STATE OF WISC	CONSIN,	
	PLAINTIFF,	JURY TRIAL TRIAL - DAY 21
rs.		Case No. 05 CF 38
TEVEN A. AVE	ERY,	
	DEFENDANT.	
ATE: MARC	CH 12, 2007	
	Patrick L. Willi Cuit Court Judge	S
APPEARANCES:	_	7
APPEARANCES.	Special Prosecut	
	THOMAS J. FALLON Special Prosecut	
		s state of wisconsin.
	NORMAN A. GAHN Special Prosecut On behalf of the	cor e State of Wisconsin.
	DEAN A. STRANG	
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the	e Defendant.
	JEROME F. BUTING	
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the	e Defendant.
	STEVEN A. AVERY	
	Defendant Appeared in pers	son.
	TRANSCRIPT OF I	PROCEEDINGS
R	eported by Diane	Tesheneck, RPR
	Official Court	

1	INDEX		
2		PAGE	
3	COURT'S DECISION		
4	FAIR TESTING MOTION	3	
5	MOTION TO SUPPRESS MULTIPLE SEARCHES	11	
6	MOTION TO DISMISS ALL CHARGES AGAINST THE DEFENDANT AT CLOSE OF STATE'S CASE	16	
7		10	
8	INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE	25	
9	DEFENDANT WAIVES RIGHT TO TESTIFY	78	
10	DEFENSE RESTS	83	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	2		

THE COURT: At this time the Court calls

State of Wisconsin vs. Steven Avery, Case No. 05 CF

381. We're here this morning for a continuation of
the trial in this matter. Will the parties state
their appearances for the record, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Good morning, Judge. The State appears by Calumet County District Attorney Ken Kratz, Assistant Attorney General Tom Fallon, and Assistant District Attorney Norm Gahn, appearing as Special Prosecutors.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Good morning, Steven

Avery is present. Jerome Buting and Dean Strang

also present on his behalf.

THE COURT: The first item of business today is for the Court to issue its decision on three outstanding motions. The Court has already heard argument on these motions. I'm ready to issue the decisions at this time.

The first motion the Court will address is a renewal from the defense of its fair testing motion; that is, a motion that was filed pre-trial by the defense, last summer, asking for permission to have an observer present while the Wisconsin State Crime Lab was performing analysis of various pieces of evidence.

The defense counsel argues that the defendant in this case was prejudiced because the defense was not permitted to have an observer present while DNA testing was conducted of a bullet, by Sherry Culhane. Ms Culhane testified that during the testing process, some of her DNA made its way into a control sample that should not have contained anyone's DNA.

She believes it happened as a result of saliva that came from her mouth while she was speaking to observers from within the lab who were being trained at the time. Ms Culhane testified that there was no evidence of contamination in the test of the extract from the bullet itself, which is found to contain Teresa Halbach's DNA.

The defense argues that this account given by Ms Culhane demonstrated the defenses need to have an observer present during testing. The observer might have suggested splitting the extract from the bullet as a control, before the remainder of the test was completed, in order to determine whether Teresa Halbach's DNA was, in fact, on the bullet, or somehow found its way into the abstract — into the extract through

contamination.

An observer may also have seen, argues the defense, how Teresa Halbach's DNA may have gotten into the extract if it happened through contamination. As a remedy, the defendant asks that the Court suppress the test results, or in the alternative, if suppression is not granted, instruct the jury that the State resisted a defense request to observe the testing process. The State's testing totally consumed the sample. And the State withheld the Crime Lab's contamination log until it was specifically requested by the defendant.

Both parties acknowledge in their argument that the test, which the Court must apply, is that set forth in the United States Supreme Court case of Arizona vs. Youngblood; that is, unless a criminal defendant can show bad faith on the part of the police, failure to preserve potentially useful evidence does not constitute a denial of due process in law. The issue boils down, then, to whether or not the State was guilty of bad faith in this matter.

The evidence that the defense cites as evidence of bad faith on behalf of the State is

the following: First of all, the State resisted the defendant's initial request to observe the testing.

Second, the State did not disclose the Crime Lab's contamination log history to the defense at the time of the original fair testing motion. The argument is that earlier disclosure may have allowed the defense to succeed in its earlier motion.

Third, that the State did not provide a copy of the contamination log as part of the defendant's original general discovery request.

Fourth, the defendant expressed its concern about contamination at an earlier stage in this proceedings and Ms Culhane's testimony demonstrated that contamination occurred.

Fifth, the defendant personally expressed his concern about being framed at an early stage in the trial.

And, sixth, there is no clean sample left for the defendant to test because the extract that was found to contain the victim's DNA may have already been contaminated and the -- there is not sufficient DNA left on the bullet to independently test.

The Court concludes that those facts do not demonstrate a finding of bad faith on the part of any representatives of the State.

With respect to the first part of the defendant's request, that the State resisted its request to observe the testing, the law in Wisconsin is that the State had a right to resist that request. Relevant are Wisconsin Statute Section 176.79 (1), as interpreted in the Court of Appeals case of **State vs. Franszczak**,

F-r-a-n-s-z-c-z-a-k, a 2002 reported decision.

The Court in that case summarized the law under the statute as follows: All evidence, information, and analyses of evidence submitted to the Crime Lab by law enforcement is privileged and, therefore, is off limits to a defendant prior to trial. The same is true as to the analyses of such evidence by the Crime Lab. This privilege also bars any effort, by a defendant, to examine Crime Lab personnel as witnesses prior to trial.

There is an exception with respect to such evidence as is subject to discovery under Section 971.23 and, in fact, discovery was exercised here and the State did present

materials. The point is there's nothing improper about the State's initial resistance to the defense request for fair testing. It's authorized under the statute.

The second State argument is that the State did not timely disclose the contamination log history to the defense, or the Court's original decision might have been different because the defense argument for observation would have been stronger.

The Court would not have ruled differently on the original motion, even if it had known of the existence of the contamination log earlier. Frankly, the Court is relieved to know that such a log is kept as an aid to defendants who are able to make use of it in cross-examination, as the defendant did in this case.

The Court believes it is far preferable to have a contamination log than if the Crime Lab was hiding its mistakes. I will also note there is no evidence to suggest the contamination log demonstrates any fraud on the part of the Crime Lab in its history, as the defense referred to in other State Crime Labs as part of its original

argument.

The defense also argues that the State did not provide a copy of the contamination log as part of the defendant's general discovery request. The Court wasn't really presented with information to suggest whether or not the contamination log would have been within the scope of the original request made by the defense.

However, it appears that the State did provide a copy of the contamination log, to the defendant, upon specific request for the log, and the Court believes that the defense was able to effectively use the information from the contamination log in its cross-examination of Ms Culhane. That is, the Court doesn't believe there was any prejudice to the defense in the conduct of its case.

The fourth argument advanced by the defendant is that the defense expressed concern for contamination, and in this case contamination admittedly occurred as Ms Culhane testified. The Court finds that despite that express concern on the part of the defense, doesn't change the law in this area, that the State is simply not

required to permit an observer at the Crime Lab.

The defense also argues that the defendant himself personally expressed concern about being framed earlier in this case. The Court understands that that in fact was the case here, but the Court also understands that the defendant's claim is that he was being framed by members of the County Sheriff's Department and not by members of the Crime Lab.

I think it's worth noting in this case that it was Ms Culhane's testing of the DNA in the 1985 case that, in fact, led to the defendant's exoneration. The Court is not aware of any allegations that the Crime Lab was a party to any frame up here and the Court finds no reason to believe that was the case.

The last argument was there's no clean sample left to test, as while there is an abstract of the blood evidence, that abstract may have been already contaminated. There's no indication here that the operator, Ms Culhane, used more of the sample than was necessary. She used her best judgment in testing the bullet as she did.

She testified that there was nothing

visible on the bullet and she felt she had to take an extract from the bullet in order to get enough of a sample to test. The Court can't find anything wrong with that, which would constitute, in any fashion, bad faith on the part of the State.

The bottom line is that Ms Culhane did somehow contaminate the control sample in the course of the testing process and she disclosed that contamination. She followed protocol in asking for an exception. Her mistake was disclosed to the defense in a timely manner as part of discovery and the defendant skillfully elicited her testimony about the mistake in cross-examination. The Court does not believe that any bad faith has been shown or that the defendant has not been -- has been unfairly prejudiced in any manner and for that reason that motion is denied.

The next motion renewed by the defense is the -- is motion to suppress evidence from multiple searches. This motion was renewed outside of the presence of the jury during the trial, on February 23rd. At that time the defense renewed its motion to suppress evidence

based on illegal searches, which was initially denied by this Court in a 21 page written decision on December 12 of last year.

