



Planet Depos
We Make It Happen™

Transcript of Eric George

Date: April 5, 2021
Case: Depp, II -v- Heard

Planet Depos
Phone: 888-433-3767
Fax: 888-503-3767
Email: transcripts@planetdepos.com
www.planetdepos.com

1 Mr. Depp ever initiated any legal action, be it a 16:39:16
2 lawsuit, arbitration, or demand against your, 16:39:21
3 then-client, Amber Heard? 16:39:24
4 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading. 16:39:26
5 Hearsay. Foundation. Speculation. 16:39:27
6 Go ahead. 16:39:29
7 A We -- will you say that again at the 16:39:30
8 beginning, you said putting aside what? 16:39:35
9 Q Putting aside the divorce case, had there 16:39:38
10 ever been any litigation or arbitration between 16:39:42
11 your former client, Amber Heard, and Johnny Depp? 16:39:45
12 A Not that I recollect. 16:39:49
13 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. 16:39:51
14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Ms. Bredehoft, I 16:39:53
15 didn't catch your objection. 16:39:55
16 MS. BREDEHOFT: It was leading. Hearsay 16:39:57
17 and foundation. Calls for speculation. 16:39:58
18 THE WITNESS: As I sit here today, not 16:40:01
19 that I recollect. 16:40:03
20 BY MR. CHEW: 16:40:04
21 Q It is fair to say that you and your client 16:40:05
22 fired the first shot, true? 16:40:10

Transcript of Eric George
April 5, 2021

137

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Objection. Misstates his	16:40:12
2	testimony. Argumentative.	16:40:14
3	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah, and hearsay.	16:40:15
4	Leading. Foundation. Calls for speculation.	16:40:18
5	You may answer.	16:40:20
6	A No.	16:40:20
7	Q Why is it not true?	16:40:21
8	A Look at the letter itself.	16:40:23
9	Q Is this a love tap?	16:40:24
10	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Argumentative.	16:40:27
11	MR. SCHWARTZ: I don't want --	16:40:30
12	MS. BREDEHOFT: [Indiscernible.] Hearsay.	16:40:33
13	BY MR. CHEW:	16:40:33
14	Q Let's look to the attachment. Was this	16:40:36
15	arbitration demand filed by Amber Heard against	16:40:39
16	Mr. Depp? What is that?	16:40:44
17	A Look at the second paragraph referencing	16:40:46
18	any further public statements that Mr. Depp or his	16:40:50
19	agents may make about Ms. Heard. I think that	16:40:53
20	speaks for itself.	16:40:56
21	Q What is the -- please describe for us what	16:40:57
22	you intended to convey as Ms. Depp's arbitration	16:41:02

1	document.	16:43:13
2	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection, hearsay.	16:43:13
3	Leading. Foundation. Not best evidence.	16:43:17
4	Document speaks for itself, and misstates the	16:43:19
5	document.	16:43:22
6	BY MR. CHEW:	16:43:22
7	Q Did I accurately read that, sir?	16:43:22
8	A Yes.	16:43:25
9	Q Was that a meritorious claim?	16:43:25
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: Objection, calls for a	16:43:34
11	legal conclusion.	16:43:40
12	MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah, calls for a legal	16:43:40
13	conclusion. Hearsay. Leading. Foundation.	16:43:42
14	BY MR. CHEW:	16:43:42
15	Q We've been talking about meritorious	16:43:44
16	claims all day long. Was that a meritorious	16:43:46
17	claim?	16:43:50
18	MS. BREDEHOFT: Same objections.	16:43:50
19	A Yes.	16:43:51
20	Q How was it resolved -- or, strike that.	16:43:51
21	How did Mr. Depp's -- how did Mr. Depp	16:43:55
22	respond to Ms. Heard's arbitration demand,	16:43:59

