

What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law Margarine, Meadows, and Removal

New York Lottery [00:00:00] Do you want a second chance to win cash? Enter eligible HGTV's My Lottery Dream Home scratch-off tickets from the New York Lottery for a second chance to win \$1 million. Visit nylmylotterydreamhome.com today for a chance to give your dreams a home. Please play responsibly. Must be 18+.

Roman Mars [00:00:15] So we are recording on Friday, September 8th at about 12:40 p.m. after a long hiatus that was totally my fault. All my home life was very complicated this summer. But now we are back. We have so many things we could be talking about. So, what did you choose for us to talk about today?

Elizabeth Joh [00:00:31] All right, Roman, let's start with the war on margarine.

Roman Mars [00:00:36] Okay. That's not what I was expecting at all.

Elizabeth Joh [00:00:41] All right, so why the war in margarine? Well, the Paris World Exhibition of 1866 offered a prize for anybody who could develop a cheap substitute for butter. And the reason was that Napoleon III wanted his armies in the Franco-Prussian War to have something less expensive than butter. Butter was getting pretty expensive. And a French chemist invented that substitute and called it Oleomargarine. Now, I don't know if you've ever seen just plain margarine.

Roman Mars [00:01:13] I have. You know, the reason why I know any of this is that Chris Berube did a story about this for 99% Invisible. So, I know some of this history. But plain margarine--you would call it unappealingly gray, I guess you would say.

Elizabeth Joh [00:01:31] Grayish white. And so, for that reason, margarine doesn't really take off at first until the Dutch bought a patent for it. They color it yellow, and it starts to look like butter and kind of tastes like butter. And it's a lot cheaper. Margarine then arrived in the United States in the 1870s. And the dairy industry hated it. They convinced state legislatures that margarine, which is of course half the price of butter, was dangerous and unwholesome. And by the 1880s it became illegal. So, seven states by that time had passed laws that made making, selling, or possessing margarine illegal. And many more states than that restricted its sale--at least the kind of margin that was colored yellow. And five states actually passed laws requiring that margarine be colored pink so it couldn't be fraudulently sold as butter. And in 1897, Joseph Blackburn--who was then the dairy commissioner of Ohio--made out a criminal complaint and had a J.B. Thomas arrested. Now, Thomas was in charge of the central branch of the National Home for a Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, which was located in Ohio. And the home was an institution created by Congress to care for Disabled Union Veterans of the Civil War, or, as Congress put it, "soldiers who served in the late war for the suppression of the rebellion." And it was the predecessor to today's Veterans Administration. And the reason for the arrest? Well, at the time of Thomas' arrest, Ohio law included an act to prevent fraud and deception in the sale of Oleomargarine. And the state law required that any eating establishment that served margarine had to display a white sign that said in black letters, not less than one and a half inches square, the words "Oleomargarine Sold and Used Here." But the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers had no such sign in its dining room, and yet it served margarine as part of the federal rations given to the veterans who lived there. Now, Thomas convinced a federal court in Ohio to order his release, and his case was eventually heard by the U.S. Supreme Court. And in 1899, the Supreme Court agreed that

the state lacked legal authority for the margarine arrest. Thomas was a federal officer doing his duty under federal law, and therefore the state had no power to punish him for his legitimate, official, federal duties. And that included serving margarine paid for and approved by Congress. It turns out that the margarine prosecution can tell us something about the complicated maneuvers happening in the state criminal case against inmate number P01135809, the Fulton County inmate number for former President Trump. What's the connection between Trump margarine and Mark Meadows? Time to find out.

Roman Mars [00:04:37] Let's do it. We're back with a bang. This is What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law, an ongoing series of indeterminate length and sporadic release schedule--I am very sorry, it has been a very weird summer--where we look at the known acts and alleged crimes of former presidents and their friends and use them to examine our Constitution like we never had before. Our music is from Doomtree Records. Our professor and neighbor is Elizabeth Joh. And I'm your fellow student and host, Roman Mars.

Woman [00:05:30] Oh. It's the magic 8 ball. What to ask? Oh, will I ever make it on the radio? "Without a doubt." Wait, does that mean I'm on the radio right now? Me, me, me, me, me, me, me. Hello? What now? I didn't really think this through. Goodbye, all of New York.

Magic 8 Ball [00:05:50] Seek a different kind of fortune. Play the new Magic 8 Ball scratch-off game for the New York Lottery for a chance to win up to \$1 million. Please play responsibly. Must be 18+. Gambling problem--call 1-877-8-HOPENY or text HOPENY.

