STATE OF WISCONSIN : CIRCUIT COURT : MANITOWOC COUNTY BRANCH 1

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
PLAINTIFF, MOTION HEARINGS
vs. Case No. 05 CF 381
STEVEN A. AVERY,
DEFENDANT.

DATE: JULY 5, 2006
BEFORE: Hon. Patrick L. Willis Circuit Court Judge

## APPEARANCES:

KENNETH R. KRATZ \& THOMAS J. FALLON
Special Prosecutors
On behalf of the State of Wisconsin.
DEAN ARTHUR STRANG \& JEROME F. BUTING
Attorneys at Law
On behalf of the Defendant.
STEVEN A. AVERY
Defendant
Appeared in person.

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Reported by Diane Tesheneck, RPR Official Court Reporter

## I N D E X

WITNESSES

SHERIFF KENNETH PETERSEN
Direct Examination by ATTORNEY STRANG 5
Cross-Examination by ATTORNEY FALLON 36
Redirect Examination by ATTORNEY STRANG 37

SHERIFF GERALD A. PAGEL
Direct Examination by ATTORNEY KRATZ 45
Cross-Examination by ATTORNEY STRANG 59
Redirect Examination by ATTORNEY KRATZ 101

PAGE36374559101

THE COURT: At this time the Court calls State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery. It's Case No. 05 CF 381. This case is scheduled for a hearing on a number of pretrial motions this morning. Will the parties state their appearances for the record, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The State of Wisconsin appears by Calumet County District Attorney Ken Kratz appearing as Special Prosecutor. Also appearing this morning is Tom Fallon from the Department of Justice, also appointed by this Court as Special Prosecutor.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Good morning, Steven Avery appears in person, he's second to my right. Jerome Buting of Buting and Williams is immediately next to me, representing Mr. Avery. And I'm Dean Strang, I also represent Mr. Avery.

THE COURT: All right. I will indicate for the record that before we began today, I met with counsel to discuss the logistics of the hearing today. I believe both parties agree that there is some overlap with some of the motions today and some of those will be heard together. With respect to the order of the motions, the parties have requested, and the Court agrees, that we'll proceed
first on the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.
And I understand, Mr. Strang, that the defense has some evidence to offer in relation to that motion, as well as the Motion For Change of Venue and Motion to Exclude the Sheriff's Department and It's Employees From Testifying and Overseeing Jurors; is that correct?

ATTORNEY STRANG: That is, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. You may call your witness at this time.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Defense calls Sheriff Kenneth Petersen.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I should note, Judge, that the examination of Sheriff Petersen and the argument on this particular motion will be done by Mr. Fallon.

THE COURT: Very well.
SHERIFF KENNETH J. PETERSEN, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Kenneth J. Petersen, P-e-t-e-r-s-e-n. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY STRANG:
Q. Good morning. Let's start with a little bit of background if we may, Sheriff Petersen. You have been with the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department for about 31 years at this point?
A. Correct.
Q. Started as a patrol deputy?
A. That's correct.
Q. You have served as sheriff for the last six years, roughly?
A. Correct.
Q. Six and a half years, pretty close to that right about now?
A. It will be six years in January.
Q. January, that's right, you were sworn in in January, 2001, as the sheriff?
A. Correct.
Q. As the Manitowoc County Sheriff, it would be fair to describe you as the chief county law enforcement officer for the County of Manitowoc?
A. Yes.
Q. During your experience with the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, sir, when was the first time in which you participated, personally, in a prosecution of Steven Avery on a charge related
to murder?
A. You mean murder of a person?
Q. Or attempted murder, yes, of a human being?
A. I think 1984.
Q. And that involved an event that since has become widely-known, involved a violent assault on a beach here in Manitowoc County?
A. Correct.
Q. You, personally -- I'm going to at least suggest to you that $I$ think it was 1985; does that sound--
A. Somewhere in the mid '80's, yes.
Q. We're talking about a violent assault on a beach?
A. Yes.
Q. You, personally, were requested by the, then, sheriff in Manitowoc County, Tom Kocourek, to arrest Mr. Avery on a charge of attempted murder?
A. Yes.
Q. You did that?
A. Yes.
Q. Prior to that arrest, you already new where Steven Avery lived in 1985?
A. Yes.
Q. And that prosecution went forward following Mr. Avery's arrest?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. On a charge of attempted first-degree intentional homicide?
A. I'm not sure what the actual charge was at the time of trial.
Q. But attempted murder charge and a sexual assault charge of some kind, perhaps others, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That resulted in a conviction?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. Resulted in a 32 year sentence being imposed?
A. Yes.
Q. You participated after the arrest of Mr. Avery, personally, in that prosecution, as a witness in that trial?
A. Yes.
Q. Later, in 2003 to be specific, the claim that Mr. Avery had made in 1985, that he was innocent of those crimes, proved to be true?
A. Possibly.
Q. That is, the State made a motion to release him from prison?
A. Yes.
Q. After some DNA testing was done?
A. Yes.
Q. That motion was made by the State, by the District Attorney of Manitowoc County, after consulting with you?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Avery was released the day, or the day following the State's motion to release him?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when you say possibly, is there any question in your mind that Gregory Allen was identified by DNA evidence as the sole attacker of the woman at issue on the beach in 1985?
A. Yes, I would have doubts.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. I would have doubt.
Q. You have doubts about that?
A. Yes, I believe the DNA created reasonable doubt and enough to release Steve, but I don't think that single hair was enough to convict Gregory Allen.
Q. Okay. Do you have doubts whether, in fact, Gregory Allen was the person who's hair was tested?
A. No, I believe it was.
Q. You base your doubts on the reliability of DNA evidence?
A. No.
Q. That is, you accept the DNA evidence and that the pubic hair at issue, in fact, was Gregory Allen's?
A. Yes.
Q. You have no reason to question or doubt the claims of the victim, the testimony of the victim in that case that one man, and one man only, attacked her in 1985 on the beach?
A. Yes.
Q. You do doubt that?
A. Oh, no. No.
Q. Okay. Mr. Avery, in any event, spent, give or take, 18 years in prison following his conviction for that crime?
A. I believe he had six years, also, on another charge.
Q. Running concurrently?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So the total time in prison was about 18 years?
A. Yes.
Q. Or in custody, I should say more accurately. You arrested him in July of 1985?
A. Yes.
Q. He was released on September 11, 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. 18 years and two months, give or take, in custody?
A. Yes.
Q. As you point out, six years of that also being on a separate and unrelated conviction?
A. Correct.
Q. But running at the same time, or concurrently?
A. Yes.
Q. You know, in your life, have you -- have you ever spent a day, or a night, in jail, for a crime you didn't commit?
A. No.
Q. Certainly not 18 years?
A. No.
Q. Or 12 years, or anything close to that?
A. No.
Q. If you were sitting here, if you were in Steven Avery's chair and you were in his shoes, so to speak, would you trust the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department in the investigation and prosecution of yourself, a second time?

MR. FALLON: Objection, speculation.
Q. (By Attorney Strang) ~ I'm not asking you to
speculate at all. I'm saying, if you were Steven Avery, with your present sense, on whether you would trust your department?

MR. FALLON: Relevance, then.
THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection.
Q. (By Attorney Strang) ~ You have told us that you are the chief county law enforcement officer?
A. Yes.
Q. Meaning, you run the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. Correct.
Q. The Sheriff's Department here in Manitowoc County, as in most counties, is organized with people in rank, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a clumsy way to put it, but you hold the rank of sheriff?
A. Yes.
Q. Obviously. The Wisconsin Statutes require you to have something called and under sheriff?
A. No.
Q. You do have an under sheriff?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And the under sheriff is the number two
person in the department?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that person, whose name I think is

Mr. Hermann, if $I$ have it right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Does he have another rank or title in addition to under sheriff?
A. Inspector.
Q. All right. And he's the one inspector for the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, he reports directly to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Others in the department then report up through him?
A. That's correct.
Q. Below him, who's the next ranking officer?
A. Deputy Inspector of Operations.
Q. And that's who?
A. Greg Schetter.
Q. I'm sorry, maybe you could spell that for the --
A. $\quad S-c-h-e-t-t-e-r$.
Q. Thank you. He's the deputy inspector?
A. Yes.
Q. Below that who do we have?
A. Deputy Inspector of Support, that's Larry Ledvina, L-e-d-v-i-n-a.
Q. That's not a parallel position; the one deputy inspector is below the other?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. How far down -- I'm not going to go through everybody at the department, but how far down do we get before we get to the chief investigator, or the lieutenant in charge of the Detective's Bureau?
A. He would be under the Deputy Inspector of Operation.
Q. As well as Mr. Ledvina?
A. No, it's two separate divisions.
Q. I understand that but, in other words, under Mr. Schetter, you said --
A. Yes.
Q. -- would be the lieutenant in charge of the Detective's Bureau?
A. Yes.
Q. And the other deputy inspector?
A. No, the Deputy Inspector of Support would take care of the court services, secretarial functions, records releases, that type of thing.
Q. It's my clumsiness. I understand they have
separate areas, but the person who's the lieutenant in charge of the Detective's Bureau is James Lenk?
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad \mathrm{L}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{k}$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Mr. Lenk and Mr. Vetter (sic) both report to Mr . Schetter; is that right -- or Mr. Ledvina?
A. Ledvina.
Q. Both report to Mr. Schetter?
A. Ledvina wouldn't directly report to him, but Lenk would.
Q. All right. And then below Lenk, there are investigators or detectives, whichever you call them, and -- correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I'm sorry, I should have paused there. Where do sergeants fall in the hierarchy?
A. Sergeants are in patrol, normally. I have sergeants in the jail and on the road.
Q. They are in charge of deputies?
A. Correct. But there's lieutenants in patrol also, which would supervise the sergeants in the patrol.
Q. Got it. So if we work our way up, we have got deputies in the various divisions of the department?
A. Yes.
Q. They report directly to sergeants?
A. Yes.
Q. Sergeant's report directly to lieutenants?
A. Yes.
Q. You haven't described any captain's, is that --
A. Deputy inspector would be equivalent to a captain.
Q. All right. And you have told us about them. So the lieutenants report to deputy inspectors?
A. Correct.
Q. Who deputy inspectors report to the inspector and under sheriff?
A. Yes.
Q. And then, ultimately, the top of the chart, or the pyramid, is you?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you are familiar with a man named Andrew Colborn?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. He's a sergeant in your department?
A. Yes.
Q. What -- Just to identify him, what's his area of responsibility?
A. He's a patrol sergeant.
Q. Patrol meaning, covering the county's roads?
A. Right. He would be referred to as a shift commander, so he would assign the beats, the vehicles, and brief the patrolmen before they go out into the road.
Q. In the patrol division?
A. Yes.
Q. Another person who will come up is, I believe, a Lieutenant named Remiker. I could be wrong. He may be a detective.
A. Remiker is a detective.
Q. All right. So he's in the Detective Bureau, obviously?
A. Correct.
Q. He would report directly to Mr. Lenk?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in a sense -- I don't mean this to sound like a loaded question, if it does, but in a sense, the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department has a paramilitary structure in that we have these ranks that we have now established, and the chain of command is clear and well established?
A. Yes.
Q. You, as the sheriff, set the overall tone for the department?
A. I believe so.
Q. You try to express your values?
A. Yes.
Q. Your policy directives?
A. Yes.
Q. And, ordinarily, you would do that -- or I shouldn't even say ordinarily -- but you may do that by written directive?
A. Yes.
Q. That written directive may go directly to one of your subordinates?
A. It could.
Q. Or it could go to a number of people, including those several steps down the ladder, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You may send a written directive to all staff, for example?
A. Correct.
Q. But in any event, you are the person who sets the tone and the policies of your department?
A. Yes.
Q. You have the power to hire?
A. Yes.
Q. You have the power to fire, probably with some oversight from the County Board or some committee of the County Board?
A. Generally, we have to inform personnel and, of course, we have to follow the state statutes.
Q. Yes, of course. But in -- It would be fair to say that, in a rough sense, the buck stops on your desk?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you find, in general, that the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department operates as a well disciplined organization?
A. I believe so.
Q. That is, your directives are communicated, faithfully, to those below you?
A. Yes.
Q. And they are followed?
A. Yes.
Q. On Saturday, November 5, 2005, and just to orient you, that Teresa Halbach, we now know, was last seen on October 31, 2005. I don't expect that you necessarily know this, but I'm led to believe that she was reported missing on Thursday, November 3. All right.

So I'm talking about two days later, on Saturday, November 5, 2005, at about 11:30 or 11:45 in the morning, a decision was made to transfer control of the investigation into her disappearance, and circumstances surrounding it, to the Calumet County Sheriff's Department and to DCI, or the Division of Criminal Investigation; is that true?
A. Yes.
Q. That decision to transfer control was made by you?
A. Indirectly, yes.
Q. You say indirectly, the primary focus of the investigation was in Manitowoc County, within the metes and bounds of Manitowoc County, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. To fall within your jurisdiction?
A. Correct.
Q. Your department had been involved in early steps in the investigation of Ms Hallbach's disappearance?
A. Correct.
Q. Maybe you would explain, then, for me, what you mean when you say, indirectly, the decision that Saturday morning was made by you?
A. I had been out of town the previous week. I was out in Seattle, Washington. And I arrived home probably 10:30, quarter to 11, Saturday morning. And that decision to transfer had already been made, I assume, by the inspector. I never inquired. I agreed with the way it was going, so I didn't interfere.
Q. Okay. I need to explore that just a little bit further to nail down timing. When you say you arrived home, do you mean physically at your home?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. You didn't go in to work immediately that Saturday morning?
A. No.
Q. Had you been in contact with the office during the course of that week in Seattle?
A. No.
Q. So you really were --
A. The first I heard --
Q. -- out of loop so to speak?
A. Yeah. The first I heard about the Halbach case was when a reporter called me Saturday after 11.
Q. Do you recall about when, after 11?
A. About 11:15, somewhere in that general area.
Q. Okay. And this was entirely news to you at that point?
A. Yes.
Q. You got in contact with Mr. Hermann?
A. Yes.
Q. Inspector Hermann?
A. Right.
Q. Do you remember about when you did that?
A. It had been shortly after the reporter called.
Q. I will bet. By telephone?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And at that point, he told you that he had already decided to shift the primary responsibility for the investigation to the two other law enforcement agencies I described?
A. Yes.
Q. Did he tell you when he had made that decision?
A. No. He had talked about conferring with Corp Counsel and that was what he advised. Normally we follow his advice.
Q. You agreed with that advice?
A. Yes.
Q. You had a discussion with him on his reasoning?
A. Yes.
Q. And in a nutshell -- and you are free to disagree
or explain this -- but in a nutshell, the reason he described to you, after consulting with Corporation Counsel, was to avoid the appearance or the reality of a conflict of interest?
A. Correct.
Q. Because at least a person of interest at that point was Steven Avery?
A. Yes.
Q. You were told that?
A. No, they didn't give me any specific suspects or people of interest. They merely stated that the vehicle had been found on the Avery Salvage Yard property.
Q. Correct. And what further information did you need, or ask for, or inquire about, to decide whether, in fact, there was a conflict of interest or the appearance of one?
A. I didn't need anything more than that at that point.
Q. Avery Auto Salvage Yard, car found, that was enough?
A. Sure.
Q. The reason you perceived, or you agreed with Inspector Hermann's assessment, that there was a potential conflict of interest, is that at that
time a civil lawsuit by Steven Avery was pending against Manitowoc County and some former officials?
A. Correct.
Q. That was a civil lawsuit for 36 million dollars in damages?
A. Correct.
Q. It related to the 1985 conviction that you and I have discussed this morning?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you see that as a real and present conflict of interest on November 5?
A. I don't see it so much as a conflict of interest, I would say a prudent decision just to keep accusation free.
Q. All right. And what did you -- what did you understand the decision to be, in terms of the shifting of responsibility?
A. That the Calumet County Sheriff would run the investigation and I would pay for it.
Q. Okay. In addition to paying for the investigation, what role was the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department to play, if any?
A. Support.
Q. What does support mean?
A. Logistics, equipment, whatever they needed, manpower.
Q. So the Calumet County Sheriff, Mr. Pagel, was to communicate with you, or your department?
A. As far as?
Q. Logistics, support, manpower, whatever he needed?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So he would request it of you, or someone in your department?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you would provide it?
A. Yes.
Q. The Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, in that way, continued to play an active role in the investigation into Ms Halbach's disappearance?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. You monitored the progress of that investigation?
A. No, I have never seen a report on the actual investigation.
Q. All right.
A. I have gotten copies of bills, we have had conferences on security, that type of thing.
Q. The guy in charge usually gets the bills.
A. Yeah.
Q. But in your department, reports generated by
deputies, or detectives, or sergeants, or lieutenants, don't necessarily all come up to your desk?
A. Most of them do.
Q. And this one may have or haven't?
A. Have not.
Q. Why?
A. I divorced myself from the early investigation.
Q. You personally?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. When did that happen, Sheriff Petersen?
A. On that Saturday.
Q. Immediately?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Who did you leave as the liaison, or the contact person, or the reviewing person within your department, for your department's role in the investigation?
A. Deputy Inspector Schetter.
Q. With a formal directive to him of some kind?
A. No.
Q. With a conversation?
A. No, I didn't talk to him. He may have talked to the inspector, he didn't talk to me.
Q. Oh. Okay. Do you know whether someone directed Deputy Inspector Schetter to play a reviewing role?
A. No.
Q. How do you know he is?
A. Because he was out at the scene with the sheriff and his people.
Q. All right. And who is getting the reports generated by the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department on the Halbach investigation and, ultimately, the arrest and prosecution of Mr. Avery?
A. I would believe Calumet County Sheriff's Department would.
Q. Not Deputy Inspector Schetter?
A. Well, they would still be in our files, there would be copies there -- or originals there. The copies would be -- would be shipped.
Q. All right. I will see if $I$ can do this efficiently, and the problem is, you may not know some of the facts I'm going to suggest to you.
A. Okay.
Q. Because it sounds like I have seen Manitowoc Sheriff's Department reports that you probably have not. All right?
A. Sure.
Q. But let me suggest these things and we'll see what you know and what you don't know, or what you dispute. All right. The first law enforcement officer to speak with -- speak personally with Steven Avery about Teresa Halbach, which was on November 3, was Sergeant Andrew Colborn of your department; is that right?
A. Don't know.
Q. One way or the other?
A. Yeah, don't know.
Q. You don't dispute that?
A. Yeah, I don't know.
Q. All right. The first law enforcement officers to search Mr. Avery's trailer, this time with consent, on Friday, November 4, were two members of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, Lieutenant Lenk and Detective Remiker?
A. I believe they were with a Calumet County officer.
Q. You think they may have been with a Calumet County officer?
A. I believe so.
Q. But you know that Lenk and Remiker --
A. Had been at the trailer.
Q. -- did a consent search of the trailer on Friday, November 4th?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. On Saturday, November 5, the first law enforcement officer, as opposed to citizen, unsworn citizen, to see Teresa Halbach's Toyota Rav 4, was a member of your department, Detective Remiker?
A. I don't know that.
Q. You don't dispute it, you just don't know one way or the other?
A. I don't know.
Q. All right. The first search of Mr. Avery's trailer, with a search warrant, occurred later on Saturday, November 5. And that involved, again, Detective Remiker of your department and Calumet County Investigator Gary Steier, or is that something you know?
A. That, I believe, is what $I$ was referring to.
Q. All right. The first law enforcement officers that day to collect any suspected blood in Mr. Avery's trailer, or on it, was, again, Detective Remiker of your department, correct?
A. It's possible, yes.
Q. He gave that to Sergeant Colborn of your
department?
A. That $I$ don't know.
Q. Don't dispute, but just don't know?
A. Yeah.
Q. The detached garage between Mr. Avery's trailer and Barb Yanda's trailer, I believe first was searched pursuant to warrant on Sunday, November 6. Were you aware that Detective Remiker and Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn, along with a Calumet County deputy, were the first law enforcement officers to search the detached garage?

MR. FALLON: Excuse me, your Honor, I'm going to impose an objection on this particular line of questioning as -- and the reason is, the previous testimony of Sheriff Petersen indicating that as of earlier that day, 11:30, 11:45, control of the investigation was passed. And given that fact, the fact that there may have been some logistical or support personnel provided by the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department to assist in these searches or contacts, was all under the control and direction of Sheriff Pagel at Calumet County. Thus, this particular line of questioning, $I$ would suggest to the Court, is irrelevant.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Let me ask some clarifying questions, because I'm not necessarily in disagreement with the factual portion of Mr. Fallon's statement, and $I$ will clarify that.
Q. (By Attorney Strang) ~ Any actions that members of your department took after, let's say 11:30, on Saturday, November 5, you believe would have been taken with the knowledge, or under the direction, at the request, however you want to put it, of either the Calumet County Sheriff's Department or the DCI?
A. Correct.
Q. That is, neither you, nor Inspector Hermann, nor anybody above the level of the people in your department involved, were directing, or controlling, or supervising the steps of those people?
A. Correct.
Q. My -- And I think you and I are in agreement, I'm not trying to suggest otherwise, my questions really are just inquiring into who the boots on the ground were, who the people were, not who's directing them, or telling them what to do and not to do; do you understand me that way?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So with that limitation, Lenk, Remiker and Colborn, along with a Calumet deputy -- Calumet County deputy, were the first to search the detached garage on Sunday, November 6th?

MR. FALLON: I'm going to renew the objection. I understand counsel's point, but I still fail to see the relevance as it pertains to the motion to dismiss and/or the motion to exclude.

ATTORNEY STRANG: It bears more on the motion to exclude. I have moved to exclude not just Sheriff Petersen from further involvement in this case, supervising the jury, or in a logistical or support role to the Court, but have moved to exclude the entire department from providing that logistical or support role. So, I think this has a bearing, the involvement of others in the department clearly has a bearing on that motion, your Honor.

THE COURT: I believe it relates to the motion to exclude, so I'm going to allow it.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Do you recall my last question?

THE WITNESS: No.
Q. (By Attorney Strang)~ Sunday, November 6,
detached garage, first law enforcement officers to search, Lenk, Remiker, Colborn, and a deputy from Calumet whose has a name, and that's Dan Kucharski?
A. I wouldn't know who searched it.
Q. Don't know one way or the other?
A. No, I don't know who was in the garage.
Q. Don't dispute that the three Manitowoc people were among the first law enforcement people to enter the garage?
A. It's possible.
Q. All right. This one you may know. On November 8, which is Tuesday, it was widely reported that a law enforcement officer found a Toyota key that fit the Toyota Rav 4, in the bedroom of Steven Avery, in the trailer; do you recall that?
A. That would be Detective Lenk.
Q. That was Detective Lenk -- or Lieutenant Lenk of your department?
A. Yes.
Q. Law enforcement officers first came across bone fragments in a burn pit out -- south, south and east of the Avery -- the Steven Avery trailer on November 8 as well. Do you recall Deputy Jost, or Sergeant Jost, of your department, as being
the first officer who claimed to see a bone fragment?
A. I don't know who saw the bone fragments.
Q. One way or the other?
A. Correct.
Q. Am I pronouncing Jost's name right? J-o-s-t?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, of the names that have come up here we have -- I have mentioned Lieutenant Lenk and Detective Remiker and Sergeant Colborn, more than once each, this morning. I want to be clear, one of the reasons you disengaged personally, completely, from this investigation, on November 5, is that you, personally, had sat for a deposition in Steven Avery's civil claim against Manitowoc County?
A. No, I don't think I had anything to do with that decision, no.
Q. Let's break this down. First of all, you did have your deposition taken in that lawsuit?
A. Yes.
Q. You had your deposition taken on October 13, 2005; does that sound right?
A. It's possible.
Q. About two and a half, three weeks, before Ms

Halbach disappeared?
A. Somewhere in that time period.
Q. And the other two members of your department who had their depositions taken about the same time were Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Andrew Colborn, correct?
A. I don't know. I don't know who gave depositions.
Q. You don't one way or the other?
A. I saw one person, actually, two people, but I don't know who they all deposed now.
Q. I think one of them had his deposition taken the same day you did. Did you ever talk to Lieutenant Lenk about having his deposition taken in that lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Or Sergeant Colborn?
A. No.
Q. You don't disagree that they both sat for depositions in that lawsuit in mid-October, 2005, you just don't know?
A. As I recall, that had something to do with some information that came somewhere in the late 90's.
Q. Mid 1990's, that's right.
A. Yeah, but I don't know when they were deposed. I wouldn't have a clue.
Q. You understand they were, you just don't know when?
A. Correct.
Q. And one of the things, that initially, I think, probably brought you here, was an interview, or a special two part series that FOX 11 TV in Green Bay did in May; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not going to go into the substance of that. I just want to nail down a couple of questions. First of all, that was you who appeared as Sheriff Petersen in that two part segment?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you remember now about when you actually sat for the interview, or interviews, that were aired on May 10 and 11?
A. I believe it was somewhere in the second half of April.
Q. Okay. So two weeks or more before this segment aired?
A. At least two weeks before.
Q. Sometime after April 15, roughly?
A. Roughly.
Q. I mean that's your best recollection as you sit here?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember whether there was one interview or more than one interview?
A. One interview, lasted about a half hour.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And that's all I have. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Fallon, any questions? MR. FALLON: One moment, Judge. I just have probably two or three questions, Sheriff. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY FALLON:
Q. As far as you know, all decisions, instructions, and supervision of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's personnel participating in the investigation of this case came at either the direction or request of Sheriff Pagel from Calumet County, or members of the Department of Justice's Division of Criminal Investigation; is that true?
A. That's correct.
Q. In your capacity as sheriff, of the county in which these proceedings are being held, have you instructed anyone, or told anyone, what to do or what to say relative to any of the court support personnel that are present here today?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Have you directed them to engage in any comments with the media or anyone connected with this case?
A. No.
Q. As far as you know, have you issued any orders or directives at all relative to the handling of these court proceedings, to your personnel, or has that been left to others, or is it simply something that they routinely do what they do?
A. You mean like court security?
Q. Right.
A. That would be what they normally do.
Q. All right. And you have given no other instructions or directions?
A. No.

## ATTORNEY FALLON: That's all I have.

 THE COURT: Any redirect? ATTORNEY STRANG: I do.
## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY STRANG:
Q. Just so I'm clear, I mean, do you have a division that provides court support? Is that a separate division within the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. That comes under the Support Division, Deputy

Inspector Ledvina.
Q. So everybody in this courtroom who is wearing a Manitowoc County Sheriff's deputy uniform, ultimately, calls you boss?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. On the scene of the investigation, I think you testified, in response to Mr. Fallon's question, that Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department personnel would have been following the directions of either the Calumet County Sheriff's Department or DCI; did I understand you correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. And within the ranks of those there in the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, you would expect the ordinary hierarchies continue to apply, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When -- You testified as well that you haven't directed anyone in your department to speak to the media about this investigation or prosecution?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And, in fact, I'm going to take that a little bit further. On or about September 12,

2003, if we go back not quite three years now, you had a conversation with Manitowoc County Corporation Counsel in which he suggested that you and members of your department make no public statements at all about Steven Avery?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall issuing a directive, a written, very short directive, to your department, that people were to make no public statements about Steven Avery?
A. It's possible.
Q. Back in December, 2003?
A. It's possible.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. No.
Q. That was, I think, marked as Exhibit 140 of your deposition; would it help to look at the deposition?
A. Could be, yeah.
Q. Okay. I am approaching you with a transcript of your deposition. You are welcome to look at all of it, but $I$ would invite your attention particularly to page 45, right after Exhibit 140 is identified. You can look at that yourself and see if that helps restore your recollection.
A. I don't see what you want me to see here.
Q. I'm sorry, do you see where it refers to Exhibit 140?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Here we go, the lawyer who is asking you questions is asking you about the circumstances of making that two sentence memo that he's marked as Exhibit No. 140?
A. Okay.
Q. All right. What it was, I mean, if you now recall, you had done a very short memo, about two sentences, telling your entire department, don't talk about Steven Avery?
A. Okay.
Q. On the advice of the Corporation Counsel.
A. Correct.
Q. Do you remember doing that?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. When did you -- When, if ever, did you lift that order?
A. Didn't.
Q. Did it apply to you in mid-April, 2006, when you sat down with FOX 11?
A. No, I don't believe so. I believe if anyone would have talked, would have been able to come
from myself or the inspector.
Q. Okay. So the two of you, the lead inspector being Mr. Hermann?
A. Correct.
Q. The two of you were excepted -- outside the scope of that and could make public comments about Steven Avery?
A. I believe.
Q. You believe?
A. Yeah, I believe we could.
Q. You are the guy who wrote the memo, I mean, is it yes or no?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. That's it. Oh, another question, you won't need the deposition, but give me -- I don't know if you have an exact number, but about how many detectives do you have in the detective bureau of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. I believe five, including the lieutenant.
Q. Including Lieutenant Lenk?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And do they cover all three shifts or is that primarily a day shift bureau?
A. Primarily a day shift, with an on call basis.
Q. And then are there acting detectives as well, or people who perform investigative duties outside the Detective Bureau?
A. We have evidence techs and things like that, yes. People that know how to take pictures, people that know how to lift fingerprints, that type of thing.
Q. To what division are they assigned?
A. Operations.
Q. To operations?
A. Yes.
Q. They are not assigned to the patrol division?
A. They come out of the patrol division, yes.

Patrol operations are synonomous.
Q. I see. All right.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you. I will just take that back. And that's all I have, your Honor.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Any further questions?
ATTORNEY FALLON: No.
THE COURT: All right. The witness is excused. Mr. Strang, any other evidence relating to these motions?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes. No other testimony. If, and when, we get to talking directly about a
change of venue, I'm -- and this was at the Court's urging -- I'm going to offer two full boxes of material. I have provided the same to the State, identical sets.

And these boxes include 24 DVD's and then thousands of $81 / 2$ by 11 pages of paper, which consist of transcripts of television and a few radio broadcasts, newspaper articles that we copied to reduce the bulk. I had four boxes and I reduced this to 2 by photocopying, judiciously. Photo copies from websites, some of newspapers, some other than newspapers, for example, television stations.

And then there are lists provided to me by something called Wisconsin Media Services that provides a few lines of text from television broadcasts relating to Ms Halbach or Mr. Avery. I used those lists to select which TV reports I wanted copied to DVD.

And I'm going to guess that of all the stories that Wisconsin Media Services covered for me, $I$ don't know, it took a quarter to a half, somewhere in there, maybe more than half of some of them. And I -- The DVD's all come from either the Milwaukee media market or the Green Bay Media

Market.
So, in other words, the Milwaukee and the Green Bay television stations, but not Wausau, not Madison. I did not make any effort to capture publicity in those media markets. So that's what's in the two boxes behind me. That may be something that's bulky enough that I should discuss with the Deputy Clerk during a break here this morning.

But if we get to the change of venue after we have argued dismissal and an adjournment, I'm prepared to offer that. Beyond that, I have got no other evidence to tender on the three motions that we're undertaking initially.

THE COURT: Does the State have any evidence to offer with respect to those three motions of the defense?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: As to the Motion to Dismiss, Judge, we did intend to call Sheriff Pagel to testify.

THE COURT: All right. You may call him at this time.

SHERIFF GERALD A.PAGEL, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was
examined and testified as follows:
THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name, spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Gerald A. Pagel, P-a-g-e-l. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY KRATZ:
Q. Mr. Pagel, how are you employed?
A. I am the Sheriff for Calumet County.
Q. And as we have heard in this last series of examinations, your department, and you
personally, were requested to assume investigative responsibility in the disappearance of Teresa Halbach and the subsequent investigation into how that occurred; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, do you recall on Saturday, November 5, 2005, being at the Avery Salvage Yard and accepting responsibility for this investigation?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. After that period of time, is it a correct statement, as we have heard from Sheriff Petersen, that your department, in concert with the Division of Criminal Investigation, made all
investigative decisions, that is, you directed the investigation; is that correct?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Now that we're beyond preliminary questions, I'm going to object to leading, at least $I$ assume Sheriff Pagel is not hostile to Mr. Kratz.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
Q. (By Attorney Strang) ~ Who then, Sheriff Pagel, was involved in directing this investigation?
A. It was members of the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, in conjunction with the Department of Criminal Investigation, as far as a joint investigation, team work.
Q. Mr. Strang's motions as to pretrial publicity and related motions deal with pretrial publicity. Let me first ask you whether you have any experience or training in media relations, specifically, as it relates to high profile cases?
A. Yes, I do. I have gone to two separate training sessions in media relations with law enforcement.
Q. Are you an elected official?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And similar to Sheriff Petersen, do you consider yourself the head of your law enforcement agency?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, prior to the discovery of Teresa Halbach's vehicle on November 5th, was your agency involved in what's been referred to as a missing persons investigation?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. Could you describe, just briefly, the scope of that investigation for us?
A. On, I believe it was November 3rd, our department received a call of a missing person, that being Teresa Halbach. Our agency became immediately involved in speaking with the relatives and friends of Teresa. And, ultimately, that Thursday evening, I received a call at home from Investigator Mark Wiegert, informing me of the fact that Teresa Halbach was missing and that last contact with her had been on October 31st.
Q. Have you been engaged in missing person investigations before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. As part of those investigations, Sheriff, and I will just ask you directly, as part of this investigation as well, did you invite participation of the media or the general public in assisting in locating Ms Halbach?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. How was that done?
A. That was done Thursday evening, shortly after I received the call from Investigator Wiegert. I responded to the Sheriff's Department. And it's been my theory, and also information that has been provided to me through investigative matters, that the quicker you get information to the media the better.

We need public's assistance in trying to locate missing individuals, and this was my thought that evening, was to get the information about Teresa, about her disappearance, to the media, so that we could have the public's assistance in attempting to locate her.
Q. After Ms Halbach's vehicle was found on the 5th of November, were there discussions as to what, if anything, would be disseminated, or told, to the general public?
A. Yes, it was felt that we needed to control the information that was disseminated to the general public. It was done for investigative purposes and also to control the information that the media received, that we needed to have disseminated to them. We still had a missing
person and we needed, again, the public's assistance in trying to locate Teresa.

We found her vehicle, that was true, but we still had not found Teresa. So we still felt that we needed the public's assistance in locating her.
Q. Was it decided, Sheriff Pagel, who would be involved in disseminating information about -both about the investigation and the request for assistance from the public?
A. Yes, a decision was made that we were going to, again, control who the media went to as far as gathering or obtaining information. And it was felt that myself and yourself would be the individuals who would disseminate the information.

Again, we could control the information that the media would obtain and, also, that it would not impair the investigation. Often in these type of cases, the media wishes to contact investigators, contact individuals who are involved in the investigation. And we felt it would be better if we just had two individuals who they could contact and who would be the individuals that they would go to in attempting
to obtain information.
Q. While this case remained a missing persons investigation, was it decided how many times per day the media would receive information?
A. Yes, we felt that we would provide information daily to the media to keep them informed, and also to, again, provide information to the general public as to the outcome, the scope, where the investigation was going.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, on those early occasions, that is the press conference on the 5 th and perhaps the 6th of November, could you characterize the interest from the public, that is, from both the media and general public, be able to gauge how interested they were in this investigation?
A. We were able to determine that there was a huge interest in this investigation. And we knew then, and we knew beginning, going into this investigation, that there would be a huge, or a large interest in the media for this investigation, and by the public as to this investigation.
Q. Were there any discussions held as to limiting what was said and the reasons to not provide information of a specific nature?
A. Yes, we had daily meetings to discuss what information was going to be provided to the media. Again, this was done for several reasons. One was to -- for investigative purposes, to ensure that information was not disseminated that we did not wish to have disseminated.

We also wanted to do what is being alleged here, in that not having prejudicial information, inflammatory information, provided to the public. And we also had a sensitivity issue. We felt that we had -- we owed it to the Halbach family, to the relatives, that information provided to the media, to the public, would be sensitive in nature and that we kept them informed. They were involved in the loop. In fact, before any information was provided to the media, the Halbach's were contacted and they were informed of what information was going to be provided that evening or that day.
Q. Was there more information that the Sheriff's Department had in it's possession that was held back, or not provided, to the media during this investigation?
A. Most definitely.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, at any point, at least prior to the 9th of November, was a specific suspect identified?
A. No, there was not. In fact, we -- it was a wide open investigation.
Q. On the 9th of November, Steven Avery was arrested on a charge of felon in possession of a firearm; do you remember holding a press conference announcing that fact on the 9th?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you recall any discussions on the 9th regarding limiting your comments to the facts that were contained within that public document, that is the Criminal Complaint?
A. Yes, that information was going to be public knowledge in the Criminal Complaint and it pertained to the felon in possession. We still had a missing person investigation.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, later in that week, between the 9th and the 11th of November, do you recall receiving specific questions, and even at the press conferences, obtaining inquiries, regarding allegations made by Mr. Avery and his family, regarding being set up or framed?
A. Yes, I do. In fact, I would be receiving phone
calls from the media, who indicated that they had received information from either Mr. Avery or members of his family. And they were making inquiries about these -- this information that they were receiving. And, again, I would not elaborate on those type of things at that particular time, via phone contacts.

Any members of the media would be informed that any information that was going to be released would be released at a news conference to be determined or announced later.
Q. All right. That brings me, then, to questions regarding a press conference held on the 11th of November, Friday, the 11th; do you recall that press conference?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you recall specific information being released, as it related to public questions, or direct questions, from the Avery's, as to being set up or framed?
A. Yes. Again, we felt that we owed it to the public, to insure them that there was no information, no evidence gathered through the investigation, tending to indicate that there was any type of conspiracy theory in effect here.
Q. Now, this may be a little awkward since I'm not a witness in this case, but I'm going to ask you about conversations that you and I had. Do you recall specific conversations with me regarding limiting, or being very careful about what was disseminated, to insure a fair trial for Mr. Avery?
A. Yes, I do. Again, we would have conferences daily to discuss what was going to be disseminated. You also indicated that it's your policy, once charges are filed, that the information disseminated to the media would cease, and that it would be the joint thought here that anything after that point would not be disseminated, there would be no more conferences.
Q. You are aware that at some point, in fact, on the 5th of November, Judge Fox, from Manitowoc County, appointed me as Special Prosecutor in this case; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Have you worked on other criminal cases with me as the Calumet County Sheriff?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Are you familiar with my general policy of not commenting on pending criminal matters, other
than in the courtroom?
A. Yes, that is your policy.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, while present with me at not only press conferences, but other times that we may have been approached, do you recall me, and other members of my office, reiterating, or explaining that policy, that no comment policy, if you will, to members of the media?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. Have you, individually, Sheriff Pagel, received offers from local, or regional, or even national news sources to comment on this case?
A. Yes, I have received numerous requests from the news media, not only in Green Bay, but in Milwaukee. And I have also received numerous calls from national news outlets requesting interviews, requesting comments.

And everything nationally has been refused. I indicated in the beginning that $I$ would not go on any national news show to discuss this matter.
Q. Several months after Mr. Avery's Criminal Complaint was filed, $I$ think it was the 14 th of November when it was filed, but in early March, March 1st and 2nd, did you become aware of a
second suspect having been arrested regarding the homicide and related charges with Ms Halbach?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And who was that person?
A. Brendan Dassey.
Q. On March 1st, do you recall holding a joint news conference informing the public?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Leading?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm sorry, what was that?
ATTORNEY STRANG: Leading.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Oh.
Q. (By Attorney Kratz)~ I could ask, what day did you hold the news conference that you informed the public of Mr. Dassey's involvement?
A. I believe it was March 1st.
Q. All right. Then, do you recall a Criminal Complaint being drafted and filed against Mr. Dassey?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Then on -- Do you recall another, in fact, the last press conference jointly held in this case?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you remember when that was?
A. That would have been the following day. I believe it was March 2nd.
Q. Sheriff Pagel, prior to that news conference, were you aware of the details; that is, were you aware of the information that would be included in that public document, in that Criminal Complaint, against Mr. Dassey?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Do you recall having conversations with me about what information should be released and how to release that information?
A. Yes, you had indicated that the information that was going to be released was information that was in the document. And we had -- a decision had to be made how it was going to be released, or what was going to be released. And it was felt that we would, again, try to control the information that was going to be released, rather than having the news media take the report and then go wherever they were going to go with it.

It was a decision that was difficult to do, but was ultimately decided that we needed to provide the information to the public and, again, control what information was disseminated.
Q. Without limiting the information in that news conference, what did you believe would happen if that document was simply released to the public?
A. Personally, I felt it was going to be helter skelter. That the news media was going to take it and go in all directions with it. And, again, we would probably lose control over what was -what was gathered by the news media if we just gave them the article and gave them the Criminal Complaint, I mean, and let them go from there. And, again, we felt that we needed to control the information.
Q. You had mentioned sensitivity to the Halbach family, to the victims, especially regarding that disturbing information. Were meetings held, before the 2nd of March, to disclose to the family what would be included in that document?
A. Yes. We had met the night before, with them, and provided them with the information that the investigators had gathered. And that provided them with the information that was going to be in the Criminal Complaint.
Q. At any time, Sheriff Pagel, were there attempts -- and I can only ask you individually -- but were there attempts by you to influence any potential jurors, or to in any way prejudice Mr. Avery through this criminal process?
A. None. In fact, this is, again, why we tried to control the information that was released, so that we could control any prejudicial information, any inflammatory information, so as to prevent, as much as possible, any pretrial prejudicial publicity.
Q. And, again, that's consistent with other cases that you and I have worked on; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all the questions I have of Sheriff Pagel. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY STRANG:
Q. Is it typical, in a missing person Complaint, that you, as the sheriff, would be notified at home, after hours, on the day that someone is reported missing?
A. It's not typical, nor is it non-typical. The investigators, the staff, do keep me informed of their investigations and do keep me informed if they want something done. And in this particular case, they wanted the information disseminated to the media and they felt it would be best if $I$ came in and did that for them.
Q. All right. You say the investigators, how many investigators, or detectives, are employed in the Calumet County Sheriff's Department?
A. We have four investigators.
Q. Does that include the lead investigator or chief investigator?
A. They are all investigators. There's no lead investigator. Whoever gets the case, initially, is the -- basically, the lead investigator, pertaining to that particular investigation.
Q. And to whom do the four investigators report directly?
A. They report to either the lieutenant or to myself.
Q. And I will keep this short, and I hope simple for you, but to the extent that you know, does the Calumet County Sheriff's Department have fewer sworn personnel than the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know, roughly, the numbers --
A. No, I don't.
Q. -- at least to your own department?
A. I don't know what the difference would be.
Q. How about your department; how many sworn officers of any rank?
A. Okay. We have 24 sworn officers and, I believe, 27 non-sworn.
Q. Non-sworn being support people, secretarial, clerical, bookkeeping, business management?
A. Dispatch and correctional officers.
Q. Very good. Were you acquainted with the Halbach family personally, before November 3, 2005?
A. I know members of the Halbach family, yes, I do.
Q. Personally?
A. Yes.
Q. Had you known Teresa Halbach personally?
A. No, I did not.
Q. But you knew some members of her family?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that in part why Detective Wiegert said he was calling you that evening?
A. No, it was not. He had no knowledge that I would have known the Halbachs.
Q. But what he did say was, hey, we need to get the public's help, or words to that effect?
A. Yes, he felt that it was important that the information be disseminated to the media so that they could disseminate it to the public for their assistance.
Q. The media being a tool to reach the public?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right. You agreed?
A. Yes. Yes, I did.
Q. As early as the evening of November 3?
A. Yes.
Q. That evening is the point at which -- and I think your words were -- you knew going into the investigation that there would be a huge amount, or huge interest on the part of the public and the media?
A. Yes. Well, I guess, not that particular evening, we didn't know the enormity. November 5th is when we realized that we were probably going to have a large media interest.
Q. You testified on direct, in response to Mr. Kratz's question, you knew going into the investigation. And so my question is, you know, is it November 5, or some time prior to or after that, that you knew going into the investigation it would be huge media and public interest?
A. What $I$ was referring to was November 5 th, the day that her vehicle was found on the Avery property.
Q. What was it that was so hugely interesting about her car being found?
A. The fact that Steven Avery had garnered a large amount of media interest concerning his release from prison, for charges that he had been alleged to have committed, and the vehicle being found on Avery property. You didn't have to be a rocket scientist to know that the media was, again, going to be interested in this.
Q. Steven Avery was a man you knew from the media before November 5?
A. That is correct.
Q. You were familiar, at least with the general outlines of his wrongful conviction and eventual exoneration?
A. Yes.
Q. Release from prison?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware that he had filed a big lawsuit against Manitowoc County over that series of events?
A. Prior to what?
Q. November 5.
A. No, I was not aware of any lawsuit prior to that.
Q. But you were aware of Avery and you thought, gee, this will attract the media?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, that's two days after Ms Halbach is reported missing. And I guess it's as early as that evening, November 3, in which you realized, look, we need some public assistance here, and the way to accomplish that is by using the media?
A. Yes, we felt that the information should be disseminated concerning Teresa Halbach, and her disappearance, and the fact that we were looking for her and the vehicle.
Q. Giving information directly to the media was not the only strategy you employed to get the word out to the public?
A. I guess I don't know.
Q. For example, you had a telephone number, that you encouraged members of the public to call and encouraged investigators to share with the public?
A. Our local Sheriff's Department number, yes, or tip number.
Q. Right, sort of a dedicated line, not for this case, but for tips, or for information from the public?
A. That is correct.
Q. You got that out to the public?
A. Yes.
Q. You had members of your department going to friends and family members of Teresa Halbach's in the early days of this search?
A. Yes, most definitely.
Q. In part, to ask them when they had last seen her, and what information they might have, but also, in part, to encourage them to talk to others?
A. Yes, to try to garner any information we could from them, again, when was the last time you had seen her, and garner any information we could about Teresa.
Q. Sure. And to get the network going so to speak, might ask a friend who else do you know she may have talked to, or called, or been e-mailing, or appointments she may have had, things like that.
A. Yeah, would be a typical missing person investigation.
Q. You also took some other steps that would be publicly visible but controlled. I mean, for example, did you -- did you rent an airplane or make arrangements for an airplane at some point?
A. Yes, that was done on November 4th.
Q. Went to an aviation service and took a plane up in the air?
A. Yes.
Q. And that involved circling a good deal, I assume, over parts of Manitowoc County?
A. Manitowoc, Brown, Calumet. I don't think we got down into Sheboygan, but basically a three county area.
Q. Sure. And at fairly low altitude?
A. Yes.
Q. That, you knew, at least would attract some public attention and raise the profile that people should be on the lookout for a missing and possibly endangered person?
A. The fact that we used the airplane?
Q. Yeah.
A. No. That was basically a search to try and to locate her vehicle. We knew that her vehicle was missing. And we were trying to locate her vehicle, or anything which could be of assistance in the missing person investigation.
Q. Okay. So, is that why you only used the plane on Friday, November 4?
A. Yes.
Q. There was -- Once you found the car, the Toyota, there was no need for further flyovers or that kind of visible activity?
A. There were other flyovers done after, yes. There were the use of other planes and helicopters throughout the search for Teresa.
Q. The search continued until -- well, I mean it continued beyond this, but on November 8, some bone fragments were found; does that sound right?
A. That could be the date, yes.
Q. All right. Which would have been a Tuesday?
A. That would be about right, yes.
Q. Were you, personally, out at the Avery Auto Salvage property on the days following this phone call, at home, on November 3?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Each day?
A. Yes, I was there every day.
Q. Starting Friday, November 4.
A. No, the 5th.
Q. So, November 5th?
A. Yes.
Q. Saturday, November 5. And then how many days in a row did you remain, personally, out at the Avery Auto Salvage property?
A. I would go out their during the daylight hours and generally would leave anywhere between 7, 8, 9 at night.
Q. How long did that continue, Sheriff Pagel?
A. I was there the entire week that we were out there.
Q. And until the road was reopened and the searching was done?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Now, during that time that you were out there, during these long daylight hours, essentially, did you, personally, direct the activities of Lieutenant Lenk?
A. Did I, personally? How did you phrase it?
Q. Direct the activities of Lieutenant Lenk of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. Not personally, no. It was -- Could have been done either through the command post. Again, they were there as a support group. So we would utilize our investigators, our officers, our personnel, along with agents from the Department of Criminal Investigation and individuals would then be assigned to those particular individuals who would be the lead people doing particular -particular programs or parts of the investigation out there.
Q. Activities. All right. So you set up a command post?
A. Yes.
Q. You set that up in conjunction with the DCI?
A. Yes.
Q. There were other law enforcement agencies, also, at the command post?
A. Yes, there were other agencies involved in the investigation who were there for support and assistance.
Q. In the command post?
A. Not necessarily inside the command post. We tried to limit individuals who would be in the command post. We had a number of individuals who were out there on any particular day and we couldn't have all those individuals in the command post, but we would have the individuals who were going to be responsible for doing a particular activity, given their assignments.
Q. Okay. Physically, what was the command post?
A. Physically, what was it?
Q. Yeah.
A. It's our command trailer that we have at the Sheriff's Department?
Q. Like a Winnebago type?
A. It's a good size.
Q. Okay. But not everybody can crowd into those
things?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So people, law enforcement officers, would come in as necessary to participate in discussions?
A. Yes. Whoever we needed to discuss matters with would be invited into the command post and we would then discuss our information with them.
Q. The -- You ran this investigation in conjunction with DCI, you said?
A. Yes.
Q. And then, jointly, with a number of other agencies?
A. Yes.
Q. The FBI was involved?
A. Yes, the FBI.
Q. They were in the command post from time to time?
A. They were -- They were only out there for a short period of time. They arrived and indicated that if we needed their assistance for anything we should feel free to contact them. I think they might have been there personally, only a couple of hours.
Q. Okay. But they said, call if you need help?
A. Yes.
Q. The Wisconsin State Patrol was out there for a longer period of time?
A. They were there several days, yes.
Q. They had command officers in and out of the command post?
A. Yes, they would have had individuals in and out.
Q. The Two Rivers Police Department?
A. Yes.
Q. They had senior staff in and out of the command post?
A. I don't know if they would have had individuals in or out, specifically, or if they were just part of the support group.
Q. All right. But what you tried to do was run this as a collaborative, or a joint effort?
A. Yes.
Q. You consulted with Manitowoc County Sheriff's personnel?
A. Yes.
Q. They were in and out of the command post?
A. Yes.
Q. At least the ranking members were?
A. Yes.
Q. So you weren't necessarily, personally, directing things, but you were part of a group that was
making conjunctive, or joint, or collaborative, investigative decisions, so that all the tasks got done?
A. Attempting to, yes.
Q. Right. Were you aware, on November 5, let's say, that Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department recently had given depositions in Steven Avery's civil lawsuit?
A. No, I was not aware of that.
Q. When did you first learn that?
A. Today, in court.
Q. Mr. Avery, then, was arrested on November 9, if I understood your testimony correctly?
A. I believe that would be correct, yes.
Q. Charged, initially, with being a felon in possession of a firearm?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you have had enough time in the criminal justice system to know that, typically, at least when somebody is charged in a Circuit Court of the State of Wisconsin, there's a Criminal Complaint filed?
A. Yes.
Q. With the court?
A. Yes, will eventually be filed.
Q. With the court, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, typically, as far as $I$ know, always, that's a publicly available document?
A. Yes.
Q. That is, anyone from the public, including a reporter, could go to the Clerk of Court's Office and say, May I see the Criminal Complaint against Joe Blow, or Steven Avery, or anyone else?
A. That is correct.
Q. Make a copy of it?
A. Yes.
Q. And leave with it?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So in terms of making something -making information available to the public, one way to do that is to file, at least, an unsealed public document in court?
A. It would be a public document, yes.
Q. That was done here with the felon in possession of a firearm Complaint, as to Mr. Avery, correct?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. It was done with the criminal charge against Brendan Dassey on or about March 2, 2006 ?
A. That's correct.
Q. You know, of your personal knowledge, that Mr. Dassey, although 16 years old, was charged as an adult from the outset?
A. Yes.
Q. So you knew that that was a public proceeding from the outset, not a juvenile and closed proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. You knew that the Criminal Complaint against Brendan Dassey, therefore, was a public document?
A. That is correct.
Q. You and Mr. Kratz began to talk about public dissemination of information in this investigation, when?
A. The dissemination of information to the media and to the public?
Q. Yeah.
A. That was done on the first day, that Saturday that we were at the Avery property.
Q. Mr. Kratz was out there as well?
A. Yes.
Q. You learned on November 5, or shortly after, that a number of people lived on what we are calling the Avery property, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Family members, including extended family members, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Husbands, wives, boyfriends, girlfriends, a whole collection of people?
A. That is correct.
Q. This is a large -- relatively large parcel of 40 acres, plus?
A. Yes.
Q. Steven Avery being one of the people who lived somewhere on what you are calling the Avery property?
A. That is correct.
Q. On November 5, when you and Mr. Kratz were on the Avery property, you began to discuss, I guess, gee, how are we going to disseminate information to the media?
A. And what information was going to be disseminated.
Q. And what. Were you and Mr. Kratz the only two decision makers on those discussions?
A. No. The investigative staff, agents from DCI, investigators from my office, would meet, and discuss, and come up with what investigative
material. What information was going to be, and should be, and needed to be, released to the media and to the public.
Q. So, again, I guess, a little bit, as you were describing the investigation itself, your personal style, or your approach to dissemination of information to the media, was more collegial or collaborative and inclusive?
A. That would be correct.
Q. And that's just a matter of personal style for you?
A. No, it's done for a number of reasons: One, to ensure that information that investigators have, information that they do not wish to be divulged, is not divulged. And, again, it's better to do it jointly, together, so that you don't say or disseminate information that should not be, and disseminate information that should be.

Again, we had a missing person. We were still looking for Teresa Halbach. And throughout this case we were looking for Teresa Halbach. And we felt that it was important that the media, the public, be provided with this information.
Q. In a criminal investigation -- Well, first of all, a criminal investigation would be different
in your world, in the jargon of law enforcement, than a missing persons investigation, correct?
A. Yes, there would be different aspects.
Q. You separate those two things, or distinguish between them?
A. You can, occasionally, but sometimes they run hand in hand. If you still do not have a missing-- if you still have not located the missing person, you still have an individual you are trying to locate, so they can run jointly.
Q. Of course, but at the outset, in law enforcement, at least in Calumet County, you distinguish between those two, a missing person investigation and the criminal investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Many missing person investigations turn out to be a teenager who was upset with mom and ran away for a few hours?
A. That can be true, yes.
Q. And I think even here, I don't remember which news conference, but I think at some point you or Mr. Kratz made a comment that, we now have a criminal investigation, not just a missing persons investigation. This isn't verbatim, I don't remember the exact words.
A. Yeah, but words to the effect that the investigation was tending to lead towards a criminal investigative nature.
Q. Right. And that would have been -- Regardless of when and who said it, you began to think of this as a criminal investigation, or at least leading that way, when?
A. Probably after information was obtained from the Crime Lab, which was providing us with details as to information being found in Teresa's vehicle.
Q. So the vehicle was found November 5?
A. Yes.
Q. What looks like blood is found that same day, November 5?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Some swabs for collection of the blood is undertaken?
A. Yes. The entire vehicle is removed from the Avery property and taken to Madison, to the Crime Lab.
Q. What day was it removed?
A. It was removed Saturday evening, late Saturday evening.
Q. Taken directly to the Crime Lab?
A. Yes.
Q. And further collection of evidence is done, then, from the vehicle?
A. Yeah, the evidence -- the vehicle is then analyzed for evidence.
Q. When -- When, then, did you get your first information back from the Crime Lab that caused you to think of this as looking like a criminal investigation?
A. Again, it was probably Monday or Tuesday. I can't recall, specifically, what day it was.
Q. Okay. Maybe this will help, you remember somebody first saying, gee, I think we have got bone fragments?
A. That would have probably been on Tuesday, I think you said, was the 8th.
Q. Right.
A. Then, yeah, we discovered some bone fragments on the property. And, again, they had to be analyzed to determine whether they were human in nature.
Q. But had you heard back from the Crime Lab before somebody said we have got bone fragments, or after?
A. I believe it was before, that we had some information back, some preliminary information
back from the Crime Lab.
Q. So probably Monday, November 7th?
A. Could be, correct.
Q. Okay. Now, in a criminal investigation, one of the things that law enforcement people do in disseminating information publicly is attempt not to disclose information that should be known only to the culprit, or the perpetrator, correct?
A. We try to do that, yes.
Q. So that if you find someone, and in talking with that person they have that information, you know that they haven't gotten it by watching television?
A. That would be correct.
Q. Or reading the newspaper or something. What sort of information, prior to a criminal investigation, do you not want disclosed in a missing persons investigation?
A. Well, in a missing persons investigation, you want to get information out to the public as to the person who was missing, what the person might have been wearing, a general description of the person, and in this particular case, her vehicle.
Q. Okay. And by elimination, then, certain personal information you would not want disclosed, I assume?
A. Personal information?
Q. About the missing person, private information?
A. You possibly could want to withhold that, yes.

