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THE COURT: At this time we're back on the record in the case of State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery, Case No. 05 CF 381. We're here for a continuation of closing arguments this morning. Will the parties present state their appearances for the record.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Good morning, Judge. The State appears by Calumet County D.A. Ken Kratz, Assistant Attorney General Tom Fallon, Assistant D.A. Norm Gahn appearing as Special Prosecutors. ATTORNEY STRANG: Good morning as well. Steven Avery is present, again. And Jerome Buting and Dean Strang standing for him.

THE COURT: All right. Before we bring in the jury and continue with closing arguments there was one matter $I$ wanted to clarify for the record. During the course of these proceedings we have had some individual voir dire with the jurors. And I wanted to clarify the Court's understanding that neither party is asking that any of the jurors be excused for cause, based on any of the information adduced at the voir dire. Mr. Kratz.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's correct, Judge. THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That is also correct.
THE COURT: Very well. Is there anything else the parties wish to take up outside the presence of the jury before we resume with closings.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge.
ATTORNEY STRANG: No, sir.
THE COURT: All right. We'll bring the jurors in at this time.
(Jury present.)
THE COURT: You may be seated. Good morning, again, members of the jury. At this time we're ready to resume closing arguments. Mr. Strang will be speaking first on behalf of the defendant. ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you. Good morning. JURORS: Good morning.

ATTORNEY STRANG: You know, I -- what's it been, five weeks, or six weeks, or whatever it's been, and the rules within which we operate fundamentally allow me only to speak at you. At this point, $I$ would be ready to speak with you. I can't exactly. But I do want to do my best to talk with you this morning. Can't hear? JUROR: It's kind of soft. ATTORNEY STRANG: Kind of soft. THE COURT: Which number is that?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'm No. 7. I'm getting nods, you hear me, whether you want to or not.

I want -- I want you to step back just a little bit here and let's try to work at assembling a bit what you might do in approaching your task. And you have got such a mass of information, really, over the last five weeks, let's call it. There are some things you are not going to be able to do, I think. But there are also some things you can do. And I want to talk about what $I$ see as the line between those things.

You, unfortunately, are not going to be able to solve the murder here. And I say that for this reason, if Steven Avery did it, if -- if he's the guy who murdered Teresa Halbach, then -then, in a sense you are not going to solve that. They already think that.

This is the person they think all the evidence points to, the person they have identified as doing it. You can agree or disagree with that, with that -- that theory of prosecution. But, fundamentally, you and I aren't solving a murder, because if Steven Avery didn't do it, we can't tell you who did.

You know, Jerry Buting, Jerome Buting, in Court, you know, is not going to tell you -doesn't mean to tell you that, for instance, Bobby Dassey murdered Teresa Halbach. We don't mean to tell you that someone else murdered Teresa Halbach. It's really kind of a point, we don't have a police department, you don't have a police department.

We're not going to be able to solve the murder, if Steven Avery did not do it. So, you know, you can agree with the State, you can agree with the defense, but at some level you are not solving the murder, as much as it's natural for all of us to want do that.

Second thing I think you are not going to be able to do, I'm quite certain you are not going to be able to do, is bring Teresa Halbach back through that door, or better yet, back through the door of her mom's house. We are not going to be able to do that. Convicting a guilty guy, convicting the person who killed her, wouldn't do it. Convicting someone who didn't kill her, certainly won't do it.

The life that was before October 31, 2005, never will be lost. It's etched in mom's
heart. It's etched in her brother's, and her sister's minds, in their memories, in the people they are. That life is not lost. The life that could have been, going forward beginning November 1, 2005 is forever lost, not forgotten, but lost.

This is human tragedy, and if you or I understood why people have been killing each other since we crawled out of caves, we would stop it. But somebody killed this woman and that life going forward is lost. You can't get it back. I can't get it back. The gentleman at this table can't get it back.

The other thing I think that you are not going to be able to do, you can't do, 13 people, 12 people, can't do, is we can't provide closure here in any real meaningful way. It's not what courtrooms are good for. You would like to be able to do that for Teresa Halbach's family.

I think you would like to be able to do that for Steven Avery's family, provide some closure. Provide it for him, for crying out loud. You would probably like to do that, too, if you could. But there again, the time since November of 2005 really, fundamentally, is lost,
as a matter of closure for Steven Avery.
He's never really, in the broader public, been presumed innocent. He's never really had the presumption to which he was entitled as an American, as a citizen accused. You folks may be the only people in the world, other than those of us at my table, who do presume him innocent.

You can't do anything about it. We can't do anything about that, for the rest of the world. And as I say, courtrooms are pitiful, pathetic places to try and provide closure for Delores, closure for the Halbach family. Not that it's not important that the system not work, it is important that the system work. Because when it works, we can provide justice, or some semblance of justice. But justice and closure are -- are two different things.

Nobody is always happy with justice, or at peace necessarily with justice. And in that sense, closure would be something more. Something more personal for that family, and for this family, and for Steven. You'd provide it if you could, I know you would. You won't be able to do it.

And in some ways you are going to be told that you ought not try to do any of these things. Because I think Judge Willis will tell you, after the lawyers are done speaking at long last, I think he will tell you that you have got to decide this case, as finders of fact, without sympathy, without prejudice, without passion, without all the things that might go into solving murders or providing closure. You will be told instead that you won't, you can't, be swayed by sympathy, or prejudice, or passion.

But there are some very important things that you can do here, now that I have identified the things you can't. There are some very important things you can do. You can honor your oath. You can keep a promise that you made before the world, more importantly, that you made for yourself. You put your own conscience on the line. You can honor the oath that you have taken and that you will take, as jurors. You can obey the oath.

That's no small thing. You are under an enormous amount of pressure, internally and externally. This table, my table, a courtroom full of people, a community at large, terribly
serious issues for everybody. So when I say you can honor and obey your oath, it's a big deal.

You also can apply the law, honestly and courageously, part of what you are duty bound to do, as the Judge delivers the law to you in the form of those jury instructions. You can apply that. You can decide this case, if you choose, on the evidence in the courtroom and only the evidence in the courtroom.

You have the power to do that. You have a duty to do it, but more importantly you have the power to do it. You get to make the choice to do that. It's something you can do. You can decide whether allegations have been proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, in considering all of the evidence.

I don't take it for granted that jurors do that, in the end. Because jurors are all human, just like I am. But if you choose to do that, you can. It's within your grasp. And I think, finally, you can, if you choose, you can get it right.

In the limited parameters available to you, you can get it right. You can go home, whenever you are done, and say, I know in my
head, because I used my head, I know in my heart, because I used my heart, I know in my conscience, because I listened to my conscience, that I got it right. You can do that. And if you do, you will also have set it right.

Just as I said I was going to ask you, when I spoke in opening statement, when it was about 19 below zero outside, or whatever it was that day, you will set a lot of things right, if you get it right, here. The 1985 case won't matter so much any more, if justice is done this time.

Will that ever go away? No, but it just won't matter so much any more, the injustice that was done to Steven then, because there is -there is something redemptive in human beings going back and trying again and getting it right eventually.

So I want to ask you simply to commit to doing the things you can do, and to living with, reconciling yourself to the things you can't do. You are not going to solve a murder -- a murder, but you may spare someone who's not a murderer. You are not going to bring Teresa Halbach back to her family, but at some level, just by this trial
ending, you can give her back to her family.
What I mean by that, I mean for crying out loud, what an artificial thing we do -- and I love this, I love being a lawyer, I love it -but what an artificial strange thing it is that we do here, rules of evidence, formal procedures. And for crying out loud, right down to taking body parts and putting exhibit numbers on them, explain a person's phone records on a screen for a room full of strangers to look at.

It is what we do. It's what we have to do here, at some level. Clinical discussions of death, dry discussions of who you are calling, or who's calling you, on your cell phone, just for example. It's important. It's necessary.

But, when this trial ends, with a just verdict, although you can't bring her back, in some ways you can give her back, you know. We can be past that and remember the Teresa Halbach who was, rather than the 15 loci of her DNA.

You won't give closure, but maybe, maybe, you can create an opening; if not closure, an opening when we finish this trial, for people to get out of these pews, out of these uncomfortable pews, go back about their lives,
and in church, and in community, and wherever -wherever the heck people hang out, in family rooms, there pursue closure.

And the sense of restoration or reconciliation that we find, or seek, in places other than courtrooms, with uncomfortable pews to sit in. So maybe, as you finish this case, although you can't give closure, maybe you can give the opening for it.

How do you undertake then, to do the things that you can do. It's witnesses, it was helpful for Mr. Kratz to give you pictures of the witnesses so you can associate the face with the name again. But much more fundamentally, how do you -- how do you assemble and assimilate this mass of information and approach it in a practical way.

You can't do it by hoping the DNA will tell you a story. You know, unfortunately, for example, DNA, doesn't tell stories. People tell stories. People have stories. DNA is submicroscopic bits of protein. Mine's a little different than yours, but, you know, fundamentally we're all about 99.9 percent the same, probably. Doesn't tell a story. It
doesn't tell why someone did something, doesn't tell when it got where it got.

If a human being made a mistake with the DNA, it doesn't tell you anything at all about whether -- whether it should have been here, or wasn't here, or whatnot. It doesn't -- It doesn't tell you a story, unfortunately, although it makes good rhetoric, in a closing argument.

So what you have to do in the end is, you have to look and listen to people here. Even when they are talking about science, or filling their -- with the propane truck, or whatever. In this process, to do your job, to do the thing you can, you have got to look at real intently on the witness stand and listen to people. And you have got to sort out who you believe and who you don't, in the end.

So I want to at least suggest that you ask two very basic questions here as -- as a framework, a possible framework for getting at the things you can do here, if you choose. First question, you know, he says he is innocent. Anybody can say they are innocent.

Back at the time before you were around, before anybody was really looking at him, you
might ask first, was he doing the things that an innocent person might do. As you look back at it, was he acting and was he behaving like an innocent man. That's one question you could ask, sort of approaching this whole mass of evidence.

A second question you might ask yourself is, for the law enforcement professionals and the prosecutors, primarily the state employees and state witnesses, call them law enforcement people generally, the ones who are so convinced he is guilty, back before they got here, were -- were they behaving as honest people acting in good faith do.

You could ask yourself that question, again, as sort of a framework for approaching this mass of evidence. Back before they knew you were going to look at them, as you see it now, were they behaving honestly, were they acting in good faith. Now, these -- these are just two suggestions, just some lawyer's idea. You can go about this whatever way you want. But this might be helpful.

And ask yourself, as to the folks who think Steven Avery is guilty, do you believe them in the end, and believe them to a level that you
would not even pause or hesitate, when called upon to act in the most important affairs of life. That's language right out of this reasonable doubt instruction that you got.

And just taking a part of it, and it's sitting under your chairs, or wherever your instructions are, you don't have to pick it up and look at it now, but you will find that. I think it's a helpful practical guide in deciding whether something is proven, whether you believe it, beyond a reasonable doubt. It's, you know, would you -- given the information you have in the end, would you pause or hesitate in the most important affairs of life.

There's no getting around that this is one of the most important affairs of your life, of your lives. A young woman is dead, for no conceivable good reason. And a man is on trial for doing it. Enormous consequences.

And Mrs. Halbach, and everybody who loved and cared about this young woman, brothers, sisters, friends, uncles, aunts, you name it. And to Mrs. Avery, whose own story is tragic. You know, and to the people who fought for his innocence, the handful of people who believed
him, before the rest of the world finally got it right, who went through all that, Mrs. Avery, and then two years later to have this come crashing down on her. This is an important affair. And it is for you now, too.

So, I start with my first question, did he behave as an innocent man might behave. Let's go back, let's go back to roughly October, 2005. What's he doing? What's Steven Avery doing? Well, he is living in a trailer that he borrowed from Rollie Johnson. That's pretty modest. That's a damn sight better than a prison cell, that he had been in. He's got himself a girlfriend. He's working in the family business. This is all honest stuff. So far.

He has a lawsuit started, for a whole lot of money, based on he's got two indisputable points on his side in that lawsuit. One, he was innocent of the earlier case, but, you know, he rotted in prison for a while anyway. So, you know, he is innocent, but he went to prison. He's got two pretty good starting points in a lawsuit, in getting some money. And that's what he's got two other lawyers pursuing for him, back in 2005. He's got his mom and dad back. I don't
mean to be ignoring Allen, but when I speak of Delores and anybody else, he's got his family back, is the point.

And as this -- as this case starts to take shape, you know, as Teresa gets reported missing, and they find out that she had a photo shoot out at the Avery property. The very night, November 3, she's reported missing, Sergeant Colborn comes out to the property, bumps into Steven Avery.

Steven is not expecting the police. There's no way he would have even known she had been reported missing at this point. Bumps into Sergeant Colborn and he is cooperative. By Sergeant Colborn's own account, he is cooperative, open, talks to Sergeant Colborn. Doesn't say I'm not talking to you, you know.

The next morning, same thing. Detective Remiker and Lieutenant Lenk come out to visit him. He's cooperative, cooperative to the point of saying you can come into my house, when they ask, go ahead, come in my house.

> I think it's later on Friday, November 4, when David Beach comes and, you know, has the poster. He wants to put the poster up.

This is Teresa's relative, nice younger guy who testified, I think the first day of testimony. And David Beach has a conversation with Steve Avery and Steve is forthright. He's calm. He appears concerned, according to Mr. Beach.

To me, this is useful, because at that point he is not posing. He is not in a courtroom. He doesn't know how this is all going to play out. These -- These are people who are seeing him real, if you will, just having, you know, encounters with him. And this is their take on what -- on what they are getting from his behavior and what he says.

Is he behaving like an innocent man?
Well, he has Teresa Halbach's cell phone number. We get a glimpse of her, she's obviously willing to give this out. She says so in the voice mail message. She leaves her cell phone number on the voice mail message. They caught that, that she leaves on the Janda voice -- or answering machine.

And Steve has her cell phone number. He has got it written down in two places in his house. They are on his computer desk somewhere. They are there on November 5 when the police
descend and the -- the Avery people get excluded from the property. And the police have it for a week. They are there. He hasn't destroyed her cell phone number, hasn't tried to get rid of it, you know. It is there in not one, but two places.

So, you know, I don't know, if you can burn a cell phone, and if you can burn an A310 Digital Power Shot Camera, I don't know why you can't burn two pieces of paper that have a cell phone number on it. That's not what he does, obviously.

There was a van for sale. Heaven knows there was a van, you saw about 10 pictures of this silly maroon van sitting out there. Why -Why do I, you know, why do I suggest that's evidence, if you will, of Steve behaving like an innocent guy would behave? Well, you know, if you're -- if you are going to lure the photographer to your property so you can have your evil way with her, and kill her, you don't need a car, you don't need anything for sale. You just lie and say, you know, I want you to come out and take a picture of a '73 Eldorado, or, you know, whatever it is.

There's a van. It's the van he tells Auto Trader. It's owned by Barb Janda, just like he tells Auto Trader, B. Janda. And gives B. Janda's telephone number. Turns out there is no dispute, of which I'm aware. The Dassey boys, you know, Scott Tadych, the people who know about this, who testified, yeah, there's a van. It's sitting there. She's trying to sell it. It's hers.

I think that's suggestive of innocent behavior. Not of, you know, luring, or concocting some scheme so that you can murder somebody.

Look, again, what he's doing in October and early November, 2005, while he's still in his house. The gun's over the bed. Are they hidden? Has he -- you know, has he run off and burned them, or asked his nephew to take them and thrown them in the bottom of a pond or something, or even moved them to the spare bedroom? No, the guns are where they are. They are right where Rollie Johnson left them.

Did he crush the car, no. Did he empty the burn barrel, try to hide, you know, whatever is in the burn barrel? Did he melt the license
plates? Did he get rid of the key that supposedly is found, you know, next to the foot of his bed, or across the way from the foot of his bed, next to his desk? No, you know, he doesn't do any of that. I don't think the key is there. But if you believe that it's -- that it's there, you know, if you believe it's there, then it's awfully incriminating, if you believe he put it there.

But, you know, I don't know why he would keep the key, and that key alone, of all of Teresa Halbach's possessions, if he has previously disconnected the battery so that the key won't work, unless he reconnect the battery for some reason. And he's got a junkyard, for crying out loud. Leave the key in the trunk where the keys are for all the other junk vehicles. Leave it in the ignition, put it in the grass, $I$ don't know. Bring that, and that alone, to your bedroom.

But you know, in general, the behavior you are seeing from Steven Avery on November 3 and November 4 is open, cooperative, sure you can search my house, contrasted to the behavior of a George Zipperer, who is one of the other
appointments Teresa has that afternoon. Uncooperative, hostile, dishonest with the police, won't let him in the house for a long time, even after he knows this young woman is missing. You get this from -- some of it from JoEllen Zipperer and some of it from Detective Remiker.

How about burning trash, plastic smell, burning trash at about, give or take, 3:45 on Monday afternoon, how about. Well, that really sort of takes you to Bobby Dassey, and Blaine Dassey, and Lisa Buchner, and John Leurquin, to decide what burning trash means.

If Bobby Dassey is right and Teresa Halbach has been there at 2:45, then burning trash at 3:45 with a plastic smell is potentially incriminating. Bob Fabian sees this, smells the plastic burning as well. That's potentially incriminating if Bobby is right.

I'm wondering why Bob Fabian doesn't smell the quite distinctive odor of a burning tire. You know, rubber burning, with black smoke pouring thickly out of the burning barrel, if supposedly the tire is being used to burn the cell phone, the camera, and the palm pilot.

But setting that aside, to me there is a more fundamental problem with that. I don't think Bobby Dassey is right. You know, Blaine Dassey has a good reason to know when he gets off the bus every day, it's 3:30 to 3:40. He comes home, Bobby is sleeping. Bobby is there and he's sleeping. This is what his own brother remembers.

More, the bus driver has a pretty good reason to know what time. She's driving the same route every afternoon, dropping off the same kids, in the same place, at about the same time, every afternoon.

She's no friend of Steven Avery. She's not connected to Steven Avery. She's not coached. She's not trying to oversell what she remembers. But that's when she drops the Dassey boys off. And one of the days that week, either Halloween, or Tuesday, the 1st, or Wednesday, November 2nd, she remembers seeing a female photographer taking pictures of a van.

If facts are stubborn, as counsel says, then that -- then that's a pretty stubborn fact. Just because she's not overselling it, and she has no reason to want -- to care how this case
comes out, you know.
So is it possible that some other female photographer was there on Tuesday, November 2nd, taking a picture of a van? Well, is it possible? Sure, it's possible. But even Investigator Wiegert concedes, when pushed a little bit about that, that he doesn't have any information about another female photographer coming to take a picture of another van.

So this is pretty reliable stuff, that Teresa is there at more like $3: 30$ or $3: 40$, not 2:45. John Leurquin sees a green SUV leaving. What does he care about Steven Avery? For that matter, what does he really care about Teresa Halbach. And he doesn't have -- he doesn't have a dog in this fight.

What he has to do is sit and stare out the front windshield of his truck, every day for half an hour, $3: 30$ to 4, quitting time, as he fills the LP truck. He has got nothing to do except look at the world. Filters out the school bus, filters out, you know, the cars he sees coming and going every day. That's common sense, that makes sense.

When something new goes by, it's not a
heavily traveled road, he notices. Is he overselling the point, no. Can't say it's that SUV, can't say it's a Toyota RAV4. Looks similar, can't say who is driving it. Didn't see whether it turned right or left at the stop sign on Highway 147. You know, he's not gilding the lily, so to speak. He's not overselling what he saw.

So, to me -- you guys are the ones that matter -- but to me, that's fairly reliable stuff. It's reported to the police, candidly, when they ask. Lisa Buchner for that matter goes up to the barricade, that Saturday, says I have some information maybe you want. They interview her two days later, you know, the following Monday, when it's fresh in mind. And she tells them what she knows. Tells them what she doesn't know, for that matter.

So, you know, you got Bobby stacked up against Blaine, Lisa Buchner and John Leurquin, and it looks to me like the more probable time frame is $3: 30 i s h$ that she's there. And if that's so, then burning garbage in your burn barrel at 3:45 is just burning garbage in your burn barrel. It's innocent. Bob Fabian smells plastic, so
what. It's a white plastic garbage bag that, you know, Blaine sees.

And you got plastic in your garbage, you know, I'll bet you do, unless you live in town where you've got a nice blue recycling tub or something, and you separate that stuff out. But this doesn't look like much, if the time frame is different than Bobby Dassey has it.

So how about -- how about the 4:35 p.m. phone call to Teresa's cell phone, what my colleague referred to as the alibi phone call. And the State argues he is doing that to create an alibi, because he knows that will create a record on the cell phone bills, cell phone company records.

Okay. All right. I mean, first of all, it makes the $* 67$ calls not very important, because they are going to create a record too. And if he knows a 4:35 call is going to create a record, then he also knows that the 2:24 and 2:33 call are going to create a record. But maybe more importantly than that, this isn't much of a alibi.

It's a cell phone, calling a cell phone, you can be anywhere, doesn't place you in any
particular, you know, spot on the planet. It's not like you are at home in your kitchen, because you called on your land line, you know, with a 6 foot cord keeping you from going any further. It's a cell phone. It's not a good alibi, you know, it doesn't get you anywhere, or suggest that it's guilty behavior.

This call, also, draws more attention to you, not less. I mean, you are going to show up on the cell phone records. It is your cell phone you are using. It's not -- This isn't something you do if you are trying to alibi yourself.

But if, while we're looking at phone calls and moving through Steve's behavior on October 31, you know, hey, there are two telephone calls the State hasn't talked much about yet, if at all, but they stipulate on this. They agreed. There are two phone calls from the Manitowoc County Jail to Steven Avery's land line.

He's got a cordless phone, it may even be in one of the pictures in the bedroom, so he can wander around. But it is, you know, it is a cordless land line phone, they have stipulated. These phone calls come in from his girlfriend,

Jodi, from the jail. First one is at 5:36 in the afternoon, 15 minutes of talking, tape recorded. Investigator Wiegert has listened to it. And then another one at 8:57 p.m., tape recorded, then listened to by the police, 15 minutes long, talking to his girlfriend.

This is what somebody who's in the process of burning a body is going to be doing? Are you kidding me? You know, I mean, you think maybe you would have heard those tapes played if there had been something incriminating, or out of the ordinary about the 15 minute conversations with the girlfriend, that night, Halloween night? It's more just evidence of every day life, doing what an innocent person might well be doing. And that's how October 31 comes to an end.

Later that week -- and I, you know, Blaine Dassey tells you this, he didn't make a big point out of it, but he told you, and I want to remind you about that, later that week Steve Avery suggests to Blaine, maybe he wants to invite some of his friends over for a bonfire, at Steve's place. Blaine's in high school, high school kids, bonfire, he makes the suggestion. It never happens, for whatever -- I don't even
know that Blaine explained why, but it just -the bonfire never happens later in the week.

But, you know, if you had burned a body in your burn pit, or you even knew that there were bones in your burn pit, spread around, human remains, you are going to invite some high school kids over to have a bonfire and sit around the same burn area? I'm not. That doesn't seem to me that somebody who's guilty, that that's something he would do, an invitation he would extend to his nephew. A bunch of random high school kids, come on over to my make shift crematorium for a bonfire and stand around.

What does he do here, in terms of behaving like an innocent guy, or not. Well, look at the witnesses we called on his behalf. Now, all walks of life, many fewer witnesses than the State called, but as I say, all walks of life. And what struck me, at least, about the folks who testified for you, because we called them, is I thought to a person, these folks were natural, they were real.

They weren't swiveling in their chair to look at you and give you a talk, as if they were an old friend of yours every time they are asked
a question. They are not advocating anything, as far as I could pick up. Or as I say, sort of selling you something, overselling something. They are candid on cross-examination, just as they were on direct examination. I thought, at least, that's what this group of people shared. Was I surprised that we had to call the bus driver, rather than the State calling, to help you with the time frame that afternoon, yeah, I was surprised. But we did it, since they didn't. And now you have got that information.

But, you know, these -- these people rang true to my ear, at least. And it's your ears that matter.

So let me move to my second question: Can you believe the police? Can you believe the law enforcement folks who are so sure that Steven Avery's guilty? What do you see about their behavior before they are on the stage here? Well, look at what they say and do when they don't know that you are going to be listening and seeing.

Let's start with Andy Colborn, since I sort of started with him on November 3. He calls in, does a license check on Teresa Halbach's car.

He says he thinks it was probably on November 3, not sure, but probably November 3, that he did that. But remember he's working on November 3, so he would have had his radio.

And it's Detective Remiker who says ordinarily you would use your radio when you are calling in a license check to dispatch. He uses his cell phone instead. The tape you hear is clearly a phone call, not a radio in. So I think it's probably more likely that this license check is November 4, when Sergeant Colborn acknowledges he was off.

Didn't work on November 4. And you may remember, Mr. Kratz asked him, do you remember what you were doing on November 4, 2005. He says, yes, I do. I was off. I remember what I was doing. Doesn't tell you what he was doing, other than to deny he went to the Avery Salvage yard, or denied he had anything to do with planting evidence. But he is off.

And I'm not going to play it for you again, it's in evidence, but -- Let's see if this comes up. That's -- That's what you hear on the tape that we played.

SERGEANT COLBORN: Lynn.

DISPATCHER: Hi Andy.
SERGEANT COLBORN: Can you run Sam, William, Henry, 582, see if it comes back to that da da da da da -- then they start talking over each other. I can't make it out. You can listen to it if you want. Then she goes off on talking about needing a Spanish interpreter, chitty chatting while she's doing the license check. She's comes back and she confirms it's Teresa Halbach's license plate, the missing person.

Sergeant Colborn says, '99 Toyota, and so on.

Why is he doing that? Why is he doing that? Why is he calling in a license check on November 3, or November 4, which ever day it is? You can get that information from Investigator Wiegert, or if you want to call your dispatcher, ask your dispatcher.

This sounds a lot like what road patrol officers do when they come across a stalled car, an abandoned car, a car where it shouldn't be. That's what this sounds like. Draw your own conclusions, obviously look at it like from any other piece of evidence. But what's important is
he is doing this, not on a witness stand, he is doing this when he doesn't know anybody is going to be seeing, or hearing, or evaluating it later.

Stay -- Move off Sergeant Colborn, but stay in the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department for the moment. Mr. Kratz argued to you yesterday that Special Agent Fassbender, starting November 5, devoted his resources where this thing was likely going. Where this thing was likely going.

True, I guess he did, in the sense that it was certainly clear pretty quickly where this thing, this investigation, was going. In my opening, and with Detective Remiker, we had a chance to hear, at 11:30 in the morning, on November 5, half an hour after the first police officers arrived at the Avery property, there to, you know, see the concealed Toyota that the Sturm's had found. Half an hour later, for you to hear, at a time when he, you know, he wouldn't have known it, Manitowoc detective, Dennis Jacobs, talking to his dispatcher:

Can you tell me, do we have a body or anything yet?

DISPATCHER: I don't believe so.

Very next thing he says:
Do we have Steven Avery in custody, though?

Yeah, it's pretty clear where this is going. By the time Special Agent Fassbender arrives, you know, at $2: 25$, 3 hours later that afternoon almost, it's pretty clear where it's going. And five minutes after this one conversation --

THE COURT: Mr. Strang, I'm getting a signal for a break, so we're going to take a short break and then we'll resume in 10 minutes.
(Jury not present.)
THE COURT: You may be seated. Let's report back at 10:15.
(Recess taken.)
(Jury present.)
THE COURT: Mr. Strang, you may resume.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you.
So five minutes later, five minutes
after Detective Jacobs called with the dispatcher, he is on the phone with Detective Remiker, or the radio, $I$ don't remember now, but you got the tape in evidence. Of course, Detective Remiker does testify, and you may
remember him, kind of presented himself as someone who thought they were barking up the wrong tree, that Steve didn't do this, when he testifies. That morning, just about an hour after the Sturms have first found the Toyota.

Okay. Other than the car, do we have anything else?

Not yet.
Okay. Is he in custody?
ATTORNEY STRANG: It's not who are you talking about, who do you mean by he.

Negative, nothing yet.
One pronoun, he, and these guys know who they are talking about at 11:35 in the morning. Are these folks acting in a way that seems good faith and honest to you, back then? Six days after this, Special Agent Fassbender makes the telephone call to Sherry Culhane at the Crime Lab, try to give her some direction. And, you know, she's holding herself out as a scientist, that's how she holds herself out.

Is Special Agent Fassbender asking for science, on the exhibit that Mr. Buting showed you? Is he asking for science there, for a good cautious, objective, let's see where the science
leads us kind of thing, when he's asking, try to put her -- put her in his house or garage. That's not a very good fit, in my view, with the State's, counsel's argument here, when they submit evidence, they are not looking for a specific answer. Oh, really.

The memo belies that. The phone memo does. And Sherry Culhane, on the stand, herself, tells you, that by the time these buccal swabs are taken in November, 2005, from all kinds of people other than Steven Avery, members of his family, these are elimination samples. Elimination samples. We have already decided they didn't do it, we're just trying to eliminate if we find their DA -- their DNA anywhere.

