

Fox Rothschild Podcast

The Presumption of Innocence Podcast Series: Episode 10

The Unpopular Client: Protecting Their Presumption of Innocence

*Featuring Matthew Adams of Fox Rothschild LLP with Jennifer Sellitti,
Director of Training and Communications at the New Jersey Office of the Public Defender*

Adams: Hi everyone, and welcome back to “The Presumption of Innocence.” My name is [Matthew Adams](#). I'll be your host today, and I'm also one of the Co-Chairs of the [White-Collar Criminal Defense and Regulatory Compliance Practice](#) at the firm.

Today, I have the great fortune of being joined by my good friend [Jennifer Sellitti](#), who is the Director of Training and Communications at the New Jersey Office of the Public Defender. To say that Jen is in the trenches as a criminal defense lawyer would be an understatement.

I want to start by congratulating Jen. Yesterday, or just this week at least, you had a wonderful victory. Why don't you tell us a little bit about that?

Sellitti: Hi, Matt. Thanks so much for that introduction and for having me. The last couple of days have been a whirlwind. On Wednesday, one of my clients who was 15 years old when he was sentenced to die in prison, was resentenced. I worked with a wonderful team of lawyers. We got him resentenced under the Miller/Comar/Zuber line of resentencing decisions that forces courts to take a look at juveniles who committed crimes in their youth but have demonstrated rehabilitation. He was resentenced to what amounts to time served. He went to court Wednesday morning having done 35 years and expecting to die in prison and at 5 p.m. on Wednesday afternoon, he walked out the front gates of the prison and took his first steps into the world.

It's been quite a few days, and I've spent a lot of time with him over the last couple of days watching him re-experience the world.

Adams: For our audience, that's who my friend Jen Sellitti is. That's the lawyer who she is.

The name of our podcast, Jen, is “The Presumption of Innocence,” and I think intuitively we all know what that means: the presumption that all who have been accused are assumed innocent unless – or until – proven guilty. What I want to talk to you today about, Jen, is the practical aspects of that. I think there are those among us who believe in that, defend that, every day of the week. But oftentimes, it seems like we're swimming upstream. It sounds and seems in the world that there is a current that goes against our clients merely because they've been investigated or even, perhaps, charged. I would even say it happens before a charging decision. Just the mere suspicion where an investigation is encompassing someone's life or their conduct in some way, shape or form.

What does the presumption of innocence mean to you?

Sellitti: It's a great question, and I think you hit something when you said swimming upstream versus swimming with it, because as a criminal defense attorney, that's just how I roll. I have embraced the presumption of innocence. I believe that everybody is entitled to that presumption. I see people as they walk through the courtroom with that presumption. But the average person who doesn't do this kind of work doesn't see it that way.

You mentioned my title is Director of Training and Communications. I do casework, but I also train a lot of lawyers. One of the things I always say to new lawyers, or even experienced lawyers, is, "Stop fighting it." You can scream that clients have the presumption of innocence in court as much as you want. But that's not intuitive to a lot of people who say, "This person is sitting here, the judge read the charges. The charges sound pretty bad."

What we have to do from the very beginning is to create a narrative and a story that shows the jurors why they should give our client that presumption. To get jurors, to get people in the courtroom, to care about our clients, to care about their story and to switch their lens. We can't see everything just through the lens of criminal defense lawyers. We have to try to see it through the lens of our jurors and judges and figure out how to tell the story of innocence to them in a way that gets them to emotionally connect to it, instead of just intellectually.

Adams: It's fascinating you should say that Jen, because I think one of the one of the things that I enjoy in almost a perverse way is when people come up to me and say, "Well, how could you represent somebody who did that?"

The nature of my practice is perhaps a little even different than your practice where the "that" in my world is typically an allegation of some sort of financial crime or something to that extent. I think in your world it's probably a crime of violence or some act against a child. These things have a tendency to just evoke such intuitive, emotional response from the public. Yet we have to sift through that in a way sometimes where I think we are left scratching our head because, at least in my experience, guilt and innocence is often a spectrum. I have yet to come across a prosecutor's office who charged something perfectly once the facts shape out. Yes, do we represent people who have committed certain acts? Sometimes, yes. But prosecutors have a tendency to overcharge. I'm always struck by people who say to me, "How do you put your head on the pillow at night knowing that this person was accused of X, Y or Z? How do you deal with that?"

