

Joyce: Welcome back to #SistersInLaw with Kimberly Atkins Stohr, Barb McQuade, and me, Joyce Vance. Jill will be back soon.

This week, we have three big topics for you. It might be a holiday week, but #SistersInLaw working overtime.

First up, we'll be talking about the most recent updates to the Abrego Garcia case. Then we'll be talking about the state of free speech in America. And finally, something I've been worried would happen, this administration's intention to strip citizenship away from people who aren't naturalized citizens.

But before we get to the serious bits, make sure you run to our merch store and look at the new Resistance mini tote. It's ready for you to order. Go to politicon.com/merch to get yours now.

We are missing Jill this week. Jill, however, has just texted us to sign in, and that's because Jill is one of the grand marshals for the Evanston, Illinois 4th of July parade. So she's texting us that she's in a Ford Model T.

Kim: Oh, gosh.

Barb: Of course she is. She's the grand marshal in the July 4th parade. I'll bet the crowds are cheering. She's probably throwing candy to the kids and all of that. It sounds amazing.

Joyce: We tape on Fridays a little bit in advance of the parade itself happening. You guys don't hear us until the weekend, but I'm dying to see pictures of Jill as the grand marshal.

Kim: Oh, I'm sure.

Barb: Oh, you know, she's looking at like 1,000,000 bucks in her red, white, and blue suit and waving the royal wave.

Kim: She's always glamorous. She literally wakes up glamorous, so she's going to look fantastic.

Barb: Very fun. How about you guys? What are your July 4th plans?

Kim: Well, mine mostly has consisted of administering medication and putting a thunder shirt on Snickers anytime that there is any loud noise. And unfortunately, I have neighbors and other groups, organizations that love fireworks. So it's going to be, I expect the big booms to continue into the weekend, which always annoys me a little bit. I'm like, "Y'all, it's the 5th. It's the 5th. It's over. You had your fun."

Barb: Yeah, I've already been hearing-

Joyce: Yeah, last night-

Kim: "Lock it up."

Joyce: ... last night was crazy here.

Barb: Yeah, yeah.

Joyce: Right? The 4th. The 4th of July, 4th.

Kim: Once the 5th rolls, you got to put them away. But I have a feeling we're going to hear them on Saturday and Sunday too. So I will have the prescription and the thunder shirt and Snickers also likes to basically get in my lap while it's happening, so I will make sure to find a nice soft spot the floor where she can cuddle me.

Joyce: Kim, we have the same situation with Bella. Thankfully, our puppy Elsa is not yet afraid of loud noises, but Bella is inconsolable.

Thunder shirt doesn't work. The medication really barely makes a dent in it. She has learned to open my shower door and she goes in my shower, shuts the door behind her, and huddles there shaking. So Bella really just is almost inconsolable.

And we're invited up to a neighbor's house after we barbecue here where, don't tell anybody, we all shoot off fireworks even though we're inside of the city limits. It's a hallowed tradition.

And Bob said, "We can go, but we can't be gone for very long because we have to come back and take care of Bella."

So that's our night too. What about you, Barb?

Barb: Well, I won't be riding in a parade and I do not try to shoot off fireworks myself. I leave that to the professionals.

But we're going to grill out tonight, little barbecue, and then head over to the professionally administered Ann Arbor fireworks. So that should be a lot of fun.

I love July 4th. It's such a great day, and I really love patriotism. And it irks, me the way some people try to appropriate patriotism. It is something for all of us, love of country, and I've got red, white, and blue bunting under my windows and I am ready to celebrate American independence.

We face challenges at the moment, but through our democracy, we have a path forward. And so I think we should all be celebrating patriotism and not let anyone take that away from us.

Kim: The headlines are chock-full of data breaches and regulatory rollbacks about hacks that make us all vulnerable. But fortunately, you can do something about it with Deleteme. Deleteme is here to make it easy, quick, and safe to remove your personal data online.

Barb: Deleteme knows your privacy is worth protecting, and we do too. Sign up and provide Deleteme with exactly what information you want deleted. Then their experts take it down from there.

More importantly, it's not a one-time service. Deleteme is always working for you to constantly monitor and remove the personal information you don't want on the internet.

Consider it like your personal warrior, protecting your data, autonomy, and privacy.

And I will tell you, all of us, anybody who does anything in the public domain, gets threats, harassment, nasty emails. And this is a very valuable way to protect yourself and your family.

Joyce: In the internet age, all of us are at risk from malicious actors, blackmailers, and worse, especially if you've got kids in your family, Deleteme as a must. I trust them to protect me, my sisters, and my family. And I know that they can keep you and your loved ones safe too.

Kim: Don't wait. Take control of your data and keep your private life private by signing up for Deleteme Now at a special discount for our listeners. Today, get a 20% off your Deleteme plan by texting Sisters to 64000. The only way to get 20% off is to text Sisters to 64000 or 64000. That's Sisters to 64000. Message and data rates may apply and the link is in the show notes.

Barb: All right, what was that again? 64000, three zeros, and I write in Sisters. I'm doing it right now. I like it. That's easy.

Joyce: There are now two federal cases involving Kilmar Abrego Garcia, the Maryland man who the Trump administration deported to his native Venezuela in March, even though an administrative judge had entered an order saying he couldn't be sent back because of the risk he would suffer physical harm at the hands of gangs who had been trying to extort his family for years over the family business.

The first case is a civil case filed by his wife on his behalf. There's also a criminal case brought against Abrego Garcia by the federal government.

So let's start there with the criminal case. Abrego Garcia is charged with transporting aliens he knew didn't have legal immigration status to be in this country, and the government has lined up quite a star witness.

Kim, why don't we start there and tell us about this new witness we're learning about and whether you find it surprising that the government would do this.

Kim: Yeah, this is interesting to say the least. So the witness is named Jose Ramon Hernandez Reyes, and he is the purported owner of the car that the government alleges that Abrego Garcia was driving when he was allegedly smuggling non-citizens into the country. So that's how he comes in.

Calling him and focusing on him is interesting for a number of reasons, not the least of which is he is currently in prison. He is actually a three-time convicted felon who is currently serving time in prison. Sounds to me like someone maybe that the government would be opening deportation proceedings into.

Oh, guess what? He does have deportation proceedings that are underway, but the government now is offering in exchange for his testimony: early release from the federal prison where he is currently located, allowing him to go into a halfway house would also not only stop the deportation proceedings against them, but help him to get a work permit.

So the government is using this witness and giving him all of these perks in favor of trying to convict someone who was minding his own business, not breaking laws, being a husband and a father, working and doing all the things one is supposed to do.