Sherry Culhane, for that matter, had she followed the protocol on her testing, the bottom line folks, had she followed her protocol on the testing of that bullet found in March. She can't say it's Teresa Halbach's DNA. First time in her career, 23 years, first time, on the last chance to put Teresa Halbach in his house or garage, she deviates from the protocol and includes Teresa Halbach.

Now, it was just the control that was
contaminated. It was just Sherry Culhane's DNA. That doesn't turn the evidentiary sample into having Teresa Halbach's DNA. Okay. All right. Fine. But the protocol presumably is there for a reason. Protocols are the foundation of good science. And the protocol says, if you have got contamination, you set that experiment aside and you do it again, you don't rely on that one.

Science ought to be reliable. It ought to be consistent. And it ought to be cautious, otherwise, it's not science. And the results simply aren't reliable. That's why you have a control. And when you get contamination, you now know that something has gone wrong with this. And to say that the contamination is over here, but not over here, is a little like saying, $I$ don't know, maybe no one even eats TV dinners any more, maybe they're microwave dinners now, I guess, from what I see in the grocery store. But whatever, however you heat this stuff up, when you pull off the plastic, or the tin, or whatever covers the meal, you know, and the little peach cobbler has a fly in it, in that little compartment, you don't eat the Salisbury steak either, okay. You know, this is -- this is
not fancy stuff in the end. It's -- It is and should be common sense, at some level, in the end. But she deviates, for the first time in 23 years.

The end -- This continues, the end of January, 2007, bringing us up to six weeks ago. Now, the State goes all the way to Virginia, to Quantico, to get the FBI. Are they trying -- Is the FBI trying to root out possible police corruption? Are they concerned about the integrity, of policing in northeastern Wisconsin? Trying to find out if there's a bad cop or not? I think the decision is already made.

You have this, too, Special Agent Gerald Mullen of the FBI, memo to the FBI laboratory, this January 30th --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt. I believe the defense is entitled to one closing. Mr. Buting covered exactly the same territory yesterday. I understood they were going to split and talk about different items. I simply wanted to interpose an objection. My apologies to counsel, but that was my understanding from the Court.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I would be more concerned
about boring you. Mr. Buting did cover it. It's there.

But I want to say something about EDTA that Mr. Buting did not. Janine Arvizu, who is not a doctor, Mr. Buting misspoke, she didn't complete her dissertation. She did the other Ph.D. work. I want to make sure you got out of that what she had to tell you. And it's this, the FBI protocol that they put together in a couple of weeks here, is good for identifying and confirming the presence of EDTA. It is not designed for confirming the absence of EDTA. It has to do with the detection limits. The instrument has a detection limit and the method has a detection limit.

So, look, if you were interested in finding out whether your friend is at home, and the instrument you chose was a telephone, call him at his house, ring his telephone number, if he answers the phone, you have confirmed his presence with your instrument. He is there, you have called his home, not his cell phone, he is there. He's got to be, if he's answering his phone. You have confirmed his presence.
However, if your instrument is your
telephone and you call his home and it just rings and rings, and it's not answered, you have not confirmed his absence. He could be in the shower. He could be in the basement folding the laundry, he could be in bed sleeping. He could be pouting and just not answering the phone because he sees it's you calling on the caller ID and he doesn't want to talk to you today. Whatever it is, you haven't confirmed his absence with the telephone. You haven't designed a protocol to get you to that.

Your method, in other words, of detection, isn't suited to confirming absence, only presence. If you like fresh baked hot apple pie, and I put you in a room and I blindfold you and we walk in, a fresh baked hot apple pie, your nose is the instrument. It has a detection limit.

A dog has a better instrument, lower detection limit, fancier instrument. He can detect less of the smell of apple pie than you can, but you have got this instrument to use. If it's within your detection limits, and the pie is, you know, slid on the table under you while you are blindfolded, you will detect it with your instrument.

However, if the method is no good, because we have got to consider that, you are not smelling an apple pie. Well, is the room too big, are the windows open, is the pie too far away, does the room smell badly of something else that's interfering with your instrument detecting the fresh baked apple pie? We have method detection problems and limits. Or is the apple pie, not fresh baked, but it's an 11 year old apple pie? You may not detect that either, with your instrument. I don't think Janine Arvizu was really telling you more than that. And, unfortunately, Dr. LeBeau was trying to tell you more than that and overselling his case.

Now, others who matter, in the law enforcement group who think Steve is guilty. Mr. Lenk and Mr. Colborn. They denied here, of course, but what are they doing, in 2002, when the evidence slip has to be signed for transmission of the hair sample and fingernail clippings, or whatever it is, to the Crime Lab, and the evidence custodian at the time, Detective Sergeant James Lenk, signs off.

Is he really, as he claims here, simply
signing the form, giving it to Sergeant Shallue and allowing Sergeant Shallue to fill out the otherwise blank form? You are entitled to disbelieve that. Or at least to say he's not an honest evidence custodian if he is doing that at the time. He is begging to be fired, because he is not documenting what's going where. Or if he's just telling you here, to distance himself from that file in the Clerk's Office, you are entitled to consider that too.

Would Lieutenant Lenk lie, in the end? Would he lie, as a sworn law enforcement officer? Well, all $I$ can tell you is, he did, twice, and you heard it. I have the transcript from the earlier hearing. Here he says he arrives at 2:00. When he's asked under oath before, it's 6:30 or 7 , once when he's asked, and the other time he's asked, it's late afternoon. This isn't 15 minutes off, folks. It's under oath and it's a difference of four and a half or five hours.

At that time of year, November, 2005, it's the difference between broad daylight and pitch black. He was under oath, and he gave two very different answers to the same question, at two different times, under oath. He was the only
witness, in five weeks, shown to have made inconsistent statements, under oath.

Others made inconsistent statements and were shown to have. Blaine Dassey comes to mind. Scott Tadych comes to mind. Both of them are asked, at first, by the police, was there a bonfire, on Halloween, no, no bonfire. Later they get asked again, now there is a bonfire. In fact, Scott Tadych comes here and says big bonfire, flames to the top of the roof. Same guy, again, I showed, when first asked by the police, no bonfire. Closer in time to October 31, no, didn't see a bonfire that night.

That's inconsistent statements, but they are not under oath. They still, as the Judge instructed you yesterday, are something you can consider, consistency or inconsistency of a witness' statements, over time. Still you can consider those when you decide who you believe, and not under oath.

Blaine explained that a little bit. Explained his changes of his story. Well, the police kept asking him. They didn't like the answer, they asked him again. Got angry with him and his mother, at the restaurant, when they
wouldn't reject Uncle Steve. Is that because Blaine is scared of Uncle Steve?

My recollection, yours will govern, there's 12 of you and one of me, but my recollection of that testimony is that the question was whether Blaine Dassey was scared, and the answer was something like, no, not really, but he used to boss us around. You will decide that.

But in any event, Lieutenant Lenk, by the time he gets to you folks, is telling you some really implausible things. Like, I had never been to Steven Avery's house. I have never been on the Avery property, but somehow, just out of habit, I turned right at the end of Avery Road, and I -- I -- I just happened to drive straight to Steven Avery's trailer. Okay.

So this -- You know, what they are doing and whether -- whether you think you can trust them back when they are not aware they are going to be observed or revealed later, is important in the same way what he does, back before he knows it's going to be played out to you, is important in assessing who you believe. Are they acting honestly? Is he acting like an innocent person
would act, or might act?
It is important because it comes down to the bias in the end. You know, would, in the end, police officers plant evidence? And that's a hard one, you know. That's why it's helpful to say, boy, are they behaving honestly and in good faith up to then. Because in the end, would they plant evidence against someone. Now, you will have to decide whether you have a reasonable doubt about that, or whether, you know, we have shown that to you at any level, or not.

But, look, it is a matter of bias, if it happened. And what you critically, I think, need to understand, that if and when police officers plant evidence, they are not doing it to frame an innocent man. They are doing it because they believe the man guilty. They are not doing it to frame an innocent man. They are doing it to ensure the conviction of someone they have decided is guilty.

That's why you plant evidence. Other than in the strangest, you know, most abandoned of conscience sort of police officer, they aren't after framing an innocent person, they are after ensuring the conviction of someone they just
believe is guilty.
So as you approach the whole concept of planting you have got to understand the bias that would drive it, not, you know, boy, they are out to get an innocent guy. It's just the opposite. It's just the opposite. But it's also just as corrosive to do it. Because juries decide guilt, not police officers who are involved in the hunt. You know, they get invested too, in the outcome, and in whom they suspect, who they think is good for something.

And, you know, the State pooh-poohs the idea that a civil lawsuit, for a whole lot of money, against the Manitowoc Sheriff's Department, would have caused anyone to so dislike Steven Avery that they would plant evidence against him. Well, look what the mere suggestion that they did plant evidence has done, in terms of a reaction here.

The defensiveness of the case that the State presented to you, the anger about the mere suggestion of planting evidence, the self-righteousness, the hostility, the trying to have it both ways with you. We trusted the Manitowoc people, they were skilled. They were
honest. They were the best available evidence technicians.

But we also had somebody watching. We were short of manpower. We needed them. But, in the first search of Steven Avery's -- first lengthy search of Steven Avery's house, on the evening of November 5, we got enough people that two of them can be taking photos. Two of them can be taking photos, in this little trailer, as you heard. You hear the State trying to have it both ways, here.

And in sort of getting at the bias that would drive a police officer, potentially, to plant evidence, it's this -- it's this need, this belief that he is not really innocent. He's guilty, he's got to be guilty. It's what you hear from Detective Jacobs and Detective Remiker, it's that quality. It's the sense that this is where this is going, three hours in, when all we have got is the car, on a big property with a whole lot of other people there.

It's the -- After five weeks of evidence and 501 exhibits, it's the State standing up and telling you it's clear. What in the world is clear and simple when it takes five weeks and 501
exhibits to try to show. And whatever this is, whatever, whichever way you come out, this case isn't clear and simple.

And that's where the civil lawsuit feeds in. It's not that it feeds in with bad cops. It feeds in with good cops, in the sense that it erodes, fundamentally, the sense of identity, we get the bad guys, we don't get the good guys.

And here it is, they got it wrong, that department got it wrong. Not only do they get it wrong, but the right guy is still out there and he commits another rape, Gregory Allen. This goes to my identity, if I wear that same uniform. Even if I'm aligned with these people, as you hear the sort of reaction from the prosecutors to this.

And now, you know, since -- since he really couldn't have been that innocent, he's got to be guilty of this one. He must be the right guy this time. So you -- you know, nobody means to do this, but you start looking around things that are inconvenient, that don't quite square up with the theory that he did it.

One example, and one example only, from the blood, Teresa Halbach's blood in her own car.

If it were true, as the State now says, that Steven Avery shot Teresa Halbach in his own garage, killed her there, and if it were true that he then burned her in the area immediately behind the garage, why, why is her bloody head ever in the Toyota at all. It's farther to take her back to her car than it is to take her around the corner of your garage, to the burn site, if that's what it is.

So the State sort of ignore's the fact that if Steve Avery had done it, and done it in the way they say, her blood wouldn't be in the car. The bloody hair stain wouldn't be there. It is there, of course, so it suggests that somebody did have to use the car as a transport. She wasn't burned there -- or wasn't killed there, but that's inconvenient. You guys have to be, in the end, if you're going to do what you can do here, more objective than that.

You can't overlook the inconvenient, because it doesn't fit. You can't overlook, for example, in deciding whether Lieutenant Lenk dropped the key on the floor, rather than finding it honestly.

You can't overlook the fact that all her
other keys are gone, the three or four other keys that Tom Pearce described, and which common sense would tell you would be on your key ring, and they are not there. It's the kind of thing that's inconvenient, but you can't overlook it, even if they do.

The overlooking of the inconvenient, really, $I$ think, reaches its peak, if you will, here in the State's opening statement, where knowing that human bone fragments are found, at least in the burn barrel, a long way from the burn area behind Steve's garage. And maybe, in the quarry, to the south.

Knowing, in other words, that their own experts will say, yeah, bones were moved here, the State never tells you in its opening statement, there's a second place, and maybe even a third, where human bone fragments, burnt human bone fragments, are found. And we have no evidence that it's more than one person. You don't get told that, it's inconvenient.

But it also is true. And that's why, in the end, it does become so important to decide, burned here and a few moved elsewhere, or burned somewhere else and most of them dumped here,
behind Avery's garage. That's why that says so much about his guilt or innocence, in the end.

Look, I have got to sit down. Which no defense lawyer ever likes to do because, in the closing argument, because the prosecution gets to stand back up. In a sense, they get the last word, in closing argument.

I'm not going to get to answer the passion, or the anger, or the replies that will come, when I sit down. I got to turn him over to you and let them have the last word. And as hard as that is on me, the greater burden is on you. The greater burden is on you. Because you have got to try to do the things you can do here, and you have got to find a way to live with the things you can't do, but would like to do here.

You have got the great burden of reaching a just, fair, and conscientious decision. And so, in a sense, I'm -- in a sense I'm going to rely on Judge Willis to give my rebuttal to their rebuttal, in a sense. Because I think he will tell you, when all is said and done, that you won't be swayed by sympathy, prejudice, or passion.

And I think that will be an answer to
what's about to come. I think he will, Judge Willis will, $I$ think, in the end, tell you, charge you, to be very careful and deliberate -deliberate in weighing the evidence, and to keep your duty steadfastly. And that will be sufficient answer, for me, to what's about to come.

So I ask you, please, give it your full and fair consideration. Do that critically here, as citizens of Manitowoc County, where we stayed to pick a jury, where we stayed to pick the 12 of you, the 13 of you. And get it right. Get it right.

Steven Avery has not been proved guilty of murdering or mutilating the corpse of Teresa Halbach. He's not been proved guilty of that, beyond a reasonable doubt. It's because he is not guilty. And that's what I'm asking you to say in getting it right.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, there is -- as counsel indicated, there's one more argument, the State gets a chance for rebuttal. I'm going to take a 10 minute break at this time, then we'll come back to hear the State's argument and I will give you final instructions.

Again, as I reminded you yesterday, because the arguments are not complete yet, do not begin your deliberations until all the arguments have been made and I give you final instructions.
(Jury not present.)
THE COURT: You may be seated. Counsel, I will see you back at 11.
(Recess taken.)
(Jury present.)
THE COURT: And, Mr. Kratz, you may begin.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
This part of the case is the shortest part, that is, the shortest argument, thankfully, but it's also the most difficult, because I have to limit my comments to what the defense has argued. And it's also the part that it's a little bit out of my comfort zone.

As you may have noticed throughout this trial, I have tried to be courteous. I have tried to examine witnesses with the fairness, and the dignity, and the respect for which they deserve in the courtroom. I have tried never to cut off a juror (sic). When a juror (sic) wanted to explain an answer, $I$ tried never to say, stop,

I don't want to hear it, or the jury doesn't want to hear what the answer might be. And so this argument is different than that. It's necessarily not as civil. It's necessarily not my style, so I want to say that upfront.

Highly charged statements have been given by the defense in their closing arguments. And it's my responsibility to meet those, hopefully, with compelling argument, the things that you will find important when dismissing or discarding some of what the defense has tried to have you believe here.

I may personally like Mr. Strang, and I may personally like Mr. Buting, but their arguments I most certainly do not like. I think they are unfair. I think they are unfair to you. I think in many instances they have been what's called disingenuous, which means that I don't think that they have been totally truthful. And in all candor towards you, I think they have tried to fool you on a number of occasions.

I have got a job to do. I have got a job to do as the lead prosecutor in this case, to make sure that you are not fooled, to make sure that you aren't sold something that isn't true.

And that's what this argument is all about.
The very first argument that Mr. Strang made in the beginning of his opening statement, he made it again in the beginning of his closing statement, and at the end of his closing statement, referenced the 1985 wrongful conviction of that man, Steven Avery.

Steven Avery was wrongfully convicted in 1985. We all understand that. We all believe that. But don't one of you consider anything about that case when deciding the facts of Teresa Halbach. Teresa Halbach, the Halbach family, and the interests of justice deserve that you decide it on this case, not on whether or not Mr. Avery deserves some sympathy, or whether or not Mr. Avery deserves to set it right. That's something for civil lawsuits. That's something for other jurisdictions to deal with and to handle.

It is absolutely improper for Mr. Strang to ask you to, in any way, consider that 1985 lawsuit, when finally coming to a decision in this case, and in Mr. Strang's statement, in his opening statement, to send him home. Sending Mr. Avery home, if that is going to happen, is
going to be because the State, the prosecution team, all of the agencies that you heard about, didn't meet its burden, we didn't meet our burden of proof on this case, not because Mr. Avery was convicted in 1985.

Let me also suggest to you that any case this big, especially what we have called the largest criminal investigation. I don't know if it is the largest in state history, but it is certainly the largest that anybody that you have heard of has ever talked about. Any case that big, with that many witnesses, and you have just gotten a sliver of the number of witnesses, and a sliver of the number of exhibits that are available in this case.

Five or six weeks may seem like a long trial. Let me assure you, it could have been a lot, lot longer, if we would have done the kinds of things that Mr. Strang asked us to do. As an example, if we would have followed every what's called "blind alley", if we would have put in what's called "negative evidence"; that is, eliminate everybody who's not even a suspect in this case, which is what law enforcement did. That's their job. That's law enforcement's job.

And then, once we get to the prosecution stage, it is our job to present evidence on who we believe committed the crime. Does everybody understand that? So, if we put in the entire case, if you will, that would certainly be something more than what would be relevant for State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery. That's what this case is about, not the ' 85 case.

The very first issue that $I$ want to talk about is perhaps the most problematic for the jurors. I want to address this upfront, because I believe that there were misrepresentations made in the defense closing. I believe they tried to fool you in their closing when they indicate that Mr. Lenk comes in and all of a sudden there's a key there.

Well, that's part of the story, and that, of course, is a true statement. But what the defense neglected, in their closing, to tell you, was everything that Sergeant Colborn told you about this particular investigation. I put these two photos up because I'm calling them the before and the after shot. And I put them next to each other for a very, very important reason, because they say a picture states a thousand
words.
This should do that for you, the before and the after picture. These are taken just a couple of minutes apart from each other, but importantly, they are taken before the search, before what Mr. Colborn talked about, not so gently, or never so gently manipulating the cabinet, and then after that had already been accomplished.

A couple of important things to note. First of all, we talked, $I$ think in my closing or in my opening perhaps even, about the slippers, about how you, through your common sense, can reconcile those slippers, that piece of evidence, not just where they are situated with the wall socket there, but you can understand how both this cabinet was pushed to the left, pushing the left slipper over to the left, and pushing the right slipper over and actually flipping the left slipper over. All right.

And then after jostling, and after pushing, and after removing all the books, and after Sergeant Colborn talked about putting those books back in, and I want to get a correct verbiage, "handled them none too gently", a key
comes out the back end of this particular cabinet. Now, what hasn't been pointed out to you yet, many of you being observant, may have already noticed the before and the after.

This is the book that they were talking about, that particular binder that was slammed back into the cabinet. The before picture has the binder virtually adjacent, or next to the cabinet itself. The after picture has it several inches back in. Why is that important? Why does that one fact corroborate or lend credence to Sergeant Colborn?

Sergeant Colborn said he slammed that book back, none too gently. You have to kind of envision this cabinet cocked, and the back of the cabinet opened, the book slamming back, and the key falling through that particular cabinet. And so the testimony in connection with all of the physical evidence, and not just what Mr. Strang or Buting might tell you some of the evidence is, where Lieutenant Lenk comes in and says, oh, there's a key, which did happen, but the explanation is absolutely plausible.

But more than that, we're going to need to delve into this key and into this planting
issue, whether or not the key was planted. Was the key planted. All right. To get to that supposition, or to get to that conclusion, which really is a supposition, because you are going to have to guess, you have to know some things about Sergeant Lenk -- excuse me -- Lieutenant Lenk, and Sergeant Colborn. You have to know if they are good, honest, decent cops, or if they are not.

Now, we asked some questions, and you can weigh their credibility. And they both appeared indignant about this. They both appeared upset about even being accused of such a thing. And that demeanor, that credibility, is something that you can and you should take into consideration, in fact, when each of them said absolutely not, absolutely not would I ever plant evidence in this case.

But as importantly than that is the lack of evidence. Mr. Strang was allowed, quite properly, to talk about the lack of evidence that the State would have presented. Wouldn't you have expected evidence, is I think the way Mr. Strang had placed it. Well, that works both ways. And subpoena power and power to bring in
physical evidence applies equally to the State as it does to the defense.

We know that because the defense has subpoenaed some witnesses. They have brought some witnesses in here. They have subpoenaed some documents, and you have seen those subpoenaed documents in this case.

Well, don't you think, folks, that if either Sergeant Colborn or Lieutenant Lenk had a pimple, had a blemish on their record for truthfulness, or for honesty, or for planting evidence, or for doing anything that was opposed to the oath that they took to uphold the law in Manitowoc County, don't you think you would have heard about that. Don't you think that those two good lawyers, excellent, in fact, defense attorneys, would have presented that to you.

So when Mr. Strang tells you to look at the big picture, and when he talks about, let's see how they acted beforehand, beforehand you didn't hear any evidence at all about Mr. Lenk or Mr. Colborn. That is significant. But as significant is the facts and circumstances surrounding this particular bedroom.

And when Mr. Kucharski, Deputy

Kucharski, talked about sitting on this bed, and actually facing towards the door, his feet, I think the testimony was, were facing where the key ends up when Lieutenant Lenk exits the room and comes back. Don't you have to kind of ask yourself the question, how did the key get there?

If it was planted, how did that key get there? Did Lieutenant Lenk, as he's walking here, throw it? Did he kind of lob it over Mr. Kucharski. Well, that's ridiculous. Absolutely ridiculous. And although all three of these officers, and in fact the prosecution team, would have preferred, obviously, that the key wouldn't have been found in this way, it was. All right.

Cases come to you how they are. And again, under the microscope of a case of this magnitude, there is going to be some human factors. And there's going to be some things that you are going to have to wrestle with. And this is one of those things. I'm not going to short change you on that particular case.

And you may take a long time in deciding whether or not that key is significant, or whether the key is not significant. But let me
ask you, just kind of for the sake of talking, as Mr. Strang wanted to talk with you rather than at you, I certainly have a style that I would prefer that as well. Let's assume they never found the key. Let's assume this key isn't part of this case at all.

Let's assume Mr. Strang's theory is correct, that these cops aren't trying to plant an innocent person, but trying to make sure that a guilty person is found guilty. Well, can't you then, with that argument, set the key aside? Do you have the ability, as a jury, to set that key aside, if in fact it doesn't matter whether or not Mr . Avery is guilty or not guilty in this analysis? Can you set that aside and decide is there enough other evidence, or is the key the only thing that points to Mr. Avery?

Well, if this was a CSI case, one of those cases on TV where sometimes that key, or sometimes one little piece of evidence like that may decide the guilt or innocence, it would make a difference. But that key, in the big picture, in the big scheme of things here, means very little. All right.

Now, I'm telling you that not because I
don't want you to consider it, not because I think that it's not important, or not because the credibility of these officers is in question to the State at all. What I am suggesting, though, is that if you buy Mr. Strang's argument, if you buy Mr. Strang's argument that they were trying to make sure that a guilty person was found guilty, then assigning accountability to the murder for Teresa Halbach, shouldn't matter whether or not that key was planted.

In other words, it shouldn't matter to the Halbach family. You shouldn't be punishing the police officers, in other words, the other officers that were involved in this investigation, if you come to that conclusion. You are not going to. You are not going to come to that conclusion because you have heard nothing about these police officers that they would do such a thing. But my suggestion is simply not to focus all your attention.

In the law, that's called searching for doubt. The Judge has told you, and may even tell you again in your closing instruction, that you are to search for the truth, you are not to search for doubt. In other words, you don't go
into this case saying, well, let's look at where all the discrepancies are first. That's the place maybe that we should start, because as my closing argument suggested to you, there's got to be a reason, right. There's got to be a reason that we have been here for five weeks.

No, there doesn't. There doesn't have to be a reason why you have been here for five weeks, other than the defendant's constitutional right to a trial. And so the Judge will tell you not to start there. The Judge will tell you not to start at searching for doubt.

The Judge will tell you that the whole process, the beginning of the process, the middle, and the end, is to search for the truth. To search for the truth in this case is who killed Teresa Halbach, not whether or not we can find some discrepancies.

More about the key. Mr. Buting, I
believe it was, had the imagination, let's call it, to suggest to you that maybe officers were taking a toothbrush and were kind of rubbing Mr. Avery's toothbrush on the key and that's how the DNA got on the key. Common sense should tell you that these kind of motions, what are called
furtive motions, or for lay people, for people like you, it's called suspicious looking things, is something that you should probably discard. Because if they take Mr. Avery's toothbrush and start rubbing it on the key, you know, and then kind of hold it behind their back, that becomes almost cartoonish, that becomes something that is not at all plausible.

But as important, when did that happen, when did they plant the DNA on Mr. Avery's key. Because we're not just talking about planting a key. If it was planting a key, that's damning enough. It's damning enough to have this particular key found in Mr. Avery's bedroom. But what makes it irrefutable is that Mr. Avery's DNA, positive, hundred percent match, is on that key. Right?

And you heard the testimony from Ms Culhane, and perhaps others, that the last person to handle a key or an object is most likely to leave the DNA on the key. Now, Mr. Strang and Mr. Buting have asked you to just discard that, ignore it, ignore that expert opinion. I don't know why they are asking you to do that, because it doesn't fit with their theory of defense. But
it's the DNA on the key that has to be planted too. Please understand that. It's not just planting the key, it's planting the DNI -- the DNA on the key as well.

If they planted the key, where did they get the key? Now, that leads to an interesting series of questions as well. There are only two ways that law enforcement can get this key. All right. Because the vehicle was locked, and because on the 5th of November officers don't really have access, as you have seen by the scene security. They had to have access to the key before the 5th.

And so there's only two ways to do that. One, they can kind of stumble across it in a scenario that Mr . Strang suggests, maybe off duty or something like that. Or the last person to hold that key, other than Teresa Halbach, is the person who killed her.

Now, you heard that testimony in this case. It may have drawn an objection, I don't remember right now, use your own collective knowledge as to whether it did. But that makes sense, that the last person, other than Teresa, to hold this key, is the person who killed her.

And if that's the case, then you hold these two gentlemen responsible for suggesting that to you.

In other words, despite Mr. Buting standing up here, I think it was the beginning of yesterday, saying, look, folks, we're not saying that the cops killed Teresa Halbach, what we're saying is that somebody else, I think his words were, "skillfully exploited law enforcement bias", as if there's somebody smart enough out there that could do that. We're going to talk about that in just a minute.

But when you go down one layer, when you scrape one layer of this manure off of the topsoil, which is what it is, you scrape one layer, you will realize that the cops had to kill her. The cops had to be involved in killing Teresa Halbach.

Now, are you prepared to say that? Are you, as the jury, in order to find Mr. Avery not guilty, willing to say that your cops, that your Manitowoc County Sheriff's deputies, Lieutenant Lenk, Sergeant Colborn, because of Mr. Avery's lawsuit, that Sergeant Colborn and Lieutenant Lenk didn't have a dime of stake in, at least financially, that they weren't involved in in

1985, that they gave a deposition in about receiving a phone call and transferring the phone call, and that's the extent to it, but because of that involvement, are you willing to say that these two otherwise honest cops came across a 25 year old photographer, killed her, mutilated her, burned her bones, all to set up and to frame Mr. Avery. You have got to be willing to say that. You have got to make that leap. Because of this question right there, where did they get the key.

The key isn't alone. The key is attached, at least at some point, to something called a lanyard, something that's around the neck, similar to what you all are wearing as juror badges. We know that that comes from Katie Halbach. We know that that is found inside of Teresa's SUV. And so where one is the other one is. All right.

So I hope that makes sense. I hope you understand that, at least for the first time in my rebuttal, I'm going to be suggesting that you dig down that one further step and understand exactly what these two gentlemen are suggesting to you. Despite Mr. Buting trying to sell you on
the fact that we're not saying the cops did it, that's exactly what they are saying. That's exactly what they are arguing to you, and you have to be prepared to go there.

The next time that Mr. Buting tried to fool you was when he told you that the police never checked out other suspects in this case. Well, you heard from Mr. Wiegert, you heard from Mr. Fassbender, more particularly, that other suspects were checked out. But let's think about other suspects. Who were the other suspects in this case? Where was the evidence pointing so strongly, other than to Mr. Avery? Where was it? Where was the evidence pointing?

Well, one choice was, Mr. Schmitz was one of the people that saw Ms Halbach. Mr. Schmitz, as you heard, was interviewed, was checked out, but guess what, folks, Teresa Halbach left that photo shoot alive. That kind of eliminates Mr. Schmitz, doesn't it, from being a suspect in this case.