And it's a -- a decision is made, is it pertinent --
Q. Right.
A. -- to this particular missing person.
Q. If it's not particularly pertinent, then privacy concerns would prevail?
A. Sure.
Q. All right. Now, the purpose, then, of these collaborative or collegial meetings, was to find out, gee, guys, what information do you think we should and should not disclose?
A. Yes.
Q. Reach some agreement on that, as a group?
A. Yes.
Q. And then, you know, as people say, make sure we're all on the same page?
A. Correct.
Q. Then, you and Mr. Kratz would be the public spokespeople?
A. That was a decision that was made, yes.
Q. Who were the decision makers on that, in the end?
A. As far as what information is released?
Q. Right. And by whom?
A. Again, it is a collaborative effort among everybody who's involved in the investigation. There were several incidences where the investigators said, no, we can't release this, or maybe we should release this, and a discussion was held.
Q. And maybe an agreement was reached each of those occasions, but to the extent that there was no agreement, or somebody had to make the call, make the decision, so to speak, who was doing that?
A. Well, I guess that information, the ultimate information that was released, would have been Mr. Kratz and myself, because we were the individuals who released the information.
Q. Jointly, not one over the other?
A. Yeah, I would believe probably, right, he would release information, $I$ would release information, but we knew what information was going to be released.
Q. And you decided that jointly?
A. Yes.
Q. The press conferences on March 1 and March 2, of course, were well after Mr. Avery had been
charged with murder?
A. Yes.
Q. The March 1 press conference was before Brendan Dassey had been charged with murder and other crimes?
A. He was in custody.
Q. Right.
A. But he had not --
Q. Before a Criminal --
A. Yes.
Q. -- Complaint had been filed?
A. Yes, before he had been taken to court.
Q. The March 2 press conference was after he had been charged formally, a Criminal Complaint had been filed against Mr. Dassey?
A. Yes.
Q. The Criminal Complaint was distributed to interested members of the media at the March 2 press conference, or after?
A. I can't recall if it was before or after.
Q. But one or the other?
A. Yes.
Q. You made copies available?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. To save them the trouble of going to the Clerk of Court?
A. Right.
Q. So the press conference wasn't going to replace disclosure of the Criminal Complaint?
A. Again, it was felt, a decision was made, that maybe we needed a press conference so that we could discuss this information with the news media and kind of inform them of what they were going to be reading and seeing in the Criminal Complaint.

It was felt that it was important. And it was a tough decision to make, should we just give it to them, or not. We felt that it was better to be able to control and to answer questions, I guess, that the media might have.
Q. Well, what control did you have after you handed them a copy of the Complaint?
A. Well, you still are able to answer questions and you are still able to provide them with some information that is of help, I guess, sensitivity, again, to the family in this matter.
Q. Okay. You had no -- you had no serious question about the ability of the assembled reporters to read English?
A. No, we knew that they were going to be doing
that, yes.
Q. They would read the Complaint for themselves?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So I guess, necessarily, the purpose of answering questions, or providing further information, was to tell them details, or explanations, beyond those contained in the words of the Criminal Complaint?
A. Yes. And, again, the concern was that they were going to take this and go in all directions. And we wanted to be able to control, again, the information. You have to look at it as a whole picture here, not just -- excuse me -- not just little pieces, but a whole picture.
Q. And I guess my question was, how in the world were you going to control the media after they left that room? And we have something called the First Amendment in this country, right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Did you ask them not to print certain things, not to broadcast certain things?
A. No, but I think by being able to answer questions and providing them with information, it's going to enhance our ability to be able to provide them and not let them run in all directions with this

Complaint, talking to individuals, trying to gather more information than what was in the Criminal Complaint.

And that's always a concern that everybody has in major investigations, is that the media, or anybody else, is going to take information that they have obtained and go further and try to enhance what they are reading, and what they are seeing, or what's in the Criminal Complaint.
Q. Okay. Now, you have used the word control here at least -- at least a half dozen times or something, I haven't counted, but. By control, you certainly could control what you and Mr. Kratz were saying, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You could put out the information under your control, that you chose to disseminate. You had control in that sense, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You could decline to put out information, that was a way to exercise control?
A. Yes, that's true.
Q. You could phrase information in a certain way, that was another form of control you had?
A. Yes.
Q. You -- These news conferences didn't just happen, invitations were sent, or notices were sent to media outlets?
A. They were provided with a date and time so that we could have everybody together at one time, rather than having individuals from the media calling and getting information at this time, and this time, and that time.
Q. Sure. Sure. So either your office or Mr. Kratz's office, somebody was either mailing or faxing, you know, here's the date, here's the time, here's the place, kind of information to media outlets?
A. Yes. And, again, this goes back to some training that I have received as to providing one news conference where everybody gets the same information.
Q. Fair enough. And you made a facility available at which cameras could be set up?
A. Yes.
Q. Microphones could be set up?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was another form of control, in the sense that, if your words are recorded on tape
or, you know, orally, as opposed to visually.
Now, you know, somebody plays the tape, you know exactly what the viewer will see and hear?
A. Yes.
Q. But what the media did after they left your news conference, after they shut off the lights, and turned off the cameras, and took the microphones, that you couldn't control?
A. That is correct.
Q. What Steven Avery might choose to say, you could not control?
A. That is correct.
Q. What his family members might say, you could not control?
A. That is correct.
Q. Other than the week or thereabouts that you had control of the Avery property, you couldn't prevent the media from going and talking to the Avery family members?
A. Yes, and that happened.
Q. How many times in your -- Well, how long have you been a law enforcement officer?
A. 33 years.
Q. Part of a long line of Pagels, I think, with the Sheriff's Department in Calumet County, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And during your 33 years in law enforcement, on how many occasions have you held a televised news conference, as you did on November 11, to respond to something that somebody, charged with being a felon in possession of a firearm, may have said publicly?
A. How many times have we had similar type --
Q. Yes.
A. -- news conferences? I would have to go back and check through my notes and records but --
Q. I bet you remember.
A. There have been a couple.
Q. There have been a couple?
A. Yes, we have had a number of major investigations that we have conducted, that we have had these type of news conferences.
Q. But my question was really more narrow. I mean, how often have you had a news conference to respond to something that an arrested defendant has said publicly?
A. Myself, probably none.
Q. This was the only time?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. This case?
A. Myself, as sheriff, investigating or being involved?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. I know there's been other cases, but not myself, no.
Q. Ever -- Ever in your experience with him, ever hear Mr. Kratz give a news conference to respond to some claim that a defendant has made publicly?
A. I don't know. I guess that would be something you would have to ask Mr. Kratz if he can --
Q. But you don't remember seeing --
A. I don't know.
Q. -- or hearing such a thing?
A. I would have to look back. I don't know. I can't answer that.
Q. As you sit here today, you don't recall?
A. I don't recall, sitting here today.
Q. Okay. If I understood your testimony on direct, you were getting phone calls from Avery family members, or members of the general public, saying something like, are you framing Steven Avery?
A. No, the news media was calling my cellphone and indicating that they were getting calls from Mr. Avery, or from family members, and that certain information was being released to the news media
via them.

And they were trying to confirm whether this was factual or not. And they would be informed that any information that was going to be divulged would be divulged at the news conference, or at the press conference.
Q. Referring to the November 11 news conference?
A. This was numerous times throughout this. And, in fact, even the day of March 1 st, $I$ was receiving phone calls from the news media inquiring about the fact that, we understand that Brendan Dassey has been interviewed, the Avery's have called us and told us this.

And, again, they were disseminating the information themselves. And we had -- we felt we had an opportunity, or we should be dispelling some of the information that the Avery's were providing.
Q. Well, let me be clear. I mean, it was members of the news media who were telling you that the Avery's had called them?
A. Yes.
Q. You probably saw some Avery family members back before Steven was in custody so, that is, before November 9, probably saw some film footage, if
you watched the TV's at all, of him and other family members?
A. That is correct.
Q. But you also know that you were getting calls from media people in which they claim that they had gotten information from the Avery's that had not been made public by those media sources?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you and Mr. Kratz made a decision to respond publicly to these phone calls on your cellphone, that you were getting from the media people, saying the Averys are calling us and telling us $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$, or Z ?
A. The news media was told that any information that was going to be released would be done at the press conference and that we weren't going to be speaking to them, or giving them information without having a joint conference.
Q. Okay. Although, you did do that, you sat down for an interview on air, in your office, at one point, didn't you?
A. Yes, I have had interviews in my office.
Q. About this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Including about claims that evidence was not
handled appropriately?
A. Yes, there was one, yes.
Q. Prior to November 11, which I think was the news conference that responded to suggestions of mishandling of evidence, or improper motives, prior to that date, what investigation had you, or those under your direction, done to assure yourself that there had not been mishandling of evidence?
A. Interviews were done, and the information that we were obtaining from the State Crime Lab was tending to indicate, or inform us, that this was impossible.
Q. When you say interviews were done, who did you interview about the possible mishandling of evidence?
A. We would be conversing with individuals out at the scene. And we knew that there was no possibility, because there was always an investigator, either from the Sheriff's Department of Calumet County, or from DCI, with these individuals. So we knew that wasn't a possibility.
Q. So when you say these individuals, you were referring to Manitowoc County Sheriff's

Department personnel?
A. That's who I thought you were referring to.
Q. I'm just asking who you were referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So the safeguard, so to speak, was, well, we will make sure we always have a Calumet County person with the Manitowoc people?
A. Calumet, DCI, yes.
Q. Somebody from outside the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. That was -- That was done, yes.
Q. Was that actually a policy that was put in place for this investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. When was that policy put in place?
A. Shortly after the investigation was turned over to Calumet County and DCI.
Q. And who put that policy in place?
A. It was a joint decision made through our agency, the Calumet County District Attorney's Office, and the Manitowoc County D.A.'s Office, and Corp Counsel, and Sheriff's Department.
Q. Okay. So, the three Manitowoc County agencies, D.A., Sheriff's Department, and Corp Counsel, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Two Calumet County agencies, Sheriff's Department and District Attorney's Office?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think I missed someone. DCI?
A. DCI.
Q. DCI. So among these six groups, this decision was made, we will always have somebody from another department there with any Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department person involved in this investigation?
A. Yes, because of the fact that we were the lead agency and we found out about the pending litigation against Manitowoc County by Mr. Avery.
Q. That's done on November 5, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why would that be done on November 5, if Steven Avery was not a suspect, or a person of interest, until November 9?
A. Again, the evidence -- the vehicle was found on the Avery property. There's a lawsuit filed by Steven. So -- So, as to not look like there was any type of tampering, we felt it was important that we do the investigation properly from the beginning. And this is the reason it was done.
Q. Again, I don't think that that addresses my question. Why, if Steven Avery was not a specific person of interest, or a suspect, until November 9, why the great concern to be shadowing, or accompanying, and watching over the shoulder of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department?
A. Because --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I'm sorry. Judge, I'm going to interpose an objection if Mr. Strang is meaning to quote a previous answer or question. The question was why was he not identified as a suspect. Mr. Strang has now said, if he was not a suspect. It is a mischaracterization of the previous question that was placed.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I will have the court reporter read back my original question. (Question read back.)
Q. (By Attorney Strang)~ Maybe you could answer that question?
A. Okay. We have a vehicle that's found on the property. We have a missing person investigation. We have Steven Avery being one of the individuals who is living on this property as were other members of his family.
Because of the litigation, it was felt
that, let's insure that there's no thing in the future that's going to be construed as being a cover up, or anything like that. Let's ensure that if we are going to do this investigation, we are going to do it properly, and let's do it from the beginning. And that's why it was done that way.
Q. All right. Now, do I understand, then, that as to what investigation you had done into the possible mishandling of evidence as of the November 11 news conference, the answer is none, but that you had put this policy in place on November 5?
A. The policy, meaning the policy as far as?
Q. If someone from another law enforcement agency is looking over the shoulder of any Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department person involved in this investigation.
A. Again, that's the reason that Manitowoc asked us to do the investigation in the first place --
Q. I understand.
A. -- because of this litigation. And so, because of that litigation, we felt it was very important, that if you wanted us to be the lead
agency, that we do it properly from the beginning and start, and so that there can't be any inference in the future that it wasn't done properly.
Q. Understood. And the question was, as of November 11, then, putting this policy in place was the only step you had taken to assure yourself that there was not mishandling of evidence, or other misconduct by law enforcement officers?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I am also going to interpose an objection. I think we're well beyond the change of venue or pretrial publicity portion of these motions. These might be relevant to other motions, but $I$ don't know as to pretrial publicity, the motion to dismiss, or the change of venue that's before the Court.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I will leave it with his answer, if he's permitted to ask that question -answer that question, I should say.

THE COURT: All right. Are you withdrawing your objection if this is the last question?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yeah, if we can move on.
THE WITNESS: I guess I'm still confused as to what you are asking.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Do you want to read it
back.
(Last question read back.)
ATTORNEY STRANG: Judge, I don't think we have got that exactly right.
Q. (By Attorney Strang) ~ What I meant to ask was, as of November 11, other than putting in place the policy that you have described, of watching over Manitowoc County people --
A. Okay.
Q. -- you had taken no step to assure yourself that there had not been mishandling of evidence or law enforcement misconduct?
A. I guess that was the reason.
Q. That was the step.
A. The step we took that day to ensure --
Q. Right. And the question is --
A. -- that could not be a question in the future, yes.
Q. Is that the only step, as of November 11?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Last area I have -- and I'm shifting gears off that, or shifting off that. You told Mr. Kratz that you had --

THE COURT: Mr. Strang before you start, about how long do you think you have got to go yet?

THE COURT: Three minutes, go ahead.
Q. (By Attorney Strang)~ You told Mr. Kratz, on direct examination, that you have gotten many phone calls, or approaches from national media, as well as local and regional media?
A. Yes.
Q. You have turned down all the national media requests for comment?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you, personally, been approached by anyone for a book deal, or a movie deal, or something of that kind?
A. Approached, no. I don't know what you mean. No.
Q. Well, now, I don't know what you mean. I mean, by approached, I mean a letter written, a call made, an e-mail received, has anybody suggested to you that you ought to become involved in a book, or a television movie, or a commercial movie, or something like that, about the Avery or the Halbach case?
A. No.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you. That's all I have then.

THE COURT: Counsel, if you have got some
redirect, I'm going to have you do it after lunch. ATTORNEY KRATZ: I think I only have two questions, Judge. I promise it will be very brief. THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I may.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY KRATZ:
Q. Sheriff Pagel, just a couple of questions. The press conference on the 2 nd of March, do you recall, before that press conference, or before I made any comments, an admonition, or a reminder to the public that all accused individuals are presumed innocent until proven guilty?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. And that wouldn't be something, if the Complaint was just released, that would be included, typically, in the Complaint; is that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.
Q. Finally, the sensitivity to the Halbach family and to crime victims, was that discussed in how details would be released? I'm specifically talking about the March 2nd Complaint and the details within there, how things would be phrased, what should be left out regarding a sensitivity to the Halbach's.
A. Oh, yes, most definitely. That was done on March 2nd, and it was done throughout the investigation.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all the questions as to the venue and the publicity issue, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. You are excused. Counsel, then as I understand it, we're going to have one more evidentiary witness after lunch and then I will hear argument on the motions; is that both parties understanding?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Not necessarily immediately after lunch -- I shouldn't speak for Mr. Fallon.

ATTORNEY FALLON: The remaining testimony anticipated for today has nothing to do with any motion that will be decided today, that's relative to a motion set for the 19th. So I think it would be better to hear the arguments, or get through as many of the arguments as we can before we take the testimony of that other witness.

THE COURT: Very well. I think in most cases, these motions, each of the parties have submitted written arguments already, so they will be somewhat supplemental. I assume they won't be too lengthy.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. We'll see you at 1:00.
(Noon recess taken.)
THE COURT: At this time we're back on the record, all counsel are present. And I believe that, with the exception of some testimony we're going to hear on one of the July 19 motions later this afternoon, we have completed the evidence portion of the hearing today; is that correct, Counsel?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, there may be some brief testimony as to the bond modification motion of Mr. Strang that we intend to come much later this afternoon, once that motion is addressed.

THE COURT: All right. Moving on to the motions themselves, and before dealing with a particular motion, I know there were a number of motions and supporting documents filed under seal. And it's my understanding from our status conference leading up to today's hearing, that the parties were going to request that a number of the documents that had been filed be unsealed. Is that correct, counsel?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't know that it's a
great number. The principal issue, at least as I recall it, your Honor, was the -- the defense motion to exclude the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, which I filed under seal in deference to Mr. Kratz's expressed view that it ought to be. So I thought it only fair to honor that, in the first instance, and then to let the Court decide rather than, in effect, deciding it myself by filing it other than under seal.

I don't think it's properly sealed.
That is, I couldn't defend a media request to unseal it. It concerns information that already has been broadcast publicly. And in general here, Steve Avery is aware that the public nature of trials in this country has been an aid to the defense. It's been a protection for the citizen accused. And I would err here on the side of making court documents publicly available where they possibly can be, and certainly there still will be some that cannot, consistent with a fair trial and the Court's obligation.

But I think this one reveals nothing that hasn't already been broadcast publicly by FOX 11 TV. So I suggest to the Court that the Motion to Exclude the Manitowoc County Sheriff's

Department, and any response from the State, rightly ought to be unsealed.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kratz and Mr. Fallon.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I do agree with Mr. Strang's position on that particular motion. Our concern was providing an additional forum for additional pretrial publicity on such a volatile issue, or at least as framed by Mr. Strang. But at this time, as the matter has been brought before the Court, and as the Court is about to receive at least brief oral argument on it, I have no objection to that course.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will order then that that motion, and any papers filed in support of or in opposition to it, can be unsealed.

The next item I have got is the State's motion concerning third party liability evidence, or a Denny motion. Is there any reason that that pleading, and the briefs submitted in support and opposition to it, cannot be unsealed?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: It's fine from the State's perspective, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang?
ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, I'm handling that
motion. I don't know that it was, actually, originally sealed, but I don't see there is any need to have it sealed, or any of the responses.

THE COURT: Okay. Court will order that motion, and the briefs relating to it, unsealed.

The next item is -- well, actually, the State I think groups together a number of preliminary motions in limine. The one that I'm looking at to be dealt with next is the motion concerning the admissibility of evidence regarding the defendant's wrongful conviction. This would be designated as item one in the pleading entitled Motion in Limine Series One from the State.

Now, there's other related motions made in the same document. I will start out I guess, Mr. Kratz, with you, since you filed it. Is there anything in there that the State feels requires sealing at this point?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Not in paragraph -- I'm sorry, Judge, not in Paragraph 1, no.

THE COURT: Well, let's take the entire document. I don't think I can unseal a paragraph. I think there is, later in the document, some evidentiary matters that are set forth in some
detail, the admissibility of which is yet to be determined.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Paragraph 5 and 6, Judge, may still be appropriate to be sealed as it requires, at least in part, a balancing test of the Court and seeks a pretrial ruling of the Court. As I told the Court, in chambers, and Mr. Strang, Paragraph No. 7, dealing with out of the court statements of Teresa Halbach, this Court understands the recently decided case of Davis vs. Washington decided by the US Supreme Court, June 19th, was very relevant to the analysis the Court must undertake in this regard.

The Court had asked for a supplementary memorandum of law to be prepared. I have done that. I have provided that to defense counsel. I at least want to provide the Court the original of that; although, it's not going to be argued until the 19th, that's been completed, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. What's the State's position on the sealing or unsealing of the State's Series One Motions in Limine.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Defense's position?
THE COURT: Defense's position, I'm sorry. ATTORNEY STRANG: This is an appropriate
case to use redacting of a public copy rather than sealing. And I think that Paragraph 1 may be made available publicly, that is, not redacted.

Paragraph 2 may be made available publicly, not redacted.

Paragraph 3, I think is appropriate for public disclosure, not redacted.

Paragraph 4, need not be redacted.
Paragraph 5, in my view, need not be redacted.

All of Paragraph 6 should be redacted at this point.

Paragraph 7, need not be redacted. The argument that follows need not be.

And, then, Paragraph 8 need not be redacted.

THE COURT: So the defense is asking for the document to be unsealed with the exception of Paragraph 6 being redacted, correct?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Paragraph 6 is the only one that you are asking to be redacted.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection from the State?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge, other than
there was discussion previously about Paragraph 5, and this Court asking for additional argument as to that may or may not include information that will be made public. Actually, the suggestion, or offer, in Paragraph 5, is probably not something that is all that noteworthy and so I would have no objection to the Court, other than Paragraph 6, allowing this document to be made public.

THE COURT: All right. Let's move on then to --

ATTORNEY STRANG: May I make a suggestion-THE COURT: Yes.

ATTORNEY STRANG: -- about the mechanics of this, which then could apply to any future issue where the document itself would be public, but parts of it may be redacted. My suggestion would be that the author of the document, in this case the State, go back to the word processing system, create a copied over document of this and then just remove Paragraph 6 and put Paragraph 6 redacted, rather than black ink and that kind of thing, which people, then, invariably are holding up to the light and trying to guess about.

I think it's just a more effective way to redact. And then the document, as refiled,
would clearly say redacted at the appropriate paragraph. And I, of course, would have no -there's every reason why a redacted copy should be treated as filed on the original date of filing, nunc pro tunc.

THE COURT: Any objection Mr. Kratz?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: My secretary might, Judge, but I don't. We'll try to accomplish that. THE COURT: All right. Let's move on then to the next item to be addressed today. That was actually, let's see, I think an additional part of the same document, which would be Paragraph 3. So that's dealt with there.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, the only filings on that motion so far is the State's Motion in Limine Series One that we just discussed, Paragraph 3, and then my letter response. I don't think that needs to be sealed.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So -- Well, that's a good point. The written arguments, in support of or in opposition to the request for each of these items, with the exception of Paragraph 6 at this time, I would think could be unsealed or submitted open, if you will, without prior request to and permission of the Court. Fair enough?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. And in that vein,
I filed a memorandum that relates only to Paragraph 6 and the State's argument there. So my memorandum probably just could be sealed.

THE COURT: That would remain sealed. Very well. The Court was also going to take up Paragraph 2 of the State's motions in limine today and that's covered by the part that has already been decided to be unsealed.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And that's a matter on which I have no doubt we'll reach a substantive stipulation at some point.

THE COURT: The State's Motion to Dismiss, I believe is already open. I don't think there's anything left to unseal there; is that correct, Counsel?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The defense motion, I don't think I filed one, Judge.

THE COURT: Right.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Right, I think that's unsealed.

THE COURT: And then there was also a defense motion concerning interference with right to counsel that $I$ was led to believe might be resolved by today, relating to the other person.

ATTORNEY STRANG: The cell mate?
THE COURT: Yes.
ATTORNEY STRANG: It's not even a motion, it's a notice.

THE COURT: True.
ATTORNEY STRANG: What I'm awaiting from the State, and I'm sure I will get when Mr. Kratz has five minutes, is an explanation of why this gentleman was in the jail at all. CCAP doesn't disclose a reason. I know that Mr. Kratz knows and he's commented about where the gentleman is now. So he has that information.

At this point I wanted the State and the Court to be on notice that we have a concern about cell mates and inquiry that may be made of Mr. Avery by cell mates. But as the notice itself says, I think at this point there hasn't been a "messiah problem" that arose as to that gentleman.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, do you have materials with you today that are hopefully going to resolve that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I have information. Actually, if the Court anticipates a mid-afternoon break, Mr. Wiegert from the Sheriff's Department can
provide that relevant information and I'm sure it will be to Mr. Strang's -- or that it will conclude the matter without further discussion with the Court.

THE COURT: All right. The last item up for consideration today is the defendant's motion to reduce bail which was also, I believe, submitted under seal. What's the position of the parties on that particular motion? Mr. Strang?

ATTORNEY STRANG: This is Mr. Buting's department.

THE COURT: Okay. Sorry, Mr. Buting.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: We're just talking on the sealing issue?

THE COURT: The sealing issue of the bail motion, correct.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, I have no reason that this could not be unsealed.

THE COURT: What is the State's position?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Well, Judge, this was what we had alerted the Court that would require some brief testimony. It deals with statements made by a co-defendant, which may or may not be admissible at trial. Quite frankly, Judge, the State doesn't -doesn't mind if it is unsealed and discussed. We
can certainly do that in open court.

As an officer of the court, however, I need to alert the Court, and I'm sure defense counsel understands, that portions of those statements may or may not be admissible. So I want to at least tell the Court that.

If we are getting into those statements, we can certainly do that in open court. That seemed an area, however, that was a little less clear about whether the Court wanted to air that in open court. But we are prepared to do so today, if the Court wishes.

THE COURT: Mr. Buting.
ATTORNEY BUTING: Again, I'm fine with unsealing it. I don't think there is any reason that it can't be.

THE COURT: Very well. The Court will allow that motion to be unsealed. And I will prepare an order regarding the documents to be unsealed, which I will submit for -- to the parties before $I$ sign it, just so everyone is in agreement.

ATTORNEY STRANG: There's one more document that's under seal, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
ATTORNEY STRANG: The -- I filed a motion
to suppress Mr. Avery's November 5 statement to a Marinette County detective and any products or fruits of that statement. The motion itself was not under seal, but I filed a supporting affidavit from Steve Glynn that has some pages from the discovery attached to it and, therefore, I sealed -- I filed under seal Mr. Glynn's affidavit, because it was my understanding if we were attaching discovery documents, it should be filed under seal.

All that said, $I$ don't think there's -you know, there's nothing all that terribly prejudicial in the document -- in the discovery documents that were attached to Mr. Glynn's affidavit. So I -- I don't feel strongly about keeping it sealed.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang -- Mr. Kratz, I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I have no objection to that as well, Judge. There was -- and I didn't know if the Court wanted to deal with the July 19th motions as well. This Marinette issue is to be dealt with, at least contemplated, partly today and partly on the 19th. And I noted the Court did not address other motions, including the other acts motions, which I'm sure should remain under seal.

But that having been said, I don't have any objection to the Marinette detective's reports, or at least portions of them included in Mr. Glynn's affidavit, to be made public.

THE COURT: Very well. I will include that as part of the order then.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Mr. Buting points out that there is one more document that remains under seal, which is the Defendant's Memorandum on Evidence of Wrongful Conviction and Accusations of Prisoners.

THE COURT: That sounds like it would fall under Paragraph 6 of the --

ATTORNEY STRANG: Some of it does and some of it concerns Paragraph 1. You know, we could -- I don't have a -- I was pretty circumspect in what I have said about the Paragraph 6 material in this memorandum; although, I did file this under seal. I don't have an objection to unsealing it.

And, indeed, maybe a good balance to strike here is there's probably about four lines of it that could be redacted with the rest of the document being unsealed. And obviously I, as the author, would handle the word processing task that I described earlier.

If the State would prefer that it not be redacted, then $I$ don't have an objection to unsealing it in the entirety.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: I don't have a position, Judge. I think Mr. Strang is correct, there isn't anything in there that is so prejudicial that it needs to remain sealed.

THE COURT: All right. I will include that as part of the Court's proposed order. Do the parties have a preference as to which motion they wish to present argument on first?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Is the Court contemplating receiving argument on the Change of Venue, Exclusion of the Sheriff's Department and Motion to Dismiss --

THE COURT: Yes.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: -- altogether, or did the Court want to receive separate argument on those? We certainly can since we -- we meaning defense counsel and the State -- have in one form or another presented the lion's share of the argument to the Court. I expect this Court wishes a very brief summary of the arguments as to those. I have no objection, Judge, to providing them en masse, that is, all three together, since they are interrelated.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang, are you going to be arguing these for the defense?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I am.
THE COURT: Any objection to combining your argument?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't.
THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.
ATTORNEY STRANG: I will start with Mr. Avery's Motion to Dismiss the five counts relating to Teresa Halbach. I was clear on the motion, but I will reiterate here that we have not moved to dismiss the felon in possession count, because I don't think the problems of which we complain relate anywhere near as strongly to that Count of the Amended Information.

The facts here, largely, are undisputed, your Honor. In terms of what -- what has happened. But I will simply review them as I understand them.

There have been eight news conferences of which I'm aware in this case. All eight of them have been set up by the State, presented by the State, as part of a decision, as Sheriff Pagel testified this morning, to disseminate information to the media and, thereby, to the
public, and to do so with control of the Calumet County Sheriff and the Calumet County District Attorney who serves here as Special Prosecutor, of course.

Each of those eight news conferences was broadcast, in full, by one or more, I think probably all, of the Green Bay television stations. Some of them were covered in full, or in large excerpt, by Milwaukee stations.

The defense appeared at none of those and there have been no news conferences called by counsel for the defense at any juncture, either current counsel or, to my knowledge, predecessor counsel, for Mr. Avery.

Of the State's eight televised news conferences, four of those came after formal charges, or a formal charge, was filed against Mr. Avery. The Court will have available to it, DVD's of all eight in full, but $I$ will represent to the Court, as an officer, that Steven Avery, by name, and then the Avery family more generally, are discussed in all eight of the news conferences, some of that incidentally, some of it in response to questions from media people, some of it just in the statements of Mr. Kratz or

Sheriff Pagel.
And, you know, to be clear, obviously, it's conceded by the defense that the locus of much of the investigated activity here was the Avery Auto Salvage property. So I don't cast dispersions or lay motives, in and of itself, to talking about the Averys, or the Avery family, or the Avery property that was the locus of many of the investigative steps here.

But it is clear that the Avery name, and Steven Avery's name in particular, was attached immediately in the news conferences, and then consistently in the news conferences, to the information that the State was making public. That included, at the March 1 and March 2 news conferences, the impetus of which we are told was the arrest, and then the plans to charge, and eventually the charging of Brendan Dassey. Impetus that may have been for the March 1 and March 2 press conference but, again, much of the content of both of those concerned Steven Avery. There have been claims of superior knowledge made -- salted throughout these various news conferences by either Mr. Kratz or Mr. Pagel. And I don't remember right now anyone
else speaking at them, although, I can't be certain.

Well, I take that back, I think Manitowoc County District Attorney Mark Rohrer spoke very briefly at one of them. And I know that others appeared on camera, but I don't recall them speaking, all of them law enforcement officers or representatives of the State. So not at every one of these conferences, but salted throughout, there are references to what the State now knows, or what is now clear.

And assurances to the public that law enforcement and the prosecuting authorities were in possession of information beyond that disclosed to the public and that they found, or viewed, the information known only to them as reliable and as informing their conduct and their decisions in the case.

One of the press conferences, March 2, 2006, was sufficiently graphic, or lurid, or colorful in its details, that Mr. Kratz did something I had not ever seen before, which is at the beginning, urge children under age 15, and friends or family members of Ms Halbach, not to watch. Essentially the State made an effort to
impose and $R$ rating on its final televised news conference here on something that it knew was to be broadcast in the media market covering this county and, therefore, the jury pool, during daytime hours.

There have been at least two other appearances by law enforcement figures on TV: One, a televised interview of Sheriff Pagel, as I recall. And that was a topic of some brief testimony by him earlier this morning.

And then, probably something that's drawn much more focus, a two part series run by WLUK TV, which is FOX 11 out of Green Bay, that featured prominently, although not exclusively by any means, Sheriff Kenneth Petersen from Manitowoc County who, it is undisputed, personally has next to no role in the actual investigation of this case, but who spoke as the chief law enforcement officer at the county level for Manitowoc County. That was aired two nights in a row, May 10 and 11. And I think the Court has already a DVD carrying the 17 plus minutes of those two segments.

I note, as well, that one of the early steps that I took, after undertaking
representation of Steve Avery, was to move for a, what we call locally, a gag order. The motion had a little bit more elegant title than gag order motion. But the gist of it was, that $I$ was moving to limit public comment.

From my recollection, and I'm sure the Court's notes or recollection are to be relied on, at least as much, if not more than mine, and the public record here. But my recollection is that the State did not join in that motion. And the Court, after some prompting to the parties to try to work things out in a reasonable way, eventually denied the motion.

The defense also, here, has sought an adjournment of the trial date, initially set for September 5; an October 16 date was proposed. The defense position, in a nutshell, was October 16 was better than September 5, but not sufficient. And that we thought an adjournment date into 2007 was necessary for adequate defense preparation and to permit a diminution in the publicity, and particularly the more inflammatory publicity that has attended this case from the outset, as Sheriff Pagel correctly anticipated back on November 5.

The State, as I recall it, agreed that on balance it was appropriate for the Court to adjourn the September 5 trial date, but the State preferred an October 16 trial date. And as we stand here today, it's the October 16 date that the Court has scheduled for trial on this.

So, I don't think there is any question that the publicity has been intense here, that at least to the extent of the eight news conferences and a couple of other televised appearances that I have described, that the State has participated actively in that; indeed, made a conscious choice to engage in the dissemination of information that way, publicly, as Sheriff Pagel testified this morning.

And that a foreseeable result of that would be to impair or threaten, put at serious risk, Mr. Avery's right to a fair trial at all, because some of this publicity has been statewide or even national, as the testimony acknowledged this morning. More specifically, has imperiled, put at risk, Mr. Avery's right to a trial at which citizens of Manitowoc County would serve as jurors.

Both of these are constitutional rights
that he has, the fair trial in general being both federal and state constitutions as providing the basis for those constitutional claims. And as to a trial in this vicinage, or a trial venued in Manitowoc County, the Wisconsin Constitution guarantees Mr. Avery that right.

Now, I don't disagree with the State's observation in the abstract, that sometimes constitutional rights come into tension with one another. Sometimes, one, a defendant, an accused, is put to a choice in, do I, for example, exercise my constitutional right to be heard at trial, as a matter of due process, by trying -- by testifying at trial, or do I exercise my 5th and 14th amendment and, for that matter, state constitutional privilege against self-incrimination by declining to testify, knowing that the State, then, can't comment on my decision not to testify and meet the charges.

That would be the classic dilemma or potential conflict of constitutional rights. The defendant who chooses to testify necessarily gives up the privilege in self-incrimination. The defendant who stands on that privilege, necessarily, then, can't testify in his defense
at trial and exercise that aspect of his due process right to be heard.

But that's not the kind of conflict of constitutional rights that the Court confronts this afternoon; that is, the constitutional rights we raise here. The right to a fair trial, the right to a trial in the venue in which the crime is alleged to have occurred, are not unavoidably in conflict as are self-incrimination and the right to be heard. And this isn't a situation where mere fate has caused these two constitutional rights to collide, where forces outside anyone's control, or as I say, fate, for shorthand, have put Steven Avery to an unhappy choice.

This is not fate, this is the State that has done this. The State has fostered the publicity. The State has contributed to the publicity. The State is not to blame for all the publicity, and I don't suggest for a moment that the State is.

Today we're being televised, I assume, or there will be newspaper reports about the proceedings today, and that's not attributable to the State. It doesn't lay at their feet. I
haven't attributed any fault, any wrong doing, to the Halbach family. They have entirely separate interests. Those interests are important, they are legitimate. They are not under the State's control.

And nobody is complaining here about statements that the Halbach family have made, or when they have been intruded upon by cameras, the way they have handled that. Although, there have been -- there has been other publicity.

So the State, you know, the State is responsible only for some of the publicity in this case. But that responsibility is significant.

When I looked around at cases, primarily on change of venue, $I$ find references to, you know, one short informational news conference, for example, Briggs (phonetic), the defendant not mentioned by name, purely an informational short news conference. Now, I can't say that there's no reported case in which there's been more than one news conference. I haven't seen one, but there may well be one.

Even in the State Courts of Wisconsin, I'm sure if $I$ cast a wider net, nationally or in
the federal decisions, I'm sure $I$ would find situations where there have been more than one news conference held by the prosecution, the State, the government, but eight is a great number. They were televised and these were not purely informational.

These included a great amount of detail, a fair amount of opinion, assertions of knowledge, as if that epistemologically were absolute, and based on information not to be disclosed to the public. In the case of March 2, the presentation was so graphic and I think effective, to give Mr. Kratz his due, that he himself warned some viewers not to watch.

And gave what I thought was a pretty effective opening statement or closing argument, running through a Criminal Complaint that was graphic and highly detailed; a Criminal Complaint that went well beyond what was necessary to establish fair probable cause against Mr. Dassey, in the information that it detailed, and then that Mr. Kratz repeated on television.

The participation of Sheriff Petersen hardly needs much further comment. I will go out on a limb and say that we will not find, in
reported decisions, another case in which the sheriff of the county in which the alleged crimes occurred opines not just that the defendant is guilty of the charged offense, but opines that if he's acquitted, somehow he will murder someone else in the future, on what possible basis, I have no idea, that assertion would be made.

I will venture further that the Court will not find a close analog to the chief county law enforcement officer in the affected county, describing with, or agreeing with a description of an accused person as a psychopath. And then suggesting further, in his own words, in a case having nothing to do with fraud, deception, that sort of wrong doing, that the defendant may be a con man.

This was really remarkable. Before we even get to the bizarre discussion of how it might have been easier to kill Steven Avery than to frame him. Off the charts.

And the direct participation of the sheriff of this county, his words, his image on TV, two nights in a row, in an interview that he said took about half an hour, that occurred in the second half of April, about five months into
the prosecution of this case and at that point almost four full months before the September 5 trial date that this Court anticipated. I will add also, the interview being given at a time when the defense already had made clear that we prefer, we want, a jury from Manitowoc County to hear this case.

So the conflict here in constitutional rights, the fair trial right, bumping up against the right to a trial in the proper venue, isn't one of fate entirely. There has been significant State action in creating that conflict. It's a choice to which the defendant ought not be put.

Because when the State takes action to interfere with any constitutional right, yet alone to bring two constitutional rights into direct contact so one cannot enjoy the one if he claims the other, the State is interfering with the defendant's constitutional rights, his bundle of trial rights assured by a Federal, in part, and the State, in full, Constitution.

And that's a denial of due process, it seems to me. I don't know what could be more fundamental to due process and to fair play than the State not interfering with, or impeding, or
imperiling the defendant's constitutional rights, particularly when they go directly to where the trial will be held and how fair that trial will be.

It is a fundamental denial of due process, in addition to an interference with the specific constitutional right at issue. That's, I think, what we have here. Dismissal is an extreme remedy. Dismissal is an extreme remedy. But we have also seen extreme conduct.

And if I thought there was some remedy short of dismissal, I understand -- I understand just how unpalatable that is to the public, how horribly unpalatable that is to the Halbach family, if they believe Mr. Avery guilty.

I understand how unpalatable that is to the Court, which sits as a neutral in this, but in all events sits to see that justice is done, which ordinarily means that causes are tried. Allegations are presented to a fact finder and they stand proven or unproven, but they are tried. So I understand this is unpalatable stuff.

Maybe I'm not smart enough to think of the lesser remedy that would remove the conflict
between the right to a fair trial and the right to a trial in this venue. The only alternative I have come up with, and I stand on, is to adjourn this trial for a number of months, into February, 2007, and to couple that adjournment with an order limiting the public disclosure by lawyers in this case and by law enforcement agencies involved in the prosecution of this case.

I think the Court has the power to do that. It's unusual to ask for an order limiting disclosure by law enforcement officers, but the Court in general has the right to control what witnesses say. And the Court has the right to preserve the integrity of the proceedings before it and to assure the rights to a fair trial that he enjoys as a matter of the constitution and that the public enjoys as a matter of common sense, as a matter of tradition in this country.

And although it's not a constitutional right for the public or the State, it's certainly a tradition, and a hope, and aspiration in this country, that the public too would have a fair trial. So maybe -- maybe an adjournment coupled with an order limiting disclosure, but I don't have more to offer, short of dismissal of the
affected charges. And, again, I tried to tailor that as best as I can to the problem.

So the first course, the one I prefer, is that the five counts relating to Ms Halbach be dismissed, without prejudice; without prejudice on the hope that at some point, if the State wishes to proceed, again, that that could be done without irreparable harm to the constitutional rights of the accused.

As a matter of second preference to adjournment, coupled with a pretty strong order eliminating public disclosure, that order would exclude the Halbach family, they would not be covered by it. And that order would exclude the defendant himself, because I don't think a Court can, or should, mute the accused himself, who has everything at stake in terms of his liberty, anything more than $I$ think the Court should mute or gag the family of someone who's been killed, who's been lost. Because that family has a great deal at stake emotionally and in seeking justice.

But I will say this, that I think Mr. Avery has been less voluble since Mr. Buting and I have arrived on the scene. Specifically, none of the Avery family members agreed to
comment for the FOX 11 report, for example, as the reporter, Lauren Cook notes at the end of both of those segments. I know that I have tried to keep my tongue in check with the media, not with 100 percent success, but I haven't had any news conferences.

And while it wouldn't be proper for the Court to order Mr. Avery to say nothing in asserting his innocence, $I$ will say, if he says anything, he's got his lawyers to explain that to. And he understands we won't be very happy. So those are the alternatives.

The third, and to us, least palatable alternative, is to change venue entirely in this case. Our motion is for relief under Section 971.22 of the Wisconsin Statutes. It is not an invitation to, or an invocation of, the use of Section 971.225.

We think that if venue has to be changed, as a least palatable alternative here, that the entire trial ought be moved to a less tainted county, in the hope that the jury there would not have to be sequestered and that we wouldn't visit that sort of imposition on 12 , or 14, or 15 , or 16 , citizens, depending on the
number of alternates the Court might pick for a trial that well could go five weeks or conceivably longer.

So, I prefer the dismissal. Failing that, an adjournment coupled with the restriction of public comment by law enforcement officers, as well as lawyers. And only last would I address change of venue.

Now, I have more to say about the change of venue, but $I$ want to end in -- for the moment, in talking about an adjournment. And this is new, I have something new to say on that. I have not put this in writing and I have struggled with how to say it, when to say it, and whether to say it, but I'm going to say it.

The Wisconsin legislature, acting rather rapidly on the last day of a special session, saw fit to decree that on this November's ballot for statewide and federal offices, the citizens of Wisconsin will be asked to give their advice, if you will, to vote, that is, on an advisory referendum on the death penalty.

Wisconsin has gone 153 years now without the death penalty. No state in the nation has an unbroken period of that length in administering
justice without killing people. That referendum will happen just about the time the State is resting its case, give or take a few days, or a week, in this trial, if this trial remains set for October 16th.

And in a state where, for example, in 1917 a bomb blew up and killed nine members of the Milwaukee Police Department; in a state that produced Ed Gein in the 1950's; in a State that produced David Spanbauer, in this neck of the woods, in the 1980's; in a state that produced Jesse Anderson, who was cynical enough to blame his own murder of his wife on a young black man figuring that would be the easiest guy to frame; in the state that in the 1990's featured Jeffrey Dahmer; in a state in which this horrible, alleged crime probably isn't even the worst Halloween crime in this part of the state, I guess that honor probably would go, dubious though it is, to Gerald Turner, in the late 1970's.

In a state with this history, Steven Avery now has become the poster child, the poster boy, for some politicians in pushing the death penalty referendum. Whether they like it or not,
to some degree, Teresa Halbach's life and death have been politicized with the death penalty.

And I tell you, I don't like it that Steven Avery, for whom I feel responsible for here, has become politicized with the death penalty. But that's how it's playing out. That's what's happening in our state capitol, and that's the reality in terms of the referendum the citizens face this November. And they ought not be going to the polls in the super heated atmosphere that this trial will produce, at least in the Manitowoc County and northeastern Wisconsin area.

His own jurors shouldn't be taking a day off to go vote on the death penalty referendum at about the time they have heard the best the State has to offer in this case and probably before the defense has been heard, or heard in full.

It's an unfortunate confluence. No one in this room is to blame for any of it. But -And, you know, I hesitated to address it.

The one, I feel very strongly about the death penalty in general. And, two, it's just one of these events out there in Wisconsin. But the fact is, and you see this if you go through
the media reports that I have assembled for the change of venue motion, the fact is, that politicians, and the media themselves, have linked the death penalty referendum to the prosecution of Steven Avery.

Senator Lasse from Depere, the principal sponsor of the death penalty referendum, said in televised interviews that he revised the wording that he had intended. He adjusted course on his referendum proposal because of the Steven Avery case, or the Teresa Halbach case. I don't remember whether he used her name or his, and they are, unfortunately, linked by this case.

But it was this set of events, that brings to the courtroom, that caused the principal author, he said on television, to revise his proposal. And this case simply is a link to it. It is not good democracy, in terms of this referendum, and it's certainly not good justice, in this particular case, to have these two things going on at the same time. So, in speaking on behalf of an adjournment, as the second of the three possible alternatives I have proposed here, I will close with that.

If we get to the change of venue issue,
the Court wanted me to be more specific about what was prejudicial about the publicity, and also to make a full record by submitting what $I$ have gathered on the publicity, and I will do that. But I'm going to yield the floor to counsel for the State on the initial matters I have addressed.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kratz, will you or Mr. Fallon be addressing?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I will, Judge. Your Honor, I have filed with the Court written argument as to the request by Mr . Strang to dismiss these charges as the appropriate remedy for what he describes as improper pretrial publicity. What Mr. Strang also identifies as the only logical remedy, I'm using his words, Mr. Strang recognizes in citing the 1968 case, the Schulter case, that dismissal due to pretrial publicity is not deemed an acceptable remedy, at least in this state, and has not been deemed an acceptable remedy when others are available.

The defense has available to it, not only increased care in the voir dire and jury selection process, but also that of change of venue. Both Schulter and Mendoza, certainly,
when read together, suggest just what Mr. Strang, I believe, already knows; that is, when change of venue is, and would be, an appropriate remedy. Even should this Court find the pretrial publicity to be improper, dismissal just is not an appropriate remedy.

I do not, Judge, intend to go through the purposes of the press conferences. I think Sheriff Pagel did a good job in doing that. This Court, however, needs to understand that the first half of those press conferences related to a missing persons investigation. Great care was taken never to identify Steven Avery as a suspect.

And, in fact, the purpose of those disclosures were to limit information. That sounds a little bit unusual that you would hold a press conference to limit release of information. But that's exactly what was done, was exactly the plan by the State, to disseminate very little information, only that necessary to request assistance of the public and to release information already made public, both which are allowed and prescribed under Rule 3.6 that I cited in my brief as well.

Let me also mention that -- things that Mr. Strang did not concede; that is, the admonition by the State when reporting the filing of the Complaints, that accused persons are presumed innocent. Not noting that, I believe, fails to recognize the very serious nature of these press conferences and the serious manner in which the State, particularly in which I, took them.

Care was taken not to prejudice Mr. Avery, not to unnecessarily identify him, and to move forward in the criminal prosecution of Mr. Avery with all deference and with all recognition of his constitutional protections. Objective, factual, non-editorial reporting is not prejudicial. That is something I will, however, also save for the change of venue discussion.

This Court can't, however, forget the facts of this case. This Court cannot forget the allegations of what happened to Teresa Halbach. And it is those facts, it is the way in which Ms Halbach was abducted, and killed, and mutilated, that has raised the intense media attention.

Mr. Strang may blame the State for that,
may say it was the State who was bringing the attention upon Mr . Avery, but this gentleman seated furthest to my right, who enjoyed a degree of celebrity, when you talk about a poster child, he enjoyed being the Innocence Project poster child, didn't shy away from media attention.

In fact he, together with his supporters and family members, continued to make allegations of being framed, of being set up. And their responsibility exists for members of law enforcement, including prosecutors, under Rule 3.6, to address just such comments made on the other side, to avoid improper publicity and improper inferences being raised.

So, Judge, not reiterating, but asking this Court to accept those arguments set forth in our motion, recognizing that the current state of Wisconsin law is to discount the possibility, or remedy, of dismissal of the charges, I'm asking the Court to reject that motion by the defense.

Secondly, the continuance of the trial is not an appropriate remedy. Mr. Strang's tying this case to the death penalty referendum is something that is improper. I can see why he was reluctant to mention it, because it has no place
in this courtroom. It has no place in this Judge's decision, whether or not to grant a continuance.

The final remedy, the change of venue, again, is something that the State is prepared to argue, is something that Schulter and Mendoza both provide for a Court, as a logical remedy, should the Court find that the publicity prevents a trial within this county for at least from jurors from within this county, and would ask the Court to deny this motion and move on, then, to the change of venue motion. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to issue a decision from the bench today on the motion to dismiss.

With respect to the venue motion I do have a couple of questions. First of all, I know in the original motion, Mr. Strang indicated that if the State opposed the motion, he requested an evidentiary hearing. I'm not sure that we have heard, on the record, yet, the position of the State on the motion, on the defense's motion to change venue, if it came to that. What is the State's position on the defense motion to change venue?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, first, Mr. Strang framed this issue as not inviting the Court to accomplish a change of venue in one manner or the other. That concerned me in addressing my position.

In other words, as I read Fonte, and the other change of venue cases, if this Court believes that pretrial publicity endangers the defendant's right to a fair trial, and this Court decides that a change of venue is appropriate, it's the Court's decision to decide how to accomplish that, whether to bring a jury from another county, or whether the entire trial moves.

By Mr. Strang imposing upon the Court what appears almost to be an ultimatum, that this Court is not invited to use one method or the other, again, is of concern. That's the preference, Judge -- or preface, excuse me, to my position. Should this Court agree with the State, that if pretrial publicity is believed to endanger the defendant's right to a fair trial, and if this Court believes it is the Court's responsibility on how best to accomplish that, the State does not intend to argue or to challenge the motion.

If this Court agrees, however, with Mr. Strang, that it is the defense's prerogative to preclude the Court from accomplishing change of venue, in one manner or another, the State very well may put the defense to its burden regarding the publicity and whether or not the change of venue is appropriate.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I understand what the State's position is yet. To be sure, it's the Court's decision to determine whether or not there is going to be a change of venue. I'm not sure that prevents the State from taking a position, either in support of or in opposition to the defense's request.

The defense is making a conditional request, as $I$ understand it, for change of venue. Its hope is, number one, that the Court will grant the defense's motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, number two, the Court will grant the defense's motion for a continuance of a trial date. But if the Court denies those two motions, I understand the defense to be asking for a change of venue. Is that a correct interpretation, Mr. Strang?

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's right.

THE COURT: What I'm asking you, Mr. Kratz, if it came to that, and because I'm taking these motions globally and together, today, if it comes to that, what is the State's position on the defense motion?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: But Mr. Strang also said, we're only asking for a change of venue if you move the whole trial to a different county. I don't think the defense can do that. And I read the statute as, they either ask for a change of venue or they don't. And it's the judge, then, who decides how best to accomplish that. If that's a correct reading of the law, I have no objection to the change of venue motion.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's fair. I mean there is a legal issue lurking here. I am suggesting that 971.22 does not automatically give the Court the power, over defense objection, to proceed under 971.225. Now, I'm not aware of any case law on the question on -- one way or the other.

But Mr. Kratz is right, to this limited extent, we are specifically making a motion, in the alternative, as the Court correctly described, to move the entire trial; that is, to pick a jury from another county, and in that
county to conduct the trial.
I'm not trying to impose anything on the Court. But I am arguing to the Court, or submitting to the Court, that here, where we have questions about the involvement of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department and, indeed, the Sheriff's Department of this county electively, on November 5, recusing itself from lead responsibility in this investigation, I'm asking, in effect, for the Court to hold the department to that, or to continue and keep in place that recusal, that stepping back, by not having the Sheriff's Department participate in contact with jurors here, unsupervised, any more than it participate in the collection of evidence, unsupervised, by other law enforcement agencies.

So, if we moved the trial to another county altogether, we would solve that problem. We would be using another county's sheriff's department to provide support to the Court in terms of witnesses, and courtroom security, and superintending the jury, and all the things that the sheriff's department, in the capacity as bailiffs, do.

So, yeah, I mean Mr. Kratz is right, I'm
not trying to impose anything on the Court. But he views -- he reads the statutes as leaving, entirely to the Court, the decision whether to proceed under 971.22 or 971.225 once the defense has asked, generally, for change of venue.

And I'm saying that on these facts here, the willingness of the defense to relinquish its constitutional right to a trial in this venue, hinges on the denial of the first two remedies we seek; and, finally, then, hinges on moving the trial altogether, if in fact we have to use jurors from a county other than Manitowoc. I don't know if that helps clarify or not.

THE COURT: So, setting aside for the moment the question of whether the Court alone has the power to utilize 971.225 as an alternative, you are saying, if the defense -- the defense position is, that if the Court does not dismiss the case and does not adjourn the trial, the defendant is requesting a change of venue, but only if the Court actually moves the trial to another county. And that if the Court -- if the Court's position was that it would consider a change of venue, if it only meant bringing jurors from another county here, then the defense would withdraw it's request for a change of venue?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right.

THE COURT: Assuming you have the power to do that?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. That's right. Mr. Avery would not relinquish his right to a trial in this venue under the circumstances the Court just outlined. I mean the Court has described our position exactly correctly.

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Kratz, it appears $I$ unfairly jumped on you. I didn't perceive what the issue was deciding the parties -- or dividing the parties. So the State's position, then, is what?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The State's position is, should the defense request this Court for a change of venue, $I$ have no objection to that change of venue. I'm confident in reading 971.225 that it then becomes the Court's obligation how best to accomplish that. Now that $I$ have 971.225 in front of me, I don't believe -- I'm quite confident the defense doesn't get to place that condition upon its request. They either ask for it, or they don't.

THE COURT: All right. Because of the criteria that apply, to evaluate a request for
change of venue, I'm not going to hear additional oral argument on that today. I think it depends, not exclusively, but in significant part, on not only the publicity the case has received but the nature of that publicity.

And I think the most effective way for me to evaluate your arguments on that issue is to get citations perhaps to specific news media accounts that relate most closely to your arguments and then have a DVD that I can look at to evaluate those arguments.

So I'm going to ask, I know the defense does, I'm not sure what the State's position is going to be but, Mr. Strang, to supplement your argument on the venue motion, which I understand to be a contingent or conditional argument, please address it in writing and direct me to those news media accounts which you wish to cite either as examples of a general theme or specific accounts. I don't think I'm going to look at every DVD that's in the box.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right.
THE COURT: I think I have a general idea what the publicity has been.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. And I very easily
can do that, your Honor, in fact, since I pulled out several pages of examples and put them down in writing already, I can just change that to a format appropriate for the Court.

And the Court is right, the way I approached this was to -- I will give the Court everything I have, and then in writing I can provide examples, some with specific dates, some just more general things to look for, and maybe with exemplars of the general problem. And in writing is just fine. That's no problem at all. Now, I have the boxes of the raw material, which if we have to have a fight over change of venue, I will want, as a matter of making a record.

THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY STRANG: But rather than making the Court search for needles in a haystack, I can give some examples.

