

EXHIBIT 6

State of WA, et al. vs Trump, et al.
 Bundesen, Liza - April 04, 2025

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 AT SEATTLE

-----)
 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,) NO.2:25-cv-00244-LK
 Plaintiffs,)
 v.)
 DONALD J. TRUMP, in his)
 official capacity as President)
 of the United States, et al.,)
 Defendants.)

-----)
 Washington, D.C.
 Friday, April 4, 2025

Deposition of LIZA Q. BUNDESEN, a witness
 herein, was called for examination by counsel for
 Plaintiffs in the above-entitled matter, pursuant to
 notice, the witness being first duly sworn by
 BESS A. AVERY, a Notary Public in and for the
 District of Columbia, taken at the offices of B&A
 Litigation Services, 1029 Vermont Avenue, N.W.,
 Washington, D.C., commencing at 9:06 a.m., when were
 present on behalf of the respective parties:

A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF WASHINGTON:

WILLIAM MCGINTY, ESQ.

LAURYN K. FRAAS, ESQ.

Assistant Attorneys General

Attorney General of Washington

800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, Washington 98104-3188

(360) 709-6027

william.mcginty@atg.wa.gov

lauryn.fraas@atg.wa.gov

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:

VINITA B. ANDRAPALLIYAL, ESQ., SR. COUNSEL

CHRISTIAN S. DANIEL, ESQ., TRIAL ATTORNEY

ROBERT C. BOMBARD, ESQ., TRIAL ATTORNEY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

1100 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20530

(202) 305-0845

Vinita.B.Andrapalliyal@usdoj.gov

Christian.S.Daniels@usdoj.gov

Robert.Bombard2@usdoj.gov

ALSO PRESENT: Miranda Berge, Esq. - HHS

Anna Jacobs, Esq. - HHS

I N D E X

Witness:	Page
----------	------

LIZA Q. BUNDESEN

Examination by Mr. McGinty.5

Examination by Ms. Andrapalliyal. . . 104

Further Examination by Mr. McGinty. . .110

- - -

E X H I B I T S

(Exhibits attached to transcript)

Bundesen Deposition Exhibits	Page
------------------------------	------

Exhibit 23 Subpoena Duces Tecum 12

Exhibit 24 Bundesen CV 15

Exhibit 4 Termination letter, dated 2/28/25 . . 33

Exhibit 3 Presidential Documents from the . . . 65

Federal Register Vol. 90, 1/20/2025,

Executive Order

Exhibit 5 Exhibit 5, article from journal . . . 68

Nature

Exhibit 8 Memo from NIH to Institute and . . . 77

Center Chief Grants Management Officers,

2/12/2025

E X H I B I T S

(Exhibits attached to transcript)

Bundesen Deposition Exhibits	Page
Exhibit 7 Memo from NIH to Institute and	79
Centers Chief Grants Management	
Officers, 2/13/2025	
Exhibit 20 NIH Grants Policy Statement	81
Exhibit 25 Application for Federal Assistance . .	92

1 that right?

2 **A Yes.**

3 Q That's the same day that you talked with
4 Rachel Riley?

5 **A Yes.**

6 Q Was this the only termination letter that
7 went out on February 28th?

8 **A No.**

9 Q How many termination letters went out on
10 February 28th?

11 MS. ANDRAPALLIYAL: Objection, assumes
12 facts not in evidence.

13 **THE WITNESS: I don't remember.**

14 BY MR. MCGINTY:

15 Q Do you know if it was more or less than
16 ten?

17 **A I think it was more than ten, less than**
18 **30.**

19 Q Okay. And do you know how the decision to
20 make the grants that were terminated was made?

21 **A I do not.**

22 Q Okay. Do you know who made the decision?

23 **A I do not.**

24 Q Do you recollect the circumstances that
25 led up to the termination of those grants on

1 February 28th?

2 A Can you please clarify.

3 Q How did you first learn that grants were
4 going to be terminated on February 28th?

5 A I received a text message over Microsoft
6 Teams from James McElroy. He said, Liza --
7 something to the effect of: Liza, can you please
8 get in touch with Rachel Riley ASAP, she's been
9 trying to reach you.

