

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOYCE BEATTY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 25 Civ. 4480 (CRC)

PLAINTIFF’S REPLY TO DEFENDANTS’ POSITION STATEMENT RESPONSE

Mindful that fact discovery closes imminently, Plaintiff submits this short reply to identify gaps in Defendants’ productions that have come to light after the filing of her original Position Statement and that underscore her concerns. For example, for the first time in a deposition today, Defendant Matthew Floca testified that JLL provided pertinent input to Center management regarding the feasibility of phased construction in the form of a letter. Yet no such letter was produced by Defendants in discovery—despite the JLL report being one of only two documents provided to the Board at the August 13 meeting. In addition, Defendants have failed to respond to a request to produce specific documents Plaintiff has identified, from the limited emails that *were* produced, as having been provided to Delta Consulting Group (including what appear to be multiple versions of the same budget projection chart).

Defendants now request that discovery be closed “immediately” based on their characterizations of the utility of discovery in this case. Naturally, Plaintiff objects to that request and to the underlying characterizations—particularly in light of the information that Plaintiff has uncovered in discovery in the short period available and despite Defendants’ apparent stonewalling. There is no basis to terminate discovery based on Defendants’ unilateral characterization of what discovery has revealed; should the Court contemplate doing so, Plaintiff respectfully requests an opportunity to address that issue. Plaintiff respectfully reiterates her request for a modest 1–2-week extension on the closure of discovery to gather highly pertinent financial information, such as FY26 financial information. Plaintiff also respectfully requests that the Court bifurcate the lift motion from summary judgment to allow sufficient time to fairly resolve discovery disputes raised by her existing discovery requests, rather than imposing an artificial deadline that would effectively give Defendants a *de facto* veto over discovery by refusing to respond. Plaintiff stands ready to respond to the remainder of Defendants’ filing at the Court’s request.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kyle R. Freeny

KYLE R. FREENY

(D.C. Bar No. 1684764)

NATHANIEL A.G. ZELINSKY

(D.C. Bar No. 1724093)

ALEXANDER KRISTOFCAK

(D.C. Bar No. 90045623)

WASHINGTON LITIGATION GROUP

1717 K Street, NW, Suite 1120

Washington, D.C. 20006

202-521-8750

kfreeny@washingtonlitigationgroup.org

NORMAN EISEN

(D.C. Bar No. 435051)

STEPHEN JONAS

(D.C. Bar No. 90037069)

DAVID W. OGDEN

(D.C. Bar No. 375951)

DEMOCRACY DEFENDERS ACTION

600 Pennsylvania Avenue SE #15180

Washington, D.C. 20003

202-594-9958

norman@democracydefenders.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff Joyce Beatty