THE COURT: And with respect to the prior argument on the Motion to Dismiss, I know that the news conferences play a more significant role in that motion, they may also relate to the venue motion as well. As I understand it, at this point there isn't a DVD that has those on, but the parties think they can get one.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's right. And I should take, obviously should take responsibility for that. They used to be online on wfrv.com and between the time I looked at them and watched them, and when Mr . Buting tried to do the same thing, they got taken down. I assume to save band width or something so what I'm going to do is, by subpoena or request to WFRV, or to one of the channels, try to get one or more, probably more than one DVD that has all of that footage, to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further on those three motions?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: So I'm clear, and I don't mean to belabor this issue, Judge, is the Court then unwilling to rule on whether or not the defense is legally able to make a conditional change of venue request? And here is why, I don't know how to respond.

There are 30 family members sitting behind me, there are 75 cops that are going to testify. I have a room full of evidence that I prefer not to trek over to La Crosse. And that is a very, very candid and very practical approach to how I mean to respond.

If the Court believes that the defense
has that ability, the Court believes that the defense can say, Judge, you are precluded under 971.225, despite saying the Court shall, you are precluded from making that decision. Then the State very well may put the defense to it's burden. Very well may argue that it was not inflammatory.

THE COURT: All right. Since the Court hasn't been focused on this particular issue until a few minutes ago, I can tell you for sure, I'm not prepared to rule on it today. I welcome you to submit written argument if you wish. And maybe the question is easy to address and maybe it isn't. I don't know, since I haven't looked at it until now. But you should submit your argument in writing.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Would the Court permit, and Mr . Strang permit, me to argue in the alternative; would that be acceptable?

THE COURT: Yes.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: All right. Thank you.
ATTORNEY STRANG: In terms of getting the written highlights or examples for change of venue purposes, does the Court have a date that I should meet?

THE COURT: How long do the parties believe
it will take them to submit their arguments to me? ATTORNEY KRATZ: I will need to see the DVD's from Mr. Strang and then we're able to respond. I doubt we can have this ready for decision by the 19th.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Okay. Now, what DVD's? I'm sorry, the news conferences or the 24 DVD's about pretrial publicity?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I understood that we were waiting for something from Mr. Strang by way of the news conferences but, also, there was going to be some opportunity that the Court provided the defense to supplement its argument as to change of venue. After I receive that, Judge, I can respond.

THE COURT: I think it's fair that the -since the State is at least reserving the right to oppose the change of venue request, that they have a right to see what the basis is for the change. So I think the defense is going to have to go first and the State is going to have to get a chance to reply.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I agree.
THE COURT: So with that in mind, Mr. Strang, I guess I ask you first, how long do you think it will take?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I really think that if I
had to, by the end of the week I could submit the written highlights of the publicity. I don't know how long it will take me to get the eight news conferences on to DVD, but I would think, certainly, by the 14 th that could be done. That's a reasonable target.

THE COURT: All right. So the defense by July 14th, and then, Mr. Kratz, what do you need for response time?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: A week is fine, Judge. I can have it by the 21st.

THE COURT: State by the 21st. Fair
enough. Anything else on those three motions?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge.
THE COURT: If not, we're going to take our afternoon break now and then resume. I think some of the other motions are a bit less time consuming than these were.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm sure they are, Judge. Thank you.
(Afternoon recess taken.)
THE COURT: At this time we'll go back on the record and move on to the next motion, which is the State's motion concerning Third Party Liability, or a Denny motion. And it's really in two parts.

The first is requesting that if the defense is going to -- or intends to introduce any evidence suggesting that someone else is guilty of the crime, other than Brendan Dassey, that they comply with the requirements of Denny, before the Court allows such evidence.

And, secondly, that the same standard be applied to any allegedly planted evidence; though, I'm not sure if -- in light of Mr. Fallon's response, if the State is still making that argument or not, that is, that the Denny standards be applied to any allegedly planted evidence.

First of all, with respect to the motion as it relates to Denny type evidence itself, I'm not sure that there's a disagreement between the parties. Counsel?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't think there is, although, that's Mr. Buting's motion to respond to. But I just want to make sure I have got the batting order, are we skipping over excluding the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, for now?

THE COURT: Well, let's see. Actually, I thought that the other arguments were including that one. I thought we were dealing with items 1, 2 , and
7.

ATTORNEY STRANG: No.
THE COURT: Well, let's do Denny and then we'll go back, as long as we're here.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, as to the first question you had, we recognize that Denny is the binding authority on third party evidence and that we would be required to comply with that as to any identified third parties, other than the co-defendant, obviously, Mr. Dassey. So I don't think there's any dispute on that particular point.

The dispute between the parties came on
whether Denny should apply to any so-called frame-up or planting kind of argument. And I think Mr. Fallon conceded that Richardson, State vs. Richardson, now makes it clear that Denny does not apply under those circumstances. And then the question becomes: What, if any, rules do apply to that, and whether there needs to be a pretrial motion and any sort of foundation laid. So that would be the area that would still be in dispute.

THE COURT: All right. In reading the arguments of both of the parties and looking at the issue, it struck me that even the planted evidence
matter could actually have two sub-issues. I could see how the defense could make such an argument, just as an inference from the evidence as it came in, without any independent evidence, or as in some of the cases -- and I forget which case it was -where they wanted to show evidence that the officer had committed similar offenses, if you will, against other arrested defendants, that there actually would be other independent evidence of planted evidence.

Let me deal with the first issue first.
If the -- Does the State feel that the defense has to do anything special to argue from evidence, as it comes in from the State, that evidence may have been planted, just as a logical inference from the evidence that the State introduces?

ATTORNEY FALLON: Thank you, your Honor. Yes, we do. I think the best way to characterize this issue is in this light. I would submit to Court, and Counsel, that it is an entirely different argument, a far different argument, to say that the constable has blundered and negligently collected the evidence, negligently transported the evidence, negligently cared for the evidence.
That's one argument. And I would
suggest they are free to make that argument and ask the jury to draw whatever reasoned inference, from that, they choose to draw, during the course of the deliberations.

However, the argument that the constable is crooked, is an entirely different argument to be offered, with respect to the presentation of evidence, the collection of evidence, the storage of evidence, the transportation of the evidence and, hence, the actual -- the integrity of the evidence itself.

The point of the State's argument is simply this, if that is the argument, if that is the inference the defense chooses to have the jury draw from the presentation of evidence, then we ought to know what that evidence is.

It is clearly -- As I argue in the brief, it clearly contemplates consideration of a variety of potential issues: The integrity of the officers, or the citizens, or whomever may be involved in the evidence which is at issue. The Court cannot make a determination of relevance and, hence, balance the competing interest to determine the admissibility of evidence, if we don't know what the evidence is, if we don't know
what the issue is.
As I suggest in my -- in the written argument, waiting until the trial to deal with objections as to the admissibility of evidence, or the appropriateness of certain arguments relative to inferences drawn from the evidence, waiting to the point of trial is not practical, nor logical. By analogy, any other trial in which evidence of this type, or similar type, is always handled pretrial, there's always a question as to its admissibility.

And while, for instance, the State may very well be prepared to concede relevance, depending on what the evidence is and what the argument is and what the theory is, conceding relevance does not in any way mean that the evidence would be admissible. And we're simply asking for the notice, and the opportunity to be heard, relative to that particular type of evidence.

So, again, it comes down to, there's a big difference regarding negligent handling of evidence and deliberately contaminating or tampering with the evidence, which goes to the very essence of the trial's goal, which is to
search for the truth. So anything that in that way suggests impropriety, challenges the fairness of the trial itself, ought to be handled pretrial.

We normally do that in a whole host of whether it's other acts motions, which we will be doing in a couple weeks, whether it's a rape shield issue. There are certain types of evidentiary issues which must be handled pretrial. And the obvious -- or the policy reason is that we have more time to think about the impact of that evidence and those arguments, and weigh the competing inferences and do the balancing test that Section 904.03 suggests.

And that's the point of our motion. If you look at Richardson and you don't look at the Supreme Court case, Holmes vs. South Carolina, even in that case, they dealt with the issue pretrial. And in Denny it's a pretrial issue, and in Scheidell, which dealt with unknown third party evidence, it's handled pretrial.

And when you look at that interplay between the statutes at issue, 901.04, 904.02, 904.03, the Court talked at length as to the interplay of that. And the whole idea is to
avoid surprise, waste of time, confusion. And I think there's a very distinct possibility of a possible mistrial, if we don't handle that evidence correctly.

And it just seems to me that we should deal with that upfront and not in the middle of the trial, and not have an argument and have to delay the trial for a day or two, which is often the remedy, if there's a problem in that regard. So that's the point of our motion, we would just like a little notice. We may very well concede the relevance, and it's possible, we might even concede the admissibility. Possible, but not likely, but that's a possibility.

So the question then becomes, what is the evidence, how can we -- how can the Court fulfill its function of applying the rules of evidence to engage in the balancing test, and to provide the parties sufficient notice to prepare the case and present it as smoothly as possible. That's what the whole point of the pretrial motion practice is.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Buting, are you going to handle this?

ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes, I am, Judge.

THE COURT: Fine.
ATTORNEY BUTING: I think the Court, really, in its introductory remarks, distinguishes what is going on here; and that is, that I think the State has sort of muddied the issues together, the question of whether or not the defense can argue reasonable inferences from the evidence that they present, or that the defense themselves presents, versus whether the defense can introduce extrinsic evidence of other -- perhaps other cases where officers committed misconduct.

That was the case, I believe Missouri -State vs. Missouri, a recent Court of Appeals case, where the defense was that the officer was biased against Missouri, the defendant, as evidenced by his bias and racial bias in numerous other cases. And the Court of Appeals said, that comes in.

Not only can they challenge his bias towards this individual defendant, but that they could use extrinsic evidence from his past cases to support the bias on this case. That's very different than what the State seems to be arguing though.
What they seem to ask for is something
much more radical than Richardson. Richardson dealt with extrinsic evidence. First of all, the State filed a motion in limine, as I understood the procedural history, to exclude two collateral pieces of extrinsic evidence. Not to prevent any argument that the defendant may make that he was being framed by his ex-wife, but to prevent testimony from the ex-wife, or the divorce attorney that she had called and made some kind of accusation. And the other item was that the defendant had successfully obtained a child abuse injunction against the ex-wife.

Well, the Court said that Denny, first of all, did not apply to those kinds of requests for evidence, and then the Court went through this 901.04 or .03, I think, type of analysis and -- because it was extrinsic evidence. And in that case, they said it was very much collateral because there was -- And, actually, there's one paragraph in that decision that troubles me that may, frankly, be overruled by Holmes vs. South Carolina. And that's Paragraph 27 of Richardson, where they sort of do a weighing of the State's evidence when they are trying to determine what is the probative value of the defense proffered
evidence.
They go through the whole State's case, including the fact that this young girl had physical evidence of a sexual assault, that there was semen, that there was three or four other things that certainly made it look like his claim was -- was of little probative value, his claim that the ex-wife was framing him who, by the way, was not even the mother of the child who was accusing him. So he had a rather tenuous argument there.

I think under Holmes vs. South Carolina, that whole analysis is, frankly, very questionable. Because they say you can't do that, you can't analyze, just look at the one side to determine if there is strong forensic evidence, or if there's strong whatever kind of evidence, that somehow that affects the admissibility of the defense.

But, again, Richardson was very, very different, because it really was not talking about whether or not the defense needs to provide notice to the State if they are going to challenge the State's evidence. I have said it as clearly as $I$ can say it in our response and
we're giving them notice now. Mr. Avery is challenging the State's evidence, including the forensic evidence. And we're going to put them to their proof.

And as a party to a litigation, we have a right to challenge the authenticity of evidence, first, to see if it could even come in; chain of custody, whether its been properly maintained; and then even if it does come in and is relevant, we have a right to challenge its reliability, its integrity, the credibility of the officers who seized it.

All of that is fair game. That is direct physical evidence in this case. It's not extrinsic. It's not some other case, or some tangential argument. So, what they are asking is -- is an absurdly high burden.

They want us, the defendant, in his own case, to be able to apparently show who -- if there is any evidence of a frame-up, or any argument, or innuendo, or inference to be made, that first the defense has to be able to show who did it, how they did it, how many people are involved, who else knows about it.

Now, how could a defendant possibly do
that, in any case, if the allegation is that the misconduct is on the part of the police. That may or may not be the allegation that's raised here.

The integrity of the evidence that appears to indicate Mr. Avery's involvement is very much going to be in play, whether it's something the police did or something someone else did. But we are free to argue any reasonable inference that comes from the evidence presented, as to how that evidence was found, seized, and secured, from that point forward, and tested, if it's forensic evidence.

Indeed, nowhere, I was able to find no case anywhere in this country that has ever -and the State has certainly cited none -- that has ever held what they are asking, to somehow prevent an entire defense argument, from reasonable inferences of physical evidence in the defendant's own case, to somehow go through this whole relevance and balancing test.

The Court doesn't have to go through that whole balancing test if we're talking about arguments from the evidence or inferences from the evidence. There are no cases that talk about
that, because that's not required.
That would be required if we were seeking to introduce extrinsic evidence, such as, for instance, that one of the officers in this case had committed some misconduct in the past that was related to this. Then we would be filing a motion, and we would go through that sort of analysis, and the Court would have to weigh and go through the balancing test.

But they are, as I understand the State's motion, at least it's written motion, going way, way, way beyond that. And I think the Court accurately distinguished those two issues in its initial comment. So if we intend to introduce extrinsic evidence of some misconduct in other cases, then I anticipate we would be filing a motion.

But we do not need to file any motion, or give any further notice than we have today, to the State, that we intend to challenge all of their evidence they marshal against Mr. Avery.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Fallon, let me ask you a question. Because I -- There might be one argument being made one way, or a different answer being given the other way. To go back to the prelim
in this case, $I$ just recall it vaguely, but the car key was found on the carpet, and I think the testimony was that there had been a couple police run-throughs through the room where the key was found. And on the third time they found it. And I think -- Let's say the defense wants to argue that, well, since the key wasn't found the first couple times, that one logical reading is that somebody from the police department planted the key and that's how they found it the third time.

If that's what happened, if the State's evidence would come in as it did at the prelim, and the defense didn't introduce any other evidence on the issue, but simply made that argument, are you saying that they have to meet some burden, or produce something, or notify the parties and the Court ahead of time, that they are going to make that argument? Or is it just if they -- if they want to argue, as Mr. Buting said, that they had some evidence that some member of the police department had been guilty of planting evidence in the past, say, and put that in?

I think they are admitting that if they
want to introduce any extrinsic evidence they would have to provide advance notice, but I think the question comes down to, aren't there times when they just want to argue, based on the evidence as it's come in, that some evidence was planted. What do they have to give a notice of? ATTORNEY FALLON: If you are going to make the argument -- If you are going to make the argument that somebody put that key there, then it seems to me the State should have the opportunity to examine and question. It's a lot easier to make an allegation of police misconduct than there is to prove it.

And what we're trying to avoid, is this trial becoming a whole series of allegations of police misconduct which are not supported by fact. I suppose you could make the argument that that's a "reasoned" inference; although -reasoned is in quotes -- from those particular facts. But I have already obtained -- We have already obtained one concession right now, because the defense is clearly saying that any extrinsic evidence that would require a motion. That's fine, then we're half way home. That's exactly what we're looking for. If they are
acknowledging the fact that they are going to bring in any type of extrinsic evidence, that's fine.

But, okay, the key is planted there. Well, who was there? Well, we know the officers who were involved in the search and we know the officer who uncovered the key. So, is there then -- Are we led to believe there's a conspiracy? Seems to me the conspiracy, for instance, is a reasonable inference. And if we're going to have inferences alleging conspiracy, conspiracy is one of those things that always requires a pretrial motion. Obviously, it's usually the State which is seeking to introduce evidence of conspiracy, but not always. It's sometimes offered by the defense as a theory.

And in Richardson, that involved somewhat of an extrinsic evidence, but it clearly set forth the analysis, that if you're going to reach to make an argument, or an inference, then you have to have a reason to make that reach, that argument, that inference. And, again, I come down to, it's a far different argument that the constable is crooked than the constable blundered.

They can make whatever argument. I don't challenge their ability to question every bit of evidence we produce, the manner in which it was collected, preserved, maintained, transported. They are free to do that.

But I take issue with the fact that we can willy nilly walk in an accuse police officers of misconduct. To me, before that evidence is submitted to the jury and argued to the jury, there ought to be a reason for that, for not every argument and not every inference, although relevant, should be heard.

THE COURT: All right. Well, in the example I gave, I mean, are you arguing that they -What you are really arguing, I think, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, so I will give you a chance to respond. But are you really arguing that the defense should have to provide notice of the argument it is going to make -- or that the defense is going to make, from the facts as they come in? Because there could easily be a scenario where the defense has no more facts than the state introduces, they just argue that there's a different inference from those facts.

In the example I gave, I think as I
recall the testimony, was that the key fell out or something. I don't want to get into the facts because, number one, my memory isn't that good. But if the defense wishes to make an argument of evidence being planted, simply based on the way the evidence is introduced on examination and cross-examination of the State's witnesses, what do they have to provide notice of?

ATTORNEY FALLON: I guess I'm envisioning you are taking one bit of evidence and looking at it in isolation, to draw an argument or an inference, and is that appropriate. And it seems to me that whether you are defending or prosecuting a case, that there are lines of evidence, there are theories of evidence, there are themes, there are admissibility strains, as it were.

And it's hard to analyze and accept the Court's proposition of looking at, for instance, the key, in isolation. I mean, there's a lot of other physical evidence that is subject to dispute. And just as an example, there is a fair amount of blood evidence obtained from the vehicle of the victim here. Well, how did that blood evidence get there?

And there's a fair amount of other
physical evidence collected elsewhere, from the garage of Mr. Avery, for instance, so how does that get there? So, are we just saying that, and can the defense just, willy nilly, say, well, we think that piece was planted and this is not. How do you make the argument? That's my concern. How do you make that argument in isolation? How do you tie it all together? Or is it just, rudimentally, they can make the argument because it is the defense and, therefore, it's admissible? That's a reasoned inference?

Because you have to -- I guess the point I'm trying to make, and I'm not being very artful, is that you have to look at the evidence as a total, as it is anticipated to come in. Admittedly, that's difficult. But generally we have a pretty good idea of what the evidence will be in this particular case; although, some of it is still the subject of motion and debate.

But I don't think you can make a determination as to whether or not a particular inference is reasoned, under the circumstances, until you consider everything. And if somebody wants to make the argument that there's a
planting of evidence, or that Mr . Avery is being framed, it seems to me that there ought to be proof of that.

It may be in extrinsic form or, to borrow a phrase, it may be intrinsic. It may be directly related to the case. But if you are going to make that argument, or you are going to introduce evidence of that, then we ought to know what it is. I'm more concerned about the evidence than the argument.

THE COURT: But that's a big "or" there, because I think as I hear the defense, they are saying, if they do intend to introduce evidence, that they will provide notice. I don't know, Mr. Buting, maybe now is the time to ask whether I'm reading too much into what you are saying.

But that's the way I understood you to say, that if the defense was going to offer any extrinsic evidence relating to the issue of planted evidence, that the defense would provide notice, but that you didn't feel that you had to make any pretrial offer if you were simply going to argue, from the evidence as it came in, that some evidence could have been planted.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes. Well, if we sought
any extrinsic evidence that's not related to the evidence directly in this case, then, yes, we would have to go through that, file a motion, I think -or we would. And then the Court could go through that balancing test. If it relates to the evidence in this case, it's fair game for us to challenge it in any way we can, whether it's by calling our own witness or cross-examining their witnesses.

This whole notion, that somehow the Court decides ahead of time what's a reasonable inference that we can argue, is absurd. That's for the fact finder. A party can argue any reasonable inference from the evidence.

Now, if our inferences are just totally absurd, then the State will get up there on its rebuttable argument and make that very argument to the jury. And the jury, collectively, will decide whether or not the inferences that the defense is advancing are reasonable or not.

And that's -- As I understand it, he seems to be trying to take that away from the defense and put -- making the Court rule in advance what -- whether or not any reasonable -or whether or not any inferences we want to argue from their evidence should even go to the jury.

And that's a complete denial of the defense's right to present a defense, a constitutional right to present a defense. And, again, there's no case law anywhere that says that. Because it's clear that the jury is the one that decides whether or not something is reasonable.

You know, I don't see anything that unusual about a defendant getting up and challenging the police for misconduct or otherwise. Think about -- Think about drug cases, hand-to-hand deliveries, dropsy type cases. Defendants do that all the time, where the defendant testifies one way, the police officer testifies another.

You know, that's not negligence that's being alleged by the defendant in those cases. The defendant is saying, I'm telling the truth and the officer is not. You don't have to file a motion ahead of time to do that, that's fundamental.

And so, if somehow the notion that in this case it's different, and that we cannot go off willy nilly accusing the police of something, you know, if the State or its witnesses put themselves in the position in this case where
they are subject to that kind of attack, and the jury finds that it's a reasonable inference to be drawn, then we can do that, plain and simple.

THE COURT: Mr. Fallon.
ATTORNEY FALLON: Again, I'm less worried about whatever argument they choose to make. I'm more concerned about what evidence they choose to introduce in support of that argument, or that inference.

The key is one thing, but when you consider the amount of physical evidence, for instance, taken from the vehicle, the vehicle wasn't processed by anyone from Manitowoc County. It wasn't processed even at the scene. It was processed at the Crime Lab in Madison. So if you're going to challenge the evidence, it necessarily involves introduction of extrinsic evidence, almost.

What about the other physical evidence that was obtained, in this particular case. Counsel is correct to a degree, he can make whatever argument he wishes to make. And if the jury rejects it out of hand, then they are stuck with that.

Again, our concern is, and the motion
is, frame-up evidence, not frame-up argument. So, just to be clear on that, and perhaps we got sidetracked on inference and argument as opposed to evidence, the motion is focussed on what evidence is there of a frame-up that's going to be introduced.

And that's the question, admittedly. And they have conceded, if they are going to introduce extrinsic evidence, then it would require a motion. That's fine. We're comfortable with that. But it just seems to me, that if that's going to be the tact, we ought to be able to talk about that and determine how that evidence is going to be used. That's the point of the motion, not so much the argument or the inference. So I should be clearer.

THE COURT: On the issues that relate to this motion, there was one other one. I think in Mr. Kratz's original argument, he indicated that he felt the Holmes case modified Denny, but it seems to me that if the result had been different, it might have modified Denny, but that the Holmes -- that the South Carolina Supreme Court result was reversed. ATTORNEY FALLON: Right. THE COURT: Was it not?

ATTORNEY BUTING: But I'm not so sure that
Holmes does anything for us, other than suggest that this should be discussed pretrial. Because Holmes did deal with third party liability. It did deal with an identified, informed third party that was suspected of committing the crime.

And the actual focus is whether or not the South Carolina rule of evidence went above and beyond what other courts have held; in other words, above and beyond, say, our Denny rule. And I think it clearly did in that case and that's why the United States Supreme Court reversed that conviction and sent it back.

So, it didn't deal with frame-up
evidence per se, but it is instructive for the proposition, I think, that it's the type of issue that's appropriately discussed pretrial. But I think Richardson is the closest we have.

THE COURT: All right. I will allow either side to correct me, but $I$ don't really detect that there's a big disagreement between the parties here. I think, number one, both parties agree that Denny is still good law, Denny applies, and that if the defense wishes to suggest that some third party, other than Mr. Dassey, is involved in the crime, the
defense will have to comply with the requirements of Denny.

Number two, that if the defense wishes to introduce any extrinsic evidence to suggest that evidence was planted, or the defendant was framed, the defense will have to seek the admissibility of that -- of such evidence before the trial and have the matter addressed at that time.

But, third, if the defense wishes to argue, that the evidence as it comes in and is offered by the State, subject to cross-examination by the defense, without any extrinsic evidence being offered, that the defense is not prohibited from making such an argument, and the defense can argue that different inferences than those suggested by the State can be accepted by the jury.

That's what I'm hearing here. And I'm not -- I'm not detecting that the parties differ on this motion.

ATTORNEY FALLON: I accept your explanation and summary of those arguments.

THE COURT: Mr. Buting?
ATTORNEY BUTING: I think we're clear, if
we have the same understanding of extrinsic evidence, I guess. That would be evidence that's not related to this case. If there's evidence that we could present, I can't really think of any analogy right now, but -- so it's probably foolish to speculate at this point.

But I -- Again, if it relates to the actual physical evidence in this case, and it somehow relates to authenticity, or chain of custody, I do not accept, by the way, the State's claim that somehow there was no opportunity for this to have been tainted by anyone, that the vehicle could not have been tainted. I don't accept that. And I don't think the evidence will show that.

But, certainly, anything that would go to chain of custody, or authenticity, or credibility, or reliability of the State's -- or bias -- of any of the State's evidence, or witnesses presenting the evidence, is fair game, and is not extrinsic. In fact, it is very clear, bias is not extrinsic to a case, authenticity is not. All of those fundamental building blocks is what I'm talking about. THE COURT: Mr. Fallon.

ATTORNEY FALLON: To the extent of the comments on bias, and those other things, that's fair game. But I do foresee a possible argument on the scope of extrinsic. But as counsel has stated, those comments there, we can live with that.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will prepare its own ruling, written decision, on this motion.

All right. Then moving back to the defense motion to exclude members of the sheriff's department from testifying and overseeing jurors. Mr. Strang, are you handling this one?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I am. Or trying to. There's conceptually two parts to this motion: One, supervision of jurors, or contact with jurors. And, two, exclusion as a witness from the State's case-in-chief. Let me address supervision of jurors first.

We learned today, that on November 5, the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department decided to turn over responsibility for the investigation to other departments and to play a background role. And then we learned that the Calumet County Sheriff, according to the policy of having
someone from another department look over the shoulder, so to speak, of any Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department employee who's involved in the investigation.

Really, what we're asking for here is a continuation of that decision by the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department and, in a sense, that policy that the Calumet County Sheriff implemented. There is, you know, a department that was concerned enough about a conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict, to take itself out of investigative responsibility and turn it over to two other departments that then were concerned enough about potential conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict, that, you know, they provided a chaperone, or an accompanying officer, from another department, any time a Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department employee was involved at the scene.

Certainly, I think ought to be -- I'm not sure why you would oppose, then, implementing that same thinking when you are not talking about an investigation, and a scene, and collection of evidence, but rather talking directly about
contact with the fact finders in the case.

And if -- if we simply extend this
recusal, or sort of turning over of
responsibility from the scene, to the jury, and the fact finding process in this case, we would have law enforcement officers, other than the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, serve as bailiffs, move the jury to and fro, move the defendant to and fro, if he were to remain in custody.

It's -- I think it's really not much different. Indeed, the argument for it is more compelling when you are talking about dealing directly with jurors, because they are the fact finders rather than just talking about the assembly of evidence, or the processing of potential evidence at a scene.

The fact is, that in any trial, the Court is left to rely on court officers, bailiffs, you know, usually Sheriff's Department personnel in this State, but I will call them court officers here. You have to rely on them heavily. They are the point of contact with the jury, at the beginning of the day, at the end of the day, lunch, if a jury is sequestered.

These people are housed in the hotel with the jurors. They are transporting the jurors. They are supervising what jurors can see and who they can talk to. And there isn't anybody looking over their shoulder. There is no one from an independent law enforcement agency to look over their shoulder.

Now, I don't have any question about the ability of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department to do that, in the ordinary case, just as they would investigate the ordinary crime in Manitowoc County, rather than recusing themselves because of concerns about a conflict, or the appearance of one.

But in that sense, this case was tabbed on November 5, by the Manitowoc County Sheriff, well, or more accurately, by his under sheriff, as not the ordinary case, as requiring a different response. And that -- that really ought to extend to contact here with the jury, particularly if we -- if we have got a sequestered jury.

The trial, obviously, should be fair and it also should appear to be fair to the public, and to the defendant, and everybody else who is
interested in it. I think it's an unusual case. It's an unusual request. But it's pretty well matched to the situation which we find ourselves, where the department itself decided that it ought not be the front line in the investigation and the collection of evidence.

So, as to that first part, I guess to some degree I'm adopting the reasoning that we have already seen Sheriff Petersen describe to his under sheriff, and seen Sheriff Pagel implement at the scene.

As to the second part, excluding Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department witnesses from the case-in-chief, Mr. Fallon, who is a very good lawyer, and a neat colleague and, you know, I enjoy his company and his work, but he's very deftly turned this and redefined this as a defense request for suppression.

It's not. Not looking to suppress any physical evidence. Not looking to suppress any testimony, actually. What I'm looking for, what I'm asking the Court to do, is to exclude particular witnesses as a limited sanction, only from the State's case-in-chief, so the defense could call them, or the defense could open doors
on cross-examination during the State's case-in-chief.

It would permit, then, the State to call in members of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department in rebuttal. And if, indeed -- if, indeed, Sheriff Pagel is right, and at least as of November 5 this policy of always having an independent law enforcement agency person accompanying any Manitowoc County law enforcement officer, if that indeed was complied with, was made practice, not just policy, then I don't know how the State even would be impeded in presenting it's case-in-chief, by the relief that I'm requesting.

Because there always would be somebody from DCI, or somebody from the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, or someone from the State Patrol, or some other agency, to testify to what was happening when a Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department employee was present. It's a little hard to know why -- why the State even would object to the exclusion, but they are, the State is.

And this is really, $I$ think, not akin to suppression, but something much closer to the
kind of sanction a Court might impose on a party in a civil case, when that party fails timely to disclose witnesses, fails timely to respond to interrogatories, or requests for production of documents.

It's the sort of sanction that is used for a failure of timely disclosure, or timely action in civil cases, regularly. Used occasionally, at least, in criminal cases for the same sort of disciplinary reason on lawyers who may be dilatory, or not following the rules.

And here the -- you know, the remedy is even more closely matched to the problem, in the sense that the Manitowoc County Sheriff, I think, conducted himself very poorly, to put it mildly, on FOX 11. Made highly inappropriate and inflammatory comments directed, by name, at Steven Avery. I went through some of them before.

I didn't touch on, you know, the sheriff dredging up and discussing on television, prior criminal acts and convictions dating back more than 20 years. It's the kind of stuff, he's been around long enough to know, juries aren't suppose to hear and, ordinarily, don't hear. It's at
least potentially inadmissible and highly prejudicial information.

So, you know, there -- this wasn't one stray comment at issue here. And he is the man who leads the department. He is the man who sets the tone. He is the man who makes the directions. He's the principal, if you will, and the others under him in that department are agents. And so this, $I$ think, is a remedy that's pretty well tailored to the problem, as to exclusion of witnesses, on the basis that I have sought.

THE COURT: Mr. Fallon. By the way, I have read your written arguments and I will read them again. So you don't have to be repetitive. ATTORNEY STRANG: That's a very kind way of saying that I'm long winded.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Thank you, Judge. I just want to make a couple of points. First and foremost, remedies should be connected to the wrong. And in this particular case, the defense seeks to exclude from participation in the administration of the jury selection process, and court security, the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department without, in any way, shape, or form, connecting the comments of

Sheriff Petersen to concerns that somehow members of his staff can't follow your instructions, can't follow the common sense, and what is, in effect, a policy that, from even Sheriff Petersen's comments this morning, run itself.

He's given no orders, no instructions, no information to his staff, per him, other than do what you guys usually do, make it safe, etcetera; in other words, follow the policies that we have. There is no connection between the comments and a concern that somehow members of his staff are going to contaminate the jury pool.

That's outrageous. There is not a single shred of information that connects those two.

If the defendant has concerns about security for himself, or courtroom security, and wants the Calumet County Sheriff's Department to continue, as it were, and take over all facets of this particular case, then we might as well have the trial in Calumet County.

Are we going to bring the entire Calumet County Sheriff's Department here and let them set up camp across the courtyard here, and tell the Manitowoc folks how to run the jail, how to walk the prisoner over, and don't talk to the jurors,
don't say anything about the case, don't even talk about the weather. Do we need Sheriff Pagel to do that?

Again, let's have the trial in Calumet County, if we're going to rely on everything else Calumet County has to resolve. And in that regard, depending on what this Court chooses to do relative to the motion to admiss (sic)/adjourn/change of venue, depending on how you resolve that issue, the change of venue may very well moot this issue out.

With respect to exclusion and suppression, rather than trade compliments with counsel on deftability to craft an argument, I will simply make this observation. If you say that a witness can't testify, then it may very well make it difficult for information collected by that witness, to present it in court. So if the witness can't testify, then perhaps some further pretrial motion practice and perhaps some testimony, not perhaps, definitely, some testimony at the trial will be affected.

Perfectly example, Detective Remiker was the one -- was the first law enforcement officer, I believe, on the scene, to verify the location
of Teresa Halbach's car, on Mr. Avery's property. Now, that's obvious, because he's here in Manitowoc County, where as the folks in Calumet County have to get in their car and drive here. So, it only stands to reason that the first person here is going to be someone from Manitowoc County.

So, if we're saying, for instance -- and this is a for instance -- Detective Remiker can't testify, then that certainly creates some issues regarding the circumstances, regarding the preservation of the evidence and the scene, until the official takeover takes place. So, in terms of deftness or clever, you can certainly make the argument that, well, we're not asking for the suppression of evidence, we're just asking for an exclusion of a witness. Well, that may very well impact the nature and the presentation of the evidence.

And, finally, to say that it's not suppression is a rather interesting issue. For instance, if the statement of an accused in a case is suppressed, for reasons of a Miranda violation, that testimony may still be heard, perhaps in rebuttal, or in an impeachment form,
should that given witness take the stand.
But it's still referred to as suppression. It's not necessarily referred to as exclusion. So whether or not you characterize it as exclusion or suppression, $I$ think it doesn't matter. The real connection is, is that the appropriate remedy.

In Hudson vs. Michigan and State vs.
Ward, clearly tell us it's not. And the reason it's not is because the harm, i.e., the comments of Sheriff Petersen are entirely unrelated to, not connected to, the evidence which is sought to be excluded.

And if, for instance, we are not to be impeded, and this is not that big a deal, I can't imagine why the State is troubled, your Honor, then my question is, if it's not meant to impede us, then why bring it. It makes no sense. The remedy must be connected to the wrong. And in this case, it's not.

THE COURT: Mr, Strang, anything else?
ATTORNEY STRANG: Yeah. As he did on brief, Mr. Fallon expresses a good deal of concern and distress with me that $I$ have not connected Sheriff Petersen to the people under him in the
department. And, indeed, I'm not trying to impugn the gentleman sitting here, or anybody else in the department. I'm simply following Petersen's lead, and Pagel's.

I mean, the Court wouldn't know this, but in his deposition, Sheriff Petersen testified that he's the last remaining member of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department who was involved in the 1985 case against Steven Avery. Last one, who was around in 1985. Most of the deputies, $I$ imagine, in this department, were in Junior High School in 1985.

None of the current Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department personnel were named as parties in the civil lawsuit that occasioned this concern about a conflict of interest. As far as I know, nobody had any specific concerns about, you know, Detective Remiker, or Sergeant Jost or anybody else on the Sheriff's Department, and yet all of them, by the department, were taken out of lead responsibility, for an investigation of crimes that occurred in Manitowoc County and ordinarily would be within their jurisdiction.

So, I'm just simply picking up on the same connection, as a matter of agency law, that
the under sheriff and Sheriff Pagel themselves drew here. As I say, I don't know if there was any specific concern on their part about the reliability of, or integrity of, this or that specific deputy, or sergeant, or detective.

But the concern about a conflict of interest, by its nature, pervades the organization. And that concern is at least as great when we're talking about direct contact with the people who will decide the facts, as opposed to simply direct contact with the items of evidence that ultimately may be introduced to assist a jury in finding the facts.

So that's -- I can be flayed for the want of a connection, but Sheriff Petersen and Sheriff Pagel would fall under the same switch.

THE COURT: All right. Also on the agenda today is the State's preliminary motion in limine regarding the jury hearing evidence concerning the defendant's 1985 wrongful conviction. I will hear argument on that motion at this time. It's the State's motion, who's going to argue that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. Judge, this is a straight relevance argument. Both 904.01, . O2, and .03 if a balancing test is to be performed,
relevancy, of course, being defined as having any tendency to make the existence of a fact of consequence more or less probable. The State argues that the defendant's wrongful conviction, or the fact that the defendant was convicted and spent some time in prison, has absolutely no relevance in this case, does not implicate any fact at consequence.

In other words, it would not be offered to prove, or disprove, or assist the jury on any element of the offense or other matter of consequence, but simply would be, in the State's opinion, offered for an impermissible purpose. Sympathy is not something for a jury to consider. Feeling sorry for Mr . Avery that he spent time, for a crime that he was later exonerated for, is the exact kind of evidence that should not be allowed.

I appreciate the response by the defense suggesting bias on the part of investigating officers, but the State argues, still, that when compared with, or when balanced against, the risk of impermissible reasons, the whole discussion of the defendant being previously wrongfully convicted, has no place in this trial.
Importantly, Judge, I believe it's
instructive to consider the other side of the coin, to consider why evidence of prior convictions are precluded. It's impermissible for the State to inflame a jury, to indicate that a defendant has previously been convicted of a crime, again, absent some permitted purpose under 904.04.

But the fact that the defendant was previously convicted of a felony, we know is inadmissible. It conjures bias and it conjures president -- prejudice, excuse me, and the State, therefore, argues that a prior exoneration would equally be impermissible.

Lastly, Judge, when we talk about 904.04, we talk about other acts. We're talking about behaviors. We're not talking about prior convictions, or prior exonerations, or prior not guilty findings. We're talking about behaviors. And when relevant for intent, or identification, motive, or those other permissible reasons, we are talking about behaviors.

Prior exoneration does not mean that the defendant is more likely to be exonerated in this case, or more likely to be not guilty of this particular offense, which is exactly what the
defense would be offering this kind of evidence for. So the risk -- the very high risk of unfair prejudice to one of the parties, which is the State, which this equally applies to, that is, the relevance standard equally applies to evidence offered on behalf of the State as well as the defense and should be applied in this case. We're asking that the Court exclude that evidence. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Strang.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Evidence of Mr. Avery's prior wrongful conviction, and the ensuing lawsuit against Manitowoc County, is what the State seeks to exclude, absolutely, as I understand the motion. Now, like any other evidence, if this is proper at all, as I have argued on brief that it is, there is, concededly, a role for the Court under Section 904.03.

How much do we get into the 1985
conviction? How much do you get into the 1983 lawsuit -- Section 1983 lawsuit, from whom, what kind of details. All of this raises 904.03 questions. And the Court had a good idea in chambers, that $I$ will act on, which is to file a motion in limine here, ourselves, as to what
specific evidence do we wish to offer of the wrongful conviction and the prior lawsuit.

But the absolute position just can't prevail here, in the end. I have argued on brief, and I won't repeat here, the bias and the credibility value of this evidence, explaining why the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, and other officers, may have acted as they did; explaining, if he becomes a witness, why Mr. Avery may have acted as he did, or helping the jury to understand and evaluate his credibility if he testifies at trial. I will stand on my brief on all of that.

I do want to add here, briefly, without repeating the arguments in the brief, that it's awfully hard for the State, fairly, to say we need to introduce evidence of what Mr. Avery said to three men in prison, and the pictures he drew for them in prison; and we want to introduce evidence, if we have Mr. Dassey testify, that, gee, Steve Avery wanted to go back to prison because life on the outside was tough; and then not allow the defense at least some room to explain that he shouldn't have been in prison in the first place, and spent 18 years trying to get
himself out, saying he was innocent. At a bare minimum, that kind of context is necessary, if the State is to offer the evidence that it has sought to offer, and pursues.

I agree with Mr. Kratz wholly, that if the issue were sympathy for Mr. Avery, that's not a proper purpose for this. It happens to be not why we're offering it, but it's not a proper purpose, simply to make a pitch for sympathy. The same, of course, would be true for Teresa Halbach's life history, which the State proposes to offer.

Had that no purpose other than generating sympathy for her, or her family, it would be improper and, indeed, that's why there's a pattern jury instruction in this state, in which this Court, I'm confident, will instruct the jury that it is not to decide this case on the basis of bias, or prejudice, or sympathy, for one party, or for anyone, for that matter.

So that can be handled very well with a jury instruction. And just as Ms Halbach's life history evidence invariably will present a 904.03 question for this Court, how much is right, how much is too much, how much distracts, or
confuses, or misleads, or wastes its time; I think the same is true of the wrongful conviction and the lawsuit.

It's clearly a Section 904.03 issue. It should be addressed before trial, an absolute position by the State on this, particularly if it's offering other evidence informing the jury that Mr. Avery was in prison. It just goes too far. Just as I think an absolute position by the defense, that nothing about the life or history of Teresa Halbach can come in, also would be mistaken and would go too far.

So we're going to be into, it seems to me, a balancing area. And $I$ will try to assist the Court by filing a motion in limine here by July 14, talking about just exactly what we hope to get into, with whom, and how.

THE COURT: Question for Mr. Strang, with respect to the bias basis for getting the evidence in, what -- what witness, or witnesses, of the State, is the defense seeking to argue that the wrongful conviction and the attendant lawsuit would show bias on the witness's part?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Anyone from the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department. Now, in practice in
this trial, that's likely to turn out to be, I can't rank order these, but it's likely to turn out to be Detective Remiker, it's likely to be Lieutenant Lenk, Sergeant Colborn, you know, anybody. Those are likely to be the main players.

But, you know, when you work for a department, or a firm, or a company, and you are getting sued for $\$ 36$ million, your department is -- and it's been an embarrassment, it's been public, you know, somebody who shouldn't have been in prison was -- I think that's likely to effect the morale, the bias. May be sub-conscious, but it really is likely to have a human effect on the people in the department. There can't have been warm feelings about Steven Avery, or even neutral feelings, about Steven Avery, at the time this was going on.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, if the State allowed -- or if the Court allowed into evidence, any of the statements that would, by their nature, suggest that Mr . Avery was in prison at the time, wouldn't it be fair to let the jury know that he was not there serving a sentence for a crime that he is still convicted of?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm not sure that we
would -- excuse me -- I'm not sure that we would have to include where the statements were made or under what context. And I appreciate Mr. Strang's concern in that regard, and I may need to fashion a explanation as to how, or in what context those statements may have been made, but I'm sure it could be done. I don't think that we have to include that these were statements that were made by Mr. Avery in prison. Let's not forget, that the first six years, Mr. Avery was not there for some un -- or impermissible reason.

THE COURT: I understand that, but I think it is significant that, at the time the statements were made, he wasn't supposed to be there.

What about the -- What's the State's response to the bias argument? As I understand, and I don't have, obviously, first hand familiarity with the lawsuit, but the argument is that the -- not only was the defendant cleared of the crime, but that the -- another police agency had provided the Sheriff's Department with information about the person who was really responsible.

And the sheriff, on the stand here today, indicates he still doesn't really accept
the fact that the defendant wasn't guilty of that offense, does not show bias on the part of at least the sheriff himself, if not other members of the department?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Here's where I agree with the defense, that the balancing test under 904.03 has to come into play, but then this Court has to decide whether or not it's relevant. This Court has to decide whether it's reasonable that police officers would try to set up Mr. Avery, because of a civil lawsuit, whether they would pick some unsuspecting woman and kill her, if in fact that's going to be the argument, that bias went to that extent, and dispose of her body, because of this lawsuit.

So, it's in those kinds of suggestions of bias, and how far they extended, whether or not this is for a permissible bias reason, or whether or not it goes beyond that into something that we're talking more about sympathy, or an impermissible reason, rather than appropriate bias.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I can -- I can say a couple things. First of all, the Court -- and the Court doesn't sit to decide the reasonableness of
the inference of bias, the jury does. That said, I can't imagine that anybody at this table is going to argue that someone in law enforcement murdered Teresa Halbach. I just don't expect that to be an argument.

Will there be questions about the fairness and integrity of the investigation, and how they came to focus on Steven Avery? You bet. Will there be questions about the reliability of physical evidence? Yes. Will there be questions about the reliability of testimony? Yes.

THE COURT: All right. The next motion I have was the motion relating to the State's motion to offer -- let's see -- evidence concerning the victim's life history. I know I got a letter from Mr. Buting, I think yesterday or the day -- I guess it was, technically, the 3rd, indicating that it was premature to address this motion until the information proposed was offered with a little more specificity. And I got as far as getting your pleading on my bench here, Mr. Kratz. I'm not sure what --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, that pleading has to do with statements of Ms Halbach.

THE COURT: Oh.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's number seven.
THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's to be addressed on the 19th.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that $I$ can address your request in the abstract without knowing exactly what it is. I mean, I'm certain that, to put anything into context, some background information is always appropriate. But I think, as Mr. Buting points out, there could be a lot more evidence that would be appropriate at the time of sentencing, that wouldn't necessarily get in at the trial. So, I'm not sure that the Court can issue any meaningful decision on the request, as it's currently framed.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I may, Judge, I don't know that Mr. Buting and I are very far apart. We understand that, in a homicide case, when taking of a human life is at issue, some aspects of the victim's life becomes relevant, her contacts with Avery, her employment, her family relationships, those things that intersect, if you will, her life with that of Mr. Avery.

That being done through at least some photographs of the victims, or some evidence of those characteristics, or part of Teresa's life
that, again, puts her in contact with Mr. Avery, will be relevant. State has no intent to overstep its authority or to offer any of this evidence for sympathy or other reasons, just those that are relevant.

It's my, perhaps, clumsy attempt to obtain pretrial rulings when $I$ can so that we don't have to stop the trial, or have those discussions in the middle. I intend, Judge, and I think perhaps this is best addressed by sharing it with the defense, if there are going to be photographs, if there are going to be kinds of evidence that, again, are relevant as to Ms Halbach, and especially as they intersect with Mr. Avery, and as I previously mentioned, I don't think that Mr . Buting and I , when I read his response, are very far apart at all.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Buting.
ATTORNEY BUTING: I guess I would just suggest that perhaps they do the same thing that we're doing on -- or that the Court's asked us to do, which is to file a motion in limine on how we would use the wrongful conviction. If the State wants to identify, certainly, any way that Teresa's life intersected with Mr. Avery, I think is going to
be fair game, just to set the context.
I'm not sure about relationships with
her family and all those kinds of things. But I think if the State wants to do that, they can file a motion and, then, before trial, share his concern about all these things coming up in the middle of the trial. But $I$ think a motion in limine before trial, where he can lay out the limits and the parameters of this kind of evidence, is the way to go.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to trust Mr. Kratz to do that. I don't know that it's necessary, in every case, that the State provide the defense with a summary of background victim information, but given the length that the parties are anticipating for this trial, and the fact that wherever we have a jury, they are going to be around, take a sizeable chunk of time out of their lives, I think to the extent that we can resolve matters ahead of time we should do so.

There's another motion filed by the State regarding prior criminal convictions of the defendant. And it's my understanding the parties were going to work together to resolve that.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We will, Judge. We will
reach a stipulation on that, and we'll attempt to reach stipulations on any witness, whether called by the State or the defense, prior to trial.

If we have issues that the Court needs to resolve, whether it's issues of remoteness or relevance, we will bring those to the Court. But I'm quite confident, with the number of years of experience between all of us, we should come pretty close to coming up with correct numbers.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. This will probably get worked out. We can raise our hands if it doesn't.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that takes us to the motion for bail reduction. I believe everything else has been addressed, unless I have missed something.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: There was the issue of the Marinette detective, and we do recognize, Judge, with the Court's previous ruling on the change of venue, that it's quite clear that a third hearing is to be set in this case. There was, as the Court knows, an audiotape recording of Mr. Avery's interviews with the Marinette detective.

We felt it fair to at least suggest to the Court that that be provided before they have
an opportunity to cross-examine the detective.
And so we plan to do that. And anticipating, we will set a date before we leave here today. We suggest, at least the State suggests, that that entire motion, then, be dealt with on that third motion date that we are contemplating.

THE COURT: Any objection?
ATTORNEY BUTING: No, Judge.
THE COURT: So I will hear the bail motion today and we'll set another hearing date then for the other motion.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'm sorry, do we have his schedule?

ATTORNEY FALLON: He's still here. Would it be possible?

THE COURT: We can set the date now. How about Thursday, August 3rd; what does that look like for the parties.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, that's the week I'm going to be out of town and out of state. Mr. Strang, I think, is gone the week before, but the week after that perhaps.

THE COURT: Wednesday, August 9th. ATTORNEY FALLON: That's fine with us. ATTORNEY BUTING: That's good.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's good.
THE COURT: All right. 9:00 on the 9th.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: And so that we're clear, Judge, that is, at least, the change of venue motion, and the statement of the Marinette detective and, perhaps, whatever we don't accomplish on the 19th; does that sound fair?

THE COURT: Everybody agree with that?
ATTORNEY BUTING: Change of venue in the sense of argument and decision or?

THE COURT: Well, let's see, I'm going to have -- I'm anticipating it would be a decision at that time because I'm going to get some written submissions from the parties, correct?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine.
THE COURT: Between the written submissions and the media reports I'm going to have to review, I think that's fair. I don't believe any further argument or evidence is necessary, is it?

ATTORNEY BUTING: Right.
THE COURT: Very well.
ATTORNEY STRANG: On the change of venue, here's the -- here are the two boxes.

THE COURT: Okay.
ATTORNEY BUTING: Should we mark them?

THE COURT: The Clerk will happily take them to the Clerk's Office when we're done today, I'm sure.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'll be happy to help.
THE COURT: Maybe you can help her out.
ATTORNEY STRANG: I can carry them, physically. What I'm -- For the record, what I'm tendering her, two bank boxes, to include thousands of pages of the copies -- photo copies I described earlier, and 24 DVD's of television clips concerning this investigation and the prosecution.

THE COURT: Very well. All right. At this time, then, I will hear argument on the bail motion. Mr. Strang, will that be you or Mr. Buting?

ATTORNEY BUTING: It's going to be me, Judge. Judge, we filed a motion for reconsideration of the bail -- our motion to reduce bail, I believe on June 2nd. June 1st is the date here that we signed it. I think it was filed in this court on June 2nd. This is our first chance to argue it.

There have been some changes since that date, in what we would have put in the motion, or presented to the Court. But when we last discussed bail it was on March 17th, and it was in conjunction with the State's motion to amend
the Criminal Complaint, adding additional counts against Mr. Avery, based upon the statements, alleged reliable, credible statements of Mr. Dassey, the 16 year old nephew.

And we argued at that time, and provided whatever case law we could, that Mr. Dassey's statements were simply not reliable and shouldn't be admissible, or considered, to establish probable cause in the Criminal Complaint. And the Court disagreed and found that they were reliable for that purpose.

The State then objected to our motion to reduce bail. And, in fact, filed their own motion to increase the bail, based, again, upon, solely, the statements of 16 year old Brendan Dassey, which were set forth in lurid detail in the Criminal Complaint. And on that basis, the Court found that, because of those statements, and only those statements, Mr. Avery's bail should be increased from 500,000 to 750,000.

Now, since that time, substantial
evidence has disproved -- certainly called into question -- the reliability of that young man's statements that are in this Complaint. As a matter of fact, the majority of the story, of how

Teresa Halbach supposedly lost her life at the hands of these two individuals, has been proven to be incorrect, either lies or guesswork made up by Mr. Dassey at the urging, coaching, of his interrogators, some of which we placed in our written motion.

He claimed, for instance, that she was handcuffed to the bed when he saw her for the first occasion. The Crime Lab tested those handcuffs. Her DNA was not found on the handcuffs. But, suggesting that they were not wiped off or wiped clean, Mr. Avery's was found on the handcuffs, as well as another individual, not Mr. Dassey, again, suggesting that these handcuffs were not used, that she was not retrained by handcuffs as Dassey claimed. Because if she was, one would certainly expect the poor woman, struggling, would have left at least as much DNA as somebody else, like Mr. Avery or the other unknown individual would have, just handling them.

So, that immediately called into question the credibility and reliability of Brendan Dassey's version of what happened. But then there were some other things that developed.

His statement also claimed that they cut off 3-inches of her hair, I believe it was. And the Crime Lab ripped up all of the carpet from Mr. Dassey's -- I'm sorry, Mr. Avery's trailer. And they took all of the wood paneling off of the walls as well. They found no hair. He also claimed that she was brutally stabbed, her throat cut in a horrific description, pure fantasy, of how that woman supposedly died at Mr. Avery's hands, in a manner that would have obviously left blood on the mattress, soaked through the bedding. Even if the bedding had been disposed of, the mattress would have had evidence.

Everybody was talking about it, even on the street, well, where's the evidence of this, wouldn't there be blood on the mattress. Well, sure enough, they took the mattress, and it's the same mattress, and there was not a speck of blood on it.

And he also claimed that Mr. Avery, then, after she had been brutally stabbed and bleeding all over the mattress, then carries her over his shoulder, out into the garage, obviously would have been dripping blood all the way,
again, not a speck of blood anywhere on the carpet, or on the steps, or anywhere leading out.

And as a matter of fact, with all the tests that they have done, of all the stuff in his trailer, not one speck of Teresa Halbach's blood or DNA has been found in Mr. Avery's trailer, directly contrary to what they claim in this Complaint to be reliable, credible evidence, sufficient to have this Court increase his bail.

Now, recognizing that, the interrogators went back to Mr. Dassey, on May 13th, I believe, and did another interview of him, once again, coaching, leading, trying to change his story to fit their theory of what happened in this case. And thank God for State vs. Jerrell, because it's recorded, for you to see, or anyone else to see, eventually, in this case, or in his case.

And the manner that they questioned him is -- it would be laughable, if it wasn't a real case with real people's lives at stake. He is fed information to change his story. Now, it turns out, according to this young man, that the whole story about him getting off the bus, finding a letter of Mr . Avery's, and going down and hearing this poor woman screaming, was
totally made up.
He hears no screaming outside the trailer. He claims that he goes in the trailer and, yes, she's there. But, again, the entire time he's there she's never screaming, which is, frankly, rather preposterous. He now, because he knows, with his lawyer, and what's been made public, that there's no DNA on the handcuffs.

It's like, oh, I was wrong about that. It was rope, her arms were bound by rope, to the headboard. So they test the headboard and there's no rope fibers on it. They swab it specifically for that purpose. No evidence, once again.

And his interrogators press him about that and they say, well, was that a lie? And he says, yes. Did you cut off her hair? No, that was a lie. Why did you tell us these things? Where did you come up with these things? Just guessing, is his response.

Recognizing that there's no blood or DNA in his trailer, it is now obvious this young woman was not killed in his trailer. So the interrogators get him to try and move the location. Again, not accepting the possibility
that Brendan Dassey's entire story is wrong. They just want to change it and somehow make it fit the physical evidence.

And so, now, she is supposedly killed in the garage. And there's one piece of evidence that they have found, that in some way might support part of his story. Allegedly, there is a very small amount of her DNA that was found on a bullet somewhere in the garage; although, it wasn't found until after March some time, when they re-searched the garage.

But, as we put in our written motion, it's a garage that is fairly accessible to many people, not just Mr. Avery. And, of course, it wasn't found until five months after Mr. Avery has been in custody. So, many people had access to it during that period of time.

But other than that, again, and -- and they -- and they challenge him, frankly, it's pretty obvious. And, frankly, I have a copy of it. I can offer it to the Court, introduce it if you would like to look at -- listen to this. But you can tell that the interrogators don't even believe most of what he's saying, until they get him to say what it was -- what they want to hear,
that they think might somehow fit the evidence. But they say, well, where's the blood? Where's the knife? They never found any knife. There was no evidence that there was ever any stabbing of this woman. He's got no explanation for it. And they say, well, one would think that there would be blood because, again, now the killing is supposedly in the garage. And it's not just a gunshot. In fact, originally it was 10 times that he shot her, now he's changed it to five. But there's still the stabbing that's going on, with her now in the garage. There's no blood to support it.

And they are relying, now, on, oh, well, they cleaned it up with bleach and gasoline, and all that stuff. Well, in truth, there was blood stains found -- or there were blood stains found on the floor of the garage, Mr. Avery's. The man works on cars in there for -- every day. He cuts himself repeatedly. His blood is found in numerous places, but not hers. If it's all cleaned up with bleach, why is his blood found anywhere. Again, it doesn't fit.