Number two, was JoEllen Zipperer. And although a nice little old lady like that probably could have killed and mutilated Teresa Halbach, guess what, folks, Teresa Halbach left

Mrs. Zipperer alive at about 2:27 p.m.
The third suspect then, or the third logical person, was Mr. Avery, that's the third customer that Teresa sees that day. That's the only person that Teresa Halbach doesn't leave alive, or at least isn't seen alive, after meeting with Mr. Avery. So Schmitz and Zipperer can be and were, early on, $I$ will admit that, were early on, eliminated as suspects in the case.

As the case develops though, you heard from Mr. Fassbender, that all the clues started pointing towards one person. All right. So when we talk about roommates and we talk about old boyfriends, what you would think about as typical suspects that may in fact be investigated, doesn't make a whole lot of sense in devoting a lot of resources in investigating those people when the car is found in a different location. When blood is found in that car, that turns out to be that of Mr. Avery.

But I guess most importantly, when the bones of the victim are found 20 feet or so behind the property belonging to Mr. Avery, you stop looking. You stop looking for people like
boyfriends, or other customers, or this kind of a search. And you narrow it to who had access to Teresa Halbach at that particular time. So it's disingenuous, it's what I'm calling fooling you, to suggest that other suspects in this case were not ever checked out.

Mr. Strang talked about this phone call. Now, this is going to take a really, really good memory. And I hope one of you, and the 12 of you collectively, we call it collective memory, which means that when you deliberate in this case you can talk about those kinds of -- those kinds of things. When Mr. Strang first played this, or attempted to play this particular tape, for Mr. Colborn, I wonder if anybody remembers the very next thing that happened.

I raised my hand and I said, objection, your Honor. I said, I want some authentication. Before Mr. Strang can play this tape, I objected and said, I want to know the date and the time of the tape. Because it's unfair to play this tape for the jury without telling them the date and the time that it's played. All right.

So it's foreseeing this very argument that Mr. Strang made about a half an hour ago, or
an hour ago; that is, the tape could have been the 3rd, but I think it was the 4th. Okay. That's what Mr. Strang said to you, that Mr. Colborn, the answer by Mr. Colborn was it was on the third, but $I$ think it was the 4 th.

What the heck do I care, Mr. Strang, what you think. What do I care if you think that it was the 4 th, or that it fits into your theory of defense. This case is about evidence. It's not about what Mr. Strang thinks. The answer given on the witness stand was, it was the 3rd, while on duty.

And the explanation about why it was a phone call rather than a radio transmission, or a dispatch kind of call, is because Mr. Wiegert had called Mr. Colborn, if you remember, on the phone. All right. He called him on the phone and said can you check this out.

So in turn, Mr. Colborn called dispatch and said $I$ want to verify this particular plate. Nothing sinister about that. Nothing unusual about that. This isn't a traffic stop. It's not a stop where you would radio it in, where your time and your date become important and you want to log in that kind of thing. It's not a traffic
stop at all. It's simply verifying Mr. Wiegert's information, verifying the year, the license plate, the make and model of the vehicle, nothing sinister.

Now, I'm going to ask you to reject what Mr. Strang said because that's not evidence. In fact, what I'm saying to you right now is not evidence. Evidence comes from the witness stand. All right.

The answer to that question was the 3rd of November. That is important. It's important whether it was the 3 rd , or whether it was the 4th. Now, when Mr. Strang answered my objection by saying, well, we'll let the witness tell the jury when it is. And the Judge allowed that, and the witness did tell the jury when that was, that it was the 3rd.

Mr. Strang still today, still today, fools you, and stands before you and says, don't believe Mr. Colborn, $I$ think it was the 4th. All right. That's the difference between evidence and speculation. That's the difference between the State's case and what the defense is trying to sell you in their arguments.

Bones were moved in this case. There's
no question of that. Who moved the bones, to the State, or for the theory of the prosecution is easy. Mr. Avery moved the bones. He moved the big bones. He moved the big bones, the ones he could identify as human bones, from his burn pit, over to his sister's burn barrel. All right. That's a couple hundred feet away. If you think about the selfishness involved in that particular act, that I think is -- is one factor. But I guess more importantly is directing attention away from himself. Might be that first night, might be the 31st, might be the 1 st or the 2 nd, because he has got a couple of days, as it turns out, before the police officers actually start the investigation.

But let's also remember this,
collectively, $I$ want the 12 of you to remember this when you deliberate. I want at least one of you to say this when you are back in the jury room. Although now we know that the cops didn't get the search warrant, and they didn't come on the property until the 5th of November, okay. We know that now. Steven Avery didn't know that. Steven Avery didn't know that Teresa Halbach wasn't going to be reported missing until
the third, or that the flyover search wasn't going to find the car, or that Ms Sturm even was going to find the car on the 5th. For all Steven Avery knows, the cops are on their way. Right away. On their way, right away, the afternoon, the late afternoon or early evening of the 31st.

Why is that important? Because as it goes through some of this evidence and your collective memories, and as you deliberate this case, please remember that. Because there are things that Mr. Avery does that the defense is saying, well, why would he do all of those kind of things.

Mr. Avery did all of those things on the 31st because he didn't know that the cops weren't going to be knocking on his door, that very night. They didn't know that -- Mr. Avery didn't know that Teresa wasn't meeting a friend for dinner, or that she wasn't going to be missed, or that she didn't have another appointment, after she was killed by Mr. Avery.

And so that's why he starts burning things right away. That's why at 3:45 the electronics are already being burned. That's why, as we will be arguing and showing you,

Mr. Avery disposes of the body at the earliest possible moment, that he moves the SUV at the earliest possible moment, that he removes the license plates.

He does all of those things, again, with the benefit, as you saw in the photograph that Mr. Remiker put in, of a police scanner, that's inside and on top of the bar in Mr. Avery's. The police scanner, so that Mr. Avery can hear, are the cops on their way. Which, again, should bolster, or should tell you why Sergeant Colborn uses the telephone rather than using the radio, it's because of things just like that, things like officer's safety. But, again, I'm advancing a little bit, and I want to make sure that I get to those points.

The bones were moved, but they were moved by Mr. Avery. These bones in the quarry, I'm going to take about 20 seconds to talk about, because the best anybody can say is that they are possible human. What does possible human mean? Well, it means we don't know what it is. All right.

The best anthropologists in the world don't know what these bones are. Dr. Eisenberg
didn't know what they were. Dr. Fairgrieve didn't know what they were, he agreed with that.

And you heard a stipulation being read to you by a person by the name of Les McCurdy. Stipulation just means an agreement between the parties, that these bones, we felt it important enough, were sent out to the FBI. And Les McCurdy from the FBI determined that these bones were so degraded, that they were in such a shape that even through testing, what's called mitochondrial DNA testing, whether they are human or not, could not, even by the FBI, be determined.

So the bones in the quarry are really not evidence in this case. And so Mr. Strang has made a big deal out of showing you maps, and a little flag, and things like that about a possible bones. Again, speculation, conjecture, is not part of this case. Facts are going to be what decides this case.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Your Honor, I'm going to interpose an objection. Like the 1985 case, there is evidence here concerning the bones from the quarry, possible human bones. It is proper for any lawyer to argue all of the evidence, or any of the
evidence, in the case, including the 1985 case, or the quarry bones, and $I$ would like the jury so instructed.

THE COURT: What $I$ will instruct the jurors is, remind you again, what you are hearing at this time are arguments, not evidence. Your job, when you are deliberating, is to remember the evidence as it's been submitted, and draw your own conclusions from that evidence. Mr. Kratz, you may proceed.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
The primary burn site, that is, where the bones started burning, are important in a sense and they are not important in a sense. All right. It seems obvious what the answer is, but if, again, you drag that first layer off of the defense argument, it isn't going to make any difference. But, of course, the primary burn location is in Mr. Avery's pit. This is the primary burn location.

And why do we say that? Dr. Fairgrieve, I'm going to start from the other side, Dr. Fairgrieve, the defense expert in this case, said that he's had a case where bones were moved from one location to the other, and that in that case the bones moved to -- to the location had
more bones than were actually there. But what Dr. Fairgrieve didn't do, and what he doesn't know, are all the things that Dr. Eisenberg did, and all the things that Dr. Eisenberg knows.

Dr. Eisenberg, of course, looked at the bones. I guess that's the most important factor. But this is one of those things that's common sense. This is one of those things that shouldn't take you a long time collectively. Shouldn't take the 12 of you very long to decide where the primary burn location is. It is the pit. It's not most likely the burn pit, it is this location.

How do we know that? Well, Teresa was invited, or lured, whatever term you want to use, on to that property. Her vehicle is there. That's the last place that she is seen alive, is just several feet from this location. Her burned affects are on that particular property, just a few feet away. Importantly though, her bone, her tissue, especially her skull fragments, all of them, all of them, are in this location.

Her clothes are there, at least what's left of her clothes, are mixed in with those bones, the rivets for her jeans are there. And
common sense, her bones and her jeans are in the same place, because she's burned their. She's burned in that location.

She was called there by Mr. Avery. And the number one, if we're doing -- I'm going to switch them around. The number one reason why this is the primary burn location is that on October 31st, Mr. Avery had a big whopping fire there, on the 31st of October. And we haven't heard any evidence of a big whopping fire, the kind that would consume, fully consume a human body, anywhere else on that property. That's the primary burn location, ladies and gentlemen. You can find that, and you should find that, beyond a reasonable doubt. That shouldn't be a question for you.

Mr. Buting said that there were no fingerprints found on the SUV. I will just, again, in 20 seconds, tell you that the testimony, that perhaps Mr. Buting is ignoring, from Mr. Riddle, or at least didn't tell you about, from Mr. Riddle, the fingerprint guy, was that of the eight latent prints that were lifted in the case, none of them were suitable for identification. All right.

So what Mr. Riddle also told you is that, if you took your hand right now and placed it onto an object, it's very likely that you wouldn't leave fingerprints. That's why DNA evidence is so much more powerful than fingerprint evidence, at least nowadays, because of those dynamics that are involved. Because of the amount of sweat in your hands, and the oils, and all of those kind of things, all are called into question. I just mention that because I am obligated to because Mr. Buting had mentioned that.

They also, they meaning the defense, talked about Teresa's body in the SUV. Once again, expert testimony was that a 5 foot 6 inch person could, in fact, fit in this particular compartment of the RAV 4. And I guess you need look no further than this area, the stamp, as I talked about, the hair impression 25 year old Teresa has left in that location. You can almost see Teresa being pushed in, or shoved in, or stuck in that location, which brings me, or will bring me, to a point in just a moment.

Mr. Strang -- excuse me -- Mr. Buting, actually asked you whether or not it would be
reasonable for police, by use of flashlights, to see the stain that was by the ignition. When I heard that I just about dropped my pen. All right. There's the location, and that's the stain that Mr. Buting is saying, why didn't the cops see this.

Somebody want to tell me where a flashlight has to be shined -- shown, from the outside, to see that stain. You can see that through the front window? You can see that through one of the side windows? Are you going to see that through the very back? Where are you going to shine a flashlight that you are going to be able to see that particular stain. All right. That's disingenuous. It's the kind of argument that you should be discarding, that you should be saying it doesn't make any sense at all.

Mr. Buting also asked, well, if this piece of evidence is -- excuse me -- if the cabinet, the bookcase, is so important, why didn't the State bring it into the courtroom. I mentioned before, I think it's obvious, the State doesn't have exclusive control over any evidence in this particular case, at least as is presented in court. The defense has just as much right to
bring that up here as the State did. All right.
We have taken photos, and I'm not going to apologize for that. I'm not going to apologize for what Mr. Buting calls my slick PowerPoints. My God, a second grader can do a PowerPoint examination. And the fact that Mr. Buting wants to fumble around, he can do that. I'm not going to do that to the jury.

But what we did do, is we took photographs of all of the evidence to make it easier to present, so that you could see all the evidence. We brought in boxes of items like the Palm Zire palm pilot box. We have the item itself, but we also have a picture of it. We have a picture of everything, as you have seen. And so we're using pictures instead of the thing itself.

And you can see, and at least
understand, with big clumsy kinds of items, the reasons that we're doing that, for ease for the jury. So that you can see big things, and you can see small things, so we can zoom into areas, and sometimes we don't need to do that.

Defense also suggested that there was no blood on the $C D$ case. Are you kidding me?

Mr. Buting may have showed you a picture, and I didn't know where he got his picture from, but the blood is obvious on the CD case. By the way, I believe you are going to be getting the photographs back into the jury room. That's something the Judge will decide, not me. But you can look at the picture itself and determine whether or not there is blood on the $C D$ case. Again, another example of being disingenuous, another example of trying to fool you.

Next time this happened in Mr. Buting's argument yesterday was when he talked about this stain, on the bathroom floor. Mr. Buting actually walked up to this particular exhibit and said, well, it looks like somebody took a Q-tip and put it right into that sample of blood. Which you heard some of the blood from Mr. Avery's bathroom was analyzed, that it was in fact Mr. Avery's blood, there isn't any question about that.

But what Mr . Buting didn't tell you, and what you heard testimony of, is when this blood sample was collected. Do you remember? Do you remember when this blood sample was collected? Remember Detective Remiker and

Mr. Tyson, on the first night, talking about going through the entire trailer and collecting all the blood, and that they finished sometime after 10:00 p.m., as it was approaching 11:00 p.m., it was pouring rain outside. You all remember that, you remember that from the 5th of November.

Mr. Buting is trying to sell you, he is trying to fool you into thinking that maybe this is the source of the blood in the SUV. Folks, the SUV was already in an enclosed and locked trailer, on its way to Madison, with Crime Lab personnel and law enforcement personnel all surrounding it.

To suggest to you that this might be the source of any of all of that blood that you saw in the SUV is, again, disingenuous. It's trying to fool you. And it's my job, as the prosecutor, to point those things out to you. It's my job to show you just how absurd and ridiculous some of those arguments are.

Mr. Buting then talked about the bullet, and about the DNA, and suggested that, well, they are both in the same room with Sherry Culhane, Ms Culhane, the analyst in this particular case.

What Mr. Buting doesn't tell you, though, doesn't remind you, though, when Mr . Gahn made this point very clear, because of what's called the contamination issue with the bullet in this case, is that the extract for a sample of evidence is done separately, and at a separate time than the extract or the control is done.

Remember Ms Culhane telling you that the samples are locked away in a cabinet. She was talking about her bench, and how it's cleaned off, and those kind of things. And I don't know if Mr . Buting, I suspect he wants you to believe, if you remember collectively, if you remember about Ms Culhane, if he's suggesting that the Pap smear, or the DNA from Teresa Halbach, somehow got out of the sealed envelope that it was in, the standard, somehow maybe walked across her desk, somehow it jumped into the vial, or onto the bullet. And that's the kind of thing that Mr. Buting wants you to believe. That's disingenuous, doesn't happen that way.

Mr. Gahn knew that was an important point and he took time, meticulous time with Ms Culhane, to explain that process for you. It's Teresa Halbach's DNA on that bullet because,
unfortunately, it went through her body. Not because the DNA from her Pap smear or from other standard that was within the Crime Lab somehow transmitted itself or made its way onto that bullet.

There are areas of agreement and this is, I guess, a positive part of the trial. There are some areas of agreement between expert witnesses in this case. Ms Arvizu, and I'm so happy that Mr. Strang cleared that up, it's not Dr. Arvizu. Mr. Strang called it a mistake that Mr. Buting made, calling her, or raising her to the level of doctor. She doesn't have her Ph.D., like Dr. LeBeau does, the Ph.D., the head of the toxicology unit at the FBI lab.

But Ms Arvizu, even the defense expert conceded on cross-examination, from Mr. Gahn, a couple of things. Number one, that a qualitative procedure is a solid scientific procedure. Don't have to do quantitative. In fact, in this case, when there's nothing there; in other words, when three of the samples don't have any EDTA, you can't quantitate it. How do you quantitate nothing? All right. You can't do that.

And so for your purposes, when these
tests had to be done at the last minute, you heard why, you heard why we didn't get these to the FBI until the last minute. You heard from Mr. Wiegert, that Mr. Wiegert and the State didn't even know about this vial of blood until sometime in December. And you heard that on February 5th, the 5th of February, when you were being selected is when this was sent out to the FBI.

Back to Ms Arvizu, though, she recognized that the protocol that was developed was a good protocol, that it was based upon scientific articles, that Dr. LeBeau had made, what she called, significant improvements to any prior protocols that the FBI had done, based upon those articles, and was no question at all that Dr. LeBeau was able to find several things.

First of all, that there was EDTA in the vial of blood. Number two, that there was no detectable EDTA on the three blood samples. Now what Ms Arvizu did have some concern was about is that this expert only tested three of the samples. All right. Three of the swabs that -that we're talking about. And I think -- I don't think that's the next slide, it is not. I will
show those in just a minute, when we get to the EDTA part of this case. But there wasn't any question that EDTA was present in the vial and no EDTA was detectable on the samples.

We also heard agreement between
Dr. Fairgrieve and Dr. Eisenberg. The agreement that we have heard. In fact, we liked Dr. Fairgrieve very much, from Canada, and although he is not board certified, you should not hold that against him. Dr. Eisenberg is, and that is only a handful of anthropologists that reach that level. But we actually thought Dr. Fairgrieve was a very, very nice man and a very good expert.

And he testifies mostly for -- in
Canada, for -- for the prosecution. And I suspect that's why he conceded several things about his colleague, Dr. Eisenberg. First of all, that the gunshot wounds were present. That there were gunshot wounds that were found in this case, two of them, one in the left parietal, one in the occipital region.

He called them peri-mortem, meaning that they were about or around the time of death. He agreed that there was only one person, the bones
of one person that we're talking about, which makes sense, and that the gunshot wounds were inflicted in this case before this burning process. All right. So Dr. Fairgrieve and Dr. Eisenberg had many -- and other than the primary burn site, which Dr. Eisenberg rendered an opinion about, and Dr. Fairgrieve was unwilling to do that -- most other areas were, in fact, something that -- that they had agreed upon.

Judge, should we take just a couple minutes for a stretch break?

THE COURT: Very well, we can do that. ATTORNEY KRATZ: I know it's been about 45, 50 minutes. Let's do that and then $I$ will conclude my remarks.

THE COURT: Let's take five minutes, at the request of one of the jurors.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We'll do that judge.
(Recess taken.)
(Jury present.)
THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, you may continue. ATTORNEY KRATZ: I appreciate it, Judge, thank you.

Defense argued that there was no blood
found in the trailer. Since Teresa wasn't killed in the trailer, there shouldn't be. But what was found in the trailer is extremely important. Remember the testimony early on in this case, that on the 5th, on the very first search of Mr. Avery's trailer, they found the very same Auto Trader Magazine, the very same type of bill of sale that we put in this exhibit, that's from Mrs. Zipperer, the very same Auto Trader Magazine, very same bill of sale. Teresa was in that trailer. She was in the trailer, but she was not killed in that trailer.

Defense has a hard decision to make regarding Ms Culhane, is she competent, or is she incompetent. And you guys already know why that question has arisen and why it is such a pointed question. Because if she's talented enough with one hair, with one piece of evidence, to exonerate Mr. Avery, why isn't she talented enough with 180 items of physical evidence to contribute to his conviction.

So it's a hard argument to make that in one case, and in one circumstance, a couple years ago, she was very talented, she knew exactly what she was doing, but all of a sudden, she's
bumbling, some mill worker, some person on a line type person, who really doesn't have any expertise. Well, you don't get it both ways. She's either talented, she either knows what she's doing, as the head of the DNA Unit at the Madison Crime Lab, or she's incompetent.

You already know the State's opinion regarding Ms Culhane. We have heard a lot about the Crime Lab Contamination Logs, 89 out of the 50,000 or so cases. I will let you guys do the math, as far as what the rate of error, or the contamination rate is.

Mr. Buting mentioned yesterday that perhaps the hood latch, perhaps the DNA that is found here was caused by that of Mr. Stahlke, because Mr. Stahlke reached up under and opened up and found that the battery cable was disconnected. Well, so what. Mr. Stahlke talked about he was rummaging around, he was actually touching all kinds of DNA and touching all kinds of blood, or any of those kind of things? Absolutely not.

These are professionals. These are people that process evidence for a living. Mr. Stahlke had gloves on when he opened -- latex
gloves when he opened this particular vehicle. So it is not Mr. Stahlke's, it was Mr. Avery's DNA that is on the hood latch.

Now, the defense also asked why would Mr. Avery disconnect the battery. You heard them asking for speculation, guessing why Mr. Avery would disconnect a battery. I have got an answer and I'm going to tell you right now, right now, that this is speculation. This is guessing. All right. This isn't evidence. It's not even close to it. It's kind of what the defense has been doing through at least their closing arguments.

But I am going to speculate and I'm going to guess that a man who hid the SUV and knew that people were going to come looking for that SUV, thought a little bit ahead, not just to crush the car, and taking -- or in unhooking the battery. But when citizen searchers looked at 40 acres of cars, and they looked and they go, oh, my goodness gracious, how am I going to find that. Mr. Avery may have thought about those little devices that most of us have on our newer cars. Where we're able to press a button and our lights go on, or an alarm goes on, or something flashes, where you can find your car in a parking
lot, if you are like me sometimes and I forget where I have parked my car.

Is that why Mr. Avery unhooked the battery, so that the citizen searchers that he knew were coming couldn't just press a button and of the 40,000 (sic) cars, could walk right to that. That's possible. All right. That's an inference, a logical inference, that could be drawn. But that's speculating, and that's not what I'm going to do. That's not what I'm asking you to do. I'm not asking you at all in this case to speculate. I'm simply answering Mr. Buting's question.

Where was Teresa killed. This is a easy answer, or at least it is an answer that is directed by all of the physical evidence in this case. Teresa Halbach, as we know, came to the trailer of Steven Avery. We know that they completed their transaction. How do we know that, because the book and the bill of sale was given to Mr. Avery. That's something that, as you heard, happens at the end of the transaction. That's sitting on Mr. Avery's computer desk.

We know sometime later, that is, we know sometime in the future, a bullet is found in this
exact area, has Teresa Halbach's DNA on it. All right. The inference, and this is an inference that I'm asking you to draw, is that Teresa Halbach was killed in the garage. She was killed in Steven Avery's garage.

Now, we have heard testimony about luminal finding blood, that is a reagent, a Chemical that is used by the Crime Lab is spread out. There's two things that are most reactive with luminal, one is human blood and the other is bleach. Bleach coincidentally is the one thing that eats up or destroys DNA.

We have heard about just to the left and just to the back of this tractor, about a three to 4 foot area, large area that lit up or glowed very brightly. Mr. Ertl testified about that. He was the person who processed that area. I'm asking you to infer that Mr. Avery cleaned up this area with bleach.

Now, you knew that inference, or that suggestion from the State, I think, was coming. We have put in the bleach. We have talked about the luminal. We have gotten expert testimony from Mr. Ertl that the two things that light up, it wasn't blood, but it was, in fact, bleach.

You heard from Blaine Dassey, importantly, that the garage, other than the junk on the surrounding edges of this garage, looked pretty much like this, from the sense of the Suzuki and the snowmobile, which were in there later on that week, were on the side of the garage at the time. So Teresa Halbach's vehicle is backed in, backed into the garage.

Teresa Halbach is killed. She's laying down. She's shot twice, once in the left side of her head, once in the back of her head, or I guess I should more accurately say she's shot at least twice. Because two bullet's were found, two entrance wounds were found to her head. We do have the 11 shell casings on the 6th that were recovered. How many times Mr. Avery actually shot this poor girl, you probably aren't going to be able to determine, but it's at least twice, and it's at least twice to the head.

What does he do though, later, with
Teresa Halbach. It's the State's theory in this case, and we're entitled to a theory, just like the defense, that after backing in the SUV, into the garage, which was, again, empty at the time, after closing the garage door, which Mr. Fabian
testified is how he saw it at around dusk, Mr. Avery does a couple of things.

Remember he doesn't know if the cops or somebody is coming looking for Teresa. He has got lots to do. He has got lots of things in the next several hours to do in this case. He has to get rid of all of Teresa's stuff, her camera, her cell phone, her PDA, which very well may be in a purse or something, in the vehicle, which he burns. We know that those are in the burn barrel. We're going to talk about that in just a minute.

And he places Teresa Halbach in the back, or the cargo area of her own SUV. Now, in doing that, Mr. Avery does a couple of things. He doesn't do it very gently, because we know that there's motion involved. He throws, if you will, Teresa, in the back, because of the blood spatter across the back of the open gate. But Teresa is laying at rest; she is resting at peace, having been killed by Mr. Avery, kind of diagonally in the back of that SUV.

And because of her hair imprint, you are able to deduce that. You are able to know that. Again, remember my closing argument, those are
more indications of Teresa telling you this is where I was. All right. This is where he put me. And those are inferences, again, that you should and can adopt. Why, because it's not dark yet, and he needs a big rip roaring fire before he can dispose of and mutilate this body.

Again, he has got to do all of this stuff quickly, because he doesn't know if the police are coming. So we hear then, at at least 7:30, perhaps before then, but at 7:30 there's already a fire, a big fire in the back. Although it's dark out, there's a big fire in the back of his garage. And we'll talk about some of the more details there. But as long as Mr. Buting asked about the theory of prosecution, again, which we are entitled, that is, in fact, the theory of the State's prosecution.

Mr. Buting then asked, why would you build a fire when you have a smelter. The smelter, as we know, or at least this is from the top of the smelter, which kind of melts aluminum as I understand it, is, if you heard the testimony, or if you saw the business buildings, the out buildings, much closer to the residences of the parents, of Delores and Allen. Much
closer to the residence of Charles Avery, the brother. Early on in this case we identified what all those buildings were and what were in all of those separate buildings.

But what Mr. Avery had to do required some alone time. Mr. Avery needed some privacy. And so Mr. Avery chose his burn area. He chose the place where somebody wouldn't happen upon him, or ask him what he was doing. He was building a fire like he had done many times before.

It's an area over which he had control. No other family members would be. And, importantly, Mr. Pevytoe, the arson investigator, remember he went through the smelter, eliminates the smelter as a possible burn location for the body.

Mr. Buting asked yesterday did we confuse Lisa Buchner in the case. When she originally testified, Mr. Strang, I believe, questioned her. Mr. Strang provided the answer. Again, this takes a good memory. This takes a lot of you to remember Lisa Buchner's question and answer. But the question was that -- I'm paraphrasing but -- directing your attention to
the 31st of October, what did you see? Well, what that does, when you ask a question like that, as a skilled lawyer, and Mr. Strang certainly is a skilled lawyer, Mr. Strang can then come up here and can say, well, she said it was the 31st of October.

But she didn't, did she. She never said that it was the 31st of October. When questioned, very courteously by Mr. Gahn, again, about what date really was it, she said, I don't know. When Mr. Gahn asked her, where was the location, that she was clear about. Wasn't down by Mr. Avery's trailer at all. It was one of these cars that's parked at the corner that are for sale.

Well, importantly, that excludes, excludes, Teresa Halbach as the person taking this picture. Not only is the time wrong, because we have Bobby Dassey who doesn't have any questions about what this person looks like, or the time this happened, or that it was before he went deer hunting and knew and was able to recognize that that was Teresa Halbach.

But we have the defense own witness saying, I don't know. I don't know the date that
this happened. Could have been the 1st, could have been the 2nd. Mr. Gahn said, could it have been a week ago, yeah, a week before. Could it have been two weeks before, yeah, it could have been two weeks before.

What does that do, how does that help? As Mr. Strang argued in his closing, do you believe that that's the truth, or do you believe that that's disingenuous, again? Is that a misrepresentation of what Ms Buchner actually said? In other words, how does it help? How does it help you? Between Bobby Dassey and Lisa Buchner, who has the better memory? Who was in a position to see what was going on that day? And those kinds of questions you are going to need to answer.

Same kind of thing with the other lay witness that was called in this case, some gentleman who was a propane employee, as I understand, who talked about seeing a green mid-sized SUV. Well, ask yourselves, is that a green, mid-sized SUV? I will argue, no, that that's not a green mid-size SUV.

But there's interpretations and there are things that may or may not be important about
that. However, it hardly helps the equation. It hardly helps you decide in this case whether or not that was Ms Halbach. In fact, we know it wasn't, because Ms Halbach never did leave that property.

All right. You need to buckle up here. Because here's where the absurdity starts. Mr. Buting wants you to believe that some unknown person, somebody that Mr. Buting can't identify, somebody that the defense cannot identify, actually undetected, took one of the four burn barrels belonging to Barb Janda.

Suggested that that theory also includes -- By the way, that would take more than one person if you think about it, 55 gallon drum, carrying this, we're talking about more than one person. But we're going to go just for now with Mr. Buting's theory in this case, and that at some remote location, Teresa's burned, that the bones are dumped, and that the burn barrel is put back.