How do you deal with that in training, in your capacity to train other lawyers in your office, but also in your capacity as just an impassioned person who believes in that presumption?

Sellitti: I remember one time I was in prison, and I was meeting with a person who –

Adams: Not as an inmate, right, Jen?

Sellitti: No, no. I haven't been there yet.

Adams: Believe it or not, we've got people who come on this podcast who have been in prison. So, I just wanted to clear it up for our audience.

Sellitti: That's an important perspective. I'm glad to hear that.

I was meeting with someone in prison who had been doing a life sentence. He'd served I think 25, 30 years of a life sentence. We were talking about his case, and he said, "Do you think that you could ever commit murder?" I said, "Geez, I never really thought about that."

How do you answer that question? I was quiet for a little bit, kind of struggling for the right answer. And I just said, "I don't know, nobody's ever asked me that." And he said, "Anyone can commit murder. You've just never had motive, means and opportunity come together at the same time." I thought that that was such an interesting response. But it's right in the line of, "there but for the grace of God go I," as my mother would say.

One of the reasons that I do this work is because I have yet to meet a person accused of a crime who maybe did that crime, who I cannot unpack and tell a story and explain and try to figure out how they got into that position. That happens frequently where somebody is overcharged. If somebody is overcharged, you're looking at what did they really do and why did they do it? If someone is guilty – and it is our duty to represent people who are guilty – I have to do my best to figure out, can the state meet its burden of proof? What is the counter story that I can tell?

When you ask about what it's like to put my head on the pillow, what it's like to represent guilty people, I always flip that around and say, "Try putting your head on the pillow at night when you have a client who you think is innocent." Those cases are, in some ways, much more frightening. I've had a couple of trials – more than a couple of trials – where I firmly believe my client was innocent. Thank God, so far, none of those clients have been found guilty. They were all acquitted. But I know lawyers who then have a person they think didn't do it and then spend the rest of their life unable to put their head on the pillow because that person is found guilty in court.

Adams: I'm paraphrasing, but it's that old adage, you know, "It's better for a thousand guilty men to go free than for one innocent to lose their liberty."

Sellitti: Absolutely. It's a complicated answer, but like you said, it's a spectrum. There are so many different shades of it. Our job is everything from preventing innocent people from being convicted of crimes to getting people to understand why somebody might do something in a certain set of circumstances, and everything in between.

Adams: And to have the empathy to the person who is guilty. You and I have both represented people who are guilty of what they are accused of. However, when you are guilty, particularly of something that the world looks at as heinous or despicable, you have nobody on your team. You don't have the judge. You don't have the jury. You don't have the court of public opinion. We're their only lifeline to somebody to say, "Hey, this is still a person with a beating heart. This is still a person whose blood is red," so to speak.

Sellitti: Yes. Empathy is the biggest tool that we have as defense lawyers. I'm constantly trying to train lawyers to say, "Stop being a lawyer, and be a human being." When you do that, when you walk into a courtroom and say, like you said, they often don't have anybody, we don't have anybody. We have our client. It's usually you and your client against the world. Having that empathy, having that vulnerability to one another, is really the only way that you can wade through some of these cases and get them to whatever that best outcome may be.

Adams: The best outcome is certainly not always a not guilty verdict or dismissal.

Sellitti: Right. Sometimes, we're trying to get a plea bargain that takes into account the story. Sometimes, in developing the counter story and the counter-narrative, somebody is guilty and is prepared to admit their guilt. It's just giving that explanation to the judge, telling the story to the judge, so that they understand how this person had – to paraphrase my client – the motive, means and opportunity come together at the same time, and why the judge should give them a lesser sentence than prosecutor is asking for.

Adams: I want to unpack with you some of the stages of the criminal justice process, and how the presumption of innocence plays into each of those various stages, from pretrial publicity through sentencing. But I want to take a bit of a different turn with the topic that we're currently on, because it's kind of current.

Our newest United States Supreme Court Justice, Ketanji Brown Jackson, recently went through what I would call a very uncomfortable and unnecessary confirmation process that was politically charged. This is not a political podcast, so we're not going down that path. But the topic that you and I were just talking about, this idea of our clients and how we grapple with even a guilty client, came up in that process.