In essence, he has now retracted almost everything. This dramatic press conference
statement that people -- the children should not listen to this, it's so terrible to hear, was pure fantasy, unsupported by any other physical evidence, and now retracted by the guy who supposedly told it.

I feel sorry for the Halbachs, that they think all these horrible things happened to their daughter and sibling. Now, we know that's not even true, but that's, unfortunately, the reality. I can go on and on. Did he punch her, or did she -- did Avery punch her in the mouth? Now, he's like, no, he never hit her at all.

Not only that, he now retracts any -any knowledge that he has that Mr. Avery ever had any sexual assault. He's still on his newest statement, newest I'm aware of, admits that he had sex with her; although, the way he admits it is certainly suspect. But he says, no, I didn't see Avery have sex with her. No, he didn't tell me he had sex with her.

So the whole sexual assault charge against Mr. Avery that's in this Criminal Complaint, and for which his bail went up, is now going to be out the window.

In Mr. Dassey's own bond hearing, the
prosecution revealed -- and by the way, I think the description of Sheriff Pagel's, the purpose of these press conferences was to control the information that went out, is a very good description of what's been going on in this case, in the public's eye all along; which is, the prosecution has controlled the evidence that the public hears, and construed it in a way that makes it look like this guy should be the poster boy for the death penalty, when, in fact, everything that they construed is one sided. It leaves out all kinds of other things.

Looking at that press conference, you would have expected that that young boy, who was holding this in for months and just had to unburden himself with this terrible story that he had -- experience that he had, was emotionally upset and came out with this whole, long story when, in fact, there is not an iota of emotion expressed by the guy.

He never cries, he's not upset at all, he's not coming out with any narrative. It's one sentence or one word responses to their questions, the entire way, all the way through that first statement. And the second statement
is more of the same. There is no emotion. If this kid had any involvement with it, he certainly hasn't described what happened, or what his involvement really was, because there's no emotional connection or affect there.

But back to the bond hearing, the prosecutor announced, oh, well, now we have new information that this was a planned murder and that they selected Teresa Halbach several days earlier. And, again, I suggest to the Court, look at that statement. Brendan Dassey says nothing about any planning until they suggest it, as the only explanation they can come up with for why there isn't more evidence.

And after he's -- he's badgered with this, he finally starts, well, yeah, I suppose; again, guessing, answering their questions. But when they press him about, okay, what was the plan; there is no plan. There's no discussion about who is going to do what, how it's going to be carried out. No plan to have sex. No plan on why Teresa Halbach.

When they start pressing him on -- on the obvious questions, he can't answer any of them, because it's, again, it's just fantasy.

It's not the truth. And, then, when they ask him, well, why -- why would Steven Avery have planned this, why would he have done this, again, there's long pauses in all these answers. And he comes up with, well, he wanted to go back to prison, because he missed it.

And even their own interrogator throws up his hands and says, He didn't say that, did he? Come on, start telling us the truth. And then there's a long sequence where they start badgering him about how he has got to help himself, and he is not being honest with them. On and on and on. So they don't even buy that story, yet they offer it, in Mr. Dassey's own bond hearing, and probably would do so here too.

So, in short, the Criminal Complaint is no longer credible and that all of the evidence that they have done, all the testing that they have done so far, has disproved Mr. Dassey's credibility, and his involvement, and, therefore, the involvement of Steven Avery in the murder, and any other offenses that go along with that, of Teresa Halbach.

What we're asking is the Court to, therefore, reconsider the bond, to once again
consider, first, reducing the bond back down to the 500,000 that was originally set, before this Brendan Dassey fantasy was filed. And, then, to once again, consider a property bond posted by Mr. Avery's family.

He's shown no evidence of a risk of flight. He's fought for 18 years to get himself out of prison. He intends to -- He's conducted himself in jail, and in this courtroom, with perfect decorum, and showing no evidence of being a disruptive individual who's a risk of flight.

Yes, he's facing serious charges, with a great deal of prison time, but that's the purpose of monetary bail, or property bond bail, to ensure that he will return. Five hundred thousand dollars is a lot. It's his parent's entire property, his brother's and sister's entire property. He's not going to risk forfeiture of that by failing to reappear in court.

So for those reasons I would ask the Court to reconsider and reduce the bail to what was originally asked on March 17th. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kratz, or Mr. Fallon, which one will be addressing?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I will, Judge. And I'm -I must say, I'm surprised that somebody, you know, we have given a lot of compliments around here, somebody with Mr. Buting's reputation, would come into this court, and express to this Court that he knows for certain, or that he has some personal opinion that this statement by Brendan Dassey is fantasy, or that it's made up, or that there are such inconsistencies in this statement that it should be disregarded.

Mr. Buting doesn't know that.
Mr. Buting can discuss inconsistencies of Brendan's statements, but what Mr. Buting hasn't expressed to the Court, at least what the State would argue, in a factual or proper manner, are the consistencies that Brendan did provide in his second statement.

Brendan Dassey, in his second statement, which, by the way, was at the invitation of a defense attorney, after his statement was not rejected by Judge Fox, does include consistencies. The consistencies that it was he and Steven Avery who killed Teresa Halbach. That it was Steven Avery who stabbed Teresa Halbach. That it was Steven Avery that shot Teresa

Halbach. That it was the shooting that occurred in the garage. That it was he and Steven Avery who mutilated the body of Teresa Halbach, hid her car and, thereafter, tried to clean up or destroy evidence. All of that information was included in Brendan's second statement.

What Mr. Buting did indicate in kind of an, oh, by the way, manner, was that there was a bullet now found in that man, Steven Avery's, garage, that had the victim, Teresa Halbach's, DNA on it. That is not insignificant, Judge. That is additional evidence that this Court did not have, since the March 1st statement that was given, and should not be given such a short shrift.

What Mr. Buting, perhaps, forgot to tell the Court was that Mr. Avery's DNA was also found on the hood latch of the SUV of the victim, since the first statement by Brendan Dassey. And because of Brendan Dassey's first statement, that Steven was fooling around with and opened up the hood of the victim's vehicle, the hood latch was swabbed and a full DNA profile match of Mr. Avery was, in fact, developed. That's been provided to the defense and, again, maybe Mr . Buting forgot
to tell the Court that.

Mr. Buting and Mr. Strang also know that additional admissions have been made by this young man, admissions to family members, that not only was he involved in the murder of Teresa Halbach, but very clearly that Steven Avery was responsible for her death. The defense, now, also knows that the victim's PDA Palm Pilot was found with the cell phone and camera, on the Avery property.

So, together with the inconsistencies, there have been additional, not only consistent statements made, but additional physical evidence, which has been developed. I also wish to alert the Court, or direct the Court, to my previous bond arguments. All of the previous evidence about the degree of violence; the prior record of this man; the ties, or lack of ties, to the community; flight risk; the penalties that he faces; and the gravity of the offense, apply today, equally, as they did previously. I'm asking this Court deny the motion for the reduction of bond. That's all I have, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Buting, anything in rebuttal?

ATTORNEY BUTING: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. The Court, in addition to the oral argument today, I, before today, read the written argument in support of the motion. And I gather that, from what I know, there appear to be at least some inconsistencies in Mr. Dassey's version of events that was originally given to the police, versus what he said recently. The significance of those inconsistencies is in dispute here today. We're only at the bail stage. The Court is not in a position to weigh credibility of the parties, or make determinations as to who's telling the truth and who isn't. That's the province of the jury.

When the Court last reviewed bail on March 17, I did consider the fact, at that time, that the State's case appeared to have been strengthened from what it had been earlier, to the extent that it was no longer based on purely circumstantial evidence, but that another person claiming to be an eye witness and, in fact, a co-defendant, had been identified, and made statements incriminating himself, along with Mr. Avery.

While different statements that he's given since then may have some affect on the credibility of the version of events he gave, that's still the case; that is, there's still another person who's made incriminating statements identifying himself and Mr. Avery. The nature of those statements seems to be such that -- they are at least not obviously, on their facts, or on their face, designed to shift blame to someone else, because they are heavily incriminatory of himself, namely Mr. Dassey.

I would also point out that it's not true that the Court, at the last hearing, only based its decision on the statements of Mr. Dassey. Of at least equal significance was the fact that the defendant's financial situation had changed considerably; specifically, it settled a lawsuit for $\$ 400,000$.

The facts, as they existed back on March 17, are largely still present today, even if the defense may have some additional argument to discredit Mr. Dassey's version of the events.

For purposes of this bail hearing, I do not find that there's been any measurable change in circumstances. And so for the reasons that I
gave on March 17, and as I have reiterated them today, the Court is not going to modify bail. I will leave it at $\$ 750,000$ cash. The motion to modify bail is denied.

Counsel, is there anything further to address before our next hearing on the 19th? ATTORNEY BUTING: Not from our standpoint, Judge.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I don't think so, Judge. We'll see you on the 19th. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very well. We'll see you on the 19th. We're adjourned for today. (Proceedings concluded.)
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| \$36 million [1] 203/8 |  | 38/21 38/25 39/5 39/9 40/6 40/11 |
| \$400,000 [1] 230/18 | 2006 [5] 1/10 40/22 73/25 121/20 | 40/13 41/6 41/16 42/25 48/13 |
| \$750,000[1] 231/3 | 232/15 | 48/13 49/8 49/9 53/4 54/3 54/5 |
|  | 2007 [2] 123/20 132/5 | 57/7 60/25 62/24 65/12 67/9 |
|  | 21st [2] 155/11 155/12 | 73/25 74/13 81/3 84/23 91/10 |
| '80's [1] 6/12 | 24 [4] 43/5 61/2 154/7 213/10 | 92/23 92/25 93/15 95/13 99/25 |
|  | 27 [2] 61/3 164/22 | 100/20 101/22 105/11 109/1 |
|  | 2nd [8] 55/25 56/25 58/13 101/9 | 109/13 109/23 112/11 112/15 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline .03 \text { [2] } 164 / 16196 / 25 \\ .02[1] & 196 / 25 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 101/22 102/2 213/18 213/20 | 114/10 115/14 116/17116/21 |
|  | 3 - | 120/7 126/23 127/6 129/24 129/25 |
| / | 3 | 135/9 135/11 136/2 137/16 137/22 |
|  | 3-inches [1] 216/2 | 139/1 139/2 142/4 147/5 154/8 |
| /adjourn/change [l] 192/9 | 3.6 [2] 140/24 142/12 | 161/11 165/22 166/24 167/23 |
| 0 | 30 [1] 152/19 | 167/25 175/9 177/8 177/10 177/10 |
| 05 [2] 1/5 3/3 | 31 [2] 5/5 18/22 | 178/6 178/7/178/19 179/13/82/24 |
|  | $32[1]$ 7/1/ | 184/10 184/14 184/23 184/25 |
| 1 | 32 [1] 7/8 | 185/13 1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 2[1] 43 / 6 \\ & 10[3] 35 / 16122 / 21220 / 10 \\ & 100[1] 134 / 5 \\ & 101[1] 2 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 33 [2] 88/23 89/2 | 191/15 192/1 192/2 195/16 195/17 |
|  | 36 [1] $2 / 523 / 5$ | 196/3 196/6 196/9 198/14 198/15 |
|  | 381[2] 1/5 3/3 | 202/10 202/16 203/15 203/1 |
|  | 3rd [3] 47/9 206/17 211/17 | 204/15 204/22 205/20 206/6 206/9 |
| 10:30 [1] 20/3 <br> 11 [20] 10/1 20/3 20/23 20/24 | 4 | 206/11 209/2 209/6 211/17 216/15 |
|  |  | 217/23 218/9 218/15 223/12 |
|  | 40 [1] 75/8 | 223/18 223/20 224/11 228/17 |
|  | 45 [2] 2/9 39/23 | above [3] 30/15 180/8 180/10 |
|  | 4th [2] 28/2 65/23 | absent [1] 198 |
|  | 5 | absolute [4] 128/10 200/3 202/5 |
| 11:15[1] 20/25 |  |  |
|  | $5500,000[2] ~ 214 / 20 ~ 225 / 2 ~$ | absolutely [2] 197/6 199/14 |
|  |  | ct [2] 125/8 207/6 |
| 11:45 in [1] 19/3 | 5th [9] $47 / 348 / 1650 / 1154 / 17$ <br> $62 / 1362 / 2267 / 1767 / 18125 / 15$ | absurd [2] 176/11 176/15 |
| 12 [3] 10/17 38/25 134/24 13 [1] $33 / 22$ | 6 | abuse [1] 164/11 |
|  |  | accept [7] 9/2 142/16 173/17 |
| $\left[\begin{array}{l} 13 \text { th [1] } 217 / 11 \\ 14[2] 134 / 25202 / 16 \end{array}\right.$ | 6th [2] 31/5 50/12 | 181/22 182/10 182/14 204/25 |
| 14 [2] 134/25 202/16 <br> 140 [4] 39/16 39/23 40/3 40/8 | 7 | acceptable [3] 139/19 139/20 |
| 14th [4] 55/23 125/15 155/5 155/8 15 [3] 35/22 121/23 134/25 153 [1] 135/23 | 75 [1 |  |
|  | 750,000 [1] 214/20 | accepted [1] 181/18 <br> accepting [2] 45/19 218/25 |
|  | 7th [1] 80/2 | access [1] 219/16 |
| 16 [8] 74/3 123/16 $123 / 18124 / 4$ 124/5 134/25 214/4 214/15 | 8 | accessible [1] 219/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16th [1] } 136 / 5 \\ & 17[4] 122 / 22229 / 17230 / 20231 / 1 \end{aligned}$$17 \text { th }[2] 213 / 24225 / 23$ | 8th [1] 79/15 | accompanying [3] 96/5 184/1 |
|  | 9 | 64/5 110/8 |
|  |  | 144/23 146/12 149/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}18 \text { [6] } \\ 225 / 7\end{array} 9 / 14$ 9/20 10/3 10/15 200/25 | $\begin{aligned} & 90 ' s[1] 34 / 22 \\ & 901.04[2] 161 / 23164 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $212 / 6$ |
| 225/718 th [] $232 / 15$19 [1] $103 / 8$l9 | 904.01 [1] 196/24 |  |
|  | 904.02 [1] 161/23 | accorants [3] 150/9 150/18150/20 account |
| 1917 [1] 136/71950 [ 11$] 136 / 9$ | 904.03 [7] 161/14 161/24 199/18 | accurately [3] $9 / 23$ 168/13 186/17 |
|  | 199/22 201/23 202/4 205/6 |  |
| 1968 [1] 139/17 | 904.04 [2] 198/7 198/15 | Accusations [1] 116/10 |
| 1970's [1] 136/21 | 971.22 [3] 134/16 146/17 148/4 | accuse [1] 172/7 |
| 1980's [1] 136/111983 [2] 199/20 199/21 | 971.225 [7] 134/18 146/19 148/4 | accused [8] 101/12 104/17 125/11 |
|  | 148/16 149/18 149/20 153/3 | 129/12 133/9 133/16 141/4 193/22 |
|  | 9:00 [1] 212/2 | accusing [2] 165/10 177/23 |
| 1985 [12] 6/10 6/22 7/18 8/11 9/9 9/24 23/8 195/9 195/10 195/12 | 9th [7] 52/2 52/6 52/9 52/11 52/20 211/23 212/2 | acknowledged [1] 124/20 |
| 196/20 199/19 <br> 1990's [2] 34/23 136/15 | A | acquainted [1] 61/7 |
|  |  | acquitted [1] 129/5 |
| 19th [11] 102/17 107/11 107/19 <br> 115/20 115/23 154/5 207/4 212/7 | A.PAGEL [1] 44/24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acres }[1] \\ & \text { ach/9 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | abducted [1] 141/23 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 231 / 6231 / 10231 / 12 \\ & 1: 00[1] 103 / 3 \\ & 1 \text { st }[6] 55 / 2556 / 656 / 1591 / 9 \\ & 213 / 18227 / 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ability [6] 84/23 85/24 153/1 172/2 | act [1] 199/24 |
|  | 186/9 232/14 | acted [2] 200/8 200/10 |
|  | able [15] 40/25 50/14 50/16 84/14 84/18 84/19 85/11 85/22 85/24 | acting [2] $42 / 1135 / 16$ |
| 2 | $6154 / 3166 / 19166 / 22$ | action [3] [1] 30/6 |
| 20 [1] 189/23 | about[137] 5/5 5/13 6/13 8/15 | active [1] 24/14 <br> actively [1] 124/12 |
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Allen's [1] 9/4
allow[4] 31/21 114/18 180/19 200/23
allowed [4] 140/24 197/17 203/19
203/19
allowing [1] 109/7
allows [1] 156/5
almost [4] 130/2 144/15 178/18 220/24
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Attorney's [2] 94/20 95/3
Attorneys [1] 1/16
attract [2] 63/24 66/9
attributable [1] 126/24
attributed [1] 127/1
audiotape [1] 210/22
August [2] 211/17211/23
August 3rd [1] 211/17
August 9th [1] 211/23
authenticity [4] 166/6 182/9
182/17 182/22
author [3] 109/17 116/24 138/16
authorities [1] 121/13
authority [2] 157/7 208/3
Auto [4] 22/20 67/10 67/22 120/5 automatically [1] 146/17
available [10] 73/5 73/17 83/23 87/19 104/18 108/3 108/4 119/18 139/2 1 139/22
AVERY[136] $1 / 6$ 1/17 3/2 3/14 3/16 3/17 5/25 6/17 6/22 7/13 $7 / 18$ 8/5 9/13 11/2 22/7 22/12 22/20 23/1 26/12 27/6 32/16 $32 / 2332 / 23$ 39/5 39/10 40/13 $41 / 743 / 1745 / 1852 / 652 / 2353 / 2$ 54/7 58/24 62/23 63/1 63/5 63/8 63/23 67/10 67/22 72/13 73/10 73/22 74/20 74/25 75/11 75/12 75/16 78/19 82/25 88/10 88/17
88/19 90/19 90/21 90/24 91/23
95/14 95/18 95/21 96/2 96/23
100/20 104/14 112/16 119/14
119/18 1 19/20 $119 / 21$ 120/5 120/7 120/8 120/10 120/21 123/1 125/6 126/14 129/19 131/15 133/23
133/25 134/8 136/23 137/4 138/5
138/10 140/13 141/11 141/13 142/2 149/6 166/1 168/21 174/2 175/1 189/18 195/9 197/14 200/10 200/17 200/21 201/6 202/8 203/16 203/17 203/21 204/8 204/10 205/10 206/8 207/20 207/22 208/1 208/15 208/25 214/2 215/20 216/21 219/14 219/15 221/11 221/14 221/19 221/22 224/2 224/21 226/23 226/24 226/25 227/2 227/23 228/6 228/10 229/25 230/6
Avery's [33] 6/25 10/20 27/15 28/13 28/22 29/5 33/15 53/19 55/22 72/8 91/12 91/17 91/21 $92 / 6115 / 1118 / 9120 / 11124 / 18$ 124/22 167/6 193/1 199/11 210/22 214/19215/12 216/4 216/10 217/6 217/24 220/18 225/5 227/9 227/17
Averys [2] 92/12 120/7
aviation [1] 65/24
avoid [4] 22/3 142/13 162/1 170/14
awaiting [1] 112/6
aware [14] 29/8 54/16 55/25 57/2
57/3 63/17 63/22 63/23 72/5
72/10 104/14 118/21 146/19
221/16
away [3] 77/17 142/6 176/21
awfully [1] 200/16
awkward [1] 54/1
B
back [33] 39/1 39/12 42/17 51/23
$79 / 679 / 2179 / 2580 / 187 / 15$
89/10 90/14 91/23 96/17 96/1 8
99/1 99/2 103/5 109/18 121/3
123/25 147/12 155/22 157/4
168/25 180/13 183/9 189/22
200/21 $217 / 11$ 223/6 224/5 225/1 230/19
background [4] 5/3 183/23 207/8 209/14
badgered [1] 223/15
badgering [1] 224/11
bail [21] $113 / 7113 / 15$ 210/14
211/9213/13 213/17 213/17
213/24 214/13 214/14 214/19
217/9 221/23 225/14 225/14
225/22 229/12 229/16 230/23
231/2 231/4
bailiffs [3] 147/24 185/8 185/20
balance[3] 116/20 124/2 159/23
balanced [1] 197/21
balancing[10] 107/5 161/14
162/18 167/21 167/23 168/9 176/5
196/25 202/14 205/6
ballot [1] 135/18
band [1] 152/6
bank [1] 213/8
Barb [1] 29/6
bare [1] 201/1
base [1] 8/24
based [7] 128/10 170/4 173/5
214/2 $214 / 14$ 229/20 230/14
basically [3] 60/9 66/5 66/15
basis [8] 41/25 125/3 129/6 154/18
190/11 201/19 202/19 214/17
batting [1] 156/20
Bay [6] 35/7 43/25 44/3 55/14
119/7 122/13
be [355]
beach [4] 6/7 6/13 8/11 9/9
bearing [2] 31/1731/19
bears [1] 31/11
beats [1] 16/6
became [1] 47/11
because [54] 22/6 26/6 26/23 30/3
82/15 93/19 95/12 96/8 97/1
97/23 97/23 115/7 118/13124/19
130/14 133/15 133/20 138/10
142/25 146/2 149/24 164/17
164/19 165/14 165/21 168/1
168/23 170/22 172/21 173/3
174/10 174/13 175/12 177/4 180/3
185/14 186/13 188/15 193/2
194/10 200/22 205/10 205/14
212/13 214/18215/17 217/15
218/6 220/7 223/4 223/25 224/6
227/20 230/10
become [5] 6/5 55/25 100/18 136/23 137/5
becomes [5] 149/19 157/18 162/15
200/9 207/19
becoming [1] 170/15
bed [1] 215/8
bedding [2] 216/12 216/13
bedroom [1] 32/15
been [117] 4/19 5/4 19/19 20/1
20/4 20/16 21/9 22/12 27/21
27/25 29/19 30/8 37/8 38/9 40/25
44/25 47/4 47/17 47/18 48/6 48/7
55/5 55/18 56/1 56/24 63/3 65/15
67/8 68/14 70/22 78/4 79/14
80/22 82/14 82/25 83/4 83/11
$83 / 1283 / 1483 / 15$ 88/22 89/13
89/14 90/4 91/12 92/7 93/8 99/11
been... [69] 100/11 103/23 104/13 104/15 104/16 104/23 105/10 107/19 111/8 112/18 116/1 118/20 118/22 119/11 120/19 120/22 122/6 124/8 124/19 127/8 127/10 127/10 127/21 128/2 129/19 130/1 1 133/19 133/20 133/23 137/2 137/18 139/20 150/24 153/9 158/14 166/8 169/3 169/22 175/24 179/21 182/12 182/13 189/23 198/5 200/24 203/9 203/9 203/11 203/15 204/6 210/15 213/21 215/2 216/13 216/22 216/25 217/6 218/7 219/16 222/5 227/24 228/3 228/12 228/14 229/18 229/19 229/23 230/24 232/8
before [47] 1/11 3/19 13/8 16/7 33/25 35/19 35/21 47/19 51/16 58/13 58/15 61/8 63/9 79/21 79/24 83/3 83/9 83/12 83/20 91/24 91/24 98/16 99/24 101/10 101/10 102/19 103/17 105/10 114/21 121/22 129/17 130/2 132/14 137/17 156/5 172/8 181/7 189/19 202/5 209/5 209/8 210/25 $211 / 3211 / 21$ 225/2 229/4 231/6 began [4] 3/19 74/13 75/16 78/5 beginning [7] 50/18 55/19 95/25 97/7 98/1 121/23 185/24
behalf [4] 1/14 1/16 138/22 199/6 behaviors [3] 198/16 198/18 198/21
behind [2] 44/6 152/20
being [49] 6/3 7/11 10/6 32/25
36/21 41/3 45/18 47/10 51/7 52/24 53/17 53/19 54/5 56/17 61/4 62/1 62/25 63/4 72/16 75/11 78/10 85/22 89/5 90/1 90/25
96/23 97/3 108/19 116/23 125/1 126/22 130/4 142/5 142/9 142/9 142/14 164/7 168/24 168/25 173/5 174/14 175/1 177/16 181/14 197/1 197/23 207/23 224/12 225/10 belabor [1] 152/14
believe [56] 3/21 8/16 8/23 9/16 16/11 17/4 18/14 18/23 24/16 26/13 27/19 27/23 28/3 28/19 29/6 30/8 31/20 35/17 40/18 40/24 40/24 41/8 41/9 41/10 41/20 47/9 56/15 56/25 57/24 61/2 72/15 73/23 78/15 79/24 82/18 89/24 99/20 103/6 111/14 111/24 113/7 131/15 140/2 141/5 149/21 153/25 163/12 171/8 192/25 197/25 210/14 212/18 213/17216/2 217/11 219/24
believed [1] 144/20
believes [4] 144/7 144/22 152/25 153/1
below [5] $12 / 17$ 12/25 13/4 14/14 18/16
bench [2] 143/14 206/21
best [10] 35/24 59/24 133/2
137/16 144/23 146/12 149/19 158/18 208/10 232/13
bet [3] 21/10 89/12 206/8
better [6] 48/9 49/23 76/15 84/14 102/18 123/18
between [14] 29/5 52/19 67/24
77/5 77/13 132/1 152/4 156/16 157/12 161/23 180/21 191/10
$210 / 8212 / 16$
beyond [11] 44/12 46/3 67/5 85/7 98/11 121/14 128/19168/12 180/9 180/10 205/19
bias [21] 163/16 163/16 163/19
163/22 182/19 182/22 183/2
197/19 198/10 200/5 201/19
202/19 202/23 203/12 204/16
205/2 205/13 205/17 205/18
205/22 206/1
biased [1] 163/15
big [5] 63/17 160/22 175/11
180/21 194/15
bills [2] 24/21 24/23
binding [1] 157/7
bit [9] $5 / 2$ 20/8 38/25 76/4 123/3 140/17 155/17 172/3 173/10
bizarre [1] 129/18
black [2] 109/21 136/13
blame [5] 126/19 136/12 137/20 141/25 230/9
bleach [2] 220/15 220/22
bleeding [1] 216/23
blew [1] 136/7
blocks [1] 182/23
blood [19] 28/21 78/13 78/16
173/22 173/24 216/11 216/17
216/19 216/25 217/1 217/6 218/21
220/2 220/7 220/13 220/16 220/17
220/20 220/22
Blow [1] 73/10
blundered [2] 158/22 171/25
Board [2] 18/3 18/4
body [2] 205/14 227/3
bomb [1] 136/7
bond [10] 103/13 221/25 223/6
224/15 224/25 225/1 225/4 225/14
228/16 228/23
bone [7] 32/21 33/1 33/3 67/6
79/13 79/17 79/22
book[2] 100/12 100/19
bookkeeping [1] 61/5
boots [1] 30/22
borrow [1] 175/5
boss [1] 38/4
both [17] 3/21 14/7 14/11 34/18 49/9 50/13 102/10 120/21 124/25 125/1 134/3 139/25 140/23 143/7 157/24 180/22 196/24
bound [1] 218/10
bounds [1] 19/15
box [1] 150/21
boxes [7] 43/2 43/5 43/9 44/6 151/12 212/23 213/8
boy [3] 136/24 222/10 222/14
boyfriends [1] 75/5
BRANCH [2] $1 / 1232 / 5$
break [4] 33/19 44/9 112/25 155/16
Brendan [17] 56/5 73/25 74/11 83/3 91/11 120/18 156/4 214/15 215/24 219/1 223/11 225/3 226/7 226/16 226/18 227/19 227/20
Brendan's [2] 226/13 227/6
brief [14] 16/7 101/3 103/13 105/12 113/22 117/22 122/9 140/25 159/18 194/23 199/16 200/5 200/13 200/15
briefly [3] 47/7 121/5 200/14
briefs [2] 105/20 106/5
Briggs [1] 127/18
bring [6] 130/16 144/11 171/2
191/21 194/18 210/6
bringing [2] $142 / 1 \quad 148 / 24$
brings [2] 53/12 138/15
broadcast [5] 85/21 104/13 104/23 119/6 122/3
broadcasts [2] 43/8 43/17
brother's [1] 225/17
brought [2] 35/5 105/10
Brown [1] 66/4
brutally [2] 216/7 216/22
buck [1] 18/8
building [1] 182/23
bulk [1] 43/9
bulky [1] 44/7
bullet [2] 219/9 227/9
bumping [1] 130/9
bundle [1] 130/19
burden [4] 145/5 153/6 166/17 169/17
bureau [7] 13/10 13/19 14/2 16/15
41/18 41/24 42/3
burn [1] 32/22
bus [1] 217/23
business [1] 61/5
but [215] 7/6 8/17 10/9 11/17 13/7
13/15 14/1 $14 / 12$ 14/23 16/21
17/10 17/22 18/7 18/23 22/1
24/25 27/2 27/24 29/3 31/7 31/15
34/9 34/24 39/22 41/15 41/16 44/3 44/10 49/3 54/2 55/4 55/14 55/24 57/20 58/22 60/16 61/14 61/20 63/23 64/22 65/7 65/20 66/5 67/5 69/15 69/25 70/24 71/14 71/25 77/6 77/11 77/21 $78 / 179 / 2182 / 1082 / 2083 / 8$ $83 / 2185 / 1485 / 2286 / 1388 / 5$ 89/11 89/18 90/4 90/11 92/4 97/13 98/14 104/22 105/9 106/2 109/15 110/8 $112 / 16114 / 11115 / 4$ 116/1 118/11 118/18119/19 120/10 120/20 121/6 121/9 122/18 123/4 123/9 123/18 124/3 126/3 127/13 127/22 128/4 129/4 131/10 131/17 131/21 132/11 132/24 133/22 134/5 135/10 135/15 137/6 137/20 137/24 138/14 139/5 139/24 140/19 142/2 142/15 145/21 $146 / 6$ 146/21 $147 / 3$ 148/1 148/20 150/3 150/4 150/14 151/16 151/24 153/15 154/11 155/4 156/20 162/14 162/14 163/20 164/7 165/20 167/9 168/10 168/18 169/1 169/15 170/2 170/20 171/4 171/15 171/18 172/6 172/17 173/4 174/17 174/21 175/6 175/11
175/17 175/21 $178 / 10179 / 11$ 179/20 179/22 180/1 180/15 180/17 180/20 181/10 182/5 182/7 182/16 183/3 183/4 184/25 185/21 186/15 187/2 187/16 188/22 188/25 194/2 195/6 196/6 196/15 197/1 1 197/20 198/8 200/3 201/8 203/2 203/6 203/13 204/6 204/12 204/1 8 204/20 205/7 207/9 209/3
209/7 209/15 210/6 $211 / 21$ 213/23
215/11 $215 / 24218 / 4219 / 12$
219/18 219/22 220/2 220/11
220/21 221/9 221/18 223/6 223/17
225/13 226/13 228/6 228/13
229/21
BUTING [26] 1/15 3/15 3/15
113/12 114/13 116/7 133/23 152/5 162/23 169/20 175/15 181/24
206/16 207/9 207/16 208/16

BUTING... [10] 208/18 213/14 226/11 226/12 226/13 227/7
227/16 227/25 228/2 228/25
Buting's [3] 113/10 156/19 226/4 buy [1] 224/13

C
call [17] 4/9 14/15 41/25 44/20 44/22 47/10 47/14 48/4 64/16
67/12 70/24 82/11 100/16 123/2
185/21 187/25 188/3
called [16] 4/18 11/21 20/23 21/9 43/15 44/24 65/15 85/17 91/12 91/21 119/11 157/13 164/9 210/2 214/22 $215 / 22$
calling [7] 61/17 74/24 75/12 87/8 90/22 92/12 176/7
calls [11] 3/1 4/11 38/4 53/1 55/16 90/19 90/23 91/10 92/4 92/10 100/5
Calumet [41] 3/8 19/6 23/19 24/3
26/13 27/19 27/21 28/16 29/10
29/23 30/11 31/3 31/3 32/3 36/16
38/10 45/8 46/10 54/22 60/3
60/17 66/4 77/12 88/25 93/21
94/6 94/8 94/17 94/20 95/2 119/1
119/2 183/24 184/8 188/16 191/17
191/20 191/21 192/4 192/6 193/3
came [12] 32/21 34/22 36/15 59/25
119/16 143/23 146/2 157/12 158/3 175/23 206/8 222/18
camera [2] 121/6 228/9
cameras [3] 87/20 88/7 127/8
camp [1] 191/23
can [74] 26/19 39/24 58/21 69/25
77/6 77/10 77/19 90/10 98/22
102/19 104/19 105/16 106/23
112/25 114/1 114/8 $117 / 19133 / 2$
133/16 142/24 146/9 150/10 151/1
151/3 151/7 151/17151/25 153/2
153/10 154/4 154/14 155/11
162/16 162/16 163/6 163/9 163/19
165/25 172/1 172/7 174/4 174/9
174/21 176/7 176/11 176/12 178/3
178/21 181/16 181/18 183/5 186/3
186/4 193/14 196/14 201/21
202/11 205/23 205/23 207/5
207/13 208/7 209/4 209/8 209/19
210/11 211/16213/5 213/6 219/21
219/23 221/10 223/13 226/12
can't [25] 79/10 82/6 83/20 90/15
98/2 114/16 121/1 125/18 125/25
127/20 141/19 165/14 165/15
182/4 191/2 191/2 192/16 192/19
193/9 194/15 200/3 203/1 203/15 206/2 223/24
candid [1] 152/23
cannot [6] 104/20 105/21 130/17
141/20 159/22 177/22
capacity [2] 36/20 147/23
capitol [1] 137/7
captain [1] 15/11
captain's [1] 15/9
capture [1] 44/5
car [7] 22/20 62/25 66/23 169/1
193/1 193/4 227/4
care [4] 13/23 139/23 140/12 141/10
cared [1] 158/24
careful [1] 54/5
carefully [1] 232/8

Carolina [5] 161/17 164/22 165/12 179/23 180/8
carpet [3] 169/2 216/3 217/2
carried [1] 223/21
carries [1] 216/23
carry [1] 213/6
carrying [1] 122/22
cars [1] 220/19
case [116] $1 / 53 / 23 / 39 / 8$ 20/22
31/14 36/15 37/3 50/2 54/2 54/19 55/12 56/21 59/23 60/8 64/22 76/21 80/23 89/25 92/23 100/21
107/10 108/1 109/17118/21
121/18 122/18 123/23 127/13
127/21 128/11 129/1 129/13 130/1
130/7 132/7 132/8 134/15 136/3
137/17 138/11 138/11 138/13
138/17 138/20 139/17 139/17
141/20 142/23 146/20 148/18
150/4 158/5 161/17 161/18 162/20 163/12 163/14 163/22 164/18 165/2 166/14 166/15 166/19 167/1 167/15 167/20 168/5 169/1 173/13 174/19 175/6 176/2 176/6 177/4
177/22 177/25 178/20 179/20
180/11 $182 / 3182 / 8182 / 22183 / 18$
185/1 185/5 186/10 186/15 186/18
187/1 187/14 187/24 188/2 188/13
189/2 190/21 191/19 192/1 193/23
194/20 195/9 197/7 198/24 199/8
201/18 207/17 209/13 210/21
214/6 217/14 217/17217/17
217/20 222/5 229/18 230/4
case-in-chief [5] 183/18 187/14
187/24 188/2 188/13
cases [19] 46/19 49/20 54/21 59/7
90/4 102/22 127/15 144/6 158/5
163/10 163/17 163/21 167/25
168/16 177/11 177/12 177/16
189/8 189/9
cash [1] 231/3
cast [2] 120/5 127/25
cause [2] 128/20 214/9
caused [3] 79/6 126/11 $138 / 15$
causes [1] 131/19
CCAP [1] 112/9
cease [1] 54/13
celebrity [1] 142/4
cell [4] 112/1 112/15 112/16 228/9
cellphone [2] 90/22 92/11
certain [10] 80/24 85/20 85/21
$86 / 24$ 90/24 121/2 160/5 161/8
207/7 226/6
certainly [21] 10/15 86/14 104/19
114/1 114/8 117/19 132/20 138/19 139/25 155/4 165/6 167/16 182/16 184/21 193/10 193/14 208/24
214/22 $215 / 17221 / 18223 / 3$
certify [1] 232/6
CF [2] 1/5 3/3
chain [4] $16 / 25$ 166/8 $182 / 9$
182/17
chair [1] 10/20
challenge [10] 144/25 163/19
165/24 166/6 166/10 168/20 172/2
176/6 178/16 219/19
challenges [1] 161/2
challenging [2] 166/2 177/9
chambers [2] 107/7 199/24
chance [3] 154/20 172/17 213/20
change [54] 4/4 43/1 44/10 98/12
98/15 117/14 127/16 134/14 135/8
135/9 138/2 138/25 139/24 140/2

141/17 143/4 143/12 143/23
143/24 144/3 144/6 144/9 145/3
145/7 145/11 145/16 145/23 146/7 146/10 146/14 148/5 148/20
148/23 148/25 149/16 149/17
150/1 151/3 151/13 152/16 153/22
154/13 154/17 154/18 192/9
192/10 210/19 212/4 212/9 212/22
217/13 217/21 219/2 230/24
changed [3] 134/20 220/10 230/17
changes [1] 213/21
channels [1] 152/8
chaperone [1] 184/17
characteristics [1] 207/25
characterize [3] 50/12 158/18 194/4
charge [17] 5/25 6/17 7/2 7/4 7/6
7/79/17 13/9 13/18 14/2 14/22
24/23 52/7 73/24 119/17 120/17
221/21
charged [8] 72/16 72/21 74/3 83/1
83/4 83/14 89/5 129/4
charges [9] 54/11 56/2 63/3
119/17 125/19 133/1 139/13
142/19 225/12
charging [1] 120/18
chart [1] 15/18
charts [1] 129/20
check [2] 89/11 134/4
chief[11] 5/19 11/8 13/8 60/5
122/19 129/9 183/18 187/14
187/24 188/2 188/13
child [5] 136/23 $142 / 4142 / 6$
164/11 165/9
children [2] 121/23 221/1
choice [4] 124/12 125/11 126/15
130/13
choose [4] 88/10 159/3 178/6 178/7
chooses [3] 125/22 159/14 192/7
chose [1] $86 / 18$
chunk [1] 209/18
circling [1] 66/2
CIRCUIT [4] 1/1 1/11 72/21 232/5
circumspect [1] 116/16
circumstances [7] 19/5 40/6 149/7
157/17 174/23 193/11 230/25
circumstantial [1] 229/21
citations [1] 150/8
cite [1] 150/18
cited [2] 140/25 167/16
citing [1] 139/17
citizen [3] 28/5 28/6 104/16
citizens [5] 124/23 134/25 135/19
137/9 159/20
civil [8] 23/1 $23 / 5$ 33/15 72/8
189/2 189/8 195/15 205/11
claim [8] 7/17 33/15 90/8 92/5
165/6 165/7 182/11 217/7
claimed [6] 33/1 215/7 215/16
216/1 216/7 216/21
claiming [1] 229/22
claims [6] $9 / 7$ 92/25 120/22 125/3
130/18 $218 / 3$
clarify [2] 30/5 148/13
clarifying [1] 30/3
classic [1] 125/20
clean [2] 215/12 227/4
cleaned [2] 220/15 220/22
clear [18] 16/25 33/11 37/21 91/19 114/10 $118 / 10$ 120/2 120/10
121/11 130/5 152/13 157/16 177/5 179/2 181/25 182/21 210/20 212/3

C
cleared [1] 204/19
clearer [1] 179/16
clearly [11] 31/18110/1 159/17
159/18 165/25 170/22 171/18
180/11 194/9 202/4 228/6
clerical [1] 61/5
Clerk [4] 44/8 73/8 83/25 213/1
Clerk's [1] 213/2
clever [1] 193/14
clips [1] 213/10
close [5] 5/12 10/17 129/9 138/24 210/9
closed [1] 74/7
closely [2] 150/9 189/13
closer [1] 188/25
closest [1] 180/18
closing [1] 128/16
clue [1] 34/25
clumsiness [1] 13/25
clumsy [2] 11/17 208/6
co [3] 113/23 157/10 229/23
co-defendant [3] 113/23 157/10
229/23
coaching [2] 215/4 217/13
coin [1] 198/2
Colborn [11] 15/22 27/8 28/25
29/9 31/3 32/2 33/10 34/5 34/16
72/6 203/4
collaborative [5] 71/15 72/1 76/8 81/13 82/3
collateral [2] 164/4 164/18
colleague [1] 187/15
collect [1] 28/21
collected [4] 158/22 172/4 174/1 192/17
collection [7] 75/6 78/16 79/1
147/15 159/8 184/24 187/6
collectively [1] 176/17
collegial [2] 76/7 81/13
collide [1] 126/12
colorful [1] 121/21
combining [1] 118/4
come [25] 16/11 25/2 33/8 40/25
42/13 43/24 70/4 75/25 103/14
125/9 132/3 166/7 166/9 169/13
170/5 171/23 172/21 174/16
202/11 205/7 210/8 218/19 223/13 224/9 226/4
comes [9] 37/25 146/3 158/13
160/21 163/18 167/10 170/3
181/11 224/5
comfortable [1] 179/11
coming [3] 209/6 210/9 222/22
command [16] 16/25 68/15 68/24
69/5 69/9 69/10 69/12 69/15
69/18 69/21 70/7 70/17 71/4 71/5 71/9 71/20
commander [1] 16/6
comment [11] 55/7 55/12 77/22
100/9 123/5 125/18 128/24 134/1 135/6 168/14 190/4
commented [1] 112/11
commenting [1] 54/25
comments [13] 37/1 41/6 52/12
$55 / 17$ 101/11 $142 / 12183 / 2$ 183/5
189/17 190/25 191/4 191/11
194/10
commercial [1] 100/19
commit [1] 10/13
committed [4] 63/4 158/7 163/11 168/5
committee [1] 18/3
committing [1] 180/6
common [2] 132/17 191/3
communicate [1] 24/4
communicated [1] 18/15
community [1] 228/19
company [2] 187/16 203/7
compared [1] 197/21
compelling [1] 185/13
competing [2] 159/23 161/13
complain [1] 118/14
complaining [1] 127/6
Complaint [35] 52/14 52/16 55/23
56/17 57/5 58/7 58/19 59/15
72/23 73/9 73/22 74/10 83/11
83/14 83/17 84/4 84/10 84/17
$85 / 285 / 886 / 186 / 386 / 10101 / 15$
101/17 101/22 128/17 128/18
214/1 214/9 214/17 214/24 217/8
221/23 224/16
Complaints [1] 141/4
complete [1] 177/1
completed [2] 103/9 107/19
completely [1] 33/13
complied [1] 188/10
compliments [2] 192/13 226/3
comply [3] 156/4 157/8 181/1
computer [1] 232/10
computer-assisted [1] 232/10
computerized [1] 232/9
con [1] 129/16
concede [4] 141/2 160/13 162/12
162/13
conceded [3] 120/3 157/15 179/8
concededly [1] 199/17
conceding [1] 160/15
conceivably [1] 135/3
conceptually [1] 183/15
concern [16] 85/9 86/4 96/4 105/7
112/14 144/17 174/7 178/25
191/11 194/23 195/16 196/3 196/6
196/8 204/4 209/6
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { concerned [6] } & 120 / 21 & 144 / 4 & 175 / 9\end{array}$ 178/7 184/10 184/14
concerning [9] 63/2 64/8 105/18
106/10 $111 / 23$ 155/24 196/19 206/14 213/10
concerns [7] 81/10 104/12 116/15
186/13 191/1 191/15 195/17
concert [1] 45/24
concession [1] 170/21
conclude [1] 113/2
concluded [1] 231/13
concurrently [2] 9/18 10/9
condition [1] 149/22
conditional [3] 145/15 150/16 152/16
conduct [3] 121/17 131/10 147/1
conducted [3] 89/16 189/15 225/8
conference [40] 50/11 52/8 53/11
$53 / 1353 / 1556 / 756 / 1356 / 21$ 57/1 57/24 77/21 83/3 83/13 83/19 84/3 84/6 87/17 88/6 89/4 89/19 90/7 91/6 91/6 91/7 92/16 92/18 93/4 97/12 101/9 101/10
103/20 120/20 122/2 127/17
127/20 127/22 128/3 140/18
220/25 222/13
conferences [30] 24/22 52/22 54/8
54/15 55/4 82/24 87/2 89/10
89/17 $118 / 20119 / 5119 / 11119 / 16$
119/23 120/12 120/13 120/16
120/24 121/9 121/19 124/9 134/6
$140 / 8$ 140/11 $141 / 7151 / 21154 / 7$
154/11 155/4 222/3
conferring [1] 21/18
confident [4] 149/18 149/21
201/17 210/7
confirm [1] 91/2
conflict [18] 22/4 22/16 22/25
23/11 23/13 125/21 126/3 126/9
130/8 130/12 131/25 184/10
184/11 184/15 184/16 186/13
195/16 196/6
confluence [1] 137/19
confronts [1] 126/4
confused [1] 98/23
confuses [1] 202/1
confusion [1] 162/1
conjunction [4] 46/11 69/2 70/9 213/25
conjunctive [1] 72/1
conjures [2] 198/10 198/10
connected [5] 37/2 190/20 194/12
194/19 194/24
connecting [1] 190/25
connection [5] 191/10 194/6
195/25 196/15 223/5
connects [1] 191/14
conscious [2] 124/12 203/13
consent [2] 27/16 28/1
consequence [3] 197/3 197/7 197/11
consider [10] 46/24 148/23 174/24
178/11 197/13 198/1 198/2 225/1
225/4 229/17
considerably [1] 230/17
consideration [2] 113/6 159/18
considered [1] 214/8
consist [1] 43/7
consistencies [3] 226/16 226/22 226/22
consistent [3] 59/7 104/20 228/12
consistently [1] 120/13
conspiracy [6] 53/25 171/8 171/9
171/11 171/11171/14
constable [4] 158/22 159/5 171/24
171/24
constitution [3] 125/5 130/21
132/16
constitutional [20] 124/25 125/3
125/9 125/12 125/16 125/21 126/4
126/5 126/12 130/8 130/15 130/16
130/19 131/1 131/7 132/19 133/8
141/14 148/8 177/2
constitutions [1] 125/2
construed [3] 97/3 222/8 222/11
consulted [1] 71/17
consulting [2] 8/3 22/2
consuming [1] 155/17
contact [17] 20/16 21/4 25/17
47/17 49/20 49/21 49/24 70/21
130/17 147/13 183/16 185/1
185/23 186/20 196/9 196/11 208/1
contacted [1] 51/18
contacts [3] 29/22 53/7 207/19
contained [2] 52/13 85/7
contaminate [1] 191/12
contaminating [1] 160/23
contemplated [1] 115/22
contemplates [1] 159/18
contemplating [2] 117/13 211/6
content [1] 120/21
context [5] 201/2 204/3 204/5
207/8 209/1
contingent [1] 150/16

C
continuance [3] 142/21 143/3 145/20
continuation [1] 184/6
continue [4] 38/16 68/1 147/11 191/18
continued [4] 24/14 67/4 67/5 142/8
contrary [1] 217/7
contributed [1] 126/18
control [35] 19/4 19/10 29/17
29/22 48/20 48/23 49/12 49/17 57/1 5 57/22 58/4 58/8 59/2 59/3
84/14 84/16 85/11 85/16 86/11
86/13 86/14 86/18 86/19 86/22
86/25 87/24 88/8 88/11 88/14
$88 / 17119 / 1126 / 13127 / 5132 / 12$ 222/3
controlled [2] 65/20 222/7
controlling [1] 30/17
conversation [2] 25/23 39/2
conversations [3] 54/3 54/4 57/7
conversing [1] 93/17
convict [1] 8/18
convicted [5] 197/5 197/24 198/5 198/9 203/24
conviction [16] $7 / 9$ 9/14 10/7 23/8
63/12 106/11 116/10 180/13
196/20 197/4 199/12 199/20 200/2 202/2 202/22 208/23
convictions [4] 189/22 198/3
198/17 209/22
Cook [1] 134/2
copied [3] 43/9 43/19 109/19 copies [7] 24/21 26/17 26/18 43/11
83/23 213/9 213/9
cops [1] 152/20
copy[5] 73/12 84/17 108/1 110/3 219/20
Corp [3] $21 / 18$ 94/21 94/24
Corporation [3] $22 / 3$ 39/3 40/1 5 correct [97] 4/7 5/6 5/8 5/11 5/17
6/8 7/7 10/8 11/12 11/15 12/5 12/16 14/16 $14 / 17$ 14/23 $15 / 14$ 15/20 16/17 17/17 17/18 17/21 19/15 19/16 19/18 19/22 22/5 22/14 23/4 23/7 23/10 25/10 28/23 30/13 30/19 31/1 33/5 34/6 $35 / 3$ 36/19 38/13 38/17 38/23 40/16 41/4 45/15 45/16 45/22 46/2 54/19 54/20 59/8 59/9 62/2 63/10 64/24 68/6 72/15 72/18 $73 / 273 / 1173 / 2274 / 174 / 12$ $74 / 2575 / 175 / 375 / 775 / 1476 / 9$ $77 / 280 / 380 / 880 / 1481 / 2186 / 15$ 86/19 88/9 88/12 88/15 92/3 94/25 101/17 101/18 103/1 103/10 103/23 108/19 111/15 113/16 117/6 145/23 146/12 178/21 180/20 210/9 212/14 232/12
correctional [1] 61/6
correctly [6] 38/12 72/14 123/24 146/23 149/9 162/4
could [63] 12/21 16/12 17/15 17/16 39/19 41/6 41/10 47/7 48/14 49/17 49/24 50/12 56/12 59/3 61/24 65/9 65/11 66/18 67/7 68/14 73/8 80/3 81/4 84/7 86/14 86/17 86/21 86/24 87/6 87/20 87/22 88/10 88/13 96/19 99/17 109/14 110/23 111/4 113/18 116/15 116/22 130/23 133/7 135/2
$155 / 1155 / 5158 / 1158 / 1158 / 2$
163/21 166/7 166/25 170/17
172/21 175/24 176/4 182/4 182/13 187/25 187/25 204/6 207/10 214/6 couldn't [4] 69/14 88/8 88/17 104/11
counsel [27] 3/20 21/19 22/3 39/3
40/15 94/22 94/24 100/25 102/7
103/6 103/11 103/24 107/16
111/16 111/24 114/4 117/20
119/12 119/13119/14139/6
156/17 158/20 178/21 183/4 192/14 231/5
counsel's [1] 31/7
count [2] 118/12 118/15
counted [1] 86/13
counties [1] 11/14
country [5] 85/18 104/15 132/18 132/22 167/15
counts [3] 118/9 133/4 214/1
county [143] $1 / 13 / 85 / 45 / 185 / 19$ 5/20 5/22 6/7 6/16 8/2 10/21 11/8 $11 / 1011 / 1412 / 10$ 16/22 18/3
18/4 18/12 19/6 19/14 19/15 23/2 23/19 23/22 24/3 24/13 26/9 26/13 27/17 27/19 27/22 28/17 29/10 29/20 29/23 30/11 31/4 $33 / 1636 / 1336 / 1636 / 2037 / 23$
$38 / 338 / 838 / 1038 / 1539 / 241 / 18$
45/8 46/10 54/18 54/22 60/3
60/17 60/1 8 63/18 66/3 66/5
68/13 71/17 72/7 77/12 88/25
93/21 93/25 94/6 94/9 94/17
94/20 94/21 94/23 95/2 95/10
95/14 96/6 97/17 99/8 104/3
104/25 115/2 119/2 119/2 121/4 122/4 122/16 122/19 122/20 124/23 125/5 129/2 129/9 129/10 129/22 130/6 134/22 137/12 143/9 143/10 144/12 146/8 146/25 147/1 147/6 147/7 147/18 148/12 148/21 148/24 156/22 178/13 183/21 183/25 184/2 184/7 184/8 184/18 185/7 186/9 186/12 186/16 187/13 188/4 188/9 188/16 188/19 189/14 190/24 191/17 191/20 191/22 192/5 192/6 193/3 193/4 193/7 195/8 195/13 195/22 199/13 200/7 202/25 232/2
county's [2] 16/4 147/19
couple [13] 35/10 70/22 89/13
$89 / 14101 / 8 \quad 124 / 10132 / 5143 / 17$ 161/7 169/3 169/8 190/19 205/24 coupled [3] 132/23 133/11 135/5
course [14] 18/6 18/7 20/17 77/11 82/25 105/13 $110 / 2$ 119/4 133/3 138/9 159/3 197/1 201/10 219/14 court [203] $1 / 1$ 1/11 1/23 3/1 3/11 3/25 13/23 29/25 31/15 36/23 37/7 37/10 37/22 72/12 72/21 $72 / 2573 / 273 / 1983 / 1284 / 1$ 96/16 98/16 104/7 104/18 104/24 105/11 105/11 105/14 106/4 107/6 107/6 107/7 107/8 107/9 107/11 107/12 107/14 107/17 109/2 109/7 110/25 111/6 112/14 112/24 113/4 113/21 114/1 114/2 114/3 114/6 114/8 114/10114/11114/12 114/17115/20 115/23 117/13 117/18 117/22 117/22 119/18 119/20 122/21 123/11 124/2 124/6 126/4 129/8 130/3 131/17 132/9 132/12 132/13 133/15 133/18

134/8 135/1 139/1 139/11 140/4 140/10 141/19 141/20 142/16 142/20 143/7 143/8 $143 / 11144 / 2$ 144/6 144/8 144/14 144/16 144/19 144/22 145/1 145/3 145/17145/19 145/21 146/18 146/23 147/3 147/3 147/4 147/10 147/20 148/1 148/3
148/15 148/18 148/20 148/22
149/7 149/8 149/16 151/4 151/5 151/6 151/17152/10 152/14 152/25 153/1 153/3 153/8 153/16 153/23 154/12 156/5 158/20 159/22 161/17 161/24 162/16 163/2 163/13 163/17 164/13 164/15 167/22 168/8 168/13 169/18 176/4 176/10 176/22 179/23 180/12 183/6 185/19 185/19 185/22 187/22 189/1 190/23 192/7 192/18 195/5 199/8 199/17 199/23 201/17 201/24 202/15 203/19 205/7 205/8 205/24 205/25 207/13 210/4 210/6 210/21 210/25 213/19 213/23 214/10 214/18 217/9 219/21 223/10 224/24 225/20 225/22 226/5 226/5 226/14 227/12 227/17 228/1 228/15 228/1 5 228/22 229/3 229/12 229/16 230/13 231/2 232/4 232/5 232/19
Court's [13] 43/1 73/8 104/21
117/10 123/7 144/10 144/22
145/10 148/22 149/19 173/18
208/21 210/19
courtroom [7] 38/2 55/1 138/15
143/1 147/21 191/16 225/9
courts [2] 127/24 180/9
courtyard [1] 191/23
cover [2] 41/23 97/4
covered [4] 43/21 111/8 119/8 133/14
covering [2] 16/4 122/3
craft [1] 192/14
create [1] 109/18
created [1] 8/16
creates [1] 193/10
creating [1] 130/12
credibility [8] 166/11 $182 / 18$ 200/6 200/12 $215 / 23$ 224/20 229/13 230/3
credible [3] 214/3 217/8 224/17 cries [1] 222/21
crime [24] 9/15 10/12 78/9 78/19 78/24 79/6 79/21 80/1 93/11 101/20 126/8 136/17 136/18 156/3 178/15 180/6 180/25 186/11 197/15 198/6 203/23 204/20 215/9 216/3
crimes [4] 7/19 83/5 129/2 195/22
criminal [48] 19/7 36/18 45/25
46/12 52/14 52/16 54/21 54/25
55/22 56/16 57/4 58/6 58/19
58/24 68/19 72/19 72/22 73/9
73/24 74/10 76/24 76/25 77/14
77/23 78/3 78/6 79/7 80/4 80/16 83/9 83/14 83/17 84/4 84/9 85/8
$86 / 386 / 10128 / 17128 / 18141 / 12$
189/9 189/22 209/22 214/1 214/9
214/17 221/22 224/16
criteria [1] 149/25
crooked [2] 159/6 171/24
cross [9] $2 / 5$ 2/10 36/10 59/13
173/7 176/8 $181 / 13$ 188/1 $211 / 1$
cross-examination [7] 2/5 2/10
cross-examination... [5] 36/10
59/13 173/7 181/13188/1
cross-examine [1] 211/1
cross-examining [1] 176/8
Crosse [1] 152/22
crowd [1] 69/25
culprit [1] 80/8
current [3] 119/13 142/17 195/13 currently [1] 207/14
custody [9] 9/23 10/4 83/6 91/24
166/8 182/10 182/17 185/10
219/16
cut [3] 216/1 216/8 218/17
cuts [1] 220/19
cynical [1] 136/12
D
D.A [1] 94/24
D.A.'s [1] 94/21