1 Exhibit 13? 16:44:02

2 MR. SCHWARTZ: Objection. Calls for 16:44:03

3 speculation, lack of personal knowledge. 16:44:04

4 MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah, objection. Hearsay, 16:44:05

5 leading, foundation, and speculation. 16:44:08

6 Go ahead. 16:44:09

7 A There was an issue raised about whether 16:44:10

8 the parties had complied with the requisite 16:44:12

9 procedures to have any such arbitration claims 16:44:20

10 properly before a judge pro tem. So for 16:44:31

11 procedural reasons, this was found not to properly 16:44:36

12 be before the judge pro tem who we brought this 16:44:41

13 before. 16:44:45

14 Q Isn't it true that Mr. Depp filed a motion 16:44:46

15 to dismiss? 16:44:49

16 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Hearsay, 16:44:50

17 leading, foundation, calls for speculation, not 16:44:51

18 best evidence. 16:44:53

19 Go ahead. 16:44:54

20 A I don't recollect the title of it, but he 16:44:55

21 did file a motion for exactly -- raising exactly 16:44:58

22 the claim that I just mentioned. 16:45:04

1	Q Who adjudicated Mr. Depp's motion to	16:45:07
2	dismiss?	16:45:10
3	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Calls for	16:45:11
4	hearsay. Leading. Foundation. Speculation. Not	16:45:13
5	best evidence.	16:45:16
6	Go ahead.	16:45:16
7	A Again, I believe it was the judge pro tem,	16:45:17
8	a man named Judge Meisinger, Lou Meisinger.	16:45:21
9	Q And is it true that Judge Meisinger	16:45:29
10	dismissed Ms. Heard's arbitration demands	16:45:33
11	summarily?	16:45:37
12	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading.	16:45:37
13	Hearsay. Foundation. Speculation.	16:45:38
14	Go ahead.	16:45:40
15	A Again, not on the merits, but precisely	16:45:41
16	because there was a question about whether the	16:45:45
17	parties stipulated to have these particular	16:45:47
18	disputes heard before him.	16:45:50
19	Q Did Judge Meisinger throw out Ms. Heard's	16:45:52
20	arbitration demand, "yes," or "no"?	16:45:56
21	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading.	16:45:59
22	Hearsay. Foundation. Not best evidence.	16:46:01

1 Speculation, and argumentative. 16:46:02

2 A You're misconstruing a decision based on a 16:46:05

3 procedural ground, and trying to suggest that it 16:46:11

4 was based on a substantive ground. And I'm 16:46:14

5 telling you that Judge Meisinger determined that 16:46:17

6 the parties had not properly dotted there is and 16:46:20

7 crossed their Ts with respect to designating him, 16:46:25

8 personally, as the judge pro tem; and, therefore, 16:46:29

9 he could not exercise jurisdiction over the claim. 16:46:32

10 There was nothing that he did that addressed the 16:46:36

11 merits of the claim. 16:46:38

12 Q Motions to dismiss are granted oftentimes 16:46:42

13 not on the merits. Did he or did he not dismiss 16:46:44

14 Ms. Heard's demand for arbitration? 16:46:50

15 MR. SCHWARTZ: Objection. Asked and 16:46:52

16 answered. 16:46:53

17 MS. BREDEHOFT: Yeah, asked and answered, 16:46:53

18 and also objection to the form of the question. 16:46:54

19 It's very argumentative and inappropriate. 16:46:57

20 Hearsay. Leading. Foundation. And calls for 16:47:00

21 speculation. 16:47:00

22 BY MR. CHEW: 16:47:00

1	[indiscernible].	16:47:58
2	MR. CHEW: Are you kidding me?	16:48:02
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: You didn't cross-notice	16:48:04
4	this deposition.	16:48:06
5	MS. BREDEHOFT: He did. He cross-noticed	16:48:06
6	it so he has the ability.	16:48:09
7	BY MR. CHEW:	16:48:09
8	Q Did --	16:48:13
9	MR. CHEW: Excuse me.	16:48:13
10	Q Did Judge Meisinger award your client any	16:48:15
11	compensatory damages?	16:48:20
12	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Hearsay,	16:48:21
13	leading, foundation, it's a hypothetical and not	16:48:23
14	best evidence. Calls for speculation.	16:48:26
15	A Again --	16:48:28
16	Q "Yes," or "no," sir.	16:48:31
17	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. You may not	16:48:32
18	badger the witness. You may not demand a "yes" or	16:48:34
19	"no." That is not appropriate in Virginia courts,	16:48:37
20	and you know it. Objection to the form of the	16:48:39
21	question.	16:48:42
22	BY MR. CHEW:	16:48:42