Defense counsel cited three separate bases for renewal of the motion at this time, based on evidence that was introduced up to February 23rd. First, the defendant claims that the testimony of Special Agent Fassbender and the other officers who participated in the execution of the multiple day search is not consistent with the facts which formed the basis of the Court's original ruling. Specifically, the defendant characterized the initial entries as prohibited warm-up searches, which are not constitutionally permitted.

In the Court's view, the evidence introduced at trial was consistent with the Court's earlier understanding of the bases for the various entries into the trailer and garage that were occupied by the defendant. The Court is not going to repeat here its earlier findings or conclusions, other than to note that the evidence supports the Court's prior understanding of the circumstances under which the entries to the defendant's trailer and garage were made.

The fact that there were admittedly multiple entries, raises a number of interesting legal issues of apparent first impression in the State of Wisconsin, but the Court believes it addressed those issues in its written decision and the evidence introduced does not change the factual assumptions which were part of that decision.

The defendant's second argument is that the facts introduced give new life to the defendant's *Franks* motion. Specifically, the emphasis by law enforcement in the early stages of the search, treating the case as a missing persons case, the defense alleges undercut the representation made in the affidavit for the initial search warrant by Mr. Wiegert.

Mr. Wiegert's specific representations in the affidavit for the warrant were the following: Your affiant believes, that based on Teresa's lack of contact with her employer and family members, and her vehicle being abandoned at the Avery Auto Salvage Yard, that Teresa Halbach is the victim of a crime, including but not limited to, homicide, sexual assault, kidnapping, false imprisonment, and theft.

defense argument to be that the State is not permitted to suspect the worst, but hope for the best. The Court does not agree, given the facts available to law enforcement authorities at the time, primarily the lack of conduct -- or contact with Teresa Halbach for a number of days, and the circumstances surrounding the discovery of her vehicle, even before anyone's blood was found inside the vehicle, there was more than probable cause to suspect serious foul play, in the form of the crimes listed in the affidavit.

It is not inconsistent, in those circumstances, for law enforcement personnel to hope that their legitimate suspicions are wrong and that there might be some explanation which would be consistent with Teresa Halbach still being alive. There is nothing unreasonable about what the State did, or what the State gave as bases in the affidavit for the search warrant. The information known to the State at the time, which was reflected in the search warrant, provides adequate probable cause for its issuance.

The defendant's third separate argument

is that the State waited too long to commence its search of the burn pit area behind the defendant's garage, where the victim's bone fragments were found. As the Court understands the argument, it's different from the challenges to the searches of the trailer and the garage because the claim is not based on improper multiple searches, but rather on an improper delay in conducting the search at a time after the possession of the defendant's living quarters should have been turned back to him.

The Court finds nothing improper about the timing of the search in this case. Section 968.15 requires that a search warrant be executed and returned within five days. The search of the burn pit commenced before that time period expired.

The defense makes much out of the fact that the searchers initially refrained from starting the search because of the presence of the defendant's dog and that's not a valid reason for not starting the search earlier, even if the dog appeared to be dangerous. The Court agrees that the presence of the dog alone would not excuse the timing of the search in this case.

However what does excuse it are a number of factors. First, as the Court noted, the search was commenced within the five day time limit.

Second, law enforcement personnel had a very large area to search under the warrant, that is, the entire Avery Auto Salvage Yard, and they did not artificially delay, in any way, their search of the burn pit.

Third, and most significant, the significance of the burn pit site was not apparent until what appeared to be human remains were discovered there. Once that discovery was made the authorities worked promptly to collect the evidence.

There was nothing unreasonable about the search of the burn pit. For these reasons, the defense renewed motion to suppress evidence based on unlawful searches is likewise denied.

Third motion that the Court addresses this morning is the defense motion to dismiss all charges against the defendant at the close of the State's case. The standard that the Court is to apply in this situation has been stated as follows:

The test is whether, considering the State's evidence in the most favorable light, and the evidence adduced, believed, and rationally considered, is sufficient to prove the defendant's guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt.

That is, the Court has to look at the evidence in a light most favorable to the State and ask itself whether a reasonable jury could find that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

In this case, the defendant moved to dismiss all charges, but did not present specific argument on the homicide, mutilation of a corpse, and possession of a firearm charges. The Court is not going to summarize all the evidence here, but it concludes that the State has introduced evidence which, if believed by the jury, would be sufficient to prove the defendant's guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt, on these three particular charges.

The argument advanced most strenuously by the defendant is that the evidence introduced by the State, even if believed by the jury, would not be sufficient to sustain a guilty verdict on the false imprisonment charge. The elements the

State must prove on the false imprisonment charge are the following:

One, the defendant confined or restrained Teresa Halbach during her lifetime.

Two, the defendant confined or restrained Teresa Halbach intentionally.

Three, Teresa Halbach was confined or restrained without her consent.

Four, the defendant had no lawful authority to confine or restrain Teresa Halbach.

Five, the defendant knew that Teresa

Halbach did not consent and knew that he did not have lawful authority to confine or restrain her.

The Court understands the defense argument primarily to be that there's no evidence the defendant confined or restrained the victim in this case. The State introduced no direct proof of that particular element, but asserts that it has a circumstantial evidence case. The State points to evidence that the defendant used his sister's name in requesting the victim to come to the property.

Bobby Dassey testified he saw Teresa
Halbach heading toward the defendant's trailer
after he observed her taking pictures of his

mother's van and did not see her three to four minutes later when he looked again after taking a shower.

The bullet fragment with the defendant's DNA was found on the floor of the garage. The State submits this evidence demonstrates that the victim was killed in the garage by two bullet wounds to the head. The State also argues the evidence demonstrates that the victim was forced, involuntarily, from the trailer to the garage, and that's the basis for the false imprisonment charge.

The State does offer a plausible scenario for what happened; however, that's not the standard that the Court must apply. The evidence has to be sufficient to support a jury verdict of guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt. The circumstantial evidence introduced by the State is, if believed by the jury, sufficient to sustain a guilty verdict on the other charges, but the Court believes there's minimal evidence supporting the false imprisonment charged.

Viewed most favorable to the State, there is a logical inference that the victim entered the defendant's trailer for some

unspecified period of time and that she was killed by the defendant in his garage. There is no evidence from which a jury can determine the circumstances of how she went from the trailer to the garage.

To conclude, on the evidence presented, that she was forced there against her will would require speculation on the part of the jury. The Court believes it is not coincidental that the defendant was not charged with false imprisonment until after the State received statements from Brendan Dassey. That fact alone would not prevent the State from pursuing the false imprisonment charge if there was other evidence to support the charge. But the record does not contain such other evidence.

During voir dire, a number of jurors indicated they were at least somewhat familiar with the case against Brendan Dassey. To submit this charge to the jury would, the Court believes, invite the jury to fill in the blanks, if you will, by what they might otherwise remember about allegations that have not been supported by evidence in this case.

The Court concludes there is not

sufficient evidence in the record to support a jury finding of guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt, on the false imprisonment charge. And the Court, therefore, grants the defendant's motion to dismiss that charge.

Counsel, is there anything further before we bring in the jury?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't know that I need, given the Court's ruling, but if I do, I would move for entry of judgment of dismissal or acquittal on Count 4 of the second Amended Information.

THE COURT: Anything else from State?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will enter, then, a judgment of dismissal of that charge.

I will indicate for the record that the Court met with counsel before beginning today.

And after discussion, I believe both parties and the Court is in agreement that the Court is going to individually voir dire the jurors, because of the length of the trial, the extensive publicity that it received, in order to make sure that the Court's order has been adhered to in this case.

And before doing that, I think it's beneficial to bring in the jurors briefly and let them know

what's going on.

I will also indicate, before we bring the jury in, that the Court has spent a good deal of time examining the circumstances under which that individual voir dire should take place.

Because the subject of the voir dire could include information about whether or not the jurors violated the Court's order, the Court does not believe that the voir dire should take place in the confines of this courtroom, which could easily be found to be somewhat intimidating to the jurors.

It's very important in this case to make sure that the jurors express candor in giving their answers. In many cases voir dire is conducted in chambers, without anyone else being present. But this case is different from many other cases because of the intense media coverage that it's received.

The media is very interested in this case and while the Court believes there may be grounds to completely close individual voir dire, the Court also believes that consideration must be given to the interests of the media. And, therefore, I have decided that, although the voir

dire will take place in a small conference room that has very limited seating, the Court is going to allow a media representative to be present during the questioning of the jurors.

the defense.