Dahmer [1] 136/16
daily [3] 50/6 51/1 54/9
damages [1] 23/6
Dan [1] 32/3
Dassey [28] 56/5 56/18 57/5 73/25
$74 / 374 / 1183 / 483 / 1591 / 11$
120/18 128/20 156/4 157/10
180/25 200/20 214/4 214/16 215/4
215/14215/16 217/11 223/11
225/3 226/7 226/18 227/19 230/11 230/15
Dassey's [11] 56/14 214/6 215/24
216/4 219/1 221/25 224/14 224/19 227/20 229/8 230/22
date [21] 1/10 67/7 87/5 87/12
93/6 110/4 123/15 123/16 123/20
124/3 124/4 124/5 130/3 145/21
153/23 211/3 211/6 211/10 211/16
213/18213/22
Dated [1] 232/15
dates [1] 151/8
dating [1] 189/22
daughter [1] 221/8
David [1] 136/10
Davis [1] 107/10
day [31] $8 / 5$ 8/5 10/12 $28 / 21 \quad 29 / 17$ 34/12 41/24 41/25 50/4 51/20
56/12 56/24 59/17 62/22 67/14
67/15 69/13 74/19 78/13 78/21
79/10 91/9 99/15 135/17 137/14
162/8 185/24 185/25 206/16
220/19 232/15
daylight [2] 67/23 68/8
days [8] 19/1 64/1 65/4 67/11
67/20 71/3 136/3 223/9
daytime [1] 122/5
DCI [13] 19/7 30/12 38/11 69/2 70/10 75/23 93/21 94/8 94/17 95/5 95/6 95/7 188/16
deal [15] 46/15 66/2 100/12
100/12 115/20 133/21 158/10
160/3 162/6 180/4 180/4 180/14 194/15 194/23 225/13
dealing [4] 103/17 107/8 156/25 185/13
deals [1] 113/22
dealt [7] 106/9 110/13 $115 / 22$
161/18 161/20 164/2 211/5
DEAN [2] $1 / 153 / 16$
death [13] $135 / 22 \quad 135 / 24136 / 24$
137/1 137/2 137/5 137/15 137/23 138/4 138/7 142/23 222/10 228/7
debate [1] 174/20
December [1] 39/12
deception [1] 129/14
decide [9] 22/15 104/7 144/10 176/18 196/10 201/18 205/8 205/9 205/25
decided [11] $21 / 13$ 49/7 50/3
57/20 82/22 102/16 107/10 107/11 111/9 183/21 187/4
decides [4] 144/9 146/11 176/10 177/5
deciding [2] 104/8 149/12
decision [37] $19 / 3$ 19/10 19/24
20/4 21/17 23/14 23/1733/18
49/11 57/12 57/19 75/22 81/5 81/24 81/25 82/12 84/5 84/12
92/9 94/19 95/7 $118 / 23$ 125/19 143/2 143/14 144/10 145/10 148/3 153/4 154/5 164/20 183/7 184/6 207/14 212/10 212/12 230/14
decisions [6] 36/12 46/1 72/2
121/18 128/1 129/1
decline [1] 86/21
declining [1] 125/17
decorum [1] 225/10
decree [1] 135/18
dedicated [1] 64/21
deemed [2] 139/18 139/20
defend [1] 104/11
defendant [39] 1/7 1/16 1/18
89/20 90/8 $113 / 23$ 125/10 125/22 125/24 127/18 129/3 129/15 130/13 133/15 148/19 157/10 163/15 163/20 164/6 164/11 166/18 166/25 177/8 177/13 177/16 177/17 181/5 185/9 186/25 191/15 197/5 197/23 198/5 198/8 198/23 204/19 205/1 209/23

## 229/23

defendant's [12] 4/1 106/11 $113 / 6$ 116/9 130/19 131/1 144/8 144/21 167/20 196/20 197/4 230/16
defendants [2] 158/8 177/12
defending [1] 173/13
defense [102] 4/3 4/11 44/18
104/2 104/16 107/16 108/17
111/17 111/23 114/3 117/19118/2 119/10 $119 / 12$ 120/3 123/14 123/17 123/20 125/25 130/5
137/18 139/22 142/20 143/24
145/5 145/15 145/22 146/4 146/9
146/18 148/4 148/7 148/17 148/17
148/25 149/16 149/22 150/12
152/15 152/25 153/2 153/5 154/12
154/19 155/7 156/1 158/2 158/11
159/14 163/6 163/8 163/9 163/14
164/25 165/19 165/22 166/22
167/18 169/6 169/14 170/22
171/16 172/18 172/20 172/22
173/4 174/4 174/10 175/12 175/18
175/20 176/19 176/22 177/2 177/3
180/24 181/1 181/3 181/6 181/10
181/13 181/15 181/16 183/10
187/18 187/24 187/25 190/21
197/18 199/1 199/7 200/23 202/10
202/21 205/6 208/11 209/14 210/3
226/20 227/25 228/7 230/21
defense's [8] 107/23 107/24
143/22 145/2 145/13 145/18
145/20 177/1
deference [2] 104/4 141/13
defined [1] 197/1
definitely [4] 51/25 65/5 102/1

192/21
deftability [1] 192/14
deftly [1] 187/17
deftness [1] 193/14
degree [6] 7/2 $137 / 1$ 142/3 178/21
187/8 228/17
delay [1] 162/8
deliberately [1] 160/23
deliberations [1] 159/4
deliveries [1] 177/11
democracy [1] 138/18
denial [4] 130/22 131/5 148/9 177/1
denied [2] 123/13 231/4
denies [1] 145/21
Denny [17] 105/19 155/25 156/5
156/12 156/15 157/3 157/6 157/13 157/16 161/19 164/13 179/20 179/22 180/10 180/22 180/23 181/2
deny [2] 143/11 228/22
department [134] 3/11 4/6 5/5
5/23 10/22 $11 / 311 / 1111 / 1312 / 1$ 12/10 12/14 13/7 15/3 15/24 16/22 17/3 17/23 18/12 19/6 19/19 23/23 24/4 24/9 24/13 24/25 25/18 26/10 26/14 26/24 27/8 27/17 28/7 28/16 28/23 29/1 29/21 30/7 30/11 30/16 31/16 $31 / 1832 / 1932 / 2534 / 336 / 17$ $37 / 2438 / 938 / 1138 / 1538 / 20$ 39/4 39/8 40/12 41/19 45/10 45/24 46/11 46/11 47/9 48/5 51/22 60/3 60/17 60/19 60/23 60/25 64/19 65/2 68/13 68/18 69/22 71/7 72/7 88/25 93/21 94/1 94/10 94/22 94/24 95/2 95/9 95/10 96/7 97/1 8 104/4 105/1 112/25 113/11 117/15 136/8 147/6 147/7 147/10 147/13 147/20 147/23 156/22 169/10 169/22 183/1 1 183/2 1 184/1 $184 / 3$ 184/7 184/9 184/18 $184 / 19185 / 7185 / 20$ 186/10 187/4 187/13 188/5 188/17 188/20 190/5 190/8 190/24 191/17 191/22 195/1 195/3 195/8 195/11 195/14 195/19 195/20 200/7 202/25 203/7 203/8 203/14 204/21 205/4
department's [1] 25/18
departments [2] 183/23 184/13
depending [4] 134/25 160/14 192/7 192/9
depends [1] 150/2
Depere [1] 138/6
deposed [2] 34/10 34/24
deposition [10] 33/15 33/20 33/22
34/11 34/13 39/17 39/18 39/21 41/15 195/6
depositions [4] 34/4 34/7 34/19 72/8
deputies [4] 14/22 15/2 25/1 195/11
deputy [23] 5/7 12/18 12/23 13/1
13/3 13/1 1 13/21 13/22 $15 / 10$ 15/13 15/15 25/20 26/2 26/15 29/10 31/3 31/4 32/2 32/24 37/25 38/3 44/8 196/5
describe [3] 5/19 47/7 187/9
described [10] 15/9 21/15 22/2
99/7 $116 / 25$ 124/11 146/24 149/8 213/9 223/3
describes [1] 139/14
describing[2] 76/5 129/11
description [5] 80/22 129/11 216/9
222/2 222/5
designated [1] 106/12
designed [1] 230/9
desk[2] 18/9 25/3
despite [1] 153/3
destroy [1] 227/4
detached [4] 29/5 29/11 $31 / 5$ 32/1
detail [3] 107/1 128/7 214/16
detailed [2] 128/18 128/21
details [7] 57/2 78/9 85/6 101/21
101/23 121/21 199/22
detect [1] 180/20
detecting [1] 181/20
detective [24] $16 / 13 \quad 16 / 1416 / 15$
27/18 28/7 28/16 28/23 29/8
32/17 32/18 33/10 41/1742/3
61/16 $115 / 2$ 192/23 193/9 195/18
196/5 203/3 210/18 210/23 211/1 212/5
detective's [4] 13/10 13/19 14/2 116/2
detectives [5] 14/15 25/1 41/17 42/1 60/2
determination [2] 159/22 174/22
determinations [1] 229/14
determine [7] 50/16 79/19 145/10 159/24 164/24 165/16 179/13 determined [2] 53/11 107/2 developed [3] $215 / 25$ 227/24 228/14
Diane [3] 1/22 232/4 232/19
did [83] 6/19 7/1 7/10 21/8 21/17 22/14 23/11 23/16 23/16 25/11 25/16 28/1 33/19 34/12 34/12 35/7 38/11 40/19 40/19 40/22 44/4 44/20 47/23 48/1 51/6 55/9 55/25 56/3 56/12 57/24 59/25 61/13 61/20 62/4 65/21 65/21 67/21 68/1 68/9 68/11 68/11 $72 / 11$ 79/5 84/16 85/20 88/5 89/4 92/19 93/14 101/14 115/23 116/18 117/17 121/21 123/10 140/9 141/2 164/14 166/23 166/23 167/8 167/9 169/13 173/23 180/4 180/4 180/1 1 194/22 200/8 200/10 217/12 218/17218/18218/19221/10 221/11 221/11 224/8 226/16 227/7 227/12 228/21 229/17
didn't [22] 10/13 20/7 20/13 22/10 22/18 25/24 25/25 40/21 62/13 63/5 87/2 92/21 115/19 142/6 149/11 169/14 175/21 180/14 189/20 221/18 221/19 224/8
died [1] 216/10
differ [1] 181/20
difference [2] 60/24 160/22
different [17] 76/25 77/3 146/8
158/20 158/21 159/6 163/23
165/21 168/24 171/23 172/23
177/22 179/21 181/17 185/12
186/19 230/1
difficult [3] 57/19 174/17 192/17
dilatory [1] 189/11
dilemma [1] 125/20
diminution [1] 123/21
dire [1] 139/23
direct [17] 2/4 2/9 4/25 45/5 53/19 62/16 68/9 68/12 90/18 100/4 129/21 130/17 150/17 166/14

196/9 196/11 228/15
directed [5] 26/1 37/1 38/20 46/1 189/17
directing [4] 30/16 30/24 46/9 71/24
direction [4] 29/22 30/9 36/15 93/7
directions [6] 37/14 38/10 58/3 85/10 85/25 190/7
directive [6] 17/11 $17 / 1317 / 19$ 25/21 39/7 39/8
directives [3] 17/7 18/15 37/6
directly [17] $12 / 12$ 14/12 $15 / 5$ 15/7
16/1 8 17/13 42/25 47/22 60/12
64/11 78/24 131/2 175/6 176/2
184/25 185/14 217/7
disagree [3] 21/25 34/18 125/7
disagreed [1] 214/10
disagreement [3] 30/4 156/16 180/21
disappearance [6] 19/5 19/21
24/15 45/12 48/13 64/9
disappeared [1] 34/1
disciplinary [1] 189/10
disciplined [1] 18/13
disclose [5] 58/13 80/7 81/15
112/10 189/3
disclosed [4] 80/17 80/25 121/15 128/11
disclosure [7] 84/4 108/7 132/6 132/11 132/24 133/12 189/7
disclosures [1] 140/16
discount [1] 142/18
discovered [1] 79/17
discovery [4] 47/2 $115 / 5$ 115/8 115/12
discredit [1] 230/22
discuss [11] 3/20 44/8 51/1 54/9
55/20 70/6 70/8 75/16 75/25 84/7 226/12
discussed [8] 23/9 101/20 110/16 113/25 119/22 180/3 180/17 213/24
discussing [1] 189/21
discussion [8] 21/23 82/7 109/1
113/3 129/18 141/18 197/22
223/19
discussions [6] 48/17 50/23 52/11 70/5 75/22 208/9
disengaged [1] 33/12
dismiss [13] 4/1 31/9 44/20 98/15
111/13 117/15 118/9118/12
139/12 143/15 145/18 148/18
151/20
dismissal [9] 44/11 131/8 131/9
131/12 132/25 135/4 139/18 140/5 142/19
dismissed [1] 133/5
Dispatch [1] 61/6
dispelling [1] 91/16
dispersions [1] 120/6
dispose [1] 205/14
disposed [1] 216/13
disprove [1] 197/9
disproved [2] 214/22 224/19
dispute [10] 27/4 27/12 28/10 29/3
32/8 157/11 157/12 157/22 173/21
229/11
disregarded [1] 226/10
disruptive [1] 225/11
disseminate [8] 49/15 61/24 75/17
76/17 76/18 86/18 $118 / 24$ 140/20
disseminated [14] 48/18 48/21
$48 / 2551 / 551 / 654 / 654 / 1054 / 12$ 54/15 57/22 59/23 61/23 64/8 75/20
disseminating [3] 49/8 80/6 91/14 dissemination [4] 74/14 74/16
76/6 124/13
distinct [1] 162/2
distinguish [2] 77/4 77/12
distinguished [1] 168/13
distinguishes [1] 163/3
distracts [1] 201/25
distress [1] 194/24
distributed [1] 83/17
District [6] 3/8 8/2 94/20 95/3 119/2 121/4
disturbing [1] 58/12
dividing [1] 149/13
division [10] 16/9 19/7 36/17
37/21 37/23 37/25 42/8 42/12 42/13 45/25
divisions [2] 13/14 15/2
divorce [1] 164/8
divorced [1] 25/8
divulged [4] 76/14 76/15 91/5 91/5
DNA [14] 7/24 8/10 8/16 8/24 9/2
215/10215/19217/6218/8218/21 219/8 227/11 227/17 227/23
do [162] 8/20 9/11 11/23 11/24 12/25 13/8 14/18 17/9 17/10 18/11 20/10 20/24 21/8 25/4 26/1 26/5 26/19 30/24 30/25 30/25 $31 / 2232 / 1632 / 2433 / 1734 / 21$ $35 / 735 / 1436 / 236 / 2237 / 937 / 9$ $37 / 1237 / 1837 / 2139 / 739 / 14$ 40/2 40/17 41/17 41/23 45/17 45/21 46/20 46/24 47/1 51/7 52/8 52/10 52/11 52/20 52/25 53/14 53/16 53/17 54/3 54/8 55/5 56/6 56/16 56/19 56/20 56/22 56/23 57/7 57/20 59/20 59/21 60/11 60/21 61/9 65/14 71/14 73/18 $76 / 14$ 76/15 77/7 80/5 80/9 80/17 81/14 92/19 95/24 97/5 97/6 97/6 97/9 97/21 98/1 98/25 99/25
101/1 101/9 102/15 105/5 112/20 114/1 114/8 114/11117/10119/1 125/11 125/14 129/14 132/9 139/4 140/7 143/16 146/9 147/24 149/4 151/1 152/5 152/7 153/25 154/23 155/8 157/3 157/19 158/12 158/18 161/5 161/13 164/23 165/14 166/25 168/18 170/6 172/5 173/8 174/6 174/7 174/8 175/13 177/12 177/19 178/3 182/10 183/3 186/10 187/22 191/8 191/8 192/2 192/3 192/8 199/19 199/20 200/1 200/14 206/24 208/20 208/22 209/4 209/12 209/20 210/18 211/2 211/12 223/20 224/15 230/23 232/6
document [23] 52/13 57/4 57/12
57/25 58/14 73/5 73/19 73/20 74/1 1 106/16 106/23 106/24 108/1 8 109/8 109/15 109/17 109/19 109/25 110/12 114/22 115/12 116/8 116/23
documents [7] 103/19 103/22 104/18 114/19 115/9115/13 189/5 does [29] 6/10 12/6 16/21 23/25 33/23 44/16 60/5 60/16 67/6 116/14 144/24 146/17 148/18 148/19 150/13 153/23 157/17 158/11 160/16 166/9 174/2 180/2
does... [7] 197/7 198/22 205/2
206/1 211/17 212/7 226/21
doesn't [12] 112/9 113/24 113/25
126/25 149/22 167/22 194/5
204/25 205/25 210/12 220/23 226/11
doing [10] 40/17 68/21 69/16 82/12 84/25 127/1 129/15 140/9 161/7 208/21
dollars [2] 23/5 225/16
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { don't }[131] & 8 / 17 & 16 / 20 & 18 / 22 \\ 23 / 13\end{array}$ 25/2 27/3 27/9 27/11 27/12 27/13 28/9 28/10 28/10 28/12 29/2 29/3 29/3 32/6 32/7 32/8 33/3 33/17 $34 / 734 / 734 / 834 / 1034 / 1834 / 20$ 34/24 35/1 39/6 40/1 40/12 40/24 41/15 43/22 60/22 60/24 64/14 66/4 71/11 76/16 77/20 77/25 90/9 90/11 90/12 90/14 90/16 90/17 96/1 98/14 99/3 100/14 100/15 103/25 104/10 106/1 106/2 106/23 110/8 $110 / 17111 / 14$ 111/18114/15 115/10115/14 116/1 116/16 116/19 117/2 117/5 118/6 $118 / 13$ 120/5 120/25 121/6 124/7 125/7 126/20 130/23 132/24 133/15 137/3 138/11 146/8 146/11
148/13 149/21 149/23 150/20 152/13 152/17 153/14 155/2 156/18 157/10 159/25 159/25 161/16 162/3 172/2 172/15 173/2 174/21 175/14 177/7 177/18 180/20 182/13 182/14 186/8 188/11 189/25 190/15 191/25 192/1 192/1 196/2 204/7 204/17 206/4 207/15 208/8 208/15 209/12 212/6 212/18 219/23 224/13 231/9 done [44] 4/15 7/24 40/11 48/2 48/3 48/22 51/3 59/22 65/23 67/1 68/5 68/15 72/3 73/21 73/24
$74 / 19$ 76/12 79/1 92/15 93/7 93/10 93/14 94/11 95/15 95/17 95/25 97/7 97/10 98/3 102/1 102/2 107/15 126/17 131/18 133/7 140/19 155/5 204/7 207/23 213/2 217/4 224/3 224/18 224/19
doors [1] 187/25
doubt [6] 8/14 8/16 9/6 9/11 111/11154/4
doubts [4] $8 / 128 / 158 / 208 / 24$
down [17] 13/6 13/8 17/17 20/9
33/19 35/10 40/23 66/5 92/19
100/8 $151 / 2$ 152/6 160/21 170/3
171/23 217/24 225/1
dozen [1] 86/12
drafted [1] 56/17
dramatic [1] 220/25
draw [4] 159/2 159/3 159/15
173/11
drawn [3] 122/12 160/6 178/3
dredging [1] 189/21
drew [2] 196/2 200/18
dripping [1] 216/25
drive [1] 193/4
dropsy [1] 177/11
drug [1] 177/10
dubious [1] 136/19

130/22 130/24 131/5 139/18
duly [2] 4/19 44/25
during [12] 5/22 20/16 44/8 51/23

67/23 68/7 68/8 89/2 122/4 159/3
188/1 219/17
duties [1] $42 / 2$
DVD [7] 43/19 122/22 150/10
150/21 151/24 152/9 155/4
DVD's [7] 43/5 43/24 $119 / 19$ 154/3
154/6 154/7 213/10
E
e-mail [1] 100/17
e-mailing [1] 65/15
each [6] 33/11 67/14 82/9 102/22
110/21 119/5
earlier [6] 29/17 116/25 122/10
213/10 223/10 229/19
early [8] $19 / 19$ 25/8 50/10 55/24
62/5 64/2 65/4 122/24
easier [2] 129/19 170/11
easiest [1] 136/14
easily [2] 150/25 172/21
east [1] 32/23
easy [1] 153/13
Ed [1] 136/9
editorial [1] 141/15
effect [8] 53/25 61/21 78/1 104/8
147/10 191/3 203/12 203/14
effective [4] 109/24 128/13 128/16
150/6
efficiently [1] 26/20
effort [4] 44/4 71/15 82/3 121/25
eight [9] 118/20 118/21 119/5
119/15 $119 / 19119 / 22$ 124/9 128/4 155/3
either [18] 30/11 36/15 38/10
43/24 53/2 60/13 68/15 87/10
87/11 93/20 $119 / 12$ 120/24 145/12
146/10 149/23 150/19 180/19
215/3
elaborate [1] 53/6
elected [1] 46/22
electively [1] 147/7
elegant [1] 123/3
element [1] 197/10
eliminating [1] 133/12
elimination [1] 80/24
else [18] 65/14 73/10 86/6 121/1 129/6 155/13 156/3 166/24 167/9
186/25 192/5 194/21 195/2 195/19
210/15 215/19 217/16 230/10
elsewhere [1] 174/1
embarrassment [1] 203/9
emotion [2] 222/19 223/1
emotional [1] 223/5
emotionally [2] 133/21 222/17
employed [3] 45/7 60/2 64/12
employee [3] 184/3 184/19 188/20
Employees [1] 4/6
employment [1] 207/20
en [1] 117/24
encourage [1] 65/8
encouraged [2] 64/16 64/17
end [6] 81/25 134/2 135/10 155/1
185/24 200/4
endanger [1] 144/21
endangered [1] 66/12
endangers [1] 144/7
enforcement [40] 5/20 11/8 21/15 27/5 27/14 28/5 28/20 29/11 32/1 32/9 32/14 32/21 46/21 46/25
69/4 70/3 77/1 77/11 80/5 88/22
89/2 97/16 98/9 99/12 121/7
121/13 122/7 122/19 129/10 132/7
132/11 135/6 142/11 147/16 185/6

186/6 188/8 188/9 192/24 206/3
engage [3] 37/1 124/13 162/18
engaged [1] 47/18
English [1] 84/24
enhance [2] 85/24 86/8
enjoy [2] 130/17 187/16
enjoyed [2] 142/3 142/5
enjoys [2] 132/16 132/17
enormity [1] 62/13
enough [14] 8/17 8/18 22/21 44/7
72/19 87/19 110/25 131/24 136/12
155/13 184/10 184/14 189/24
216/18
ensuing [1] 199/12
ensure[5] 51/5 76/13 97/4 99/15 225/15
enter [1] 32/10
entire [16] 31/16 40/12 68/2 78/18
106/22 134/21 144/12 146/24
167/18 191/21 211/5 218/4 219/1
222/24 225/17 225/18
entirely [8] 21/1 127/2 130/11
134/14 148/3 $158 / 20159 / 6194 / 11$
entirety [1] 117/3
entitled [1] 106/13
envisioning [1] 173/9
epistemologically [1] 128/9
equal [1] 230/15
equally [4] 198/13 199/4 199/5 228/21
equipment [1] 24/1
equivalent [1] 15/10
err [1] 104/17
especially [2] 58/11 208/14
essence [2] 160/25 220/24
essentially [2] 68/9 121/25
establish [2] 128/20 214/8
established [2] 16/24 16/25
etcetera [1] 191/9
evaluate [4] 149/25 150/7 150/11 200/11
even [32] 17/10 52/21 55/11 77/20
91/9 112/3 124/20 127/24 129/18
136/17 140/4 157/25 161/18
162/13 165/9 166/7 166/9 176/25
178/14 188/12 188/21 189/13
191/4 192/1 203/16 216/12 216/15 219/23 221/9 224/7 224/13 230/20
evening [11] $47 / 1448 / 348 / 12$
51/19 61/17 62/5 62/7 62/12 64/3 78/22 78/23
event [3] 6/5 9/13 17/22
events [7] 63/19 131/18 137/24
138/14 229/8 230/3 230/22
eventual [1] 63/12
eventually [4] 73/1 120/18 123/13 217/17
ever [11] 10/11 34/12 40/19 90/6
90/6 90/6 121/22 167/15 167/17 220/4 221/14
every [9] 67/15 110/3 121/9
150/21 172/2 172/11 172/11
209/13 220/19
everybody [10] 13/7 38/2 69/25
82/4 86/5 87/6 87/17 186/25
212/8216/15
everyone [1] 114/21
everything [8] 55/18 133/17 151/7
174/24 192/5 210/14 220/25
222/11
evidence [211] 4/3 8/10 8/25 9/2
42/4 42/22 44/13 44/17 53/23
79/1 79/3 79/4 92/25 93/5 93/9
$133 / 13133 / 14164 / 4183 / 10$
187/22 190/22 199/8 199/14
excluded [1] 194/13
98/8 99/11 103/9 105/18 106/10 116/10 147/15 152/21 156/2 156/6 156/8 156/13 156/15 157/7 157/25 158/3 158/4 158/6 158/9 158/9 158/13 158/14 158/15 158/23 158/23 158/24 159/8 159/8 159/9 159/9 159/11 159/15 159/16 159/21 159/24 159/25 160/4 160/6 160/9 160/14 160/17 160/20
160/23 160/24 161/12 161/21 162/4 162/16 162/18 163/7 163/10 163/21 164/2 164/5 164/15 164/17 164/24 165/1 165/4 165/17 165/18 165/24 166/2 166/3 166/7 166/14
166/20 167/5 167/10 167/11
167/13 167/19 167/24 167/25
168/3 168/15 168/21 169/13
169/15 169/21 169/23 170/1 170/5
170/5 170/23 171/2 171/14 171/18
172/3 172/8 173/5 173/6 173/10
173/14 173/15 173/20 173/22
173/24 174/1 $174 / 15$ 174/18 175/1 175/8 175/10 175/13 175/19 175/20 175/23 175/24 176/1 176/2 176/5 176/13 176/25 178/7 178/11 178/16 178/18 178/19 179/1 179/4 179/5 179/9 179/14 180/8 180/15 181/4 181/5 181/7 181/11 181/14 182/2 182/2 182/3 182/8 182/14 182/19 182/20 184/25 185/16 185/17 187/6 187/20 193/12 193/16 193/19 194/12 196/12 196/19 197/16 198/2 199/1 199/6 199/9 199/11 199/15 200/1 200/6 200/17 200/20 201/3 201/23 202/7 202/19 203/19 206/10 206/14 207/10 207/24 208/4 208/13 209/10 212/19 214/22 216/14 216/16 217/8 $218 / 13219 / 3219 / 5$ 220/1 220/4 221/4 222/7 223/14 224/17 225/6 225/10 227/5 227/12 228/14 228/17 229/21
evidenced [1] 163/16
evidentiary [4] 102/8 106/25
143/20 161/9
ex[4] 164/7 164/8 $164 / 12$ 165/8 ex-wife [4] 164/7 164/8 164/12 165/8
exact [3] $41 / 16$ 77/25 197/16
exactly [9] 88/3 99/4 140/19
140/19 149/9 170/25 198/25 202/16 207/6
examination [18] 2/4 2/5 2/6 2/9 $2 / 102 / 114 / 144 / 2536 / 1037 / 19$ $45 / 5$ 59/13 100/4 101/6 173/6 173/7 181/13 188/1
examinations [1] 45/10
examine [2] 170/11 211/1
examined [2] 4/20 45/1
examining [1] 176/8
example [12] 17/20 43/12 64/15
65/21 125/12 127/18 134/1 136/6 172/14 172/25 173/21 192/23
examples [5] 150/19 151/2 151/8 151/18 153/22
excepted [1] 41/5
exception [3] 103/7 108/18 110/22
excerpt [1] 119/9
exclude [16] 4/5 31/10 31/12
$31 / 1231 / 1531 / 21$ 104/3 104/25
excluding [2] 156/21 187/12
exclusion [8] 117/14 183/17 188/22 190/11 192/12 193/17 194/4 194/5
exclusively [2] 122/14 150/3
excuse [5] 29/13 85/13 144/18
198/11 204/1
excused [2] 42/22 102/6
exemplars [1] 151/10
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { exercise [4] 86/22 125/12 } & 125 / 15\end{array}$
126/1
Exhibit [4] 39/16 39/23 40/2 40/8
Exhibit 140 [2] 39/16 39/23
existed [1] 230/19
existence [1] 197/2
exists [1] 142/10
exonerated [2] 197/15 198/23
exoneration [3] 63/13 198/12
198/22
exonerations [1] 198/17
expect [5] 18/22 38/16 117/22
206/4 215/17
expected [1] 222/14
experience [5] 5/22 46/17 90/6
210/8 222/17
explain [4] 19/23 22/1 $134 / 10$ 200/24
explaining [3] 55/6 200/6 200/9
explanation [5] 112/8 181/22
204/5 220/5 223/13
explanations [1] 85/7
explore [1] 20/8
express [2] 17/5 226/5
expressed [3] 104/5 222/20 226/14
expresses [1] 194/23
extend [2] 185/2 186/20
extended [2] 75/2 205/17
extent [8] 60/16 82/10 124/9
146/22 183/1 205/14 209/19
229/20
extreme [3] 131/9 131/9 131/10
extrinsic [23] $163 / 9 \quad 163 / 21 \quad 164 / 2$
164/5 164/17 166/15 168/3 168/15
170/1 170/23 171/2 171/18 175/4
175/19 176/1 $178 / 17$ 179/9 181/4
181/14 182/1 182/21 182/22 183/4
eye[2] 222/6 229/22
F
face [2] 137/9 230/9
faces [1] 228/20
facets [1] 191/18
facility [1] 87/19
facing [1] 225/12
fact [54] 8/20 9/3 22/16 29/18 29/19 38/24 47/16 51/16 52/4 52/9 52/25 54/16 56/20 59/1 63/1 64/9 66/13 91/9 91/11 95/12 131/20 137/25 138/2 140/15 142/7 148/11 151/1 165/3 170/17 171/1 172/6 176/12 182/21 185/1 185/5 185/14 185/18 197/2 197/5 197/7 198/8 205/1 205/12 209/16 214/13 214/25 217/3 220/9 222/10 222/19 227/24 229/17 229/22 230/16
facts [15] 26/21 52/12 118/16 141/20 141/22 148/6 170/20 172/20 172/22 172/24 173/2
196/10 196/13 230/9 230/19
factual [4] 30/4 91/3 141/15
$226 / 15$
fail [1] 31/8
failing [2] 135/4 225/19
fails [3] 141/6 189/2 189/3
failure [1] 189/7
fair [36] 5/18 $18 / 7$ 54/6 87/19
104/6 104/20 110/25 124/18 125/1
126/6 128/8 128/20 130/9 130/24
131/3 132/1 132/15 132/22 144/8
144/21 146/15 154/15 155/12
166/13 173/21 173/25 176/6
182/20 183/3 186/23 186/24
203/22 209/1 210/24 212/7 212/18
fairly [3] 66/7 200/16 219/13
fairness [2] 161/2 206/7
faithfully [1] 18/16
fall [4] 14/19 19/17 $116 / 12$ 196/16
FALLON [17] $1 / 132 / 53 / 104 / 16$
31/6 36/7 102/13 105/4 139/9
157/15 168/22 178/4 182/25
187/14 190/13 194/23 225/25
Fallon's [3] 30/5 38/7 156/10
familiar [3] 15/21 54/24 63/11
familiarity [1] 204/18
family [37] 51/12 52/23 53/3 58/11 58/14 61/8 61/9 61/14 65/3 75/2
75/2 84/21 88/13 88/19 90/19
90/24 91/23 92/2 96/25 101/19
119/21 120/7 121/24 127/2 127/7
131/15 133/13 133/19 133/20
133/25 142/8 152/19 201/14
207/20 209/3 225/5 228/4
fantasy [5] 216/9 221/3 223/25 225/3 226/8

46/12 49/12 73/4 82/1 97/15
110/15 158/21 171/23 195/16
202/9 202/12 205/17 206/20
207/16 208/17 224/19
fashion [1] 204/4
fate [4] 126/11 126/13 126/16 130/11
fault [1] 127/1
faxing [1] 87/12
FBI [2] 70/15 70/16
featured [2] 122/14 136/15
February [1] 132/4
fed [1] 217/21
federal [4] 125/2 128/1 130/20 135/19
feel [7] 70/21 $115 / 14$ 137/4 137/22
158/11 175/21 221/6
Feeling [1] 197/14
feelings [2] 203/15 203/16
feels [1] 106/18
feet [1] 126/25
fell [1] 173/1
felon [6] 52/7 52/17 72/16 73/21
89/6 $118 / 12$
felony [1] 198/9
felt [23] 48/20 49/4 49/14 49/22
50/5 51/11 53/21 57/14 58/1 58/8
59/24 61/22 64/7 76/22 84/5
84/11 84/13 91/15 95/23 97/1
97/24 179/20 210/24
few [5] 43/8 43/16 77/18 136/3
153/10
fewer [1] 60/17
fibers [1] 218/12
fight [1] 151/13
figures [1] 122/7
figuring [1] 136/14
file [8] 73/18 $116 / 18$ 168/18 176/3

| F | $32$ | 129/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| file... [4] 177/18 199/24 208/22 | [3] 165/16 166/3 167/13 | G |
| 209/5 | foresee [1] 183/3 | gag [3] 123 |
| filed [30] 54/11 55/23 55/24 56/17 | foreseeable [1] 124/16 | [5] 166/13 176/6 182/20 |
| 63/17 72/23 73/1 83/11 83/15 | forfeiture [1] 225/19 | 209/1 |
| 95/21 103/19 103/23 104/4 105/15 | forget [4] 141/19 141/20 158/5 | garage [17] 29/5 29/12 31/5 32/1 |
| 106/17 110/4 111/2 111/18 114/25 | 204/9 | 32/7 32/10 174/2 216/24 219/5 |
| 115/4 115/6 115/9119/17139/11 | forgot [2] 227/16 227/25 | 219/9 219/11 219/13 220/8 220/12 |
| 164/3 209/21 213/16 213/19 | form [6] 86/25 87/24 117/20 175/4 | 220/18 227/2 227/10 |
| 214/13 225/3 | 190/25 193/25 | garner [2] 65/9 65/11 |
| files [1] 26/16 | formal [3] 25/21 119/16 119/17 | garnered [1] 63/1 |
| filing [6] 104/8 110/5 141/3 168/7 | formally [1] $83 / 14$ | Gary [1] 28/17 |
| 168/17 202/15 | format [1] 151/3 | gasoline [1] 220/15 |
| filings [1] 110/14 | former [1] 23/2 | gather [2] 86/2 229/6 |
| film [1] 91/25 | forth [4] 106/25 142/16 171/19 | gathered [4] 53/23 58/5 58/17 |
| final [2] 122/1 143/4 | 214/16 |  |
| finally [4] 101/19 148/10 193/20 | forum [1] | gathering [1] 49/13 |
| 223/16 | forward [3] 6/24 141/12 167/12 | gauge [1] 50/14 |
| financial [1] 230/16 | fostered [1] 126/17 | gave [9] 28/25 34/7 |
| find [12] 18/11 80/10 81/13 | fought [1] 225/7 | 128/15 172/14 172/25 230/3 231/ |
| 127/16 128/1 128/25 129/9 140/4 | found [42] 22/12 22/20 32/14 | gears [1] 99/21 |
| 143/8 167/14 187/3 230/24 | 48/16 49/3 49/4 62/23 62/25 63/4 | gee [5] 63/23 75/17 79/12 81/14 |
| finder [2] 131/20 176/12 | 66/23 67/6 78/10 78/11 78/13 | 200/21 |
| finders [2] 185/1 185/15 | 95/13 95/20 96/21 121/15 167/11 | Gein [1] 136/9 |
| finding [3] 185/5 196/13 217/24 | 169/2 169/5 169/5 169/8 169/11 | general [19] 18/11 20/25 47/24 |
| findings [1] 198/18 | 214/10 214/18215/10 215/12 | 48/19 48/21 50/8 50/14 54/24 |
| finds [1] 178/2 | 216/6 217/6 219/6 219/8 219/10 | 63/11 80/22 90/20 104/13 125/1 |
| fine [10] 105/22 114/14 151/11 | 219/15 220/3 220/17 220/17 | 132/12 137/23 150/19 150/23 |
| 155/10 163/1 170/24 171/3 179/10 | 220/20 220/22 227/9 227/17 228/9 | 151/9 151/10 |
| 1/24 212/15 | foundation [1] 157/20 | generally [5] 18/5 67/24 119/22 |
| fingerprints [1] 42/6 | four [7] 43/9 60/4 60/ | 148/5 174/17 |
| fire [1] 18/2 | 119/16 130/2 165/5 | generated [2] 24/25 26/9 |
| firearm [4] 52/7 72/17 73/22 89/6 | FOX [8] 35/6 40/23 54/17 104/24 | generating [1] 201/14 |
| firm [1] 203/7 | 122/13 134/1 189/16 226/21 | gentleman [5] 112/9 112/11 |
| first [63] 4/1 4/19 5/23 7/2 20/20 | fragment [1] 33/2 | 112/19 142/2 195/2 |
| 20/22 27/4 27/14 28/4 28/13 | fragments [6] 32/22 33/3 67/6 | GERALD [4] 2/8 44/24 45/4 136/20 |
| 28/20 29/6 29/10 31/4 32/1 32/9 | 79/13 79/17 79/22 | get [36] 13/8 13/8 42/25 44/10 |
| 32/21 33/1 33/19 35/11 44/25 | frame [8] 129/20 136/14 157/14 | 48/8 48/12 61/20 64/12 65/13 |
| 46/16 72/11 74/19 76/24 79/5 | 166/20 179/1 179/1 179/5 180/14 | 79/5 80/20 102/18 112/7 129/18 |
| 79/12 85/18 97/21 104/6 117/12 | frame-up [6] 157/14 166/20 179/1 | 138/25 149/22 150/8 151/25 152/9 |
| 133/3 140/11 143/17 144/1 148/9 | 179/1 179/5 180/14 | 154/20 155/3 173/2 173/24 174/3 |
| 154/19 154/23 156/1 156/14 157/5 | framed [9] 52/24 53/20 105/9 | 176/15 193/4 199/19 199/20 |
| 158/10 158/10 164/2 164/13 166/7 | 142/9 144/2 164/7 175/2 181/6 | 200/25 202/17 207/12 210/11 |
| 166/22 169/8 183/19 187/7 190/19 | 207/14 | 212/13 218/24 219/24 225/7 |
| 192/24 193/5 200/25 204/9 204/17 | framing [2] 90/21 165/8 | gets [3] 24/23 60/8 87/17 |
| 205/24 213/20 215/9 222/25 225/1 | frankly [6] 113/24 164/21 165/13 | getting [13] 26/8 87/8 90/19 90/23 |
| 227/19 227/20 | 218/6 219/19 219/20 | 92/4 92/11 114/7 153/21 177/8 |
| first-degree [1] 7/2 | fraud [1] 129/14 | 202/19 203/8 206/20 217/23 |
| fit [6] 32/15 135/18 217/14 219/3 | free [6] $21 / 25$ 23/15 70/21 159/1 | girl [1] 16 |
| 220/1 220/23 | 167/9 172/5 | girlfriends [1] 75/5 |
| five [9] 41/20 112/8 $118 / 9129 / 25$ | Friday [5] 27/16 28/1 53/14 66/21 | gist [1] 123/4 |
| 133/4 135/2 219/15 220/11 225/15 | 67/16 | give [15] 9/13 10/3 22/10 41/15 |
| flayed [1] 196/14 | friend [1] | 84/13 90/7 128/13 135/20 136/3 |
| flight [3] 225/7 225/11 228/19 | friends [3] 47/13 65/3 121/24 | 146/17 151/6 151/18 168/19 170/6 |
| floor [2] 139/5 220/18 | fro [2] 185/8 185/9 | 172/16 |
| flyovers [2] 66/24 67/1 | front [2] 149/20 187/5 | given [14] 29/18 37/13 69/17 72/8 |
| focus [4] 19/13 122/12 180/7 | fruits [1] 115/3 | 130/4 168/25 191/6 194/1 209/15 |
| 206/8 | fulfill [1] 162/17 | 226/3 227/14 227/14 229/9 230/2 |
| focused [1] 153/9 | full [10] 43/2 119/6 119/8 119/19 | gives [1] 125/23 |
| focussed [1] 179/4 | 130/2 130/21 137/18 139/3 152/21 | giving [3] 64/11 92/17 166/1 |
| folks [2] 191/24 193/3 | 227/23 | globally [1] 146/3 |
| follow[5] 18/6 21/20 191/2 191/3 |  | Glynn [1] 115/5 |
| 191/9 | functions [1] 13/24 | Glynn's [3] 115/7 115/13 116/3 |
| followed [1] 18/18 | fundamental [4] 130/24 131/5 | go [50] 13/6 16/7 17/13 17/16 |
| following [8] 6/24 8/6 9/14 38/9 | 177/20 182/23 | 20/13 35/9 39/1 40/5 49/25 55/20 |
| 56/24 67/11 189/11195/3 | further [19] 20/9 22/14 31/13 | 57/17 57/18 58/3 58/7 67/23 73/8 |
| follows [3] 4/20 45/1 108/14 | 38/25 42/18 42/19 66/24 79/1 | 85/10 86/7 89/10 99/25 100/2 |
| Fonte [1] 144/5 | (268/8 113/3 128/24 129/8 | 101/4 109/18 128/24 131/2 135/2 |
| fooling [1] 227/21 | 129/13 152/11 168/19 192/20 | 136/19 137/15 137/25 140/7 |
| foolish [1] 182/5 | 212/18231/5 | 154/19 155/22 157/4 165/2 167/20 |
| footage [2] 91/25 152/10 | furthest [1] 142/3 | 167/22 168/7 168/9 168/25 176/3 |
| forces [1] 126/12 | future [5] 97/3 98/3 99/17 109/14 | 176/4 176/25 177/22 182/16 |

go... [6] 200/21 202/12 209/10
221/10 224/5 224/22
goal [1] 160/25
God [1] 217/15
goes [5] 87/15 160/24 202/8 205/19 218/3
going [135] 6/9 11/5 13/6 20/6 26/21 29/14 31/6 31/21 35/9 38/24 43/2 43/20 46/4 49/11 50/9 50/18 51/2 51/19 52/15 53/9 54/2 54/9 57/11 57/13 57/14 57/16 57/18 58/1 58/2 58/18 62/8 62/14 62/17 62/20 63/7 65/2 65/13 69/16 75/17 75/19 76/1 82/20 83/25 84/3 84/9 84/25 85/10
85/16 85/23 86/6 88/18 91/4 92/15 92/16 96/10 97/3 97/5 97/6 98/10 101/1 102/7 103/8 103/22 107/18 111/6 112/21 118/1 135/15 137/10 138/21 139/5 143/13 145/11 150/1 150/12 150/14 150/20 152/7 152/20 154/11 154/19 154/20 155/15 156/1 162/24 163/4 165/23 166/3 167/7 168/12 169/19 170/7 170/8 171/1 171/10 171/19 172/19 172/20 175/7 175/7 175/18 175/22 178/16 179/5 179/8 179/12 179/14 191/12 191/21 192/5 193/6 196/22 202/13 203/17 205/13 206/2 208/11 208/12 208/25 209/11 209/17 209/24 211/20 212/11 212/13 212/17 213/15 217/24 220/12 221/24 222/5 223/20 223/20 225/18 231/2
gone [3] 46/20 135/23 211/21 good [19] 3/13 5/2 61/7 66/2 69/24 110/20 116/20 138/18 138/19 140/9 173/3 174/18 180/23 187/15 194/23 199/23 211/25 212/1 222/4
got [22] 15/1 15/1 21/4 44/13 64/25 66/4 72/3 79/12 79/22 99/4 99/25 100/25 105/17 134/10 152/6 156/20 179/2 186/21 206/15 206/20 220/5 224/11
gotten [4] 24/21 80/12 92/6 100/4 government [1] 128/4
grant [3] 143/2 145/18 145/19 graphic [3] 121/20 128/12 128/18 gravity [1] 228/20
 133/20 140/12 196/9 225/13
Green [6] 35/6 43/25 44/3 55/14 119/7 122/13
Greg [1] 12/20
Gregory [4] 8/9 8/18 8/21 9/3
ground [1] 30/23
group [4] 68/16 71/13 71/25 81/17
groups [2] 95/7 106/7
guarantees [1] 125/6
guess [24] 43/20 62/12 64/2 64/14
75/16 76/4 82/13 84/15 84/20 85/4 85/15 90/9 98/23 99/13
106/16 109/23 136/19 154/23
173/9 174/13 182/2 187/7 206/16
208/19
guessing [2] 218/20 223/17
guesswork [1] 215/3
guilty [8] $101 / 13$ 129/4 131/15
156/3 169/22 198/18 198/24 205/1
gunshot [1] 220/9
guy [6] 24/23 41/11 136/14 221/4 222/9 222/20
guys [2] 81/14 191/8

## H

had [133] 7/18 9/16 19/19 20/1 20/4 20/16 21/9 21/13 21/17 21/18 21/23 22/12 24/21 27/25 $33 / 1433 / 17$ 33/22 34/4 34/11 34/21 39/2 40/11 43/9 47/17 48/25 49/4 49/23 51/1 51/10 51/11 51/22 52/1853/1 54/3 57/10 57/12 57/12 58/10 58/15 58/17 61/12 61/18 63/1 63/3 63/17 64/15 65/2 65/6 65/10 65/16 69/12 71/4 71/6 71/9 71/11 72/8 72/19 76/19 79/18 79/21 79/24 82/11 82/25 83/4 83/8 83/11 83/12 83/13 83/14 84/22 84/22 86/1 $886 / 2588 / 16$ 89/8 89/15 89/16 89/19 91/15 91/16 91/21 92/6 92/6 92/22 93/6 93/8 97/10 97/13 98/7 99/10 99/11 99/23 103/23 107/14 113/21 121/22 123/3 130/5 134/5 138/9 155/1 157/6 158/7 164/9 164/11 165/3 165/10 168/5 169/3 169/21 169/22 175/21 179/21 195/17 199/23 201/13 204/21 216/13 216/14 216/22 219/16 221/14 221/17 221/20 222/15 222/17 222/17 223/2 227/10 229/19 229/23 230/17 232/13
hair [6] 8/18 8/21 9/3 216/2 216/6 218/17
Halbach [46] 18/21 20/22 26/10 27/7 34/1 43/17 45/13 47/11 47/16 47/25 51/12 56/2 58/10 61/7 61/9 61/12 64/1 64/8 76/20 76/21 100/21 101/19 107/9 118/10 121/24 127/2 127/7 131/14 133/4 133/13 138/11 $141 / 21$ 141/23
202/11 206/4 206/24 208/14 215/1 223/9 223/22 224/23 226/23
226/24 227/1 227/3 228/6
Halbach's [13] 24/15 28/6 47/3 48/16 51/17 65/3 101/25 137/1 193/1 201/11 201/22 217/5 227/10 Halbachs [2] 61/19 221/6
half [11] $5 / 1233 / 2535 / 1736 / 4$
43/22 43/23 86/12 129/24 129/25 140/11 170/24
Hallbach's [1] 19/20
Halloween [1] 136/18
hand [6] 77/7 77/7 177/11 177/11
178/23 204/17
hand-to-hand [1] 177/11
handcuffed [1] 215/8
handcuffs [6] 215/10 215/11
215/13 215/15 215/16 218/8
handed [1] $84 / 16$
handle [3] 116/24 162/3 162/24
handled [7] 93/1 127/9 160/10
161/3 161/9 161/21 201/21
handling [5] 37/6 105/25 160/22
183/12 215/21
hands [4] 210/11 215/2 216/10 224/8
happen [4] 25/11 57/24 87/2 136/2
happened [8] 88/20 118/18 141/21
169/12 215/24 217/14 221/7 223/3
happening [2] 137/7 188/19
happens [1] 201/7
happily [1] 213/1
happy [2] 134/11 213/4
hard [3] 173/17 188/21 200/16
hardly [1] 128/24
harm [2] 133/8 194/10
has [99] 4/3 6/5 16/23 31/17 31/19
32/3 37/8 48/6 55/18 86/5 89/21
90/8 91/12 96/13 100/17 102/15
104/13 104/15 105/10 111/8 112/8
112/12 115/5 118/17122/17
122/22 $123 / 14$ 123/23 $124 / 6$ 124/8
124/11 124/19 124/21 125/1
126/11 126/17 126/17 126/18
127/10 130/11 132/9 132/12
132/13 133/16 133/20 133/23
134/19 135/23 135/24 136/23
137/5 137/17 137/18 139/19
139/22 141/24 142/25 143/1 148/5
148/15 149/8 150/4 150/24 151/24 152/9 153/1 158/12 158/22 163/5 166/22 167/15 167/16 167/17 172/22 183/4 191/15 192/6 197/6 197/24 198/5 201/3 205/7 205/7 205/8 206/23 208/2 210/15 214/22 215/2 217/6 219/16 220/24 221/14 222/7 224/11 224/19 226/6 228/14 232/8
hasn't [5] 104/23 $112 / 17$ 153/9 223/3 226/13
have [346]
haven't [9] 15/9 25/5 38/19 80/12 86/13 127/1 127/22 134/5 153/14
having [15] $4 / 19$ 34/13 44/25 51/8 56/1 57/7 57/16 87/7 92/18 116/1 129/14 147/12 183/25 188/7 197/1 haystack [1] 151/17
he [132] 7/18 9/16 10/1 12/6 12/12 13/11 16/5 16/6 16/12 16/18 21/12 21/13 21/17 21/17 21/18 21/19 22/2 24/6 24/8 25/24 25/25 26/5 26/6 28/25 39/3 61/16 61/18 61/20 61/22 63/3 63/17 82/1 8 83/6 83/8 83/12 83/13 $90 / 1096 / 12$ 96/13 112/12 125/1 128/13 129/5 129/23 130/17 132/16 134/9 134/11 $138 / 8$ 138/9 138/9 138/12 $138 / 16$ 139/13 $142 / 5$ 142/7 142/24 143/19 148/2 148/2 164/6 165/10 176/20 178/21 178/22 179/19 179/19 185/9 190/4 190/5 190/6 194/22 197/14 197/15 200/9 200/10 200/12 200/18 200/24 201/1 203/22 203/23 204/14 204/25 209/8 215/7 215/8 216/7 216/21 217/20 218/2 218/3 218/3 218/6 218/6 218/16 220/10 220/19 220/24 221/10 221/12 221/13 221/14 221/16 221/17 221/18 221/19 221/20 222/16 222/17 222/21 223/2 223/16 223/24 224/3 224/4 224/5 224/6 224/8 224/9 224/11 224/12 225/8 225/15 226/5 226/6 226/22 227/2 228/5 228/19 229/9 230/3
he's [34] 3/14 12/9 12/23 15/24 16/3 16/15 40/7 98/18 112/11 129/5 134/10 187/16 189/23 190/7 191/6 193/2 195/7 211/14 218/5 219/24 220/5 220/10 221/12 221/15 222/21 222/22 223/15 223/15 225/6 225/7 225/8 225/12 225/18 230/1
highlights [2] 153/22 155/2 highly [3] 128/18 189/16 190/1 him [32] 7/21 8/6 9/24 12/15
12/17 14/12 16/1 21/23 25/21
25/24 44/22 90/6 92/1 122/10
129/20 141/11 165/8 165/10 190/8
191/7 194/25 217/12 217/18
217/23 218/15 218/24 219/19
219/25 223/18 223/23 224/2
224/11
himself [15] 128/14 133/15 133/16
189/15 191/16 201/1 205/3 220/20
222/16 224/12 225/7 225/9 229/24
230/6 230/11
hinges [2] 148/9 148/10
hire [1] 17/25
his [80] 9/14 10/20 16/1 21/20
21/23 26/7 34/11 34/13 52/23
53/3 63/2 63/12 88/13 96/25
98/17 125/25 126/1 128/13 129/13
129/22 129/22 130/19 133/17
134/9 134/10 136/13 136/13
137/14 138/9 138/12 138/17
139/16 141/14 142/7 149/6 163/16
163/19 163/21 164/7 165/6 165/7
166/18 186/17 187/10 187/16
187/16 191/2 191/7 191/12 195/6
200/11 208/16 209/5 211/12 215/4
216/1 216/24 217/5 217/9 217/13
217/17217/21 218/7218/15
218/20 218/22 218/23 219/7
220/20 220/22 221/15 221/23
223/4 224/8 224/20 225/16 225/17
226/16 226/18 226/20
history [6] 136/22 164/4 201/11
201/23 202/10 206/15
hit [1] 221/12
hmm [1] 85/19
hold [4] 11/17 56/13 140/17 147/10
holding [4] 52/8 56/6 109/22
222/15
Holmes [7] 161/17 164/21 165/12
179/20 179/22 180/2 180/3
home [7] 20/2 20/10 20/11 47/14
59/17 67/12 170/24
homicide [3] 7/3 56/2 207/17
Hon [1] 1/11
honest [1] 224/12
honor [15] 4/8 29/13 31/19 42/17
104/2 104/6 108/23 114/23 118/17
136/19 139/11 151/1 158/17
194/16 229/2
hood [3] 227/18 227/22 227/22
hope [6] 60/15 132/21 133/6
134/22 145/17 202/16
hopefully [1] 112/21
horrible [2] 136/16 221/7
horribly [1] 131/14
horrific [1] 216/8
host [1] 161/5
hostile [1] 46/6
hotel [1] 186/1
hour [2] 36/4 129/24
hours [6] 59/17 67/23 68/8 70/23
77/18 122/5
housed [1] 186/1
how [78] 13/6 13/7 26/5 41/16
$42 / 542 / 645 / 745 / 1448 / 250 / 3$
50/14 57/8 57/13 60/1 60/25
60/25 67/20 68/1 68/11 75/17
$85 / 15$ 88/21 88/21 89/3 89/8

89/19 99/25 101/20 101/23 129/18
131/3 131/13 131/13 131/16
135/14 137/6 144/10 144/23
146/12 149/19 152/17 152/24
153/25 154/23 155/3 158/2 162/16 162/16 166/23 166/23 166/25
167/11 169/10 173/23 174/2 174/6 174/7 174/8 179/13 188/12 191/24 191/24 192/9 199/19 199/20
201/24 201/24 201/25 202/17
204/5 205/17 206/8 208/22 211/16
214/25 216/9 223/20 224/11
however [8] 30/10 $114 / 2114 / 9$
140/10 141/17 141/19 145/1 159/5
Hudson [1] 194/8
huge [5] 50/16 50/19 62/9 62/10 62/21
hugely [1] 62/24
human [4] 6/3 79/19 203/14 207/18
hundred [1] 225/15
Husbands [1] 75/5

