the group as a whole feels reveals more about the process than is appropriate, we reserve the right to restrict its inclusion in any broadcast.

Any other thoughts? (Karu, I'm not interested in yours.)

---

Ilona Gale  
to jurors

Oct 12

I am comfortable with these ground rules.

Ilona

---

Barbara Tomanelli  
to Jurors

Oct 13

Hi Kristina and everyone. Kristina I am very comfortable with you handling the arrangements for a 20/20 Nightline interview. I trust your good judgement completely. I also think that Philip's proposed ground rules are good and should take care of any concerns we have.

Kristina, please let me know if I can help you in any way. I'll await to hear further from you. How is everyone doing - isn't it nice that this is Tuesday and we do not have to go to court.

Love to all - Barbara

---

Philip Bump  
to jurors

Oct 13

I'm not sure we'll have that opportunity. ABC's interest in our stories may not wait.

Of course neither do we have a sense of what ABC wants to do, and when they want to do it. They may be on a longer timeframe than we're expecting anyway.

---

On Oct 13, 2009, at 9:01 AM, caninc wrote:

> Hi All,

>

> After reading everyone's responses this morning, I think the wisest thing to do is to wait for Meryl Gordon's article to come out so we can see what direction this has taken, before speaking to anyone else. At that point, we will be a little more education on the path it's forming.

- > We can then revisit the option to talk to ABC if we wish to.
- >
- > Have a good day everyone, J
- >
- > Kristina
- >

---

Tom Davey  
to caninc, jurors

Oct 13

- > and although they were
- > thinking of a possible aftermath segment, it's clear that that has
- > faded as well.

Very likely. The next flurry of interest in the story will probably come on Dec. 8, when the defendants are sentenced. By then Gordon's piece should be out. Gordon's piece may cause of flurry of interest itself.

Tom

--

Tom Davey  
New York NY USA

- 
- > -----Original Message-----
  - > From: caninc
  - > Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 3:19 PM
  - > To: jurors
  - > Subject: No call backs from ABC
  - >
  - > It may put everyone's mind at ease to know that neither person from ABC has called me back today.
  - >
  - > I'm guessing that since there was no response to them last Thursday,
  - > they decided it wasn't within their time frame, and although they were
  - > thinking of a possible aftermath segment, it's clear that that has
  - > faded as well.
  - >
  - > I will of course let everyone know if they do contact me.
  - >
  - > Best,
  - >
  - > Kristina

---

lkaagan  
to jurors

Oct 13

[Full disclosure: I circulated an earlier version of this note to a smaller sub-circle yesterday. Now I send it to everyone. I think Philip will have a retort coming sometime soon.]

Dear fellow traumatized jurors,

When we still had the privacy of the jury room at our disposal, you heard me say my piece about "doing media." Tom had gotten his input from a veteran of press coverage, and I offered my perspective as both a former journalist and as a researcher who has sought and received judicial permission to interview jurors in the aftermath of trials, and written (non-published) analyses of what I learned.

When we talked last week, I was hopeful that there was a resolve to: a) talk as freely about the trial and our individual perspectives on it as each individual wished, but b) preserve the sanctity of the deliberations, and characterize them in only the most general way, without reference to votes, positions taken by specific jurors, or how particular charges were addressed. For better or worse (mostly worse, from what I've been reading), some of that resolve has either been tossed overboard, or accidentally misplaced under the pressure of real-time interviewing. That, of course, is each individual's prerogative. Judge Bartley made it a point to say he was restoring all our constitutional rights when he released us...but he also made a point of saying that he hoped we would not, in essence, open up the jury decision-making process to public view. It might have sounded old-fashioned, but I believe he was encouraging us to preserve the sanctity of something really important, not just to him, but to everyone.