I know in preparing to come today and talk, you and I have, offline, talked about this very topic. Justice Brown Jackson was questioned extensively on her role as a criminal defense lawyer in ways that former prosecutors who become judges or may even have ascended to the United States Supreme Court, the highest court in the land, have never experienced, because simply she was a defense lawyer at a point in her career. She was forced to endure fairly confrontational questioning about that role. I want your take, Jen, on why this concept that we're exploring about the presumption of innocence, and about the role of the defense lawyer, trickles into the judiciary and the dangers of not having enough former defense lawyers who have the characteristics and viewpoints that you and I are talking about on the bench itself.

Sellitti: That confirmation hearing was one of the proudest moments for public defenders and one of the most excruciatingly painful moments for public defenders. We see the first Black woman – of course, we need to celebrate that – but also the first public defender being nominated to the highest court in the land. You see – many of them lawyers – senators asking questions that show that they don't even understand the fundamental principles of the presumption of innocence and the right to counsel and all the things that being a public defender entails. She was getting vilified for representing clients as if she had done the things that her clients were accused of doing, rather than playing a constitutionally mandated role of providing the best defense she can and doing all the things that you and I have already talked about for the clients that she represented. To see that was really frustrating.

At the same time, it is so important to see more public defenders becoming judges because they have had the kinds of conversations with our clients that we're talking about. They have that sense of empathy. They have that sense of tempering justice with mercy and all the things we want to see judges doing.

But it is funny, right? You mentioned the differences between prosecutors, and plenty of former prosecutors are on federal benches and plenty of former prosecutors are on the Supreme Court. You don't ever see them in their confirmation hearings getting asked about the innocent person that they convicted and the case was later overturned. Or the [Brady violations](#) that might be in their past, or the overcharging of cases, or sentencing Black and Brown people to really, really harsh sentencing schemes in the 1980s during the drug war, in the 1990s during the drug war. Nobody asked them about those things. But Ketanji Brown Jackson represents somebody charged with a sex crime and does a good job representing them and suddenly she's vilified.

The presumption of our client's innocence, like you said earlier, is really something that when you get people's gut reaction to, even people who are trained to speak and trained ask questions and speak publicly for a living, like our senators, really stepped in it with some of those questions. Their instinct is to say that somebody who's representing people charged with these crimes, especially

poor people charged with horrible crimes, is somehow less than, they're less than of a lawyer. That's why it was so frustrating.

Adams: I think, Jen, you nailed it. It was like they were treating her as if she had committed those acts. I can't say that I don't have a personal experience or two where I felt treated that way as a defense lawyer and had to revert either to a very strict constitutional argument about the presumption of innocence and the right of the defense lawyer or humor and say, "Well, yeah, you say that now, until you or someone in your family needs me," and then you'll be fine.

Jen, I want to build, now, on this primer on the presumption of innocence and how the practical effect of the presumption of innocence is that it really doesn't exist. It's an aspirational construct.

Let's go to the phases of the criminal justice process and talk a little bit about how that notion of swimming upstream that I presented at the outset really spills over to the various phases of the criminal justice process, and how we as lawyers can attempt at correcting it.

Let's start first with pretrial publicity. This usually starts when an event is exposed. I suppose, in a more of a street-crime concept, this happens when there is a criminal event that takes place that gets notoriety through media coverage. In some respects, in the white-collar space where I mostly operate, this usually happens because somebody leaks something that they think is going to set them up for some kind of strategic advantage. The nature of these cases is that they tend to drag along very, very slowly and then come to this crescendo at a certain point where a charging decision is made.

I'm interested in your take on how to deal with pretrial publicity while you're already swimming upstream. You're already fighting against the current of this rush to judgment and the process moving very, very slowly, as it does by design. How do you counter that tide of publicity, especially in the current media environment: social media, 24-hour news cycles, this craving to just have clickbait out there. How do you counter that?

Sellitti: It's really difficult. I think in some ways this also is a little different with public defenders. Sometimes the case is in the media before we even know we represent that person or have had an opportunity to represent the person.

Let's say there's a murder that takes place during the night, and it may not be a day or two before we know that we are the attorney in charge of that. You've got two or three days in a 24-hour news cycle that slip by before you can do anything. Then we have the other problem: We often don't have the discovery. We don't have the information about the case. So even if we wanted to say something to the press, what do you say? You don't know what's out there that may contradict what you say. You might not have had extensive conversation with the client or the witnesses.