Earlier this morning, I instructed the media coordinator to contact the media folks who are here today and designate one of their members to be present. It will be the obligation of that member to report back to the other members of the media. Obviously, they still will be prohibited from disclosing the identity of any juror.

If any action is required as a result of the answers given by the jurors, the Court anticipates that that would take place in open court and not in the voir dire investigation in chambers.

Anything further that either party would like to add to that before we bring in the jury?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Nothing -- Nothing from

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Let's call in the jurors at this time.

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Good

morning, members of the jury. I can tell you that your first sitting in the jury box this morning will be probably the shortest sitting that you have during the course of this trial.

I indicated last Friday, that because of the length of the trial and the concerns about exposure to media coverage and other items, that it was entirely possible that the Court would conduct some questioning of the jurors on an individual basis before the end of the trial in order to make sure that no improper information had found its way to the jury. Before we proceed further with the defense case this morning, that is what we're going to do.

We're not going to conduct the voir dire in this courtroom; it's going to be done in a small conference room and you will be escorted by a sheriff's deputy, one by one, to the conference room, so that the questioning may take place. I only called you out here this morning so I would have a chance to tell you that.

So at this time, I'm going to allow you to go back to the jury room and in a few minutes we'll begin the individual questioning. Although you will be questioned individually, the Court

does not anticipate that the process will be very long, with respect to any individual juror. So you are excused at this time.

(Jury not present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Counsel, then, I will see you in the conference room near the judge's chambers in 10 minutes.

(Individual voir dire in conference room.)

THE COURT: I'm not going to take them all in order, we'll start out with Mr. Slaby.

Mr. Slaby, I think I indicated on the record the reason for our little session here.

Because of the length of this trial, which was kind of unusual in the amount of media attention it's received.

You probably have memorized by now the admonition I normally give at the end of the week. And we just wanted to take -- give each juror an opportunity to let us know if there have been any problems, if they have been exposed to any information from any source whatsoever about the case, that, you know, might have an effect on the juror. So, is there anything that you feel the Court should know?

MR. SLABY: I don't believe so.

1	THE COURT: You feel you have been able to
2	follow the instructions okay?
3	MR. SLABY: Yes.
4	THE COURT: All right. Can you tell me,
5	have you heard any other persons, whether they be
6	jurors or otherwise, say anything about the case?
7	MR. SLABY: No, not about the case.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. SLABY: I mean
10	THE COURT: I'm sure there's been talk
11	among the jurors, we have heard it sometimes as you
12	leave.
13	MR. SLABY: I don't think there's been
14	anything improper.
15	THE COURT: All right. Very well, I'm
16	going to excuse you then. The sheriff will escort
17	you back to the jury room.
18	****
19	ATTORNEY STRANG: If we're going to
20	continue this, we should see if Mr. Avery is willing
21	to waive his presence. We have got the sheriff
22	walking these people in. We've got two armed law
23	enforcement officers right outside the door, and
24	we've got a fourth one right in here. It just has a

feeling of, you know, an encampment. I don't think

1	anybody would assume that they are worried about
2	Norm Gahn.
3	ATTORNEY FALLON: I'm worried, he is right
4	behind me.
5	THE COURT: Well, we'll There's only one
6	sheriff's person in the room. And I think at
7	defense counsel request, I deliberately kept them
8	stationed behind the juror.
9	ATTORNEY STRANG: If he was going to be
10	here at all, that's right. But the sheriff is
11	walking them in and there are two armed, in uniform,
12	officers right outside the door.
13	ATTORNEY BUTING: Could they be out that
14	door?
15	ATTORNEY STRANG: There's another one out
16	there. That's five.
17	THE COURT: Let's do this, after this next
18	juror, we'll take it up and we'll ask the sheriff to
19	return.
20	ATTORNEY BUTING: Okay. Sure.
21	THE COURT: Hi.
22	MS DORN: Hi.
23	THE COURT: Have seat.
24	MS DORN: Is this the hot seat?
25	THE COURT: That's the hot seat. I told

you the room wouldn't be very big. 2 MS DORN: Yup. 3 THE COURT: As I explained late Friday and this morning, because of the length of this trial 4 5 and the publicity that's it's received, now, as we're getting toward the final stages, we just want 7 to make sure that there haven't been any problems with jurors being exposed to information they 8 shouldn't be. 9 10 MS DORN: Mm-hmm. THE COURT: So what I'm primarily looking 11 12 for is, do you feel that you have been exposed to 13 anything that you shouldn't have been? 14 MS DORN: My night ends at 8:30 at 15 night. I'm running -- too much running with the 16 kids, tournaments, everything. 17 THE COURT: So you have been busy and you 18 don't feel there's anything you have been exposed 19 to? 20 MS DORN: No. 21 THE COURT: Have you -- Let me ask you 22 this, has there been -- I know that the jurors talk 23 to each other, but has there been any discussion

1

24

25

aware of?

about anything involving the case, that you are

1	MS DORN: No.
2	THE COURT: There's not been.
3	MS DORN: No.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Very well, thank you.
5	****
6	THE COURT: At this time we're back on the
7	record. The sheriff is in the conference room, the
8	juror is outside the conference room. The defense
9	counsel, I think, expressed concern about the jurors
10	seeing the sheriff's deputies as they came into the
11	room. It's not a problem with the deputy in the
12	room, as I understand it, but the defense was asking
13	if the deputies outside could, what?
14	ATTORNEY STRANG: Not be there. I mean
15	that's, you know, I'm just concerned about doing
16	this in a way that
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	ATTORNEY STRANG: has as heavy a law
19	enforcement presence as we have got here.
20	THE COURT: What about if they sat in the
21	outer conference room, behind the wall that's
22	behind?
23	OFFICER: That was a jailer and State
24	Patrol. We could dismiss the State Patrol
25	officer.

1	ATTORNEY BUTING: If they are sitting out
2	there no one is going to see them.
3	ATTORNEY STRANG: I think Brett Bowe is
4	already out there.
5	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Can I ask, in this room,
6	why we're not using a stun belt?
7	THE COURT: That's been ruled on already.
8	ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's been ruled on in a
9	court proceeding, not in a conference room, Judge.
10	THE COURT: I think the concern about what
11	could happen with the stun belt remains the same.
12	I'm not going to revisit that. There has not been
13	any problems with the defendant throughout this
14	trial; I see no reason to revisit it.
15	But security wise sheriff I guess the
16	question is, does that work for you?
17	OFFICER: Sure, if I could just be
18	standing out here after I bring the juror in?
19	THE COURT: Right.
20	OFFICER: Okay.
21	THE COURT: You can stay out there, I think
22	they're asking and the deputies, if you like them
23	nearby for security, that's fine.
24	OFFICER: Okay.
25	THE COURT: Have them sit in the outer

office rather than standing by the door. 1 2 correct? ATTORNEY STRANG: Yeah, and if that doesn't 3 work, we will talk about waiving his presence, so to 4 5 speak. THE COURT: Okay. For what it's worth, I 7 should note that when I saw the first juror come in, and the kind of surprised look on his face on the 8 9 way out of this room, I didn't get the impression it 10 was due to a couple deputies outside so much as all of us sitting in this room, with one -- just one 11 12 chair left for him. That was my impression. 13 But at any rate, Sheriff, if that works 14 for you, you can have your deputies sit down in 15 the other outer office. Take Ms Dorn back. 16 Let's bring in Mr. Mahler, Richard Mahler. 17 OFFICER: Okay. 18 ATTORNEY STRANG: Do you have a particular 19 order in your head? 20 THE COURT: No, I'm trying to go as random 21 as I can. 22 ATTORNEY STRANG: There was much less 23 physical fidgeting with this juror. 24 ATTORNEY GAHN: She saw the other one come 25 back so.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Right. Some Stranger wasn't sent in to pick up his coat. ATTORNEY BUTING: She was always a little more effervescent in court. The other guy wasn't quite as talkative. THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Mahler. MR. MAHLER: Good morning. THE COURT: Well, there's no secret why you are here, I indicated in the courtroom. MR. MAHLER: Right. THE COURT: Because of the fact that the

trial has gone on for six weeks and that there's been a fair amount of publicity about the trial, I have given the jurors warnings at the end of every day and admonishments not to watch the news media. We just want to make sure that none of the jurors have been exposed to information that they shouldn't have been seeing.

MR. MAHLER: Okay.

THE COURT: And so at this time, I'm just asking, is there anything that you feel you have been exposed to that could impact your service as a juror.