And then there is the issue that Tom has raised, namely the interest of the lawyers on the "losing" side to find every tool that might be used to overturn the verdict and set aside the outcome of the trial on appeal. We already know that the "juror feeling threatened" episode is in the toolkit, and that they are scanning the public comments of all 12 of us for anything else. Saying things we don't mean to say; saying things to journalists that we then strive to "take back;" disclosing details that we haven't thought about before the moment we are asked about them in an interview – all these are potential hand-grenades.

I began by being ambivalent about the follow-up interviews. Over the weekend, I spoke to John Eligon of The Times, and to Meryl Gordon for her Vanity Fair and book-revision projects. Some part of my brain was looking forward to the opportunity, and frankly, to the visibility, of the ABC group-interview: my professional life has taken a tumble in the past 6 months, and free advertising is good advertising.

My ambivalence has shifted toward the negative. I see jeopardy more than I see opportunity. Even if the ABC team is the most respectful and careful team of journalists ever, they will be looking (trust me, I've been on the other side) for tales of conflict, for the roadmap to decision-making, and for whatever disagreements they can illuminate, especially if those disagreements can be re-created on-camera. Personally, I'm at the point where I feel I've worked too hard, for too long, in the security of the jury room where I knew argument, disagreement, emotion and even ill-temper were protected, to risk replicating them in an unprotected setting.

I have seen the ground-rules that Philip proposes for the Nightline + 20/20 segment... I have also bounced them off a former TV news-segment producer, who regards them as a nice idea, but nowhere near enforceable, and therefore, not very protective of the jurors who might be depending on them. Depending (this is difficult to say out loud) on who it is among the 12 of us that agrees to them, and intends on showing up, I have varying degrees of confidence that they can be adhered to in any case. Absent that, I'm leaning toward opting out of ABC. To those among us who have already opted out of future media visibility for personal, professional or other reasons, what I've written here doesn't matter much. To those who have already responded "yeah, sure, that looks good to me," without giving serious thought to the balance between risk and reward, I encourage everybody to ponder before signing up for the ABC appearance. Friends from my days in journalism school would be aghast if they knew I was writing this; but just now, I'm more concerned about my friends from the jury room.

Beyond that, get home safely, and enjoy the evening (I've heard that somewhere, haven't I?)

-Larry

Tom Davey  
to jurors

Oct 13

Hi Olga,  
Nice to hear from you! I bet you're like me and actually in a little bit of withdrawals from the trial. It truly became a ingrained routine, almost more normal than the "real" normal life I've just resumed, and which now seems a little odd and unfamiliar.

You write:

- > I'm hoping Tom will change, his reluctance to talk,
- > or do you think maybe I'm too naive?

To the first part of your question: no, sorry, it's impossible for me to change my mind on this. I am more convinced than ever that it's inappropriate for me to say anything in public about the experience of deliberations while post-trial proceedings, specifically the defendant's announced appeal based on how Bartley handled "the note," are in progress. In particular, I don't want to put any material into the public domain that might find its way into Hafetz's appellate brief. I feel it would be an astor-nomical miscarriage of justice were our verdicts to be tossed out on such a small technicality.

As to the second part of your question: brace yourself! Yes, I think it's naïve not to believe that Meryl Gordon, ABC News, etc. merely want to whip up the scandal. I'm not going to play that game. I have yet to talk to a reporter and I assure you I will not.

I happily admit I've changed my tune on this since our visit to the Blue Ribbon Bakery Thursday afternoon. Over beers I speculated that ABC News might be interested in covering the story in a nobler way and said we should consider an appearance to talk about, say, elder abuse. At that point I didn't know about the defendant's appeal, the way "the note" had been covered by the press, etc. In other words, at that point I was naïve.

To summarize: If I want my Mom to see me on TV I can always rob a bank. :-)

Hey, look what time it is: 5:45! It's time to say, "Beyond that, get home safely and enjoy the evening." (BTGHSÆTE)

Tom

Tom

--

Tom Davey

New York NY USA

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Olga Zugor [

> Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 4:30 PM

> To: jurors

- > Subject: Re: pondering ABC>

> Hello to my 11 friends;

> Yesterday I had brunch with Susanne, she is sending here best regards,

> and she said that she is very proud of us, and I share her opinion.