Mr. Buting doesn't tell you, though, are the eight or nine steps in between that you as a jury have to find as facts, in order to kind of buy this. Okay. When somebody is trying to sell
you something, and when you decide whether or not you are going to buy that, you should understand all of the steps that you have to buy.

You have to buy that they could first of all take one of these barrels undetected. All right. Next, that they have Teresa Halbach lying dead somewhere. Whoever this is, has Teresa already lying dead in some remote location. And rather, rather than dispose of Teresa Halbach, if they were inclined to do so, at that remote location, Mr. Buting is asking you to believe that she's burned, that her body is mutilated, that her body is then loaded, apparently, into this 55 gallon drum of Barb Janda, that has been stolen, it's a theft, that's been somehow secreted off of the property.

What you are then being asked to believe is that they loaded back on whatever vehicle it is that they are able to transport Ms Halbach, after, remember, the at least hour and a half to 2 and a half hours at 1600 degrees that it takes to fully cremate a body, that they load all of these remains. And rather than dumping them someplace else, they bring them back to the very place that Steven Avery, on the day that Teresa

Halbach was killed, had a big fire.
And they decide to dump the bones. Now, they don't decide to dump all the bones, Mr. Buting's theory goes. They only dump the bones, some of them, and they leave some of them. But interestingly, the ones they dump are the little ones, and the ones they leave in the barrel are the big ones.

Undetected. But they are able to do this, undetected, just a couple of feet from Mr. Avery's trailer. Then Mr. Buting wants you to believe that they are able to put back the barrel that has been taken off of the property, again, undetected, and leave.

Now, Mr. Buting called that a plausible explanation, one theory as to how these bones can be in two different places. I hope you agree with me as to the plausibility of that defense theory.

Coupled with that theory, what you have to buy into, what you have to believe, is that there is somebody else out there, that there is somebody, not a police officer. All right. So that narrows the scope of people that are able to do this. Somebody who's not a police officer,
who skillfully exploited the law enforcement bias. That the real killer knew about, apparently, the lawsuit, or the animosity, or the embarrassment, or something about the 1985 case enough, where it was important enough to them to kill some innocent 25 year old victim and plant it on Mr. Avery's property.

That's absurd. If this wasn't such a important decision that you had to make, it would be laughable. It would be something that if somebody told you at a party, or somebody told you at your home, you would say nobody would believe that. And nobody should. Nobody should believe this series of situations or coincidences that would necessarily lead you to find Mr. Avery not guilty.

The SUV was planted in this case, or at least the defense will have you believe that the SUV was planted, that somebody planted the SUV. The fact of the matter is that this SUV was concealed. It was obscured. Somebody didn't want it to be found. Let me say that again. What you are looking at right here, how the SUV was found by Ms Sturm, was by somebody who didn't want this SUV to be found. All right. That
makes sense.
Well, if you are going to plant evidence, you have to want it to be found. Because if Mr. Avery is going to be accused of some murder that he didn't do in this case, you would expect to find this vehicle, if it was planted, in the Avery parking lot, or by Mr. Avery's trailer, or in some location where it would be found.

Again, it was only through happenstance and by very fortuitous intervention that vehicle was ever found. Very important, collectively again, and using your common sense to understand that concept, that this vehicle was obscured in such a way that whoever put it there, like this, didn't want it to be found.

Defense wants you to ignore this, and for good reason. The defense wants you to ignore the electronics that were found in the burn barrel. Why, because there's no explanation for it. Because it doesn't fit in any, in any theory that the defense has advanced in this case. All right. No law enforcement planting theory, no civilian planting theory, no individual who skillfully exploited the law enforcement bias
theory, explains why these things are burned in Mr. Avery's burn barrel.

And so apparently the defense wants you to ignore that. Well, remember the instruction, and reasonable doubt is not -- is a doubt based upon reason and common sense, but in consideration of the evidence, which means all of the evidence in this case, not just some of it.

So my point, ladies and gentlemen, is if you are going to buy into one of these theories, you have got to ask yourself, collectively, what the heck is this. Her phone, her PDA, her camera, are all found about 20 feet from Mr. Avery's door, and he is found, that day, burning in that particular barrel. If Mr. Avery is not involved in the death and mutilation of Teresa Halbach, then why are these things in that barrel.

Also, you can't ignore the fact, please, collectively remember, that after 2:41 p.m., after 2:41 p.m. on the 31st, Teresa Halbach's phone is never used again. Never used again. Her phone is in that burn barrel. Her phone is being burned. And you, as the jury, have to decide why. There's a couple of explanations,
one is that the defendant killed her and burned it, and the other one, I guess, the defense wants you to just come up with on your own.

That brings me to the conclusion, or the last question, and that's, did the cops kill Teresa Halbach. Again, the defense says no. But if the cops had her blood, if the cops had her bones, and before the 5th, if the cops knew she was dead, let me say that again, if before the 5th the cops knew that Teresa Halbach was dead, they were either told that by the real killer, or they killed Teresa Halbach.

You have got to be willing to accept one of those scenarios. And I don't think you can. And I don't think you should. And I don't think that the evidence points to that at all.

Mr. Strang, in his opening statement, promised you what the defense was going to be. Mr. Strang told you that it's no surprise that the blood from an unsecured vial in the box in the Clerk's Office, that Lieutenant Lenk examined in 2002, ends up in the Toyota. At the start of the case, that was what the defense was. That's what the defense theory was. That's what the defense said their theory of defense and what the
evidence was going to show in this case.
Vial planting, though, causes some risks, risks to, what I'm characterizing as risks to the defense. Because when you announce that defense, the State gets to meet that defense. We get an opportunity to tell you, the jury, through witnesses, whether or not that's plausible, whether or not that could happen, or whether or not that's implausible.

And there's two ways to do that. First, is the common sense way to do that. The vial planting defense for Mr. Avery, and for the defense team, is that either Mr. Lenk or Mr. Colborn got through this door. All right. They got through a door that they didn't have a key to, and they got through a door that they didn't have the code to. That's the first part of this.

The next thing that they are asking you to buy is that they knew that there was a file someplace in the Clerk of Court's Office, sometime between the 3 rd and the 5 th of November. Now, why do I say the 3rd and the 5th, because the 3rd is when Teresa is reported missing, doesn't pay to plant evidence and to steal a vial of blood before we know that it's going to do any good. And the 5th is when Pam Sturm finds her. So between the 3rd and the 5th they have to know that this box actually exists.

They also need you to buy that they know that there is a box within the box. That there is a vial of blood inside of that particular box in the Clerk's Office. They need you to believe -- They need you to believe that they get through a door they have no key, that they have no code, they find a box that they don't know the existence of, they find the vial that they don't know the existence of, and then they are able to get their hands on that vial of blood.

They also need you to believe that nobody sees them do this, that they are able to do that undetected, to secret it, again, to remove it from the Clerk of Court's Office in Manitowoc, to plant the blood, assuming they know how to do that, in six different places.

I'm stopping right here, because I need to. Because for the defense version to hold any water at all, the van -- excuse me -- the SUV can't be found yet. They have to plant the blood before it's found. Again, there's only two ways
that they can do that. Either they kill this 25 year old girl, or they found her murdered somewhere else.

And if they found her murdered somewhere else, then weren't they taking quite a chance, weren't Mr. Lenk and Colborn, if you admit or buy what it is that these two gentlemen are selling, wouldn't you have to agree that they took a chance that this very 25 year old photographer was also last seen alive by that man.

My God, they got lucky, didn't they. To go and find the vial of blood, even assuming they knew where it was, that the dead woman that they had in their possession, theoretically, was also the last person to have seen Mr. Avery. It doesn't make sense. All right.

That's the common sense way to deal with the vial of blood planting. By the way, because the vial of blood is still in the Clerk's Office, you have to reverse this process. You have got to get the blood back after we do the planting. We have to get through, again, the door that we have no key to, and we have no code to, and into the box, and get this thing secreted back in there, undetected, with nobody seeing.

That's not reasonable. That's not a reasonable doubt. Reasonable doubts are for innocent people. Reasonable doubts are things that juries adopt when all the evidence points to that. And this planting, this vial planting defense, even from a common sense standpoint, is absolutely ludicrous.

But what we were able to do, what you heard, is scientifically exclude that vial of blood. You heard from Dr. LeBeau, who testified that this blood is loaded with EDTA and this blood, and this blood, and this blood, have no detectable levels of EDTA. And so instead of calling all of the people with keys and with codes, and people in the Clerk's Office, and who might have seen Lieutenant Lenk or Colborn, or all those kinds of things, instead of doing it that way, we only had to call one witness, who scientifically could tell you that there is absolutely no way that that vial of blood was used to plant.

In fact, that very question was asked of Dr. LeBeau, the head of the toxicology section, or the unit at the FBI. And he said, by a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, this
vial of blood is excluded, that means it's not it, it's excluded as the source of those three bloodstains.

Now, why is that important. Lieutenant Lenk and Sergeant Colborn, as I mentioned earlier, are good, decent, honest cops, sworn to uphold the law. Kinds of officers Manitowoc citizens should be proud to have on your police force. They are the kinds of guys that you want investigating cases for you, for Manitowoc County. And again, they are not just some cops, they are your cops, that's why a Manitowoc jury decides this case.

This isn't just two guys, it's Jim Lenk and it's Andy Colborn. And when you accuse police officers of official misconduct, that's serious business. Mr. Strang correctly predicted that there would be some anger about this issue, coming from the prosecution side, and there is.

Let me tell you why. Their livelihood, their reputations, their families, everything in their 20 plus years of law enforcement are on the line, when some lawyer accuses them of misconduct. Not just any misconduct, but planting evidence in a murder case. All right.

Serious, serious business.
And as a representative of the State, as the prosecutor in this case, I'm here to tell you folks, that if you are going to allege that some Manitowoc cop is crooked, that some Manitowoc cop committed a crime, you better have something to back it up. And when you don't, and when there is a witness from the FBI who says that didn't happen, and when common sense said, that didn't happen, these men are owed an apology. Their good name, their reputations, need to be restored to them.

And Mr. Strang talked about what a guilty verdict, or a not guilty verdict, may do in this case. A guilty verdict is most importantly attributed to whether or not Mr. Avery committed these horrific acts in these cases. But also the issue of official or police misconduct should be something that angers you, just as its angers me.

Mr. Buting said that he might have been a little rough on Ms Culhane, that he owed her an apology. I'm hoping that the comments that have been directed towards Jim Lenk and towards Andy Colborn, at the conclusion of this case, are also
met with an apology.
But what I heard yesterday, what I heard yesterday, from Mr. Buting, when he suggested that perhaps it was Teresa's lifestyle that contributed to her homicide, I'm paraphrasing, but he said, because she was at some party, what do we know about this party that she was at on Saturday, or what do we know about some phone calls that she had gotten, or what do we know about her living arrangements.

Do you blame a 25 year old homicide victim? And when you suggest that that victim had some responsibility, or something to do with her own demise, you need to be held accountable for that. You need to be taken to task for that. And, again, as the prosecutor, I'm expressing my indignance about that.

Any suggestion that these good people of the Halbach family have to endure in listening to Mr. Buting stand before you and say, what about this woman's lifestyle, or what about this party, or what about who she's living with, is absolutely out of bounds, absolutely improper, has no place in this case.

What does have a place in this case is
the facts. And now I have come full circle. And at the conclusion of this, my final argument before you, the jurors, you have seen, and should see by now, the stark difference between the State's facts, between our reliance on the facts, and the defense necessarily relying upon speculation.

Physical evidence, the DNA evidence, the eyewitness testimony, the scientific evidence, the big fire that Mr. Avery had, common sense all point to one person and there's a reason for that. As the jury in this case, you have a duty. You have a duty to return what's called a true verdict. You have a duty to search for the truth.

I agree with Mr. Strang that you do have a duty in this case, but I disagree when Mr. Strang tells you that your finding of guilt in this case is not going to solve the crime. It is. It's going to solve the crime.

And I'm here to tell you, also, as the prosecutor, and collectively, the three of us prosecutors, with lots and lots of years of experience, are also going to tell you that it will provide closure. It will provide closure
for the Halbach family, at least in the legal sense. And it's in the sense for what you are charged to do, and that is to assign responsibility. It's to assign accountability for the death of Teresa Halbach.

I don't believe it is a difficult decision. It's a complex series of facts. And it is a very, very serious case. But it's not a difficult case. It's not a difficult decision that you have to make, because everything in this case pointed towards one person, towards one defendant.

I'm thanking you, at the conclusion of this case, on behalf of the State of Wisconsin. And urging you, urging you, to follow the Court's instructions, to follow the evidence in the case, and return verdicts of guilty. Thank you. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, members of the jury, the duties of counsel and the Court have been performed. The case has been argued by counsel. The Court has instructed you regarding the rules of law which should govern you in your deliberations. The time has now come when the great burden of reaching a just, fair, and conscientious decision of this case
is to be thrown wholly upon you, the jurors selected for this important duty.

You will not be swayed by sympathy, prejudice, or passion. You will be very careful and deliberate in weighing the evidence. I charge you to keep your duty steadfastly in mind and, as upright citizens, to render a just and true verdict, or in this case, just and true verdicts.

The following six forms of verdict will be submitted to you concerning the charges against the defendant, Steven A. Avery.

One reading: We, the jury, find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, guilty of first degree intentional homicide, as charged in the first count of the Information.

A second reading: We, the jury, find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, not guilty of first degree intentional homicide, as charged in the first count of the Information.

A third reading: We, the jury, find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, guilty of mutilating a corpse, as charged in the second count of the Information.

And a fourth reading: We, the jury,
find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, not guilty of mutilating a corpse, as charged in the second count of the Information.

A fifth reading: We, the jury, find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, guilty of possession of a firearm, as charged in the third count of the Information.

And a sixth reading: We, the jury, find the defendant, Steven A. Avery, not guilty of possession of a firearm, as charged in the third count of the information.

It is for you to determine whether the defendant is guilty, or not guilty, of each of the offenses charged. You must make a finding as to each count of the Information.

Each count charges a separate crime and you must consider each one separately. Your verdict for the crime charged in one count must not affect your verdict on any other count.

This is a criminal, not a civil case, therefore, before the jury may return a verdict which may legally be received, the verdict must be reached unanimously. In a criminal case, all 12 jurors must agree in order to arrive at a verdict.

When you return to the jury room, select one of your members to preside over your deliberations. That person's vote is entitled to no greater weight than the vote of any other juror.

When you have agreed upon your verdicts, have them signed and dated by the person you have selected to preside. I ask that you return the unsigned verdict forms as well.

At this point, I'm going to ask the media folks to shut the audio down because the Court is going to be identifying one of the jurors by name. I believe somebody is supposed to signal me once that's been done. Thank you.

Members of the jury, as I previously indicated, just before the beginning of deliberations, any remaining alternate jurors would be selected. We are now at that point in the trial.

The alternate juror will be sequestered separately from the other jurors until deliberations are completed, to be available in the event one of the other 12 jurors becomes unable to complete deliberations.

The alternate juror in this case has
been determined to be Nancy Stienmetz. Ms Stienmetz, with the consent of counsel for both parties, $I$ will be meeting with you shortly, in chambers, to explain your remaining role in this case.

At this time $I$ will ask the Clerk to swear the officer.
(Jury bailiff sworn.)
THE COURT: The jury is excused. Ms Stienmetz, you'll be waiting in the hallway to meet with me.
(Jury not present.)
THE COURT: You may be seated. Counsel, if you should leave the courtroom area, I ask you to keep the Clerk's Office informed of your whereabouts.

ATTORNEY STRANG: The remaining task to tend to is that we had agreed, I think, that all photographs would go to the jury without a request. But since then, $I$ don't remember if $I$ did this on the record or not, but had moved to exclude some of the exhibits already admitted, and photographs of those.

I have numbers of them in my brief case, but they are the handcuffs, leg irons, electrical
cords, and as I say, related pictures. So the Court would need to rule on those, because if to be excluded, of course, those photographs ought not go.

THE COURT: I recall being informed that I could anticipate the receipt of such a motion; I don't know that $I$ have received it yet. But I was notified of it and my recollection is that the parties were going to discuss the potentially disputed items of evidence in order to determine whether there would be a stipulation proposed.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't know that we had much further conversation, so the question may be best put to the State.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I could just have a moment, Judge, I will be happy to identify those for the Court. Exhibit 173, Exhibit 174.

ATTORNEY STRANG: 228 and 229.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, counsel. 228, and 229, although those are items themselves.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes, some of these are photographs and some are the items themselves. And I don't have which is which.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: All right. 228 -- 229 has already been withdrawn, I think, as an exhibit. 228
is the other photo that is at issue in the case. And those three photos, then, that have been identified, we have no objection they be removed from the binder of photos, and that the balance of the photos be tendered to the jury at this time.

THE COURT: All right. Can you give me the numbers of the photos again.

ATTORNEY STRANG: 173, 174, 228, and Mr. Kratz says that 229 already was withdrawn.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Right. Those are the three exhibits.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Then the items themselves are Exhibits 203, 204, and 249. Those are the actual items.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: They wouldn't be going back anyway, Judge.

THE COURT: Pardon me?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: The items wouldn't be going back anyway.

THE COURT: I understand the motion to be going beyond that.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. But they -- I'm asking that they be excluded, that is, that the Court reconsider the ruling admitting them, exclude those things as exhibits. I agree, of course, with

Mr. Kratz, that these things wouldn't be going to the jury anyway, absent a request, but I'm looking to have them excluded as evidence altogether.

THE COURT: My only hesitation there is, given the stage of the trial at which this is being raised. I take it you are not asking for some type of further instruction to the jury that they have been withdrawn.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I'm not, no. I mean, we would have addressed that before closing arguments.

THE COURT: Does the State have any objection?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The only issue, Judge, is if they would ask to see those items, I think that could be addressed at that time. I don't believe that the items themselves, that is the physical items themselves, need to be addressed at this time. Certainly an argument could be made as to the relevance, they are part of the record. And up and until the time that those may be asked for, I believe that request by counsel is premature.

THE COURT: Let me ask this. Is the defense, with the understanding that both parties agree that these six exhibits that have been identified, that is, three photos and three physical
items, with the understanding that they will not be sent to the jury, and I believe there's a stipulation that the three photos can simply be withdrawn, is the defense willing to postpone further consideration of its request to withdraw the other exhibits to such time as the jury requests to see them?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Sure, because there is -it's true, there is no practical effect other than cleaning up the record, and that can be done any time.

THE COURT: So, based on the stipulation of the parties then, items -- Exhibits 173, 174 and 228 that are photos, are withdrawn, and items 203, 204, and 249, will not be sent to the jury room if requested.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's right. Now, I have to say, I had -- our exhibit shows 229.

THE COURT: I have been told -- my understanding was that's already been withdrawn.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Let's just confirm that with the clerk, I probably am wrong, but 229, Janet. THE CLERK: I didn't show that as withdrawn.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: It should be, I have no
problem with that.
THE COURT: All right. 229, then, is also withdrawn.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Very well.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you.
THE COURT: Very well, we're in recess.
ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, one other matter.
THE COURT: Yes.
ATTORNEY BUTING: I don't know what other exhibits you intend to send back to the jury, other than the photographs, but certainly we would object to the expert's reports going back.

THE COURT: Let me clarify my understanding further. If I understand what the parties are telling me, and I want to make sure I'm not reading too much in, I'm glad, Mr. Buting, that you brought this up. If the jury requests permission to see any of the other photos, are the parties saying I can send them back, or the parties wish to be heard before they are sent back?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Photos can be sent without jury request.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Right now.
ATTORNEY STRANG: That's what we agreed. THE COURT: You are asking the Court to
send them back.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Right now, yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: But any other exhibits, if they ask to be seen, we would all like to be heard on that.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And maybe we didn't have an agreement on this, I expressed the view to counsel that we also could send CV's for all experts back, without request. If they are not in agreement --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, that--
THE COURT: I'm a little concerned if we're sending all photos, that's one thing. I hate to send back nothing but all CV's and nothing else, for fear that it might draw undue attention to them. So I'm going to wait, and if the jury requests to see anything other than the remaining photos, I will notify the parties, just as I would if I receive a question from the jury, and the parties will have a chance to be heard before they go back.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That sounds good.
THE COURT: Fair enough?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. We're adjourned for this time.
(Court in recess, jury deliberating.)
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Bob [3] 23/17 23/20 26/25
Bobby[11] 6/4 23/11 23/14 23/19 24/3 24/6 24/6 26/19 27/8 102/19 103/12
body [13] 12/8 29/8 30/3 34/23 78/1 82/12 83/14 89/1 100/6 101/17 105/12 105/13 105/22 bolster [1] 78/11
bone [4] 51/1051/1851/19 81/20 bones [34] 30/5 51/15 70/7 72/23 75/25 76/1 76/3 76/4 76/4 76/5 78/17 78/1 8 78/25 79/6 79/8 79/14 79/18 79/23 79/24 80/2 80/12 80/23 80/25 81/1 81/6 81/25 82/1 91/25 104/20 106/2 106/3 106/5 106/16 110/8
bonfire [11] 29/22 29/24 30/2 30/7 30/1 3 44/7 44/7 44/8 44/10 44/12 44/13
book [4] 60/5 60/14 60/16 96/20
bookcase [1] 84/20
books [2] 59/22 59/24
boring [1] 40/1
borrowed [1] 17/10
boss [1] 45/8
both [11] 44/5 47/24 48/11 59/16
61/11 61/12 61/24 87/24 94/3
123/2 126/23
bottom [2] 21/19 37/17
bound [1] 10/4
bounds [1] 117/23
box[8] 85/13 110/20 112/4 112/6 112/6 112/7 112/11113/24
boxes [1] 85/12
boy [2] 46/6 47/4
boyfriends [2] 72/15 73/1
boys [2] 21/5 24/18
BRANCH [2] $1 / 1$ 131/5
break [4] 35/11 35/12 53/23 92/12
brief [1] 123/24
brightly [1] 97/16
bring [11] 3/15 4/7 6/17 11/24
12/17 22/19 61/25 83/23 84/21
85/1 105/24
bringing [1] 39/6
brings [2] 83/22 110/4
broad [1] 43/22
broader [1] 8/2
brother [2] 24/7 101/2
brother's [1] 7/1
brothers [1] 16/21
brought [3] 62/4 85/12 128/16