OFFICER: No. In the beginning, my wife said that Channel 12 humiliated me and my family

1	on TV, but that was about it. That has no affect
2	on what I'm doing here.
3	THE COURT: I don't think they would have
4	been permitted to identify a juror.
5	MR. MAHLER: Well, they didn't say my
6	name, but my wife said she knew who I was because
7	they said a musician living on the wife's trust
8	fund, which kind of pissed her off. So she wants
9	nothing to do with it.
10	THE COURT: Channel 12 is in Milwaukee?
11	MR. MAHLER: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Hopefully people in Milwaukee
13	didn't know, but do you feel that that would have
14	any impact on your ability to be fair in this case?
15	MR. MAHLER: No, I'm here to take in the
16	evidence and weigh it out.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Have you heard any
18	discussion of the case by any of the jurors, or
19	anything about the case?
20	MR. MAHLER: Nobody has said anything.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Good. Thank
22	you. You may step outside, the sheriff will take
23	you back.
24	****
25	THE COURT: All right. How about

Mr. Wardman? Good morning, Mr. Wardman. As I indicated on the record, we're having this session just because this is a trial that's gone on for six weeks. There's been a lot of publicity about it.

And for the benefit of the Court and the parties and to make sure there is a fair trial, we're just double checking to see if any of the jurors may have been exposed to any information about the case that would affect their ability to serve as a juror. Can you tell us if you feel you have been.

MR. WARDMAN: No, last night is the only

MR. WARDMAN: No, last night is the only night I seen it on TV and I had clicked it real quick.

THE COURT: You turned it off right away?

MR. WARDMAN: Yeah, after I was watching

Deal or No Deal, I was surprised they put you on
there in commercial time.

THE COURT: They tell me I have been on there more than I should be. Okay. So -- But that was it and you turned it off right away.

MR. WARDMAN: Yeah. And I don't get the paper so.

THE COURT: And the second question, to the best of your knowledge has there been any discussion about the case by any of the jurors?

1 MR. WARDMAN: No. THE COURT: No. Okay. Thank you. You can 2 3 step outside, the sheriff will take you back. **** 4 5 And let's try, if the sheriff can duck in here for a minute. Sheriff, Diane Free, 6 7 number two. THE COURT: Good morning, Ms Free. 8 9 MS FREE: Good morning. 10 THE COURT: As I indicated in the courtroom, the reason we're doing this is because 11 12 the trial has gone on for, you know, five weeks now. 13 And there's been a good deal of publicity about the 14 case, so just to make sure that both sides get a --15 a fair trial, we're double checking to see if any of 16 the jurors may have been exposed to any information 17 about the case that you feel could impact your 18 ability to serve as a juror. Have you been exposed 19 to any information about the case? 20 MS FREE: No, I'm -- I miss the news, 21 though. 22 THE COURT: You are not that many days 23 away. And the second question I have is, are you

24

25

aware of any conversations that have taken place

among any of the jurors involving the case.

1	MS FREE: No, we have done really good
2	policing ourselves.
3	THE COURT: Okay. I'm glad to hear that.
4	All right. Thank you, that's all I have. You are
5	excused.
6	MS FREE: Thanks.
7	****
8	THE COURT: Number seven, Paul Nelesen.
9	Good morning, Mr. Nelesen.
10	MR. NELESEN: Good morning.
11	THE COURT: First of all, how are you
12	feeling today?
13	MR. NELESEN: Oh, fair to partly cloudy,
14	I guess.
15	THE COURT: Better than last week?
16	MR. NELESEN: Yeah, a little bit better.
17	THE COURT: As I indicated on the record,
18	because of the fact that the trial has gone on for
19	six weeks and has been the subject of a lot of
20	publicity, as we get toward the end stages of the
21	trial here, I'm just trying to make sure that there
22	haven't been any problems of the nature
23	MR. NELESEN: Sure.
24	THE COURT: I addressed. So my question
25	is, whether you have been exposed to any

1	information, whether anybody tried to talk to you or
2	anything, anything that information about the
3	case that could affect your ability as a juror?
4	MR. NELESEN: No, I have had people ask
5	me, but I just pretty much tell them what you
6	told me, no, I can't talk about it. Everyone
7	pretty much just drops it.
8	THE COURT: Okay. That's good to hear.
9	And the second and the final question is, are you
10	aware of any discussion that's taken place among any
11	of the other jurors about the case?
12	MR. NELESEN: No, we usually keep pretty
13	quiet.
14	THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's good.
15	You are excused.
16	MR. NELESEN: That's it? Okay.
17	THE COURT: That wasn't so bad.
18	MR. NELESEN: No.
19	****
20	THE COURT: Let's do number eight, Nathan
21	Klein. Good morning, Mr. Klein.
22	MR. KLEIN: Good morning.
23	THE COURT: As I indicated on the record,
24	because of the fact the trial has gone on for six
25	weeks and has been the subject of a lot of publicity

1	and the trial is starting to wind down and we're
2	getting near the end, we're taking the opportunity
3	to make sure that the that the jurors haven't
4	been exposed to anything they shouldn't be. So my
5	first question would be, have you inadvertently, or
6	otherwise, heard anything on the news, or had
7	persons talk to you, or anything else
8	MR. KLEIN: No.
9	THE COURT: about the case?
10	MR. KLEIN: No, I have been very good
11	about it. Immediate family, nor anybody else in
12	the group.
13	THE COURT: And I did get your note about
14	the propane delivery driver, as I understand it that
15	was one of the witnesses from a few days ago.
16	MR. KLEIN: Correct.
17	THE COURT: You indicated you spoke to him
18	two or three years ago when your propane tank
19	MR. KLEIN: Yeah.
20	THE COURT: Did you just talk about the
21	propane?
22	MR. KLEIN: Yes. There was nothing
23	more, but I felt that I should let you guys know.
24	THE COURT: Is that the extent of your

acquaintance with him?

1	MR. KLEIN: Yes.
2	THE COURT: You don't think that would
3	impair
4	MR. KLEIN: I don't know the guy. He
5	doesn't hardly know me.
6	THE COURT: Last question is, are you aware
7	of any discussion that's taken place about the case
8	by any other members of the jury?
9	MR. KLEIN: No. No, I feel we have a
10	really good group in this. Everybody is very
11	diligent about not speaking of anything.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you.
13	MR. KLEIN: Yeah, thanks.
14	****
15	THE COURT: How about number 12, William
16	Mohr? Good morning. Mr. Mohr.
17	MR. MOHR: Good morning.
18	THE COURT: As I indicated on the record,
19	because of the fact that a trial has gone on for six
20	weeks and it's been the subject of a good deal of
21	publicity, we're just questioning the jurors to make
22	sure that they haven't been exposed to anything that
23	could jeopardize the right of either side to a fair
24	trial.
25	So my first question is whether,

1	inadvertently or otherwise, you have heard
2	anything on the news, or other persons have
3	talked to you or tried to talk to you about the
4	case?
5	MR. MOHR: No.
6	THE COURT: Anything?
7	MR. MOHR: No.
8	THE COURT: Thanks. And the second
9	question I have is, are you aware of any
10	conversations that have taken place among any
11	members of the jury that were related to the case or
12	about the case?
13	MR. MOHR: No.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Very good. You may
15	stand up and you will be escorted back.
16	MR. MOHR: All righty.
17	****
18	THE COURT: Number three, Terri Temme.
19	Good morning.
20	MS TEMME: Good morning.
21	THE COURT: Have a seat.
22	MS TEMME: Okay.
23	THE COURT: As I indicated on the record,
24	because of the fact that a trial has gone on for
25	five weeks now and it's been the subject of a good

deal of publicity, we're just taking this opportunity as we near the end of the trial to make sure that, inadvertently or otherwise, none of the jurors have been exposed to any information about the case that they shouldn't be. So, my first question is, has there been anything on the news, or any person who has tried to talk to you, or anything else, with information about the trial?

MS TEMME: No.

THE COURT: Okay. And my second question is, are you aware, have you heard of any discussions by any other members of the jury about the case?

MS TEMME: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. That's it.