Make it make sense.

Joyce: This is just crazy. And I have seen people on the internet saying, "Well, the government makes these sorts of deals with cooperating witnesses all the time."

And let me tell you, no, that's not the case. 25 years of prosecution here. I know Barb will add her experience in. Something that you don't do is cooperate a big fish against a little fish. Juries hate it, judges hate it. It doesn't make sense from a prosecutive perspective.

And to point out, not to spotlight the Trump administration's hypocrisy, the cooperating witness, that's the guy who they said that they would deport, a guy who's got criminal convictions, including one for violent conduct.

And now they're just so focused on justifying their own mistake and making this criminal case against Abrego Garcia stick.

So to the extent that we can make sense out of this for you, it's to say that this is an administration that's not really focused on undoing justice.

To that point, Barbara, Abrego Garcia's lawyers filed a motion complaining about out-of-court statements made by government officials and the judge ruled on that motion late Wednesday.

Can you explain what that motion is about and what you think of the judge's ruling?

Barb: Yeah, first I'd like to chime in, though, on the use of this witness as a cooperator. This is so unusual. It goes against the textbook way that prosecutors use cooperators. Joyce, I'm sure you learned about the Stephen Trott article, The Do's and Don'ts of Cooperators, because what you're trying to do is protect the integrity of the prosecution, and you don't want to incentivize somebody to lie and result in a miscarriage of justice.

So there are a couple of things here that are real red flags. One is you've both mentioned working your way up the chain. Ordinarily, what you use is a lower-level offender to testify against a higher-level offender, on the theory that it's better to forego the conviction of this lower-level offender in an effort to get this person whose conduct is more egregious and is responsible for more harm. They're flipping that upside down. They are using this more egregious offender to testify against the lower-level alleged offender, Kilmar Abrego Garcia. So that alone is problematic.

But the other thing they've done here that is so unusual is they've given him the benefit before he's actually testified at trial. Typically, you want to wait and see what they do, and then you decide what their cooperation is worth. They've already taken him out of prison. They've already promised not to deport him, and so he's gotten this benefit. And so he incentivized him to tell the government whatever it is they want to hear about Abrego Garcia, so that they can justify and vindicate their conduct already. So this has all the red flags that Stephen Trott warned about. So it seems to me that the methods that DOJ are using here in this case are completely contrary to the way we are taught we were taught to handle a cooperator, and that makes me very concerned.

But to answer the question you asked, Joyce, about this motion that was filed about out-of-court statements, the judge has ruled that the parties should comply with a local rule that exists in the district there. There's a local rule that says that lawyers and parties should not make extrajudicial statements about a case if they anticipate that those statements might be published in some way. And that includes anything that goes beyond any documents that are publicly filed in the case, which is a pretty strong rule. But the judge just said, "Hey, that's the rule and you need to follow it."

I think it'll be interesting to see whether the Trump administration does so, because already we have seen so many claims made about Abrego Garcia, some of which may be true, but others are not included in the indictment. At Pam Bondi's press conference announcing these charges, she talked about him being a rapist and involved with this group that smuggled people, that it resulted in deaths, even though none of those things are contained in the four corners of the indictment.

So I think the judge will give them a warning, and if they fail to comply, then we'll see whether he's able to escalate some of the sanctions against the Justice Department.

Joyce: I mean, ultimately, this sort of conduct can impair a conviction in a prosecution, right? This is why no smart prosecutor does this. It just opens you up to motions if there is a conviction arguing that the jury pool was tainted.

Barb, would you not have disciplined your own prosecutors had they made these kind of comments? But now we're seeing them from the Attorney General?

Barb: Yes. Well, it just wouldn't have happened. I wouldn't have had the need to discipline anybody because all prosecutors go through media training. They know what they're allowed to say. There are ethical rules about these things. And so the idea that these phrases came out of the mouth of the Attorney General is really something and shows just how quickly the standards of the Department of Justice have changed.

Joyce: Well, the civil case was filed originally in March, but this week the lawyers for Abrego Garcia ask the judge for permission to amend the complaint. Kim, you are our civil lawyer. Talk about what it means to amend a complaint and why they would want to do that.

Kim: Yeah, so someone who is bringing a civil action can seek to amend the complaint if new evidence arises, for example, that is related to the action that might be introduced and

therefore other claims could be made. They can do it if the facts or circumstances have changed in a case.

And in this case, the wife of Kilmar Abrego Garcia moved to amend the complaint. And someone can amend the complaint if new facts or evidence come up, or if an investigation reveals other circumstances that could lead to changes in the claims that are made in the complaint. That's a fairly routine thing to do.

I would say in most of the actions that I was involved with as a civil attorney, the complaints would be amended at some point or another. So that's not at all unusual.

In this case, the government wants to argue that the case should be dismissed as moot because Kilmar Abrego Garcia has already been returned to the United States. I think that that is certainly not... Doesn't mean that there is no right of action there, but that's where we stand at the moment.

Joyce: It's really interesting. We actually know what would be in this proposed amended complaint because Abrego Garcia's lawyers attached it as an exhibit to their motion. And I assume that by now you've heard something about it because it has been widely covered in the news. But Barb, talk a little bit about the new allegations that they want to include in the complaint.

Barb: Yeah, there's basically three. One is the government defied court orders, and some relief for that. The second is this new whistleblower complaint that was revealed since the time of the filing. A DOJ lawyer named Erez Reuveni who filed this scathing whistleblower complaint about how DOJ officials, including Emil Bove, who was at the time a high-level DOJ official, talked about violating court orders.

But to me, the most concerning allegation is the third one, which is Abrego Garcia's allegations of torture and mistreatment at this prison in El Salvador. And some of it we know about: how they arrived, they had their heads shaved, they were told, "Welcome to CICOT; whoever enters here never leaves." There was physical abuse, though, kicked in the legs with boots, struck in his head and his arms when he wasn't changing his clothing fast enough. His head was shaved; he was marched into a cell. He was struck with batons on the way. He had bruises and lumps all over his body.

And this one, the prisoners were all forced to kneel from 9:00 PM to 6:00 AM, and anybody who fell over from exhaustion would be struck by a guard. He was denied access to the bathroom and soiled himself. They're in metal bunks with no mattresses, they have bright lights on 24 hours a day, minimal access to sanitation. There are fights between gang members that are not being stopped by some of the guards. He lost 31 pounds while he was in prison.