To me, I always respond to reporters' requests, and I try to at least remind them of the presumption of innocence. I remind them that there's a lot more distance to go in a case. Then, to really do the talking in court. When I get the earliest opportunity to come to court, I start to try to tell my client's story. I hate the word "humanize" because it suggests somebody is not human to begin with. A good term for that escapes me right now, but just try to try to start to at least tell who my client is. What is their family like? What do they do for a living? At least give information so that if a reporter is going to write a story and I can't talk that much about the facts, I can at least create a counter picture of my client as a person who may not do the kind of thing that the media is reporting about.

That's sometimes the best you can do right up front. Of course, as the strategy in the case develops, then you can start to think, "Strategically, is it important for me to talk to the press? What do I say? How do I talk to my client about what I say to the press?" Whatever it is as the case rolls on.

Adams: When we started talking about this, my mind immediately went to the O.J. Simpson case. I was a young person during that period of time. I was in my formative years about what I was going to do with my career as I began to get out of school and things like that.

I remember in that case, it consumed everything. I mean, you couldn't walk down the street without being immersed in it, to the point where the jury had to be sequestered. We're going to talk a little bit about the impact of this swimming upstream against this tide and current that's contrary to the presumption of innocence in a moment as it relates to jury selection. But in this concept of pretrial publicity, I think prosecutors have gone to this idea of a speaking indictment, almost.

I was talking to one of my partners, another guest on this podcast, [Joe DeMaria](#), recently and he was saying that phenomenon really came out of the Rudy Giuliani years. Rudy Giuliani was this prosecutor who was sort of half politician, half prosecutor, wanting to be out there in the media headlines to build his career. The name of the game at a time, I think, in the early phases of my career even, used to be "no comment." You could never go wrong with "no comment." I don't think that's the case anymore, because if you say, "no comment," you might as well stand up in court and say, "I'm guilty."

Sellitti: Yep.

Adams: That fascinates me because I remember one or two of my first supervising attorneys. When I was a young associate, we had a little bit of a splashy case in federal court. It had some tentacles into organized crime that the media was a little enamored by, even though it had nothing to do with organized crime. They just decided to make the connection themselves. I remember feeling like "no comment" did not do my client a service.

I think that the practice has evolved. What are you training your lawyers to do in this day and age of 24-hour news cycles, social media, everybody wants a story? "No comment," to me, it's almost counterproductive for a client.

Sellitti: Yes. I also do the communications. Part of my title is that I do the press relations for our office. I often get phone calls and wind up speaking to attorneys. You're right, I grew up in that same, "there's no comment." Even if there's no comment, even if there's literally nothing you can say about your case for whatever strategic reason, it's an opportunity to remind people of how the process works and the presumption. Even if I don't have anything I can say, I always say to the reporter, "We want to remind people that anybody charged with the crime enjoys the presumption of innocence, that there is a lot more information, investigation on our side is ongoing." It's something that suggests that just because somebody's charged, they're not guilty.

We're always at a huge disadvantage. But I agree with you; I think just saying "no comment" sounds guilty. It sounds like you have nothing to say. There's a way to say "no comment" in a way that provides even just a little bit of information, or education, or a reminder to the public out there.

Adams: At least in my career, there is a point in time where "no comment," it sounds like you're throwing in the towel at the earliest phases of the proceedings.

Sellitti: Yeah, yeah.

Adams: The government prosecutors and regulatory agencies love, at the earliest phase, to issue that press release. If you go to the U.S. Attorney's website, any U.S. Attorney throughout the country, every day it is filled with press releases about presumed innocent people. They also issue them once they convict them, but I have less of a problem with that because it's after a conviction. But, presumed innocent people, and all these comprehensive, detailed files about what they allegedly did without even an arraignment in some respects.

Sellitti: Yes, that's the problem because the prosecutors are holding all the cards. At the arraignment, at that stage, we don't have all the discovery yet. They're sitting there, they know everything that they have. It's a much more comfortable position to be in when you're making a statement.