15 *****

THE COURT: Let's try Barbara Schmidt, number four. Good morning. Good morning, Ms Schmidt. As you know, the trial has been going on, we're in our fifth week now. And because of the fact of the length of the trial and the amount of publicity that it's received, it's very important to both sides that the trial is heard by a fair and impartial jury. And we want to make sure, that whether through inadvertence or otherwise, or for any other reason, that none of the jurors has been

exposed to any information that could affect their 1 2 ability to serve as a juror. 3 So I have a few questions for you. you heard anything about the case from any of the 4 5 media during the trial? MS SCHMIDT: No, sir. 7 THE COURT: The other thing that we asked about and I know that sometimes through inadvertence 8 9 or through no fault of the jurors, it can happen, 10 but have any other persons attempted to talk to you about the trial, whether other jurors, or family 11 12 members, or anything else? 13 MS SCHMIDT: No. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Have -- Is there anybody 15 else that lives in your household with you? MS SCHMIDT: Well, my husband, my three 16 17 sons. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Are your three sons home 19 during the day? 20 MS SCHMIDT: Mostly the older one is a 21 foreman at EVM and the other two go to school. 22 Okay. Have either -- Any of your children or Ο. 23 your husband said anything to you about the trial 24 during the course of the trial?

MS SCHMIDT:

They mention things, but I

1	just kind of ignore them.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Who would mention
3	things?
4	MS SCHMIDT: Mostly my husband. I think
5	he knows more about what's going on than I do.
6	THE COURT: Can you tell me some of the
7	types of things he might mention?
8	MS SCHMIDT: Well, Saturday he said
9	something to the affect that it didn't make any
10	difference what the jurors would decide because
11	everybody would go to appeals and all that kind
12	of stuff. So that's basically it.
13	THE COURT: Has he do you know where
14	he's gotten whatever information he has about the
15	trial?
16	MS SCHMIDT: I don't know. He has he
17	goes out to the greenhouse, which is our part
18	business. And I imagine he has got a radio out
19	there.
20	THE COURT: Has he said anything to you
21	that in any way is for or against one of the parties
22	to the trial?
23	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.
24	THE COURT: Okay. So he's mentioned things
25	to you about the trial, but he hasn't said anything

1	about, for example, how he feels?
2	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.
3	THE COURT: Okay. And what have you done
4	when he's talked to you about the trial?
5	MS SCHMIDT: Well, on Saturday, I went
6	down to carry in wood. See, we have a wood
7	burner in our basement so that's what I do in my
8	spare time. Carry in, putting in, carry in,
9	putting in, that kind of stuff.
10	THE COURT: So you have walked away when
11	he's talked about it?
12	MS SCHMIDT: Yeah, it kind of perturbed
13	him, but I did walk away, yes.
14	THE COURT: And is he aware of the
15	restrictions the Court has placed on you, that you
16	are not supposed to talk about it.
17	MS SCHMIDT: He's aware, but he likes to
18	see if he can get my goat, so to speak.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Has he attempted to
20	provide you with any information outside of what the
21	jury has heard in court about the case.
22	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir, that he won't do.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MS SCHMIDT: But I do have a problem
25	with those little I don't know what you call

1	them tickers across the bottom of the screen.
2	I usually pay attention because it means
3	something has happened, or like the kids don't
4	have to go to school that day
5	THE COURT: Sure.
6	MS SCHMIDT: because of bad storms,
7	that kind of bothers once in a while, if I don't
8	catch it in time.
9	THE COURT: So you What do you do if you
10	see a ticker that involves the trial?
11	MS SCHMIDT: Well, I have been engrossed
12	pretty much in books and stuff. I don't pay too
13	much attention to TV, but when this little sign
14	goes off and then all of a sudden the ticker
15	flies across, well, you kind of pay attention to
16	it.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MS SCHMIDT: But when it involves the
19	trial or something like that, I turn it off
20	quick.
21	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So do you
22	feel that you have been exposed to any information
23	that would affect you or your ability to be fair as
24	a juror?

MS SCHMIDT: Not that I know of.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Are you Have you
2	talked to any other jurors about what you just
3	talked to me about?
4	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.
5	THE COURT: Do you know if any other jurors
6	have talked to you or have you heard anything about
7	similar situations where they might somebody in
8	their family might be talking to them?
9	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir. I kind of sit
10	back in the room and read all day. And they go
11	around talking, talking.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MS SCHMIDT: And I kind of absorb bits
14	and pieces here and there but.
15	THE COURT: Has any other juror said
16	anything to you on the bus about them talking to
17	their spouse or anything?
18	MS SCHMIDT: Not their talking to their
19	spouse, no.
20	THE COURT: Talking to anybody about the
21	case?
22	MS SCHMIDT: Not about the case, about
23	their measures as to not hearing it, you know,
24	like turning off the radio
25	THE COURT: Okay.

1	MS SCHMIDT: or listening to the PF,
2	whatever, public service thing, you know.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MS SCHMIDT: I don't know what that's
5	called, PBS.
6	THE COURT: So, based on what you know, you
7	feel that the other jurors are doing their best not
8	to hear anything about the case?
9	MS SCHMIDT: That's right.
10	THE COURT: All right. I'm going to have
11	you why don't you just step outside for a second
12	with the sheriff there.
13	MS SCHMIDT: Excuse me.
14	****
15	THE COURT: Let's just hold for a second,
16	shut the door.
17	OFFICER: Okay.
18	
	THE COURT: We'll be right with you.
19	THE COURT: We'll be right with you. ATTORNEY FALLON: The only thought I had is
19 20	
	ATTORNEY FALLON: The only thought I had is
20	ATTORNEY FALLON: The only thought I had is you might want to ask her what she's learned from
20 21	ATTORNEY FALLON: The only thought I had is you might want to ask her what she's learned from the tickers.
20 21 22	ATTORNEY FALLON: The only thought I had is you might want to ask her what she's learned from the tickers. ATTORNEY KRATZ: If she learned anything

dependent on that answer.

ATTORNEY GAHN: The tickers, I wouldn't even bring her back in for that.

ATTORNEY BUTING: It's kind of hard to believe that as to how many times that her husband has said anything and if he is trying to get her goat all the time, but I'm not sure what would provoke that thing, doesn't matter what the jurors are going to do, everybody is going to appeal.

THE COURT: Yeah, well, that can be a situation where a spouse, you know, if they know they are not supposed to be talking about the case, can tease them without saying anything that would prejudice the juror.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Let's ask her what her husband thinks about the case.

ATTORNEY BUTING: More open ended, what does he think about the case. He knows more about it, what's going on, than I do. How can that be?

THE COURT: Sure. Anything else before we bring her back in? I will ask her both, I'll ask her about the tickers.

Ms Schmidt, I just have a couple follow-up questions. One was about the tickers you mentioned. Do you know, before you were able

1	to turn the TV off, or look away, do you remember
2	anything that you saw on the tickers?
3	MS SCHMIDT: Not Not particularly,
4	no. It just it mentioned you and something
5	about Mr. Avery. And then I don't have any idea.
6	But see like the something is, you know, it goes
7	like I said, it goes in one ear and out the
8	other and sometimes it doesn't register in
9	between.
10	THE COURT: So whatever you saw on the
11	tickers, you can't remember?
12	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.
13	THE COURT: The other question I have is
14	with respect to your husband, do you know what his
15	opinion is about the case? Does he think
16	MS SCHMIDT: He has strong opinions,
17	they don't always agree with mine.
18	THE COURT: Okay. But what opinions of his
19	has he given to you?
20	MS SCHMIDT: Just what he mentioned
21	about, no matter what happens to the trial, you
22	are going to have appeals and all kinds of stuff
23	anyway, so.
24	THE COURT: Has he told you anything about
25	whether he thinks the defendant is guilty or

1	innocent?
2	MS SCHMIDT: No. No.
3	THE COURT: He has not.
4	MS SCHMIDT: No.
5	THE COURT: When you say he has strong
6	feelings, what what are those strong feelings
7	that he passed on to you?
8	MS SCHMIDT: Not anything regarding the
9	trial, but but like home things. Like if the
10	boys have trouble with this or that, they know
11	better, they are supposed to do this and they are
12	supposed to do that. He doesn't holler at them
13	or scold them, it's always up to me to do the
14	punishing.
15	THE COURT: How often has your husband
16	attempted to talk to you about the case?
17	MS SCHMIDT: Well, twice for sure. As
18	long as this has been going on, maybe twice.
19	THE COURT: Over the five weeks.
20	MS SCHMIDT: Yes, sir.
21	THE COURT: Do you remember which about
22	when they were?
23	MS SCHMIDT: No, I couldn't tell you on
24	it.
25	THE COURT: Do you remember the most recent

1	one?
2	MS SCHMIDT: Just that Saturday, this
3	past Saturday.
4	THE COURT: This past Saturday?
5	MS SCHMIDT: Yeah.
6	THE COURT: And the other one would have
7	been about how long before that?
8	MS SCHMIDT: Probably when it just
9	started.
10	THE COURT: Nothing other than that?
11	MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.
12	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may
13	step outside.
14	****
15	THE COURT: Just hold it for a second and
16	shut the door.
17	ATTORNEY BUTING: I think we need to hear
18	from the reporter next, we're kind of shooting in a
19	vacuum.
20	THE COURT: Do you have any questions for
21	this juror at this time?
22	ATTORNEY FALLON: On the thing as a result
23	of that family dynamic, do you think that's going to
24	have any problem for you?
25	COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, you're going

to have to talk a little louder.

attorney fallon: Okay. I'm sorry. The only thought I had and I'm not saying you definitely need to ask it, but the only question I had is, do you think as a result of the family dynamics here that you would still be able to fulfill your role or duty as a juror in this case, or something to that affect. But other than that, I don't really see anything else.

