

## Boom! Lawyered Ep. 301: What Are Republicans Hiding in Kavanaugh's Documents?

Imani Gandy: Hello, fellow law nerds. Welcome to a brand new episode of Boom! Lawyered, a *Rewire.News* podcast hosted by the legal journalism team that is really excited to be back from our short summer break and ready to pour legal knowledge directly into your ear holes. I'm Imani Gandy ...

Jessica Pieklo: And I'm Jess Pieklo. *Rewire.News* is dedicated to bringing you the best reproductive rights and social justice news, commentary and analysis on the web. And the #TeamLegal podcast is part of that mission.

So, a big thank you to our subscribers and a welcome to our new listeners.

Imani Gandy: Yes, welcome. Thank you for joining us. We are back from our brief sabbatical to regale you of news that Democrats may have finally grown a backbone when it comes to this Kavanaugh nomination, Jessica. It's shocking.

Jessica Pieklo: What?

Imani Gandy: I know. It is--

Jessica Pieklo: Get out.

Imani Gandy: It is shocking, but it's true. Sincerely, we even have audio proof.

Sen. Chuck Schumer: Senator Blumenthal issued a FOIA request to the National Archives seeking the full gamut of Kavanaugh's records including his time as staff secretary. We'd much rather follow the bi-partisan process that's been around for years.

And today we're announcing that we stand ready to sue the National Archives for Judge Kavanaugh's full records if necessary.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay, so let's give this some context. The Democrats have filed a Freedom of Information Act request, or a FOIA request, and that's basically a letter that says, "Hey, give us these documents." And they filed one with the National Archives, who has all of Kavanaugh's documents. And they said, "Hey, give us the documents," and they're threatening to sue if they don't get these documents answered before the confirmation hearings. Those are set to begin right after Labor Day. So, today we want to talk about this big papers fight in the Kavanaugh nomination. Why is this happening, and just how big of a deal is it?

Imani Gandy: This episode is going to unpack how we got to the point where we might actually have litigation surrounding a Supreme Court nominee. We're also going to tell you why these documents are so important, including what we could learn about Kavanaugh from them.

So, now we're going to talk about what is actually happening with this disclosure process. So Jessica, what exactly is happening with this disclosure process?

Jessica Pieklo: A big circus, basically, is what this disclosure process has turned into. So, disclosure, broadly speaking is, as I said in the first segment, "give us the documents," right? Well, Republicans aren't giving the documents. So, let's talk about that a little bit. First, who isn't giving the documents? That's this guy named Bill Burck. Who is Bill Burck? He happens to represent President Trump's former chief political strategist Steve Bannon. That's pretty interesting.

He also works with all the White House counsel folks like Don McGahn and former White House chief of staff Reince Priebus and all of those guys in the Russia investigation, also lovely.

Imani Gandy: Yeah Reince Priebus. I love that guy's name.

Jessica Pieklo: Right?

Imani Gandy: Another interesting tidbit is that he also represents Judge Alex Kozinski, and for those of you who may not recognize the name, Alex Kozinski is a very--or was a very--prominent Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's judge who had to resign in disgrace this year due to allegations of sexual harassment. That he was sexually harassing his law clerks, which raises the question, what did Kavanaugh know about this and when did he know it? Because he actually clerked for Alex Kozinski. So, that has some severe and interesting implications for the hashtag #MeToo movement.

Jessica Pieklo: Yep. So, we've got Burck who worked in the Bush White House when Kavanaugh was there working on such things like torture policy which we'll dive into, working with the current Trump White House on Russia investigation, working with Judge Alex Kozinski related to #MeToo allegations, and is the point person in charge of the Kavanaugh documents. So, that's all really lovely isn't it?

Imani Gandy: Good times. He's also working with Chuck Grassley, and Jess why don't you tell me what that means and why it matters?

Jessica Pieklo: So, in any other normal confirmation and nomination process this disclosure of documents and candidates' background and their prior work, all of that would just hum along. But what Grassley has done is really put this on partisan steroids. He made a request for Kavanaugh's documents to the National Archives which has all of them. National archives said, "That will be till the end of October." Grassley said, "Mm-hmm (affirmative), I don't think that will work. I mean, I scheduled hearings to start right after Labor Day" and is working with Burck to decide more or less which documents the Judiciary Committee and thus the American people get to see and which ones they don't.