## buccal [1] 37/9

Buchner [6] 23/12 26/12 26/20
101/19 103/10 103/13
Buchner's [1] 101/23
buckle [1] 104/6
build [1] 100/19
building [1] 101/10
buildings [4] 100/23 100/24 101/3
101/4
bullet [7] 37/19 87/22 88/4 88/19
88/25 89/5 96/25
bullet's [1] 98/13
bumbling [1] 94/1
bumps [2] 18/9 18/13
bunch [1] 30/11
burden [6] 52/12 52/13 52/17 57/3 57/3 119/24
burn [32] 20/8 20/8 20/10 21/24 21/25 23/24 26/23 26/24 30/4 $30 / 5$ 30/8 50/8 51/11 51/12 76/5
76/6 80/11 80/17 80/19 81/11
81/12 82/7 82/13 92/6 99/10
101/7 101/16 104/11 104/20
108/19 109/2 109/23
burned [16] $21 / 1730 / 350 / 450 / 16$ 51/24 51/24 70/7 77/24 81/18 82/2 82/3 104/19 105/12 109/1 109/24 $110 / 1$
burning [15] 23/8 23/9 23/13
23/15 23/18 23/21 23/22 23/23 26/23 26/24 29/8 77/22 80/12 92/3 109/15
burns [1] 99/10
burnt [1] 51/18
bus [4] 24/5 24/9 25/22 31/8
business [4] 17/14 100/23 115/17 116/1
BUTING [47] $1 / 19$ 3/13 6/1 6/1
36/23 39/19 40/1 40/4 40/5 55/14
60/20 66/19 67/22 69/3 70/25
$71 / 582 / 1782 / 2083 / 1183 / 24$
$84 / 584 / 1885 / 485 / 786 / 186 / 13$
86/21 87/8 87/22 88/1 88/12
88/20 89/12 94/13 100/14 100/18
101/18 104/8 104/9 104/22 105/11
106/11 106/15 116/21 117/3
117/20 128/16
Buting's [4] 86/11 96/13 104/18 106/4
button [2] 95/23 96/5
buy [11] 65/5 65/6 104/25 105/2
105/3 105/4 106/21 109/10 111/20
112/5 113/6
C
cabinet [10] 59/8 59/17 60/2 60/7
60/9 60/15 60/16 60/17 84/20
88/9
cable [1] 94/17
called [28] 16/1 28/3 30/16 30/18
30/20 35/21 40/22 55/18 57/7
57/21 57/22 65/21 66/25 67/2
70/14 74/16 74/17 74/19 79/10
$82 / 483 / 988 / 389 / 11$ 90/14 91/23
103/18 106/15 118/13
caller [1] 41/7
calling [11] 12/13 12/14 27/24
$31 / 832 / 733 / 1541 / 7$ 58/22 73/4 89/12 114/14
calls [8] $27 / 17$ 28/14 28/16 28/18
28/25 31/24 85/4 117/9
calm [1] 19/4
Calumet [1] 3/9
camera [4] 20/9 23/25 99/7 109/13
Canada [2] 91/8 91/16
candid [1] 31/4
candidly [1] 26/11
candor [1] 55/20
cannot [1] 104/10
car[19] 20/22 21/23 31/25 33/21
33/22 33/22 36/6 48/20 49/25
50/7 50/13 50/15 72/19 72/20
77/2 77/3 95/17 95/25 96/2
care [5] 24/25 25/13 25/14 74/6 74/7
cared [1] 16/21
career [1] 37/21
careful [2] 53/3 120/4
carefully [1] 131/8
cargo [1] 99/14
carrying [1] 104/16
cars [5] $25 / 2295 / 19$ 95/23 96/6 102/14
cartoonish [1] 67/7
case [110] 1/5 3/3 3/4 9/6 10/7
11/10 13/7 17/19 18/4 24/25
42/15 47/20 49/2 54/13 55/23
56/11 56/14 56/23 57/4 57/6
57/11 57/15 57/24 58/5 58/8 58/8
61/18 62/7 63/17 63/22 64/6
64/18 66/1 66/16 68/21 69/1 71/7
$71 / 1271 / 2172 / 1072 / 1173 / 5$
73/11 74/9 75/23 75/25 77/10
79/1 5 79/19 79/20 79/22 80/1
80/1 80/22 80/23 80/25 82/24
84/24 85/25 86/3 86/8 87/25 88/4
89/9 89/20 91/2 91/21 92/3 93/4
93/23 96/12 96/17 98/22 99/6
101/2 101/19 103/18 104/2 104/18
107/4 107/17 108/5 108/22 109/8
110/23 111/1 115/13115/25 116/3
116/15 116/25 117/24 117/25
118/12 118/17118/19119/8119/9
119/11 119/14 119/16119/21
119/25 120/8 121/20 121/23
122/25 123/5 123/24 125/1
cases [5] 63/16 64/19 94/10
115/10 116/18
casings [1] 98/15
caught [1] 19/19
cause [1] 3/22
caused [2] 47/15 94/15
causes [1] 111/2
cautious [2] 36/25 38/10
caves [1] 7/9
CD [3] $85 / 25$ 86/3 86/8
cell[20] 12/14 17/12 19/15 19/18
19/22 20/4 20/8 20/10 23/25
27/10 27/14 27/14 27/24 27/24
28/5 28/10 28/10 32/8 40/22 99/8
certain [1] 6/16
certainly [9] 6/23 34/12 55/15
57/10 58/5 64/3 102/4 126/18 128/11
certainty [1] 114/25
certified [1] 91/9
certify [1] 131/6
CF [2] 1/5 3/4
chair [1] 30/23
chairs [1] 16/6
chambers [1] 123/4
chance [6] 34/15 37/21 53/22
$113 / 5113 / 9129 / 21$
change [1] 63/22
changes [1] 44/22
characterizing [1] 111/3
charge [2] 53/3 120/6
charged [10] 55/6 119/3 120/15
120/19 120/23 121/2 121/6 121/10
121/14121/18
charges [2] 120/11 121/16
Charles [1] 101/1
chatting [1] 33/8
check[6] 31/25 32/7 32/10 33/8
33/15 74/18
checked [4] 71/7 71/10 71/18 73/6
chemical [1] 97/8
chitty [1] 33/7
choice [2] 10/12 71/15
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { choose [4] } & 10 / 7 & 10 / 19 & 10 / 21 & 14 / 21\end{array}$
chose [3] 40/18 101/7 101/7
church [1] 13/1
circle [1] 118/1
CIRCUIT [3] 1/1 1/10 131/5
circumstance [1] 93/23
circumstances [1] 62/23
citizen [3] 8/5 95/18 96/4
citizens [3] 53/10 $115 / 8$ 120/7
civil [5] 47/13 49/4 55/4 56/17
121/20
civilian [1] 108/24
claims [1] $42 / 25$
clarify [3] 3/17 3/20 128/13
cleaned [2] 88/10 97/18
cleaning[1] 127/10
clear [8] 34/12 35/4 35/7 48/24
48/25 49/3 88/3 102/12
cleared [1] 89/10
clearly [1] 32/9
 127/22
Clerk's [6] 43/9 110/21 112/8
113/19 114/15 123/15
Clinical [1] 12/12
clippings [1] 42/22
close [1] 95/10
closer [3] 44/12 100/24 101/1
closing [23] 1/4 2/3 3/5 3/16 4/12
14/8 39/19 52/5 52/7 55/7 56/4
56/5 58/13 58/14 58/19 59/11
65/23 66/4 95/12 98/25 99/25
103/7 126/10
closings [1] 4/4
closure [14] 7/16 7/22 8/1 8/12
8/13 8/17 8/21 9/9 12/21 12/22
13/3 13/8 $118 / 25118 / 25$
clothes [2] 81/23 81/24
clues [1] 72/12
clumsy [1] 85/19
coached [1] 24/16
cobbler [1] 38/23
cocked [1] 60/15
code [3] 111/17112/11113/23
codes [1] 114/15
coincidences [1] 107/14
coincidentally [1] 97/11
Colborn [33] 18/9 18/14 18/16 $31 / 2332 / 1132 / 2533 / 233 / 12$ 34/4 42/18 58/20 59/6 59/23 60/12 60/13 61/7 62/9 62/22 69/22 69/23 73/15 74/4 74/4 74/16 74/19 75/20 78/11 111/14
113/6 114/16 115/5 115/15 116/25
Colborn's [1] 18/15
colleague [2] 27/11 91/18
collected [2] 86/23 86/25
collecting [1] 87/2
collective [3] 68/22 73/10 77/9
collectively [8] 73/10 76/17 81/9
88/13 108/12 109/11 109/20 118/22
comes [18] 18/9 18/24 24/5 25/1
29/16 32/23 33/3 33/9 44/4 44/5 44/9 46/2 58/15 60/1 60/21 63/5 70/16 75/8
comfort [1] 54/18
coming [8] 25/8 25/23 56/22 96/5
97/21 99/4 100/9 115/19
comments [2] 54/16 116/23
commit [1] 11/19
commits [1] 49/12
committed [3] 58/3 116/6 116/17
common [14] 25/23 39/2 51/2
59/13 66/24 81/7 82/1 108/13
109/6 $111 / 11113 / 17114 / 6116 / 9$
118/10
community [2] 9/25 13/1
company [1] 27/15
compartment [2] 38/24 83/17
compelling [1] 55/9
competent [1] 93/14
complete [3] 40/6 54/2 122/24
completed [2] 96/19 122/22
complex [1] 119/7
computer [3] 19/24 96/23 131/10
computer-assisted [1] 131/10
computerized [1] 131/9
concealed [2] 34/18 107/21
conceded [2] 89/17 91/17
concedes [1] 25/6
conceivable [1] 16/18
concept [2] 47/2 108/14
concern [1] 90/21
concerned [4] 19/5 39/10 39/25
129/13
concerning [2] 79/23 120/11
conclude [1] 92/15
conclusion [7] 61/3 65/15 65/17
110/4 116/25 118/2 $119 / 13$
conclusions [2] 33/24 80/8
concocting [1] 21/12
confirm [1] 127/21
confirmed [4] 40/20 40/24 41/3 41/9
confirming [3] 40/11 40/12 41/13
confirms [1] 33/9
confuse [1] 101/19
conjecture [1] 79/18
connected [1] 24/15
connection [1] 60/18
conscience [4] 9/18 $11 / 2$ 11/3
46/23
conscientious [2] 52/18 119/25
consent [1] 123/2
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { consequences [1] } & 16 / 19\end{array}$
consider [8] 42/3 43/10 44/17
44/19 56/10 56/21 65/1 121/17
consideration [4] 53/9 61/16 109/7
127/5
considering [1] 10/15
consistency [1] 44/17
consistent [1] 38/10
constitutional [1] 66/9
consume [2] 82/11 82/11
contaminated [1] 38/1
contamination [6] 38/7 38/13
38/15 88/4 94/9 94/12
CONTD [1] 1/4
continuation [1] 3/5
continue [2] 3/16 92/22
continues [1] 39/5
contrasted [1] 22/24
contribute [1] 93/21
contributed [1] 117/5
control [5] 37/25 38/13 84/23 88/7
101/12
conversation [3] 19/3 35/9 124/13
conversations [1] 29/12
convicted [2] 56/8 57/5
convicting [3] 6/20 6/21 6/22
conviction [4] 46/19 46/25 56/7 93/21
convinced [1] 15/10
cooperative [5] 18/14 18/16 18/20 18/20 22/23
cop [3] 39/12 $116 / 5116 / 5$
cops [24] 49/5 49/6 61/8 64/8 69/6
69/15 69/16 69/20 70/5 71/1
76/20 77/4 77/15 78/10 84/6 99/3
110/5 110/7 110/7 110/8 110/10
115/6 115/11 115/12
cord [1] 28/4
cordless [2] 28/21 28/24
cords [1] 124/1
corner [2] 50/8 102/14
corpse [3] 53/15 120/23 121/2
correct [5] 3/24 4/1 59/24 64/8
131/12
correctly [1] 115/17
corroborate [1] 60/11
corrosive [1] 47/7
corruption [1] 39/10
could [33] 7/4 7/24 8/24 15/4
15/14 31/2 41/3 41/4 41/5 41/5
57/17 69/10 71/24 74/1 76/5
79/12 83/16 85/11 96/6 96/8
103/1 103/1 103/2 103/3 103/4
105/4 111/8 114/19 124/6 124/15
126/15 126/18 129/9
couldn't [2] 49/18 96/5
counsel [11] 24/22 39/23 53/21
54/7 119/20 119/21 123/2 123/13
124/19 126/21 129/9
counsel's [1] 37/4
count [10] 120/16 120/20 120/23
121/3 121/6 121/11 121/15 121/16 121/18121/19
COUNTY [9] 1/1 3/9 28/19 34/5 53/10 62/14 69/21 $115 / 11$ 131/2 couple [12] 40/10 59/4 59/10 76/7 76/14 89/18 92/11 93/23 99/2 99/15 106/10 109/25
Coupled [1] 106/20
courageously [1] 10/4
course [9] $3 / 1835 / 2442 / 19$ 50/14 58/18 80/17 81/5 124/3 125/25
court [17] 1/1 1/10 1/25 6/2 39/24
84/25 119/20 1 19/21 122/12 124/2
124/17 125/24 128/25 130/3 131/4 131/5 131/19
Court's [4] 3/20 111/21 112/18 119/15
courteous [1] 54/20
courteously [1] 102/9
courtroom [7] 9/24 10/8 10/9 19/8
54/23 84/21 123/14
courtrooms [3] 7/18 8/11 13/6
cover [1] 40/1
covered [1] 39/19
covers [1] 38/22
crashing [1] 17/3
crawled [1] 7/9
create [6] 12/22 27/12 27/13 27/18 27/19 27/21
credence [1] 60/11
credibility [3] 61/11 61/14 65/3
cremate [1] 105/22
crematorium [1] 30/13
crime [13] $36 / 1842 / 22$ 58/3 87/12 89/3 94/6 94/9 97/8 $116 / 6118 / 19$ 118/20 121/16 121/18
criminal [3] $57 / 8$ 121/20 121/23
critically [2] 46/13 53/9
crooked [1] 116/5
cross [2] 31/4 89/17
cross-examination [2] 31/4 89/17
crush [2] 21/23 95/17
crying [4] 7/22 12/2 12/7 22/16
CSI [1] 64/18
Culhane [12] 36/18 37/8 37/16
$67 / 19$ 87/24 87/25 88/8 88/14
88/24 93/14 94/8 116/22
Culhane's [1] 38/1
custodian [2] 42/23 43/5
custody [2] 35/2 36/9
customer [1] 72/4
customers [1] 73/1
cut [1] 54/24
CV's [2] 129/9 129/15
D
D.A [2] 3/9 3/11
da [6] 33/4 33/4 33/4 33/4 33/4
37/15
dad [1] 17/25
damn [1] 17/12
damning [2] 67/12 67/13
dark [2] 100/4 100/12
Dassey[15] 6/4 21/5 23/11 23/12
23/14 24/3 24/4 24/17 27/8 29/18
44/4 45/6 98/1 102/19 103/12
date [6] $1 / 873 / 2073 / 2274 / 24$
102/10 102/25
dated [2] 122/7 131/15
David [2] 18/24 19/3
day[13] 1/4 11/9 19/2 24/5 25/18
25/23 29/14 33/16 72/4 103/14
105/25 109/14 131/15
daylight [1] 43/22
days [4] $24 / 18$ 26/15 36/16 76/14
dead [6] $16 / 17$ 105/7 105/8 110/9 110/10113/13
deal [4] 10/2 56/18 79/16 113/17
DEAN [3] $1 / 172 / 43 / 14$
death [4] 12/13 91/24 109/16 119/5
December [1] 90/6
decent [2] 61/8 115/6
decide [19] 9/6 10/7 10/14 23/13
44/19 45/9 46/9 47/7 51/23 56/13
64/15 64/21 81/10 86/6 104/2
105/1 106/2 106/3 109/25
decided [2] 37/13 46/20
decides [2] 79/20 115/13
deciding [4] 16/9 50/22 56/11
63/23
decision [8] 39/13 52/19 56/22
93/13 107/9 119/7 119/9 119/25
deduce [1] 99/24
deer [1] 102/22
defendant [15] 1/7 1/18 1/20 1/21
4/13 110/1 119/12 120/12 120/14

120/18 120/22 121/1 121/5 121/9
121/13
defendant's [1] 66/9
defense [51] 6/12 39/18 52/4
54/16 55/755/11 58/13 58/19 62/2 62/3 62/16 67/25 74/9 75/23
77/11 80/16 80/22 83/13 84/25
85/24 89/16 92/25 93/13 95/4
95/11 98/23 102/24 104/10 106/18
107/18 108/17 108/18 108/22
109/3 110/2 110/6 110/18 110/23
110/24 110/25 110/25 111/4 111/5
111/5 111/12 111/13112/22114/6
118/6 126/23 127/4
defensiveness [1] 47/20
degraded [1] 79/9
degree [3] 114/25 120/15 120/19
degrees [1] 105/21
deliberate [6] 53/3 53/4 73/11
76/18 77/9 120/5
deliberating [2] 80/7 130/3
deliberations [6] 54/3 119/23
122/3 122/17 122/22 122/24
delivers [1] 10/5
Delores [3] 8/13 18/2 100/25
delve [1] 60/25
demeanor [1] 61/14
demise [1] 117/14
denied [2] 32/19 42/18
Dennis [1] 34/21
deny [1] 32/18
department [5] 6/7 6/8 34/5 47/15 49/10
deposition [1] 70/1
deputies [1] 69/21
Deputy [1] 62/25
descend [1] 20/1
described [1] 51/2
deserve [2] 54/23 56/13
deserves [2] 56/15 56/16
designed [2] 40/12 41/10
desk[4] 19/24 22/4 88/18 96/23
despite [2] 69/3 70/25
destroyed [1] 20/3
destroys [1] 97/12
details [1] 100/14
detect [3] 41/21 41/25 42/11
detectable [3] 90/20 91/4 114/13
detecting [1] 42/7
detection [8] 40/13 40/14 40/15
41/13 41/17 41/20 41/23 42/9
detective [12] 18/18 23/6 32/5
34/14 34/21 35/21 35/22 35/25
42/23 48/17 48/17 86/25
determine [4] 86/7 98/18 121/12 124/10
determined [3] 79/8 79/13 123/1
developed [1] 90/11
develops [1] 72/11
deviates [2] 37/23 39/3
devices [1] 95/22
devoted [1] 34/8
devoting [1] 72/17
diagonally [1] 99/22
Diane [3] 1/24 131/4 131/19
difference [7] 43/20 43/22 64/22
75/21 75/22 80/17 $118 / 4$
different [10] $8 / 18$ 13/23 27/8
39/21 43/24 43/25 55/3 72/19
106/17 112/20
difficult [4] 54/15 119/6 119/9
119/9
dig [1] 70/23

53/17 65/22 65/25 66/12 82/15 109/5 109/5 $114 / 2$
doubts [2] 114/2 114/3
down [11] 12/7 17/4 19/23 46/2
dignity [1] 54/22
dime [1] 69/24
dinner [1] 77/19
dinners [2] 38/18 38/18
dire [2] 3/19 3/23
direct [1] 31/5
directed [2] 96/16 116/24
directing [2] 76/11 101/25
direction [1] 36/19
disagree [2] 5/22 $118 / 17$
disbelieve [1] 43/4
discard [2] 67/3 67/22
discarding [2] 55/11 84/16
disconnect [2] 95/5 95/7
disconnected [2] 22/13 94/18
discrepancies [2] 66/2 66/18
discuss [1] 124/9
discussions [2] 12/12 12/13
dishonest [1] 23/2
disingenuous [7] 55/18 73/4 84/15
86/9 87/17 88/21 103/9
dislike [1] 47/16
dismissing [1] 55/10
dispatch [3] $32 / 7$ 74/15 74/19
dispatcher [6] 33/1 33/18 33/19
34/22 34/25 35/22
dispose [2] 100/6 105/9
disposes [1] 78/1
dispute [1] 21/5
disputed [1] 124/10
dissertation [1] 40/6
distance [1] 43/8
distinctive [1] 23/21
DNA [28] 12/20 $13 / 18$ 13/20 $13 / 21$
14/4 37/15 37/20 38/1 38/3 66/24 67/10 67/16 67/21 68/1 68/4
79/1 1 83/4 87/23 88/1 $588 / 25$
89/2 94/5 94/14 94/20 95/3 97/1
97/12 $118 / 8$
DNI [1] 68/3
doctor [2] 40/5 89/13
documenting [1] 43/7
documents [2] 62/6 62/7
doesn't [49] 6/3 13/20 13/25 14/1
14/1 14/4 14/6 14/7 18/17 19/8
22/5 23/20 25/7 25/15 25/15
26/17 27/7 27/25 28/6 30/8 32/17 34/2 38/2 41/8 50/21 55/1 64/13
66/7 66/7 67/25 71/20 72/5 72/17
81/2 84/17 84/23 88/1 88/1 88/21
89/13 94/2 99/3 99/16 100/8
102/19 104/22 108/21 111/25 113/16
doesn't have [1] 25/15
dog [2] 25/16 41/19
doing [35] 5/21 11/20 15/1 16/19 17/9 17/9 21/14 27/12 29/8 29/14 29/15 32/15 32/17 32/17 33/8 $33 / 1433 / 1434 / 134 / 242 / 1943 / 5$ $45 / 1846 / 1546 / 1646 / 1746 / 18$ 62/12 82/5 85/20 93/25 94/5 95/12 99/15 101/9 114/17
done [16] 9/4 10/25 11/1111/15 47/18 50/11 50/11 52/23 57/18 $88 / 6$ 88/7 90/1 90/15 101/10 122/14 127/10
door[11] 6/18 6/19 63/2 77/16 98/25 109/14 111/14111/15 111/16112/10113/22
doubt [12] 10/15 16/4 16/11 46/10

52/3 52/10 69/12 70/23 98/10
102/12 122/11
Dr. [25] 42/14 78/25 79/1 80/20
80/22 81/2 81/3 81/4 81/5 89/11
89/14 90/13 90/17 91/6 91/6 91/8
91/10 91/13 91/18 92/4 92/5 92/6
92/7 114/10 114/23
Dr. Arvizu [1] 89/11
Dr. Eisenberg [9] 78/25 81/3 81/4 81/5 91/6 91/10 91/18 92/5 92/6
Dr. Fairgrieve [9] 79/1 80/20 80/22
81/2 91/6 91/8 91/13 92/4 92/7
Dr. LeBeau [6] 42/14 89/14 90/13
90/17 114/10 114/23
drag [1] 80/15
draw [4] 33/23 80/8 97/3 129/16
drawn [2] 68/21 96/9
draws [1] 28/8
drive [3] $45 / 1647 / 448 / 13$
driver [2] 24/9 31/8
driving [2] 24/10 26/4
dropped [2] 50/23 84/3
dropping [1] 24/11
drops [1] 24/17
drum [2] 104/15 105/14
dry [1] 12/13
dump [4] 106/2 106/3 106/4 106/6
dumped [2] 51/25 104/20
dumping [1] 105/23
During [1] 3/18
dusk [1] 99/1
duties [1] 119/20
duty [11] 10/4 10/11 53/5 68/16
74/12 118/12 118/13118/14
118/17 120/2 120/6
dynamics [1] 83/7
E
each [9] 7/8 33/5 58/24 59/4 61/16
121/13 121/15 121/16 121/17
ear [1] 31/13
earlier [3] 17/19 43/15 $115 / 6$
earliest [2] 78/1 78/3
early [6] 21/15 72/8 72/9 77/6
93/4 101/2
ears [1] 31/14
ease [1] 85/20
easier [1] 85/11
easy [2] 76/3 96/14
eat [1] 38/24
eats [2] 38/17 97/12
edges [1] 98/3
EDTA [11] 40/3 40/11 40/12 89/22
90/18 90/20 91/2 91/3 91/4
114/11114/13
effect [1] 127/9
eight [2] 82/23 104/23
Eisenberg[9] 78/25 81/3 81/4 81/5
91/6 91/10 91/18 92/5 92/6
either [9] 24/18 38/25 42/11 62/9
94/4 94/4 110/11 $111 / 13113 / 1$
Eldorado [1] 20/24
electrical [1] 123/25
electronics [2] 77/24 108/19
eliminate [2] 37/14 57/23
eliminated [1] 72/9
eliminates [2] 71/20 101/15
elimination [2] 37/12 37/13
else [13] $4 / 3$ 6/5 18/2 36/7 42/6

51/25 69/7 82/12 105/24 106/22
113/3 113/5 129/15
elsewhere [1] 51/24
embarrassment [1] 107/4
employee [1] 103/19
employees [1] 15/8
empty [2] 21/23 98/24
enclosed [1] 87/11
encounters [1] 19/11
end [23] 10/18 14/9 14/17 15/25
16/13 29/16 39/1 39/3 39/5 39/5
$43 / 1145 / 15$ 46/3 46/4 46/7 50/18
51/23 52/2 53/2 56/5 60/1 66/15 96/22
ending [1] 12/1
ends [3] 12/16 63/4 110/22
endure [1] 117/19
enforcement [13] 15/7 15/9 31/17
42/17 43/12 57/24 68/8 69/8
87/13 107/1 108/23 108/25 115/22
enforcement's [1] 57/25
enormous [2] 9/23 16/19
enough [11] 48/7 64/16 67/13
67/13 69/9 79/7 93/17 93/20
107/5 107/5 129/23
ensure [1] 46/19
ensuring [1] 46/25
entire [2] 58/4 87/2
entitled [7] 8/5 39/19 43/3 43/10
98/22 100/16 122/3
entrance [1] 98/14
envelope [1] 88/16
envision [1] 60/15
equally [1] 62/1
equation [1] 104/1
erodes [1] 49/7
error [1] 94/11
Ertl [2] 97/16 97/24
especially [2] 57/7 81/21
etched [2] 6/25 7/1
evaluating [1] 34/3
even [25] 14/10 16/1 18/12 21/20
23/4 25/5 28/21 29/25 30/4 38/17
49/1451/651/1757/23 59/12
61/13 65/22 77/2 79/10 79/12
89/16 90/5 95/10 113/12 114/6
evening [2] 48/7 77/6
event [2] 45/10 122/23
eventually [1] 11/18
ever [8] $11 / 1333 / 1650 / 652 / 4$ 57/11 61/17 73/6 108/12
every[8] 24/5 24/11 24/13 25/18
25/23 29/14 30/25 57/20
everybody [4] 10/1 16/20 57/23 58/3
everything [4] 58/20 85/15 115/21
119/10
evidence [86] 5/20 10/8 10/9 10/16
12/6 15/5 15/16 20/17 29/14
$32 / 2032 / 2233 / 2535 / 2437 / 5$
42/20 42/23 43/5 46/4 46/8 46/1 5
46/2 1 47/17 47/18 47/22 48/1
48/14 48/22 51/20 53/4 57/22
58/2 59/14 60/19 60/20 61/18
61/20 61/21 61/23 62/1 62/12
62/21 64/16 64/20 71/12 71/14
74/9 75/6 75/8 75/8 75/21 77/8
79/15 79/23 79/25 80/1 80/6 80/7
$80 / 982 / 1083 / 583 / 684 / 1984 / 23$
85/10 85/12 88/5 93/18 93/20
94/24 95/10 96/16 108/3 109/7
109/8 110/16 111/1 111/25 114/4
115/25 118/8 118/8118/9119/16
evidence...[3] 120/5 124/10 126/3 evidentiary [1] 38/2
evil [1] 20/21
exact [1] 97/1
exactly [6] 4/21 39/19 70/24 71/2
71/3 93/24
examination [4] 31/4 31/5 85/6 89/17
examine [1] 54/21
examined [1] 110/21
example [8] 12/15 13/20 49/24
49/24 50/22 57/20 86/9 86/10
excellent [1] 62/16
except [1] 25/21
exclude [3] 114/9 123/21 125/24
excluded [6] 20/1 $115 / 1115 / 2$
124/3 125/23 126/3
excludes [2] 102/16 102/17
exclusive [1] 84/23
excuse [4] 61/6 83/24 84/19
112/23
excused [2] 3/22 123/9
exhibit [8] 12/8 36/23 86/14 93/8
124/17 124/17 124/25 127/18
Exhibit 174[1] 124/17
exhibits [12] 48/23 49/1 57/14
123/22 125/11 125/13 125/25
126/24 127/6 127/13 128/10 129/4
Exhibits 173 [1] 127/13
existence [2] 112/12 112/13
exists [1] 112/4
exits [1] 63/4
exonerate [1] 93/19
expect [1] 108/6
expected [1] 61/23
expecting [1] 18/11
experience [1] 118/24
experiment [1] 38/7
expert [8] 67/23 80/22 83/15 89/8
89/16 90/22 91/14 97/23
expert's [1] 128/12
expertise [1] 94/3
experts [2] 51/15 129/9
explain [4] 12/9 54/25 88/24 123/4
explained [3] 30/1 44/21 44/22
explains [1] 109/1
explanation [4] 60/23 74/13
106/16 108/20
explanations [1] 109/25
exploited [3] 69/8 107/1 108/25
expressed [1] 129/8
expressing [1] 117/16
extend [1] 30/11
extent [1] 70/3
externally [1] 9/24
extract [2] 88/5 88/7
extremely [1] 93/3
eyewitness [1] 118/9
F
Fabian [4] 23/17 23/20 26/25 98/25
face [1] 13/13
facing [2] 63/2 63/3
fact [25] 9/6 24/23 44/9 50/10
50/25 60/11 61/16 62/16 63/12
64/13 71/1 72/16 75/7 83/16 85/6
86/19 89/20 91/7 92/9 97/25
100/16 104/3 107/20 109/19 114/22
factor [2] 76/10 81/6
factors [1] 63/19
facts [9] $24 / 22$ 56/11 62/23 79/19 104/24 118/1 118/5 118/5 119/7
fair [4] $52 / 18$ 53/9 $119 / 25$ 129/23
Fairgrieve [9] 79/1 80/20 80/22
81/2 91/6 91/8 91/13 92/4 92/7
fairly [1] 26/10
fairness [1] 54/21
faith [4] 15/13 15/19 36/16 46/7
falling [1] 60/17
FALLON [2] 1/13 3/10
families [1] 115/21
family [16] 7/19 7/21 8/13 8/22
8/23 11/25 12/1 13/2 17/14 18/2
37/12 56/12 65/12 101/13 117/19 119/1
fancier [1] 41/20
fancy [1] 39/1
far [4] 17/15 31/2 42/5 94/11
farther [1] 50/6
Fassbender [6] 34/7 35/5 36/17
36/22 71/9 72/12
FBI [14] 39/8 39/9 39/15 39/15
40/9 79/7 79/8 79/12 89/15 90/3
90/9 90/15 114/24 116/8
fear [1] 129/16
February [2] 90/7 90/7
feeds [3] 49/4 49/5 49/6
feet [7] 63/2 72/23 76/7 81/18
81/20 106/10 109/13
felt [1] 79/6
female [3] 24/20 25/2 25/8
few [2] 51/24 81/20
fewer [1] 30/17
fifth [1] 121/4
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108/21
fits [1] 74/8
five [13] $4 / 175 / 735 / 835 / 20$
35/20 43/20 44/1 48/22 48/25
57/16 66/6 66/8 92/17
flag [1] 79/17
flames [1] 44/10
flashes [1] 95/25
flashlight [2] 84/8 84/13
flashlights [1] 84/1
flipping [1] 59/19
floor [2] 50/23 86/13
fly [1] 38/23
flyover [1] 77/1
focus [1] 65/20
folding [1] 41/4
folks [16] 8/6 15/23 30/20 30/21
31/17 36/15 37/18 43/19 45/11
62/8 69/5 71/18 71/25 87/10
116/4 122/11
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followed [3] 37/17 37/18 57/20
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fool [6] 55/21 58/14 71/6 86/10
87/9 87/18
fooled [1] 55/24
fooling [1] 73/4
fools [1] 75/19
foot [5] 22/2 22/3 28/4 83/15
97/15
force [1] 115/9
foregoing [2] 131/7 131/7
foreseeing [1] 73/24
forever [1] 7/5
forget [1] 96/1
forgotten [1] 7/5
form [3] 10/6 43/1 43/3
formal [1] 12/6
forms [2] 120/10 122/9
forthright [1] 19/4
fortuitous [1] 108/11
forward [2] 7/4 7/11
fought [1] 16/24
found [39] 22/2 34/19 36/5 37/19
51/10 51/19 63/14 64/4 64/10
65/7 67/14 70/17 72/19 72/20
72/23 82/18 91/20 93/1 93/3 93/6
94/15 94/17 96/25 98/13 98/14
107/22 107/24 107/25 108/3 108/9
108/12 108/16 108/19 109/13
109/14 112/24 112/25 113/2 113/4
foundation [1] 38/5
four [3] 43/20 51/1 104/11
fourth [1] 120/25
fragments [4] 51/10 51/1851/19 81/21
frame [6] 26/22 27/7 31/9 46/15 46/1870/7
framework [3] 14/20 14/20 15/15
framing [1] 46/24
fresh [5] 26/16 41/14 41/16 42/8 42/10
Friday [1] 18/23
friend [4] 24/14 30/25 40/17 77/18
friends [2] 16/22 29/22
front [2] 25/18 84/10
full [4] $9 / 25 \quad 12 / 1053 / 8 \quad 118 / 1$
fully [2] 82/11 105/22
fumble [1] 85/7
fundamental [1] 24/2
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13/14 13/24 49/7
further [7] 28/4 70/23 83/18