1 Q Did he award compensatory damages to your 16:48:42
2 client, "yes," or "no"? 16:48:47

3 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Asked and 16:48:47
4 answered. Leading. Hearsay. Foundation. Not 16:48:48
5 best evidence. 16:48:50

6 A Again, as I've explained, there was no 16:48:51
7 hearing; and, therefore, there was no adjudication 16:48:56
8 in favor of or against my client on the merits. 16:48:59

9 Q Did he award any punitive damages to 16:49:03
10 Ms. Heard? 16:49:06

11 MR. SCHWARTZ: Asked and answered. 16:49:06

12 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading. 16:49:06
13 Hearsay. Foundation. Not best evidence. And 16:49:08
14 asked and answered and argumentative. 16:49:13

15 BY MR. CHEW: 16:49:15

16 Q Please answer the question: Did he award 16:49:15
17 punitive damages to your client, or not? 16:49:18

18 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading. 16:49:20
19 Hearsay. Foundation. Not best evidence. 16:49:22
20 Argumentative. Asked and answered. 16:49:24

21 A So for the reasons I've explained, as 16:49:26
22 there was no hearing whatsoever since, for 16:49:29

1 procedural reasons, the matter was not before him, 16:49:33
2 there was no award of punitive damages or any 16:49:36
3 other relief for either side in the proceeding. 16:49:39
4 Q What communications, if any, did you have 16:49:43
5 with Ms. Heard about Judge Meisinger's decision 16:49:45
6 throwing out her demand for arbitration? 16:49:51
7 MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object. Let 16:49:53
8 me object first. Calls for attorney-client 16:49:56
9 communication, so I'm invoking the attorney-client 16:49:59
10 communications. 16:50:02
11 MR. SCHWARTZ: And I will instruct the 16:50:02
12 witness not to answer for that reason, and also 16:50:03
13 for attorney work product protection. 16:50:05
14 MR. CHEW: All right. Let me make a 16:50:05
15 record because we are, as Mr. George aptly 16:50:10
16 predicted, we are going back to the Court. So I 16:50:13
17 will ask the questions, and Mr. George will wait 16:50:16
18 for you to instruct. 16:50:19
19 BY MR. CHEW: 16:50:19
20 Q Did you have any oral communications with 16:50:20
21 Ms. Heard relating to the demand for arbitration 16:50:22
22 and the results of that as reflected in 16:50:25

1 MR. SCHWARTZ: Also lack of foundation, 18:30:47
2 and I'll instruct the witness not to answer. 18:30:49
3 MS. BREDEHOFT: Lack of foundation, 18:30:51
4 speculation, hearsay. 18:30:54
5 MR. CHEW: You're instructing him not to 18:30:55
6 answer that, too? 18:30:57
7 MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct. 18:30:59
8 BY MR. CHEW: 18:31:00
9 Q Who is Paul Berese [ph]. 18:31:01
10 A Paul Berese is a private investigator. 18:31:05
11 Q Did there come a time when you engaged 18:31:10
12 Mr. Berese to be a private investigator for 18:31:16
13 Ms. Heard with respect to Mr. Depp's defamation 18:31:21
14 case in Virginia? 18:31:24
15 MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object on the 18:31:25
16 grounds that it calls for either attorney-client 18:31:27
17 communications or work product in connection with 18:31:31
18 representation, and I would invoke the privileges. 18:31:35
19 MR. SCHWARTZ: And I will assert the 18:31:38
20 attorney work product protection on Mr. George's 18:31:39
21 behalf and instruct him not to answer for the same 18:31:39
22 reason. 18:31:45