> After reading many articles, my feeling is, that would be a mistake not

> to talk to the press. One incident totally blown out of

> proportion and the defense grasping for straw. We can ask ourselves

> "Did we do anything wrong?" "Did we twisted anybodies arm?" to go

> one way or another? We did not do anything wrong, and basically non of

> us has anything to hide. We wanted to keep Yvonne name out of

> attention, but since she apologized front of us and disclosed it

> publicly, I can not see any reason for a big "hush-hush." I'm hoping

> Tom will change, his reluctance to talk, or do you think maybe I'm

> too naive? When I came here from the communist Hungary where I

> witnessed a decade of silence. People didn't dare to voice there

> opinion they could end up in concentration camp. I just can't imagine

> that we have anything to be afraid of!! I believe we live in a very

> fragile democracy but it is a democracy. I'm hoping that most of you

> agree with me, but if you don't I still love you the same. What is

> going on with Philip, and Karu? being "Mortal enemies?" I can't

> believe that is possible, let me know, is that a joke?

> Sending love for all!!!!

> Olga

|

Tom Davey  
to jurors

Oct 13

> For the most part  
> (only in baseball are we enemies).

Ah, now I see what's it all about. No need to fight! Join me in serene contemplation of the upcoming freeway Series, Dodgers vs. Angels. I grew up five miles from Angel Stadium so naturally I'm rooting for the invincible Halos.

Oops, got to go! Time to pet my Rally Monkey.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rally\\_Monkey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rally_Monkey)

<http://images.google.com/images?q=rally+monkey>

<http://www.rallymonkey.com/shop.php>

--

Tom Davey  
New York NY USA

> -----Original Message-----

> From: karu kozuma

> To: jurors

> Subject: My involvement

>

> Hi folks,

>

> Good to hear from folks that people are trying to get back to life  
> before Astor. Anyhow, I explained this to some folks, but at this  
> point for me, I am not interested in talking to any form of media  
> (unless there is loads of money to pay off my school loans or they  
take

> out Phil, my nemesis).

>

> I am trying to refocus on some of the other things in my life that I  
> have been putting on hold, and I need to do so. I am concerned about  
> how this all plays out, and I still have faith and trust in us as  
> individuals and as a group.

>

> It does not mean that I will move on from staying connected to all of  
> you, however. Keep me in the loop (or not if you feel that my use has  
> run its course now). : )

>

> Phil, watch your back. Olga, yes, we are joking. For the most part  
> (only in baseball are we enemies).

>

> Talk to you soon,

> The President of the Puma Fan Club (Phil wanted to be president, but  
he

> got VP, thus he is pissed)

>  
> \_\_\_\_\_

FW: For Judi DeMarco, please

|  
caninc  
to me

Oct 13

Hello there girl,

I hope you had a great time with your sister.

As I insisted, I wouldn't give Meryl your info, but she asked that I forward this one last email to you.

I think this is her last try, so I won't bother you anymore regarding Meryl. Sorry to do this to you, but I just didn't want you out of the loop completely in knowing what's going on with the Vanity Fair article.

There are things about me in there, I'm sure, that I don't know about. It sounds like many people spoke.