I'll [1] 213/4
I'm [129] 3/16 6/9 7/4 8/13 10/25
11/1 11/5 12/21 13/6 14/18 18/23
19/1 26/21 29/13 30/3 30/20 31/6
31/21 35/9 37/21 38/24 40/2 43/1
43/2 43/20 44/12 46/4 54/1 54/2
56/9 94/3 96/9 96/10 98/23 99/21
101/1 101/21 105/25 106/8 106/20 107/24 108/20 112/6 112/7 113/1 114/3 114/14 115/16 115/25
118/21 123/6 127/25 128/1 131/24 135/15 139/5 139/16 142/19 143/13 143/20 $145 / 8145 / 11$ 146/1 146/2 146/19 147/2 147/9 147/25
148/6 149/18 149/21 150/1 150/12
150/13 150/20 152/7 152/13
153/10 154/7 155/19 156/9 156/15 173/9 174/14 174/14 175/9 175/15 177/17 178/5 178/6 180/1 181/19 181/19 181/20 182/24 184/21 187/8 187/21 187/22 188/13 190/17 195/1 195/3 195/24 201/17 203/25 204/1 204/6 206/21 207/5 207/7 207/12 209/2 209/11 210/7 211/12 211/20 212/11 212/12
212/13 212/17 213/3 213/7 213/7
216/4 221/16 226/1 226/2 228/21
i.e [1] 194/10
idea [5] 129/7 150/23 161/25
174/18 199/23
identical [1] 43/4
identification [1] 198/19
identified [7] 8/9 39/24 52/3 96/12 157/9 180/5 229/23
identifies [1] 139/15
identify [4] 16/1 140/13 141/11 208/24
identifying [1] 230/6
if [200] $5 / 3$ 10/19 $10 / 1911 / 1 \quad 12 / 4$
15/1 16/21 23/23 26/19 39/1
39/25 40/10 40/19 40/24 41/16 42/25 44/10 48/18 49/23 55/7 57/24 58/5 59/21 59/24 70/20 $70 / 2471 / 1171 / 1272 / 1377 / 7$ 77/8 80/10 81/9 83/20 87/25 90/10 90/18 91/25 95/17 96/2 96/10 96/13 97/5 97/16 97/25
98/18 98/21 98/22 100/25 101/5
101/15 110/24 112/24 113/25

| I | include [9] $43 / 5 \quad 60 / 5 \quad 109 / 3 \quad 116 / 5$ | 109/3 112/12 112/23 113/1 118/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| if... [146] 114/7 114/12 115/8 | included [7] 57/3 58/14 101/16 | 6 |
| 115/20 117/1 123/8 127/25 128/9 | 116/3 120/15 128/7 227/5 | 140/18 140/21 140/23 190/2 191/7 |
| 129/4 130/17 131/11 131/15 133/6 | including [11] 17/16 41/20 41/21 | 191/14 192/17 204/22 206/19 |
| 134/9 134/19 135/20 136/4 137/25 | 73/7 75/2 92/25 115/24 142/11 | 207/8 209/15 $217 / 21$ 222/4 223/8 |
| 138/25 143/19 143/23 144/6 | 156/24 165/3 166/2 | 227/5 |
| 144/20 144/22 145/1 145/21 146/2 | inclusive [1] 76/8 | informational [3] 127/17 127/19 |
| 146/3 146/7 146/12 147/17 148/11 | inconsistencies [5] 226/9 226/12 | 128/6 |
| 148/13 148/17 148/18 148/20 | 228/11 229/7 229/11 | informed [9] 50/6 51/15 51/18 |
| 148/22 148/22 148/23 151/13 | incorrect [1] 215/3 | 53/9 56/13 59/20 59/21 91/4 |
| 152/25 153/12 154/25 155/15 | increase [2] 214/14 217/9 | 180/5 |
| 156/1 156/9 156/10 157/18 158/7 | increased [2] 139/23 214/20 | informing [4] 47/15 56/7 121/17 |
| 158/11 159/13 159/13 159/24 | incriminating [2] 229/24 230/5 | 202/7 |
| 159/25 161/15 162/3 162/9 165/16 | incrimination [3] 125/17 125/23 | initial [2] 139/6 168/14 |
| 165/17 165/23 166/7 166/9 166/19 | 126/9 | initially [5] 35/4 44/15 60/8 72/16 |
| 167/1 167/13 167/23 168/2 168/14 | incriminatory [1] 230/11 | 123/15 |
| 169/12 169/12 169/20 169/20 | indeed [10] $116 / 20124 / 12$ 147/6 | injunction [1] 164/12 |
| 169/25 170/7 170/8 170/25 171/10 | 167/14 185/12 188/5 188/6 188/10 | ink [1] 109/21 |
| 171/19 173/4 174/24 175/6 175/13 | 195/1 201/15 | innocence [2] 134/9 142/5 |
| 175/18 175/22 175/25 176/5 | independent [4] 158/4 158/9 186/6 | innocent [4] 7/18 101/13 141/5 |
| 176/14 177/21 177/24 178/15 | 188/8 | 201/1 |
| 178/22 179/8 179/12 179/21 | indicate [6] 3/18 53/24 93/12 | innuendo [1] 166/21 |
| 180/23 181/3 181/10 181/25 182/3 | 167/6 198/4 227/7 | inquire [1] 22/15 |
| 182/7 185/2 185/2 185/9 185/25 | indicated [7] 53/1 54/10 55/19 | inquired [1] 20/6 |
| 186/21 186/21 188/5 188/5 188/10 | 57/10 70/19 143/18179/19 | inquiries [2] 52/22 53/4 |
| 190/7 191/15 192/5 192/15 192/18 | indicates [1] 204/25 | inquiring [2] 30/22 91/10 |
| 193/8 193/22 194/14 194/17 196/2 | indicating [3] 29/16 90/23 206/17 | inquiry [1] 112/15 |
| 196/25 199/15 200/9 200/12 | indirectly [3] 19/12 19/13 19/24 | inside [1] 69/10 |
| 200/20 201/2 201/5 202/6 203/18 | individual [5] 77/9 163/20 215/13 | insignificant [1] 227/11 |
| 203/19 205/3 205/12 207/15 | 215/20 225/11 | inspector [22] 12/8 12/9 12/18 |
| 207/21 208/11 208/12 208/23 | individually [2] 55/10 58/22 | 12/23 13/1 13/4 13/11 13/21 |
| 209/4 210/4 210/11 215/17216/12 | individuals [22] 48/11 49/15 49/21 | 13/22 15/10 15/15 20/5 21/6 |
| 217/19 219/21 220/21 223/1 | 49/23 49/25 68/19 68/20 69/11 | 22/24 25/20 25/25 26/2 26/15 |
| 230/20 | 69/12 69/14 69/15 71/6 71/11 | 30/14 38/1 41/1 41/2 |
| image [1] 129/22 | 82/16 86/1 87/7 93/17 93/22 | inspectors [2] 15/13 15/15 |
| imagine [3] 194/16 195/11 206/2 | 93/24 96/24 101/12 215/2 | instance [12] 104/7 160/12 168/4 |
| immediately [7] 3/15 20/13 25/14 | inference [23] 98/3 158/3 158/15 | 171/9 173/18 174/2 178/12 193/8 |
| 47/11 102/12 120/12 215/22 | 159/2 $159 / 14166 / 21$ 167/10 | 193/9 193/22 194/14 $215 / 7$ |
| impact [2] 161/12 193/18 | 170/18 171/10 171/20 171/22 | instruct [1] 201/17 |
| impair [2] 49/19 124/17 | 172/11 172/24 173/11 174/12 | instructed [1] 36/22 |
| impeachment [1] 193/25 | 174/23 176/11 176/13 178/2 178/9 | instruction [2] 201/16 201/22 |
| impede [1] 194/17 | 179/3 179/16 206/1 | instructions [4] 36/12 37/14 191/2 |
| impeded [2] 188/12 194/15 | inferences[11] 142/14 160/6 | 191/6 |
| impeding[1] 130/25 | 161/13 163/7 167/19 167/24 | instructive [2] 180/15 198/1 |
| imperiled [1] 124/21 | 171/11 176/14 176/18 176/24 | insure [3] 53/22 54/6 97/2 |
| imperiling [1] 131/1 | 181/17 | integrity [7] 132/14 159/10 159/19 |
| impermissible [6] 197/12 197/22 | inflame [1] 198/4 | 166/11 167/5 196/4 206/7 |
| 198/3 198/13 204/11 205/21 | inflammatory [5] 51/9 59/4 123/22 | intend [8] 44/20 103/14 140/7 |
| impetus [2] 120/16 120/19 | 153/7 189/17 | 144/24 168/14 168/20 175/13 |
| implement [1] 187/11 | influence [1] 58/23 | 208/9 |
| implemented [1] 184/9 | inform [3] 18/5 84/8 93/12 | intended [1] 138/9 |
| implementing [1] 184/22 | information [139] 22/14 34/22 | intends [2] 156/2 225/8 |
| implicate [1] 197/7 | 48/6 48/8 48/12 48/21 48/23 49/8 | intense [2] 124/8 141/24 |
| important [6] 61/22 76/22 84/11 | 49/13 49/16 49/17 50/1 50/4 50/5 | intent [2] 198/19 208/2 |
| 95/23 97/25 127/3 | 50/7 50/25 51/2 51/5 51/9 51/9 | intentional [1] 7/2 |
| Importantly [1] 197/25 | 51/13 51/1651/1951/21 52/15 | interest [21] 22/4 22/6 22/11 |
| impose [5] 29/14 122/1 147/2 | 53/2 53/4 53/9 53/17 53/23 54/12 | 22/17 22/25 23/12 23/13 50/13 |
| 148/1 189/1 | 57/3 57/8 57/9 57/10 57/11 57/15 | 50/17 50/20 62/10 62/15 62/21 |
| imposed [1] 7/11 | 57/21 57/22 57/23 58/9 58/12 | 63/2 95/18 96/3 159/23 184/11 |
| imposing [1] 144/14 | 58/16 58/18 59/2 59/4 59/4 59/23 | 184/15 195/16 196/7 |
| imposition [1] 134/24 | 61/23 64/7 64/1 1 64/22 65/7 65/9 | interested [4] 50/15 63/7 83/18 |
| impossible [1] 93/13 | 65/11 70/8 73/17 74/14 74/16 | 187/1 |
| improper [7] 93/5 139/14 140/5 | 75/17 75/19 76/1 76/7 76/13 | interesting [2] 62/24 193/21 |
| 142/13 142/14 142/24 201/15 | 76/14 76/17 76/18 76/23 78/8 | interests [2] 127/3 127/3 |
| impropriety [1] 161/2 | 78/10 79/6 79/25 79/25 80/6 80/7 | interfere [2] 20/7 130/15 |
| impugn [1] 195/1 | 80/11 80/16 80/20 80/25 81/2 | interference [2] 111/23 131/6 |
| in [720] | 81/3 81/14 82/1 82/13 82/14 | interfering [2] 130/18 130/25 |
| inadmissible [2] 190/1 198/10 | 82/16 82/19 82/19 82/20 84/7 | interplay [2] 161/22 161/25 |
| inappropriate [1] 189/16 | 84/20 85/6 85/12 85/23 86/2 86/7 | interpose [2] 96/10 98/11 |
| inches [1] 216/2 | 86/17 86/21 86/24 87/8 87/13 | interpretation [1] 145/24 |
| incidences [1] 82/5 | $87 / 1890 / 2591 / 491 / 1591 / 17$ | interrelated [1] 117/25 |
| incidentally [1] 119/23 | 92/6 92/14 92/17 93/10 104/12 | interrogator [1] 224/7 |

interrogatories [1] 189/4
interrogators [5] 215/5 217/10
218/15 218/24 219/23
intersect [2] 207/21 208/14
intersected [1] 208/25
interview [11] 35/5 35/15 36/2
36/3 36/4 92/20 93/15 122/8
129/23 130/4 217/12
interviewed [1] 91/12
interviews [7] 35/15 55/17 92/22
93/10 93/14 138/8 210/23
into [34] 16/8 19/4 24/15 30/22
35/9 45/14 50/18 62/8 62/17 62/20 66/5 69/25 70/7 97/10 114/7 123/20 125/9 129/25 130/16 132/4 173/2 175/16 199/19 199/20 202/13 202/17 203/19 205/7 205/19 207/8 214/22 $215 / 22$ 216/24 226/5
intrinsic [1] 175/5
introduce [15] 156/2 163/9 168/3
168/15 169/14 170/1 171/14 175/8 175/13 178/8 179/9 181/4 200/17 200/19 219/21
introduced [3] 173/6 179/6 196/12
introduces [2] 158/16 172/23
introduction [1] 178/17
introductory [1] 163/3
intruded [1] 127/8
invariably [2] 109/22 201/23
investigate [1] 186/11
investigated [1] 120/4
investigating [2] $90 / 1 \quad 197 / 19$
investigation [92] 10/22 19/4 19/7
19/14 19/20 $21 / 14$ 23/20 23/22
24/15 24/17 24/19 25/8 25/19
26/10 29/1 $833 / 13$ 36/14 36/18
38/6 38/21 45/14 45/20 45/25
46/2 46/9 46/12 46/13 47/5 47/8
47/23 49/9 49/19 49/22 50/3 50/9
50/1 5 50/1750/19 50/21 50/22
$51 / 2452 / 5$ 52/18 53/24 60/10
62/9 62/18 62/20 65/18 66/19
68/19 68/22 69/7 70/9 74/15 76/5
76/24 76/25 77/2 77/13 77/14
77/23 77/24 78/2 78/6 79/8 80/4 80/17 80/1 8 80/19 82/4 93/6 $94 / 13$ 94/16 95/11 95/24 96/23 97/5 97/10 97/19 97/21 102/3 122/18 140/12 147/9 183/22 184/4 184/24 187/5 195/21 206/7 213/11 investigations [6] 47/19 47/21 59/21 77/16 86/5 89/15
investigative [12] $42 / 245 / 1246 / 1$
48/7 48/22 51/4 72/2 75/23 75/25 78/3 120/9 184/12
investigator [9] 13/9 28/17 47/15 48/4 60/5 60/6 60/8 60/9 93/20
investigators [14] 14/15 49/21
58/17 59/20 60/1 60/2 60/4 60/7 60/11 64/17 68/17 75/24 76/13
82/6
invitation [2] 134/17 226/19
invitations [1] $87 / 3$
invite [2] 39/22 47/23
invited [2] 70/7 144/16
inviting [1] 144/2
invocation [1] 134/17
involved [29] 6/5 6/6 19/19 28/15
30/16 46/9 47/4 47/12 49/8 49/22 $51 / 15$ 66/2 69/6 70/15 82/4 90/2

95/10 97/18 100/18 132/8 159/21
166/24 171/6 171/17 180/25 184/3
184/19 195/9 228/5
involvement [9] 31/13 31/18 56/14
147/5 167/6 223/2 223/4 224/20
224/21
involves [1] 178/17
iota [1] 222/19
irrelevant [1] 29/25
irreparable [1] 133/8
is [467]
isn't [11] 77/24 117/6 126/10
130/10 136/17 151/24 153/13
173/3 186/4 223/14 229/15
isolation [3] $173 / 11173 / 19174 / 8$
issue [41] $8 / 119 / 351 / 11102 / 5$
104/1 105/9 109/14 113/14113/15
115/21 131/7 138/25 143/14 144/2 146/16 149/12 150/7 152/14 153/9 157/25 158/10 158/19 159/21
160/1 161/8 161/18 161/19 161/23
169/15 172/6 175/19 180/16 190/4
192/10 192/11 193/21 201/6 202/4
207/13 207/18 210/17
issued [1] 37/5
issues [9] 158/1 159/19 161/9
163/5 168/13 179/17 193/10 210/4 210/5
issuing [1] 39/7
it [382]
it's [126] 3/2 4/6 13/14 13/25
28/24 32/11 33/24 39/11 39/13
48/5 51/22 54/10 59/19 64/2
69/21 69/24 76/12 76/15 81/5
81/9 85/23 103/20 103/25 104/10 104/16 105/22 107/18 109/24 112/3 112/4 120/3 124/5 130/12 132/10 132/19 132/20 137/6 137/19 137/23 138/19 144/10
145/9 146/11 148/25 153/5 154/15 155/25 161/6 161/7 161/19 161/21 162/12 166/14 166/15 167/7 167/13 168/11 170/5 170/11 171/13 171/15 171/23 173/17 174/11 176/6 176/7 177/5 177/22 178/2 180/16 182/5 185/11185/11 187/1 187/2 187/2 187/19 188/13 188/20 189/6 189/23 189/25 193/20 194/2 194/3 194/9 194/10 194/17 194/20 196/21 197/25 198/3 200/15 201/8 202/4 202/7 203/2 203/3 203/9 203/9 205/8 205/9 205/16 207/14 208/6 209/12 209/23 210/5 210/20 213/15
216/18 217/15 218/9 219/13
219/19 220/8 220/21 221/2 222/22 223/20 223/25 223/25 224/1 225/16 226/8 230/12
item [6] 105/17 106/6 106/12 110/10 113/5 164/10
items [3] 110/22 156/25 196/11
its [22] 121/21 $122 / 1 \quad 136 / 3145 / 5$ 145/17 148/7 149/22 154/13
160/11 162/17 163/3 166/8 166/10
166/11 168/14 176/15 177/24
183/7 196/7 202/1 208/3 230/14
itself [12] 76/5 109/15 112/17
115/3 120/6 147/8 156/15 159/11
161/3 184/12 187/4 191/5

## J

J-o-s-t [1] 33/6
jail [5] 10/12 14/21 $112 / 9$ 191/24
$225 / 9$
James [1] 14/3
January [3] 5/14 5/15 5/16
jargon [1] 77/1
Jeffrey [1] 136/15
JEROME [2] 1/15 3/15
Jerrell [1] 217/15
Jesse [1] 136/12
job [1] 140/9
Joe [1] 73/10
join [1] 123/10
joint [7] 46/12 54/13 56/6 71/15
72/1 92/18 94/19
jointly [6] 56/21 70/12 76/16
77/10 82/17 82/22
Jost [3] 32/24 32/25 195/18
Jost's [1] 33/6
judge [66] $1 / 114 / 13$ 36/8 44/20
54/17 59/1 1 96/9 96/9 98/10 99/3 101/3 102/5 103/12 105/5 105/23 105/25 106/21 107/3 107/19 108/25 110/7 110/14 111/18 113/17113/20 113/24 115/19 117/6 117/24 139/10 140/7 142/15 143/12 144/1 144/18 146/11 152/14 153/2 154/14 155/10 155/14 155/19 157/5 162/25 190/18 196/23 196/23 197/25 198/14 199/9 206/23 207/15 208/9 209/25 210/18 211/8 211/19 212/4 213/16 213/16 226/1 226/21
227/11 228/23 231/8 231/9
Judge's [1] 143/2
judiciously [1] 43/10
JULY [7] $1 / 109 / 24103 / 8115 / 20$
155/8 202/16 232/15
July 14 [1] 202/16
July 14th [1] 155/8
July 19 [1] 103/8
July 19th [1] 115/20
jumped [1] 149/11
juncture [1] 119/12
June [4] 107/11 213/18 213/18
213/20
June 19th [1] 107/11
June 1st [1] 213/18
June 2nd [1] 213/18
Junior [1] 195/12
juries [1] 189/24
jurisdiction [2] 19/17 195/23
jurors [17] $4 / 7$ 58/23 124/24
137/14 143/10 147/14 148/12 148/24 183/12 183/16 183/16 183/18 185/14 186/2 186/3 186/3 191/25
jury [41] $31 / 14122 / 4130 / 6$ 134/22 139/23 144/11 146/25 147/22 159/2 159/15 172/9 172/9
176/17 176/17 176/25 177/5 178/2
178/23 181/18 $185 / 4185 / 8185 / 24$
185/25 186/20 186/22 190/23
191/12 196/13 196/19 197/9
197/13 198/4 200/11 201/16
201/1 8 201/22 202/7 203/22 206/1
209/17 229/15
just [85] 16/1 18/20 20/8 23/14 28/10 29/3 30/22 31/12 34/20 35/1 35/10 36/8 37/21 42/16 47/7 $47 / 22$ 49/23 58/5 71/12 76/10 77/23 84/12 85/13 85/13 87/2 94/3 101/8 101/16 109/19 109/24 110/16 $111 / 4113 / 13114 / 21$
119/25 129/3 131/13 136/2 137/23

| J | $232 / 14$ | learned [3] 74/23 183/20 183/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| just... [46] 140/1 140/5 142/12 | 121/16 |  |
| 149/7 151/3 151/9 151/11 156/20 | knows [8] 112/10 121/11 140/2 | 73/18 77/12 78/6 86/12 86/12 |
| 158/3 158/14 162/5 162/11 165/15 | 166/24 210/22 $218 / 7$ 226/6 228/8 | 104/1 105/9 105/11 107/5 107/17 |
| 169/1 169/19 170/4 172/23 173/21 | Kocourek [1] 6/16 | 114/6 $115 / 22116 / 3122 / 6$ 123/8 |
| 174/3 174/4 174/9 176/14 179/2 | KRATZ [42] 1/13 2/9 2/11 3/9 46/6 | 124/9 134/13 134/20 137/11 |
| 179/11 185/15 186/10 188/11 | 74/13 74/21 75/15 75/21 77/22 | 139/19 143/9 154/16 168/11 188/6 |
| 190/18 193/16 195/24 200/3 | 81/22 82/15 86/15 90/7 90/10 | 189/9 190/1 196/8 200/23 205/3 |
| 201/22 202/8 202/9 202/16 206/4 | 92/9 99/22 100/3 105/3 106/17 | 207/23 210/24 211/4 212/4 215/19 |
| 208/4 208/19 209/1 $215 / 21218 / 19$ | 110/6 112/7 112/10 112/20 115/16 | 226/14 229/7 230/8 230/15 |
| 219/2 219/14 220/9 222/15 223/25 | 117/4 119/25 120/24 121/21 | leave [6] 25/16 67/24 73/14 98/17 |
| justice [6] 3/11 72/20 131/18 | 128/13 128/22 139/8 146/1 146/21 | 211/3 231/3 |
| 133/21 136/1 138/20 | 147/25 149/10 155/8 201/5 203/18 | leaves [1] 222/12 |
| Justice's [1] 36/17 | 206/21 209/12 225/24 | leaving [1] 148/2 |
| iuvenile [1] 74/7 | Kratz's [4] 62/17 87/11 104/5 | led [3] 18/23 111/24 171/8 |
| K | $179 / 19$ | Ledvina [6] 13/2 13/13 14/9 14/10 |
| keep [7] 23/14 50/6 59/20 59/21 | L | left [8] 37/8 85/17 88/5 101/24 |
| 60/15 134/4 147/11 | L | 111/15 185/19215/18216/11 |
| keeping [1] 115/15 | L-e-d-v-i-n-a [1] 13/2 | legal [1] 146/16 |
| Ken [1] 3/8 | L-e-n-k [1] 14/5 | legally [1] 152/16 |
| KENNETH[6] 1/13 2/3 4/12 4/18 | La [1] 152/22 | legislature [1] 135/16 |
| 4/23 122/15 | Lab [10] 78/9 78/20 78/24 79/6 | legitimate [1] 127/4 |
| kept [1] 51/14 | 79/21 80/1 93/11 178/15 215/9 | length [3] 135/25 161/24 209/15 |
| key[11] 32/14 169/2 169/4 169/7 | 216/3 | lengthy [1] 102/25 |
| 169/10 170/9 171/4 171/7 173/1 | lack [1] 228/18 | Lenk [21] 14/3 14/7 14/12 14/14 |
| 173/19 178/10 | ladder [1] 17/17 | 16/18 27/18 27/24 29/9 31/2 32/2 |
| kid [1] 223/2 | laid [1] 157/20 | $32 / 1732 / 1832 / 1833 / 934 / 5$ |
| kill [2] 129/19 205/12 | large [6] 50/20 62/15 63/1 75/8 | 34/13 41/21 68/10 68/12 72/6 |
| killed [6] 133/19 136/7 141/23 | 75/8 $119 / 9$ | 203/4 |
| 218/23 219/4 226/23 | largely [2] 118/16 230/20 | less [6] 114/9 133/23 134/21 |
| killing [2] 136/1 220/8 | Larry [1] 13/1 | 155/17 178/5 197/3 |
| kind [21] 7/7 25/21 66/25 84/8 | Lasse [1] 138/6 | lesser [1] 131/25 |
| 87/13 100/13 109/21 126/3 157/14 | last [21] 4/22 5/9 18/21 31/22 45/3 | let [13] 27/2 30/2 46/16 58/7 |
| 164/9 165/17 178/1 189/1 189/23 | 45/9 47/17 56/21 65/6 65/10 | 85/25 91/19 104/7 141/1 158/10 |
| 190/16 197/16 199/1 199/22 201/2 | 98/21 99/2 99/21 113/5 135/7 | 168/22 183/18 191/22 203/22 |
| 209/9 227/7 | 135/17 195/7 195/10 213/23 | let's [18] 5/2 30/7 33/19 72/5 97/2 |
| kinds [5] 164/14 205/16 208/12 | 229/16 230/13 | 97/4 97/6 106/22 109/9 110/9 |
| 209/3 222/12 | lasted [1] 36/4 | 110/11 156/23 157/3 169/6 192/4 |
| knew [16] 50/17 50/18 61/14 62/8 | Lastly [1] 198/14 | 204/9 206/14 212/11 |
| 62/17 62/20 63/8 66/9 66/16 74/6 | latch [2] 227/18 227/22 | letter [4] 100/16 110/17 206/15 |
| 74/10 82/20 84/25 93/18 93/22 | late [3] 34/22 78/22 136/20 | 217/24 |
| 122/2 | later [9] 7/17 19/1 28/14 52/19 | level [2] 30/15 122/19 |
| knife [2] 220/3 220/3 | 53/11 103/8 103/14 106/24 197/15 | liability [3] 105/18 155/24 180/4 |
| know [120] 10/11 18/21 18/23 | laughable [1] 217/19 | liaison [1] 25/16 |
| 26/1 26/5 26/20 27/3 27/3 27/9 | Lauren [1] 134/2 | liberty [1] 133/17 |
| 27/11 27/13 27/24 28/9 28/10 | law [49] 1/16 5/19 11/8 21/15 27/4 | lie [2] 218/16 $218 / 18$ |
| 28/12 28/18 29/2 29/3 32/5 32/6 | 27/14 28/4 28/20 29/10 32/1 32/9 | lies [1] 215/3 |
| 32/7 32/12 33/3 34/7 34/7 34/10 | 32/14 32/21 46/21 46/25 69/4 | lieutenant [17] 13/9 13/18 14/2 |
| 34/20 34/24 35/1 36/12 37/5 | 70/3 77/1 77/11 80/5 88/22 89/2 | 16/12 27/18 29/9 32/18 33/9 34/5 |
| 41/16 42/5 42/6 43/22 60/16 | 97/16 98/9 99/11 107/15 121/7 | 34/13 41/20 41/21 60/13 68/10 |
| 60/21 60/24 61/9 62/13 62/18 | 121/12 122/7 122/19 129/10 132/7 | 68/12 72/6 203/3 |
| 63/6 64/14 65/14 71/11 72/20 | 132/11 135/6 142/10 142/18 | lieutenants [4] 14/23 15/7 15/13 |
| 73/4 74/2 80/11 81/19 87/12 88/1 | 146/13 146/20 147/16 177/4 | 25/2 |
| 88/2 88/2 90/4 90/9 90/12 90/14 | 180/23 185/6 186/6 188/8 188/9 | life [13] 10/11 137/1 200/22 |
| 92/4 98/14 100/14 100/15 103/18 | 192/24 195/25 206/3 214/6 | 201/11 201/22 202/10 206/15 |
| 103/25 106/1 112/10 $115 / 11$ | lawsuit [20] 23/1 23/5 33/20 34/14 | 207/18 207/19 207/21 207/25 |
| 115/19 116/15 120/2 121/5 127/11 | 34/19 63/17 63/22 72/9 95/21 | 208/25 215/1 |
| 127/17 130/23 134/3 137/21 | 195/15 199/12 199/21 199/21 | lift [2] 40/20 42/6 |
| 143/17 148/13 150/12 151/20 | 200/2 202/3 202/22 204/18 205/11 | light [3] 109/22 156/9 158/19 |
| 152/17 153/14 155/2 159/16 | 205/15 230/18 | lights [1] 88/6 |
| 159/25 159/25 171/5 171/6 175/8 | lawyer [3] 40/5 187/15 218/7 | like [24] 16/2 $126 / 23$ 37/10 42/4 |
| 175/14 177/7 177/15 177/24 184/9 | lawyers [4] 132/6 134/10 135/7 | 65/16 69/23 78/13 79/7 90/21 |
| 184/16 185/20 187/15 188/11 | 189/10 | 95/22 97/4 100/20 116/12 136/25 |
| 188/21 189/12 189/20 189/24 | lay [3] 120/6 126/25 209/8 | 137/3 162/11 165/6 199/15 $211 / 17$ |
| 190/3 195/5 195/17 195/18 196/2 | lead [11] 41/2 60/5 60/7 60/9 | 215/19 218/9 219/22 221/12 222/9 |
| 198/9 203/4 203/6 203/10 203/22 | 68/21 78/2 95/12 97/25 147/8 | likely [9] 162/14 198/23 198/24 |
| 206/15 207/16 209/12 221/8 226/2 | 195/3 195/21 | 203/1 203/2 203/3 203/5 203/11 |
| 226/11 228/2 229/6 | leading [7] 46/5 56/8 56/10 78/6 | 203/13 |
| knowing [2] 125/18 207/6 | 103/21 217/2 217/13 | limb [1] 128/25 |
| knowledge [9] 30/9 52/16 61/18 | leads [1] 190/5 | limine [11] 106/8 106/13 107/22 |
| 74/2 119/13 120/23 128/9 221/14 | learn [1] 72/11 | 110/16 111/7 164/3 196/18 199/25 |

limine... [3] 202/15 208/22 209/8 limit [4] 69/11 123/5 140/16 140/18
limitation [1] 31/2
limited [2] 146/21 187/23
limiting [7] 50/23 52/12 54/5
57/23 132/6 132/10 132/24
limits [1] 209/9
line [5] 29/14 29/24 64/21 88/24 187/5
lines [3] 43/16 116/21 173/14
link [1] 138/18
linked [2] 138/4 138/13
lion's [1] 117/21
listen [2] 219/22 221/2
lists [2] $43 / 1443 / 18$
litigation [5] 95/14 97/1 97/23
97/24 166/5
little [14] 5/2 20/8 38/25 54/1 76/4
85/14 114/9 123/3 140/17 140/20
162/11 165/7 188/20 206/19
live [1] 183/5
lived [3] 6/22 74/24 75/11
lives [2] 209/19 217/20
living [1] 96/24
loaded [1] 16/21
local [3] 55/11 64/19 100/6
locally [1] 123/2
locate [6] 48/11 48/15 49/2 66/16 66/17 77/10
located [1] 77/8
locating [2] 47/25 49/6
location [2] 192/25 218/25
locus [2] 120/3 120/8
logical [5] 139/15 143/7 158/14 160/8 169/8
logistical [3] 29/19 31/14 31/16
logistics [3] 3/20 24/1 24/6
long [14] 68/1 68/8 88/21 88/24
99/25 153/25 154/23 155/3 157/4
189/24 190/17 222/18 224/4
224/10
longer [4] 71/2 135/3 224/17 229/20
look [22] 39/17 39/21 39/24 64/4 85/12 90/14 95/22 150/10 150/20
151/9 161/16 161/16 161/22 165/6 165/15 174/15 184/1 186/7 211/17 219/22 222/9 223/11
looked [3] 127/15 152/4 153/14 looking [15] 64/9 76/20 76/21 79/7 97/17 106/9 157/24 170/25 173/10 173/18 186/5 187/19 187/20 187/21 222/13
lookout [1] 66/11
looks [1] 78/13
loop [2] 20/21 51/15
lose [1] 58/4
lost [2] 133/20 215/1
lot [5] 170/11 173/19 207/10 225/16 226/3
low [1] 66/7
lunch [4] 101/1 102/8 102/12 185/25
lurid [2] 121/20 214/16
lurking [1] 146/16

## M

machine [1] 232/10
made [60] $7 / 18$ 7/21 8/1 19/3
19/10 19/25 20/5 21/17 45/25

49/11 52/23 57/13 77/22 81/5
81/24 83/23 84/5 87/19 90/8 92/7 92/9 94/19 95/8 100/17 101/11 106/15 108/2 108/4 109/4 109/8 112/15 113/22 116/4 120/23
121/25 124/12 127/7 129/7 130/5
140/23 142/12 164/9 165/6 166/21
168/24 169/15 188/11 189/16
204/2 204/6 204/8 204/14 215/3
218/1 218/7 226/8 228/3 228/13
229/23 230/5
Madison [3] 44/4 78/19 178/15
mail [1] 100/17
mailing[2] 65/15 87/11
main [1] 203/5
maintained [2] 166/9 172/4
major [2] 86/5 89/15
majority [1] 214/25
make [52] 39/4 39/9 41/6 44/4 65/22 73/12 81/19 82/11 82/11 84/12 94/6 109/11 $139 / 3142 / 8$ 152/16 156/20 158/2 159/1 159/22 164/6 169/19 170/7 170/8 170/11 170/17 171/20 171/21 172/1
172/19 172/20 173/4 174/6 174/7
174/9 174/14 174/21 174/25 175/7
175/22 176/16 178/6 178/21
178/22 190/19 191/8 192/15
192/17 193/14 197/2 201/9 219/2 229/14
makers [2] 75/22 81/25
makes [4] 157/16 190/6 194/18 222/9
making [15] 40/7 53/3 72/1 73/16 73/17 104/18 120/14 145/15 146/22 151/14 151/16 153/4 156/11 176/22 181/15
man [14] 9/8 9/8 $15 / 21$ 63/8
129/16 136/13 190/4 190/5 190/6
217/22 220/18 227/9 228/4 228/18
man's [1] 214/23
management [1] 61/5
MANITOWOC [88] 1/1 5/4 5/18
5/20 5/22 6/7 6/16 8/2 10/21
11/10 11/13 12/10 16/22 18/11 19/14 19/15 23/2 23/22 24/13 26/9 26/23 27/17 29/20 32/8
$33 / 1636 / 1337 / 2338 / 338 / 8$
38/15 39/2 $41 / 1854 / 1760 / 18$
63/1 8 66/3 66/4 68/13 71/17 72/7 93/25 94/7 94/9 94/21 94/23 95/9 95/14 96/6 97/17 97/20 99/8
104/3 104/25 121/4 122/16 122/20 124/23 125/5 130/6 137/12 147/5 148/12 156/21 178/13 183/21 184/2 184/6 184/18 185/7 186/9
186/12 186/16 187/13 188/4 188/9 188/19 189/14 190/24 191/24
193/3 193/6 195/8 195/13 195/22
199/13 200/7 202/24 232/2
manner [8] 141/7 144/3 145/4
172/3 216/10 217/18 226/15 227/8
manpower [2] 24/2 24/6
many [15] 41/17 50/3 60/1 60/25
67/20 77/16 88/21 89/3 89/8
100/4 102/19 120/8 166/23 219/13 219/16
March [29] 55/24 55/25 56/6 56/15
56/25 58/13 73/25 82/24 82/24
83/3 83/13 83/18 91/9 101/9
101/22 102/2 120/15 120/15
120/19 120/20 121/19 128/11
213/24 219/10 225/23 227/13

229/17 230/19 231/1
March 1 [3] 82/24 120/15 120/19
March 17 [2] 229/17 231/1
March 17th [2] 213/24 225/23
March 1st [4] 56/6 56/15 91/9 227/13
March 2 [6] 73/25 82/24 120/15
120/20 121/19 128/11
March 2nd [3] 56/25 101/22 102/2
Marinette [6] 115/2 115/21 116/2
210/18 210/23 212/5
mark[3] 47/15 121/4 212/25
marked [2] 39/16 40/7
market [3] 43/25 44/1 122/3
markets [1] 44/5
marshal [1] 168/21
masse [1] 117/24
match [1] 227/23
matched [2] 187/3 189/13
mate [1] 112/1
material [4] 43/3 76/1 116/17
151/12
materials [1] 112/21
mates [2] 112/15 112/16
matter [23] 55/21 76/10 84/21 105/10 111/10 113/3 125/13 125/16 132/16 132/17 132/18 133/10 151/14 158/1 181/8 194/6 195/25 197/10 201/20 214/25 217/3 232/7 232/13
matters [6] 48/8 54/25 70/6 106/25 139/6 209/20
mattress [6] 216/12 216/13 216/17 216/18216/19 216/23
may[73] 4/9 5/3 16/13 17/10 17/13 17/19 25/5 25/24 26/20 27/21 29/19 32/12 35/7 35/16 44/7 44/22 54/1 55/4 65/14 65/16 73/9 89/6 101/5 103/12 107/4 108/2 108/4 109/3 109/3 109/11 109/16 112/15 113/23 113/23 114/5 114/5 118/7 120/19 122/21 127/23 129/15 141/25 142/1 145/5 151/22 153/5 153/6 158/14 159/20 160/12 162/11 164/6 164/21 167/3 167/3 175/4 175/5 175/5 189/11 192/10 192/16 193/17 193/24 196/12 200/8 200/10 203/12 204/4 204/6 207/15 217/11 230/2 230/21
May 10 [1] 122/21
May 13th [1] 217/11
maybe [18] 12/21 19/23 43/23
79/11 82/7 82/9 84/6 96/19
116/20 131/24 132/23 132/23 151/9 153/12 153/13 175/15 213/5 227/25
me [62] 3/16 19/23 20/23 22/10 25/25 27/2 29/13 30/2 30/25 40/1 $41 / 15$ 43/14 43/22 44/6 46/16 47/15 48/7 53/12 54/4 54/18 54/21 55/3 55/5 57/7 59/20 59/21 85/13 91/19 130/23 139/1 141/1 144/4 144/18 149/21 150/7 150/17 152/20 153/17 154/1 155/3 157/25 158/10 162/5 164/20 168/22 170/10 171/9 172/8 173/12 175/2 179/11 179/21 180/20 183/18 194/24 198/1 1 202/14 204/1 213/15 221/20 232/8 232/9 mean [30] 6/2 16/20 19/24 20/10 23/25 35/24 37/10 37/21 40/10 $41 / 11$ 58/7 65/20 67/4 89/18 91/19 100/14 100/15 100/15
mean...[12] 100/16 146/15 147/25 149/8 152/14 152/24 160/16
172/14 173/19 195/5 198/22 207/7 meaning [5] 11/10 16/4 96/11 97/15 117/19
meaningful [1] 207/13
means [2] 122/15 131/19
meant [3] 99/5 148/24 194/17 measurable [1] 230/24
mechanics [1] 109/13
media [82] 37/2 38/21 43/15 43/21 43/25 43/25 44/5 46/17 46/21 47/24 48/9 48/14 48/24 49/12 49/1 8 49/20 50/4 50/6 50/14 50/20 51/3 51/1351/1751/23
$53 / 153 / 854 / 1255 / 855 / 1457 / 17$ $58 / 258 / 5$ 59/24 61/23 62/1 62/11
62/15 62/21 63/2 63/6 63/8 63/24 64/6 64/11 74/16 75/18 76/3 76/7 76/22 83/18 84/8 84/15 85/16 86/6 87/4 87/7 87/14 88/5 88/18 90/22 90/25 91/10 91/20 92/5 92/7 92/11 92/14 100/5 100/6 100/8 104/11 $118 / 25119 / 24122 / 3$ 134/4 138/1 138/3 141/24 142/6 150/8 150/18212/17
meet [4] 75/24 125/19 153/24 169/16
meetings [3] 51/1 58/12 81/13 member [3] 28/7 169/22 195/7 members [40] 27/16 30/6 34/3 36/16 39/4 46/1 0 53/3 53/8 55/6 55/8 61/9 61/14 64/16 65/2 65/3 71/22 75/2 75/3 83/18 88/13 88/19 90/20 90/20 90/24 91/19 91/23 92/2 96/25 121/24 133/25 136/7 142/8 142/10 152/19 183/10
188/4 191/1 191/11 205/3 228/4
memo [3] 40/7 40/11 41/11
memorandum [5] 107/15 111/2
111/4 116/9 116/18
memory [1] 173/3
men [1] 200/18
Mendoza [2] 139/25 143/6
mention [2] 141/1 142/25
mentioned [4] 33/9 58/10 127/19
208/15
mere [1] 126/11
merely [1] 22/11
messiah [1] 112/18
met [2] 3/19 58/15
metes [1] 19/15
method [1] 144/16
Michigan [1] 194/8
microphones [2] 87/22 88/7
mid [5] 6/12 34/19 34/23 40/22
112/24
mid-afternoon [1] 112/24
mid-April [1] 40/22
mid-October [1] 34/19
middle [3] 162/6 208/9 209/7
might [19] 65/7 65/14 70/22 80/21
84/15 88/10 88/13 98/13 110/7
111/24 129/19 135/1 162/13
168/23 179/21 189/1 191/19 219/6 220/1
mildly [1] 189/15
million [2] 23/5 203/8
Milwaukee [5] 43/25 44/2 55/15 119/9 136/8
mind [3] 8/9 113/25 154/22
mine [1] 123/8
minimum [1] 201/2
minutes [5] 100/1 100/2 112/8
122/22 153/10
Miranda [1] 193/23
mischaracterization [1] 96/14
misconduct [10] 98/9 99/12
163/11 167/2 168/5 168/15 170/12 170/16 172/8 177/9
mishandling [6] 93/5 93/8 93/15
97/11 98/8 99/11
misleads [1] 202/1
missed [3] 95/5 210/15 224/6
missing[30] 18/24 47/5 47/10
47/16 47/18 48/11 48/25 50/2
$52 / 1859 / 15$ 59/18 64/2 65/17
$66 / 1166 / 1766 / 1976 / 1977 / 2$
77/8 77/9 77/13 77/16 77/23
80/18 80/19 80/21 81/3 81/8
96/22 140/12
Missouri [3] 163/12 163/13 163/15
mistaken [1] 202/12
mistrial [1] 162/3
Mm [1] 85/19
Mm-hmm [1] 85/19
modification [1] 103/13
modified [2] 179/20 179/22
modify [2] 231/2 231/4
mom [1] 77/17
moment [4] 36/8 126/20 135/10
148/15
Monday [2] 79/9 80/2
monetary [1] 225/14
monitored [1] 24/17
months [7] 10/3 55/22 129/25
130/2 132/4 219/15 222/15
moot [1] 192/11
morale [1] 203/12
more [52] 9/23 22/18 31/11 33/10 35/19 36/3 43/23 51/21 54/15 76/7 86/2 89/18 102/8 109/24 114/22 116/8 $119 / 6119 / 21122 / 12$ 123/3 123/8 123/22 124/21 127/21 128/2 130/23 132/25 133/18 135/9 139/1 147/14 151/9 151/21 152/9 152/9 161/11 164/1 172/22 175/9 178/7 185/12 186/17 189/13 189/22 197/3 198/23 198/24
205/20 206/19 207/10 223/1

## 223/14

morning [16] $3 / 43 / 103 / 135 / 2$ 19/3 19/25 20/3 20/14 23/9 33/11 44/9 118/24 122/10 124/15 124/21 191/5
most [10] 11/14 25/4 51/25 65/5
102/1 102/21 150/6 150/9 195/10 219/24
mother [1] 165/9
motion [137] 1/4 4/1 4/4 4/4 4/5
4/15 7/21 8/1 8/6 31/9 31/9 31/12 31/19 31/21 44/19 98/15 102/16 102/17 103/13 103/15 103/18 104/2 104/25 105/6 105/15 105/18 105/19 106/1 106/5 106/9 106/13 110/15 110/15 111/13111/17
111/23 112/3 113/6 113/9113/16 114/18 114/25 115/3 117/11
117/15 118/9 118/11 123/2 123/4 123/10 123/13 134/15 138/2
142/17 142/20 143/11 143/12
143/14 143/16 143/18 143/19
143/22 143/22 143/24 144/25
145/18 145/20 146/5 146/14
$146 / 22150 / 15151 / 20151 / 22$
151/23 155/23 155/24 155/25
156/14 156/19 157/20 161/15 162/10 162/22 164/3 168/7 168/11
168/11 168/17 168/18 170/23
171/13 174/20 176/3 177/19
178/25 179/4 179/10 179/15
179/18 181/21 183/8 183/10
183/15 192/8 192/20 196/18
196/21 196/22 199/14 199/25
202/15 206/12 206/13 206/13
206/1 8 208/22 209/5 209/7 209/21
210/14 211/5 211/6 211/9 211/11
212/5 213/13 213/16 213/17
213/22 213/25 214/12 214/14
215/6 219/12 228/22 229/6 231/3
motions [28] 3/4 3/22 3/24 42/23
44/14 44/18 46/14 46/15 98/13
98/14 102/9 102/22 103/8 103/17
103/19 106/8 106/15 107/22 111/7
115/21 115/24 115/25 145/21
146/3 152/12 155/13 155/17161/6
motive [1] 198/20
motives [2] 93/5 120/6
mouth [2] 172/16 221/11
move [12] 98/22 109/9 110/9
123/1 $141 / 12$ 143/11 146/7 146/24
155/23 185/8 185/8 218/24
moved [5] 31/12 31/15 118/12
134/21 147/17
moves [2] 144/13 148/21
movie [3] 100/12 100/19 100/20
moving [4] 103/16 123/5 148/10 183/9
Mr [9] 6/17 31/6 46/6 90/23
105/24 139/9 145/24 174/2 194/21
Mr. [239]
Mr. Avery [53] 3/16 3/17 7/13 7/18 8/5 9/13 26/12 43/17 52/23 53/2
54/7 58/24 72/13 73/22 82/25
95/14 112/16119/14119/18125/6 131/15 133/23 134/8 141/11 141/13 142/2 149/6 166/1 168/21
175/1 197/14 200/10 200/17 201/6
202/8 203/21 204/8 204/10 205/10 207/22 208/1 208/15 208/25 214/2 215/20 216/21 219/14 219/15 221/14 221/22 227/23 229/25 230/6
Mr. Avery's [23] 6/25 27/15 28/13 28/22 29/5 55/22 115/1 118/9 124/18 124/22 167/6 193/1 199/11 210/22 214/19 215/12 216/4
216/10 217/6 $217 / 24$ 220/18 225/5 227/17
Mr. Buting [23] 113/12 114/13
116/7 133/23 152/5 162/23 169/20 175/15 181/24 206/16 207/9
207/16 208/16 208/18 213/14
226/11 226/12 226/13 227/7
227/16 227/25 228/2 228/25
Mr. Buting's [3] 113/10 156/19 226/4
Mr. Dassey [14] 56/18 57/5 74/3 83/15 128/20 157/10 180/25
200/20 214/4 $215 / 4215 / 14217 / 11$ 230/11 230/15
Mr. Dassey's [8] 56/14 214/6 216/4 221/25 224/14 224/19 229/8 230/22
Mr. Fallon [12] 4/16 36/7 102/13 105/4 157/15 168/22 178/4 182/25 187/14 190/13 194/23 225/25

Mr. Fallon's [3] 30/5 38/7 156/10
Mr. Glynn's [3] 115/7 115/13 116/3
Mr. Hermann [3] 12/4 21/4 41/3
Mr. Kratz [37] 74/13 74/21 75/15 75/21 77/22 81/22 82/15 86/15 90/7 90/10 92/9 99/22 100/3
105/3 106/17 110/6 112/7 112/10 112/20 115/16 117/4 119/25 120/24 121/21 128/13 128/22 139/8 146/1 146/21 147/25 149/10 155/8 201/5 203/18 206/21 209/12 225/24
Mr. Kratz's [4] 62/17 87/11 104/5 179/19
Mr. Ledvina [2] 13/13 14/9
Mr. Lenk [2] 14/7 16/18
Mr. Pagel [3] 24/3 45/7 120/25
Mr. Schetter [3] 13/16 14/8 14/11
Mr. Strang [36] 4/2 30/1 42/22
59/12 96/10 96/13 99/24 103/14 105/9 107/7 113/9 115/16 117/6
$118 / 1$ 139/12 139/15 139/16 140/1
141/2 141/25 143/18 144/1 144/14
145/2 146/6 150/14 153/17 154/3
154/10 154/23 183/12 199/10
202/18 211/21 213/14 228/2
Mr. Strang's [5] 46/14 105/6 113/2 142/22 204/3
Mr. Vetter [1] 14/7
Mr. Wiegert [1] 112/25
Ms [14] 19/20 24/15 33/25 43/17 47/25 48/16 56/2 64/1 121/24 133/4 141/22 201/22 206/24 208/13
much [22] 23/13 59/5 103/14
120/4 120/20 122/12 123/8 128/24
164/1 164/18 167/7 175/16 179/15
185/11 188/25 199/19 199/20
201/24 201/25 201/25 201/25
215/19
muddied [1] 163/5
murder [12] 6/1 6/2 6/3 6/17 7/6
83/1 83/4 129/5 136/13 223/8 224/21 228/5
murdered [1] 206/3
must [4] 107/12 161/9 194/19 226/2
mute [2] 133/16 133/18
mutilated [2] 141/23 227/3
my [47] 3/14 13/25 30/20 30/21 31/22 48/6 48/11 54/24 55/6 62/18 75/24 85/15 89/11 89/18 90/22 92/22 96/1 96/17 103/20 108/9 109/16 110/7 110/17 111/3 115/7119/13 123/6 123/9 125/12 125/15 125/18 134/4 140/25 142/3 144/4 144/18 160/2 173/3 174/6 194/17 200/13 206/21 208/6 209/23 228/15 232/9 232/13
myself [9] 25/8 41/1 49/14 60/14 82/15 89/22 90/1 90/5 104/8
N
nail [2] 20/9 35/10
name [13] 4/22 4/22 12/3 32/3 33/6 45/3 45/3 119/21 120/10 120/11 127/19 138/12 189/17
named [3] 15/21 16/12 195/14
namely [1] 230/11
names [1] 33/8
narrative [1] 222/22
narrow [1] 89/18
nation [1] 135/24
national [6] 55/11 55/16 55/20
100/5 100/8 124/20
nationally [2] 55/18 127/25
nature [11] 50/25 51/14 78/3
79/20 104/14 141/6 150/5 193/18
196/7 203/20 230/7
near [1] 118/14
neat [1] 187/15
necessarily [12] 18/23 25/2 30/3
69/10 71/24 85/4 102/11 125/22
125/25 $178 / 17$ 194/3 207/12
necessary [7] 70/4 123/20 128/19
140/21 201/2 209/13 212/19
neck [1] 136/10
need [22] 20/8 22/15 22/1841/15 48/10 61/20 64/4 66/24 70/24
106/2 108/8 108/9 108/13 108/14
108/15 114/3 154/2 155/8 168/18 192/2 200/17 204/4
needed [12] 24/1 24/6 48/20 48/24
49/1 49/5 57/20 58/8 70/6 70/20
76/2 84/6
needles [1] 151/17
needs [7] 110/18 $117 / 8$ 128/24
140/10 157/19 165/22 210/4
negligence [1] 177/15
negligent [1] 160/22
negligently [3] 158/22 158/23
158/24
neither [1] 30/14
nephew [1] 214/4
net [1] 127/25
network [1] 65/13
neutral [2] 131/17 203/16
never [7] 20/5 24/18 140/13 218/5
220/3 221/12 222/21
new [4] 6/21 135/12 135/12 223/7
newest [2] 221/15 221/16
news [54] $21 / 153 / 1055 / 1255 / 14$ 55/16 55/20 56/6 56/13 57/1
57/17 57/23 58/2 58/5 77/21 84/7 87/2 87/16 88/5 89/3 89/10 89/17 89/19 90/7 90/22 90/25 91/5 91/7 91/10 91/20 92/14 93/3 97/12 118/20 119/5 119/11119/15 119/22 120/12 120/13 120/15 120/24 122/1 $124 / 9$ 127/17 127/20 127/22 128/3 134/6 150/8 150/18 151/21 154/7 154/11 155/3 newspaper [3] 43/8 80/15 126/23 newspapers [2] 43/11 43/12 next [10] 3/16 12/17 105/17 106/6 106/9 110/10 122/17 155/23 206/12 231/6
night [3] 10/12 58/15 67/25
nights [2] 122/20 129/23
nilly [3] 172/7 174/4 177/23
nine [1] 136/7
no [134] $1 / 5$ 3/2 8/23 9/1 9/6 9/12 9/12 10/14 10/16 10/18 11/22 13/14 13/22 20/15 20/18 21/18 22/10 24/18 25/22 25/24 26/4 $31 / 2432 / 733 / 1733 / 1834 / 15$ $34 / 1736 / 2537 / 437 / 1337 / 15$ 39/4 39/9 39/15 40/24 41/12 42/20 42/24 44/13 52/4 53/22 53/23 54/15 55/7 60/7 60/22 $61 / 1361 / 1861 / 1863 / 2266 / 15$ 66/24 67/17 68/14 72/10 75/23 76/12 82/6 82/10 84/22 84/22 84/25 85/22 90/5 90/22 93/18

97/2 99/10 100/14 100/14 100/22
105/12 106/21 107/8 108/25 109/6
110/2111/11113/17115/18
117/23 119/11 122/17 127/21
129/7 135/24 137/19 142/25 143/1
146/13 149/17 151/11 155/14
157/2 167/14 167/25 172/22 177/4
182/11 186/5 191/6 191/6 191/7 191/10 194/18 197/6 197/24
201/13 208/2 211/8 216/6 218/2 218/8 218/12 218/13 218/17
$218 / 21$ 220/4 220/5 220/12 221/12
221/18 221/19 223/1 223/4 223/19
223/19 223/21 223/21 224/17
225/6 225/10 229/2 229/20
No. [1] 40/8
No. 140 [1] 40/8
nobody [2] 127/6 195/17
non [4] 59/19 61/3 61/4 141/15
non-editorial [1] 141/15
non-sworn [2] 61/3 61/4
non-typical [1] 59/19
none[7] 59/1 89/22 97/12 119/10
133/25 167/16 195/13
Noon [1] 103/4
nor [4] 30/14 30/14 59/19 160/8
normally [4] 14/20 21/19 37/12
161/5
northeastern [1] 137/12
not [318]
note [2] 4/13 122/24
noted [1] 115/23
notes [4] 89/11 123/7 134/2 232/9
noteworthy [1] 109/6
nothing [8] 42/18 102/15 104/22
115/11 129/14 134/8 202/10
223/12
notice [15] 112/4 112/14 112/16
160/18 162/11 162/19 165/23
166/1 168/19 170/2 170/6 172/18
173/8 175/14 175/21
notices [1] 87/3
notified [1] 59/16
notify [1] 169/17
noting [1] 141/5
notion [2] 176/9 177/21
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { November [69] } & 18 / 20 & 18 / 25 & 19 / 2\end{array}$
23/12 27/7 27/16 28/2 28/4 28/15
29/7 30/8 31/5 31/25 32/12 32/24
33/13 45/18 47/3 47/9 48/17
$50 / 1252 / 252 / 652 / 2053 / 14$
54/17 55/24 61/8 62/5 62/13
62/19 62/22 63/9 63/21 64/3
65/23 66/21 67/5 67/12 67/16
67/1 8 67/20 72/5 72/13 74/23
75/15 78/11 78/14 80/2 89/4 91/7
91/25 93/3 95/15 95/17 95/19
96/4 97/12 97/14 98/5 99/6 99/19
115/1 123/25 137/9 147/8 183/20 186/16 188/7
November 11 [3] 89/4 93/3 97/12
November 3 [5] 18/25 61/8 62/5
64/3 67/12
November 3rd [1] 47/9
November 4 [3] 27/16 66/21 67/16
November 5 [20] 18/20 23/12
28/15 30/8 45/18 62/19 63/9
63/21 72/5 74/23 75/15 78/11
78/14 95/15 $115 / 1$ 123/25 147/8
183/20 186/16 188/7
November 5th [2] 47/3 62/13
November 6 [1] 31/25
November 8 [1] 67/5