I am heartened, though, that there are some newspaper outlets – and I know the Star-Ledger is one of them that are now taking this position and it's part of their attempts to eliminate implicit bias from reporting – have taken this position, or are at least investigating taking this position, of not reporting on a story unless they can get some corroborative comment from a defense attorney or at least not going into the details of a story. That's one of the other reasons why we've been trying to encourage our lawyers to at least give some information, even if it's just to say, “The presumption applies here. Remember that.”

Because then it's not just cops, it's not just prosecutors who are giving the statements. There's an attorney at least saying, “I'm here. I have a different story. You're going to hear it and you're not supposed to shift the blame to my client.”

Adams: Right. Because frequently at that phase, we don't even know where the twists and turns in this case lie yet. It would be reckless for us to get that far out in front.

Sellitti: Yes, yes. I've seen plenty of attorneys try it. I'm not to shame private attorneys, but it's usually private attorneys – it's usually not our office – going out in front of cases and saying things and I'm like, “You just committed to self-defense and you don't even have the discovery. You just committed to an ID defense when you don't know if your client's DNA is at the scene.” In really high profile cases, I've seen lawyers do that, and got really, really messed up fast.

Adams: Let's shift to the next phase. The pretrial stuff is over with. The initial splash of the indictment or other charging instrument, it fizzles out. You get into the meat of the case and now you're ready to go to trial.

To me, the trial is the Super Bowl of the presumption of innocence. It's the jurors in the box, the jury comprised of the accused's peers ready to cast judgment on guilt or innocence based upon admissible facts only. All that noise, all those press releases, all that nonsense is over. It's really time to laser focus on admissible evidence only. That which can only sustain a conviction.

What are you experiencing about this tide that we're swimming against, and how does it impact the jury selection process? If we recognize that everybody's feeling it, we recognize that the public at large doesn't quite understand that a charge is just a charge, it's not a conviction. How do you get a fair jury to then weigh in on the admissible facts if we're acknowledging from the outset that this countercurrent exists?

Sellitti: I think one of the things that's going to be helpful in this process is the new approach to jury selection, the new jury selection pilot. In New Jersey, historically, we have not had a lot of

conversations with jurors, with the judge asking these weird, three open-ended questions that aren't really open-ended. The whole system is not one in which we get really one-on-one conversation.

Under the new pilot program, we will be able to engage in conversations with jurors. We will be able to talk to them, to throw out a question, talk to them about the answers, and watch them talk to one another. I think that's one way we're going to be able to ask questions that get at whether they can follow the presumption of innocence.

I think when we look at traditionally the way it's worked in New Jersey, we have to obviously be really careful to how people are answering the question of, "Can you abide by the presumption of innocence?" I always try to use one of my open-ended questions to get at whether they can really follow it, to ask that open-ended question about whether or not they consider the indictment proof someone had committed a crime. You'd be surprised how many people actually say, "Yeah, it seems like they wouldn't have charged them if they were guilty." We can weed those people out.

I do think it's a mistake not to follow up on it. I don't think the standard questions that we use right now are enough. I also think that when it comes to the actual trial phase, it's getting to that counter story as soon as possible.

There's been so many studies of the way jurors think. We know that most jurors are persuaded in opening and don't change their minds after the opening statements. Getting to the actual story as quickly as possible, getting the jury to say, "Well, I know there's a lot of problems with drug dealing out there in the world, but this person didn't deal drugs because I'm hearing their story." You're not trying to take on the whole system, that there are people out there committing these crimes. You're trying to tell a story about why there's one person who happens to be sitting next to you enjoys that presumption. Immediately getting out not just with saying, "Oh, he's entitled to the presumption. All there's proof beyond a reasonable doubt." I hate it when people talk about that stuff in opening. Tell the story. Tell them why not only do they enjoy the presumption, why they're flat out innocent in your opening statement. Nip any lingering doubt about that that you couldn't weed out in jury selection in the bottle at that point.

Adams: Don't be afraid of the fact that prosecutors do charge people who are guilty. It's just not this guy.

Sellitti: Right, absolutely. Absolutely.

Adams: I was naive enough to think that the prosecutors, they get it wrong sometimes, but not all the time.

Sellitti: Right. I always say to people in cop cases, cases where the credibility of a police officer is at issue, "You are going to lose if you try to convince a jury all cops are dirty." As defense attorneys, we walk through the world with the suspicion of police officers. That is not normal. Normal people do not walk through the world suspicious of police. That's what we do.