This is the kind of stuff that, if a prisoner in the United States experienced these kinds of things, would have a civil rights violation. And the idea that you can send someone to a foreign prison and then wash your hands of him, I think is really problematic under our criminal justice system. If somebody needs to be deported, so be it. If somebody needs to be imprisoned, so be it. But there are still standards of care that have to be part of the equation when somebody is incarcerated in the United States. And just by sending them

out of the country, I don't think we have alleviated the federal government of their responsibilities to treat prisoners with dignity.

Kim: I would just add, I mean, it's not directly relevant to this case, but what you described, Barb, seems to me to violate international human rights treaties of which America's signature... I mean, that is just gobsmacking.

Joyce: I don't say this lightly, but you're reading the way these people are being treated, and it sounds very much like concentration camp treatment.

Kim: Absolutely, absolutely.

Joyce: They're not systematically killing people. But I think it's always important to acknowledge that where things start isn't necessarily where they end up. And if you're willing to dehumanize people and treat them in this way, then what comes next?

And I'm particularly offended by the outsourcing, this BS nonsense that we hear: "Oh, well, once they're in El Salvador, there's nothing that we can do about it." Well, we are paying for this. My taxpayer's money is going to pay it.

And if you are asking yourself what you would've done in Nazi Germany, then you had better start asking yourself what you're doing right now. I know at the last big protest, everybody held due process signs. People were concerned about Abrego Garcia. Now that we have his firsthand testimony, I just simply don't think that we can afford to do nothing.

And this administration often makes us feel so overwhelmed and so powerless that people just go into their shells. I know that's how I've been feeling for the last few days. It's time for us to reorganize and to express our outrage. We cannot afford to be silent in the face of this.

Kim, I wonder if this evidence that Abrego Garcia is now offering in court, if this might be used in other existing cases or in other cases as a way to get at that and to try to use the legal system to restore some sanity to our government.

Kim: Oh, absolutely. Listen, this should be used in subsequent cases or investigations that come up. This should be used by members of Congress to address this and ensure that laws are passed to reform this system. This is information that should be used to fix the system.

Will it be? That's the problem of where we are right now. There seems to be an absolute lack of will to even look clearly at what this is because, for the people in power, the head of their party believes that this is good politically, that people love this, that this is what people voted for.

It really will take the American people to remind all of those folks that it is not.

Joyce: Well, Barb, the Constitution, as you pointed out, does ban cruel and unusual punishment. And of course, as we've touched on, the government maintains that the El Salvadoran government now has these men in its custody and it's their responsibility.

What's your sense? Kim has talked about the evidence and how it might be used. Do you think that the government will actually get away with this or do you think that we have some hope that there's accountability in store?

Barb: Yeah, the cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment theory is really interesting. I had a student ask about this way back when these men were initially deported. One of the things that's so interesting is they haven't committed crimes. Unlike the men who've been deported to South Sudan, who have been convicted of crimes, these are people who were, at least, we don't know because they didn't have due process, but at least presumably, other than those who were erroneously deported, they were unlawfully in the United States, so they can be removed from the United States.

You can't be here anymore. But the idea that they're in a prison is really unusual. They perhaps can't be in the United States, but the only reason they were detained is because they lacked immigration status, and now they've been removed. You send them typically back to their country of origin, and if you can't do that, you find a third country that is willing to take them.

By sending them back to El Salvador, they're now in prison there, and according to what we heard from Abrego Garcia, being tortured. But the Eighth Amendment is limited to punishment administered by the government in a post-conviction posture. And so I'm thinking about, there's a case called, I think it's called Salerno, that distinguished between pretrial detention even and post-conviction detention, saying that's more of a regulatory type of detention as opposed to punishment. So it wasn't covered by-

Kim: Remember, removals are civil actions.

Barb: Yeah, so it's not covered by the Eighth Amendment.

Kim: No.

Barb: So I don't think that there is any relief there. Now, maybe there is some sort of civil liability in store.

It reminds me of the era we went through when the Bush administration tried to use a prison at Guantanamo Bay, and they thought that, "Well, by taking this outside the United States, we can avoid the courts from being involved." And so far, the courts have been involved, but only sort of, right? We have not really seen the full relief that you might expect. And we have not also seen the Trump administration really comply with court orders.

So I guess I don't know. I mean, until recent months, I would've said, "No way can they get away with this." Just as the courts said Guantanamo is part of the US, people in prison there under US authority are still subject to US laws and the US courts.

The same would be true of these men who have been sent to this prison. And as you point out, Joyce, because the United States is paying for it, I have to believe that ultimately that we will see relief for these men. But man, it's been frustrating to see how slowly it is coming for them.

Joyce: Yeah, I mean, I think that your Eighth Amendment analysis is sophisticated and correct, and ultimately this may bounce back to a Fifth Amendment due process deprivation case, right? You can't be deprived of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness. Well, we're seeing all of those things happen.

And of course, MAGA is quick to say, "Well, constitutional rights shouldn't apply to people who aren't here legally." And as we have repeatedly discussed and debunked, legally, that's not the case.

The Supreme Court believes in history and tradition. Well, here's one: constitutional rights apply to everybody who's in the country, and we understand the reason that that's true. If somebody who is not a citizen is denied due process, functionally, that means you and I can be denied our due process too.

Kim: Over 1,000,000 Americans, including me, suffer from allergies every year, and 48% of allergy sufferers have avoided social gatherings due to their allergies.

I have spent many, many years of my life only inviting the cat lovers in my life to my house because there was no way that I would survive in their house. It would just be too hard. But owning a cat shouldn't mean being a leper and not having any of your allergic friends being able to enjoy your company.

And three out of four people aren't happy with their current allergy solutions. Pacagen's cat allergen neutralizing spray targets triggering home-based allergens and breaks them down so you and your family can live and breathe and socialize in peace.

And you know what? I'm just going to start carrying it with me to any home fête in my purse so that I can relax and have a good time, Joyce.

Joyce: I'm the only Sister with cats. We have a few of them around here, and they're cherished family members. So I actually discovered Pacagen before they started advertising with us, and I am here to say this is a product you absolutely want to have.

I learned something interesting when we were looking at the advertising, which is that cats constantly groom themselves, and it's their saliva that's the main source of the allergens. So that means that your cat, who has just freshly groomed itself and has been so cute and sweet doing it, is now covered in allergens that will shed all around your house.

Enter Pacagen's cat allergen neutralizing spray. It uses their patent-pending Whisker Block protein to bind and neutralize allergens in your home. No harsh chemicals, no side effects. Just spray it every few days and keep the allergens at bay.