Elizabeth Joh [00:06:01] All right, so why don't we talk about how the Georgia case started? Okay?

Roman Mars [00:06:06] I just wanted to say that the most alarming thing about this whole conversation and the way we got into this conversation is I know more about that margarine story than I know about the politics and the law of the thing that we're going to be talking about. So, I just think that's pretty funny. Okay.

Elizabeth Joh [00:06:22] Well, now your two worlds will collide.

Roman Mars [00:06:24] Exactly. So go ahead.

Elizabeth Joh [00:06:27] Okay. More than two years ago, the district attorney of Fulton County, Georgia--that's Fani Willis--she began an investigation into the phone call made by then President Trump in 2021 to a Georgia Secretary of State, Brad Raffensperger. Now, remember, Trump said during that infamous phone call that he wanted Raffensperger to find about 12,000 votes to overturn Georgia's 2020 presidential election results. And this was after Biden had been projected as the winner in Georgia. And then the Fulton County DA began a very lengthy investigation of who and what else was involved in those efforts. And she eventually presented her case to a grand jury in Fulton County. And on August 14th, Fani Willis announced that a grand jury had returned a criminal indictment against Trump and 18 other defendants for what they did in the days and weeks after the 2020 election. Now, we've experienced 234 years as a nation with no president or former president ever having been criminally indicted. Now we have one former president--four criminal cases. Georgia is the fourth criminal indictment that Trump now faces in less than six months. There's the Florida classified documents case, the New York hush money case, the case brought by special counsel Jack Smith about Trump's role in January 6th,

and now the Georgia case. And the 19 defendants in the Georgia criminal case include people you've probably heard of--of course, Trump and Rudy Giuliani, his personal lawyer, and Sidney Powell, another lawyer who advised Trump, and Mark Meadows, his former chief of staff. And then there are people you've probably never heard of--like Trevian Kutti, who was a former publicist for Kanye West and is charged with pressuring a Georgia elections worker, or David Shafer, the former chairman of the Georgia Republican Party, who played a really big role in organizing a group of fake electors in Georgia. Now, the indictment contains 41 counts. Those criminal counts include lying to state officials and legislators, intimidating Fulton County election workers, making fake Electoral College documents, and trying to unlawfully access election equipment. And Trump himself faces 13 felony counts for interfering with Georgia's elections. Now, the story told by the indictment is that this group of 19 people were part of a criminal enterprise consisting of the then president of the United States and the people who supported him, working toward one singular goal. And that was to overturn the 2020 presidential election results in Georgia. But the most noteworthy charge is the one involving RICO.

Roman Mars [00:09:17] So I hear RICO charges all the time--RICO cases all the time--in TV. But I really have never committed it to memory. Like, what is a RICO case? What are RICO charges?

Elizabeth Joh [00:09:28] Okay, so the original RICO is the federal criminal law known as the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. And it was passed in 1970 by Congress to fight organized crime. So that's probably what you've seen on TV, right? Going after the mob. So, if you think about criminal organizations like the mob, there are going to be people at the top who run the whole thing. But they don't personally carry out every single crime that's committed to support the organization. And because organized crime is aware that they are often under investigation, there may not be direct orders from the top of the organization--from the mob boss to the underlings--even though there are understandings all the same about what's necessary to achieve the goals of that criminal organization. So, RICO is really a tool for the prosecutor to get at this kind of organized criminal activity. And so, Roman, you're probably familiar with the crime of conspiracy, right?

Roman Mars [00:10:24] Yeah.

Elizabeth Joh [00:10:25] Okay. So, the crime of conspiracy punishes an agreement to do something illegal. Prosecutors just have to show that there was an agreement and there was at least one act--even a small act--by just one person to further that criminal agreement. And so, because conspiracy punishes the agreement, it's not even necessary to prove that you were successful in achieving the goal of the conspiracy. In other words, you don't even have to be a particularly good criminal. With conspiracy we're actually just concerned about the problem of groups getting together to plan crimes. That's the dangerous activity.

Roman Mars [00:11:00] And because criminal organizations know that the agreement is the thing that can be prosecuted, they build structures so that there is no agreement--like formal something written down or spoken to. They have all these sort of ways of, you know, kind of having understood agreements, but that can't be used as evidence against them.