So, I say to them, "Stop trying to convince the world to see things through your not-blue colored glasses." All you have to do is convince them this cop in this case was not telling the truth, not trying to change the world. You're not trying to make a movement in your trial. You're just trying to say, "In this case, this person was wrong." But because "normal" people, not defense attorneys, walk into the jury box with this assumption that police are going to be telling you the truth, you've got to counter that really, really, really hard in your opening statement in order to get them to say, "Oh, I trust all cops, but not this cop."

Adams: With specificity.

Sellitti: “Your congressman not my congressman.” It’s that old cliché.

Adams: Right. Right. I have some fascinating conversations about those types of credibility cases with my retired police officer father all the time. It makes for good Thanksgiving dessert conversation for sure.

Sellitti: I bet.

Adams: Jen, in our waning moments together today, I want to just bring it back to where we started.

This is a process that is, by design, slow. At times, clunky. Do you think that the process itself deficiently protects the presumption of innocence? With all its quirks, all of its inadequacies that we can talk about, do you think that the process that we have, that we’re operating, in a general sense at this moment, preserves, protects and defends that presumption of innocence?

Sellitti: What is that line? “I love my country and the right to criticize it.” I don’t know if I’m butchering that line.

We have the best system in the world, but it is still an imperfect system in some ways. I wouldn’t trade it for any other system that I’ve seen. Undergirding the whole system is this presumption of innocence. I think we do have some serious systemic issues, though, when it comes to bias. I think the way the system fails to protect people is the way it fails to protect Black and Brown people, the way it fails to protect poor people. That’s one of the reasons I’ve always done public defense work. I really believe that the population of clients who cannot afford representation, if we can perfect that, then the whole system becomes perfect. Perfecting the people of the least resources is the way to build the system and protect the system.

I do think that this whole national conversation that we’re having about systemic racism in the criminal legal system is one that we need to continue to focus on. I mean, I’m proud New Jersey has taken those steps and has done that through a number of programs, has been trying to do this. They’re one of the only states that brought people in and did consistent implicit bias training of judges and prosecutors.

I also think it takes more training of all the stakeholders in the system together, to come together and hear the same message about implicit bias and these systemic issues. I guess the short answer is that... I feel like I’m rambling, but the short answer to that is, it’s an imperfect system, but it’s the best system out there. The improvements need to be made that all of us need to focus on ensuring that every person in the system, regardless of their status, regardless of their background, regardless of the resources that they have or where they came from, is receiving the same kind of justice as everyone else.

Adams: Is that ever attainable in a society like ours, where we have sort of the haves and the have nots? Is that ever attainable in a capitalist market where we have people of immense wealth and then people with literally nothing?

Sellitti: Yes, I think there’s always going to be an element of it that is aspirational. I think we have to keep our eye on it, though. We have to keep bending in that direction. I think one of the ways that we can do it – and there’s this trend in public defense that I’m a firm believer in – is to move to more of a holistic defense. So that public defenders are not just trained to be killer courtroom advocates and

experienced trial attorneys and doing our job in the courtroom. We also have a seat at the table whenever public policy decisions are being made that affect our clients. That we offer not just criminal defense services, but the wraparound services: assistance with employment, the social work services. Connection to services, connection to community programs, re-entry programs, things like that. That we can offer some of those services to treat the underlying issues associated with crime rate. Poverty is a huge driver of crime. Giving people the tools that they need to lift themselves out of the situations that they're in can help.

The modern approach to defense ... I don't think we can look at public defense any longer as: We go to court, we represent our client, and we go home. Public defense has to be about more than that. We've got to start giving our clients the tools that they need to be successful once the case has ended and they go back out into the world. That's the only way we're going to address recidivism and stop this cycle that you're talking about. It's hard. We can do it. As a state agency, I think we could do it. There are ways to do it. That's one way to address the problem, I think.

In terms of, can we ever achieve that goal? You're never going to fully eliminate poverty in the system and inequities in the system. But to get close, public defenders have to be the vanguard of that movement because it's our clients that you're talking about when you ask that question.

Adams: Based on your comments, I'm reminded of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s remarks: "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice." I think that's a great point for us to leave on today. Jen, I can't thank you enough for your time with us. That's all the time we have for "The Presumption of Innocence" today. Please join us next time. Thank you so much.