Anyhooooo, lets try again for drinks, when you're free. :)

-----Original Message-----

From: meryl@mindspring.com [mailto:meryl@mindspring.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2009 10:00 PM

To: caninc

Subject: For Judi DeMarco, please

Dear Judi DeMarco,

I thought I would try one more time to see if you will speak to me, even on background, for my Vanity Fair article. I am mentioning you in the story, and I want to make sure that I get my facts right. Even the small details would be helpful; various stories that I have read seem to list different ages for you. My story is for the December issue of the magazine, which will appear in early November. I can be reached at 212-580-4718. Best regards, Meryl Gordon

---

From: "Strauss, Eric M" <Eric.M.Strauss@abc.com>

Date: Wed, 14 Oct 2009 19:43:36 +0000

To: caninc

Subject: RE: ABC News

Hello Kristina:

Unfortunately, at this time ABC News 20/20 and Nightline have decided not to go forward with an interview with the jury. When the verdict was delivered Thursday afternoon we rushed to put the program on for that Friday and our Executive producer decided it would be too soon to air another segment about the trial.

There is a chance that we would re-examine this during the summer, but for now we are not going to proceed with any other interviews.

Personally I am disappointed. I would have liked to hear what the process was like.

I hope we will stay in touch in case things change. If you have any questions about the trial or advice for dealing with other media please feel free to get in touch with me.

Sincerely,

-Eric Strauss

212-456-2016

eric.m.strauss@abc.com

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Philip Bump  
To: jurors  
Sent: Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:57 pm  
Subject: Times

Got a call from Eligon from the Times, asking questions about my take on the T&E component of the case. Answered his questions that didn't deal with deliberations - he then transitioned to the forgery. Really hammered on it, asking me about six questions at various angles, to the point that I was laughing as I said, "No comment."

Just a heads up.

Ikaagan  
to caninc, jurors

Oct 15

I'm not in any way paranoid, but I have no interest in fending off more questions seeking to deconstruct the deliberations and probe for "how did you reach your decision." The journalist in me feels bad, but the juror in me feels just fine not returning his call.

-LK

---

-----Original Message-----

From: caninc  
To: Ikaagan; jurors  
Sent: Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:25 pm  
Subject: Re: Times

A message on my phone too.  
Don't know if I should bother calling back. What do you think?

---

Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T  
From: Ikaagan  
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 2009 18:56:05 -0400  
To: <philip >; <jurors >  
Subject: Re: Times

Thanks, Philip. There was a message from him on my answering machine when I got home....

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Philip Bump  
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2009 3:15 PM  
To: Jurors  
Subject: Vincent Astor, circa 1913

My wife bought me a little memento on eBay - a 1913 newspaper article profiling Vincent Astor's personality, by way of the bumps on his head. Yes, really.

---

Greta Goldberg  
to Philip, Jurors

Oct 30

That is very sweet of your wife. However, I was more concerned with what

was on your head in the picture of you at the top of the blog. A Phillies hat, really?

|  
Barbara Tomanelli  
to Philip, Jurors

Oct 31

Kudos to you Philip for posing unafraid in your Phillies baseball cap - I am impressed. Have a good weekend everyone. Love BT

---

> On Nov 2, 2009, at 9:15 AM, lkaagan wrote:

>

>

> Hello all,

>

> If you are not monitoring the media, here is the online version of how Vanity Fair is promoting the upcoming Meryl Gordon piece for the December issue. Phasers on stun; shields up.

>

> -Larry

>

> -----

>

> Inside the Astor Verdict

> After five stressful months, and weeks of deliberation, the verdict finally came: Anthony Marshall was guilty of defrauding his centenarian mother, Brooke Astor. With in-depth accounts from eight jurors, Meryl Gordon reveals the fears, tears, and backroom fireworks that nearly led to the mistrial of the decade.

---

Philip Bump  
to Jurors

Nov 2

A few things to keep in mind - first, Meryl doesn't write the teasers, and the editors that do might not have read the piece in its entirety yet. The piece I did for the Daily Beast, for example, had a teaser about my noting what the press got wrong, which wasn't at all what it was about.

Which brings me to the second point - they're just trying to sell magazines. They're going to make it sound like this piece is the most exciting fascinating look at human behavior ever. Which I doubt it is.

Also: Yo! Tomanelli!