Elizabeth Joh [00:11:18] Yeah, there's lots of ways to prove agreements. And it's also just human nature. If you and I are going to be involved in criminal activity, we're not going to

write down a contract to agree about our responsibilities. So that's right. So, you can think of RICO as a super charged, more sprawling version of the crime of conspiracy. And that allows the prosecutor to use a broader range of evidence than it otherwise would be allowed to. And by bringing in a whole lot of evidence, Rico allows the prosecutor to tell a big grand story about a group of people getting together or just trying to get together and commit a complex group of crimes. And after Congress passed the federal version of RICO, states began to pass their own state RICO laws. And Georgia's RICO Act was passed in 1981. And so even though RICO was originally intended to target organized crime, today it's used for all kinds of other things as well. They've used it against pharmaceutical executives. Even groups of teachers and school administrators in Georgia accused of helping kids cheat on standardized tests became part of a RICO prosecution. So, it's no longer just a tool against the mafia or, you know, Hells Angels or groups like that. Now, under Georgia's RICO Act, the prosecution has to show that the defendants were engaged in a pattern of what's called a racketeering activity. And that means you've participated in at least two crimes--we'd call them "predicate acts"--that are specifically listed under the state's RICO law. Now, remember that the target of RICO is the criminal enterprise with a lot of leeway for the prosecutor to prove that this enterprise existed. That means that to be charged as part of the criminal enterprise trying to overturn the state's election results, it's not even necessary that you were in the state of Georgia. What matters is that you were part of the plan to overturn the results in Georgia. So that's why the Fulton County indictment also refers to evidence of the conspiracy that happened outside of the state, like similar efforts to overturn results in Pennsylvania and Arizona. All of this is allegedly evidence of the organizations coordinated efforts for their illegal objective. And remember, it's not like Trump created a company called Overturning the Election Inc. The enterprise is really just an idea that there's a group of people working towards a common goal. There's also something we should clear up that's potentially confusing about the indictment that I've seen in the news. So why don't we go over that? The 98-page Georgia indictment lists 41 criminal counts, but most of it is focused on the RICO statute. And the RICO section of the indictment lists 161 things called "acts," and that includes phone calls and even tweets that were posted by Trump. Act 100, for example, refers to a tweet by Trump telling his followers to turn on the TV and watch something about the election results being overturned. And then he also calls for Governor Kemp to resign. So, you might think, "Well, why would you put that in there? It's not a crime to tweet, right? Or at least not about that." Well, generally that's true. These are not things that are criminal. Trump is allowed to tweet. But the indictment is alleging that Trump and his co-defendants were part of a giant conspiracy. And for a conspiracy, you need proof of what's called an "overt act." And an overt act doesn't have to be a crime. An overt act is just proof that you took a small step--even a little step--towards your illegal goal. So, let's say you're involved in a conspiracy to rob a bank and you rent a getaway car there. Renting the car can be an overt act. It's showing that we're trying to get towards our goal, even though renting the car itself isn't a crime. So here the Fulton County DA has chosen to describe this giant, complex effort by this group of 19 people--plus 30 other unindicted co-conspirators we don't know about--to overturn the results in the Georgia election in 2020. And she's chosen to do that by talking about these 161 acts, some of which don't seem to be criminal at all. And that's fine. But the Georgia RICO law also requires that there are at least two what are called "predicate crimes." These are specific crimes that qualify your big conspiracy for a RICO prosecution. And that's where the indictment also lists crimes like false statements, forgery, perjury, computer trespass--things like that. If you've seen things on the news that say, "Wow, I can't believe that this charges Trump was tweeting," it's not actually correct to say that.

Roman Mars [00:15:50] Right. That makes sense to me.

Elizabeth Joh [00:15:52] All right. So now we can turn to our margarine connection, right?

Roman Mars [00:15:54] Okay.

Elizabeth Joh [00:15:56] So the main objective in the 1899 case for J.B. Thomas was this: He really wanted to have his state prosecution dismissed by a federal court. He was really arguing that the state was improperly prosecuting him. And in the Fulton County case, we can already see that there's been a very similar kind of move called "removal." It's a legal maneuver. And removal here just means transferring a case from state court to federal court. And when it comes to civil cases--non-criminal cases--transferring your case from state to federal court is pretty common. As long as there is some federal issue in the case or the two parties are from different states and there's at least \$75,000 at stake, a defendant in a civil case that begins in state court can ask to have their case removed or transferred to federal court. But that same maneuver is pretty uncommon in criminal cases. And remember, the vast majority of criminal cases are in the state courts not the federal courts. But just a day after Fani Willis announced the criminal indictment against Trump and the other 18 defendants, Mark Meadows--and that's Trump's former White House chief of staff--tried to remove his case to federal court.