| F | gone [2] 38/14 51/1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| r... [4] 124/13 126/7 127/5 | 7/18 14/8 15/12 15/19 16/18 | [8] 56/25 60/22 67/ |
|  | 36/15 36/24 | 101/8 111/8 116/9 116/10 |
| rtive [1] 67 | 0/10 42/2 46/6 47/10 | happened [6] 45/16 46/13 |
| future [1] 96/25 | 2/16 73/8 90/12 | 86/11 102/21 103/1 |
| G | /22 108/18 112/2 115/6 | happens [3] 29/25 3 |
| GAHN [8] $1 / 153 / 1188 / 288 / 22$ <br> $89 / 17102 / 9102 / 11103 / 2$ <br> gallon [2] $104 / 15105 / 14$ <br> garage [16] $37 / 237 / 2250 / 350 / 5$ <br> $50 / 851 / 1252 / 197 / 497 / 598 / 2$ <br> $98 / 398 / 798 / 898 / 2498 / 25$ <br> $100 / 13$ |  | happy[3] 8/19 89/10 124/16 |
|  | g | 93/ |
|  |  | ly [2] 104 |
|  | gracious [1] | sn't [4] 20/3 20/4 28/16 60/2 |
|  | grader [1] 85/5 | e [1] 129/14 |
|  | granted [1] 10 | haven't [3] 41/9 |
|  | grasp [1] 10/20 | ng [3] 19/10 38/3 99/21 |
| garbage [4] 26/23 26/24 27/1 27/3 gate [1] 99/19 | grass [1] 22/19 | 10] 11/1 11/1 50/5 89/14 |
|  |  |  |
| gate [1] 99/19 <br> gave [2] 43/23 70/1 | gre | 14/23 |
| general [2] 3/10 22/21 <br> generally [1] 15/10 | green [4] 25/12 103/20 103/2 | hear [15] 4/22 5/2 32/8 32/23 |
|  |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { generally }[1] \quad 15 / 10 \\ & \text { gentleman }[2] \\ & \text { gentlemen }[5] 12 \\ & \text { gen } \\ & 109 / 9113 / 7 \end{aligned}\right.$ | Gregor |  |
|  | grocery [1] 38/ | [38] 29/1043/14 48/10 57/2 |
|  |  |  |
| 109/9 113/7gently [5] $59 / 7$ 59/7 59/25 60/14$99 / 16$ | guess [13] 34/1 | 71/871/17 $72 / 1189 / 3$ 82/10 |
|  | 2/22 76/10 81/6 83/1 | 84/3 86/17 86/22 90/2 90/2 90/3 |
|  | 89/7 95/14 98/12 110/2 | 90/6 91/5 91/7 94/8 95/5 96/22 |
| ```George [1] 22/25 Gerald [1] 39/14 gets[6] 18/5 24/4 45/11 52/5``` |  | /22 114/9 |
|  | guide [1] 16/9 | 28/19129/5 |
| gets [6] 18/5 24/4 45/11 52/5 <br> 53/22 $111 / 5$ <br> getting [10] 5/1 11/17 14/20 16/15 | guilt [4] 47/7 52 | 129/21 |
|  | guilty [36] 6/20 15/11 15/24 28/7 | hearing [3] 34/3 43/15 |
| getting [10] 5/1 $11 / 17$ 14/20 16/15 17/23 19/12 35/10 48/12 53/19 86/4 | 30/9 31/18 42/17 46/17 46/20 | heart[3] 7/1 11/1 11/2 |
|  |  | heat [1] 38/20 |
| lgilding [1] $26 / 6$girl [2] $98 / 17113 / 2$ | 53/18 64/10 64/10 64/14 | Heaven [1] 20/13 |
|  | 64/14 65/7 65/8 69/20 107/16 | heavily [1] 26/1 |
| ```girl [2] 98/17 113/2 girlfriend [4] 17/14 28/25 29/6 29/13``` | /17 | heck [3] 13/2 74/6 109/1 |
|  | 20/14 120/18 120/22 121/1 121/5 | held [1] 117/14 |
| give [15] $12 / 112 / 1812 / 2113 / 8$$13 / 913 / 1219 / 1723 / 930 / 24$ | 21/9 121/13121/13 | help [4] 31/9 103/6 103/11 103/12 |
|  | gu | helpful [4] 13/12 15/22 16/9 46/5 |
| 13/9 13/12 19/17 23/9 30/24 36/19 52/20 53/8 53/25 54/4 125/6 | guns [1] 21/21 | helps [2] 104/1 104/2 |
|  | gunshot [3] 91/19 91/20 92/2 guy[10] 5/16 6/21 19/1 20/18 | Henry [1] 33/3 here's [1] 104/7 |
| $\underset{126 / 5}{\operatorname{given}[5]} \quad 16 / 1255 / 774 / 1196 / 21$ |  |  |
| 126/5 gives [1] 21/3 | 82/22 | hers [1] 21/9 |
| gives [1] 21/3 giving [1] $43 / 1$ glad [1] 128/16 | guys [9] | herself [3] 36/20 36/21 37/8 |
|  |  |  |
| glimpse [1] 19/1 | H | 126/4 |
|  |  |  |
| glowed [1] 97/15godGod [2] 85/5 113/11 | habit [1] 45/15 | Hi [1] 33/1 |
|  | hair[5] 42/21 50/13 83/19 93/18 | hid [1] 95/14 |
| God [2] 85/5 113/11goes [8] $25 / 2526 / 1233 / 639 / 7$$49 / 1377 / 895 / 24106 / 4$ | 99/23 | hidden [1] 21/16 |
|  | Halbach [52] 5/16 6/4 6/6 6/17 | hide [1] 21/24 |
| going [109] $5 / 95 / 135 / 176 / 26 / 9$$6 / 156 / 176 / 20 ~ 7 / 4 ~ 7 / 11 ~ 7 / 15 ~ 9 / 1 ~$ | 8/13 11/24 12/19 16/20 23/15 | high [4] 29/23 29/23 30/6 30/11 |
|  | 25/15 37/22 37/24 50/2 53/16 | Highly [1] 55/6 |
| 11/6 11/17 11/22 11/24 15/17 | 56/12 56/12 56/12 65/9 65/12 | Highway [1] 26/6 |
| 19/8 20/19 25/23 27/18 27/19 | 66/17 68/18 69/6 69/17 70/17 | himself [4] 17/13 36/1 43/8 76/12 |
|  | 71/16 71/19 71/25 71/25 72/5 | history [1] 57/9 |
| 32/21 $34 / 234 / 934 / 1034 / 1335 / 5$$35 / 835 / 1139 / 2143 / 745 / 20$ | 73/3 76/25 88/15 96/17 97/4 98/9 | hold [6] 67/6 68/18 68/25 69/1 |
|  | 98/21 99/13 102/17 102/23 104/3 | 91/10 112/22 |
| 45/23 48/19 50/18 52/8 52/20 | 104/4 105/6 105/9 105/10 | holding [1] 36/20 |
| 53/23 56/25 57/1 60/24 61/4 | 109/17 110/6 110/10 110/12 | holds [1] 36/2 |
| 63/18 63/19 63/20 63/21 65/16 | 117/19 119/1119/5 | home [9] 10/24 24/6 28/2 40/17 |
|  | Halbach's [12] 7/19 19/15 22/12 |  |
| ( $76 / 25$ 77/2 77/3 77/16 77/19 $78 / 1979 / 1979 / 2180 / 1680 / 21$ | 31/25 33/10 37/20 38/3 49/25 | homicide [4] 117/5 117/11120/ |
| 78/19 79/19 79/21 80/16 80/21 $82 / 584 / 1184 / 1384 / 1385 / 285 / 3$ | 88/25 97/1 98/7 109/21 | 120/19 |
|  | half [7] 25/19 34/16 34/19 |  |
| 85/8 86/4 87/2 95/8 95/13 95/14 95/15 95/20 96/10 98/17 99/11 | 73/25 105/20 105/21 | honest [8] 15/12 17/15 36/16 43/5 |
|  | Halloween [3] 24/19 29/13 44/7 | 48/1 61/870/5 115 |
| 103/14 103/15 104/17105/2 108/2$108 / 4109 / 10110 / 1811 / 1112 / 1$ | hallway [1] 123/17 | honestly [5] 10/3 15/18 |
|  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { ha } \\ & \mathrm{ha} \end{aligned}\right.$ | 50/24 |
| 116/4 118/19 118/20 118/24 | handcuffs [1] |  |
| 122/10 122/12 124/9 125/15 | handful [2] 16/25 97/11 | honor [5] 9/15 9/19 10/2 73/18 |
| 125/19 125/21 126/1 128/12 | handle [2] 56/19 67/20 | $79 / 21$ |
|  | handled [1] 59/25 | hood [2] 94/14 95/3 |


| H | inch [1] 83/15 | $101 / 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hope [4] 70/20 70/20 73/9 106/17 | inclined [1] 105/10 | invite [2] 29/22 30/6 |
| hopefully [1] 55/9 | includes [2] 37/23 104/14 | invited [1] 81/15 |
| hoping [2] 13/18 116/23 | including [1] 80/1 | involved [8] 47/8 65/14 69/16 |
| horrific [1] 116/17 | incompetent [2] 93/15 94/6 | 69/25 76/9 83/7 99/17 109/16 |
| hostile [1] 23/2 | inconsistency [1] 44/17 | involvement [1] 70/4 |
| hostility [1] 47/23 | inconsistent [3] 44/2 44/3 44/14 | irons [1] 123/25 |
| hot [2] 41/14 41/16 | inconvenient [6] 49/22 50/17 | irrefutable [1] 67/15 |
| hour [7] 25/19 34/16 34/19 36/4 | 50/20 51/5 51/7 51/21 | issue [7] 58/9 61/1 88/4 115/18 |
| 73/25 74/1 105/20 | incriminating [4] 22/8 23/17 23/19 | 116/18 125/1 126/13 |
| hours [5] 35/6 43/20 48/19 99/6 | 29/11 | issues [1] 10/1 |
| 105/21 | indicate [1] 58/14 | item [1] 85/13 |
| house [12] $6 / 1918 / 2118 / 22$ 19/24 | indicated [2] 53/21 122/16 | items [16] 39/21 85/12 85/19 |
| 21/16 22/24 23/3 37/2 37/22 | indications [1] 100/1 | 93/20 124/10 124/20 124/22 |
| 40/19 45/13 48/6 | indignance [1] 117/17 | 125/12 125/14 125/18 126/14 |
| however [4] 38/20 40/25 42/2 | indignant [1] 61/12 | 126/16 126/17 127/1 127/13 |
| 104/1 | indisputable [1] 17/17 | $127 / 14$ |
| human [16] 7/7 10/19 11/16 14/3 | individual [2] 3/19 108/24 | itself [5] 60/9 85/14 85/17 86/7 |
| 30/5 51/10 51/1851/1863/18 | infer [1] 97/18 | 89/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76 / 578 / 2178 / 2179 / 1179 / 24 \\ & 82 / 1197 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | inference [5] 96/8 96/8 97/2 97/2 $97 / 20$ | J |
| hundred [2] 67/ | inferences [1] 100/3 | Jacobs [3] 34/22 35/21 48/17 |
| hunt [1] 47/8 | inflicted [1] 92/3 | jail [2] 28/19 29/1 |
| hunting [1] 102/22 | information [16] 3/22 5/7 13/16 | James [1] 42/24 |
| I | 16/12 25/7 26/14 31/11 33/17 | Janda [5] 19/20 21/2 21/3 104/12 |
| I'II [1] 27/4 | 121/7 121/11 121/15 | Janda's [1] 21/4 |
| I'm [57] 5/1 5/1 6/16 18/17 21/5 | informed [2] 123/15 124/5 | Janet [1] 127/22 |
| 23/20 30/8 32/21 35/10 39/17 | injustice [1] 11/14 | Janine [2] 40/4 42/12 |
| 49/14 52/8 52/19 52/20 53/18 | innocence [3] 16/25 52/2 64/21 | January [3] 39/6 39/16 131/15 |
| 53/22 58/22 63/21 64/25 70/22 | innocent [25] 8/3 8/8 14/22 14/23 | January 30th [1] 39/16 |
| 73/4 75/5 75/7 78/14 78/19 79/21 | 15/2 15/4 17/7 17/19 17/21 19/14 | jeans [2] 81/25 82/1 |
| 80/21 82/5 85/2 85/3 85/8 89/9 | 20/18 21/10 26/25 29/15 30/15 | JEROME [3] 1/19 3/13 6/1 |
| 95/8 95/13 96/10 96/10 96/11 | 45/25 46/16 46/18 46/24 47/5 | Jerry [1] 6/1 |
| 96/12 97/3 97/17 101/24 111/3 | 48/15 49/18 64/9 107/6 114/3 | Jim [2] 115/14 116/24 |
| 112/21 116/3 116/23 117/5 117/16 | inside [3] 70/17 78/8 112/7 | job [9] 14/13 55/22 55/23 57/25 |
| 118/21 119/13 122/10 125/22 | instance [1] 6/3 | 57/25 58/2 80/6 87/18 87/19 |
| 126/2 126/9 128/15 128/16 129/13 | instances [1] 55/17 | Jodi [1] 29/1 |
| 129/17 | instead [5] 9/10 32/8 85/16 114/13 | JoEllen [2] 23/6 71/22 |
| ID [1] 41/7 | 114/17 | John [3] 23/12 25/12 26/20 |
| idea [2] 15/20 47/13 | instruct [1] 80/4 | Johnson [2] 17/11 21/22 |
| identification [1] 82/25 | instructed [3] 44/16 80/3 119/22 | jostling [1] 59/21 |
| identified [5] 5/21 9/13 101/2 | instruction [4] 16/4 65/23 109/4 | judge [27] 1/10 3/8 3/24 4/5 9/3 |
| 125/3 126/25 | 126/7 | 10/5 39/17 44/15 52/20 53/1 |
| identify [4] 76/5 104/9 104/10 | instructions [6] 2/8 10/6 16/7 | 54/12 65/22 66/10 66/11 66/13 |
| 124/16 | 53/25 54/5 119/16 | 75/15 80/10 86/6 92/11 92/19 |
| identifying [2] 40/10 122/12 | instrument [11] 40/14 40/18 40/21 | 92/23 119/18 124/16 125/16 |
| identity [2] 49/7 49/13 | 40/25 41/1741/19 41/20 41/22 | 126/13 128/7 129/24 |
| ignition [2] 22/18 84/2 | 42/1 42/7 42/12 | jumped [1] 88/18 |
| ignore [6] 67/23 67/23 108/17 | integrity [1] 39/11 | junk [2] 22/17 98/2 |
| 108/18 109/4 109/19 | intend [1] 128/10 | junkyard [1] 22/15 |
| ignore's [1] 50/10 | intentional [2] 120/15 120/19 | juries [2] 47/7 114/4 |
| ignoring [2] 18/1 82/20 | intently [1] 14/14 | jurisdictions [1] 56/18 |
| imagination [1] 66/20 | interested [1] 40/16 | juror [8] 2/10 4/23 54/24 54/24 |
| immediately [1] 50/4 | interesting [1] 68/6 | 70/16 122/5 122/20 122/25 |
| implausible [2] 45/12 111/9 | interestingly [1] 106/6 | jurors [17] 3/19 3/21 4/8 4/15 |
| important [38] 8/14 8/15 9/12 9/15 | interests [1] 56/13 | 9/20 10/17 10/18 58/11 80/4 |
| 12/15 16/2 16/14 16/16 17/4 | interfering [1] 42/7 | 92/18 118/3 120/1 121/24 122/13 |
| 27/17 33/25 45/21 45/23 46/2 | internally [1] 9/23 | 122/17 122/21 122/23 |
| 51/23 55/10 58/24 59/10 60/10 | interpose [2] 39/22 79/22 | jury[56] 1/4 3/1 3/16 4/4 4/9 4/11 |
| 65/2 67/9 74/24 75/11 75/11 77/7 | interpretations [1] 103/24 | 10/6 35/13 35/17 53/11 53/20 |
| 79/6 80/12 80/13 81/6 84/20 | interpreter [1] 33/7 | 54/6 54/10 55/1 64/12 69/19 |
| 88/22 93/3 103/25 107/5 107/9 | interrupt [1] 39/18 | 73/22 75/15 75/16 76/19 80/2 |
| 108/12 115/4 120/2 | intervention [1] 108/11 | 85/8 85/21 86/5 92/21 104/24 |
| importantly [12] 9/17 10/11 27/22 | interview [1] 26/14 | 109/24 111/6 115/12 118/12 |
| 59/5 61/19 72/22 76/11 81/20 | interviewed [1] 71/17 | 119/19 120/13 120/17 120/21 |
| 98/2 101/14 102/16 116/16 | invested [1] 47/9 | 120/25 121/4 121/8 121/21 122/1 |
| impression [1] 83/19 | investigated [1] 72/16 | 122/15 123/8 123/9 123/12 123/19 |
| imprint [1] 99/23 | investigating [2] 72/18 115/10 | 125/5 126/2 126/7 127/2 127/6 |
| improper [2] 56/20 117/23 | investigation [5] 34/13 57/8 58/21 | 127/15 128/10 128/17 128/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { improvements [1] 90/14 } \\ & \text { in [442] } \end{aligned}$ | 65/15 76/15 <br> investigator [4] 25/5 29/3 33/17 | 129/17 129/20 130/3 <br> justice [7] 8/16 8/17 8/17 8/19 |


|  | $82 / 2$ | $\text { 1] } 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iustice.... [3] 8/20 11/11 56/13 | later[15] 17/3 18/23 26/15 29/17 | likely [6] 32/10 34/9 34/10 67/20 |
| K | 29/20 30/2 34/3 34/19 35/6 35/20 | 81/12 $23 / 3$ |
| Katie [1] 70/16keep [5] $9 / 16$ 22/11 53/4 120/6$123 / 15$ |  |  |
|  | $\text { able [1] } 10$ | [5] 40/14 40/15 41/1841/20 |
| $123 / 15$ keeping [1] 28/4 |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{llll} \text { Ken } 11] & 3 / 9 \\ \text { KENNETH [2] } & 1 / 11 & 2 / 7 \end{array}\right.$ | 15/931/17 42/16 43/12 57/24 | 2/9 |
|  | 57/25 62/13 65/21 68/8 69/8 | line [8] 5/11 9/19 28/3 28/20 |
| kept [1] 44/23 | 87/13 107/1 108/23 108/25 115/7 | 28/24 37/18 94/1 115/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { key [55] } 22 / 1 & 22 / 5 & 22 / 11 & 22 / 11 \\ 22 / 1422 / 16 & 50 / 23 & 51 / 3 & 58 / 16\end{array}$ | 115/22 119/22 | Lisa [6] 23/12 26/12 26/20 101/19 |
|  | lawsuit [8] 17/ | 101/23 103/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59 / 2560 / 1760 / 2260 / 2561 / 1 \\ & 61 / 263 / 463 / 663 / 763 / 1363 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | 47/13 49/4 56/22 69/23 107/3 | listen [3] 14/10 |
|  | lawsuits [1] 56/17 | listened [3] 11/3 29/3 29/5 |
| 63/25 64/5 64/5 64/11 64/12 <br> 64/16 64/19 64/22 65/10 66/19 | lawyer [6] 12/4 52/4 | listening [2] 31/21 117/19 |
|  | 102/4 115/23 | lit [1] 97/15 |
| 64/16 64/19 64/22 65/10 66/19 66/23 66/24 67/5 67/10 67/12 | lawyer's [1] 15/20 | little[19] 5/4 13/22 25/6 38/16 |
| 67/12 67/14 67/17 67/20 67/21 | lawyers [3] 9/4 17/24 | 38/23 38/24 44/21 48/9 54/18 |
| 68/1 68/3 68/4 68/5 68/6 68/8 68/12 68/18 68/25 70/11 70/12 70/12 111/16 112/10 113/23 | lay [2] 67/1 103/17 | 64/20 64/24 71/23 78/15 79/17 |
|  | layer [4] 69/12 69/13 69/15 80/15 | 95/16 95/22 106/7 116/22 129/13 |
|  | laying [2] 98/9 99/20 | live [2] 27/4 52/1 |
| keys [4] 22/17 51/1 51/1 114/14 kidding [2] 29/9 85/25 | lead [2] 55/23 107/15 | livelihood [1] 115/20 |
|  | leads [2] 37/1 68/6 | lives [2] 12/25 16/17 |
| kids [4] 24/12 29/24 30/7 30/12 | leap [1] 70/9 | living [5] 11/20 17/10 |
|  | least [26] 14/1 | 117/10 117/22 |
|  | 51/11 69/24 70/13 70/21 | load [1] 105/22 |
| killed [21] 6/21 7/10 50/3 50/16 66/17 68/19 68/25 69/6 70/6 | 72/6 76/18 81/23 82/21 83/6 | loaded [3] 105/13 |
|  | 84/24 85/18 95/12 96/15 98/1 | lob [1] 63 |
| 71/24 77/21 93/1 93/12 96/14 <br> 97/4 97/4 98/9 99/21 106/1 110/1 | 98/18 98/19 100/9 100/20 105/20 | location[21] 72/19 80/1880/19 |
|  | 107/18 119/1 | 80/24 80/25 81/11 81/13 81/18 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 110/12 } \\ \text { killer [2] } & 107 / 2110 / 11\end{array}$ | leave [10] 22/16 | 81/22 82/3 82/7 82/13 83/20 |
| killer [2] 107/2 110/11 | 83/4 104/4 106/5 106/7 106/14 | 83/22 84/4 101/16 102/12 104/19 |
|  | 123/14 | 105/11 108/8 |
| kind [30] 4/23 4/24 6/6 36/1 37/1 <br> 51/4 60/14 63/5 63/9 64/1 66/22 | leaves [2] 19/18 | loci [1] 12/ |
|  | leaving [1] 25/12 | locked [3] 68/9 87/11 88/9 |
| 66/25 67/6 68/15 71/19 73/1 | LeBeau [6] 42/14 89/1 | $\log$ [1] $74 / 25$ |
| 74/15 74/25 77/12 82/11 83/9 | 90/17 114/10 114/23 | logical [2] 72/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 84 / 1588 / 1188 / 1994 / 2195 / 11 \\ & 99 / 21100 / 21103 / 17104 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | left [13] 21/22 26/5 59/17 59/18 | Logs [1] 94 |
|  | 59/18 59/19 71/19 71/25 81/24 | long [9] 9/4 23 |
| kinds [11] 37/10 57/18 73/12$73 / 1285 / 1994 / 2094 / 20103 / 1$ | 83/20 91/21 97/13 98/10 | 63/23 81/9 81/10 |
|  | $\operatorname{leg}$ [1] 123/25 | longer [1] 57/18 |
| 114/17 115/7 115/9 | legal [1] 119/1 | looked [4] 81/5 95/18 95/19 98/3 |
| kitchen [1] 28/2knocking [1] 77/16 | legally [1] 121/22 | looking [11] 14/25 28/13 37/5 |
|  | lend [1] $60 / 11$ | 49/21 67/2 72/25 72/25 95/15 |
| knocking [1] 77/16 <br> knowing [2] 51/10 51/14 | lengthy [1] 48/6 | 99/4 107/23 126/2 |
| knowledge [2] 68/23 131/14 known [2] 18/12 34/21 | Lenk [23] 18/19 42/18 42/24 43/1 | looks [4] 26/3 26/21 86/15 102/20 |
|  | 45/10 50/22 58/15 60/21 61/6 | lost [6] 6/25 7/3 7/5 7/6 7/11 7/25 |
| knows [10] 20/13 23/4 26/1727/13 27/1927/20 45/22 77/4 | 61/6 62/9 62/21 63/4 63/8 69/22 | lot [13] 11/9 17/17 33/20 47/13 |
|  | 6/24 110/21 111/13 113/6 114/16 | 48/21 57/18 57/18 72/17 72/18 |
| 81/4 94/4 | 115/5 115/14 116/24 | 94/8 96/1 101/23 108/7 |
|  | Les [2] 79/4 79/7 | lots [4] $99 / 5$ 99/5 $118 / 23118 / 23$ |
|  | less [2] 28/9 41/2 | loud [4] 7/23 12/3 12/7 22/16 |
| 92/22 125/9 126/1 | let's [19] 5/4 5/8 17/7 17/8 31/23 | love [3] 12/4 12/4 12/4 |
| Kucharski [3] 62/25 63/1 63/10 | 32/22 35/1/4 36/25 62/19 64/4 | loved [1] 16/21 |
|  | 64/7 66/1 66/20 71/10 76/16 | lower [1] 41/19 |
| lab [8] $36 / 1942 / 2287 / 1289 / 3$ <br> $89 / 1594 / 6 ~ 94 / 997 / 8$ <br> laboratory [1] $39 / 15$ <br> lack [2] $61 / 1961 / 21$ <br> ladies [2] $82 / 13109 / 9$ <br> lady [1] $71 / 23$ <br> land [3] $28 / 328 / 1928 / 24$ <br> language [1] $16 / 3$ <br> lanyard [1] $70 / 14$ <br> large [2] $9 / 2597 / 15$ <br> largest [3] $57 / 857 / 957 / 10$ <br> last [14] $5 / 79 / 537 / 2152 / 652 / 11$ <br> $67 / 1968 / 1768 / 2481 / 1790 / 1$ <br> $90 / 3110 / 5113 / 10113 / 15$ <br> latch [2] $94 / 1495 / 3$ | /15 92/17/127/21 | [1] 25/20 |
|  | $\mathrm{Le}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 20 |
|  | license [9] 21/25 31/25 32/7 32/10 | lured [1] 81/ |
|  | 33/8 33/10 33/15 75/2 78/4 | luring [1] 21 |
|  | lie [3] 20/23 43/1 | lying [2] 105/6 105/8 |
|  |  | Lynn [1] 3 |
|  | 50/22 60/21 61/6 62/9 63/4 63/8 | M |
|  | [10] 6/24 |  |
|  | 1416/16 |  |
|  |  | 退 |
|  |  |  |
|  | light [1] 97/24 | -13126/18 |

mid [3] 103/21 103/22 103/23
mid-size [1] 103/23
mid-sized [2] 103/21 $103 / 22$
middle [1] 66/15
might [18] 5/5 9/8 $15 / 1$ 15/2 15/6
15/21 17/7 29/15 46/1 55/2 60/20
76/12 76/12 76/13 87/15 114/16
116/21 129/16
mill [1] 94/1
mind [4] 26/16 44/4 44/5 120/6
minds [1] $7 / 2$
Mine's [1] 13/22
minute [7] 29/12 53/23 69/11 90/1 90/3 91/1 99/12
minutes [11] 29/2 29/5 35/8 35/12
35/20 35/20 43/19 59/4 92/12
92/15 92/17
misconduct [4] 115/16 115/24
115/24 116/19
misrepresentation [1] 103/10
misrepresentations [1] 58/12
missed [1] 77/19
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { missing [7] } & 18 / 6 & 18 / 8 & 18 / 13 & 23 / 5\end{array}$
33/10 76/25 111/24
misspoke [1] 40/5
mistake [2] 14/3 89/11
mitochondrial [1] 79/11
mixed [1] 81/24
model [1] 75/3
modest [1] 17/11
mom [1] 17/25
mom's [2] 6/19 6/25
moment [5] 34/6 78/2 78/3 83/23
124/16
Monday [2] 23/10 26/16
money [3] 17/17 17/23 47/14
morning[11] $3 / 53 / 83 / 124 / 11$ 4/14 4/15 4/22 18/18 34/15 36/4 36/14
mortem [1] 91/23
most [16] 16/2 16/13 16/16 46/22
51/25 54/15 55/15 58/10 67/20
72/22 81/6 81/12 92/8 95/22 97/9 116/15
mostly [1] 91/15
mother [1] 44/25
motion [3] 99/17 124/6 125/20
motions [2] 66/25 67/1
move [2] 31/15 34/4
moved [13] 21/20 51/15 51/24
75/25 76/1 76/3 76/3 76/4 78/17
78/18 80/23 80/25 123/21
moves [1] 78/2
moving [1] 28/14
Mr [15] 60/19 66/22 71/9 71/16 73/19 78/8 88/12 89/10 95/21 100/14 102/3 103/7 116/13 116/21 118/17
Mr. [195]
Mr. Avery [43] 56/14 56/16 56/25 57/4 64/14 64/17 69/19 70/8 71/13 72/3 72/7 72/21 72/24 76/3 $77 / 1177 / 1477 / 1777 / 2178 / 1$ 78/9 78/1 8 82/4 82/8 93/19 95/5
95/6 96/3 96/21 97/18 98/16 99/2 99/15 99/21 101/5 101/6 101/7 107/15 108/4 109/15 111/12 113/15 116/17118/10
Mr. Avery's [17] 67/4 67/10 67/14 67/15 69/22 80/18 86/18 86/19 93/6 95/2 96/23 102/13 106/11 107/7 108/8 109/2 109/14
Mr. Beach [1] 19/5