That's why 97% of Pacagen customers, including me, feel relief and breathe easier around their cats. It's a big deal.

Kim: Yeah, one thing that I realized is when I would take Snickers to the vet, a lot of times I would be miserable once we got home, and I'm like, "Duh." There's a office cat that just hangs out in the lobby of our vet's office, and I'm sure Snickers, just by being in there, brings some of those pathogens home.

So it's good for us to have in the house even though we don't have a cat. It's amazing to learn that I could keep my home sniffle-free if Snickers were to, say, get a cat friend. There is a cat in the neighborhood that she desperately wants to be friends with. I don't think the cat is into it, but if they are able to form that bond, then I am all covered.

And I know that Pacagen would be a power player in Joyce's home to compliment her wonderful felines and allow me to come and stay. I keep inviting myself over, Joyce, I'm going to keep doing it until you actually open the door.

Joyce: Girl, you are welcome anytime and I will spray for you ahead of your visit.

Kim: Thank you. Thank you so much. And you know what? I'll tell you all a secret. I'm allergic to dogs a little bit too, not as much as I am cats, but it's also good to know that Pacagen has dog and dust allergen neutralizing sprays too.

Barb: I am so encouraged by Pacagen. Our family has not been blessed with a dog or a cat because we have serious allergies by many of our family members, but maybe this could be a game-changer that could let me be part of the Sister's club of pet owners.

Pacagen was founded by a team of passionate scientists from top universities. It has set a new standard for allergen management. Their products are allergist recommended, vet approved, and PhD engineered to precisely zap allergens to deliver the results and safety you and your family deserve.

Your pets aren't just pets, they're family. We know that. So get the relief you need with Pacagen. Head to pacagen.com/sisters for an extra 25% off your order and an exclusive gift for our listeners at checkout.

That's P-A-C-A-G-E-N.com/sisters for an extra 25% off your order and an exclusive gift. One last time: that's pacagen.com/sisters for an extra 25% off and an exclusive gift, which is auto applied at checkout. The link, as always, is in our show notes.

Kim: Well, it seems in the past week we are learning that free speech can be costly.

The First Amendment to the Constitution prohibits the government from "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances." But apparently Trump and his administration did not get the memo.

Exhibit A: about 140 employees of the Environmental Protection Agency exercised their First Amendment rights when they sent a letter to EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin,

expressing concern that the agency was making decisions that were based on politics and not the law or science.

So Barb, what happened next and what is your reaction to it?

Barb: Yeah, so the Trump administration has suspended these employees. They're on administrative leave and they are now under investigation solely on the basis of their decision to sign this letter, which, as you said, accused the Trump administration of politicizing the agency.

I think this is a stunning violation of not only their free speech rights, but their whistleblower protection rights. When you are a federal employee, you have the protection of certain rules. It's called the Merit System, and this seems to me a blatant violation of that.

What the government said is that they are casting their agency in a poor light by making these allegations. Well, yeah, because you're in a poor light and that they use-

Kim: That's the whole idea behind petitioning the government for your grievances and speaking up and having a whistle blow... Yes.

Barb: It's a bizarro world.

But one thing I worry about, Kim, is we may be seeing now some of these earlier decisions coming into play. Remember that Donald Trump fired Hampton Dellinger, who's the head of the Office of Special Counsel, and has now installed his own guy there, a guy named Paul Ingrassia, who is a total election denier, thinks there should be a holiday for January 6th, reparations for the January 6th defendants.

This is the guy who is now in charge of the office that protects government employees when they face retaliation for protected workplace activities. So you think he's going to come to their rescue?

It's like watching a story unfold, right? In chapter one, somebody gets fired, like, "Huh, I wonder how that might play out as the story unfolds." Well, here we are now that we are seeing this adverse employment action taken against people for speaking out, exercising their rights, and is anybody going to be there to protect them?

Something tells me that Paul Ingrassia is not going to be as staunch a defender of their rights as Hampton Dellinger would've been.

Kim: Yeah. Joyce, what do you think? You have any reaction to what's happening over there at EPA?

Joyce: I mean, I was looking at the New York Times reporting where they were talking about the government's reaction to the letter, and they said, I wrote this down, they said in quotes, "appear to be ignoring, appear to be ignoring the employees' First Amendment rights."

I mean, there's no appearance here. This is an administration that is setting up yet another confrontation in the courts about the extent of presidential power. And it's happening because Donald Trump craves these confrontations, and recent Supreme Court decisions are only making him bolder.

He continues to think that he can claim a larger and larger share of the power of government for himself at the expense of others, including federal employees who've been one of his targets since before he was reelected.

So to me, the question that's raised by this entire development is: will the Supreme Court ever find a place that it will draw a line in the sand to shut Donald Trump down? Because this one is coming to the court soon.

Kim: Well, Joyce, I have more for you. Here's a shot and a chaser.

Joyce: You are such a good friend.

Kim: Yeah. So just-

Joyce: Just what you want.

Kim: That's what I'm here for. Just as CBS was reaching a settlement with the administration over the network having the audacity, the gall, to practice journalism, the Trump administration has now turned its ire against CNN, but this time with the threat of criminal action.

What's going on here, Joyce?

Joyce: The CBS settlement was just crazy. I mean, every First Amendment expert in the country rolled their eyes when they read this complaint, right?

The lawsuit was just, I think, this administration trying to put CBS on a leash like they have with other journalistic organizations. The complaint was putzing around about how they edited an interview with Kamala Harris, and it's really a BS case, not the kind of case that you would advise your client to pay \$16,000,000 to resolve before discovery was even complete.

Kim: I mean, can we just remind the world that, in addition to the fact that, yeah, it was edited, every TV spot is edited, that's what they do. But this claim that it somehow influenced the election. She lost. Why are you paying a dime?

Joyce: And so here's the answer to Kim's question: why are they paying a dime? Well, Trump has created a mechanism. So CBS's parent company, Paramount, wants to complete its merger deal with Skydance, a multi-million dollar deal. They've got to have the administration sign off before they can move forward, and the clock is ticking.

This deal was supposed to close in the first half of 2025. There are a couple of mandatory extension periods. They're well into the first one, so it's time for them to make that happen, and this is how they're making it happen, apparently.

As bad as that whole deal is, this thing with CNN, this is next level. The threat comes from DHS Secretary Kristi Noem, by the way, the same high-ranking Trump official who did not know what habeas corpus was, so not exactly a constitutional law scholar.