Roman Mars [00:17:09] So why would Mark Meadows want this to be tried in federal court versus Georgia state court?

Elizabeth Joh [00:17:15] Well, let's think about what the purposes are. For more than 200 years, there's been a way for a federal official who's been sued or prosecuted in state court to have their case transferred to federal court. And the idea behind the Federal Officer Removal Statute is to make sure that states don't interfere with legitimate federal interests. So that's not an automatic thing that's granted. But in order to have your case successfully removed from state court to a federal court under the statute, you have to show three things. First, that you were a federal officer. And second, that you are facing charges for or relating to any act under a color of such office. And then finally, that you can raise what's called a "colorable federal defense."

Roman Mars [00:18:02] Okay, so let me get this straight. There's this 1899 case where J.B. Thomas was found in violation of state law because he was feeding margarine to two vets without letting them know or having a plaque prominently displayed. But his defense was that he was a federal officer doing his federal job, that case would move into federal court, and therefore that it's not against the law--he's fine. And because of that, Mark Meadows is saying, "Well, hey, this may be a crime in Georgia, but I was doing my job as a federal officer." And therefore, he wants this case moved into federal court so he can sort of mount the same margarine defense, essentially.

Elizabeth Joh [00:18:41] Yeah. I mean, it's very similar. So, the margarine case didn't rely exactly on that statute, but the principle is exactly the same. You're right. So, Meadows eventually would want to argue that he has a defense of what's called "Supremacy Clause immunity." Now, that's similar to what happened in the margarine case because Article VI of the Constitution contains what's called the Supremacy Clause. And that part of the Constitution means that federal law is supreme or superior to any conflicting state law. So, for Meadows's theory of his own defense, he's saying something like what you've just described--that Georgia can't punish him, RICO, for doing what federal law allows him to do as the White House chief of staff. So, he's saying, "Well, I'm allowed to do things like help the president of the United States arrange for phone calls or arrange for meetings.

That's what the White House chief of staff does. It's kind of like serving margarine to veterans, right? Federal law allows me to do this. And the state can't punish me for doing the same thing." And Meadows actually refers to our margarine case in his court filing. But there is a problem, and that is he has to get in federal court in the first place, right? And that is the removal statute. So why don't we talk about how he could get into federal court? So, the Fulton County indictment charged Meadows with two counts, including the RICO count. And Meadows is specifically accused of doing things like offering funding to Georgia to speed up an audit, writing emails about fake electors, and again, trying not to just arrange all of Trump's phone calls, but the famous phone call or the infamous phone call to Brad Raffensperger. So, the first requirement--is he a federal officer? I don't think that's very difficult for him. He was Trump's chief of staff at the time that these acts took place. Second--does he face charges for or relating to any act under color of such office? So here "color of office" simply means are the things he's accused of doing connected to his federal position? Now, you might think, "Well, of course they don't, right?" It might sound like a losing argument for Meadows. Trying to overturn state election results are not really part of what it means to be the White House chief of staff. But it turns out that the legal standard for this is actually pretty easy to satisfy. Courts have called it a "low bar." So, remember, the removal statute is not about whether you're guilty or not guilty, it's whether you qualify to move your case. Those are two different issues. And so here Meadows argued, "Well, I'm being charged with things--if we describe them in a very general way--helping the president do things. And I'm allowed to help the president do things. That's the job." And so, if there's a very low bar to say, "I was doing these things under color of federal office," maybe he meets that standard. Then there's the last element. Does Meadows have what's called a "colorable federal defense"? So, we've just talked about the potential defense he'll want to raise--the Supremacy Clause immunity defense. But at this stage for removal, all he needs to do is to say it's colorable. "Colorable" simply means plausible. Like, you know, not laugh out loud, funny, get out of here kind of defense. Okay? So that means it's a very low bar too. So, for removal in Meadows's case, it's not obvious that it's a loser. There's actually a pretty good chance that he might get his case removed and then transferred to federal court. Now, if he were to get his case removed to federal court, then presumably he'd ask the federal court to dismiss the case based on Supremacy Clause immunity. And he's pretty much said so in his court filings--that that's the object--that's going to be the plan. Now, that actual defense is going to be much more difficult as a hurdle for Meadows than actually removing the case itself because here it's not a low bar; Meadows would actually have to convince the federal court that federal law did authorize him to act this way and it was actually part of the job to do the things that he's accused of. So that's much more difficult in part because, you know, it looks like pretty political activity. And there are things like the federal law called the Hatch Act, which bars federal officials from engaging in political activity. So, there he has a bigger problem. But for now, his more immediate problem is getting into federal court in the first place.