THE COURT: I think I asked her something like that earlier, but it's a good idea to ask her again, now that we have heard everything. Let's bring her back for that one question.

One more question.

MS SCHMIDT: All right.

THE COURT: Ms Schmidt, you will be relieved to know I only have one more question. As a result of whatever discussion you had with your husband on those two occasions when he's tried to talk to you about it; do you feel that anything he said would affect your ability to be fair and just base your decision on the evidence in this case?

MS SCHMIDT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS SCHMIDT: This is it, this time,

1	right?
2	THE COURT: I promise, you are not coming
3	back.
4	****
5	THE COURT: Nancy Stienmetz.
6	ATTORNEY STRANG: As a matter of demeanor
7	and watching her, listening to the answers, I don't
8	believe her. I don't think this is a candid juror.
9	****
10	THE COURT: Good morning.
11	MS STIENMETZ: Good morning.
12	THE COURT: Have a seat. Ms Stienmetz,
13	we're bringing all of the jurors in this morning to
14	ask some questions, because of the length of the
15	trial and the amount of publicity that it's had,
16	just to make sure that all the jurors can be fair
17	and impartial.
18	You should know that, although there's a
19	reporter sitting behind you, they are prohibited
20	from identifying any juror by name. And I told
21	him also by sex. So any reporting as a result of
22	what happens here cannot in any way identify
23	anything that is said by any particular juror.
24	MS STIENMETZ: Okay.

THE COURT: The first thing I want to ask

is that the trial has gone on for five weeks now and 1 it's received a great deal of publicity, so we're 2 calling in each of the jurors in order to find out 3 whether any juror may have, through inadvertence or 4 5 anything else, been exposed to any information about the case from the news media, another person, or any 7 other source, that you can remember? Have you been exposed to any such information? 8 9 MS STIENMETZ: I have been exposed to --10 I have not seen a thing on TV, absolutely nothing media wise. I have just been exposed to some 11 12 chit chat that I have heard, but that's --

THE COURT: Chit chat from who?

MS STIENMETZ: Some of the other jurors.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you referring to the information you provided the Court earlier?

MS STIENMETZ: Yeah.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And we have heard something about that as well from one of the participants. I'm going to ask you, if you will, at this time, to tell me as best you can remember, the circumstances and what happened.

MS STIENMETZ: For -- From the whole perspective of what I have heard -- THE COURT: Yes.

1	MS STIENMETZ: since the beginning of
2	everything?
3	THE COURT: Yes. My understanding, it
4	involves two other jurors.
5	MS STIENMETZ: Correct. From what I had
6	heard. The first week, first couple of days
7	Auggie, he sits right next to me, made the
8	comment that when he got
9	THE COURT: Sits next to you on the bus?
10	MS STIENMETZ: No, he sits next to me at
11	our long table in the room.
12	THE COURT: Oh, not in the courtroom,
13	though?
14	MS STIENMETZ: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MS STIENMETZ: No, in that sitting room.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MS STIENMETZ: So, you know, there's
19	always conversation, everyone is laughing and
20	having a pretty good time, generally speaking,
21	but the first week he made a couple comments that
22	when he would get home that his wife watches the
23	trial while he is in there and that she would
24	tell him what transpired when we would be sent
25	out of the courtroom.

And one of the other jurors went, shh, shh, you are not supposed to be talking about that. You are not supposed to do that, you know. And then he was quiet. And then a couple of days later, again, he started saying that. And he got shooed by several people and -- Oh, man, I don't like having to do this. And, um, then that was like the first week. Then you had said that you were going to be giving a CD to keep everyone's temptation.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MS STIENMETZ: So, I think that was like on a Friday and about a few days after that, beginning of the next week, it was conversation about how nice it was and that, you know, no one should be tempted now and whatever. And then there was conversation, just everybody generally here and there popping in something. And they were saying how you could -- you were not supposed to -- because you were doing this, were not supposed to be watching TV, reading newspapers, the computer and stuff like that. And then computer talk started and Auggie, he tends to want to, I know we're not supposed to talk about it but, and he wants to try to start a

conversation and he gets shooed.

But then when we were on the computer stuff, saying well, you can pull stuff up. And I had said, I think what started that was I had said, well, I had a girlfriend who said that we were all in the computer with our occupations, our family, and I was kind of worried about it because I didn't want anybody to know who I was. I think that's how the computer started.

And then Auggie, he was saying, well, how can you erase something on the computer, to have it off of the C drive, I believe. And they were telling him, but then they said, well, once you delete it, it's still in the memory, etched in the computer and anyone can still pull that information out if they want to.

It was just speculation on my part. It just was all very coincidental. And he got like whiter than a ghost and didn't say a word the rest of the day. So that was just circumstantial, but I mean it was -- it put a flag in my mind and I'm thinking, well, should I say something, not, no. So I didn't, thinking that was the end of it. Then, I guess what made me think, well, I better say something was then

Wednesday on the bus, him and Barb were sitting together and Barb is very quiet.

THE COURT: Mm-hmm.

MS STIENMETZ: And she was talking about all her things going on at home on the farm and stuff. And I heard Auggie mention, again, about his wife watching it and wanting to tell him what happens.

And Barb said that her husband watches it, too, during the day, but he tries to pressure her, influence her with his opinions. She wouldn't mind if he -- She doesn't mind him watching it, but he pressures her with his opinions.

And then they were talking -- I don't know, I heard bits and pieces about when news flashes pop up on the screen with film flashes, Auggie was saying that it's hard to get up and leave. I don't know if he said he does or doesn't, but that when they pop up, because they pop up frequently, it's difficult.

And that's when I heard Barb, specifically say, that she sees when the ticker tape goes across the bottom of the screen, even though there is a program on, that she does read

1	that ticker tape, that she doesn't leave the
2	room. And that's when I sat on it for a couple
3	days and I thought, well, I better say something.
4	THE COURT: Sure. Let me ask you just a
5	few follow-up questions. First of all, that
6	represents the extent of exposure you have had,
7	right?
8	MS STIENMETZ: Yes.
9	THE COURT: As I understand what you are
10	saying
11	MS STIENMETZ: Yeah.
12	THE COURT: from what you reported that
13	Auggie said, did you get the impression that besides
14	his wife watching what happens when the jurors leave
15	the room, that that she's passing that
16	information on to him?
17	MS STIENMETZ: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: Do you have any reason to
19	believe anybody else on the jury is getting that
20	information?
21	MS STIENMETZ: From someone else?
22	THE COURT: Well, but if Auggie passing on
23	what he knows to anybody else.
24	MS STIENMETZ: I don't think so, I mean
25	Auggie, he he didn't say, oh, this is what

1	happened and this is what happened, but he just
2	said my wife tells me
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MS STIENMETZ when I had come home. A
5	few times I have heard him say that.
6	THE COURT: Did he say if he makes any
7	effort to stop her?
8	MS STIENMETZ: I did not hear that.
9	THE COURT: And with Barb, did you learn
10	anything about what her husband's opinions are?
11	MS STIENMETZ: No.
12	THE COURT: So you don't know what they
13	are?
14	MS STIENMETZ: No. All I heard was, she
15	said that her husband watches the court
16	proceedings on TV, too, while she's in in here
17	and that she doesn't mind except that he
18	pressures her with his opinions about what goes
19	on in the courtroom.
20	THE COURT: When she When you heard her
21	say, pressures her with his opinions
22	MS STIENMETZ: Mm-hmm.
23	THE COURT: were you sure that it was
24	pressures her with his opinions about this case, as
25	opposed to pressures her with his opinions about

1	other things.
2	MS STIENMETZ: I got the impression it
3	was with the case, because that's what they were
4	talking about.
5	THE COURT: Okay. But she didn't say what
6	those opinions were?
7	MS STIENMETZ: No, no, they did not. I
8	have not heard any of them say what someone had
9	told them, other than that they had been told.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	MS STIENMETZ: Influenced, or whatever,
12	I don't know. So, I'm sorry this has turned into
13	a mess.
14	THE COURT: No reason to be sorry for being
15	conscientious.
16	MS STIENMETZ: It's probably nothing,
17	but if it is something and if I didn't say
18	anything, it would be very difficult.
19	THE COURT: Believe me, everybody has to
20	live with themselves and it's good to be
21	conscientious.
22	MS STIENMETZ: So.
23	THE COURT: All right. I think that's all
24	I have for you. I'm going to let the sheriff take
25	you back.