She's on her little cosplay field trip down to this new detention facility in Florida, the one that the conservatives, that the MAGA folks are taking enormous joy in calling "Alligator Alcatraz," which makes me sick to my stomach. Everything that's going on is performative. She's looking at this new facility in front of the press, she's discussing CNN's reporting on ISIS dragnets in communities, and she says, and let me just read you the quote, "We are working with the Department of Justice to see if we can prosecute them, CNN, because what they're doing is actively encouraging people to avoid law enforcement activities and operations. We're going to actually go after them and prosecute them. What they're doing is illegal."

Well, Madam Secretary, I suspect that by now someone has introduced you to the First Amendment. But if they haven't, let me just say, even in this crazy, farkakte environment that we live in, the First Amendment will not permit a prosecution of CNN for reporting on what ICE is doing in our communities.

There's not very much that I would be willing at this point to say I don't think the Supreme Court could buy in on. This one, I think, that there would still be six votes on the Supreme Court to say no. Maybe five, but I think a majority.

Kim: Joyce, I don't mean to take away at all from your very salient point, but what was that word you used? Was that a swear word in a different language? Does that count, Barb?

Joyce: Oh, Barb, can I say farkakte?

Barb: I didn't even understand it.

Joyce: It's Yiddish, so it's okay. It's okay.

Kim: All right. Well, let's keep it rolling. Barb, what are your thoughts about this media madness that Joyce explained?

Barb: Yeah, I mean, this is so outrageous that it almost makes me think it's thrown out there more for a chilling effect than an actual idea of filing a lawsuit or criminal charges. I mean, think how ridiculous this is. CNN reported that there is such a thing as an app that someone can use to tell you when ICE is in the vicinity. It is sort of like reporting that there is such a thing called a radar detector that a person can buy and recognize when a police radar done is nearby, right? I mean, that's all that is.

That is so far afield from what you could charge. Now, if somebody obstructs or impedes a federal official in their work, that can be a crime. You have to do it with a corrupt intent. And so first, I don't think this gets off the ground in terms of a criminal prosecution by establishing that criminal intent. But even if somehow it did, then I imagine CNN will come back with a First Amendment defense that just says, "We have a right to report about this."

I mean, think about what they reported about in the Pentagon Papers, and they didn't have a case there, right?

Kim: Right.

Barb: I mean, anything short of the location of movement of troops or something is going to be permitted under the First Amendment. So, I think it's an absolute non-starter as criminal charges.

But it's not for nothing that they say these things, and could have a chilling effect where newspapers start to self-censor and say, "Ooh, they're being very aggressive. I don't want them to come after me. I'm just going to tone it down a little bit."

And then we don't have a vigorous free press pointing out some of these kinds of things that are going on in society that we all need to know about.

Kim: So I just want to quickly get both of your thoughts on a different lawsuit. This one against Fox News, filed by California governor Gavin Newsom, who claims in a segment on Fox News, there was a doctored video used to falsely claim that the governor lied when it came to who ordered National Guard troops to Los Angeles.

We've talked about Fox being sued before by Dominion, the voting system. What do you think about the governor taking a lawsuit and what feels like a political fight?

Joyce: It does feel like a political fight. I mean, it's a pretty good technical case because they actually aired these doctored... Or I think what happened is they actually aired the actual call log showing when the calls occurred, while alleging that they said something that they didn't in the course of the reporting.

And so these are two public figures involved, too, when Governor Newsom would have to argue that they made the false statements with reckless disregard. And the on-air broadcast itself would sort of seem to add up to that.

But this just looks to me like retail politics more than anything else. And there's also maybe an asterisk on this, which is that the Supreme Court, or at least some of the justices, have been spoiling for a fight to weaken the standard that a plaintiff has to prove to make a libel case.

That's what Viktor Orbán did in Hungary as part of transforming that country into an illiberal democracy. The last thing that folks like Donald Trump need is an easier path to suing people for defamation.

So I sort of wish that this case would just go away.

Barb: Yeah, I have a similar reaction to it. I think that the \$787,000,000 damage request is no coincidence, right? That's exactly what Fox News paid Dominion Voting Systems in exchange for the settlement in that case.

I think he's making a political point. Fox News apparently falsely reported that Donald Trump had spoken to Gavin Newsom by phone when that absolutely wasn't the case.

But to make out a defamation case, especially in a case involving a public official like Gavin Newsom, you have to show actual malice, that they knew it was false or acted with disregard to whether it was false, and that Newsom suffered some sort of harm to his reputation.

I don't know that you suffer harm to your reputation when Donald Trump lies about you. So I doubt this case goes anywhere, but I think he is trying to take a stand and respond strongly to Donald Trump's sending of troops.

I also think, as Dre said, he's running for president. He wants to be seen as the anti-Trump, and so he's going to show strength by taking him on.

But I don't know that we ever really win when people abuse the court process for their own political or personal gain.

Well, here in the Midwest, Sisters, we all have some questions when it comes to the freshness of our seafood, but not anymore.

I know tuna are not native to the Great Lakes, but when they come fresh, frozen, and wild-caught from the coast with Wild Alaskan Company, I know my friends, family, and I are getting the best.

Kim: Who wouldn't want a home in Alaska? And that's basically what you have, Barb, because the seafood is fresh there, right at your door.

Everything from Wild Alaskan is 100% wild-caught and never farmed. This means there are no antibiotics, GMOs, or additives in their catch, just clean, real fish that support healthy oceans and fishing communities. So don't settle for less. Go with fish that are nutrient-rich and full of flavor.

And I have to say, I am not good at preparing most fish, and I think it's because I've been preparing bad fish. Because I took some of the cod and made this panko crust, and cooked it in the pan for a little bit, but then put the pan in the oven until it was done. And it might be my favorite dish that I have cooked in the household in a minute. It was so delicious.

I even left it in a little too long, because you know fish, you can ruin it. And that's how I usually do. But it was forgiving. It was forgiving. It still tasted really good.

And I think one reason is that their fish is frozen off the boat to lock in the taste, texture, and nutrients, like omega-threes. And it's so fresh when it gets to your door because it's always been fresh.

Barb: I'm all about forgiving meals.

Joyce: Like us, you'll love that everything from Wild Alaskan is sustainably sourced and wild-caught from Alaska, with every order supporting sustainable harvesting practices.

Plus, becoming a member means your deliveries are flexible and at your own pace, and you'll get chef tips from the pros. It's an endless smorgasbord of truly feel-good seafood, and I love seafood.

Even though we live close to the Gulf Coast, I have become a huge fan of Wild Alaskan because the seafood is absolutely beautiful and delicious.