Mr. Buting [39] 36/23 39/19 40/1
40/4 40/5 55/14 66/19 67/22 69/3
$70 / 2571 / 582 / 1782 / 2083 / 11$
83/24 84/5 84/1 8 85/4 85/7 86/1 86/13 86/21 87/8 87/22 88/1 88/20 89/12 94/13 100/18 101/18 104/8 104/9 104/22 105/11 106/11 106/15 117/3 117/20 128/16
Mr. Buting's [4] 86/11 96/13 104/18 106/4
Mr. Colborn [10] 42/18 59/6 62/22 73/1 5 74/4 74/4 74/16 74/19 75/20 111/14
Mr. Ertl [2] 97/16 97/24
Mr. Fabian [1] 98/25
Mr. Fassbender [1] 72/12
Mr. Gahn [6] 88/2 88/22 89/17
102/9 102/11 103/2
Mr. Kratz [9] 3/23 13/12 32/14
34/6 54/11 80/9 92/22 125/9 126/1
Mr. Kucharski [2] 62/25 63/10
Mr. Lenk[5] 42/18 58/15 62/21 111/13113/6
Mr. Pevytoe [1] 101/14
Mr. Remiker [1] 78/7
Mr. Riddle [3] 82/21 82/22 83/1
Mr. Schmitz [2] 71/15 71/20
Mr. Stahlke [4] 94/15 94/16 94/18 94/25
Mr. Stahlke's [1] 95/2
Mr. Strang [33] 3/25 4/12 35/10 35/18 55/13 56/2 56/20 57/19 61/20 61/24 62/18 64/2 67/21 68/1 6 73/7 73/13 73/25 74/3 74/6 74/10 75/6 75/13 75/18 79/15 83/24 89/11 101/20 101/21 102/4 110/17 110/19115/17118/16
Mr. Strang's [4] 56/23 64/7 65/5 65/6
Mr. Tyson [1] 87/1
Mr. Wiegert [4] 71/8 74/15 90/4 90/4
Mr. Wiegert's [1] 75/1
Mrs [1] 93/9
Mrs. [4] 16/20 16/23 17/2 72/1
Mrs. Avery [2] 16/23 17/2
Mrs. Halbach [1] 16/20
Mrs. Zipperer [1] 72/1
Ms [21] 67/18 71/16 77/2 87/24 88/8 88/14 88/23 89/9 89/16 $90 / 1090 / 21$ 93/14 94/8 103/10 104/3 104/4 105/19 107/24 116/22 123/1 123/9
Mullen [1] 39/15
murder [10] 5/14 5/24 6/10 6/13
11/22 11/22 21/12 65/9 108/5 115/25
murdered [5] 5/16 6/4 6/5 113/2 113/4
murderer [1] 11/23
murdering [1] 53/15
murders [1] 9/9
must [6] 49/19 121/14 121/17
121/18 121/22 121/24
mutilate [1] 100/6
mutilated [3] 70/6 71/24 105/12 mutilating [3] 53/15 120/22 121/2 mutilation [1] 109/16
N
name[5] 13/14 16/22 79/4 116/11 122/13
$N$
NANCY [2] 2/11 123/1
narrow [1] 73/2
narrows [1] 106/24
natural [2] 6/13 30/22
necessarily [5] 8/20 55/4 55/4
107/15 118/6
necessary [1] 12/15
neck [1] 70/15
need [19] 20/22 20/22 46/13 48/14
60/24 83/17 85/23 103/15 104/6
112/5 112/8 112/9 112/15 112/21
116/11 117/14 117/15 124/2
126/17
needed [2] 48/4 101/6
needing [1] 33/7
needs [1] 100/5
negative [2] 36/12 57/22
neglected [1] 58/19
neither [1] 3/21
nephew [2] 21/18 30/11
never [17] 6/25 8/2 8/3 29/25 30/2 45/13 45/13 51/16 54/23 54/25
59/7 64/4 71/7 102/7 104/4
109/22 109/22
new [1] 25/25
newer [1] 95/22
next [13] 18/18 22/2 22/4 35/1
58/23 60/8 71/5 73/16 86/11
90/25 99/6 105/6 111/19
nice [4] 19/1 27/5 71/23 91/13
night [7] 18/7 29/13 29/13 44/13
76/12 77/17 87/1
nine [1] 104/23
No. [1] 5/1
No. 7 [1] 5/1
nobody[7] 8/19 49/20 107/12
107/13 107/13 112/16 113/25
nods [1] 5/2
none [3] 59/25 60/14 82/24
Norm [1] 3/11
NORMAN [1] 1/15
northeastern [1] 39/11
nose [1] 41/17
note [1] 59/10
notes [1] 131/9
nothing [10] 25/20 36/12 65/17
74/21 74/21 75/3 89/21 89/24
129/15 129/15
noticed [2] 54/19 60/4
notices [1] 26/1
notified [1] 124/8
notify [1] 129/19
November [29] 7/5 7/25 18/8
18/24 19/25 21/15 22/22 22/23
24/20 25/3 31/24 32/1 32/2 32/3
$32 / 1132 / 1332 / 1533 / 1633 / 16$
34/8 34/16 37/10 43/21 48/7
68/10 75/11 76/22 87/7 111/22
November 1 [1] 7/5
November 2nd [2] 24/20 25/3
November 3 [5] 18/8 31/24 32/1

## 32/3 33/16

November 4 [6] 18/24 22/23 32/11 32/13 32/15 33/16
November 5 [3] 19/25 34/8 34/16 nowadays [1] 83/6
number [16] 4/25 19/15 19/18 19/22 20/4 20/11 21/4 40/19 55/21 57/13 57/14 71/22 82/5 82/6 89/18 90/19
numbers [3] 12/8 123/24 125/7
oath [12] 9/16 9/19 9/21 10/2
43/16 43/19 43/23 43/25 44/2
44/15 44/20 62/13
obey [2] $9 / 20$ 10/2
object [3] 67/20 83/3 128/11
objected [1] 73/19
objection [7] 39/22 68/21 73/17
75/13 79/22 125/3 126/12
objective [2] 36/25 50/19
obligated [1] 83/11
obscured [2] 107/21 108/14
observant [1] 60/3
observed [1] 45/21
obvious [3] 80/14 84/22 86/3
obviously [4] 19/16 20/12 33/24 63/13
occasions [1] 55/21
occipital [1] 91/22
October [11] 6/24 17/8 21/14
28/15 29/16 44/12 82/8 82/9
102/1 102/6 102/8
October 31 [3] 6/24 28/15 29/16
October 31st [1] 82/8
odor [1] 23/21
off [19] 21/17 24/4 24/11 $24 / 18$
32/12 32/16 32/20 33/6 34/4
38/21 42/24 43/19 54/24 68/16
69/13 80/15 88/11 105/16 106/13
offenses [1] 121/14
Office [8] 43/9 110/21 111/21
112/8 112/18 113/19114/15
123/15
officer [6] 43/12 46/23 48/13
106/23 106/25 123/7
officer's [1] 78/14
officers [15] 33/21 34/17 46/4
46/14 47/8 63/12 65/3 65/13
65/14 65/18 66/21 68/10 76/15
115/7115/16
official [5] 1/25 115/16 116/18
131/4 131/19
oh [3] 37/6 60/21 95/20
oils [1] $83 / 8$
old [10] 30/25 42/10 70/6 71/23
72/14 83/19 107/6 113/2 113/9 117/11
once [6] 43/17 58/1 83/14 98/10 98/11 122/14
ones [7] 15/10 26/9 76/4 106/6 106/7 106/7 106/8
only [21] $4 / 198 / 610 / 841 / 14$
43/25 49/10 49/24 64/17 68/7
68/14 72/5 90/22 91/11 91/25
102/18 106/4 108/10 112/25
114/18 126/4 126/13
onto [3] $83 / 388 / 1889 / 4$
open [4] 18/16 22/23 42/5 99/19
opened [4] 60/16 94/16 94/25 95/1
opening[11] 11/7 12/22 12/23
13/9 34/1451/951/16 56/3 56/24 59/12 110/17
operate [1] 4/18
opinion [3] 67/23 92/7 94/7
opportunity [1] 111/6
opposed [1] 62/12
opposite [2] 47/5 47/6
order [4] 69/19 104/24 121/24
124/10
ordinarily [1] 32/6
ordinary [1] 29/12
originally [1] 101/20
other [66] $7 / 97 / 148 / 713 / 617 / 24$
22/17 22/25 25/2 32/18 33/5
$33 / 25$ 36/6 37/11 40/6 41/12
43/17 46/21 48/21 51/1 51/1 51/14 56/18 58/24 59/4 64/16 65/11 65/13 65/13 65/25 66/9 68/18 68/24 69/3 70/18 71/7 71/9
$71 / 1171 / 1171 / 13$ 73/1 73/5
80/21 80/24 89/2 89/21 92/5 92/8
97/10 98/2 101/13 103/11 103/17
110/2 121/19 122/4 122/21 122/23
125/1 127/6 127/9 128/7 128/9
128/10 128/18 129/4 129/18
others [3] $42 / 1644 / 367 / 19$
otherwise [3] 38/11 43/3 70/5
ought [5] 9/2 38/9 38/9 38/10
124/3
our [6] 57/3 58/2 95/22 95/23
118/5 127/18
outcome [1] 47/9
outside [4] $4 / 311 / 884 / 987 / 5$
over [18] 5/7 21/16 29/22 30/7
30/12 33/4 38/16 38/16 44/18
52/10 59/18 59/19 59/20 63/9
76/6 84/23 101/12 122/2
overlook [4] 50/20 50/21 50/25
51/5
overlooking [1] 51/7
oversell [1] 24/16
overselling [5] 24/24 26/2 26/7 31/3 42/15
owed [2] 116/10 116/22
own [14] 9/18 16/23 18/15 24/7
33/23 49/25 50/2 51/14 68/22
80/8 99/14 102/24 110/3 117/14 owned [1] 21/2
P
p.m[7] 27/9 29/4 72/1 87/4 87/5

109/20 109/21
PAGE [1] 2/2
palm [3] 23/25 85/13 85/13
Pam [1] 112/2
Pap [2] 88/14 89/2
paper [1] 20/10
parameters [1] 10/23
paraphrasing [2] 101/25 117/5
Pardon [1] 125/17
parents [1] 100/25
parietal [1] 91/21
parked [2] 96/2 102/14
parking [2] 95/25 108/7
part [12] 10/4 16/5 54/13 54/14
54/17 58/17 64/5 79/19 89/7 91/2 111/17126/19
particular [21] 28/1 58/21 60/1
60/6 60/17 62/24 63/22 67/14 $73 / 373 / 1474 / 2076 / 981 / 19$ $83 / 1684 / 1484 / 2486 / 1487 / 25$ 95/1 109/15 112/7
particularly [1] 71/9
parties [12] 3/6 4/3 79/6 123/3
124/9 126/23 127/13 128/14
128/18 128/19 129/19 129/20
parts [1] 12/8
party [5] 3/21 107/11 117/6 117/7 117/21
passion [5] 9/7 9/11 52/9 52/24 120/4
past [1] 12/19
pathetic [1] 8/12
Patrick [1] 1/9
patrol [1] 33/20

| P | pilot [2] 23/25 85/13 $\text { pimple [1] } 62 / 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pouting[1] 41/6 } \\ & \text { power [5] 10/10 10/12 20/9 61/25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pause [2] 16/1 16/13 | pit [6] 30/4 30/5 76/5 80/18 81/12 | 1/25 |
| pay [1] 111/25 | 81/12 | powerful [1] 83/5 |
| PDA [2] 99/8 109/12 | pitch [1] 43/23 | PowerPoint [1] 85/6 |
| peace [2] 8/20 99/2 | pitiful [1] 8/1 | PowerPoints [1] 85/5 |
| peach [1] 38/23 | place [11] 24/12 27/25 | practical [3] 13/17 16/9 127/9 |
| peak [1] 51/8 | 51/17 66/3 81/17 82/2 101/8 | predicted [1] 115/17 |
| Pearce [1] 51/2 | 105/25 117/24 117/25 | prefer [1] 64/3 |
| pen [1] 84/3 | placed [2] 61/24 83/2 | preferred [1] 63/13 |
| people [38] $7 / 27 / 87 / 15$ 7/16 8/6 | places [7] 8/12 13/5 19/23 20/6 | prejudice [4] 9/7 9/11 52/24 120/4 |
| 9/25 12/23 13/2 13/20 13/21 | 99/13 106/17 112/20 | premature [1] 126/21 |
| 14/10 14/15 15/9 15/12 16/24 | PLAINTIFF [1] 1/4 | prepared [3] 69/18 71/4 131/8 |
| 16/25 19/9 20/1 21/6 31/6 31/12 | planet [1] 28/1 | presence [5] 4/4 40/11 40/21 |
| 37/11 47/25 48/7 48/21 49/14 | plant [16] 46/4 46/8 46/15 46/21 | 40/24 41/14 |
| 67/1 67/1 71/16 72/18 72/25 | 47/16 47/18 48/14 61/17 64/8 | present [14] 3/1 3/6 3/13 4/9 |
| 94/24 95/15 106/24 114/3 114/14 | 67/10 107/6 108/2 111/25 112/19 | 35/13 35/17 54/6 54/10 58/2 |
| 114/15 117/18 | 112/24 114/21 | 85/11 91/3 91/19 92/21 123/12 |
| percent [2] 13/24 67/16 | planted [10] 61/1 61/2 63/7 65/10 | presented [5] 36/1 47/21 61/22 |
| performed [1] 119/20 | 68/1 68/5 107/17 107/19 107/19 | $62 / 1784 / 24$ |
| perhaps [8] 58/10 59/12 67/19 | 108/7 | preside [2] 122/2 122/8 |
| 82/20 94/14 94/14 100/10 117/4 | planting [18] 32/20 47/3 47/22 | press [2] 95/23 96/5 |
| peri [1] 91/23 | 60/25 62/11 67/11 67/12 68/3 | pressure [1] 9/23 |
| peri-mortem [1] 91/23 | 68/3 108/23 108/24 111/2 111/12 | presumably [1] 38/4 |
| permission [1] 128/17 | 113/18 113/21 114/5 114/5 115/25 | presume [1] 8/8 |
| person [38] 1/22 5/19 5/20 6/21 | plastic[7] 23/8 23/16 23/18 26/25 | presumed [1] 8/3 |
| 15/2 29/15 30/21 33/11 45/25 | 27/1 27/3 38/21 | presumption [1] 8/4 |
| 46/24 51/20 64/9 64/10 65/7 | plate [3] 33/10 74/20 75/3 | retty[9] 17/11 17/22 24/9 24/23 |
| 67/19 68/17 68/19 68/24 68/25 | plates[2] 22/1 78/4 | 25/10 34/12 35/4 35/7 98/4 |
| 72/3 72/5 72/13 79/4 83/16 91/25 | plausibility [1] 106/18 | previously [2] 22/13 122/15 |
| 92/1 94/1 94/2 97/17 102/17 | plausible [4] 60/23 67/8 106/15 | primarily [1] 15/8 |
| 102/20 104/9 104/15 104/17 | 111/7 | primary [7] 80/11 80/17 80/19 |
| 113/15 118/11119/11 122/7 | play [5] 19/9 32/21 73/14 73/19 | 81/11 82/7 82/13 92/6 |
| person's [2] 12/9 122/3 | 73/21 | prints [1] 82/23 |
| personal [1] 8/22 | played [5] 29/10 | rior [1] 90/15 |
| personally [2] 55/13 55/14 | $73 / 1373 / 23$ | prison [3] 17/12 17/20 17/21 |
| personnel [2] 87/13 87/13 | please [4] 53/8 68/2 77/10 109/19 | privacy [1] 101/6 |
| Pevytoe [1] 101/14 | plus [1] 115/22 | probable [1] 26/21 |
| pews [3] 12/24 12/25 13/6 | point [17] 4/20 6/6 18/3 18/13 | probably [9] 7/23 13/25 32/1 32/2 |
| Ph.D [3] 40/7 89/13 89/14 | 18/20 19/7 26/2 29/19 70/13 | 32/10 67/3 71/24 98/17 127/22 |
| phone [44] 12/9 12/14 19/15 19/18 | 83/23 87/19 88/2 88/23 109/9 | oblem [2] 24/2 128/1 |
| 19/22 20/4 20/8 20/11 23/25 | 118/11 122/10 122/18 | problematic [1] 58/10 |
| 27/10 27/10 27/11 27/14 27/14 | pointed [3] 60/2 93/16 119/11 | problems [1] 42/9 |
| 27/24 27/24 28/5 28/10 28/10 | pointing [3] 71/12 71/14 72/13 | procedure [2] 89/19 89/19 |
| 28/13 28/18 28/21 28/24 28/25 | points [7] 5/20 17/18 17/22 64/17 | procedures [1] 12/6 |
| 32/8 32/9 35/22 37/7 40/20 40/22 | 78/16 110/16 114/4 | proceed [1] 80/9 |
| 40/24 41/6 70/2 70/2 73/7 74/14 | police [32] $6 / 7$ 6/8 18/1119/25 | proceedings [3] 1/23 3/18 131/13 |
| 74/17 74/17 99/8 109/12 109/22 | 20/2 23/3 26/11 29/5 31/16 34/16 | process [8] 14/13 29/8 66/14 |
| 109/23 109/23 117/8 | 39/9 44/6 44/12 44/23 46/4 46/14 | 66/14 88/24 92/4 94/24 113/20 |
| photo [3] 18/6 71/19 125/1 | 46/23 47/8 48/13 65/13 65/18 | processed [1] 97/17 |
| photograph [1] 78/6 | 71/6 76/15 78/7 78/9 84/1 100/9 | professionals [2] 15/7 94/23 |
| photographer [6] 20/20 24/21 25/3 | 106/23 106/25 115/8 115/16 | promise [1] 9/16 |
| 25/8 70/6 $113 / 9$ | 116/18 | promised [1] 110/18 |
| photographs [7] 85/ | policing [1] 39/1 | pronoun [1] 36/13 |
| 123/19 123/22 124/3 124/22 | pond [1] 21/19 | proof [1] 57/4 |
| 128/11 | pooh [1] 47/12 | propane [2] 14/12 103/19 |
| photos [15] 48/8 48/9 58/22 85/2 | pooh-poohs [1] 47/12 | proper [1] 79/24 |
| 125/2 125/4 125/5 125/7 126/25 | poohs [1] 47/12 | properly [1] 61/21 |
| 127/3 127/14 128/18 128/21 | poor [1] 98/17 | property [16] 18/7 18/9 20/2 20/20 |
| 129/14 129/18 | posing [1] 19/7 | 34/17 45/14 48/20 72/24 76/22 |
| physical [7] 60/19 62/1 93/20 | position [1] 103/ | 81/16 81/19 82/12 104/5 105/16 |
| 96/16 118/8 126/16 126/25 | positive [2] 67/16 89/7 | 106/13 107/7 |
| pick [4] 16/7 31/2 53/11 53/11 | possession [3] 113/14 121/5 | proposed [1] 124/11 |
| picture [15] 20/24 25/4 25/9 58/25 | 121/10 | prosecution [10] 5/23 52/5 57/1 |
| 59/3 60/7 60/9 62/19 64/22 85/14 | possessions [1] 22/12 | 58/1 63/12 76/2 91/16 100/15 |
| 85/15 86/1 86/2 86/7 102/18 | possible [13] 14/20 25/2 25/4 25/5 | 100/17115/19 |
| pictures [6] 13/12 20/14 24/21 | 39/9 78/2 78/3 78/21 78/21 79/18 | prosecutor [8] 1/11 1/13 1/15 |
| 28/22 85/16 124/1 | 79/24 96/7 101/16 | 55/23 87/18 116/3117/16118/22 |
| pie [9] 41/15 41/16 41/21 41/23 | poster [2] 18/25 18/25 | prosecutors [4] 3/11 15/8 49/15 |
| 42/4 42/5 42/8 42/10 42/11 | postpone [1] 127/4 | 118/23 |
| piece [5] 33/25 59/14 64/20 84/19 | potentially [4] 23/16 23/18 48/13 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93 / 18 \\ & \text { pieces [1] } 20 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 / 9 \\ & \text { pouring [2] } 23 / 2387 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { protocol [9] } 37 / 1737 / 1837 / 23 \\ & 38 / 438 / 640 / 941 / 1190 / 1190 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |



| R | searchers [2] 95/18 96/4 | shorthand [1] 131/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| root [1] 39/9 | seated [4] 4/10 35/14 54/7 123/13 | hot [6] 20/9 50/2 58/23 98/10 |
| rotted [1] 17/20 | second [8] 6/15 15/6 31/15 51/17 | 98/12 98/17 |
| rough [1] 116/22 | 85/5 120/17 120/23 121/2 | should [26] 14/5 39/2 59/2 61/15 |
| roughly [1] 17/8 | seconds [2] 78/19 82/19 | 66/3 66/24 67/3 78/10 78/11 |
| route [1] 24/11 | secret [1] 112/17 | 82/14 84/16 84/16 91/9 92/11 |
| RPR [2] 1/24 131/19 | secreted [2] 105/16 113/24 | 98/12 100/4 105/2 107/13 107/13 |
| bber [1] 23/22 | section [1] 114/23 | 110/15 115/8116/19 118/3 119/23 |
| ubbing [2] 66/22 67/5 | security [1] 68/12 | 123/14 127/25 |
| ule [1] 124/2 | seeing [7] 19/10 22/22 24/20 | shouldn't [8] 33/22 65/9 65/11 |
| rules [3] 4/18 12/6 119/22 | $31 / 22$ 34/3 103/20 $113 / 25$ | 65/12 81/9 81/10 82/15 93/2 |
| ruling [1] 125/24 | seek [1] $13 / 5$ | shoved [1] 83/21 |
| rummaging [1] 94/19 | seem [2] 30/8 57/1 | show [6] 28/9 49/1 87/20 91/1 |
| run [2] 21/17 33/2 | seems [2] 36/15 80/14 | 111/1 127/23 |
| S | seen [10] 62/6 68/11 72/6 81/1 | showed [3] 36/23 44/11 86/1 |
|  | 85/15 113/10 113/15 114/16118/3 | shower [1] 41/4 |
| safety [1] 78/ | 129/5 | showing [2] 77/25 79/16 |
| said [25] 11/6 52/22 60/13 61/16 | sees [7] 23/17 25/12 25/22 27/2 | shown [4] 44/1 44/4 46/11 84/8 |
| 73/17 73/18 73/20 74/3 74/18 | 41/7 72/4 112/16 | shows [1] 127/18 |
| 74/20 75/6 80/23 82/17 86/15 | select [1] 122/1 | shut [1] 122/11 |
| 102/5 102/7 102/10 103/2 103/11 | selected [4] 90/8 120/1 122/8 | sic [3] 54/24 54/24 96/6 |
| 110/25 114/24 116/9 116/21 117/6 | 122/18 | side [6] 17/18 80/21 84/11 98/6 |
| 131/13 | self [1] 47/23 | 98/10 115/19 |
| sake [1] 64/1 | self-righteousness [1] 47/23 | sight [1] 17/12 |
| sale [6] 20/13 20/22 93/8 93/10 | selfishness [1] 76/8 | sign [1] 26/5 |
| 96/20 102/15 | sell [5] $21 / 8$ 70/25 75/24 87/8 | signal [2] 35/11 122/14 |
| Salisbury [1] 38/ | 104/25 | signed [2] 42/20 122/7 |
| Salvage [1] 32/18 | selling [2] 31 | significant [5] 62/22 62/23 63/24 |
| Sam [1] 33/2 | semblance [1] 8/17 | $63 / 2590 / 14$ |
| same [19] 13/25 18/18 24/10 | send [6] 56/24 128/10 128/1 | signing [1] 43/1 |
| 24/11 24/12 24/12 30/8 39/20 | 129/1 129/9 129/15 | signs [1] 42/24 |
| 43/24 44/10 45/22 49/13 82/2 | sending [2] 56/24 129/14 | silly [1] 20/15 |
| 87/24 93/6 93/7 93/9 93/10 | sense [38] $5 / 178 / 21 \quad 13 / 4$ 25/23 | similar [2] 26/4 70/15 |
| 103/17 | 25/24 34/11 39/2 48/18 49/6 49/7 | simple [2] 48/25 49/3 |
| sample [6] 38/2 42/21 86/16 86/23 | 51/2 52/6 52/19 52/19 52/21 | simply [8] 11/19 38/12 39/22 |
| 86/24 88/5 | 59/13 66/24 68/24 70/20 72/17 | 42/25 65/19 75/1 96/12 127/3 |
| samples [7] 37/12 37/13 88/9 | 80/13 80/13 81/8 82/1 84/17 92/2 | since [8] 7/9 7/24 31/10 31/23 |
| 89/22 90/20 90/23 91/4 | 98/4 108/1 108/13 109/6 111/11 | 49/17 49/17 93/1 123/20 |
| Saturday [2] 26/13 117/8 | 113/16 113/17114/6 116/9 118/10 | sinister [2] 74/21 75/4 |
| saw [7] 20/14 26/8 71/16 78/6 | 119/2 119/2 | sir [1] $4 / 6$ |
| 87/16 99/1 100/23 | sent [6] 79/7 90/8 127/2 127/15 | sister's [2] 7/2 76/ |
| saying [15] 18/21 38/17 66/1 69/5 | 128/20 128/21 | sisters [1] 16/22 |
| 69/5 69/7 71/1 71/2 75/7 75/14 | separate [4] 27/6 | sit[5] 13/7 25/17 30/7 52/3 52/10 |
| 77/12 84/5 84/17 102/25 128/18 | 121/16 | site [3] 50/8 80/11 92/6 |
| says [20] 14/22 19/13 19/17 24/22 | separately [3] 88/6 121/17 122/21 | sitting [5] 16/6 20/15 21/8 63/1 |
| 26/13 32/1 32/5 32/16 33/12 35/1 | sequestered [1] 122/20 | 96/23 |
| 38/6 43/15 44/9 50/1 52/1 60/21 | Sergeant [23] 18/8 18/14 18/15 | situated [1] |
| 75/19 110/6 116/8 125/9 | 18/16 32/11 32/25 33/2 33/12 | situations [1] 107/14 |
| scanner [2] 78/7 78/9 | 34/4 42/24 43/1 43/2 58/20 59/23 | six [7] 4/17 36/16 39/6 57/16 |
| scared [2] 45/2 45/6 | 60/12 60/13 61/6 61/7 62/9 69/22 | 112/20 120/10 126/24 |
| scenario [1] 68/16 | 69/23 78/11 $115 / 5$ | sixth [1] 121/8 |
| scenarios [1] 110/14 | series [3] 68/7 107/14 119/7 | size [1] 103/23 |
| scene [1] 68/11 | serious [5] 10/1 $115 / 17116 / 1$ | sized [2] 103/2 |
| scheme [2] 21/12 64/23 | 116/1 119/8 | skilled [3] 47/25 102/3 102/4 |
| Schmitz [4] 71/15 71/17 71/20 | set [8] 11/5 11/9 38/7 56/16 64/11 | skillfully [3] 69/8 107/1 108/25 |
| 72/7 | 64/12 64/15 70/7 | skull [1] 81/21 |
| school [5] 25/21 29/23 29/24 30/6 | setting [1] 24/1 | slammed [2] 60/6 60/13 |
| 30/12 | several [5] 60/9 81/18 90/17 91/17 | slamming[1] 60/16 |
| science | 99/6 | sleeping [3] 24/6 24/7 41/ |
| 36/25 38/6 38/9 38/11 | Shallue [2] 43/1 43/2 | slick [1] 85/4 |
| scientific [4] 89/19 90/13 114/25 | shape [2] 18/5 79/9 | slid [1] $41 / 24$ |
| 118/9 | shared [1] 31/6 | slide [1] 90/25 |
| scientifically [2] 114/9 114/19 | shell [1] 98/15 | slip [1] 42/20 |
| scientist [1] 36/20 | Sheriff's [3] 34/5 47/14 69/21 | slipper [3] 59/18 59/19 59/20 |
| scope [1] 106/24 | Sherry [5] 36/18 37/8 37/16 38/1 | slippers [2] 59/12 59/14 |
| Scott [3] 21/6 44/5 44/9 | 87/24 | sliver [2] 57/13 57/14 |
| scrape [2] 69/13 69/14 | shift [1] | small [2] 9/22 85/22 |
| screen [1] 12/9 | shine [1] 84/13 | smart [1] 69/9 |
| sealed [1] 88/16 | shined [1] 84/8 | smear [2] 88/15 89/2 |
| search [13] 22/24 48/5 48/6 59/5 | shoot [2] 18/7 71/19 | smell [5] 23/8 23/16 23/21 41/21 |
| 65/24 65/25 66/15 66/16 73/2 | short [3] 35/11 48/4 63/22 | $42 / 6$ |
| 76/21 77/1 93/5 118/14 | shortest [2] 54/13 54/14 | smelling [1] 42/4 |

