Here is the Dialogue immediately preceding this extract (conversational context):

“Attorney: Now, it all stems from what happened on May 30th, 2013 at Clarence Howard's body shop.

Attorney: Howard's Body and Paint, isn't that correct?

Attorney: Yes.

Attorney: And you went over there at that time to basically get some money from Clarence Howard, about $2,000?

Attorney: Is that what it was?

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): Well, um, Clarence...

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): I called him Howard, but Clarence, my husband, I loaned him $2,000.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): He promised to pay me back.

Attorney: Well, you went over to get that, isn't that right?

Attorney: For seeing him go to Augusta?

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): Yeah.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): I had came home to check on my animals and take care of them for a day or two.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): And I would do that every other week, sometimes every week.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): So I came to the shop to get, we had made an agreement that he would give me so much money a week to help me out.

Attorney: You went over there to get money from Clarence Howard, your husband, isn't that correct?

Unkown Speaker: Yes.

Unkown Speaker: So if we don't see frustration while we're talking about Clarence Howard, what happened, that's what a juror should determine.

Unkown Speaker: We don't see frustration.

Unkown Speaker: So, in sequestration, it said that Kirkwood, who the sequestration is, has been a witness who has not testified or who has not completed his or her testimony from over here and having his or her testimony affected by the testimony of another witness.

Unkown Speaker: So you just said in your sequestration, what plans, how, and what she did, they don't retain them.

Attorney: at that time you became upset with him because he didn't give you the money that you thought you wanted isn't that right yes at that time you want to basically call the police on him isn't that correct

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): That is correct, but there's a missing link there.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): He got on the phone and pretended to call the police on me.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): Called the police on him because we both had disagreements.

Attorney: Okay.

Attorney: And you wound up saying that basically he had scratched you and hurt you and tore your clothing.

Attorney: Isn't that correct?

Attorney: It did.

Attorney: And that wasn't true, was it?

Attorney: No, that was true.

Attorney: You didn't scratch yourself and tear your own clothing, ma'am?

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): No.”

Here is the conversation between a Defense Witness in the Jamie Hood case and the judge/attorney that you are supposed to analyze for factuality:

“Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): He pushed me, and I was up in his face.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): Definitely in his face.

Attorney: Did he have to call the police?

Attorney: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): He pushed me.

Defense Witness (Clarence Howard's Wife): I don't know if he did it on purpose, but he scratched my neck, and as he scratched my neck, I had a...”