If you're not completely satisfied with your first box, Wild Alaskan Company will give you a full refund, no questions asked, no risk, just high-quality seafood. Not all fish are the same. Get seafood you can trust.

Go to wildalaskan.com/sisters for \$35 off your first box of premium wild-caught seafood. That's wildalaskan.com/sisters for \$35 off your first order.

A big thanks to Wild Alaskan Company for sponsoring this episode. The link is in our show notes.

Barb: Well, this week, President Donald Trump toured a new immigration detention center in Florida that, as Joyce mentioned earlier, they're calling "Alligator Alcatraz," which, by the way, I think had a flood. Did you guys see that?

Kim: Horrific.

Barb: Yeah, so some hideous place they've got now in Florida. And while he was there, he made some really remarkable comments. This idea of dehumanizing and demonizing immigrants really continues. Most recently, he said, "They are not new to our country," speaking of immigrants, "they're old to our country. Many of them were born in our country. I think we ought to get them the hell out of here too, if you want to know the truth. So maybe that will be the next job."

And it seems like he's suggesting deporting American citizens who are born in the United States. So sometimes we sound alarmist, I think, when we talk about, "Sure, this is bad, but what comes next?" I think it might be a preview about what comes next.

And Kim and Joyce, you both wrote this week about this concept. Kim, in your column in the Boston Globe, you wrote about this memo that was issued by the Department of Justice relating to immigration, and this is a memo directing prosecutors to prioritize denaturalization of naturalized US citizens in certain cases. Now, this is something that's always been available under the law, but tell us what's changed and why you're concerned.

Kim: Yeah, so as you said, yes, denaturalization, which is the process of revoking citizenship that someone obtained, has always been, or at least has long been, a remedy that the government can seek in cases where it is found that the person obtains citizenship through false or fraudulent means. For example, hiding the fact that they'd been convicted

of a felony or something like that. Then they can take that, the government can seek to take that away.

But what is alarming about this, and it's worth noting that this happened rarely, I think I found a report that found that for at least the past three decades, the government usually brings a single digit number of these cases each year. It's really, really a rare occurrence.

But now there is a new memo that directs a more aggressive use of this, and it lists all the kind of categories, the things that are like lying, fraud, other things, but it also includes this last 10th category that is a catch-all that basically says in any case where the government has serious reason to seek this penalty. That blows open a loophole in this guidance that you can drive a truck through. It allows the government to seek to denaturalize anyone if they think it's important enough and strip them of their citizenship and render them therefore removable.

Now, I'm sure people will say, "Oh, no, no, you're overreacting to this." Well, given what, as Barb pointed out, the President said about people who were born here, I'm not talking about naturalized citizens, I'm talking about American-born citizens, that he wants some of them to be deported, do you really think they're going to be that nuanced and careful with the use of this new policy?

I doubt that.

Barb: Yeah. Joyce, what do you think? You wrote about this also in your Civil Discourse newsletter.

Of course, DOJ is constrained by a denaturalization statute, right? I mean, if somebody procured their citizenship by fraud, they made some false statement in their application, then a remedy is to say, "We will undo that and denaturalize you."

So, if they're bound by a statute, what's your concern about this memo?

Joyce: Yeah, so we should include both Kim's and my pieces in the show note this week so that people can read up on this. I think that this is one of the stealth moves that this justice department and this administration is making and something that we need to wake up to, because Barb raises this really normal argument, right?

There's a statute that permits DOJ, permits US attorneys, it's very specific, to strip citizenship from people who lie during the naturalization process in order to get it or even conceal or withhold information, right? As Kim says, it's not used frequently, something like an average of 11 times a year over the last three decades. And I bet if you're of a certain age like I am, you can remember some of those cases. They involved people who were involved in the Holocaust who lied when they got citizenship, right? I mean, really serious cases.

Well, here's the problem with saying, "Oh, this statute only lets them go just so far." We need to stop engaging in that kind of magical thinking, because this is not an administration that feels like it's constrained by the law. This is an administration that

contorts the law and stretches the law to serve its own purposes, just like it's doing with the Alien Enemies Act and thousands of other things.

And we see the proof of that right here in the memo, this mid-June memo where we learn that pursuing denaturalization is a new priority. This is a normal memo. Barb wrote them for her office. I wrote them for mine. Attorneys General write them. Every assistant attorney general for a division DOJ writes them. It's a memo setting your new priorities, and sometimes do that at the start of your time in office. Maybe there are changing circumstances, new crimes emerge. You write a new one a couple years in.

Well, this was written by the new head of DOJ's Civil Division, Brett Shumate, and he says, and this is so very normal, I can't tell you how normal this is, "The Attorney General has said that we at DOJ will align our priorities with the priorities in the White House." I bet you I use that same language in mind. The problem is, I didn't work for a Donald Trump White House.

But be that as it may, he then goes on to list a number of other priorities for Civil Division lawyers. And the first one involves a use of a fraud statute, a civil fraud statute, not a criminal one, that Barb and I both used a whole lot of the time to go after people who were engaged in fraud on the government, fraud involving your taxpayer dollars. It's a great statute. It's an important authority for the Civil Division.

But what he talks about in this memo is using that provision to go after people whose policies this administration doesn't like, to go after people, for instance, who promoted DEI, and viewing that as a form of fraud on the government.

And how does this connect up with denaturalization? It connects up like this: because now you can denaturalize people who violated the laws after they became citizens, under their view of how the laws work. And so if, for instance, the Civil Division goes after you for violating the fraud statute, why not denaturalize you at that same time?

And as Kim points out, they list 10 categories of people that they will pursue denaturalization for. And the 10th one is so vague as to be meaningless. In essence, it's a license to go after journalists and professors and students and lawyers that you don't like.

And here's the reality, will it hold up in court? We don't know, because it's clearly BS. The risk that people will have to go through denaturalization proceedings is so serious and so severe that, yet again, this administration is using it like a stick to keep people in line. And that's exactly what's going on here.

Barb: Wow, that's a very interesting perspective, because I had been thinking that, "I don't know that this is such a big deal."

As you said, Joyce, we use this from time to time. I can think of a person who lied in her citizenship application about her role in a bombing, a terrorist bombing in Jerusalem, and she was convicted and stripped of her citizenship because she lied on the application about whether she had ever been convicted of a crime anywhere in the world.

But a court had to make a finding and had to say, "Yes, I make a finding that this is true." A jury made a finding, and then the court entered an order. So it does require involvement of the courts, but as you've said, even if it doesn't hold up in court, it can still be a cudgel and a threat to hang over people's heads.