smells [2] 23/17 26/25
smelter [5] 100/19 100/20 100/21
101/15 101/16
smoke [1] 23/22
snowmobile [1] 98/5
socket [1] 59/16
soft [2] 4/23 4/24
sold [1] 55/25
solid [1] 89/19
solve [6] 5/14 5/17 6/9 11/22
118/19118/20
solving [3] 5/24 6/13 9/8
somebody [24] 7/10 21/13 29/7
30/9 48/3 50/15 69/7 69/9 84/7
86/15 99/4 101/8 104/9 104/10
104/25 106/22 106/23 106/25
107/11 107/11 107/19 107/21
107/24 122/13
somehow [6] 45/14 88/15 88/17
88/18 89/3 105/15
someone [8] 6/5 6/22 11/23 14/1
36/2 46/8 46/19 46/25
someplace [2] 105/24 111/21
something [41] 8/21 8/22 10/13
11/16 14/1 16/10 21/19 25/25
$27 / 6$ 28/11 $29 / 1130 / 1031 / 331 / 3$
38/14 40/3 42/6 44/16 45/7 47/11
55/25 56/17 56/1758/6 61/15
67/3 67/7 68/17 70/13 70/14 86/6 92/9 95/24 96/21 99/9 105/1
107/4 107/10 116/6 116/19 117/13
sometime [5] 87/3 90/6 96/24
96/25 111/22
sometimes [4] 64/19 64/20 85/23 96/1
somewhere [5] 19/24 51/25 105/7
113/3 113/4
sorry [1] 39/17
sort [10] 14/16 15/5 15/15 23/11
31/2 31/24 46/23 48/12 49/15
50/10
sounds [3] 33/20 33/23 129/22
source [3] 87/10 87/16 115/2
south [1] 51/13
Spanish [1] 33/7
spare [2] 11/23 21/20
spatter [1] 99/19
speak [4] 4/19 4/20 18/1 26/7
speaking [2] 4/13 9/4
Special [9] 1/11 1/13 1/15 3/11
$34 / 735 / 536 / 1736 / 2239 / 14$
specific [1] 37/6
speculate [2] 95/13 96/12
speculating [1] 96/9
speculation [5] 75/22 79/18 95/6
95/9 118/7
split [1] 39/21
spoke [1] 11/7
spot [1] 28/1
spread [2] 30/5 97/8
square [1] 49/22
ss [1] 131/1
stacked [1] 26/19
stage [3] 31/19 58/2 126/5
Stahlke [4] 94/15 94/16 94/18 94/25
Stahlke's [1] 95/2
stain [6] 50/13 84/2 84/5 84/9 84/14 86/13
stake [1] 69/24
stalled [1] 33/21
stamp [1] $83 / 18$
stand [8] 14/15 30/13 34/1 37/8
52/6 74/11 75/8 117/20
standard [2] 88/17 89/3
standing [3] 3/14 48/23 69/4
standpoint [1] 114/6
stands [1] 75/19
stare [1] 25/17
stark [1] 118/4
start [11] 17/6 31/23 33/4 49/21
66/3 66/11 66/12 67/5 76/15
80/21 110/22
started [4] 17/16 31/24 72/12
80/12
starting [2] 17/22 34/7
starts [3] 18/4 77/22 104/7
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { state [43] } & 1 / 1 & 1 / 3 & 1 / 12 & 1 / 14 \\ 1 / 16\end{array}$
3/3 3/6 3/9 6/1 1 15/8 15/9 27/12
28/16 30/18 31/8 39/7 47/12
47/21 48/10 48/23 50/1 50/10
51/16 53/22 57/1 57/9 58/7 61/22 62/1 65/4 76/2 84/21 84/22 85/1
90/4 97/21 111/5 116/2 119/14
124/14 126/11 131/1 131/5
State's [8] 37/4 51/9 53/24 75/23 94/7 98/21 100/17118/5
statement [10] 11/7 51/9 51/17
56/3 56/5 56/6 56/23 56/24 58/18 110/17
statements [5] 44/2 44/3 44/14
44/18 55/6
states [1] 58/25
stay [2] 34/4 34/5
stayed [2] 53/10 53/11
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { steadfastly } & {[2]} & 53 / 5 \quad 120 / 6\end{array}$
steak [1] 38/25
steal [1] 111/25
stenographic [1] 131/9
step [2] 5/3 70/23
steps [2] 104/23 105/3
Steve [10] 19/3 19/4 19/22 20/17
29/20 36/3 42/17 45/1 45/2 50/11
Steve's [3] 28/14 29/23 51/12
STEVEN [46] $1 / 61 / 213 / 33 / 13$
5/15 5/24 6/10 7/21 8/1 8/23
11/15 15/24 17/9 18/10 18/11
22/22 24/14 24/15 25/13 28/19
$31 / 1735 / 237 / 1145 / 1345 / 17$ $47 / 16$ 48/5 48/6 50/2 53/14 56/7
56/8 58/7 76/23 76/24 77/3 96/18
97/5 105/25 120/12 120/14 120/18
120/22 121/1 121/5 121/9
STIENMETZ [4] $2 / 11123 / 1123 / 2$ 123/10
still [7] $21 / 15$ 44/15 44/18 49/11
75/18 75/18 113/19
stipulate [1] 28/17
stipulated [1] 28/24
stipulation [5] 79/3 79/5 124/11
127/3 127/12
stolen [1] 105/15
stop [8] 7/10 26/5 54/25 72/25
72/25 74/22 74/23 75/1
stopping [1] 112/21
store [1] 38/20
stories [3] 13/20 $13 / 2113 / 21$
story [6] 13/19 13/25 14/7 16/23
44/22 58/17
straight [1] 45/17
STRANG[43] $1 / 172 / 43 / 143 / 25$ 4/12 35/10 35/18 55/13 56/2
56/20 57/19 60/19 61/20 61/24 62/18 64/2 67/21 68/16 73/7
$73 / 1373 / 1973 / 2574 / 374 / 6$
$74 / 1075 / 675 / 1375 / 1879 / 15$
83/24 89/10 89/11 101/20 101/21
102/3 102/4 103/7 $110 / 17110 / 19$
115/17116/13118/16118/18
Strang's [4] 56/23 64/7 65/5 65/6
strange [1] 12/5
strangers [1] 12/10
strangest [1] 46/22
stretch [1] 92/12
strongly [1] 71/13
struck [1] 30/19
stubborn [2] 24/22 24/23
stuck [1] 83/22
stuff [8] 17/15 25/10 26/11 27/6
38/20 39/1 99/7 100/8
stumble [1] 68/15
Sturm [3] 77/2 107/24 112/2
Sturm's [1] 34/19
Sturms [1] 36/5
style [2] 55/5 64/3
submicroscopic [1] 13/22
submit [1] 37/5
submitted [2] 80/8 120/11
subpoena [1] 61/25
subpoenaed [3] 62/4 62/5 62/7
such [9] 5/6 61/13 65/19 79/9
93/16 107/8 108/15 124/6 127/6
sudden [2] 58/15 93/25
sufficient [1] 53/6
suggest [8] $14 / 18$ 20/16 28/6 57/6
66/21 73/5 87/15 117/12
suggested [5] 66/4 85/24 87/23 104/13 117/3
suggesting [5] 65/4 69/2 70/22 70/24 88/14
suggestion [6] 29/24 47/18 47/22
65/19 97/21 117/18
suggestions [1] 15/20
suggestive [1] 21/10
suggests [3] 29/21 50/14 68/16
suitable [1] $82 / 24$
suited [1] 41/13
supposed [1] 122/13
supposedly [2] 22/2 23/24
supposition [2] 61/3 61/4
surprise [1] 110/19
surprised [2] 31/7 31/10
surrounding [3] 62/24 87/14 98/3
suspect [6] $47 / 1057 / 2371 / 21$
72/2 88/12 91/17
suspects [7] 71/7 71/10 71/11
71/11 72/9 72/16 73/5
suspicious [1] 67/2
SUV [24] $25 / 12$ 26/3 70/18 78/2
82/18 83/14 87/10 87/11 87/17
95/14 95/16 98/23 99/14 99/22
103/21 103/22 103/23 107/17
107/19 107/19 107/20 107/23
107/25 112/23
Suzuki [1] 98/5
swabs [2] 37/9 90/23
swayed [3] 9/10 52/23 120/3
swear [1] 123/7
sweat [1] 83/8
switch [1] 82/6
swiveling [1] 30/23
sworn [3] 43/12 $115 / 6$ 123/8
sympathy [5] 9/7 9/11 52/23 56/15 120/3
system [2] 8/14 8/15

Tadych [3] 21/6 44/5 44/9
take [25] 4/3 9/20 10/17 18/5
19/12 20/24 21/18 23/9 25/8
35/11 50/6 50/7 53/23 61/15
63/23 67/4 73/8 78/19 81/9 81/10
92/11 92/17 104/14 105/5 126/6
taken [11] 9/19 35/16 37/10 54/9
59/3 59/5 85/2 92/20 106/13 117/15 131/9
takes [5] 23/11 48/25 101/22 101/22 105/21
taking [10] 12/7 16/5 24/21 25/4 48/8 48/9 66/22 95/17 102/17 113/5
talented [4] 93/17 93/19 93/24 94/4
talk[15] 4/21 5/10 30/24 39/21
41/8 58/9 61/21 64/2 69/10 72/14 72/14 73/12 78/19 99/11 100/13
talked [15] 28/16 57/11 59/6 59/11 59/23 63/1 73/7 83/14 83/19
86/12 87/22 94/18 97/22 103/20 116/13
talking [17] 14/11 18/17 29/2 29/6 33/4 33/6 34/22 36/1 $136 / 14$ 60/5 64/1 67/11 87/1 88/10 90/24 92/1 104/16
talks [2] 18/16 62/19
tape [10] 29/2 29/4 32/8 32/24 35/24 73/14 73/19 73/21 73/21 74/1
tapes [1] 29/10
task[3] 5/6 117/15 123/17
team [3] 57/2 63/12 111/13
technicians [1] 48/2
telephone [8] $21 / 428 / 1636 / 18$ 40/18 40/19 41/1 41/10 78/12 telling [9] $42 / 13$ 43/8 45/11 48/24 64/25 73/22 88/8 100/1 128/15 tells [9] $21 / 121 / 326 / 1626 / 17$ 29/18 37/951/16 62/18 118/18 tend [1] 123/18
tendered [1] 125/5
Teresa [71] 5/16 6/4 6/6 6/17 7/19 11/24 12/19 18/5 19/15 22/12 23/1 23/14 25/11 25/14 31/25 $33 / 1037 / 2037 / 2237 / 2338 / 3$ 49/25 50/2 53/15 56/11 56/12 65/9 66/17 68/1 8 68/24 69/6 69/17 71/18 71/24 71/25 72/4 $72 / 573 / 376 / 2477 / 1881 / 14$ 83/20 83/21 88/15 88/25 93/1 93/10 96/14 96/17 97/1 97/3 98/7 98/9 98/21 99/4 99/13 99/18 99/20 100/1 102/17 102/23 105/6 105/7 105/9 105/25 109/17 109/21 110/6 110/10 110/12 111/24 119/5
Teresa's [7] 19/1 27/10 70/18
83/14 99/7 104/19 117/4
term [1] 81/15
terms [2] 30/14 47/19
terribly [1] 9/25
territory [1] 39/20
Tesheneck [3] 1/24 131/4 131/19
tested [1] 90/22
testified [7] 19/2 21/7 30/20 97/16 99/1 101/20 114/10
testifies [2] 36/4 91/15
testify [1] 35/25
testimony [14] 19/2 45/5 60/18 63/3 67/18 68/20 82/20 83/15

86/22 93/4 97/6 97/23 100/23
118/9
testing [4] 37/17 37/19 79/10 79/1 1
tests [1] 90/1
thank[11] $4 / 1435 / 1954 / 12$ 80/10
92/24 119/17119/17 122/14
124/19 128/5 129/24
thankfully [1] 54/14
thanking [1] 119/13
theft [1] 105/15
their [36] $3 / 67 / 2 \quad 12 / 25 \quad 14 / 12$
19/11 30/23 31/18 37/15 37/15
51/14 52/21 55/7 55/14 57/25
58/14 58/19 61/11 62/10 67/6
67/25 75/24 77/4 77/5 78/10 82/2
95/12 96/19 110/25 112/14 113/14
115/20 115/21 115/21 115/22 116/10 116/11
themselves [5] 124/20 124/22 125/12 126/16 126/17
theoretically [1] 113/14
theories [1] 109/10
theory [22] 5/22 49/23 64/7 67/25
74/8 76/2 98/21 98/22 100/15
100/17 104/13 104/18 106/4
106/16 106/19 106/20 108/21
108/23 108/24 109/1 110/24
110/25
there's [29] 16/15 18/12 21/1 21/7 39/12 45/4 51/1753/21 58/15 60/22 63/19 66/4 66/5 68/14 69/9 75/25 84/4 89/21 97/9 99/17 100/10 100/12 103/24 108/20 109/25 111/10 112/25 118/11 127/2
thereafter [1] 131/11
therefore [1] 121/21
these [50] $3 / 189 / 2$ 12/24 12/24
15/19 15/19 19/9 19/9 28/25
$30 / 2131 / 1231 / 1236 / 1336 / 15$
37/9 37/12 49/14 58/22 59/3
$63 / 1264 / 8$ 65/3 65/18 66/25 69/1
70/5 70/24 78/18 78/25 79/6 79/8
89/25 90/2 94/23 94/23 102/14
105/5 105/23 106/16 109/1 109/10
109/17 $113 / 7116 / 10116 / 17$
116/17 117/18 124/21 126/1
126/24
they're [1] 38/18
thickly [1] 23/23
thing [25] 6/15 7/14 9/22 12/3
12/5 14/13 $18 / 18$ 34/9 34/9 34/13 35/1 37/1 51/4 61/14 64/17 65/19 73/16 74/25 85/16 88/19 97/11 103/17111/19113/24 129/14 things [61] $5 / 85 / 105 / 128 / 189 / 3$ 9/8 9/12 9/14 9/15 11/9 11/20 11/21 $13 / 1114 / 2115 / 145 / 12$ 49/21 52/14 52/16 55/9 57/19 59/10 61/5 63/19 63/21 64/23 67/2 73/13 77/11 77/13 77/14 77/23 78/5 78/13 78/13 79/17 $81 / 381 / 481 / 781 / 883 / 985 / 21$ $85 / 22$ 87/19 88/11 89/18 90/17 91/17 94/21 97/9 97/24 99/2 99/5 99/15 103/25 109/1 109/17 114/3 114/17 125/25 126/1
think [63] 5/9 5/18 5/19 6/15 7/14 7/20 9/3 9/5 10/21 15/24 16/9 18/23 19/2 $21 / 10$ 22/5 24/3 29/9 32/9 39/13 42/12 42/17 45/19 $46 / 13$ 47/10 51/8 52/22 52/25
$53 / 153 / 255 / 1555 / 1655 / 17$ 55/19 55/20 59/11 61/23 62/8 62/14 62/15 63/3 65/2 69/4 69/7 71/10 72/15 74/2 74/5 74/7 74/7 75/20 76/8 76/9 84/22 90/24 90/25 97/21 104/15 110/14 110/15 110/15 123/18 124/25 126/14 thinking [1] 87/9
thinks [2] 32/1 74/10
third [9] 51/18 72/2 72/2 72/3 74/5 77/1 120/21 121/6 121/10 THOMAS [1] 1/13
those [51] 5/11 8/7 10/6 29/10 44/19 55/8 59/14 59/23 62/6 62/15 63/21 64/19 72/18 73/12 73/12 77/12 77/14 78/5 78/16 81/7 81/8 81/24 83/7 83/9 87/19 87/21 88/11 90/16 91/1 94/21 95/21 99/10 99/25 100/3 101/3 101/4 103/15 110/14 114/17115/2 123/23 124/2 124/3 124/16 124/20 125/2 125/10 125/13 125/25 126/14 126/20
though [10] 35/3 65/4 72/11 81/20 88/1 88/2 90/10 98/20 104/22 111/2
thought [6] 30/21 31/5 36/2 91/12 95/16 95/21
thousand [1] 58/25
three [15] 48/1951/1 63/11 89/22 90/20 90/22 90/23 97/14 115/2 118/22 125/2 125/11 126/25 126/25 127/3
through [22] 6/18 6/19 17/2 28/14
59/13 60/17 77/8 79/10 84/10
84/11 84/12 87/2 89/1 95/12
101/15 108/10 111/6 111/14
111/15111/16112/10113/22
throughout [1] 54/19
throw [1] 63/9
thrown [2] 21/18 120/1
throws [1] 99/17
time [57] $3 / 24 / 84 / 117 / 2411 / 12$ 14/24 23/4 24/10 24/12 25/19 26/21 27/7 30/25 31/9 34/20 35/5 $37 / 9$ 37/20 37/21 39/3 42/23 43/6 $43 / 1843 / 2144 / 1244 / 1845 / 11$ 49/20 53/23 63/23 70/21 71/5 $73 / 373 / 2073 / 2374 / 2480 / 681 / 9$ 86/11 88/6 88/23 88/23 91/24 98/7 98/24 101/6 102/18 102/21 119/23 123/6 125/5 126/15 126/17 126/20 127/6 127/11 130/2
times [3] 43/25 98/16 101/10
tin [1] 38/21
tip [1] 86/15
tire [2] 23/22 23/24
tissue [1] 81/21
to Ms [1] 90/10
today [3] 41/8 75/18 75/18
together [1] 40/9
told [13] 9/2 9/9 29/19 51/21 58/20 65/22 71/6 83/1 107/11 107/11 110/11 110/19 127/19
Tom [2] 3/10 51/2
took [7] 62/13 83/2 85/9 86/15
88/23 104/11 113/8
toothbrush [3] 66/22 66/23 67/4
top [3] 44/10 78/8 100/21
topsoil [1] 69/14
totally [1] 55/19
touching [2] 94/20 94/20
towards [7] 55/20 63/2 72/13

| T | U | $\begin{aligned} & 88 / 391 / 891 / 1391 / 1391 / 14 \\ & 92 / 1393 / 593 / 693 / 793 / 993 / 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [4] 116/24 116/24 | unable [1] 122/24 | /24 97/16 99/8 99/16 102/9 |
| 9/1 | unanimously [1] 121/23 | 5/24 108/11 108/12 113/9 |
| wn [1] 27/4 | Uncle [2] 45/1 45/2 | 1/4 128/4 |
| toxicology [2] 89/15 114/23 | uncles [1] 16/22 | 8/6 |
| Toyota [6] 26/3 33/12 34/1836/5 | uncomfortable [2] 12/25 13/6 | vial [18] 88/18 90/5 90/19 91/3 |
| /6 110/22 | Uncooperative [1] 23/2 | 11 |
| tractor [1] 97/14 | under [12] 9/22 16/6 41/24 43/16 | 12/12 112/14 113/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trader [4] } 21 / 2 \quad 21 / 393 / 793 / 9 \\ & \text { Traffic [2] } \\ & 74 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 43/19 43/23 43/25 44/2 44/15 | 13/19 114/5 114/9 114/20115/1 |
|  | 44/20 63/17 94/16 | victim [4] 72/23 107/6 117/12 |
| tragic [1] 16/23 | 15] 46 | 117/12 |
|  |  | view [2] 37/3 129/8 |
| trailer [16] 17/10 45/17 48/9 87/2 87/12 93/1 93/2 93/3 93/6 93/11 93/11 93/12 96/18 102/13 106/11 | 85/19 100/22 103/20 105/2 108/13 | Virginia [1] 39/7 |
|  | understanding [6] 3/20 39/23 |  |
|  | 126/23 127/1 127/20 128/13 | voice [3] 19/17 19/19 19/20 |
| transaction [2] 96/19 96/22 transcribed [1] 131/11 | understood [2] 7/8 39/20 | voir [2] 3/19 3/23 |
|  | undertake [1] 13/10 | vote [2] 122/3 122/4 |
| $\underset{131 / 12}{t r a n s c r i p t[4] ~ 1 / 2343 / 14131 / 8}$ | undetected [7] 104/11 105/5 106/9 | W |
|  |  |  |
| transcription [1] 131/11 transferring [1] 70/2 | undue [1] | wait [1] 12 |
|  | unfair [3] 55 |  |
| transmission [2] 42/21 74/14 transmitted [1] 89/4 | unfortunately [5] 5/13 13/19 14/7 | walk [2] 41/16 96/6 |
|  | 42/14 89/1 | ked [2] 86/14 88/1 |
| transport [2] 50/15 105/19 |  |  |
| trash [4] 23/8 23/9 23/13 23/16 traveled [1] 26/1 | unhooking [1] 95/ | ks [2] 30/17 30/18 |
|  | uniform [1] 49/13 | all [1] 59/15 |
| tree [1] 36/3 | unit [3] 89/15 94/5 | er [1] |
| trial [11] $1 / 411 / 2512 / 1612 / 23$ | unknown [1] 104/8 | want [40] $4 / 215 / 25$ |
|  | unless [2] 22/14 27/4 | 6/14 11/19 14/18 15/21 20/23 |
| 122/19 126/5 | unsecured [1] 110/20 | 24/25 26/14 29/19 33/6 33/18 |
| (tried [9] 20/4 54/20 54/21 54/23 | unsigned [1] 122/9 | 40/3 40/7 41/8 55/1 55/1 55/5 |
|  | until [7] 54/3 76/22 76/25 90/3 | 58/9 58/11 59/24 65/173/18 |
| 54/25 55/11 55/21 58/13 71/5 truck [3] 14/12 25/18 25/20 true [12] 31/13 34/1150/1 50/3 | 90/5 122/21 126/20 | 73/20 74/20 74/24 76/17 76/18 |
|  | unusual [1] 74/21 | 78/15 81/15 84/7 107/22 107/2 |
| true [12] $31 / 1334 / 1150 / 150 / 3$$51 / 2255 / 2558 / 18118 / 13120 / 8$ 120/8 127/9 131/12 | unwilling [1] 92/8 | 108/3 108/16 115/9 128/15 |
|  | upfront [2] 55/5 58/1 | wanted [5] 3/17 3/20 39/22 54/24 |
| trunk [1] $22 / 16$trust [1] $45 / 19$ | uphold [2] 62/13 115/7 | 64/2 |
|  | upon [9] 16/2 90/12 90/15 92/10 | wants [11] 18/25 29/21 85/7 88/12 |
| trusted [1] 47/24truth [5] 65/24 66/15 66/16 103/8 | 101/8 109/6 118/6 120/1 122/6 | 88/20 104/8 106/11 108/17 108/18 |
|  | upright [1] 120/7 | 109/3 110/2 |
| 118/15 | upset [1] 61/13 | warrant [1] 76/2 |
| truthful [1] 55/19truthfulness [1] 62/11 | urging [2] 119/ | wasn't [13] 14/6 50/16 50/16 76/2 |
|  | use [6] $32 / 641$ | 77/1 77/18 77/19 91/2 93/1 97/2 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} \text { try }[8] & 5 / 4 & 8 / 129 / 2 \\ 37!1 & 49 / 1 & 52 / 14 \end{array}\right.$ | 81/15 84/1 | 102/12 104/4 107/8 |
|  | used [8] 11/1 11/2 23/24 45/8 97/8 | watching [1] 48/3 |
| trying [21] $11 / 17821 / 824 / 1628 / 12$th/14 39/8 39/9 39/12 42/14 | 109/22 109/22 114/21 | water [1] 112/23 |
|  | useful [1] 19/6 | way[30] 7/17 13/17 15/21 18/12 |
| 47/23 48/10 64/8 64/9 65/6 70/25 | uses [2] 32/7 78/12 | 20/21 22/3 36/15 39/7 45/22 49/2 |
| $75 / 23$ 86/10 87/8 87/9 87/17$104 / 25$ | using [4] 28/11 78/12 85/16 | 50/12 51/11 52/15 56/21 61/23 |
|  |  |  |
| $\text { tub [1] } 27 / 5$ | V |  |
| Tuesday [2] 24/19 25/3 turn [3] 38/2 52/10 74/19 | van [10 | ways [10] 9/1 12/18 47/24 48/1 |
|  | 21/1 21/7 24/21 25/4 25/9 112/23 | 68/8 68/14 94/3 11/10 |
| turned [2] $26 / 545 / 15$ turns [3] $21 / 472 / 2076 / 14$ | vehicle [10] 68/9 75/3 81/16 95/1 | 112/25 |
| TV [2] 38/17 64/19 twice [5] 43/13 98/10 98/13 98/18 | 98/7 99/9 105/18 108/6 108/11 | we [143] |
|  | 108/14 | we'll [6] 4/7 3 |
| $98 / 19$ | vehicles [1] 22/18 | 92/19 100/13 |
| two [38] 8/18 14/19 15/19 17/3 17/17 17/22 17/24 19/23 20/5 | verbiage [1] 59/25 | we're [27] 3/2 3/4 4/12 6/9 13/24 |
|  | verdict[13] 12/17 116/14116/14 | 28/13 35/11 37/14 60/2467/1 |
| 20/10 26/15 28/15 28/18 43/23 <br> 43/25 48/8 48/8 58/22 62/15 68/7 | 116/15 118/14 120/8 120/10 | 69/5 69/6 69/10 71/1 82/5 85/16 |
|  | 121/18 121/19 121/21 121/22 | 85/20 90/24 92/1 95/23 98/22 |
| 68/14 69/1 70/5 70/24 71/22 <br> 90/19 91/21 97/9 97/24 98/13 | 121/25 122/9 | 99/11 104/16 104/17 128/6 129/1 |
|  | verdicts [3] 119/17 120/9 122/6 | 130/1 |
| 98/14 103/4 103/5106/17111/10$112 / 25113 / 7115 / 14$ | verify [1] 74/20 | wear [1] 49/13 |
|  | verifying | wearing [1] 70/15 |
|  | version [1] 112/22 | Wednesday [1] 24/19 |
|  | very [47] $4 / 2$ 9/12 9/14 14/19 18/7 | week[8] 20/3 24/18 29/17 29/20 |
| Tyson [1] 87/1 | 27/17 35/1 37/3 43/24 53/3 56/2 |  |
|  | 73/16 | 5/7 39/6 |
|  | (24 77/16 81/10 83/3 84/12 | 40/10 44/1 48/22 48/25 57/16 |

woman's [1] 117/21
weeks... [4] 66/6 66/9 103/4 103/5
wonder [1] 73/15
weigh [1] 61/11
weighing [2] 53/4 120/5
weight [1] 122/4
went [6] 17/2 17/21 32/18 89/1
101/15 102/22
weren't [5] 30/23 69/25 77/15

## 113/5 113/6

what's [14] 4/16 17/9 17/9 33/25
43/7 53/1 53/6 55/17 57/20 57/22
79/10 81/23 88/3 118/13
what's it [1] $4 / 16$
whatever[15] 4/17 11/8 14/12
15/21 20/25 21/24 29/25 38/20
38/22 41/9 42/22 49/1 49/2 81/15
105/18
whatnot [1] 14/6
whenever [1] 10/25
whereabouts [1] 123/16
wherever [3] 13/1 13/2 16/6
whether [36] $5 / 2$ 10/14 $14 / 5$ 14/5
16/10 16/10 26/5 40/17 45/6
45/19 45/19 46/9 46/10 50/22
56/14 56/15 61/1 63/24 63/25
64/13 65/10 66/17 68/23 75/12
75/12 79/11 83/25 86/8 104/2
105/1 111/7111/8111/8116/16
121/12 124/11
whichever [1] 49/2
while [6] 17/20 21/15 28/13 33/8
41/24 74/12
white [1] 27/1
who's [6] 11/23 12/14 29/7 30/9
57/23 106/25
whoever [2] 105/7 108/15
whole [7] 15/5 17/16 47/2 47/13
48/21 66/13 72/17
wholly [1] 120/1
whom [1] 47/10
whopping [2] 82/8 82/10
whose [1] 16/23
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Wiegert [7] } & 25 / 6 & 29 / 3 & 33 / 18 & 71 / 8\end{array}$
74/15 90/4 90/4
Wiegert's [1] 75/1
William [1] 33/3
willing [6] 19/16 69/20 70/4 70/8
110/13 127/4
Willis [4] $1 / 9$ 9/3 52/20 53/2
window [1] 84/10
windows [2] $42 / 5$ 84/11
windshield [1] 25/18
WISCONSIN [11] $1 / 1 \quad 1 / 31 / 121 / 14$
1/16 3/3 39/11 58/7 119/14 131/1 131/6
wish [2] 4/3 128/19
withdraw [1] 127/5
withdrawn [8] $124 / 25 \quad 125 / 9 \quad 126 / 8$
127/4 127/14 127/20 127/24 128/3
within [5] 4/18 10/20 41/23 89/3
112/6
without [8] 9/6 9/7 9/7 9/8 73/22
123/19 128/22 129/10
witness [11] 14/15 34/1 44/1
$74 / 11$ 75/8 75/14 75/16 102/24
103/18 114/18116/8
witness' [1] 44/18
witnesses [12] $13 / 1113 / 1315 / 9$
30/16 30/1754/21 57/12 57/13
62/4 62/5 89/9 $111 / 7$
woman [5] 7/10 16/17 16/21 $23 / 4$ 113/13
word [2] 52/7 52/11
words [10] 41/12 51/14 59/1 65/11
65/13 65/25 69/3 69/7 89/21
103/11
work [6] 5/4 8/14 8/15 22/14
32/13 40/7
worker [1] 94/1
working [2] 17/14 32/3
works [2] $8 / 1661 / 24$
world [7] 8/6 8/11 9/17 17/1 25/21
48/24 78/24
wouldn't [13] 6/22 34/20 45/1
50/12 50/13 61/22 63/14 83/4
101/8 113/8 125/15 125/18 126/1
wounds [4] 91/19 91/20 92/2
98/14
wrestle [1] 63/20
written [1] 19/23
wrong [7] 36/3 38/14 49/9 49/10 49/1 1 102/18 127/22
wrongful [1] 56/6
wrongfully [1] 56/8
Y
yard [1] 32/19
year [9] 42/10 43/21 70/6 75/2
83/19 107/6 113/2 113/9 117/11
years [6] 17/3 37/21 39/4 93/23
115/22 $118 / 23$
yesterday [10] 34/7 39/20 44/16
54/1 69/5 86/12 94/13 101/18
117/2 117/3
yet [10] $6 / 1828 / 1734 / 2436 / 8$
36/12 54/2 60/3 100/5 112/24 124/7
You'd [1] 8/23
you'll [1] 123/10
you're [2] 20/19 50/18
you've [1] 27/5
young [3] $16 / 17$ 16/21 $23 / 4$
younger [1] 19/1
yours [3] 13/23 30/25 45/3
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { yourself [8] } & 9 / 18 & 11 / 21 & 15 / 6 & 15 / 14\end{array}$ 15/23 28/12 63/6 109/11
yourselves [1] 103/21
Z
zero [1] 11/8
Zipperer [6] 22/25 23/6 71/22 72/1 72/7 93/9
Zire [1] 85/13
zone [1] 54/18
zoom [1] 85/22