November 9 [3] 72/13 95/19 96/4 November's [1] 135/18
now [72] 5/13 8/8 12/12 15/21 16/24 18/21 33/8 34/10 35/14 39/1 40/10 46/3 54/1 64/1 68/7 72/19 77/22 80/4 81/12 86/11 88/2 96/13 97/9 100/15 106/15 112/11 120/25 121/11 121/11 125/7 127/20 135/9 135/23 136/23 146/19 149/20 151/12 153/14 154/6 155/16 156/22 157/16 166/1 166/25 170/21 175/15 176/14 182/5 186/8 193/2 199/15 202/25 211/16 214/21 217/10 217/21 218/6 218/22 219/4 220/7 220/10 220/12 220/14 220/24 221/4 221/8 221/12 221/13 221/23 223/7 227/9 228/7
nowhere [1] 167/14
number [26] 3/4 11/25 17/16 $41 / 16$ 64/15 64/19 64/20 69/12 70/12 74/24 76/12 89/15 103/18 103/22 104/1 106/7 128/5 132/4 135/1 145/17 145/19 173/3 180/22 181/3 207/1 210/7
numbers [2] 60/21 210/9
numerous [5] 55/13 55/15 91/8 163/16 220/21
nunc [1] 110/5
nutshell [3] 21/25 22/1 123/17
0
object [2] 46/4 188/22
objected [1] 214/12
objection [22] 10/24 11/6 29/14 $31 / 7$ 46/7 96/10 98/11 98/21 105/12 108/24 109/6 110/6 115/18 116/2 116/19 117/2 117/24 118/4 146/13 146/18 149/17 211/7
objections [1] 160/4
Objective [1] 141/15
obligation [2] 104/21 149/19
observation [2] 125/8 192/15
obtain [3] 49/18 50/1 208/7
obtained [7] 78/8 86/7 164/11
170/20 170/21 173/22 178/20
obtaining [3] 49/13 52/22 93/11
obvious [5] 161/10 193/2 218/22
219/20 223/24
obviously [12] 11/20 16/16 116/23
120/2 152/2 157/10 171/13 186/23
204/17 216/11 216/24 230/8
occasion [1] 215/9
occasionally [2] 77/6 189/9
occasioned [1] 195/15
occasions [3] 50/10 82/10 89/3 occurred [7] 28/14 45/14 126/8 129/3 129/24 195/22 227/1
October [9] 18/22 33/22 34/19 47/17 123/16 123/18 124/4 124/5 136/5
October 16 [3] 123/16 123/18 124/5
October 16th [1] 136/5
October 31 [1] 18/22
off [12] 88/6 88/7 99/21 99/22 129/20 137/15 177/23 215/12 216/1 216/5 217/23 218/17
offense [5] 129/4 197/10 198/25
205/2 228/20
offenses [2] 158/7 224/22
offer [17] $4 / 343 / 244 / 1244 / 17$
109/4 132/25 137/17 175/18
175/22 200/1 201/3 201/4 201/12 206/14 208/3 219/21 224/14
offered [8] 159/7 171/15 181/12
181/14 197/8 197/12 199/6 206/19
offering [3] 199/1 201/8 202/7
offers [1] 55/11
office [12] 20/16 55/6 73/8 75/24
87/10 87/11 92/20 92/22 94/20
94/21 95/3 213/2
officer [22] $5 / 2011 / 812 / 17$ 27/5
27/20 27/22 28/5 32/14 33/1
88/22 $114 / 2119 / 20122 / 19129 / 10$ 158/6 163/14 171/7 177/14 177/18 184/17 188/10 192/24
officers [27] 27/14 28/20 29/11
$32 / 132 / 21$ 61/1 61/2 61/6 68/17 70/3 71/4 98/9 121/8 132/11
135/6 159/20 163/11 166/12 168/4
171/5 172/7 185/6 185/19 185/22
197/20 200/8 205/10
offices [1] 135/19
official [5] 1/23 46/22 193/13
232/4 232/19
officials [1] 23/3
often [3] 49/19 89/19 162/8
oh [10] 9/12 26/1 41/14 56/11
102/1 206/25 $218 / 9$ 220/14 223/7 227/8
okay[44] 8/20 9/13 9/20 11/25
20/8 21/1 23/21 25/16 26/1 26/22 $31 / 2$ 35/19 39/20 40/5 40/9 40/14 40/19 41/2 61/2 66/20 69/18 69/25 70/3 70/24 79/11 80/4 80/24 84/22 86/11 90/18 92/19 94/5 94/23 96/21 99/9 106/4 110/19 113/12 114/24 154/6 171/4 210/13 212/24 223/18
old [3] 74/3 214/4 214/15 on [329]
once [9] 33/11 54/11 66/23 103/15 148/4 217/12 $218 / 13$ 224/25 225/4 one [110] 9/8 9/8 $12 / 9$ 13/3 17/13 22/17 25/5 27/10 28/10 32/6 $32 / 1233 / 433 / 1134 / 834 / 934 / 11$ $35 / 436 / 236 / 336 / 436 / 851 / 4$ 73/17 75/11 76/12 80/4 82/17 83/21 87/6 87/16 92/20 93/2 96/23 102/8 103/8 104/22 106/8 106/12 106/13 107/22 108/21 110/16 $111 / 18114 / 22$ 116/8 117/20 119/6 121/5 121/9 121/19 122/8 122/24 125/9 125/10 127/17 127/22 127/22 127/23 128/2
130/11 130/17 130/17 133/3
137/19 137/22 137/24 144/3
144/16 145/4 145/17 146/20
151/25 152/8 152/9 152/9 156/25
158/25 164/19 165/15 168/4
168/23 168/24 169/8 170/21
171/11 173/3 173/10 177/5 177/13
178/10 179/18 $179 / 18$ 180/22
183/13 183/15 186/6 186/14 190/3
192/24 195/10 199/3 201/20
215/17 217/5 219/5 220/6 222/11
222/22 222/23 225/25
online [1] 152/3
only [40] $9 / 855 / 355 / 1458 / 21$ 64/12 66/20 70/18 70/22 75/21 80/7 89/23 98/7 99/19 101/2 104/6 108/21 110/14 111/2 121/16 127/12 132/2 135/7 139/15 139/23

140/21 146/7 148/20 148/23 150/4
163/19 187/23 193/5 204/19
214/19 221/13 223/13 228/5
228/12 229/12 230/13
open [7] 52/5 110/24 111/14 114/1
114/8 114/11 187/25
opened [1] 227/21
opening [1] 128/16
operates [1] 18/12
Operation [1] 13/12
operations[4] 12/18 42/9 42/10 42/14
opines [2] 129/3 129/4
opinion [3] 128/8 197/12 226/7
opportunity [6] 91/16 154/12
160/18 170/10 182/11 211/1
oppose [2] 154/17 184/22
opposed [5] 28/5 88/1 $143 / 19$
179/3 196/11
opposition [4] 105/16 105/21
110/21 145/13
or [438]
oral [3] 105/12 150/2 229/4
orally [1] 88/1
order [18] 3/24 40/20 105/15
106/4 $114 / 19116 / 6117 / 10123 / 2$
123/4 132/6 132/10 132/24 133/1 1
133/12 133/14 134/8 156/21 203/2
orders [2] 37/5 191/6
ordinarily [5] 17/9 17/10 131/19 189/25 195/23
ordinary [4] 38/16 186/10 186/11 186/18
organization [2] 18/13 196/8
organized [1] 11/14
orient [1] 18/20
original [5] 96/17 107/17 110/4 143/18 179/19
originally [5] 106/2 220/9 225/2
225/23 229/8
originals [1] 26/17
other [107] 13/4 13/15 13/21 21/15 27/10 28/11 32/6 33/4 34/3 34/8 37/13 42/22 42/24 43/12 44/2 44/13 54/21 54/25 55/4 55/5 59/7 65/19 67/1 67/2 69/4 69/6 $70 / 1282 / 1783 / 483 / 2188 / 16$ 90/4 92/1 96/25 98/8 98/13 99/6 102/20 104/9 106/15 108/25 109/7 111/25 115/24 115/24 122/6 124/10 127/10 130/18142/13 144/4 144/5 144/6 144/17 146/20 147/16 148/12 155/17 156/4 156/24 157/9 158/8 $158 / 9$ 160/8 161/6 163/10 163/10 163/17 164/10 165/5 166/15 168/16 168/25 169/14 173/20 173/25 178/19 179/18 180/2 180/9 180/9 180/25 183/2 183/23 184/13 185/6 188/18 191/7 191/9 197/8 197/10 198/1 198/15 198/20 199/15 200/8 201/13 202/7 205/3 208/4 211/11 215/20 215/25 219/18 221/3 222/12 224/22
others [8] 7/7 12/14 31/18 37/8 65/8 $121 / 6$ 139/20 190/8
otherwise [2] 30/21 177/10
ought [15] 100/18 104/5 105/2
130/13 134/21 137/9 159/16 161/3 172/10 175/2 175/8 179/12 184/21 186/20 187/4
our [34] 15/1 26/16 47/9 47/11 64/19 68/17 68/17 68/17 69/21
our... [25] 70/8 85/24 94/19 103/20 105/7 134/15 137/7 142/17 149/8
155/15 161/15 162/10 165/25
176/7 176/14 178/25 180/10
210/11 213/17 213/20 214/12
215/5 219/12 231/6 231/7
ourselves [2] 187/3 199/25
out [68] 10/6 16/8 20/1 20/2 20/21
26/6 32/22 42/13 64/13 64/25 67/10 67/21 67/23 68/2 68/8 68/23 69/1 3 70/18 71/1 71/4 71/6 71/9 71/12 71/20 74/21 77/16 80/20 81/14 86/17 86/21 93/17 95/13 101/24 106/16 107/8 116/7 122/13 123/12 128/24 137/6
137/24 151/1 173/1 178/23 184/12 192/1 1 195/20 201/1 203/1 203/2
207/10 209/8 209/18 210/11
211/20 211/20 213/5 216/24 217/2
217/22 221/24 222/4 222/12
222/18 222/22 223/21 225/8 230/12
outcome [1] 50/8
outlets [3] 55/16 87/4 87/14
outlined [1] 149/8
outlines [1] 63/12
outrageous [1] 191/13
outset [4] 74/4 74/7 77/11 123/24
outside [6] 41/5 42/2 94/9 126/13
200/22 218/2
over [23] 58/4 63/18 66/3 82/17
94/16 96/5 97/17 99/7 109/19
146/18 151/13 152/22 156/21
183/22 $184 / 1 \quad 184 / 13185 / 3186 / 5$
186/7 191/18 191/25 216/23
216/24
overall [1] 17/2
overlap [1] 3/22
overruled [1] 164/21
overseeing [2] 4/7 183/12
oversight [1] 18/3
overstep [1] 208/3
owed [2] 51/11 53/21
own [12] 60/23 129/13 136/13
137/14 166/18 167/20 176/7 183/7 214/13 221/25 224/7 224/14

## P

P-a-g-e-I [1] 45/4
P-e-t-e-r-s-e-n [1] 4/24
page [3] 2/2 39/23 81/20
PAGEL [34] 2/8 24/3 29/23 36/16
44/20 45/4 45/7 45/17 46/5 46/8 47/2 49/7 50/10 52/1 52/19 55/3
$55 / 1057 / 158 / 2059 / 1168 / 1$
101/8 118/24 120/1 120/25 122/8 123/24 124/14 140/9 187/10 188/6 192/2 196/1 196/16
Pagel's [2] 195/4 222/2
Pagels [1] 88/24
pages [4] 43/6 115/5 151/2 213/9 palatable [2] 134/13 134/20
Palm [1] 228/8
paneling [1] 216/5
paper [1] 43/6
papers [1] 105/15
paragraph [31] 106/20 106/21
106/23 107/3 107/8 108/2 108/4 108/6 108/8 108/9 108/11 108/13 108/15 108/19 108/21 109/1 109/5 109/7 109/20 109/20 110/2 110/12

110/16 110/22 111/3 111/7 116/13|
116/15 116/17 164/20 164/22
Paragraph 1 [3] 106/21 108/2
116/15
Paragraph 2 [2] 108/4 111/7
Paragraph 27 [1] 164/22
Paragraph 3 [2] 108/6 110/12
Paragraph 4 [1] 108/8
Paragraph 5 [4] 107/3 108/9 109/1 109/5
Paragraph 6 [10] 108/11 108/19
108/21 109/7 109/20 109/20
110/22 111/3 116/13116/17
Paragraph 7 [1] 108/13
Paragraph 8 [1] 108/15
parallel [1] 13/3
parameters [1] 209/9
paramilitary [1] 16/23
parcel [1] 75/8
parent's [1] 225/16
part [30] 35/6 35/12 47/21 47/22 61/16 62/10 65/6 65/8 71/13 71/25 88/24 107/5 110/11111/8 116/6 117/10 118/23 122/12 130/20 136/1 8 150/3 167/2 187/7 187/12 196/3 197/19 202/23 205/2 207/25 219/7
participate [3] 70/4 147/13 147/15
participated [3] 5/24 7/13 124/11
participating [1] 36/14
participation [4] 47/24 128/23
129/21 190/22
particular [30] 4/15 29/14 29/24
53/7 59/22 60/10 62/12 68/20
68/21 68/22 69/13 69/17 80/23 81/8 103/18 105/6 113/9 120/11 138/20 153/9 157/11 160/19 170/19 174/19 174/22 178/20 187/23 190/21 191/19 198/25
particularly [7] 39/23 81/9 123/22
131/2 141/8 186/21 202/6
parties [30] 3/5 3/21 3/24 102/10
102/22 103/21 113/8 114/20
117/11 123/11 149/12 149/13
151/24 153/25 156/17 157/9
157/12 157/24 162/19 169/18
180/21 180/22 181/20 195/15 199/3 209/15 209/23 211/18 212/14 229/13
partly [2] 115/22 115/23
parts [5] 66/3 68/22 109/15 155/25 183/15
party [12] 105/18 155/24 157/7
161/21 166/5 176/12 180/4 180/5
180/24 189/1 189/2 201/20
passed [1] 29/18
past [3] 163/21 168/5 169/23
Patrick [1] 1/11
patrol [12] $5 / 7$ 14/20 $14 / 2314 / 25$
16/3 16/4 16/9 42/12 42/13 42/14
71/1 188/18
patrolmen [1] 16/7
pattern [1] 201/16
paused [1] 14/18
pauses [1] 224/4
pay[1] 23/20
paying [1] 23/21
PDA [1] 228/8
penalties [1] 228/19
penalty [11] 135/22 135/24 136/25 137/2 137/6 137/15 137/23 138/4 138/7 142/23 222/10
pending [3] 23/1 54/25 95/13
people [38] $11 / 15$ 17/16 22/11 26/7 30/15 30/18 30/23 32/8 32/9 34/9 39/9 42/2 42/5 42/5 61/4 66/11 68/21 70/3 74/24 75/6 75/11 80/5 81/19 92/5 92/12 94/7 99/8 109/21 $119 / 24$ 136/1 166/23
186/1 194/25 196/10 203/14
219/14 219/16 221/1
people's [1] 217/20
per [3] 50/3 180/15 191/7
perceive [1] 149/11
perceived [1] 22/23
percent [1] 134/5
perfect [1] 225/10
Perfectly [1] 192/23
perform [1] 42/2
performed [1] 196/25
perhaps [15] 7/750/11 150/8
163/10 179/2 192/19 192/20
192/21 193/25 208/6 208/10
208/20 $211 / 22$ 212/6 227/16
period [6] 34/2 45/22 70/19 71/2
135/25 219/17
permissible [2] 198/20 205/18
permission [1] 110/25
permit [4] 123/21 153/16 153/17 188/3
permitted [2] 98/18 198/6
perpetrator [1] 80/8
person [45] $1 / 183 / 14$ 6/2 8/21 12/1 12/3 14/1 16/11 17/22 22/6 25/17 25/17 34/9 47/10 47/18 49/1 52/18 56/4 59/15 65/17
66/12 66/19 76/19 77/9 77/13
$77 / 1680 / 1180 / 2180 / 2180 / 23$ 81/3 81/8 94/7 95/10 95/18 96/3 96/22 97/18 $111 / 25$ 129/12 188/8 193/6 204/22 229/21 230/5
personal [6] 74/2 76/6 76/10 80/24
81/2 226/6
personally [22] 5/24 6/9 6/15 7/14 25/9 27/6 33/12 33/14 45/11 58/1 61/8 61/10 61/12 67/10 67/21
68/9 68/11 68/14 70/22 71/24 100/11 122/17
personnel [12] 18/5 29/20 36/14
36/24 37/7 38/9 60/18 68/18 71/18 94/1 185/21 195/14
persons [8] 47/5 50/2 77/2 77/24
80/18 80/19 140/12 141/4
perspective [1] 105/23
pertained [1] 52/17
pertaining [1] 60/10
pertains [1] 31/8
pertinent [2] 81/6 81/9
pervades [1] 196/7
PETERSEN [20] $2 / 3$ 4/12 4/14 4/18 4/23 5/3 25/12 29/16 31/13 35/12 45/24 46/24 122/15 128/23 187/9
191/1 194/11 194/25 195/6 196/15
Petersen's [2] 191/4 195/3
phone [8] 52/25 53/7 67/11 90/19
91/10 92/10 100/5 228/9
phonetic [1] 127/18
photo [2] 43/11 213/9
photocopying [1] 43/10
photographs [2] 207/24 208/12
phrase [3] 68/11 86/24 175/5
phrased [1] 101/24
physical [13] 165/4 166/14 167/19
173/20 174/1 $178 / 11178 / 19182 / 8$
187/20 206/10 219/3 221/3 228/13
physically [4] 20/10 69/1869/19

|  | 150/13 177/25 200/3 202/6 202/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ysically... [1] 213/7 | possession [8] 51/22 52/7 52/17 | 57/20 160/10 161/4 161/10 |
| pick [3] 135/1 146/25 205/1 | 72/17 73/21 89/6118/12 121/1 | 161/19 161/19 161/21 162/21 |
|  | possibility [6] 93/19 93/23 142/18 | 171/12 175/22 180/3 180/17 |
| [2] $85 / 1385 / 14$ | 162/2 162/14 218/25 | 192/20 208/7 |
| ctures [2] 42/5 200/1 | possible [16] 28/24 32/11 33/24 | pretty [9] 5/12 116/16 128/15 |
| ece [2] 174/5 219/5 | 39/11 39/13 59/5 93/15 97/11 | 3/11 174/18 187/2 190/10 2 |
| eces [2] 85/14 164/5 | 29/6 138/23 162/3 162/12 162/13 | 219/20 |
| ot [1] 228/8 | 62/20 183/3 211/15 | prevail [2] 81/10 200/4 |
| [1] 32 | possibly [6] 7/20 8/8 | prevent [5] 59/5 88/18 |
| ch [1] 201/9 | 104/19 166/25 | 164/7 167/18 |
| ace [15] 87/13 94/12 94/15 | post[13] 68/15 68/25 69/5 69/9 | prevents [2] 143/8 145/12 |
| 18187/13 97/21 98/6 99/6 | 69/10 69/12 69/15 69/18 70/7 | vious [7] 20/1 29/15 96/11 |
| 142/25 143/1 147/11 149/22 | 0/17 71/5 71/10 71/20 | 6/14 210/19 228/16 228/16 |
| 33/13 197/24 200/25 | posted [1] 225/4 | ously [6] 109/1 197/23 198/5 |
| placed [2] 96/15 215/5 | poster [5] 136/23 | 198/9 208/15 228/21 |
| places [1] 220/21 |  | arily [3] 41/24 41/2 |
| plain [1] 178/3 <br> PLAINTIFF [1] $1 / 4$ | potential [6] 22/25 58/23 125/21 | primary [2] 19/13 21/13 |
| an [6] 140/20 211/2 223/19 | ally [1] 190/1 | 190/7 |
| 223/19 223/21 223/21 | power [6] 17/25 18/2 132/9 146/18 | print [1] 85/20 |
| 24 66/20 | 148/16 149/3 | prior [24] 6/21 47/2 52/1 57/1 |
| nes [1] 67/2 | practical [2] | 62/19 63/20 63/22 80/16 93/3 |
| planned [2] 223/8 | practice [4] 162/22 188/11 192/20 | (193110/24 151/19 189/21 198/2 |
| planning [1] 223/1 | 202/25 | 98/12 198/16 198/17 198/17 |
| (lans [1] 120/17 ${ }^{\text {pla }}$ planted [13] 156/8 156/13 157/25 | preclud | 198/22 199/12 200/2 209/22 2 |
| planted [13] 156/8 156/13 157/25 | precluded [3] 153/2 153/4 198/3 | 228/17 |
| 158/9 158/14 169/10 170/6 171/4 | predecessor [1] 119/13 | on [1 |
| 173/5 174/5 175/20 175/24 181/5 | preface [1] 144/18 | 63/15 197/6 200/18 200/19 200 |
| anting [3] 157/14 169/23 175/1 | prefer [5] $117 / 1130 / 6133 / 3135 / 4$ | 200/24 202/8 203/11 203/21 204 |
| play [8] 23/23 24/14 26/2 130/24 |  | 224/6 225/8 225/13 |
| 151/21 167/7 183/23 205/7 | preference [3] 117/11 133/10 | prisoner [1] 191/25 |
| players [1] 203/5 | 144/18 | Prisoners [1] 116/11 |
| ing [1] 137/6 | preferred [1] 124/4 |  |
| plays [1] 88/2 | prejudice [7] 58/24 133/5 133/5 | private [1] $81 / 3$ |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { pleading [4] } \\ \text { 206/23 }}}{ } 105 / 20$ 106/13 206/21 | $141 / 10198 / 11199 / 3201 / 19$ prejudicial [8] $51 / 859 / 359 / 6$ |  |
| 206/23 | prejudicial [8] 51/8 59/3 59/6 | pro [1] 110/5 |
| please [6] $3 / 64 / 214 / 2145 / 245 / 2$ | 115/12 117/7 139/2 141/16 190/2 | probable [3] 128/20 197/3 214/9 |
| $150 / 17$ <br> plus [2] 75/9 122/22 | prelim [2] 168/25 169/13 | probably [27] 18/2 20/3 26/24 35/5 36/9 58/4 62/14 78/8 79/9 |
| $\text { int }[35] 5 / 5 \quad 10 / 6$ | $\underset{196 / 18}{\text { preliminary [4] 46/4 79/25 106/8 }}$ | $35 / 536 / 9 / 58 / 4 / 18 / 98 / 2291 / 23$ $79 / 1480 / 282 / 18 / 7$ |
| 22/7 22/19 31/7 52/1 54/14 54/16 | prematu |  |
| 62/7 65/22 77/21 92/21 106/19 | preparation [1] 123/21 | 12/11 136/17136/19 137/17 |
| 108/12 110/20 111/12 112/13 | prepare [3] 114/19 162/19 183/7 | 152/9 182/5 210/11 224/15 |
| 112/17 130/1 133/6 151/23 157/11 | prepared [7] 44/12 107/15 114/11 | probative [2] 164/25 165/7 |
| 159/12 160/7 161/15 162/10 | 143/5 153/11 160/13 232/8 | problem [9] 26/20 112/18 133/2 |
| 162/21 167/12 174/13 179/14 | preposterous [1] 218/6 | 147/18 151/10 151/11162/9 |
| 182/6 185/23 230/12 points [3] 116/7 190/19 207/10 | prerogative [1] 145/2 | 189/13 190/10 |
| points [3] 116/7 190/19 207/10 | prescribed [1] 140/24 | problems [1] 118/13 |
| police [16] 71/7 136/8 167/2 167/8 | present [15] 11/2 23/11 | procedural [1] 164/4 |
| 169/3 169/9 169/22 170/12 170/16 | 55/3 103/6 117/12 162/20 163/8 | proceed [5] 3/25 118/7 133/7 |
| 172/7 177/9 177/13 177/23 204/20 | 177/2 177/3 182/4 188/20 192/18 | 146/19 148/4 |
| 205/9 229/9 | 201/23 230/20 |  |
| policies [2] 17/23 | presentation [4] 128/12 159/7 | proceedings [7] 1/21 36/21 37/7 |
| policy [20] 17/7 54/11 54/24 55 | 159/15 193/18 | 126/24 132/14 231/13 232/13 |
| 55/7 55/7 94/12 94/15 94/18 | presented [5] 117/21 1 | ocess [9] 58/25 125/13 126/2 |
| 97/13 97/15 97/15 98/6 99/7 | 131/20 167/11 213/23 | 130/22 130/24 131/6 139/24 185/5 |
| 161/10 183/25 184/8 188/7 188/11 | presenting [2] 182/20 188/12 | 190/23 |
| 191/4 | presents [1] 163/8 | processed [3] |
| politicians [2] 136/24 138/3 | preservation [1] 193/12 | 178/15 |
| politicized [2] 137/2 137/5 | preserve [1] 132/14 | processing [3] 109/18 116/24 |
| olls [1] 137/10 | preserved [1] 172/4 | 185/16 |
| pool [2] 122/4 191/12 | president [1] 198/11 | produce [3] 137/11 169/17 172/3 |
| poor [2] 215/18 217/25 | press [28] 50/11 52/8 52/22 53/13 | produced [3] 136/9 136/10 136/1 |
| poorly [1] 189/15 | 84/3 | production [1] 189/4 |
| portion [3] 30/4 98/12 103/10 | 83/13 83/19 84/3 84/6 91/6 92/16 | products [1] 115/2 |
| portions [2] 114/4 116/3 | 101/9 101/10 120/20 121/19 140/8 |  |
| position [27] 13/3 105/6 107/21 | 140/11 140/18 141/7 218/15 | profile [3] 46/18 66/10 227/23 |
|  | 220/25 222/3 222/13 223/18 | programs [1] 68/22 |
| $123 / 17 \quad 143 / 21 \quad 143 / 24 \quad 144 / 4$ | pressing [1] 223/23 | progress [1] 24/17 |
| 144/19 145/9 145/12 146/4 148/17 | presumed [2] 101/1 | prohibited [1] 181/15 |
| 148/22 149/9 149/13 149/15 |  |  |
| $148 / 22$ 149/9 149/13 4 149/15 |  |  |


| P | 123/22 123/23 124/8 124/19 | rapidly [1] 135/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| minently [1] 122/14 | 127/12 139/2 139/4 139/14 139/18 | 109/20 135/16 151/16 165/10 |
| promise [1] 101/3 | 140/5 142/13 143/8 1 | 184/25 185/15 186/12 192/13 |
| prompting [1] 123/11 | 145/6 150/4 150/5 150/24 154/8 | 193/21 205/21 218/6 |
| pronouncing [1] 33/6 | 155/2 | rating [1] 122/1 |
| proof [2] 166/4 175/3 | publicly [13] 65/20 73/5 80/6 89/7 | Rav [2] 28/7 32/15 |
| proper [6] 130/10 134/7 199/15 | 89/21 90/8 92/10 104/13 104/18 | raw [1] 151/12 |
| 201/7 201/8 226/15 | 104/23 108/3 108/5 124/14 | re [1] 219/11 |
| properly [6] 95/24 97/6 98/1 98/4 | pulled [1] 151/1 | re-searched [1] 219 |
| 104/10 166/8 | punch [2] 221/10 221 | reach [7] 62/1 81/17111/11 |
| property [23] 22/13 62/23 63/5 | pure [2] 216/9 221/3 | 171/20 171/21 210/1 210/2 |
| 67/11 67/22 74/20 74/25 75/13 | purely [3] 127/19 128/6 229/20 | reached [1] 82/9 |
| 75/16 78/19 79/18 88/17 95/21 | purpose [12] 81/12 85/4 140/15 | read [13] 84/24 85/2 96/17 96/18 |
| 96/22 96/24 120/5 120/8 193/1 | 197/12 198/6 201/7 201/9 201/13 | 98/25 99/2 140/1 144/5 146/9 |
| 225/4 225/14 225/17 225/18 | 214/11218/13 222/2 225/13 | 190/14 190/14 208/16 229/5 |
| 228/10 | purposes [5] 48/22 51/4 140/8 | reading [8] 80/15 84/9 86/8 |
| proposal [2] 138/10 | 153/23 230/23 | 146/13 149/18 157/23 169/9 |
| proposed [4] 117/10 123/16 | pursuant [1] 29/7 | 175/16 |
| 138/24 206/19 | pursues [1] 201/4 | reads [1] 148/2 |
| proposes [1] 201/11 | pushing [1] 136/24 | ready [1] 154/4 |
| proposition [2] 173/18 180/16 | put [28] $11 / 1730 / 1086 / 1786 / 21$ | real [4] 23/11 194/6 217/19 217/20 |
| prosecuting [2] 121/13 173/13 | 94/12 94/15 94/18 97/13 109/20 | ality[3] 22/4 137/8 221/10 |
| prosecution [14] 5/25 6/24 7/14 | 124/17 124/22 125/11 126/14 | realized [2] 62/14 64/4 |
| 10/23 26/11 38/22 128/3 130/1 | 130/13 135/13 145/5 151/2 153/5 | really [20] 20/19 30/22 89/18 |
| 132/8 138/5 141/12 213/11 222/1 | 166/3 169/23 170/9 172/16 176/22 | 129/17 154/25 155/25 163/3 |
| 222/7 | 177/24 189/15 207/7 213/22 | 165/21 172/15 172/17180/20 |
| prosecutor [5] 3/9 3/12 54/18 | 219/12 | 182/4 184/5 185/11 186/19 188/24 |
| 119/3 223/7 | puts [1] | 203/13 204/22 204/25 223/4 |
| prosecutors [2] 1/14 142/11 | putting [2] 98/6 99/6 | reappear [1] 225/19 |
| protection [1] 10 | pyramid [1] 15/19 | reason [21] 9/6 22/1 22/23 29/15 |
| tections [1] 141/14 | Q | /25 97/20 99/13 105/19 110/3 |
| proved [1] 7/19 | quarter [2] 20/3 43/22 | 171/21 172/10 189/10 193/5 194/9 |
| proven [3] 101/13 131/21 215 | question [45] 8/8 9/6 16/21 31/23 | 204/11 205/18 205/21 |
| provide [21] 24/11 50/5 50/7 | 38/8 41/14 62/17 62/18 84/22 | reasonable [14] 8/16 123/12 155/5 |
| 50/24 57/21 84/19 85/24 107/17 | 85/15 89/18 96/2 96/11 96/12 | 163/7 167/10 167/19 171/10 |
| 113/1 143/7 147/20 151/8 162/19 | 96/14 96/17 96/18 96/20 98/5 | 176/10 176/13 176/19 176/23 |
| 165/22 170/2 172/18 173/8 175/14 | 98/18 98/19 98/21 99/2 99/16 | 177/6 178/2 205/9 |
| 175/20 209/13 226/16 | 99/17 124/7 146/20 148/15 153/13 | reasonableness [1] 205/25 |
| provided [21] 29/20 43/3 43/14 | 157/6 157/18 160/11 162/15 163/6 | reasoned [5] 159/2 170/18 170/19 |
| 48/7 51/2 51/9 51/13 51/1751/19 | 168/23 170/3 170/11 172/2 179/7 | 174/11 174/23 |
| 51/23 58/16 58/17 76/23 87/5 | 186/8 194/17 201/24 202/18 | reasoning [2] 21/23 187/8 |
| 107/16 154/12 184/16 204/21 | 214/23 215/23 | reasons [10] 33/12 50/24 51/3 |
| 210/25 214/5 227/24 | questionable [1] 165/14 | 76/12 193/23 197/22 198/20 208/4 |
| provides [2] 37/22 43/16 | questioned [1] 217/18 | 225/21 230/25 |
| providing [9] 31/16 78/9 85/5 | questioning [2] 29/15 29/24 | rebuttable [1] 176/16 |
| 85/23 87/16 91/18 105/7 117/24 | questions [30] 30/3 30/21 35/10 | rebuttal [3] 188/5 193/25 229/1 |
| 125/2 | 36/7 36/9 40/6 42/19 46/4 52/21 | recall [31] 20/24 31/22 32/16 |
| province [1] 229/15 | 53/12 53/18 53/19 59/10 84/15 | 32/24 34/21 39/6 39/7 39/14 |
| prudent [1] 23/14 | 84/18 85/5 85/22 101/3 101/8 | 40/11 45/1752/11 52/20 53/14 |
| psychopath [1] 129/12 | 102/4 119/24 143/17 147/5 199/23 | 53/17 54/4 55/5 56/6 56/16 56/20 |
| pubic [1] 9/3 | 206/6 206/9 206/10 222/24 223/17 | 57/7 79/10 83/20 90/16 90/17 |
| public[75] 39/4 39/9 41/6 47/2 | 223/24 | 101/10 104/2 121/7 122/9 124/1 |
| 48/19 48/22 49/10 50/8 50/13 | quicker [1] 48/8 | 169/1 173/1 |
| 50/14 50/21 51/10 51/13 52/13 | quite [5] 39/1 113/24 149/21 210/7 | receive [4] 50/4 105/11 117/18 |
| 52/15 53/18 53/22 56/7 56/14 | 210/20 | 154/14 |
| 57/4 57/21 57/25 61/24 62/1 | quote [1] 96/11 | received [11] 47/10 47/14 48/4 |
| 62/10 62/21 64/4 64/13 64/16 | quotes [1] 170/19 | 48/24 53/2 55/10 55/13 55/15 |
| 64/18 64/23 64/25 66/10 73/7 | R | 87/16 100/17150/4 |
| 73/17 73/19 73/20 74/6 74/11 |  | receiving [5] 52/21 52/25 53/5 |
| 74/13 74/17 76/3 76/23 80/20 | racial [1] 163/16 | 91/9 117/14 |
| 81/22 90/20 92/7 101/12 104/14 | radical [1] 164/1 | recent [1] 163/13 |
| 108/1 108/7 109/4 109/8 109/15 | radio [1] 43/8 | recently [3] 72/7 107/10 229/9 |
| 116/4 119/1 120/14 121/12 121/15 | raise [3] 66/10 126/6 210/11 | recess [2] 103/4 155/21 |
| 123/5 123/9 128/11 131/13 132/6 | raised [3] 141/24 142/14 167/3 | recognition [1] 141/14 |
| 132/17 132/20 132/22 133/12 | raises [1] 199/22 | recognize [3] 141/6 157/6 210/18 |
| 135/6 140/22 140/23 186/24 | ran [2] 70/9 77/17 | recognizes [1] 139/16 |
| 203/10 218/8 222/8 | rank[5] 11/15 11/18 12/6 61/1 | recognizing [3] 142/17 217/10 |
| public's [6] 48/10 48/14 49/1 49/5 | 203/2 | 218/21 |
|  | ranking [2] 12/17 71/22 ranks [2] 16/24 38/14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recollection [5] } 35 / 2439 / 25 \quad 123 / 6 \\ & 123 / 7 \quad 123 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 59/6 98/12 98/14 102/5 105/8 |  | reconsider [2] 224/25 225/22 |


| R | 82/16 82/21 90/25 92/15 101/16 | $16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reconsideration [1] 213/16 | releases [1] 13/24 | 52/8 152/17 154/17 187/2 187/18 |
| record [12] 3/5 3/19 4/22 45/3 | relevance [11] 11/4 31/8 159/22 | 207/6 207/14 |
| 103/6 123/9 139/3 143/21 151/14 | 160/13 160/16 162/12 167/21 | requested [4] 3/25 6/15 45/11 |
| 155/23 213/7 228/18 | 196/24 197/6 199/5 210/6 | 143/19 |
| recorded [2] 87/25 217/16 | relevancy [1] 197/1 | requesting [5] 55/16 55/17 148/20 |
| recording [1] 210/22 | relevant[11] 98/13 107/12 113/1 | 156/1 188/14 |
| records [2] 13/24 89/11 | 166/10 172/12 198/19 205/8 | requests [4] 55/13 100/9 164/14 |
| recusal [2] 147/12 185/3 | 207/19 208/2 208/5 208/13 | 189/4 |
| recusing [2] 147/8 186/12 | reliability [8] 8/24 166/11 182/18 | require [4] 11/20 113/21 170/23 |
| redact [1] 109/25 | 196/4 206/9 206/11 214/23 215/23 | 179/10 |
| redacted [16] 108/3 108/5 108/7 | reliable [5] 121/17 214/3 214/7 | required [3] 157/8 168/1 168/2 |
| 108/8 108/10 108/11 108/13 | 214/11217/8 | requirements [2] 156/5 181/1 |
| 108/16 108/19 108/22 109/16 | relied [1] 123/7 | requires [3] 106/19 107/5 171/12 |
| 109/20 110/1 110/3 116/22 117/2 | relief [2] 134/15 188/13 | requiring [1] 186/18 |
| redacting [1] 108/1 | relinquish [2] 148/7 149/6 | reserving [1] 154/16 |
| redefined [1] 187/17 | reluctant [1] 142/25 | resolve [6] 112/22 192/6 192/10 |
| redirect [6] 2/6 2/11 3 | rely [3] 185/19 185/22 192/5 | 209/19 209/24 210/5 |
| 101/1 101/6 | relying [1] 220/14 | resolved [1] 111/24 |
| reduce [5] 43/9 113/7 213/17 | remain [5] 67/21 111/5 115/25 | respect [8] 3/23 44/17 143/16 |
| 214/13 225/22 | 117/8 185/9 | 151/19156/14 159/7 192/12 |
| reduced [1] 43/10 | remained [1] 50/2 | 202/19 |
| reducing [1] 225/1 | remaining [2] 102/ | respond [11] 89/4 89/20 90/7 |
| reduction [2] 210/14 228/23 | remains [2] 116/8 136/4 | 92/10 $152 / 18152 / 24154 / 4154 / 14$ |
| references [2] 121/10 127/16 | remarkable [1] 129/17 | 156/19 172/17189/3 |
| referendum [10] 135/22 136/1 | remarks [1] 163/3 | responded [2] 48/5 93/4 |
| 136/25 137/8 137/15 138/4 138/7 | remedies [2] 148/9 190/20 | response [13] 38/7 62/16 105/1 |
| 138/10 138/19 142/23 | remedy [19] 131/9 131/9 131/11 | 110/17 119/24 155/9156/10 |
| referred [4] 16/5 47/4 194/2 194/3 | 131/25 139/13 139/16 139/19 | 165/25 186/19 197/18 204/16 |
| referring [6] 28/19 62/22 91/7 | 139/20 140/3 140/6 142/19 142/22 | 208/17218/20 |
| 93/25 94/2 94/3 | 143/4 143/7 162/9 189/12 190/9 | responses [2] 106/3 222/23 |
| refers [1] 40/2 | 194/7 194/19 | responsibility [14] 16/2 21/14 |
| refiled [1] 109/25 | remember [14] 21/8 35/7 35/14 | 23/18 45/12 45/19 127/13 142/10 |
| refused [1] 55/19 | 36/2 40/17 52/8 56/23 77/20 | 144/23 147/9 152/2 183/22 184/12 |
| regard [4] 107/13 162 | 77/25 79/11 89/12 90/11 120/25 | 185/4 195/21 |
| 204/4 | 138/12 | responsible [5] 69/16 127/12 |
| regarding [16] 52/12 52/22 52/24 | Remiker [15] 16/12 16/14 27/18 | 137/4 204/23 228/7 |
| 53/13 54/4 56/1 58/11 101/24 | 27/24 28/8 28/16 28/23 29/8 31/2 | rest [1] 116/22 |
| 106/11 114/19 145/6 160/22 | 32/2 33/10 192/23 193/9 195/18 | resting [1] 136/3 |
| 193/11 193/11 196/19 209/22 | 203/3 | restore [1] 39/25 |
| Regardless [1] 78/4 | remind | restriction [1] 135/5 |
| regional [2] 55/11 100/6 | remoteness [1] 210/5 | result [3] 124/16 179/21 179/23 |
| regularly [1] 189/8 | remove [2] 109/19 131/25 | sulted [2] 7/9 7/11 |
| reiterate [1] 118/11 | removed [3] 78/18 78/21 7 | resume [1] 155/16 |
| reiterated [1] 231/1 | renew [1] 31/6 | retracted [2] 220/24 221/4 |
| reiterating [2] 55/6 | rent [1] 65/21 | tracts [1] 221/13 |
| reject [1] 142/20 | reopened [1] | retrained [1] 215/16 |
| rejected [1] 226/21 | repeat [1] 200/5 | return [1] 225/15 |
| rejects [1] 178/23 | repeated [1] 128/ | revealed [1] 222/1 |
| relate [4] 118/14 150/9 151/2 | repeatedly [1] 220/20 | reveals [1] 104/22 |
| 179/17 | repeating [1] 200/15 | reversed [2] 179/23 180/13 |
| related [11] 5/25 23/8 46/15 53/18 | repetitive [1] 190/15 | review [2] 118/18212/17 |
| 56/2 106/15 140/11 168/6 175/6 | replace [1] 84/3 | reviewed [1] 229/16 |
| 176/1 182/3 | reply [1] 154/20 | reviewing [2] 25/17 26/2 |
| relates [7] 31/20 46/18111/2 | report [14] 12/14 14/8 14/11 14/12 | revise [1] 138/17 |
| 156/15 176/5 182/7 182/9 | 15/5 15/715/13 15/15 16/18 | revised [1] 138/8 |
| relating [8] 42/22 43/17 106/5 | 24/18 57/17 60/11 60/13 134/1 | Richardson [9] 157/15 157/16 |
| 111/25 118/10 133/4 175/19 | reported [8] 1/22 18/24 32/13 | 161/16 164/1 164/1 164/22 165/20 |
| 206/13 | 59/18 64/2 127/21 129/1 232/6 | 171/17180/18 |
| relation [1] 4/3 | reporter [8] 1/23 20/23 21/9 73/8 | right [168] 3/14 3/18 4/9 5/12 |
| relations [2] 46/17 46/21 | 96/17 134/2 232/5 232/19 | $5 / 15 \quad 9 / 19 \quad 12 / 4 \quad 12 / 9 \quad 13 / 6 \quad 14 / 7$ |
| relationships [2] 207/20 209/2 | reporters [1] 84/23 | $14 / 8 \quad 14 / 1415 / 12 \quad 15 / 2416 / 5$ |
| relative [6] 36/23 37/6 102/16 | reporting [2] 141/3 141/15 | 16/15 18/25 20/13 21/7 21/12 |
| 160/6 160/19 192/8 | reports [9] 12/12 24/25 26/8 26/24 | 23/16 24/8 24/20 25/11 25/15 |
| relatively [1] 75/8 | 43/18 116/2 126/23 138/1 212/17 | 26/8 26/19 26/25 27/4 27/8 27/14 |
| relatives [2] 47/12 51/12 | represent [2] 3/17 119/19 | 28/13 28/20 32/12 33/6 33/23 |
| release [12] 7/21 8/6 8/17 57/9 | representation [1] 123/1 | 34/23 35/14 37/11 37/13 38/6 |
| 63/2 63/15 82/6 82/7 82/19 82/19 | representatives [1] 121/8 | 38/24 39/23 40/10 41/23 42/15 |
| 140/18 140/22 | representing [1] 3/16 | 42/21 44/22 53/12 56/16 60/1 |
| released [21] 8/5 10/1 53/10 53/10 | reputation [1] 226/4 | 62/3 64/1 64/21 67/6 67/8 67/9 |
| 53/18 57/8 57/11 57/13 57/14 | request [23] 24/8 30/10 36/15 | 68/7 68/24 70/2 71/14 72/5 73/16 |
| 57/16 57/25 59/2 76/2 82/1 82/14 | 49/9 103/22 104/11 110/21 110/24 | 78/4 79/16 81/7 81/12 82/2 82/18 |
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129/25 133/10 138/23 187/12
222/25 226/17 226/18 227/6
secondly [2] 142/21 156/7
secretarial [2] 13/23 61/4
secretary [1] 110/7

Section [6] 134/15 134/18 161/14 199/17 199/21 202/4
secured [1] 167/12
security [6] 24/22 37/10 147/21 190/23 191/16 191/16
see [34] 23/11 $23 / 1326 / 19$ 27/2
28/6 31/8 33/1 39/25 40/1 40/1
40/2 42/15 73/9 88/3 103/2 106/2
110/11 131/18 137/25 142/24
154/2 154/18 156/23 158/2 166/7
177/7 186/3 206/14 212/11 217/16
217/16 221/19 231/10 231/11
seeing [3] 84/9 86/9 90/11
seek [2] 148/10 181/6
seeking [4] 133/21 168/3 171/14 202/21
seeks [3] 107/6 190/21 199/13
seem [1] 163/25
seemed [1] 114/9
seems [12] 130/23 162/5 163/23
170/10 171/9 173/12 175/2 176/21
179/11 179/20 202/13 230/7
seen [10] 18/22 24/18 26/23 65/6
65/11 121/22 127/22 131/10 187/9
187/10
segment [2] 35/12 35/19
segments [2] 122/23 134/3
seized [2] 166/12 167/12
select [1] $43 / 18$
selected [1] 223/9
selection [2] 139/24 190/23
self [3] 125/17 125/23 126/9
self-incrimination [3] 125/17
125/23 126/9
semen [1] 165/5
Senator [1] 138/6
send [1] 17/19
senior [1] 71/9
sense [13] $11 / 216 / 20 \quad 16 / 22 \quad 18 / 8$
86/19 87/25 132/18 184/7 186/15
189/14 191/3 194/18 212/10
sensitive [1] 51/14
sensitivity [5] 51/10 58/10 84/21 101/19 101/25
sent [3] 87/3 87/3 180/13
sentence [4] 7/11 40/7 203/23
222/23
sentences [1] 40/12
sentencing [1] 207/11
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { separate [8] } & 10 / 7 & 13 / 14 & 14 / 1 \\ 37 / 22\end{array}$ 46/20 77/4 117/18 127/2
September [6] 10/1 38/25 123/16 123/18 124/3 130/2
September 11 [1] 10/1
September 12 [1] 38/25
September 5 [4] 123/16 123/18 124/3 130/2
sequence [1] 224/10
sequestered [3] 134/23 185/25 186/22
sergeant [13] 15/24 16/3 27/7
28/25 29/9 32/25 33/10 34/5
34/16 72/6 195/18 196/5 203/4
Sergeant's [1] 15/7
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { sergeants [6] } & 14 / 19 & 14 / 20 \quad 14 / 21\end{array}$ 14/24 15/5 25/1
series [8] $35 / 645 / 963 / 18106 / 13$
107/22 110/16 122/12 170/15
serious [5] 84/22 124/17 141/6 141/7 225/12
serve [2] 124/23 185/7
served [1] 5/9
serves [1] 119/3
service [1] 65/24
services [3] 13/23 43/15 43/21
serving [1] 203/23
session [1] 135/17
sessions [1] 46/21
set [25] 17/2 52/24 53/20 68/24
69/2 87/20 87/22 102/17 106/25
118/22 123/15 136/4 138/14 142/9
142/16 171/19 191/22 205/10
209/1 210/21 211/3 211/10 211/16 214/16 225/2
sets [3] 17/22 43/4 190/5
setting [1] 148/14
settled [1] 230/18
seven [1] 207/1
several [7] 17/17 51/3 55/22 71/3
82/5 151/2 223/9
sex[4] 221/17 221/19 221/20 223/21
sexual [4] 7/6 165/4 221/15 221/21
shadowing [1] 96/5
shall [1] 153/3
shape [1] 190/25
share [3] 64/17 $117 / 21$ 209/5
sharing [1] 208/10
she [11] 18/24 65/14 65/16 164/9
215/7215/15215/17216/7216/22 219/4 221/11
she's [2] 218/4 218/5
Sheboygan [1] 66/5
sheriff [86] $2 / 3$ 2/8 4/11 4/14 4/18 5/3 5/9 5/16 5/18 6/16 11/18 11/21 11/23 11/25 12/7 15/16 17/2 23/19 24/3 25/11 26/6 29/16 29/23 31/13 35/12 36/9 36/16 36/20 44/20 44/24 45/8 45/17 45/23 46/5 46/8 46/24 47/2 47/21 49/7 50/10 52/1 52/19 54/22 55/3 55/10 57/1 58/20 59/11 59/16 68/1 90/1 101/8 118/23 119/2 120/1 122/8 $122 / 15$ 123/24 124/14 128/23 129/2 129/22 140/9 183/25 184/8 186/16 186/17 187/9 187/10 187/10 188/6 189/14 189/20 191/1 191/4 192/2 194/11 194/25 195/6 196/1 196/1 196/15 196/16 204/24 205/3 222/2
sheriff's [77] 4/5 5/4 5/23 10/22
11/10 11/13 12/10 16/22 18/12 19/6 23/23 24/13 26/9 26/13 26/24 27/17 29/21 30/11 36/13 37/23 38/3 38/8 38/11 38/15 $41 / 18$ 46/10 48/5 51/21 60/3 60/17 60/19 64/19 68/13 69/22 71/17 72/7 88/25 93/20 93/25 94/10 94/22 94/24 95/2 95/10 96/6 97/18 104/3 104/25 112/25 117/15 147/6 147/7 147/13 147/19 147/23 156/22 183/11 183/21 184/3 184/7 184/19 185/7 185/20 186/9 187/13 188/4 188/17 188/19 190/24 191/17 191/22 195/8 195/14 195/19 200/7 202/25 204/21
shield [1] 161/8
shift [5] 16/5 21/13 41/24 41/25
230/9
shifting [3] 23/18 99/21 99/22
shifts [1] 41/23
shipped [1] 26/18
shoes [1] 10/20
shooting [1] 227/1
short [10] 39/8 40/11 60/15 70/18 127/17 127/19 131/12 132/25 224/16 227/14
shorthand [2] 126/14 232/10
shortly [4] 21/9 48/3 74/23 94/16 shot [2] 220/10 226/25
should [56] 4/13 9/23 14/18 44/8 57/8 64/7 66/11 70/21 76/2 76/17 76/18 80/7 81/15 81/15 82/7
84/12 91/16 98/19 101/24 108/11
110/3 $115 / 9115 / 25133 / 16133 / 18$ 140/4 143/8 144/19 149/16 152/2 152/2 153/15 153/23 157/13 162/5 170/10 172/12 172/18 176/25 179/16 180/3 186/23 186/24 190/20 194/1 197/16 199/7 202/5 209/20 210/8 212/25 214/20 221/1 222/9 226/10 227/14
shoulder [6] 96/6 97/17 184/2 186/5 186/7 216/24
shouldn't [6] 17/10 102/12 137/14 200/24 203/10 214/7
show [7] 55/20 158/6 166/19
166/22 182/15 202/23 205/2
showing [1] 225/10
shown [1] 225/6
shred [1] 191/13
shrift [1] 227/15
shut [1] 88/6
shy [1] 142/6
sibling [1] 221/8
sic [2] 14/7 192/9
side [5] 104/17 142/13 165/16 180/20 198/1
sided [1] 222/11
sidetracked [1] 179/3
sign [1] 114/21
signed [1] 213/19
significance [2] $229 / 10 ~ 230 / 15$
significant [5] 127/14 130/11
150/3 151/21 204/13
similar [4] 46/24 89/8 158/7 160/9
simple [2] 60/15 178/3
simply [17] 37/8 57/25 118/18
138/17 159/13 160/17 169/15
173/5 175/22 185/2 192/15 195/3
195/24 196/11 197/11 201/9 214/7
since [16] 6/5 54/1 106/17 117/19
117/25 133/23 $151 / 1$ 153/8 $153 / 14$
154/16 169/7 $213 / 21$ 214/21
227/13 227/18 230/2
single [2] 8/18 191/13
sir [1] 5/23
sister's [1] 225/17
sit [3] 35/24 90/16 205/25
sits [2] 131/17 131/18
sitting [4] 10/19 90/17 152/19
195/2
situation [3] $126 / 11$ 187/3 230/16
situations [1] 128/2
six[7] 5/9 5/12 5/14 9/16 10/6
95/7 204/9
size [1] 69/24
sizeable [1] 209/18
skelter [1] 58/2
skipping [1] 156/21
small [1] 219/8
smart [1] 131/24
smoothly [1] 162/20
so [175] 9/20 10/20 15/1 15/12
16/6 16/15 17/4 18/14 19/1 20/6
20/19 20/21 23/13 24/3 24/8

24/16 27/23 28/3 31/2 31/17
$31 / 2135 / 1937 / 2138 / 240 / 18$ 40/24 41/2 44/2 44/5 48/14 49/4 59/2 59/4 61/23 62/18 62/24 65/13 66/20 67/18 68/16 68/24
70/3 71/24 72/2 73/16 73/23 74/6
76/4 76/16 77/10 78/11 78/15
$80 / 280 / 1082 / 12$ 84/3 84/6 85/4
87/5 87/10 89/24 91/24 92/9
93/22 93/24 94/5 94/5 94/23 95/7
95/22 95/22 97/23 98/2 99/20
102/17 102/23 104/5 104/24
108/17 109/6 110/12 110/15
110/19 111/3112/11114/5 114/11
114/21 115/14 $117 / 7119 / 1120 / 5$
121/8 124/7 127/11 128/12 130/8
130/17 131/22 132/23 133/3
134/12 135/4 138/21 142/15
147/17 147/25 148/14 149/13
150/12 152/7 152/13 154/18
154/22 155/7 157/10 157/13
157/21 160/21 161/1 162/10
162/15 165/10 166/16 168/14
171/7 172/16 174/2 174/3 177/21
178/15 179/2 179/15 179/16 180/1
180/14 182/5 184/2 187/7 187/24
190/3 190/9 190/15 192/18 193/5
193/8 193/13 194/4 195/24 196/14
199/2 201/21 202/13 205/16
207/12 208/7 209/20 211/2 211/9
212/3 $215 / 22218 / 11218 / 23219 / 4$
219/16 221/2 221/21 224/13
224/15 224/16 224/19 225/21
228/11 230/25 231/9
so-called [1] 157/13
soaked [1] 216/12
sole [1] 8/10
solely [1] 214/15
solve [1] 147/18
some [105] 3/22 3/22 3/22 4/3 7/7
$7 / 2418 / 218 / 323 / 2$ 25/21 26/21
29/19 30/2 34/21 43/11 43/12
43/23 54/16 61/14 62/19 64/4
65/19 65/22 66/9 67/5 77/21
78/16 79/17 79/24 79/25 81/17 84/19 87/15 90/8 91/17 91/23
91/25 100/25 103/7 103/12 104/20 106/24 106/25 111/12 113/21
115/5 116/14 $116 / 14119 / 8119 / 23$
119/23 119/25 122/9 123/11
124/19 127/12 128/14 131/11
133/6 136/24 137/1 151/8 151/8
151/18 154/12 155/16 158/4 164/9
166/15 166/15 168/5 168/15
169/17 169/21 169/21 170/5
174/19 175/24 180/24 187/8
188/18 189/18 192/19 192/20
192/21 193/10 197/5 198/6 200/23
204/10 205/11 207/8 207/18
207/23 207/24 212/13 213/21
215/5 $215 / 25219 / 6219 / 10226 / 6$
229/7 230/2 230/21
somebody [18] 72/21 79/12 79/22
82/11 87/11 88/2 89/5 94/9 95/8
169/9 170/9 174/24 188/15 188/16
203/10 $215 / 19$ 226/2 226/4
somehow [12] 129/5 165/18
167/17 167/20 176/9 177/21 182/9
182/11 191/1 191/11 219/2 220/1
someone [15] 24/9 26/1 59/17
80/10 95/5 97/16 129/5 133/19
156/3 167/8 184/1 188/17 193/6
206/3 230/10
something [40] 11/21 28/18 34/21 37/9 43/15 44/7 59/22 73/16
80/15 85/17 86/13 89/5 89/20 90/9 90/21 100/12 100/20 101/15 109/5 121/22 122/2 122/11 135/12 141/16 142/24 143/5 143/6 152/7 154/10 163/25 167/8 167/8 169/17 173/2 177/6 177/23 188/25 197/13 205/19 210/16
Sometime [1] 35/22
sometimes [4] 77/6 125/8 125/10 171/15
somewhat [2] 102/24 171/18 somewhere [8] 6/12 20/25 34/2
34/22 35/17 43/23 75/12 219/9 sorry [16] 8/13 12/21 14/18 40/2 56/9 96/9 106/21 107/24 108/20 113/12 $115 / 17$ 154/7 197/14 211/12 216/4 221/6
sort [11] 64/21 80/15 129/15
134/24 157/20 163/5 164/23 168/8 185/3 189/6 189/10
sought [5] 123/14 175/25 190/12 194/12 201/4
sound [5] 6/11 16/20 33/23 67/6 212/7
sounds [3] 26/23 116/12 140/17
sources [2] 55/12 92/7
south [7] 32/22 32/22 161/17
164/21 165/12 179/23 180/8
Spanbauer [1] 136/10
speak [10] 10/21 20/21 27/5 27/5
38/20 65/13 82/12 94/5 102/12 184/2
speaking [5] 47/12 92/17 121/1 121/7 138/22
special [8] 1/14 3/9 3/12 35/6 54/18 119/3 135/17 158/12
specific [17] 7/17 22/10 50/25
52/2 52/21 53/17 54/4 96/3 131/7 139/1 150/8 $150 / 19151 / 8195 / 17$ 196/3 196/5 200/1
specifically [9] 46/18 71/12 79/10 101/21 124/21 133/24 146/22
218/13 230/17
specificity [1] 206/20
speck [3] 216/19 217/1 217/5
speculate [2] 11/1 182/6
speculation [1] 10/24
spell [3] 4/22 12/21 45/3
spent [5] 9/13 10/12 197/5 197/14
200/25
spoke [2] 121/5 122/18
spokespeople [1] 81/23
sponsor [1] 138/7
ss [1] 232/1
stabbed [3] 216/8 216/22 226/24
stabbing [2] 220/4 220/11
staff [7] 17/19 59/20 71/9 75/23
191/2 191/7 191/12
stage [1] 229/12
stains [2] 220/17 220/17
stake [3] $133 / 17$ 133/21 $217 / 20$
stand [6] 124/5 131/21 132/3
194/1 200/13 204/24
standard [2] 156/7 199/5
standards [1] 156/12
standpoint [1] 231/7
stands [2] 125/24 193/5
start [8] 5/2 98/2 99/24 106/16 118/8 223/23 224/9 224/10