And of course, I've been very surprised before by what our Supreme Court ultimately decides in some of these cases.

Joyce: Yeah, and I mean, let me say, or does it require a finding in a court, right?

Donald Trump can rewrite the law with an executive order, or at least that's what Donald Trump thinks he can do, and what the Supreme Court has said he can do. And now there's no nationwide injunction mechanism that lets the courts shut it down across the country.

They can bring online clearly unconstitutional measures, and it will take the lawyers some time to shut them down because there is no more nationwide injunction. At best, you've got to go in each of the 94 federal districts and file a lawsuit. Maybe you can certify a nationwide class, but that doesn't happen particularly quickly.

And so we are in a whole new world when it comes to these sorts of unconstitutional measures, the kind of stuff that people like the three of us say, "That can never happen. The law doesn't permit that." Well, now this administration can push even further.

Barb: Yeah. Kim, you made a similar note about Trump's attack on birthright citizenship, and he's trying to change the definition. His executive order would strip citizenship of babies born in the United States with undocumented parents.

That alone would be a seismic change. And as Joy said, now we don't have any universal injunctions, so there's going to have to be this piecemeal challenge to it.

But you write that you're concerned that he won't stop there. What's your concern?

Kim: Yeah, so it's based on actions of the administration and one thing, and also the fact that we now know the Supreme Court will allow the policies that he puts out to go into effect and force the people impacted by them to sue one at a time. So that's a big guardrail that's already gone, right?

Well, look at what they're planning next. There was a NPR report that, did you wonder where all that data that DOJ mined during its time infiltrating the agencies? Well, we have a partial answer.

Citizenship information garnered from places like the Social Security Administration and other sources are being compiled to create a national citizenship database. Yes, a national citizenship database.

They say they want to use it to give states a tool to ensure voter eligibility. In that way, if they use this database, they won't even have to ask for ID or all the other things that they do that people who support voting rights have criticized.

Here's the problem. There's a reason we don't have nationwide databases like this in the election realm or elsewhere, because it's been tried before and it was so unwieldy to administer, and it was so riddled with errors because you're relying on this data from different places, which could sometimes be wrong.

Once, my name on my birth certificate, when I asked for a copy, was wrong. So now the only birth certificate I had misspelled my middle name, and the rigmarole that I had to go to to get that corrected was wild on the state and federal level, just to be able to get my driver's license one year. I mean, it was crazy.

So imagine how easy it would be to have a mistake on this citizenship database. If it's used for voting, that's bad enough because that would deny someone the right to vote, which is probably the point, right?

But think about it. Would someone want to vote, cast a vote in an election, knowing that they're going to be checked against a database that could have mistakes and that could not only deny them the right to vote, that could end up with maybe they fear ICE will show up at their door, or at the door of their family members. Maybe they feel like it will put their job in peril.

So then they're definitely not going to vote then, right? And could it be used for these reasons? I have so many questions. This is just a stupendously terrifying idea. And in this posture that we're talking about, with the president's views about citizenship and who should be one and who shouldn't, I really fear we have crossed a Rubicon into something really dark.

Barb: Yeah. I just worry about it from a hacking perspective that one entity has all that information in one place makes it a danger. Joyce, what do you think? Do you think that this is a significant risk?

Joyce: Before we move on, let me just issue this generalized reminder.

After Trump won in 2016, he created an election inquiry commission. And one of the things that they started doing was collecting data on voters in a much less sophisticated way than Elon Musk's folks did it. And that commission was shuttered after it came to light that the intention for collecting that data was mining it to use for voter suppression purposes.

Well, here you've got that on steroids, and I think Kim's point about convincing people to stay away from the polls out of fear is a really good one. Who knows how they might microtarget individual voters either to make that fear take on outsized proportions or just to do what we all know happens.

So I think it's really concerning.

Kim: When it's hot, as it has been in DC over the past couple of weeks, I don't love putting a lot of makeup on. But I never, ever, ever leave the house without mascara. I don't care if I'm taking the trash out.

And my favorite one comes from Thrive Causemetics. So whether you keep things simple in the summertime or you like to go all out with a full face beat, Thrive Causemetics has a trusted favorite that will be perfect for you.

Thrive makes certified 100% vegan and cruelty-free products you can depend on for everything from simple daily wear to show-stopping self-expression. Plus, everything from Thrive uses clean skin-loving ingredients, high-performance and trademark formulas, and uncompromising standards that you'll be proud to wear even when taking out the trash.

Joyce: Kim and I are opposites. Not only do I not put on makeup to take out the trash, mascara is always the very last thing that I put on. Sometimes I even forget to use it when I do TV just because I have sensitive eyes and mascara can bother me.

The one mascara that I've discovered I don't have issues with is Thrive's mascara. I mean, it really delivers. I'm in love with everything about Thrive, especially their brilliant eye brighteners.

These are new to me. I hadn't used these before. They come with a luxurious eye shadow highlighter stick that brightens and opens your eyes to give you an instant eye lift. You don't even need the mascara, and it also gives you depth.

There's nothing better for a fresh, vibrant look, and Thrive's foolproof formula makes it extremely easy to apply and blend the 31 shades. If you're like me and you just tend to use the crayon and you don't think to blend, this is the product for you because it will encourage you to be more like a makeup artist in your own home.

Barb: I love Joyce's claim that she's going on TV without mascara. Give me a break. Is it because you're wearing three inch long false eyelashes? "Oh, oh, this is all natural. No mascara at all."

Joyce: The sad truth is, as much as I don't love makeup, I do love false eyelashes. And now that I've actually had them put on professionally a couple of times, I would do it every day if I could, but I can't. And so Thrive's mascara is the next best thing.

I mean, really, we talk about Thrive a lot, but we all use it. And even for people like Barb and me who don't love makeup, it really is fabulous. You can use as little or as much as you'd like to create the look you want.

You just apply these new eyeshadow sticks to the inner corner of your eye for this rested and effortless look. And sometimes I use another dark color as a liner. You can use the eyeshadow for the perfect daytime glow. It's just all good.

Jill would recommend that you also try applying a metallic shade all over your eyelid and blending it with your finger for an easy smoky eye that pops. That one might still be beyond me, but it looks great on Jill.

Kim: Joyce, I also have good news for you because Thrive makes instant false eyelashes that I use when I'm doing my makeup at home for TV. If you let me in your house, then we will have a little session to help each other learn how to put them on.

Barb: We love that cause is in the name for a reason. Thrive not only defines luxury beauty with clean skin-loving ingredients and uncompromising standards, but they give back too.