Imani Gandy: So, essentially Grassley is just slow dripping documents knowing full well that all of the documents are not even going to be available until about a month and a half after he scheduled these hearings. And certainly not in any way giving any time to Democrats to actually review the documents and potentially release information they think is important to the American people. So, he's basically just hiding the ball is what you're saying.

Jessica Pieklo: He is. He is. He's hiding the ball. And none of this should be a surprise to Republicans, right? Brett Kavanaugh served in the Bush White House for five years. He produced a lot of paper. I mean, we're talking about damn near 1,000,000 pages of documents in total here.

Imani Gandy: \*coughs twice\* I'm sorry that got caught in my---did you say 1,000,000 pages of documents?

Jessica Pieklo: Just about, and so far, there have been approximately 200,000, if I'm being generous, pages of Kavanaugh documents released. Some of those have been as a result of third party FOIA requests. So, not even just from Republicans playing nice and square in any capacity. So yeah, we've got confirmation hearings in about two weeks and approximately seven hundred, eight hundred thousand pages of documents yet to be released.

Imani Gandy: Well, that's not surprising considering how shady these Republicans are acting, but what is also not surprising is the type of crap that they've actually released. And that type of crap is well, it's crap. I mean a lot of, for example, Ginni Thomas, right? Ginni Thomas is Clarence Thomas' wife, right?

Jessica Pieklo: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Imani Gandy: She's the woman who drunk-dialed Anita Hill a few years ago and demanded satisfaction for what Anita Hill did to her husband during the confirmation hearings, which as we all know was tell the truth about how Clarence Thomas is a sexual harasser. But that's another episode for another time.

Jessica Pieklo: Oh she also likes to harass the Parkland survivors on her Facebook page.

Imani Gandy: Oh my God. Yeah she does. She goes after David Hogg and Emma Gonzales and all of those kids who tragically had to watch their classmates gunned down. She's harassing them. So, she's a real peach of a woman.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah, she's lovely.

Imani Gandy: But she also happens to be, she's also very, very involved in The Heritage Foundation. So, some of the documents that have been released -- and I'm just going to pause, pregnant pause here -- 40,000 pages of documents that are all Ginni Thomas' emails.

Jessica Pieklo: 40,000 emails from Ginni Thomas: "Leave my husband alone."

Imani Gandy: "Stop being mean to Clarence." I mean, there is no way that anybody needs to see 40,000 pages of, "Hey, do you wanna come to this Heritage Foundation event?" Or, "Hey, please stop picking on Clarence." It's absurd.

Jessica Pieklo: It really is absurd. And I think it's a really, I mean, yes it's absurd but it's also a just perfect touchstone of an example of the Republicans completely thumbing their nose at this process. We are talking about really serious issues here and a lifetime appointment to the most powerful court in this country, and the Republicans are instead releasing, oh I don't know, 40,000 emails of Ginni Thomas' Heritage Foundation and other fluff happy hour kind of things. It's absurd. There is nothing of substance here. There is no "there" there.

Imani Gandy: There is no there there and it's really crucial to understand that this is not the way the process is supposed to work. This is not normal. They're treating the disclosure process like it's discovery in adversarial litigation, right? So, Jess and I we're both lawyers, we were both litigators. We both have been involved in discovery whereby you either refuse to turn over everything and force the court to order you to turn stuff over, or you do these document dumps. You dump boxes and boxes of documents on people and then you maybe hide the important stuff in between thousands of pages of Ginni Thomas' risotto recipes and hope the other side never finds them.

And the problem here is that the Republicans are treating us like we are the other side in litigation. Like we are the adversaries instead of the public, the people to whom Kavanaugh is going to be accountable and for whom Kavanaugh's rulings will have a lifetime effect. This man is going to be on the court, should he get on the court, for 40 years.

Jessica Pieklo: Absolutely. And I mean, that a document dump example is so perfect because yeah you would take an email and this is what we're seeing with Ginni Thomas here. That's like event at Friday at 4:30 and there's 20 people in the CC and then anytime somebody responds to that you produce that response as a new response in litigation. So, you're like, "I don't know what you're complaining about. I just gave you 40,000 pages." But it's 40,000 of the same damn page.