1	MS STIENMETZ: Give me a minute to I
2	blush very easily.
3	THE COURT: Ms Stienmetz.
4	MS STIENMETZ: Yes.
5	THE COURT: When you leave with the
6	sheriff, you can tell them, if you want to sit down
7	outside for a little while, you can go in my office
8	if you want.
9	MS STIENMETZ: They have already made a
10	comment that Barb was out so long and I'm out as
11	long as she. And I don't want them to get any
12	ideas.
13	THE COURT: At any rate, you take whatever
14	time you need and we'll have the sheriff take you
15	back.
16	MS STIENMETZ: Okay.
17	THE COURT: Thank you.
18	****
19	THE COURT: Let's try 16, Laura Barber.
20	ATTORNEY BUTING: We may want to ask this
21	next juror a little more pointed questions about,
22	you know, how you police yourselves. If she says
23	that nobody is talking about it, does it come up at
24	all, you know, what do you say, or how far does it

get, or sounds like something that's happened more

1 than once.

2 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Might want to keep her a longer time.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Right. I knew they were going to wonder because Barb was back here longer.

ATTORNEY GAHN: I was wondering that too.

THE COURT: Good morning, again.

MS BARBER: Good morning.

THE COURT: As I indicated on the record, because of the fact that the trial has gone on for a number of weeks and because it's gotten a lot of publicity and, now, as we're getting toward the end of the trial, we're taking time to make sure that none of the jurors has been exposed to anything they shouldn't be. So, my first question for you would be, can you think of any information from the news media, or any persons who said or tried to say anything to you, has anything about the case been presented to you.

MS BARBER: Not at all. Not at all. In fact, if I can just speak, my family, once they knew I was going to be on this jury, as soon as anything comes on, you know, they mute it.

It's --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS BARBER: And I, then, avoid all visual contact with the television. When it's over, they will say it's over and put it back on. People I work with, even, avoid saying. They will come up and say glad to see you're still working here. I work one day a week, you know, and that's the extent, they don't care anything else. And I appreciate that. I haven't picked up a newspaper, I don't even go through the sale papers on Sunday any more.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS BARBER: Just in case.

THE COURT: That's good to know. Next, I'm wondering, and we're asking all the jurors about this, have you heard any discussion about the case during the course of the trial from any of the other jurors?

MS BARBER: No, we make it specific that we do not talk about the case. We may talk about some of the people --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS BARBER: But that's -- usually it's in a humorous -- in fact, I have never been with a group, this long, this close, that everyone gets along so well.

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MS BARBER: It's sometimes rather
3	humorous.
4	THE COURT: Sure.
5	MS BARBER: And I appreciate that,
6	because the time goes a lot nicer.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Have any members of the
8	jury had to kind of hush up any other ones before
9	they started talking about the case or
10	MS BARBER: Someone might have started
11	to say something and it's like, whoa, hold it,
12	that's it, and it's quiet.
13	THE COURT: Okay. So there's pretty good
14	policing?
15	MS BARBER: Very much, very much.
16	Everybody keeps track of everybody else. Unless
17	they are talking to themself in the bathroom, but
18	to me that's
19	THE COURT: And you haven't heard
20	MS BARBER: I'm sorry.
21	THE COURT: And you haven't heard anything
22	come from any of the jurors in this case?
23	MS BARBER: No. Not at all.
24	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
25	MS BARBER: Oh, darn, I was kind of

1	enjoying this.
2	THE COURT: Well, it's a break from the
3	norm.
4	MS BARBER: Definitely, actually, we
5	were just discussing, we missed our morning
6	break, is it okay if we have one.
7	THE COURT: It's going to be running
8	altogether.
9	MS BARBER: I'm telling you, that's why
10	it's such an enjoyable group. Because this is
11	one of the things, we're worried about our break.
12	THE COURT: Well, that is good.
13	MS BARBER: Thanks.
14	****
15	THE COURT: Let's try Marion Flint.
16	ATTORNEY FALLON: We don't talk about the
17	trial, but we talk about the people.
18	THE COURT: Talking to themselves in the
19	bathroom. I didn't know that any of you guys wanted
20	me to pursue that. I didn't know if they meant
21	other jurors or the participants in the trial.
22	Marion Flint is the next one.
23	Good morning, have a seat.
24	MS FLINT: Good morning. Okay.
25	THE COURT: We saved you the only chair

that's left. This is, as I explained on the record, because of the fact the trial has gone on for a number of weeks, it's gotten a lot of publicity.

We're near -- getting near the final stages of the trial. And because of the length of the trial and the publicity, we're taking this opportunity to talk to each of the jurors, just to make sure that the jurors haven't heard anything inadvertently or otherwise, that could impact their ability to serve.

So, my first question is, are you aware of any information that you have been exposed to, by accident or otherwise, on the news or from other persons, or any other member of the jury, anything about the case?

MS FLINT: No.

THE COURT: You have been able to --

MS FLINT: I live alone.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS FLINT: And so I can monitor myself.

THE COURT: Sounds like you are doing a good job. Next question is, I know the jurors have been together a lot about this case, are you aware of any instances that came to your attention in which any of the jurors, other jurors, said anything about the case?

1 MS FLINT: None, they have been really good.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, that's good to hear. I think that's all I have got for you.

MS FLINT: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Schuette. Good morning.

MR. SCHUETTE: Good morning.

THE COURT: We're, as I indicated on the record, in recognition of the fact that the trial has gone on for five weeks now and it's been the subject of a good deal of publicity, and now that we're starting to get near the end of the trial, we wanted to make sure that -- that all the jurors haven't been exposed -- or that none of the jurors have been exposed to any information through inadvertence, or otherwise, about the trial, because of the importance to both parties to get a absolutely fair trial.

And we're especially doing it because we understand, even if the parties try to avoid information, it's not always easy to do that.

So, in that light, I would like to ask you a couple questions. First of all, whether or not

1	you have been exposed directly to any media
2	reporting about the case during the course of the
3	trial?
4	MR. SCHUETTE: No, I have not.
5	THE COURT: The next question I have
6	relates to information gained from other parties, or
7	other persons, whether there's been any personal
8	acquaintances, other jurors or, I know in special
9	cases, members of the person's family, whether any
10	such information, or any persons have attempted to
11	talk to you about the case in any way?
12	MR. SCHUETTE: No, nobody has. No there
13	have not.
14	THE COURT: Have there been any other
15	conversations with involving other members of the
16	jury about the case?
17	MS SCHUETTE: None at all, no.
18	THE COURT: Okay. There In cases with
19	people that have spouses, especially, we're asking
20	the question, do you have a spouse at home?
21	MS SCHUETTE: Yes, I do.
22	THE COURT: Has there been any discussion
23	whatsoever between you and your wife about the case;
24	is she following the case in any way?
25	MS SCHUETTE: She's limitedly following

We have had no discussion that would be 1 involved. I think the only thing about the whole 2 procedure, is what we have for lunch. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 5 MR. SCHUETTE: So there hasn't been anything as far as any details, as far as the 6 7 trial itself. THE COURT: Okay. Has she been following 8 9 the trial in any sense at home, on the internet? MR. SCHUETTE: Well, somewhat, I think a 10 11 little bit in the newspapers. Not on the 12 internet, she doesn't know how to get on the 13 internet. Limitedly on the radio. I don't think 14 the radio, just limitedly. 15 THE COURT: And you said she hasn't talked 16 to you about the facts of the case; has she said 17 anything to you about the case during the course of 18 the trial? MS SCHUETTE: No, not that I can 19 20 remember. I pretty much told her let's not talk 21 about it. She may well talk about it to some of her family members, but she doesn't relay that to 22 23 me.