10 I'm paraphrasing.

11 I said, James, I'm sorry, I do not know
12 who Rachel Riley is. And then shortly thereafter,
13 James called me over a Microsoft Teams video call,
14 and so he was there and Rachel Riley was there. She
15 introduced herself as being part of DOGE, who was
16 working with HHS.

17 And she informed me that a number of
18 grants will need to be terminated and that
19 Matt Memoli will be sending me an e-mail, a list of
20 grants in an e-mail shortly thereafter.

21 Q Did she explain why the grants were being
22 terminated?

23 A No.

24 Q Did you ask?

25 A She explained that -- excuse me, let me

1 clarify.

2 She said that the current administration's
3 OGC has a different opinion from the previous
4 administration's OGC on grant termination and,
5 therefore, we will need to terminate grants by the
6 end of the day.

7 I did not ask what, you know, what grants
8 because I just literally was a little bit confused
9 and caught off guard. And so I waited to see what I
10 would receive by e-mail.

11 Q And then what did you receive by e-mail?

12 A I received an e-mail from Matt Memoli that
13 said something to the effect of: Liza, the attached
14 list of grants need to be terminated by COB today.
15 And there was an Excel file attached to the e-mail.

16 Q And did you look at the Excel file?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And can you describe it for me.

19 A It was a list of grants -- well, you know,
20 I'm trying -- I don't exactly remember all of the
21 cells in the Excel file, but it was a list of
22 grants. I can't remember if it had the grant
23 numbers, the titles, the institutions. It had some
24 combination.

25 Q Did it give any reason why the grants were

1 being terminated?

2 **A No.**

3 Q And what did you do next after you got
4 that memo from Matt Memoli?

5 **A And please allow me to clarify.**

6 **Also attached in the e-mail, I forgot to**
7 **mention, Matt said attached is an OGC-approved**
8 **termination letter, which was the template. So then**
9 **after I received the e-mail, I took a look at the**
10 **list and then I called Ms. Michelle Bulls to talk**
11 **through next steps.**

12 Q And what did you say to Michelle?

13 **MS. ANDRAPALLIYAL: Objection, calls for**
14 **the provision of deliberative information. I'd ask**
15 **the witness not to answer insofar that it would**
16 **divulge deliberative information.**

17 **THE WITNESS: Also, in addition to talking**
18 **with Michelle, I also talked with, on the same phone**
19 **call, Teams call, with our Office of General**
20 **Counsel.**

21 **MR. MCGINTY: Okay. So I'm just going to**
22 **say for the record that the deliberative process**
23 **exemption applies to communications made prior to a**
24 **decision that's made and only to the extent that**
25 **they are, in fact, deliberative communications. So**

1 here a decision had already been made, so I don't
2 think the deliberative process exemption applies.
3 If you make an offer of proof, want to put that on
4 the record.

5 MS. ANDRAPALLIYAL: Again, the
6 deliberative process privilege routinely applies to
7 protect pre-decisional and deliberative
8 communications about a decision even if --
9 regardless of whether it has already been made, for
10 example, in employee cases where deliberative
11 process privilege is routinely invoked to protect
12 documents about decisions that have already come to
13 pass. And the purpose of the privilege is to
14 protect agency deliberations decision making to
15 ensure that folks can frankly discuss their concerns
16 without being concerned about that information
17 making its way out of the government.

18 So I am happy to provide case law shortly.
19 If we could take a break, and if we could do that
20 now?

21 BY MR. MCGINTY:

22 Q Ms. Bundesen, when you got the e-mail from
23 Matt Memoli was it your understanding that the
24 decision to terminate the grants had already been
25 made?