Imani Gandy: Right, and it's absurd, and there are also, one of the things that they're trying to do which is really, really frustrating, is they're trying to downplay Kavanaugh's role in the White House as being "just a secretary," when really he was counsel working in the White House.

I mean, the word secretary evokes something like a 1950 style Don Draper situation where you've got a woman who's just running around making coffee for people, but that's not what Brett Kavanaugh was. He wasn't the coffee gal. He was the lawyer. He was the guy who decided what documents were important enough to put on President Bush's desk. So, while McConnell is

running around saying, "Kavanaugh, he was just a secretary. Really he was just the President's inbox, or he was a document traffic cop." But even that role, even if he was just a "document traffic cop," what documents he saw as important, is important to us to know what kind of jurist he's going to be.

Jessica Pieklo: Absolutely and so, this has been a lot. Let's recap it, because wow, we are talking about a triumvirate of terrible here when it comes to disclosures on the Kavanaugh nomination, right? So, what do we have? We have some really bad stuff going on here. We have Bill Burck who's working with the Trump White House in defending the Russia probe. He is in charge of dripping, dripping, dripping the documents. He's working with Chuck Grassley -- that's weird and not normal. So far, we've got about 900,000 pages of documents. We've seen 200,000. That means 700,000 to go, and we've got two weeks till the nomination hearing. That's also weird. And what has been released has been pretty useless, and intentionally so. So, the only conclusion that we can really come to is, like Imani said, they're treating the American public as an adversary.

Imani Gandy: And coming up we're going to talk about the purpose of document disclosures. Why it's inappropriate to treat the American people as an adversary, and how this whole process is supposed to work.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay Imani, so what is the purpose of these document disclosures anyway? How is this, in a normal time and in a normal administration, how is this supposed to work?

Imani Gandy: All right. So, first I'm going to have to tell you a little something about the Presidential Records Act. The Presidential-

Jessica Pieklo: Ooooh what's that?

Imani Gandy: Ooooh it's exciting. The Presidential Records Act is an act that governs the preservation of and the access to official records of US presidents, right? So, all presidents produce paper and the PRA is the law that governs how those documents and how that paper is supposed to be preserved.

Congress passed this law after President Nixon tried to destroy the Watergate tapes when he left office. The purpose of the act is to make it crystal clear that presidential records belong to the American people. They do not belong to the president himself. And therefore former presidents do not have an unlimited right to control access to their records.

The law gives Congress a right to special access to official presidential records that are stored at the National Archives, and it does not allow president to unilaterally impose restrictions on Congress' ability to get those records.

So, again here we have the PRA which was enacted in response to one of the biggest scandals in presidential history, Watergate, and the law says that

Congress has a right to access these records and the president can't prevent Congress from getting them.

Jessica Pieklo: I really sincerely think based on your summary of the PRA that nobody in the Kavanaugh camp knows it exists, or if they do, intends clearly to follow it. Because literally, I mean, it's a law that says, "Hey presidents, your documents, the things that you produce while you are in office and those who were working for you, those belong to the American people, not you."

Imani Gandy: Right. And that matters, because as Nina Totenberg once pointed out -- Nina Totenberg if you don't know is NPR's legal affairs journalist -- she once said that, "The confirmation process is the last chance to affect the least accountable branch of government."

Jessica Pieklo: Right. She's absolutely right. I mean, Nina Totenberg knows her shit, right? The confirmation process, this is the only time the American people are going to see and hear Brett Kavanaugh speak for himself to his records and to his views. We don't get a vote on his nomination directly. This is the only way, and so Republicans are making it damn near impossible. They're just flouting the law basically, right? And ignoring it, and doing all of this shady stuff and saying, "Screw you transparency, we don't need you anyway."

Imani Gandy: Right. And what's particularly frustrating about this is that Democrats aren't asking for some sort of unusual process here, they're asking for exactly the same process that went on when Elena Kagan was nominated, right?

Jessica Pieklo: Oh yes, so let's talk about the Elena Kagan nomination because it's such a perfect example on so many levels. So, Justice Elena Kagan when she was nominated had a pretty decent paper trail herself, not as long as Brett Kavanaugh's but a decent one, because she had served as Solicitor General in the Clinton Administration. And Republicans were like, "Oh, this is a big deal. She has all these papers. You're not going to give it to us." And they sent a letter and Democrats said, "You know what? She does have a lot of paper. You should see it. Here we're going to work with you and disclose it." And well, damn that's what they did.