Roman Mars [00:23:04] So what happens if he does get his case removed to federal court?

Elizabeth Joh [00:23:07] Okay. So, we don't know yet. And the judge in that case, Judge Steven Jones, says he's working on the decision and will have one out imminently. If Meadows's case is removed, then the state court proceeding is actually over. The case becomes a federal case. Here's the twist. The prosecution is still based on the same state crimes. And the Fulton County DA's office--that's Fani Willis and her team--they're still the prosecutors. They'd use the federal rules of evidence, but the rest of the case is essentially the same. And, in fact, Fani Willis already has a case like this right now. So, two years ago, a Fulton County grand jury indicted two members of a U.S. Marshals

fugitive task force for the death of a man named Jamarion Robinson. Now, they were trying to arrest him as part of their job. They got involved in a shootout with Robinson and ended up killing him. In October of last year, a federal court allowed the two defendants to remove their case to federal court on the same statutory basis that Meadows is relying on. And it's now a criminal case in federal court based on state law with Fani Willis--the same prosecutor--and her team, who were the prosecutors in that case. So, it's certainly not unprecedented, and it does happen. So, it's possible that Meadows can get the case removed. But whatever the federal judge decides about that immediate request for removal for Meadows, it's certainly not going to be the last word about anything. The loser here is going to go to the federal appeals court. That's the 11th Circuit. And then there's a good chance that this might be heard by the Supreme Court because there are some questions about what exactly is permitted in these kinds of removal cases. And so far, we've only talked about Meadows. But as of today, there are at least four other defendants in the case who have also sought to remove their cases to federal court. And then, of course, there's one person we haven't talked about.

Roman Mars [00:25:06] So Trump?

Elizabeth Joh [00:25:06] Yes. And on September 6th, Trump's lawyers told the state court judge in the case--that's Judge Scott McAfee--that he may seek removal. I don't think it's a "may," I think he will. It's almost certain that he's going to try and seek removal as well. In other words, to transfer his case to federal court because Trump, like Meadows, is probably going to claim that the criminal case against him should be dismissed because of Supremacy Clause immunity. Trump will probably try to argue that his Georgia shenanigans were not criminal, just part of his duties as president, trying to make sure the elections were fair.

Roman Mars [00:25:42] What is the difference between a state case being a state case in every respect in terms of who is prosecuting it and maybe there's some changes in the rules of evidence and the venue? Why is it they can only use the Supremacy Clause immunity in a federal case? Everything about the case is the same. Why does that designation of venue matter?

Elizabeth Joh [00:26:03] Yeah, that's a good question. I mean, you can imagine a defendant in state court saying, "Well, the Supremacy Clause means you can't prosecute me." And it's certainly possible we'll see some of that in the Georgia cases. But the original idea behind this is that there are some pretty big institutional differences between federal courts and state courts. And then, of course, remember that a state court, if it's the place where there is a criminal proceeding against a federal official, there's not just the state prosecutor, but there's the state judge. So, there's the concern that there will be sort of state prejudices working against the defendant at all sides. Whereas if you move the case to federal court, even though there's still state law crimes at issue and a state prosecutor, well, the federal judge is kind of the tempering influence to make sure that the federal interests at stake are being respected, too. And that also has to do with things like the fact that federal judges have life tenure. They don't necessarily have an interest in the cases going one way or the other, whereas state judges tend to be elected or appointed through some sort of political process. And the concern, even if we can't prove it, is that, well, maybe they put a thumb on the scale for the side of the state prosecution in that case. And this is a kind of really fundamental core concern about federalism--state and federal interests. But the irony, of course, is that you have the Republican Party saying these cases must be removed to federal court, whereas I thought their line was always that things should stay with the states.

Roman Mars [00:27:39] Well, ideological consistency was never their strongest quality. Okay. That helps me out. Thanks.