Transcript of Eric George
April 5, 2021

217

1	BY MR. CHEW:	18:31:45
2	Q Isn't it true that Mr. Berese was a male	18:31:46
3	adult film star before he moved into the area of	18:31:50
4	private investigation?	18:31:55
5	MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object.	18:31:57
6	Leading. Hearsay. Foundation. Calls for	18:31:58
7	speculation. And to the extent that this calls	18:32:03
8	for any information that would be associated with	18:32:05
9	work product, I would invoke that doctrine and	18:32:08
10	privilege, as well if there is any communication	18:32:13
11	with respect to attorney-client communications, I	18:32:15
12	would invoke that privilege.	18:32:17
13	MR. CHEW: Are you instructing him not to	18:32:19
14	answer?	18:32:21
15	MR. SCHWARTZ: I don't think the question	18:32:21
16	calls for that, but go ahead.	18:32:22
17	A I can certainly tell you I have no	18:32:24
18	personal information on that one.	18:32:26
19	Q But you did engage him as an investigator	18:32:30
20	in the context of the Virginia case, correct?	18:32:33
21	MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object.	18:32:36
22	A I didn't say that.	18:32:39

1	MR. SCHWARTZ: Go ahead, Elaine.	18:32:42
2	MS. BREDEHOFT: That was already asked and	18:32:44
3	answered. I've already objected on the basis of	18:32:46
4	work product and, potentially, attorney-client	18:32:47
5	privilege, and I'm invoking those.	18:32:51
6	MR. SCHWARTZ: And I'll object on the	18:32:54
7	basis of the attorney work product protection and	18:32:56
8	instruct the witness not to answer on the basis	18:32:59
9	for that.	18:33:02
10	MR. CHEW: Well, all of this has been	18:33:02
11	waived, but we're going to fight this another day.	18:33:04
12	So please be very quick in your instructions not	18:33:04
13	to answer so we can move on. But I have to make a	18:33:09
14	record, as you know.	18:33:10
15	BY MR. CHEW:	18:33:12
16	Q What tasks if any, did you give Mr. Berese	18:33:13
17	with respect to investigating Mr. Depp in the	18:33:17
18	context of the Virginia action?	18:33:21
19	MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object, and	18:33:22
20	calls for hearsay, foundation, speculation, and to	18:33:24
21	the extent that it calls for any attorney-client	18:33:29
22	communications or work product associated with the	18:33:32

1 to the extent that it calls for attorney-client 19:17:38
2 communications outside of the scope of the 19:17:41
3 representation of the drafting and publication of 19:17:44
4 the op-ed and also work product, and will invoke 19:17:47
5 those privileges. 19:17:49
6 BY MR. CHEW: 19:17:53
7 Q What communications, if any, did you have 19:17:53
8 with Amber Heard about your allegation here that 19:17:56
9 Johnny Depp "repeatedly" beat her? 19:17:59
10 MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object to the 19:18:02
11 extent that it calls for attorney-client 19:18:04
12 communications outside the representation of Amber 19:18:06
13 for the drafting and publication of the op-ed, and 19:18:09
14 also work product privileges, and invoke those. 19:18:12
15 MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll add asked and 19:18:15
16 answered, and I'll instruct the witness not to 19:18:18
17 answer to the extent that the answer reveals 19:18:20
18 communications outside the limited scope we've 19:18:25
19 been discussing. 19:18:28
20 BY MR. CHEW: 19:18:28
21 Q What did your investigator, Paul Berese, 19:18:28
22 write you or write you about what he had 19:18:33