Imani Gandy: What's frustrating here is that Democrats have sent the exact same letter -- except but with the names changed -- to Republicans, the same letter that Republicans sent to Democrats regarding Kagan. Democrats have sent to Republicans regarding Kavanaugh, and Republicans are thumbing their nose at Democrats and the American people.

Jessica Pieklo: Absolutely, and Kagan is a good example not just because in that case Democrats once again did the thing and abided by the norms that Republicans are now ignoring, but because in the process of releasing the Kagan documents there were some really good robust conversations around her record. For

example, when I was doing research and working on, for this podcast I found an article that I wrote way back in 2010 for the--

Imani Gandy: 2010?

Jessica Pieklo: --For the Kagan nomination that was basically talking to her critics on the left and responding to concerns they had that Kagan would be soft on choice. And those concerns came out because during the disclosure process, there was a memo that she had written while in the Solicitor General's office that advised Clinton to take a stance and support a bill that was being pushed by then Senator Tom Daschle from South Dakota that was a later term abortion ban and the policy papers said it was basically a strategic wedge. We can look like we're doing something but block a more restrictive measure that would likely pass. And ultimately her advice worked. And in the process, she had to answer for that, and gave a really good response and at the time folks on the left were worried that Kagan would be a vote to overturn *Roe*.

Imani Gandy: So, these are the kind of discussions that we need to be having about Kavanaugh from his time in the Bush White House. We need to look at those policy papers, look at the things that he thought were important enough to put on President Bush's desk, and figure out how he might rule on some of the most crucial issues that are going to affect us.

Jessica Pieklo: Absolutely. And so next up we're going to talk about why these Kavanaugh disclosures are so important, more specifically what are the issues that we're looking at? What can we learn?

Imani Gandy: Or what is he hiding?

So, Jessica, what could we learn about Kavanaugh?

Jessica Pieklo: We could learn a lot. He was in the Bush White House for five years during the time when the administration was working on some of its worst policies, particularly, with regards to torture and detention, for example. And this has come up once before. So, before his nomination Judge Kavanaugh was a judge, is a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, and that means he had a confirmation and hearing process.

So, senators asked him about some of these stuff before, in particular they asked him about his time and work on torture policy and warrantless wiretapping. And Kavanaugh's response at the time in those 2006 hearings was effectively, "Meh, I didn't do that much."

Imani Gandy: And he said it under oath. He said under oath in response to these questions from Patrick Leahy and Dick Durbin that he had no knowledge of warrantless wire tapping or torture, didn't he?

Jessica Pieklo: He sure did. And it's because we've had emails released as part of a Freedom of Information Act request related to his Supreme Court nomination and confirmation and subsequent reporting on that, that this bubble of doubt around Kavanaugh's truthfulness on those initial answers has even come up. He very well could have lied about that. Or at least he wasn't very candid.

Imani Gandy: So, if that's the case, if he lied about how much knowledge he had about warrantless wire tapping and torture, what does that mean? I mean, that sounds like it's pretty bad. I mean, how are Patrick Leahy and Dick Durbin supposed to feel about being lied to?

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, I can imagine that they're pretty pissed. I would be, right? And it's real bad. I mean, one, he lied to get himself on the DC's Circuit Court of Appeals and there's not much that we can do about it. Impeachment is really the avenue there.

Imani Gandy: And that's very rare. I mean, I think we looked it up and it was something like 15 judges have been impeached in our 200 and some year history.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah. So, I mean that's a long process. But I mean also it shows that Brett Kavanaugh isn't this reasonable sensible non-partisan jurist at all. He is a conservative hack who's willing to do what needs to be done to get to where he wants to go.

Imani Gandy: Another thing that we might be able to learn is his thoughts on executive power and Kavanaugh's views on executive power are front and center in the debates over his confirmation. And that's because there are critics who are concerned that his writings suggest that he believes that presidents should be able to remove independent counsel at will.

Jessica Pieklo: Woah. Woah. Woah. Woah. That removing an independent counsel just because they want to that's a big deal with what we've got going on right now.