---

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Philip Bump

> Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 10:21 AM

> To: Jurors

> Subject: Re: Vanity Fair blurb

>

> And with the guy from Twilight on the cover, we can be assured that the article will be read (or at least possessed) by thousands of teenage girls. And Greta.

---

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Greta Goldberg > Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 11:07 AM

> To: 'Jurors'

> Subject: RE: Vanity Fair blurb

>

> Eek! This looks like it should be a lot of fun (insert sarcasm). According to my Twilight fan page, the issue comes out on Wednesday (insert even more sarcasm). I am already bracing myself...

>

---

On Nov 2, 2009, at 11:22 AM, Barbara Tomanelli wrote:

> And Meryl seemed like such a nice lady (said with much skepticism). Oh well, we know the true story no matter what. Hi everyone. Love BT

caninc  
to jurors

Nov 2

Sooo dramatic! J The mistrial of the decade? Have they been watching the Gotti, Jr trial?

---

From: Greta Goldberg  
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2009 2:28 AM  
To: 'Jurors'  
Subject: Vanity Fair article

The Meryl Gordon VF article has arrived. Here is the link: <http://www.vanityfair.com/culture/features/2009/12/astor-trial-verdict-200912?currentPage=1>.

I would say that it is not 100% accurate but not terrible either. I look forward to hearing what others think.

Best,

Greta

---

Barbara Tomanelli  
to Greta, Jurors

Nov 3

I agree with you Greta. The article is not 100% accurate but it's not too bad – she quoted me accurately anyway. It makes me wonder that when the defense team reads this – and you know they will – will they second guess their decision to not call witnesses. Have a good day all. Love BT

---

On Nov 3, 2009, at 8:50 AM, Judi DeMarco wrote:

- > 1) Philip, I called you an asshole once, not twice
- > 2) Go fuck yourself, Olga, you are a crazy old coot.
- > 3) If I had to do it over again, i'd not hug Yvonne, nor change my votes.

---

Philip Bump  
to me

Nov 3

I know it won't change anything, but I told Meryl that as a, "People got annoyed and got over it. No big deal." I didn't tell her it was from you, just that it happened.

And of course, I totally get your frustration.

---

Philip Bump  
to Jurors

Nov 3

I think it's kind of crummy. The opinion of one person is continually presented as the opinion of the group.

As for the "asshole" comment, I used that with Meryl in support of the "tensions rose every so often" line of argument - not naming names, just a sort of, "Big deal, I was called an asshole a few times, we moved forward." I now wish I hadn't, of course.

---

On Nov 3, 2009, at 9:16 AM, Judi DeMarco wrote:

I only once said I felt threatened-AND I DID.

You all can re-create how you remember things. I have my perceptions as well, equally valid and real. I have never been called a drama queen in my life. My opinion differed than yours, it was difficult for one person to go up against 11 others who felt equally strong in their opinions.

I do not wish to be a part of your email circle any longer, so please do not include me on any future emails. The trial is over, I am trying to move on and revisiting the jury room with revisionist and inaccurate history serves no one well. (That does not make me a drama queen, Olga, just someone who wants to live an honest life) .

---

Philip Bump  
to me

Nov 3

I'll remove you from the list.

---

lkaagan  
to me

Nov 3

Judi,

You may notice that I have not joined in on the commentary on what anybody (other than myself) said, either in the Gordon interview or in the circular e-mails. Having spent 5 months wedged between you and Yvonne in the courtroom, there is a peculiar emotional resonance for me about the fracas that everybody seems focused on. My interest now is pretty much the same as it was during deliberations: keeping myself clear-headed and on as much of an "even keel" as I could, and trying my best to help others achieve the same goals.

I respect your decision to cut the cord and get on with post-trial life. The attention of the Outside World makes that hard. Let me know if you ever get around to reading the Cuomo book; and if you ever want to maintain direct one-on-one contact, without the Circle of 12 being involved, I hope you'll feel comfortable doing that.

-Larry