1 discovered about the allegation concerning 19:18:36

2 Mr. Depp beating Amber Heard? 19:18:39

3 MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object to the 19:18:41

4 extent that calls for hearsay, foundation, 19:18:43

5 speculation, and then also to the extent that it 19:18:46

6 calls for attorney work product outside the scope 19:18:49

7 of the representation for the op-ed, for the 19:18:52

8 drafting and publication of the op-ed. I would 19:18:54

9 invoke that privilege. 19:18:57

10 MR. SCHWARTZ: And I'll also object on the 19:18:59

11 basis of attorney work product and instruct the 19:19:01

12 witness not to answer. 19:19:04

13 BY MR. CHEW: 19:19:05

14 Q Isn't it true that Mr. Berese told you he 19:19:06

15 came up with no one that could corroborate 19:19:09

16 Ms. Heard's allegations? 19:19:12

17 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Leading. 19:19:13

18 Hearsay. Foundation. And then to the extent it 19:19:15

19 calls for work product outside the representation 19:19:17

20 -- outside the scope of the representation for the 19:19:20

21 drafting and publication of the op-ed, I would 19:19:23

22 invoke the privilege. 19:19:26

1	meritorious claims, correct?	20:07:09
2	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. Hearsay.	20:07:11
3	Foundation. Speculation. Not best evidence.	20:07:13
4	MR. SCHWARTZ: And mischaracterizes the	20:07:17
5	evidence.	20:07:17
6	A Mr. Chew, I should only say that I do	20:07:21
7	understand that an order was issued denying the	20:07:23
8	motion to dismiss; but beyond that, I really	20:07:26
9	shouldn't comment on it because I just don't know	20:07:30
10	the particulars of what occurred at that point in	20:07:32
11	time.	20:07:32
12	Q All right. Mr. George, I just want to --	20:07:32
13	this is just for purposes of making the record.	20:07:40
14	Did Ms. Heard, either directly or through	20:07:44
15	you, engage Paul Berese to be a private	20:07:47
16	investigator in the Depp v Heard matter?	20:07:53
17	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection to the extent	20:07:56
18	that this calls for any attorney-client	20:07:59
19	communications outside the scope of the drafting	20:08:01
20	and publication of the op-ed or outside the scope	20:08:02
21	of -- or with work product outside the scope of	20:08:06
22	the drafting and publication of the op-ed, I would	20:08:10

1	impose the -- I would invoke the privilege and the	20:08:15
2	doctrine.	20:08:19
3	MR. SCHWARTZ: And I will also object on	20:08:19
4	the basis of the attorney work product protection,	20:08:20
5	and instruct the witness not to answer.	20:08:22
6	MR. CHEW: Okay. Just two more.	20:08:24
7	BY MR. CHEW:	20:08:24
8	Q Were you, or some attorney at your law	20:08:29
9	firm, the person who engaged Mr. Berese, or was it	20:08:31
10	someone else?	20:08:35
11	MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection to the extent it	20:08:35
12	calls for work product outside the scope of the	20:08:37
13	drafting and publication of the op-ed, I would	20:08:41
14	invoke the work product privilege. And to the	20:08:44
15	extent that it would involve or implicate	20:08:48
16	attorney-client communications, because I guess	20:08:53
17	that's a possibility in that one, outside the	20:08:56
18	scope of the op-ed, I will impose that.	20:08:59
19	MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll object on the basis of	20:09:01
20	attorney work product protection, and instruct the	20:09:04
21	witness not to answer.	20:09:05
22	BY MR. CHEW:	20:09:06

1 Q Was Ms. Heard the one who directly engaged 20:09:07
2 Mr. Berese to serve as a private investigator in 20:09:11
3 matters relating to Depp versus Heard? 20:09:14

4 MS. BREDEHOFT: Objection. I believe that 20:09:16
5 one definitely calls for attorney-client 20:09:19
6 communications outside the scope of the -- it 20:09:20
7 calls for an answer to that involving either 20:09:23
8 attorney-client communications outside the scope 20:09:28
9 of the op-ed, the drafting and publication of the 20:09:29
10 op-ed, or work product also outside that scope of 20:09:33
11 the op-ed. So I would invoke the privilege and 20:09:38
12 the document. 20:09:41

13 MR. SCHWARTZ: And I will object on the 20:09:41
14 basis of the attorney work product protection, and 20:09:42
15 instruct the witness not to answer. 20:09:45

16 BY MR. CHEW: 20:09:47

17 Q At the time of the op-ed representation 20:09:47
18 that you were trying to carve out, what, if any, 20:09:50
19 conversations did you have with James Franco or 20:09:53
20 James Franco's lawyer? 20:09:58

21 MS. BREDEHOFT: I'm going to object to the 20:10:01
22 extent that it calls for any work product outside 20:10:03