Imani Gandy: It really does sound like a big deal, and so it is and it isn't a big deal because on the one hand it sounds terrible in light of the ongoing Mueller investigation and Trump's near daily shrieking on Twitter about how, "It's rigged, and it's a witch hunt!" and "Crooked Hillary," and whatever other nonsense he likes to spell. But on the other hand, it's not as big of a deal as people make it sound like because I actually read some of Brett Kavanaugh's writings on executive power. And he is not wrong, right?

He seems to think that the way to check executive power is pushback from the public. So, for example, if Clinton had tried to just get rid of Ken Starr back during the Lewinsky saga, the public would have freaked out. I mean, we can imagine how much the news would have been covering it, cable news, people would have been talking about how horrible it is that Clinton just up and decided to get rid of independent counsel. And the fear of that pushback is



enough to make any normal president decide not to do something insane like fire the independent counsel that is looking into that president's own bad doings. But we don't have a normal president Jess.

Jessica Pieklo: No, we don't, and I mean that--okay I'll give Kavanaugh point for reasonableness there, but at the same time he was involved with that Starr report. He was the one who said that folks should be asking president Clinton really invasive questions about his relationship with Monica Lewinsky. So, what fucking gives?

Imani Gandy: I think what fucking gives is that he's a conservative and he's about to be elevated to the court by a conservative and so the question becomes is, has his evolution, is that a word, evolution, evolution is the word I'm looking for, has his evolution on executive power been partisan? Right? Is he now willing to give Trump more power to vest all of this power in Trump just because he's a Republican? Power that he was not willing to vest in Clinton?

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah, I mean, how are we supposed to know what he actually believes? I would love to have a point with Kavanaugh that I was like, "Yeah, he's pretty reasonable," but even this, that just sounds shady. How on earth do we know or can we get to a sense of what his views on this really are, because this is a big deal.

Imani Gandy: It is a big deal. And another thing that he's evolved on perhaps is whether or not the case *US v. Nixon* was rightfully decided. And it was in--

Jessica Pieklo: Uhh, what's this?

Imani Gandy: So, *US v. Nixon* is the case whereby a vote of eight to zero -- there were only eight justices at the time. The Supreme Court said that Nixon had to turn over the Watergate tapes and he had to respond to subpoenas. Back in 1999 Kavanaugh sat on a panel where he basically suggested that the Supreme Court got that decision wrong. He suggested that Nixon should not have been forced to turn over those Watergate tapes.

Now since then, he has reversed course and he's actually said that the *Nixon* decision is one of the most momentous in judicial history or something like that. But of course that is now, I mean he made those comments in 2016, the comments of praising the decision as one of the greatest moments in judicial history.

So, 2016 we're already staring down the barrel of a Trump presidency. So, it's like how do we know what he really believes? Does it matter? Do his beliefs depend on who is in office? And if his beliefs are so partisan then that's something that we as the American people need to know, because that matters when it comes to trying to figure out how he's going to rule -- if for example, Trump up and decides to fire Mueller.

Jessica Pieklo: And that's the sort of information we might be able to figure out if the Republicans would just disclose the damn documents, right?

Imani Gandy: It really does seem like it's that simple. Just give us the fucking documents so we can review them and figure out who this guy is, because this guy is going to be involved in some of the most important decisions involving people, the rights of marginalized people, civil rights, voting rights, all sorts of really crucial issues. And if we don't know how he's going to vote on it, then how can we know what to expect? How can we know how far down the hell hole we're going to go?

Jessica Pieklo: I don't even want to contemplate how far down the hell hole we can go.

Imani Gandy: I think the answer is really far down.

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, by way of comparison, how far down are we?

Imani Gandy: Pretty far down.

Jessica Pieklo: We sure are. Oh Imani, this is all a lot to take in. I mean, we've just touched on two areas real quickly, right? Kavanaugh's work on torture policy and his thoughts on executive power, and at *Rewire.News* we have also covered Kavanaugh's relationship and thoughts on *Roe*, abortion rights, LGBTQ rights, what his impact would have on the disability rights communities. So there's a lot there-

Imani Gandy: The trans community.

Jessica Pieklo: ... the trans community, immigration and detention policy. We've got two weeks to go and 700,000 pages of documents we haven't seen.

Imani Gandy: Right. And so we're going to end the episode here because we know we've just dumped a lot of information into your heads and we don't want your brain to explode. But first, Jess, let me ask you a question. So, we said upfront at the top that Democrats have threatened to sue if they don't receive these documents from Republicans. So, if Democrats actually sue, what can we expect to happen?