Started [1] 5/7
Starting [1] 67/16
starts [1] 223/16
state [143] $1 / 1 \quad 1 / 31 / 143 / 23 / 5$
3/7 4/21 7/21 8/1 18/6 43/3 44/16
45/2 71/1 72/22 93/11 105/1
106/7 106/14 106/18 108/24
109/17 112/7 $112 / 13113 / 24117 / 1$
117/20 $118 / 22118 / 23120 / 14$
121/8 121/11 121/25 123/10 124/1 124/3 124/11 125/2 125/16 125/18 126/16 126/17 126/18 126/19
126/21 126/25 127/11 127/11
127/24 128/4 130/12 130/14
130/18 130/21 130/25 132/20
133/6 135/24 136/2 136/6 136/8 136/9 136/11 136/15 136/16
136/18 136/22 137/7 137/16 139/6
139/19 140/20 141/3 141/8 141/25
142/1 142/17 143/5 143/19 143/22
144/20 144/24 145/4 145/12 153/5
154/16 154/20 155/12 156/10
157/15 158/11 158/13 158/15
160/12 163/5 163/13 163/23 164/3
165/23 167/16 168/20 170/10
171/13 172/22 176/15 177/24
181/12 181/18 185/21 188/3
188/12 188/17 188/21 188/22
194/8 194/16 197/3 197/20 198/4
198/1 1 199/4 199/6 199/13 200/16 201/3 201/11 201/16 202/6 202/21 203/18 208/2 208/23 209/4 209/13 209/22 210/3 211/4 211/20 214/12 217/15 226/14 232/1 232/5
State's [41] 8/6 105/17 105/22
107/20 107/21 110/15 111/3 111/7
111/13 113/19 119/15 125/7 127/4
143/24 145/9 146/4 149/13 149/15
150/13 155/24 159/12 164/23
165/2 165/24 166/2 168/11 169/12
173/7 182/10 182/18 182/19
183/17 187/24 188/1 196/18
196/22 197/11 204/15 206/13
213/25 229/18
stated [2] 22/11 183/4
statement [22] 30/5 45/23 115/1
115/3 128/16 193/22 212/5 216/1 221/1 221/16 222/25 222/25
223/11 226/7 226/9 226/17 226/18 226/20 227/6 227/13 227/19 227/20
statements [28] 39/5 39/9 107/9
113/22 114/5 114/7 119/25 127/7 203/20 204/2 204/6 204/8 204/13
206/24 214/2 214/3 214/7 214/15
214/18 214/19 214/24 226/13
228/13 229/24 230/1 230/6 230/7 230/14
States [1] 180/12
statewide [2] 124/19 135/19
stations [4] 43/13 44/3 119/8
119/9
status [1] 103/20
statute [1] 146/10
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { statutes }[5] & 11 / 20 & 18 / 6 & 134 / 16\end{array}$ 148/2 161/23
Steier [1] 28/17
stenographic [1] 232/9
step [5] 98/7 99/10 99/14 99/15 99/19
stepping [1] 147/12
steps [7] 17/17 19/19 30/17 65/19
120/9 122/25 217/2

Steve[5] 8/17 104/14 115/5 123/1 200/21
STEVEN[55] $1 / 6$ 1/17 3/2 3/13
5/25 6/22 10/19 11/1 22/7 23/1 27/6 32/15 32/23 33/15 39/5 39/10 40/13 41/7 52/6 63/1 63/8 72/8 73/10 75/11 88/10 90/21
91/24 95/17 95/22 96/2 96/23 119/20 120/11 120/21 126/14 129/19 136/22 137/4 138/5 138/10 140/13 189/18 195/9 203/15 203/16 206/8 224/2 224/21 226/23 226/24 226/25 227/2 227/9 227/21 228/6
still [30] 26/16 31/8 48/25 49/4 49/4 52/17 76/20 77/7 77/8 77/9 84/18 84/19 98/23 104/19 107/4
156/10 157/21 174/20 180/23 193/24 194/2 197/20 203/24 204/25 211/14 220/11 221/15 230/4 230/4 230/20
stipulation [2] 111/12 210/1
stipulations [1] 210/2
stop [1] 208/8
stops [1] 18/8
storage [1] 159/8
stories [1] 43/21
story [9] 214/25 217/13 217/21
217/23 219/1 $219 / 7$ 222/16 222/18 224/14
straight [1] 196/24
strains [1] 173/16
STRANG [44] $1 / 15$ 2/4 2/6 2/10
3/17 4/2 30/1 42/22 59/12 96/10
96/13 99/24 103/14 105/9 105/24
107/7 113/9 115/16 117/6 118/1
139/12 139/15 139/16 140/1 141/2 141/25 143/18 $144 / 1$ 144/14 145/2 145/24 146/6 150/14 153/17 154/3
154/10 154/23 183/12 194/21
199/10 202/18 $211 / 21213 / 14$ 228/2
Strang's [5] 46/14 105/6 113/2 142/22 204/3
strategy [1] 64/12
stray [1] 190/4
street [1] 216/16
strengthened [1] 229/19
strike [1] 116/21
strong[3] 133/11 165/16 165/17
strongly [3] 115/14 118/14 137/22
struck [1] 157/25
structure [1] 16/23
struggled [1] 135/13
struggling[1] 215/18
stuck [1] 178/23
stuff [4] 131/23 189/23 217/4
220/16
style [2] 76/6 76/10
sub [2] 158/1 203/13
sub-conscious [1] 203/13
sub-issues [1] 158/1
subject [4] 173/20 174/20 178/1 181/12
submissions [2] 212/14 212/16
submit [6] 114/20 153/12 153/15
154/1 155/1 158/19
submitted [5] 102/23 105/20
110/24 113/7 172/9
submitting [2] 139/3 147/4
subordinates [1] 17/14
subpoena [1] 152/7
subsequent [1] 45/13
sustained [1] 46/7
SUV [1] 227/18
swab [1] 218/12
swabbed [1] 227/23
swabs [1] 78/16
switch [1] 196/16
sworn [8] 4/19 5/15 44/25 60/18
60/25 61/2 61/3 61/4
sympathy [7] 197/13 201/6 201/9
201/14 201/19 205/20 208/4
synonomous [1] 42/14
system [2] 72/20 109/18
T
tabbed [1] 186/15
table [1] 206/2
tact [1] 179/12
tailor [1] 133/1
tailored [1] 190/10
tainted [3] 134/22 182/12 182/13
take [28] 9/14 10/3 13/22 38/24
42/5 42/17 57/17 58/2 85/10 86/6
102/19 106/22 111/6 121/3 136/3
152/2 152/2 154/1 154/24 155/3
155/15 172/6 176/21 184/12
191/18 194/1 209/18 $213 / 1$
taken [19] 30/9 33/20 33/22 34/4
34/11 34/13 78/19 78/24 83/12
98/7 99/10 103/4 140/13 141/10
152/6 155/21 178/12 195/20 232/9
takeover [1] 193/13
takes [3] 130/14 193/13 210/13
taking [5] 137/14 145/12 146/2
173/10 207/17
talk[14] 25/24 25/25 34/12 40/13
65/8 74/13 142/4 167/25 179/13
186/4 191/25 192/2 198/14 198/15
talked [5] 21/18 25/24 40/25 65/15
161/24
talking [25] 6/13 19/1 42/25 80/10
86/1 88/18 101/22 113/13 120/7
135/11 165/21 167/23 182/24
$184 / 23184 / 25185 / 13185 / 15$
196/9 198/15 198/16 198/18
198/21 202/16 205/20 216/15
tampering [2] 95/23 160/24
tangential [1] 166/16
tape [2] 87/25 88/2
target [1] 155/6
task [1] 116/24
tasks [1] 72/2
team [1] 46/13
technically [1] 206/17
techs [1] 42/4
teenager [1] 77/17
telephone [2] 21/10 64/15
televised [8] 89/3 119/15 122/1
122/8 124/10 126/22 128/5 138/8
television [11] 43/7 43/13 43/16
44/3 80/13 100/19 119/7 128/22
138/16 189/21 213/10
tell [12] $21 / 1785 / 6114 / 6$ 137/3
153/10 191/23 194/9 218/18
219/23 221/19 227/16 228/1
telling [7] 30/24 40/12 91/20
92/13 177/17 224/9 229/14
tendency [1] 197/2
tender [1] 44/13
tendering [1] 213/8
tending [3] 53/24 78/2 93/12
tension [1] 125/9
tenuous [1] 165/10
Teresa [38] 18/21 27/6 28/6 45/13
$47 / 247 / 1147 / 1347 / 1648 / 13$
49/2 49/4 61/12 64/8 65/3 65/12
67/3 76/20 76/21 107/9118/10
137/1 138/11 141/21 193/1 201/10
202/11 206/4 215/1 217/5 223/9
223/22 224/23 226/23 226/24
226/25 227/3 227/10 228/5
Teresa's [3] 78/10 207/25 208/24
terms [9] 23/17 73/16 $118 / 17$
133/17 137/8 138/18 147/21
153/21 193/13
terrible [2] 221/2 222/16
terribly [1] 115/11
Tesheneck [3] 1/22 232/4 232/19
test [10] 107/5 161/14 162/18 167/21 167/23 168/9 176/5 196/25 205/6 218/11
tested [3] 8/22 167/13 215/9 testified [8] 4/20 38/7 38/19 45/1 62/16 118/24 124/14 195/6 testifies [3] 177/13 177/14 200/12 testify [11] 44/21 125/17 125/19 125/22 125/25 152/21 188/18 192/16 192/19 193/10 200/20
testifying [3] 4/6 125/14 183/11
testimony [20] 9/7 29/16 42/24
72/14 90/18 102/14 102/20 103/7
103/13 113/22 122/10 124/20
164/8 169/3 173/1 187/21 192/21
192/22 193/24 206/11
testing [2] $7 / 24$ 224/18
tests [1] 217/4
text [1] $43 / 16$
than [53] $22 / 1833 / 1036 / 343 / 12$
$43 / 2355 / 157 / 16$ 60/18 77/2 86/2 87/7 88/16 99/6 104/8 104/9 108/1 108/25 109/7 109/21 123/3 123/8 123/18 127/21 128/2 129/19 130/24 133/18 147/14 148/12
151/16 152/9 155/18 156/4 157/9 163/23 164/1 168/19 170/12 171/24 172/22 175/10 180/2
180/25 181/17 185/6 185/15
186/12 189/23 191/7 192/13
201/13 205/21 219/18
thank [17] 12/23 36/6 41/14 42/16
59/1 1 100/23 143/12 153/20
155/20 158/17 190/18 196/23
199/9 217/15 225/23 228/24 231/10
that [1314]
that's [128] 5/8 5/15 11/1712/5 12/16 12/19 13/1 13/3 32/3 34/23 35/24 36/5 36/19 37/16 41/14 $42 / 17$ 44/6 44/7 59/7 59/1 0 64/1 68/6 72/18 73/4 74/1 76/10 86/4 86/23 94/2 95/15 96/21 97/3 97/7 97/20 98/15 100/23 102/4 102/16 107/19 110/13 110/20 111/8 111/10111/20114/23122/11 126/3 126/24 130/22 131/7 137/6 137/7 137/8 140/19 144/17 145/25 146/12 146/15 149/5 150/21 151/11 152/1 155/5 156/19 158/25 161/15 162/10 162/14 162/21 163/22 164/22 167/3 168/1 169/10 169/12 170/18 170/24 170/24
171/2 174/6 174/11 174/17175/11 175/17 176/1 176/11 176/20 177/1 177/15 177/15 177/19 179/5 179/7 179/10 179/12 179/14 180/12
180/17 181/19 182/2 183/2 190/9
190/16 191/13 193/2 196/14 201/6
that's... [21] 201/15 203/1 203/11
205/12 207/1 207/3 211/19 211/24 211/25 212/1 212/15 212/18 220/11 221/8 221/9 221/22 225/13 227/24 228/23 229/15 230/4 their [33] 3/5 34/4 59/21 61/24 67/23 69/17 70/20 121/17 121/17 126/25 135/20 142/9 154/1 166/4 168/21 172/2 176/8 $176 / 25$ 186/5 186/7 193/4 195/23 196/3 203/20 209/18 214/13 217/14 221/7 222/23 223/17 224/7 230/8 230/9
them [72] 14/16 15/12 25/4 30/24 30/24 34/11 37/1 43/24 48/25 50/6 51/15 53/22 58/6 58/6 58/7 58/15 58/16 58/18 59/25 65/6 65/8 65/10 70/8 70/21 77/5 83/25 84/8 84/13 84/17 84/19 85/6 85/20 85/23 85/24 85/25 91/1 91/21 92/17 92/17 116/3 117/24 118/18 $118 / 19118 / 22119 / 8121 / 1$ 121/5 121/7 121/7 121/16 141/9 151/2 152/4 152/4 154/1 166/1 166/3 185/21 185/22 187/25 189/18 190/14 191/22 195/20 200/19 212/25 213/2 213/6 215/21 223/25 224/12 231/1
theme [1] 150/19
themes [1] 173/15
themselves [8] 85/2 91/15 103/17 138/3 163/8 177/25 186/12 196/1
then [114] 6/15 11/4 12/14 14/14
15/18 19/23 24/11 42/1 43/6 43/14 46/8 50/18 53/12 56/16 56/20 57/17 67/20 68/20 70/8
70/12 72/13 79/1 79/3 79/5 79/17 80/24 81/9 81/12 81/19 81/22 97/9 98/6 100/24 102/7 102/9 104/7 105/15 108/15 109/9 109/14 109/19 109/22 109/25 110/9 110/17111/22 116/6 117/2 119/21 120/12 120/17 122/11 125/18 125/25 128/21 129/12 143/11 146/11 148/10 148/24 149/14 149/19 150/10 151/7 152/14 153/4 154/3 155/8 155/16 157/3 157/18 159/15 162/15 164/15 166/9 168/6 168/16 170/9 170/24 171/7 171/20 175/8 176/2 176/4 176/15 178/3 178/23 179/9 183/9 183/24 184/14 184/22 188/3 188/11 191/19 192/16 192/19 193/10 194/17 194/18 200/22 205/7 209/5 211/5 211/10 213/13 214/12 215/25 216/22 216/23 224/1 224/10 225/3 230/2
theories [1] 173/14
theory [5] 48/6 53/25 160/15 171/16217/14
there [181] $3 / 218 / 814 / 1414 / 18$ 22/16 22/24 26/16 26/17 26/17 29/19 36/2 38/14 42/1 43/14 43/23 48/17 50/16 50/19 50/23 51/21 52/4 53/22 53/24 54/15 58/7 58/20 58/22 62/9 66/23 66/24 67/1 67/1 67/15 68/2 68/3 68/8 68/16 68/23 69/4 69/6 69/7 69/13 70/18 70/22 71/1 71/3 74/21 77/3 82/5 82/10 89/13 89/14 93/2 93/8 93/1 8 93/19 95/9 95/22 98/2 98/8 99/11 101/23

103/12 103/18 104/19 105/19
106/2 106/18 106/18 106/24 109/1 110/13 111/3 111/15 111/22 112/17 114/15 115/19116/8 117/6 117/7118/20 119/11 120/22 121/10 122/6 124/7 126/23 127/9 127/10 127/23 128/2 130/11 131/11 134/22 137/24 145/10 146/16 151/24 152/19 152/20 154/11 156/18 157/19 158/8 161/8 164/19 165/4 165/5 165/11 165/16 166/20 167/25 168/23 169/3 170/3 170/9 170/12 171/4 171/5 171/7 172/10 172/21 173/14 173/14 173/15 173/15 173/21 173/24 174/3 175/2 175/11 176/15 179/5 179/18 182/11 183/5 184/9 186/4
186/5 188/15 190/3 191/10 191/13 196/2 199/16 203/15 203/23
204/10 204/14 206/6 206/9 206/10 207/10 208/11 208/12 210/17
210/21 213/21 215/25 216/17 216/19218/4218/5 219/7 220/3 220/4 220/7 220/16 220/17 220/19 222/19 223/1 223/5 223/14 223/19 226/8 227/8 228/12 229/6 231/5 there's [46] 14/23 60/7 72/22 90/4 95/21 97/2 106/15 110/3 111/14 114/22 115/10 $115 / 11116 / 21$ 127/20 127/21 156/16 157/11
160/10 160/21 162/2 162/9 164/19 165/17 171/8 172/23 173/19 173/25 174/25 177/3 180/21 182/3 183/15 201/15 209/21 218/8
218/12 218/21 219/5 220/11
220/12 223/4 223/19 224/4 224/10 230/4 230/24
thereabouts [1] 88/16
thereafter [2] 227/4 232/11 thereby [1] 118/25
therefore [7] $74 / 11115 / 6 \quad 122 / 4$ 174/11 198/12 224/20 224/25 these [46] 16/24 27/2 29/21 36/21 $37 / 742 / 2343 / 549 / 2053 / 468 / 8$ 81/12 87/2 89/16 92/10 93/22 93/24 95/7 98/13 98/13 102/22 110/22 $118 / 2$ 120/23 121/9 124/25 126/11 128/5 128/7 137/24 138/20 139/12 141/7 146/2 148/6 155/18 186/1 203/2 204/8 209/6 $215 / 2$ 215/14218/18218/19 221/7 222/3 224/4
they [218] 13/25 14/22 15/5 16/7 18/18 22/10 22/11 24/1 26/16 27/19 27/21 34/10 34/18 34/24 $35 / 137 / 937 / 937 / 1241 / 2342 / 8$ $42 / 1242 / 13$ 49/24 49/25 50/15 $51 / 1551 / 1853 / 153 / 353 / 557 / 18$ 59/22 59/23 59/24 60/7 60/13 61/24 65/6 65/7 68/16 70/17 70/18 70/18 70/19 70/21 70/24 71/3 71/4 71/6 71/9 71/11 71/12 71/20 76/14 77/6 77/10 79/18 $79 / 1980 / 1180 / 1284 / 884 / 25$ 85/2 85/9 85/16 86/7 86/8 86/9 $87 / 588 / 588 / 6$ 90/23 91/2 91/3 91/14 92/5 92/5 102/23 102/24 104/19 117/11117/25 121/15 127/2 127/3 127/4 127/8 127/9 128/5 131/2 131/15 131/21 131/21 133/13 136/25 137/9 137/16 138/13 146/10 146/11 149/23 149/23 151/22 151/25 152/3 152/5

154/17 155/19 $156 / 4$ 158/6 159/1
159/3 161/18 163/7 163/19 163/20 163/25 164/18 164/23 164/24 165/2 165/14 165/23 166/16 166/18 166/23 167/17 168/10 168/21 169/5 169/10 169/16
169/1 8 169/20 169/20 169/21 169/25 169/25 170/1 170/4 170/6 170/25 171/1 172/1 172/5 172/14 172/20 172/23 173/8 174/9 175/12 175/13 175/14 178/1 178/6 178/7
178/23 179/8 $179 / 8184 / 16185 / 14$
185/23 186/2 186/3 186/4 186/11
188/22 200/8 205/11 205/17 206/8 208/14 208/20 209/4 209/17
210/25 214/10215/11 216/1 216/5 216/6 216/18 217/4 217/7 217/18
$218 / 11218 / 12218 / 16219 / 2219 / 6$ 219/11 219/19 219/19 219/24 219/25 220/1 220/2 220/3 220/6 220/14 220/15 221/6 222/11 223/9 223/12 223/13 223/18 223/23 224/1 224/10 224/13 224/14 224/18 224/18 228/21 230/8 230/10 230/19
thing [9] $13 / 2424 / 2242 / 7$ 90/13 97/2 109/21 152/5 178/10 208/20 things [29] 27/2 35/4 42/4 53/6 65/16 70/1 71/25 77/4 80/5 85/20 85/21 101/23 123/12 138/21 141/1 147/22 151/9 165/6 171/12 183/2 205/24 207/21 209/3 209/6 215/25 218/18 218/19 221/7 222/12
think[138] 6/4 6/10 8/17 12/3
27/21 30/20 31/17 33/17 34/11 $35 / 438 / 739 / 1655 / 2362 / 766 / 4$ 70/21 77/20 77/21 78/5 79/7 79/12 79/14 81/14 85/22 88/24 93/3 95/5 96/1 98/11 99/3 99/25 101/2 102/17 102/21 104/10 104/22 106/7 106/23 106/24 108/2 108/6 109/24 110/11110/17
110/23 111/14 111/18111/20 112/17114/15 115/10117/6 118/13 119/6 121/3 122/21 124/7 128/12 131/8 131/24 132/9 133/15 133/1 8 133/22 134/19 140/8 146/9 150/2 150/6 150/20 150/23 151/25 154/15 154/19 154/24 154/25
155/4 155/16 156/18 157/11
157/15 158/18 161/11 162/2 163/2 163/4 164/16 165/12 168/12 169/2 169/6 169/25 170/2 172/15 172/25 174/5 174/21 175/12 176/3 177/10 177/10 179/18 180/11 180/16 180/1 8 180/22 181/25 182/4 182/14 184/21 185/11 187/1 188/24 189/14 190/9 194/5 202/2 202/9 203/1 1 204/7 204/12 206/16 207/9 208/10 208/16 208/25 209/4 209/7 209/19 210/13 211/21 212/18 213/19 220/1 220/6 221/7 222/1 231/9
thinking [1] 184/23
third [14] 105/18 134/13 155/24
157/7 157/9 161/20 169/5 169/11
180/4 180/5 180/24 181/10 210/20 211/5
this [345]
THOMAS [1] $1 / 13$
those [75] 3/23 7/19 17/17 18/16
30/17 38/14 43/18 44/5 44/17
$47 / 2150 / 10$ 53/6 68/20 69/14
those... [61] 69/25 75/22 77/4 77/13 82/9 85/7 92/7 93/7 114/4 114/7 117/18 117/23 119/5 119/10 119/16 120/21 122/23 125/3 127/3 134/3 134/12 140/11 140/15
141/22 142/16 145/21 150/11
150/18 151/24 152/12 155/13
157/17 161/12 164/14 168/13
170/19 171/12 172/24 177/16
181/17 181/23 182/23 183/2 183/5 191/14 198/20 203/4 204/5 205/16 207/21 207/25 208/5 208/8 209/3
210/6 214/18 214/19 215/9 225/21 229/10 230/7
though [3] 136/20 156/9 163/24
thought [10] 48/12 54/13 63/23
94/2 104/6 123/19 128/15 131/11 156/24 156/25
thousand [1] 225/16
thousands [2] 43/6 213/8
threaten [1] 124/17
three [17] 32/8 33/25 36/9 39/1
41/23 44/14 44/17 66/5 94/23
100/1 100/2 117/25 138/23 152/12 155/13 165/5 200/18
throat [1] 216/8
through [25] 12/14 13/7 48/7
53/23 58/24 68/15 89/11 94/19 102/18 128/17 137/25 140/7
164/15 165/2 167/20 167/22 168/7
168/9 169/4 176/3 176/4 189/18
207/23 216/12 222/24
throughout [6] 67/3 76/20 91/8
102/2 120/23 121/10
throughs [1] 169/4
throws [1] 224/7
Thursday [4] 18/24 47/14 48/3 211/17
Thus [1] 29/23
tie [1] 174/8
ties [2] $228 / 18228 / 18$
time [71] 3/1 4/10 5/24 7/5 9/20 10/9 10/23 23/1 27/15 34/2 34/4 44/23 45/22 53/7 58/20 62/19 65/10 68/7 70/17 70/17 70/19 71/2 72/19 87/5 87/6 87/8 87/9 87/9 87/13 89/23 103/5 105/10 110/23 130/4 136/2 137/16 138/21 152/4 155/9 155/17 155/22 161/11 162/1 169/5 169/11 169/18 175/15 176/10 177/12 177/19 181/9
184/18 196/21 197/6 197/14 202/1 203/17 203/21 204/13 207/11 209/18 209/20 212/13 213/13
214/5 214/21 218/5 219/10 219/17 225/13 229/17
timely [4] $189 / 2 \quad 189 / 3189 / 7 \quad 189 / 7$
times [9] 50/3 55/4 86/12 88/21
89/8 91/8 169/8 170/3 220/10
timing [1] 20/9
tip [1] 64/20
tips [1] 64/22
title [2] 12/6 123/3
today [38] 3/19 3/21 3/22 36/24
$72 / 1290 / 1690 / 17102 / 15102 / 16$ 103/10 110/10 111/7 111/25
112/21 113/6 114/12 115/22 124/5
126/22 126/24 143/14 146/3 150/2
153/11 168/19 183/20 196/18
204/25 211/3 211/10 213/2 228/21
229/4 229/5 229/11 230/20 231/2
$231 / 12$
today's [1] 103/21
together [12] 3/23 76/16 87/6
106/7 117/25 140/1 142/7 146/3
163/5 174/8 209/24 228/11
told [13] 11/7 15/12 21/12 22/9
36/22 48/18 91/13 92/14 99/22
100/3 107/7 120/16 221/5
Tom [2] 3/10 6/16
tone [3] 17/2 17/23 190/6
tongue [1] 134/4
too [7] 102/24 132/22 175/16
201/25 202/8 202/12 224/15
took [11] 30/7 43/22 65/19 65/24
88/7 99/15 122/25 129/24 141/8
216/5 216/18
tool [1] 62/1
top [1] 15/18
topic [1] 122/9
total [2] 9/20 174/16
totally [2] 176/14 218/1
touch [1] 189/20
tough [2] 84/12 200/22
towards [2] 78/2 163/20
town [2] 20/1 $211 / 20$
Toyota [4] 28/6 32/14 32/15 66/23
trade [1] 192/13
tradition [2] 132/18 132/21
trailer [17] 27/15 27/25 28/1 28/14
28/22 29/5 29/6 32/16 32/23
69/21 216/4 217/5 217/7 218/3
218/3 218/22 218/23
training [3] $46 / 1746 / 2087 / 15$
transcribed [1] 232/11
transcript [4] $1 / 21$ 39/20 232/8 232/12
transcription [1] 232/11
transcripts [1] 43/7
transfer [3] 19/4 19/10 20/4
transportation [1] 159/9
transported [2] 158/23 172/5
transporting [1] 186/2
treated [1] 110/4
trek [1] 152/22
trial [74] 7/5 7/15 54/6 104/21
113/24 123/15 124/3 124/4 124/6 124/18 $124 / 22$ 125/1 $125 / 4125 / 4$ 125/13 125/14 126/1 126/6 126/7 130/3 130/9 130/10 130/20 131/3 131/3 132/1 132/2 132/4 132/15 132/23 134/21 135/2 136/4 136/4 137/11 $142 / 21$ 143/9 144/8 144/12 144/21 $145 / 20$ 146/8 146/24 147/1 147/17 148/8 148/1 1 148/19 148/21 149/6 160/3 160/7 160/8 161/3 162/7 162/8 170/15 181/8 185/18 186/23 191/20 192/4
192/22 197/24 200/12 202/5 203/1 207/12 208/8 209/5 209/7 209/8 209/16 210/3
trial's [1] 160/25
trials [1] 104/15
tried [9] 59/1 69/11 71/14 131/19 131/22 133/1 134/3 152/5 227/4
trouble [1] 83/25
troubled [1] 194/16
troubles [1] 164/20
true [12] 7/19 19/8 36/18 49/3
77/19 86/23 112/5 201/10 202/2
221/9 230/13 232/12
trust [3] 10/21 11/3 209/11
truth [6] 161/1 177/17 220/16
224/1 224/9 229/14
try [12] $17 / 5$ 57/15 65/9 66/15
80/9 86/8 $110 / 8123 / 12$ 152/8 202/14 205/10 218/24
trying [19] 30/21 48/10 49/2 66/17 77/10 86/1 91/2 109/23 125/14 147/2 148/1 164/24 170/14 174/14 176/21 183/14 195/1 200/25 217/13
Tuesday [4] 32/13 67/8 79/9 79/14
tunc [1] 110/5
turn [5] 77/16 183/22 184/13
203/1 203/2
turned [4] 88/7 94/16 100/8 187/17
Turner [1] 136/20
turning [1] 185/3
turns [1] 217/22
TV [6] 35/6 43/18 104/24 122/7 122/13 129/23
TV's [1] 92/1
two [54] $10 / 3$ 11/25 13/14 19/1
$21 / 1427 / 1633 / 2534 / 334 / 935 / 6$
35/12 35/19 35/21 36/9 40/7
$40 / 1141 / 241 / 543 / 244 / 646 / 20$
49/23 64/1 71/7 75/21 77/4 77/13
95/2 101/2 122/6 122/12 122/20
122/23 126/11 129/23 130/16
137/23 138/21 145/19 145/21
148/9 155/25 $158 / 1$ 162/8 164/4
168/13 181/3 183/15 183/17
184/13 191/14 212/23 213/8 215/2
tying [1] 142/22
type [18] 13/24 24/22 42/6 49/20 53/6 53/25 69/23 89/8 89/17 95/23 156/15 160/9 160/9 160/19 164/16 171/2 177/11 180/16
types [1] 161/8
typical [4] 59/15 59/19 59/19 65/17
typically [3] 72/20 73/4 101/17 U
ultimate [1] 82/13
ultimately [6] 15/18 26/11 38/4
47/13 57/20 196/12
ultimatum [1] 144/15
un [1] 204/10
unavoidably [1] 126/9
unbroken [1] 135/25
unburden [1] 222/16
uncovered [1] 171/7
under [46] 11/21 11/23 11/25 12/7
13/11 $13 / 15$ 15/16 29/22 30/9
37/25 86/17 93/7 103/19 104/4 104/9 $113 / 8114 / 23115 / 4115 / 7$ 115/9115/25 116/8 116/13116/18 121/23 127/4 134/15 140/24 142/1 1 146/19 148/4 149/7 153/2
157/17 165/12 174/23 186/17
187/10 190/8 194/25 196/1 196/16 198/6 199/17 204/3 205/6
understand [30] 4/2 13/15 13/25 23/17 30/25 31/7 35/1 38/11 91/11 97/9 97/22 102/7 118/19 131/12 131/12 131/16 131/22 140/10 145/8 145/16 145/22
150/15 151/23 168/10 176/20
199/14 200/11 204/12 204/16
207/17
understanding [5] 102/10 103/20 115/8 182/1 209/23
understands [3] 107/9 114/4 134/11


154/9 164/3 175/17
undertake [1] 107/12
undertaken [1] 78/17
undertaking [2] 44/14 122/25
undisputed [2] 118/16 122/16
unfair [1] 199/2
unfairly [1] 149/11
unfortunate [1] 137/19
unfortunately [2] 138/13 221/9
unhappy [1] 126/14
uniform [1] 38/3
United [1] 180/12
unknown [2] 161/20 215/20
unless [1] 210/15
unnecessarily [1] 141/11
unpalatable [4] 131/13 131/14 131/16 131/22
unproven [1] 131/21
unrelated [2] 10/7 194/11
unseal [3] 104/12 106/23 111/15
unsealed [15] 73/18 103/23 105/2
105/16 105/21 106/5 108/18
110/23 111/9111/21113/18
113/25 114/18 114/20 116/23
unsealing [4] 107/21 114/15
116/19 117/3
unsupervised [2] 147/14 147/16
unsupported [1] 221/3
unsuspecting [1] 205/12
unsworn [1] 28/6
until [16] 67/4 68/4 95/19 96/3
101/13 107/19 153/9 153/14 160/3 174/24 193/12 206/18 219/10
219/15 219/24 223/12
unusual [5] 132/10 140/17 177/8
187/1 187/2
unwilling [1] 152/15
up [51] 12/14 15/1 16/11 25/2
33/8 52/24 53/20 65/24 68/24
69/2 75/25 87/20 87/22 97/4
103/21 109/22 $111 / 6$ 113/5 118/22
125/23 130/9 132/3 136/7 142/9
157/14 166/20 176/15 177/8 179/1
179/1 179/5 180/14 189/21 191/23
195/24 205/10 209/6 210/9 215/3
216/3 218/1 $218 / 19$ 220/15 220/22
221/23 223/13 224/5 224/8 226/8 227/4 227/21
upfront [1] 162/6
upon [6] 127/8 $142 / 2 \quad 144 / 14$
149/22 214/2 214/14
upset [3] 77/17 222/18 222/21
urge [1] 121/23
urging [2] $43 / 2215 / 4$
us [24] 11/7 15/12 47/8 78/9 91/12 91/13 92/12 92/13 93/12 97/20 97/25 107/11 134/13 166/18 176/6 180/2 194/9 194/18 208/21 210/8
210/13 211/24 218/18 224/9
use [7] 67/2 108/1 134/17 144/16
148/11 163/21 208/23
used [10] 43/18 66/13 66/20 86/11 138/12 152/3 179/14 189/6 189/8 215/15
using [3] 64/5 139/16 147/19
usually [4] 24/23 171/13 185/20 191/8
utilize [2] 68/17 148/16
walk [2] 172/7 191/24
walls [1] 216/6
want [30] 30/10 33/11 35/10 40/1 59/22 80/17 80/20 80/25 81/4 98/25 107/17 114/6 117/18 130/6 135/10 151/14 156/20 166/18 169/20 170/1 170/4 172/16 173/2 176/24 190/19 196/15 200/14 200/19 219/2 219/25
wanted [12] $43 / 1951 / 759 / 23$
85/11 97/25 112/13 114/10115/20 139/1 158/6 200/21 224/5
wants [5] 169/7 174/25 191/17
208/24 209/4
Ward [1] 194/9
warm [1] 203/15
warned [1] 128/14
warrant [2] 28/14 29/7
was [443]
Washington [2] 20/2 107/10
wasn't [12] 84/3 93/22 98/3 169/7
178/13 178/14 190/3 204/14 205/1
217/19 219/10219/15
waste [1] 162/1
wastes [1] 202/1
watch [2] 121/25 128/14
watched [2] 92/1 $152 / 4$
watching [3] 80/12 96/5 99/7
Wausau [1] 44/4
way [55] $11 / 17$ 15/1 20/6 24/14
27/10 28/10 30/25 32/6 33/4 34/8
58/23 64/5 73/18 78/7 86/22
86/24 97/8 109/24 123/12 124/14
127/9 141/22 146/20 150/6 151/5
154/10 158/18 160/16 161/2 165/8 168/12 168/12 168/12 168/24 168/25 170/24 173/5 175/17 176/7 177/13 182/10 190/13 190/16 190/25 208/24 209/10 216/25 219/6 221/17 222/1 222/8 222/24 222/24 226/19 227/8
we [309]
we'll [11] 3/25 27/2 103/2 110/8
111/11155/22157/4 210/1211/10 231/10 231/11
we're [43] 6/13 44/14 46/3 81/20
98/11 102/7 103/5 103/7 113/13 126/22 146/7 154/3 155/15 157/4 160/17 166/1 166/3 167/23 170/14 170/24 170/25 171/10 179/10 181/25 184/5 192/5 193/8 193/15 193/16 196/9 198/15 198/16 198/1 8 199/8 201/8 202/13 205/20 208/21 212/3 213/2 224/24 229/11 231/12
wearing [2] $38 / 280 / 22$
weather [1] 192/2
websites [1] 43/11
Wednesday [1] 211/23
week[11] 20/1 20/1752/19 68/2
88/16 136/4 155/1 155/10 211/19
211/21 211/22
weeks [5] 33/25 35/19 35/21 135/2
161/7
weigh [3] 161/13 168/9 229/13
weighing [1] 164/23
welcome [2] 39/21 $153 / 11$
well [86] $4 / 44 / 1713 / 1316 / 25$
18/12 26/16 32/24 38/19 42/1
47/23 62/12 67/4 74/21 76/24
$80 / 1982 / 1382 / 2584 / 1684 / 18$
$88 / 2191 / 19$ 94/5 98/11 100/6
100/15 102/21 106/6 106/22
well... [58] 110/19 111/6 113/20 114/17115/19115/21116/5 121/3 122/24 127/23 128/19 135/2 135/7 140/25 145/5 $151 / 23153 / 5$ 153/6 156/23 157/3 160/13 162/12 164/13 169/7 171/5 171/5 172/13 173/23 174/4 175/25 186/17 187/2 190/10 191/19 192/11 192/17 193/15 193/17 193/17 199/6 201/21 212/11 212/21 213/12 215/13 216/6 216/16 216/17 218/16 220/2 220/6 220/14 220/16 223/7 223/16 224/2 224/5 231/11 went [11] 6/24 49/12 65/24 128/19 164/15 180/8 189/18 205/13 217/11 221/23 222/4
were [144] 5/15 6/15 10/19 10/19 10/20 11/1 20/19 22/9 27/16 27/19 29/8 29/10 30/16 30/23 30/23 31/4 32/9 34/5 34/24 35/1 35/16 39/9 41/5 45/11 47/6 48/17 49/11 50/15 50/16 50/23 51/15 $51 / 1751 / 1852 / 1353 / 353 / 557 / 2$ $57 / 257 / 1858 / 1258 / 2058 / 22$ 61/7 62/8 62/14 63/11 63/17 63/23 64/9 66/17 67/1 67/2 67/6 67/10 68/2 68/7 68/16 69/4 69/6 69/7 69/13 69/16 70/17 70/18 70/18 71/3 71/12 71/20 71/22 71/25 72/5 74/20 75/15 75/21 76/4 76/19 76/21 79/19 81/25 $82 / 582 / 15$ 82/25 84/8 84/25 85/9 85/16 86/15 87/3 87/3 87/5 90/19 90/23 91/2 91/14 91/17 91/20 92/4 92/11 93/10 93/11 93/14 93/24 94/2 94/3 95/12 96/25 103/18 103/21 115/8 $115 / 13119 / 8$ 121/13 128/5 128/5 128/9 140/16 154/9 155/18 156/24 156/25 168/2 171/6 173/16 175/22 184/14 185/9 191/18 195/11 195/14 195/20 201/6 204/2 204/8 204/8 204/14 209/24 214/7 214/10 214/16 215/11215/15215/25 218/10 220/17
weren't [2] 71/24 92/16
WFRV [1] 152/8
wfrv.com [1] 152/3
what [187] 7/4 16/1 19/23 21/19 22/14 23/16 23/16 23/22 23/25 27/3 27/3 27/3 28/19 30/24 36/22 36/23 37/9 37/12 40/1 40/10 42/8 48/1750/24 51/1 51/751/1854/5 54/9 56/9 56/12 57/8 57/13 57/22 57/24 58/4 58/5 58/14 60/24 61/20 62/22 62/24 63/20 65/7 69/1 8 69/19 71/14 74/24 75/12 $75 / 19$ 75/21 75/25 76/1 78/13 78/21 79/10 80/15 80/21 81/14 $82 / 182 / 2084 / 8$ 84/16 86/2 86/8 86/9 86/14 88/3 88/5 88/10 88/13 93/6 97/10 98/24 99/5 100/14 100/15 101/24 112/6 113/19 113/20 116/16 $118 / 17118 / 17$ 121/10 121/11 123/2 128/15 128/19 129/6 130/23 131/8 132/12 139/2 139/3 139/13 139/14 140/1 140/19 141/21 143/23 144/15 145/8 146/1 146/4 149/12 149/14 150/13 150/24 152/7 154/6 154/18 155/8 157/18 159/16 159/25 160/1

160/14 160/14 160/15 162/15
162/21 163/4 163/23 163/25
164/24 166/16 167/17 169/12
170/6 170/14 170/25 172/15 173/7 174/18 175/9 175/16 176/23 178/7 178/19 179/4 180/9 181/19 182/24 184/5 186/3 187/21 187/21 188/18 191/3 191/8 192/7 198/25 199/13 199/21 199/25 200/17 202/16 202/20 202/20 204/3 204/5 204/15 206/22 207/7 211/17 213/7 213/7 213/22 215/24 217/7 217/14
219/24 219/25 219/25 223/3 223/3
223/18 223/20 224/24 225/22
226/13 226/14 227/7 227/16 229/6 229/9 229/19
what's [11] 16/1 44/6 47/4 86/9 107/20 113/8 137/7 176/10 204/15 218/7 222/5
whatever [9] 24/1 24/6 159/2
165/17 172/1 178/6 178/22 212/6

## 214/6

when [73] $5 / 238 / 8 \quad 19 / 2420 / 9$ 20/23 20/24 21/8 21/17 25/11 34/24 35/2 35/14 38/19 40/19 40/19 40/22 42/25 55/24 56/23 62/14 65/6 65/10 72/11 72/21 74/15 75/15 78/5 78/7 79/5 79/5 93/14 93/24 94/15 112/7 127/8 127/15 130/5 130/14 131/2 135/14 139/20 140/1 140/2 141/3 142/4 152/5 161/22 164/24 170/4 178/10 184/23 185/13 188/19 189/2 196/9 197/20 197/21 198/14 198/19
203/6 207/17 208/7 208/16 213/2 213/23 $215 / 8219 / 10222 / 10$ 222/19 223/18 223/23 224/1 229/16
where [30] 6/21 14/18 40/2 50/9 82/5 87/17 104/18 109/15 112/11 126/11 126/12 128/2 131/2 136/6 147/4 158/6 163/10 163/14 164/23 169/4 172/22 177/12 177/25 187/4 193/3 204/2 205/5 209/8 $218 / 19$ 224/10
where's [3] 216/16 220/2 220/2 wherever [2] 57/18 209/17 whether [46] 8/20 11/2 22/16 26/1 36/2 46/16 79/19 91/2 114/10 135/14 136/25 138/12 143/2 144/11 144/12 145/6 145/10 148/3 148/15 152/15 157/13 157/19 161/6 161/7 163/6 163/9 165/22 166/8 167/7 173/13 174/22 175/15 176/7 176/18 176/23 176/24 177/6 180/7 194/4 205/8 205/9 205/1 1 205/17 205/19 210/2 210/5 which [80] $5 / 24$ 14/24 27/7 32/13 36/2 1 39/3 43/7 43/18 62/7 64/3 66/1 8 67/8 77/20 78/9 87/20 92/5 93/3 104/4 107/1 109/14 109/21 110/12 111/11 113/7113/23 114/20 $115 / 25116 / 9117 / 11$ 118/13 118/21 120/16 121/22 122/13 124/23 126/7 127/21 129/1 129/2 130/13 131/17 131/19
136/16 140/23 141/8 141/8 141/22 150/15 150/18 151/12 155/23 158/5 159/21 160/9 160/24 160/25 161/6 161/9 161/20 162/8 170/16 171/13 172/3 187/3 194/12 198/25 199/3 199/4 199/24 201/11 201/17 208/22 214/16 215/5 218/5 221/23
| 222/6 225/25 226/19 228/14
whichever [1] 14/15
while [5] 50/2 55/3 134/7 160/12 230/1
who [87] 12/19 12/25 15/15 16/11 $17 / 22$ 25/16 26/8 30/22 30/23 $32 / 532 / 733 / 133 / 334 / 334 / 7$ $34 / 1035 / 1138 / 240 / 541 / 1142 / 2$ 46/8 49/7 49/12 49/15 49/21
49/24 49/24 53/1 56/4 65/14 68/21 69/7 69/11 69/12 69/16 $75 / 11$ 77/17 78/5 80/21 81/25 82/12 82/16 91/20 93/14 94/2 94/3 94/18 96/24 119/3 122/16 122/18 125/22 125/24 133/16 136/12 142/1 142/3 146/11 165/8 165/9 166/12 166/19 166/22 166/24 171/5 171/6 171/7 186/4 186/25 187/14 $189 / 10$ 190/5 190/5 190/6 195/8 195/10 196/10 203/10 204/22 221/4 222/14 223/20
226/23 226/24 227/3 229/15
who's [12] $8 / 2112 / 1714 / 130 / 23$
82/4 133/19 133/20 184/3 196/22
225/11 229/14 230/5
Whoever [2] 60/8 70/6
whole [17] 75/5 85/12 85/14 146/8 161/5 161/25 162/21 165/2 165/13 167/21 167/23 170/15 176/9
197/22 217/23 221/21 222/18
wholly [1] 201/5
whom [5] 60/11 82/2 137/4 199/21
202/17
whomever [1] 159/20
whose [2] 12/3 32/3
why [31] $25 / 7$ 59/1 61/16 66/20 95/17 96/2 96/4 96/12 97/7 110/3 112/8 142/24 152/17 180/12 184/22 188/21 188/21 194/16 194/18 198/2 200/7 200/9 201/8 201/15 $218 / 18220 / 22$ 223/14 223/22 224/2 224/2 224/3
wide [1] 52/4
widely [2] 6/6 32/13
widely-known [1] 6/6
wider [1] 127/25
width [1] 152/6
Wiegert [4] 47/15 48/4 61/16 112/25
wife [5] 136/13 164/7 164/8 164/12 165/8
will [114] 3/4 3/18 3/23 4/15 5/14 16/11 $21 / 1026 / 1930 / 542 / 16$ 47/22 55/7 60/15 63/24 73/1 79/1 1 88/3 94/6 95/8 96/16 98/17 101/3 102/9 102/16 102/23 104/20 105/14 106/4 106/16 109/3 110/24 112/7113/2 113/2 114/17114/18 114/20 116/5 117/9 118/8 118/11 118/18 119/18 $119 / 19$ 126/23 128/24 128/25 129/5 129/8 129/9 130/3 131/3 131/3 133/22 134/9 135/20 135/21 136/2 137/11 138/24 139/4 139/8 139/10 141/16 145/17 145/19 151/6 151/14 154/1 154/2 154/24 155/3 158/7 161/6 172/16 174/18 175/14 176/15 176/17 180/19 181/1 181/6 182/14 183/6 185/21 190/7 190/14 192/15 192/22 196/10 196/20 199/24 200/12 201/17 201/23 202/14 206/6 206/9 206/10 207/21 208/2 209/25 209/25 210/6 210/10 211/3
will... [8] 211/9 213/1 213/13
213/14 225/15 225/25 226/1 231/3
Williams [1] 3/15
willingness [1] 148/7
Willis [1] $1 / 11$
willy [3] 172/7 174/4 177/23
winded [1] 190/17
window [1] 221/24
Winnebago [1] 69/23
wiped [2] 215/12 215/12
WISCONSIN [21] $1 / 1$ 1/3 $1 / 143 / 2$
3/7 11/20 43/15 43/21 71/1 72/22
125/5 127/24 134/16 135/16
135/20 135/23 137/13 137/24
142/18 232/1 232/6
wish [7] $51 / 6$ 76/14 117/12 150/18
153/12 200/1 228/14
wishes [9] 49/20 114/12 117/22
133/7 173/4 178/22 180/24 181/3
181/10
withdraw [1] 148/25
withdrawing [1] 98/20
withhold [1] 81/4
within [10] 19/14 19/17 25/17
37/23 38/14 52/13 101/23 143/9
143/10 195/23
without [14] 57/23 92/18 110/24
113/3 133/5 133/5 133/8 135/23
136/1 158/4 181/13 190/24 200/14 207/6
witness [19] 4/10 4/19 7/14 42/21
$44 / 25$ 54/2 102/8 102/20 176/8
183/17 192/16 192/18 192/19
193/17 194/1 200/9 202/20 210/2 229/22
witness's [1] 202/23
witnesses [12] $2 / 2$ 132/13 147/21
173/7 176/8 177/24 182/20 187/13
187/23 189/3 190/11 202/20
wives [1] 75/5
WLUK [1] 122/13
woman [7] 8/10 205/12 215/18
216/9 217/25 218/23 220/5
won't [4] 41/15 102/24 134/11
200/5
wood [1] 216/5
woods [1] 136/11
word [5] 64/12 86/11 109/18
116/24 222/23
wording [1] 138/8
words [16] 13/15 44/2 61/21 62/8
$77 / 25$ 78/1 85/7 87/25 129/13
129/22 139/16 144/5 172/16 180/10 191/9 197/8
work [7] 15/1 20/13 46/13 123/12 187/16 203/6 209/24
worked [3] 54/21 59/8 210/11
works [1] 220/19
world [2] 77/1 85/15
worried [1] 178/5
worst [1] 136/17
would [228] 5/18 8/12 8/14 10/21 11/3 13/11 13/18 13/22 14/13 14/24 15/10 16/5 16/6 16/18 17/9 18/7 19/23 23/14 23/19 23/20 24/8 24/11 26/13 26/14 26/16 26/17 26/1 8 26/1 8 29/24 30/8 32/17 37/12 38/9 38/15 39/17 39/22 40/25 40/25 48/1 8 49/7 49/1 4 49/1 5 49/1 8 49/19 49/23 49/24 49/25 50/4 50/5 50/19
$51 / 1452 / 2553 / 553 / 853 / 1054 / 8$
$54 / 1254 / 1354 / 1454 / 1555 / 20$
56/24 57/3 57/15 57/24 58/4
58/14 59/16 59/24 60/24 61/18
62/9 62/21 65/17 65/19 66/9 67/8
67/9 67/23 67/24 68/16 68/19
68/21 69/11 69/15 70/3 70/7 70/8
71/6 71/11 72/15 73/20 75/24
76/9 76/25 77/3 78/4 79/14 80/14
80/25 81/10 81/22 82/14 82/18
82/1 8 82/19 85/2 89/10 90/9
90/10 90/14 91/3 91/5 92/15
93/17 95/17 101/16 101/21 101/23
102/17 104/17 106/12 109/6
109/15 109/16 $110 / 1$ 110/2 110/12
110/23 111/5 113/21 116/12
116/24 117/1 124/17 124/23
125/20 128/1 129/7 131/25 132/22
133/12 133/13 133/14 134/23
135/7 136/14 136/19 140/3 140/17
143/10 147/18 147/19 148/23
148/25 149/6 153/16 153/18 155/4
157/8 157/21 157/21 158/8 158/19
158/25 160/17 162/11 168/2 168/6
168/7 168/8 168/16 169/13 170/2
170/23 175/20 176/2 176/4 179/9
182/2 $182 / 16184 / 22$ 185/5 186/1 1
188/3 188/12 188/15 188/21
195/23 196/16 197/8 197/11
198/12 199/1 201/10 201/15
202/1 1 202/12 202/22 203/20
204/1 204/1 205/10 205/11 207/1 1
208/19 208/23 211/14 212/12
213/22 $215 / 17215 / 18215 / 20$
216/11 216/14 216/25 217/19
219/22 220/6 220/7 222/14 224/2
224/3 224/15 225/21 226/4 226/15 230/12
wouldn't [10] 14/12 32/5 34/25
101/15 134/7 134/24 195/5 203/22
207/12 216/17
writing [6] $135 / 13150 / 17151 / 3$
151/7 151/11 153/15
written [20] 17/11 17/13 17/19
39/7 100/16 102/23 110/20 139/11 153/12 153/22 155/2 160/2 168/11 183/7 190/14 212/13 212/16 215/6 219/12 229/5
wrong [7] 16/12 127/1 129/15
190/20 194/19 218/9 219/1
wrongful [10] 63/12 106/11
116/10 196/20 197/4 199/12 200/2
202/2 202/22 208/23
wrongfully [1] 197/23
wrote [1] 41/11
Y
Yanda's [1] 29/6
Yard [3] 22/12 22/20 45/18
yeah [20] 20/22 24/24 27/11 27/13
29/4 34/24 39/19 41/10 65/17
66/14 69/20 74/18 78/1 79/3
79/17 82/18 98/22 147/25 194/22
223/16
year[3] 7/11 214/4 214/15
years [21] 5/5 5/10 5/12 5/14 9/14
9/16 9/21 10/3 10/6 10/15 10/17
39/1 74/3 88/23 89/2 135/23
189/23 200/25 204/9 210/7 225/7
yes [244]
yesterday [1] 206/16
yet [7] 99/25 107/1 130/15 143/21
145/9 195/19 224/14
yield [1] 139/5
you [531]
you're [2] 171/19 178/16
young [7] 136/13 165/3 214/23
217/22 218/22 222/14 228/4
your [104] 4/8 4/9 4/22 4/22 5/22 $8 / 98 / 2410 / 1111 / 211 / 315 / 24$ 17/5 17/7 17/14 17/23 18/9 18/15 19/17 19/19 20/10 24/4 24/9 24/25 25/3 25/18 25/18 27/8 28/7 28/16 28/23 28/25 29/13 30/7 $30 / 15$ 31/19 32/19 32/25 33/20 33/22 34/3 35/24 36/20 37/7 38/20 39/4 39/8 39/16 39/21 39/22 39/25 40/12 42/17 45/3 45/3 45/10 45/24 46/25 47/3 52/12 54/10 55/2 60/23 60/25 62/8 65/2 72/14 74/2 76/5 76/6 77/1 79/5 86/17 87/10 87/25 88/5 88/21 89/2 90/6 90/1 8 92/10 92/20 93/7 98/21 104/2 108/23 114/23 118/4 $118 / 17139 / 10150 / 7$ 150/9 150/14 151/1 153/15 158/17 172/16 181/22 190/14 191/2
194/16 203/8 206/20 207/6 229/2
yourself [7] 10/23 39/24 46/25 49/14 93/8 98/7 99/10