Elizabeth Joh [00:27:46] Now, going back to Trump and removal, Trump has already tried this maneuver already. Now, remember, there's a New York criminal case pending against him. That's the one related to hush money payments and the shady accounting done to conceal those payments. Trump argued that that case should be transferred to federal court, relying on the same basis. But in that case, the federal court ruled against Trump. Now, it's true that Trump is being charged in the New York case for things he did while he was president of the United States. But the federal judge concluded there that there was no evidence that the hush money payments and the related accounting maneuvers had anything to do with his duties as president. And, in fact, the judge put it this way: "Hush money paid to an adult film star is not related to a president's official acts, in case you were curious."

Roman Mars [00:28:39] I like it when the personality comes through, and they still try to make it sound judgy, but not, you know... Like, they make it sound like professional and legally, but you can tell there's a burn in there.

Elizabeth Joh [00:28:49] Yeah, exactly. A tiny bit of snark, right? But I actually think that in the Georgia case, though, Trump's argument for removal is less of a losing issue because one of the big problems for all of us during these years has been Trump's knack for raising the kinds of legal questions for which we have no clear legal answers. So, I don't mean whether Trump can overturn the results of a legitimate election. He can't do that lawfully. But there is a question about what is the outer boundary of any president's official acts and Supremacy Clause immunity. So maybe what Trump and his henchmen--henchpeople--have done is beyond the protections of this kind of immunity. But maybe there's some factual situation in the future hypothetical where a future president--not Trump--is legitimately concerned about a state's election results. So maybe we'd want some clarity on that. I'm not sure that we would get clarity here, but it is a question for which there is no clear answer. So now back to Meadows. If he wins, there's a bunch of problems. If he wins on removal, what does that mean for the other Georgia defense? It's not totally clear whether removing Meadows's case automatically drags the other defendants along with him or not. And that is already a problem because the Fulton County case is also going in a totally different direction. Two of the 19 defendants have already asked for and been granted a speedy trial. Kenneth Chesebro was a lawyer who advised Trump. And Sidney Powell--she was another lawyer who advised Trump and suggested the military might seize voting machines. Remember, that's her. They wanted to start their trials right away. And their trials are set for October 23rd of this year, next month. And Chesebro wanted to sever or be separated from Sidney Powell's case. But actually, Judge McAfee--that's the state judge--denied the request. He said the law wasn't on Chesebro's side. Now they're stuck together, but they're going to trial very soon. So, the question is, if Meadows has his removal request granted, then what happens to these early-stage trials? It's absolutely not clear at all. So, no matter what the federal court decides about removing Meadows's case, one thing is pretty certain. We're not going to have anything settled about the direction of these cases any time soon, which means that these Georgia cases, along with the other Trump indictments, are headed right into the 2024 presidential campaign. And Trump is the likely Republican nominee again.

Roman Mars [00:31:30] Oh my God. So, the big thing that could happen...

Elizabeth Joh [00:31:32] Purely hypothetical.

Roman Mars [00:31:34] God help us. The first episode we ever did was basically can Trump pardon himself via tweet was actually the specific scenario we were suggesting. It seems like that's totally possible. That was the answer that we got to, is that there were almost no boundaries around what a president can do in terms of pardoning power. And does this all change when Trump is president? And therefore, he could just pardon himself.

Elizabeth Joh [00:31:58] Unfortunately for Trump, not in the Georgia case, even if the case were transferred to federal court. And here's the easy answer. The Constitution only allows the president to grant pardons for offenses against the United States, and that means federal crimes only. The removed case would still be based on state crimes in Georgia. And therefore, he does not get to pardon himself even by tweet.

Roman Mars [00:32:22] Okay. That is a good clarification. That's really important.

Elizabeth Joh [00:32:24] It's what the founders would have wanted.

Roman Mars [00:32:28] I know. Thank you so much.

Elizabeth Joh [00:32:31] Thanks, Roman.

Roman Mars [00:32:35] After we recorded, Mark Meadows's bid to remove his case to the federal court was denied by Judge Steve Jones. The Meadows team immediately filed notice to appeal the decision. This show is produced by Elizabeth Joh, Jeyca Maldonado-Medina, and me, Roman Mars. You can find us online at learnconlaw.com. All the music in What Roman Mars Can Learn About Con Law is provided by Doomtree Records, the Midwest Hip Hop Collective. You can find out more about Doomtree Records, get merch, and learn about their monthly membership exclusives at doomtree.net. We are part of the Stitcher and SiriusXM Podcast Family.