Jessica Pieklo: Okay. So, this is fascinating for law nerds. So, gather around kiddos.

Imani Gandy: Put your glasses on, push them up your nose.

Jessica Pieklo: And I'll just go ahead and make fun of myself here for a moment and admit to all of you I had an Orrin Hatch moment the other day where I adjusted glasses that were not on my face to read a document. We've entered into that stage of life. But so what happens? The Democrats have threatened to sue. If they sue what happens?

So this turns into a discovery battle within a discovery battle. So, at the beginning of the episode we talked about a FOIA request as a "hey give me the documents" and Imani helped describe how this is really playing out like civil discovery and that's the process where both sides exchange information. So, a lawsuit will take this to a court and a court will order, or not, the Archives to produce the documents and that could have an effect of pausing the nomination.

There's a lot of things that have to happen for those events to line up, but it's not outside of the realm of possibility.

Imani Gandy: And just last week I know you appeared on *Rise Up With Sonali*, it's a radio program and you had a revolutionary idea of what Democrats could do. And I really, really like that idea. So could you explain what that was?

Jessica Pieklo: Oh yeah. So, I know some folks have been feeling discouraged because on the numbers alone Republicans have the vote if they play really dirty and keep everybody on their side in line. And we don't know that that will happen. There's a lot of pushback happening. But if Grassley and the Republicans insist on railroading this nomination and confirmation process, then we have a model of resistance that we can look from way back in 2010 in the state of Wisconsin, when Democrats, in response to Scott Walker pushing the anti-union agenda that he did, said just, "Hell with you, we're out. We're leaving." And they fled the state. They left.

Imani Gandy: They did.

Jessica Pieklo: They refused to give him a quorum, and Republicans a quorum, while they were working through parts of that legislation. So, that's a model.

Imani Gandy: They could just leave.

Jessica Pieklo: Democrats could say, "Screw you. You're out."

Imani Gandy: Democrats just peace out. That all, they could just peace out and say, "You know what? If you're going to do this, you're going to have to do it without us." And that would be, I think that would be a really strong statement. And I think that would definitely, that would just ratchet up this nomination to a level of absurdity that unlike we've ever seen, besides Bork, I think.

Jessica Pieklo: Absolutely, I mean it would really call cold the Republican play here because it would force them to have a confirmation vote without a single Democrat present. And should John McCain be absent because of his health issues, it would force them to bring in Vice President Pence, too.

Imani Gandy: And that would look terrible.

Jessica Pieklo: The optics on that are awful.

Imani Gandy: It would be terrible.

Jessica Pieklo: The American people--and it's an extreme suggestion but these are extreme times and if the Republicans refuse to allow us the opportunity to properly vet a nominee for the Supreme Court for a lifetime appointment, extreme measures might be in order.

Imani Gandy: I agree. I'm all about extreme measures.

So, that's our episode for you today. We just want to let you know that once the Kavanaugh hearings start after Labor Day, should they actually get going after Labor Day, we're going to be doing reaction pods on the daily. We know how you love our reaction pods, so keep an eye out for that. Also, be sure to join our Facebook group. We have a Facebook group, we've got about 500 members right now. We post a lot of exclusive content, stuff like pictures of Jessica posing with my dog, or pictures of Jessica eating oversized chicken pot pies.

Jessica Pieklo: It's good.

Imani Gandy: That's the kind of real gritty content you're not going to be able to get just on Twitter. So, please join our Facebook group. Look up Boom! Lawyered, answer the question, and we will let you right in.

Jessica Pieklo: And for all you students going back to school or starting up law school, Godspeed. May the odds be ever in your favor.

Imani Gandy: That's it for us today. You can find us on Twitter, I'm @angryblacklady, Jessica is @hegemommy H-E-G-E-M-O-M-M-Y. Please feel free to hit us up, ask us questions, use the #TeamLegal hashtag, and we will see you on the tubes.

Jessica Pieklo: See you on the tubes.

Imani Gandy: Boom! Lawyered is created and hosted by Imani Gandy and Jessica Mason Pieklo. The show is produced by Nora Hurley, our executive producer is Marc Faletti and *Rewire's* editor in chief is Jodi Jacobson.