Every purchase supports organizations helping communities thrive across eight major causes, including the fight against cancer and domestic abuse, veteran and education organizations, and more.

Try your new trusty favorites with an exclusive set for our listeners. New customers can get the Liquid Lash Extensions Mascara and a mini-sized brilliant eye brightener at a special set price with free shipping available at thrivecausemetics.com/sisters. Or save more than 20% off your first order at thrivecausemetics.com/sisters.

That's Thrive Causemetics, C-A-U-S-E-M-E-T-I-C-S, [.com/sisters](https://thrivecausemetics.com/sisters) for 20% off your first order. The link is in our show notes.

Joyce: Well, thanks for sticking it out with us during a really difficult week. I think it's important to acknowledge that this has maybe been the toughest week we've seen so far under Donald Trump.

Don't let him steal your joy. I hope you've had a good 4th of July celebration.

And like always, #SistersInLaw, we are here to answer your questions. It really is our favorite part of the show. We look forward to your questions every week. Please send us more. I know you have them right now.

If you've got a question, email us at sistersinlaw@politicon.com, or you can also tag us on social media using #SistersInLaw. And if we don't answer your question during the show, keep an eye on our feeds during the week because we often drop in to try and answer more of your questions online.

Our first question today comes from Lori, and this question, Barb, this is a good one for you: Can this administration cancel the midterms or future elections?

Barb: Yeah, Lori, I suppose that we can't predict anything this administration will do because they have proven to be so aggressive, at times lawless, and pushing to extend the law. But I don't think so, and that's because our elections are individual state elections.

Every state administers its own election. It's down at the county level. There are county boards of canvassers, there are election boards, local clerks.

It is really one of the either intentionally or accidentally ingenious structures of our elections because it makes it difficult for somebody to hack into our elections and to disrupt them because we have such decentralized elections.

So never underestimate the nefariousness of this administration, but I don't think so. I think that we are safe.

Joyce: Our next question comes from Bev in Phoenix, Arizona, one of my favorite cities. So I'll answer your question, Bev. It's a great one.

You ask, could Congress outlaw the Supreme Court's shadow docket? The shadow docket is this much: really, people don't have a high opinion of it very often in the public discourse docket that the Supreme Court uses where it decides not cases, but rather where it issues orders without a case being fully briefed and orally argued.

These aren't decisions on the merits. They're often procedural rulings early on in cases, for instance, about whether or not an injunction can remain in place.

So I feel the angst about the way these decisions are made and the kind of issues that the Supreme Court is taking on the shadow docket and making decisions literally in the shadows.

The Supreme Court does, however, need to have a shadow docket. It's really their emergency docket.

So for instance, if there's a death penalty execution, often those last-minute appeals go up through the shadow docket, as do other emergency motions.

I think that distinction is important. It's not the docket itself; it's the way that the Court is using it.

And there has been some suggestion that Congress might come in and through legislation do something or another about it.

There have been multiple plans.

I think the reality is that that ship has sailed and that Congress has lost control of the Supreme Court.

And as a practical matter, there would not be majorities in Congress right now to do anything to rein them back in.

Which raises a very interesting question about what could happen if guardrails are reinstated in the midterm elections and what the priorities might be for ensuring that we restored the balance of power between the three branches of government that the Founding Fathers intended to exist.

So it's a great question, Bev. I'm sorry I don't have a more distinct answer for you, but it's one of those issues I think we should stick a pin in. I think it's something that we'll be discussing in the future.

Our last question comes from Stacy in Massachusetts.

Kim, this one's for you.

Stacy asks, in light of recent devastating rulings from the Supreme Court, is there a way for the public to communicate with the court to express their disapproval of these decisions?

Kim: So, Stacy, and shout out to the base date, which has always been very good to me. I'm going to give you the constitutional answer and then I'm going to give you the real-life answer.

So in terms of public approval or disapproval, the judiciary branch was set up to purposely be insulated from that. So whereas members of the executive and members of the legislative branches are elected, so they answer directly to the people, the framers envision that the judiciary would be an impartial branch that can serve as a check on the other two.

But that operates by being faithful to the law, not being swayed by public opinion. So it's really not supposed to work that way. And that's why you don't have things like a tip line or a comment line on the Supreme Court's website where you can leave your reviews because they're not here for your reviews. They speak through their opinions based on their interpretation.

Now, in practical reality, these are nine human beings who do things like care about what people think. Of course, they are aware... Well, let me take that back. They're nine human beings who most certainly are aware that people have very strong opinions about the court in general, the rulings that the court put out, and each justice individually.

They are aware of that. Do they all care? I know for a fact some of them do. I don't know. There's a couple, I'm not sure if they care or not. I do not know what Sam Alito cares about. I don't know.

And so obviously they're aware. There are polls that are done that measure people's satisfaction with the Supreme Court. They see the protesters outside the building every day. So certainly they are aware, but they're not supposed to be swayed by that.

And that's why there's really no formal way for the public to air their grievances about what the justices do.

Joyce: Ooh, but Kim, you have just given me a great idea. I think we should create that website, right? I'm listening to you talk about what people might expect. Let's do [supremecourtfeedbackwebsite.com](#), right? And people can leave their comments. If nothing else, it would make us all feel good after-

Kim: It'll be cathartic even if they don't see them.

Joyce: I'm really liking this. We need to do it. It can be our next adventure.

Well, listen. Thank you for listening to #SistersInLaw this week with Kimberly Atkins Stohr, Barb McQuade, and me, Joyce Vance. Our parade queen Jill Wine-Banks will rejoin us next week.

Follow #SistersInLaw wherever you listen, and please give us a five-star review. It really helps others find the podcast.

Please show some love to this week's sponsors. We love them: Deleteme, Pacagen, Wild Alaskan Company, and Thrive Causemetics. The links, like always, are in our show notes. Support them because they really make the podcast possible.

See you next week with another episode, #SistersInLaw.

Dan: Oh, that's cool. Oh, that's real cool.

Joyce: You guys hear that?

Barb: Yeah, what was that?

Kim: Dan, what...

Joyce: Was that Dan?

Kim: Yes.

Joyce: Was that a comment on my story? That's hilarious. You were talking to your dog. I love that.

Barb: Yeah, somebody wants to be in the coda.

Joyce: We have series of codas today. That was excellent. That was so outstanding.

Kim: That was amazing.

Barb: I thought we'd been hacked.

Joyce: No, that was worth the price of admission. It's worth [inaudible 01:15:00].

Barb: I thought we'd been hacked by Russians.

Joyce: End of third coda for the show.