

Capital Reporting Company
In Re: FEMA PW No. 54 (Volume IV) 05-22-2014

1316

1 the review and processing of all the PWs and
2 the appeals.

3 We think that the panel is entitled
4 to have the full story of everybody that
5 touched this clean-up effort, including the
6 consultant that FEMA chose, was not hoisted on
7 him, they chose to hire him, so with all due
8 respect to Ms. Litke, I think that evidence is
9 entirely proper before this panel.

10 MS. LITKE: Your Honor, if I could
11 just rebut that.

12 Mr. Delahoussaye is a confirmed FBI
13 informant. He was a whistleblower and that is
14 why the parish has gone after him. Obviously
15 the government has confirmed all of these
16 allegations. There is no truth to these
17 allegations. The parish can claim whatever
18 they like.

19 But as far as this case, if we were
20 to accept Mr. Cairnie's, I guess, theory in
21 this case, then any other criminal indictment
22 for any other person that touched this case

Capital Reporting Company
In Re: FEMA PW No. 54 (Volume IV) 05-22-2014

1317

1 would be admissible. That is not what we are
2 here talking about today. A photograph of
3 Mr. Delahoussaye with his son, depositions in a
4 case that has nothing to do with this.

5 Again, I would argue they are
6 attempting to make this into a creditability
7 issue against Mr. Delahoussaye. He is only
8 here on a consultant capacity. The
9 documentation in the record is from the record.
10 It is not from Mr. Delahoussaye. If you look
11 at his affidavit he might have submitted six or
12 seven documents he had.

13 This is outrageous, and I find it to
14 be reprehensible that they would make this case
15 about Mr. Delahoussaye and not about the public
16 assistance eligibility determination that we
17 are here to talk about today.

18 JUDGE DANIELS: Let me say that this
19 is not a trial. This is an arbitration. We
20 haven't been shown any of these exhibits yet.
21 We haven't looked at any of these exhibits. We
22 will not necessarily look at the exhibits