24

25

THE COURT: Are you aware of any discussions that have been had between any members

1	of the jury about the case during the course of the
2	trial.
3	MS SCHUETTE: Not at all, no. I think
4	the jury, in my observation, I think they have
5	been very observant of your request not to talk
6	about anything.
7	THE COURT: Have any of the jurors had to
8	be told to stop talking about the case by any other
9	jurors?
10	MR. SCHUETTE: Not that I can recall.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Has anybody given any
12	person given any information to you about what was
13	happening during the trial while the jurors were
14	outside of the courtroom?
15	MR SCHUETTE: No.
16	THE COURT: Thank you. I think that's all
17	I have. The sheriff will take you back.
18	MR. SCHUETTE: Thank you.
19	****
20	THE COURT: And Ms Thorne will be next.
21	Good morning.
22	MS THORNE: Good morning.
23	THE COURT: By luck of the draw, you are
24	the last person.
25	MS THORNE: Yeah, I get to wait the

1 | longest and sit and wonder.

THE COURT: We, as I indicated on the record, this trial is different than most in a number of ways and one of the reasons is it's gone on for five weeks now.

MS THORNE: Mm-hmm.

THE COURT: It's been the subject of a good deal of publicity. And as we now get near the end of the trial, because of the length of it and the publicity, we're interviewing each of the jurors to make sure that they haven't been exposed, through inadvertence, no fault of their own, or any other reason, deliberate or not, to any information about the case.

MS THORNE: Okay.

THE COURT: So the first question I have for you, is whether, during the course of the trial, through the news media, family members, employers, members of the public, anyone, have you received any information about the case during the trial?

MS THORNE: No.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm trying to remember, where are you employed, again?

MS THORNE: Waitress, but I'm off the schedule until I go back.

1	THE COURT: Oh. So you have been off
2	off the
3	MS THORNE: Right.
4	THE COURT: schedule?
5	MS THORNE: Mm-hmm, ever since it
6	started.
7	THE COURT: Do you remember the last time
8	you worked there?
9	MS THORNE: The Sunday right before we
10	started.
11	THE COURT: Before the trial started?
12	MS THORNE: Uh-huh. Yeah.
13	THE COURT: So it was after the jury
14	selection, but before the trial started.
15	MS THORNE: Right. Right.
16	THE COURT: And you haven't worked since
17	then?
18	MS THORNE: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Has anyone Do any
20	family members or anyone live with you at home?
21	MS THORNE: My fiance.
22	THE COURT: Has he attempted to talk to you
23	about the case?
24	MS THORNE: No, huh-uh.
25	THE COURT: Have any fellow employees,

1	members of the public, anyone else, talked about it?
2	MS THORNE: No.
3	THE COURT: And are you aware as to whether
4	or not there's been any discussion by any of the
5	other jurors about the case?
6	MS THORNE: No, huh-uh.
7	THE COURT: No one has tried to talk to
8	you?
9	MS THORNE: No.
10	THE COURT: And you haven't heard anyone
11	else?
12	MS THORNE: No.
13	THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think
14	that's all I have.
15	MS THORNE: Okay.
16	THE COURT: You can step outside with the
17	sheriff.
18	MS THORNE: All that wondering for
19	nothing, huh.
20	THE COURT: We were trying to get you some
21	exercise this morning.
22	MS THORNE: Okay.
23	****
24	THE COURT: All right. Counsel, what I'm
25	going to do at this time is adjourn for a break. I

will give you a chance to look at your notes and 1 digest things. And I have 11:22 right how, about 20 2 minutes to 12 report to chambers. 3 ATTORNEY KRATZ: This isn't something we'll 4 5 do on the record? THE COURT: We'll determine --7 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Oh, I see what you are saying. 8 9 THE COURT: -- what's the next step after 10 that. 11 ATTORNEY KRATZ: Okay. 12 (Jury not present.) 13 THE COURT: At this time we are back on the 14 record, outside the presence of the jurors. All 15 counsel and the defendant are present. Mr. Strang, 16 does the defense have any additional evidence it 17 wishes to present? 18 ATTORNEY STRANG: We do not, your Honor. 19 We intend to rest, formally, before the jury next 20 joins us in the courtroom. 21 THE COURT: Very well, before we bring the 22 jurors in the courtroom to inform them of that fact, the defendant in this case has a right to testify if 23 24 he wishes. And the Court wants to make sure that if

he is declining to exercise that right, that it is

25

1	done so knowingly and voluntarily. Mr. Strang, have
2	you raised this issue with your client?
3	ATTORNEY STRANG: I have raised it with
4	Mr. Avery; that is, Mr. Buting and I both have,
5	jointly, several times, probably beginning before
6	trial and then during the trial.
7	THE COURT: Thank you. You can move the
8	microphone over to Mr. Avery then.
9	Mr. Avery, do you understand that you
10	have a constitutional right to testify in this
11	case, if you wish?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
13	THE COURT: And do you further understand
14	that you have a constitutional right not to testify,
15	if you wish?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
17	THE COURT: Do you understand that the
18	decision whether to testify or not is yours to make?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20	THE COURT: That means, you can listen to
21	your attorneys and listen to their advice, but,
22	ultimately, it's your call; do you understand that?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
24	THE COURT: Has anyone made any threats or
25	promises to you to influence your decision?

1	THE DEFENDANT: No, they didn't.
2	THE COURT: Have you thoroughly discussed
3	your decision with your attorneys?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
5	THE COURT: And have you made a decision as
6	to whether or not you wish to testify in this case?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
8	THE COURT: What is your decision?
9	THE DEFENDANT: My decision is, I'm an
10	innocent man and there's no reason for me to
11	testify. Everybody knows I'm innocent.
12	THE COURT: Okay. So you wish not to
13	testify; is that correct?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.
16	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Strang and Mr. Buting, have
18	each of you had sufficient opportunity to thoroughly
19	discuss this case and the decision whether or not to
20	testify with your client?
21	ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes, we both have.
22	THE COURT: And are each of you satisfied
23	that he's making his decision not to testify
24	knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily?
25	ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes.

THE COURT: Very well, the Court finds that Mr. Avery's decision not to testify in this case is knowingly and voluntarily made. I'm satisfied he's aware of his constitutional right to testify, if he wishes. And he is knowingly and voluntarily declining the right to exercise the right to testify. Is there anything else that either party wishes to address before we bring the jurors in?

ATTORNEY STRANG: There is, from the defense, your Honor. I cannot remember when, but sometime earlier in this trial, we discussed the issue of one of our juror's participation on an earlier civil jury in which the witness here was a party. I will not name the juror, but the juror is known to the Court and to opposing counsel.

We argued at the time, that although this was uncharted territory, as a matter of case law, that the juror having once passed on the credibility of a witness here, and that witness' role as a party in a prior civil lawsuit, we thought would leave a strong enough impression on a juror and enough commitment to conclusions about credibility that there would be at least objective bias, if not also subjective bias, and reason to relieve the juror from further

responsibilities. The Court disagreed.

We went back to the case file in the earlier civil case and had our defense investigator look at that file in the Manitowoc County Circuit Court. And it appears from our investigator's review that the real crux of the dispute that was to be resolved by that earlier civil jury was whether the man who was a witness here and the plaintiff in that earlier case was malingering or not.

So his credibility, as we understand that earlier file, was not only in issue, but probably the main fighting issue, the main point of dispute in the earlier case. Clearly, given the jury's award of something better than \$170,000, to the plaintiff, that credibility contest was resolved in favor of the plaintiff there, witness here.

What we would like, and ask the Court to do, is to transfer the whole of the file from the earlier case to your Honor's custody now, so that your honor might review both the Clerk's minutes and such trial transcripts as there are. The parties also should have an opportunity to review those.

I have no reason to think that opposing counsel have seen the file and I know that neither Mr. Buting or I, personally, had seen the file. We simply delegated this to an investigator to take a first pass through that earlier file.

So I request that the Court bring the file, physically, to Chilton, from Manitowoc, review the file itself, allow the parties an opportunity to do that. And we anticipate renewing our motion to relieve this juror from further responsibilities in this case, acknowledging, as we have from the beginning, that the juror did the right thing by raising the issue at all, with the Court.

So this isn't a juror misconduct issue, claim, not even remotely. We think it's an interesting, as far as we know, unprecedented factual situation that arises, that we believe does require that the juror be relieved. So that's the request I'm making today and the one I'm forecasting later.

THE COURT: Let me ask one question before

I ask the State if they wish to comment, just to

enable me to prepare to reevaluate your request. Is

it the defense position that even if this juror is not subjectively biased, that by virtue of the juror's participation in this prior trial, that the juror is objectively biased?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes, in a word. And I won't labor again to the argument I made earlier, but I spoke to the Court, at the time, about the unique function of being a judge of facts. And the stylized way in which judges of facts, namely jurors, assess the credibility of witnesses and that it's very different than the way we assess credibility day-to-day, or in the grocery store, or barbershop, or wherever we may have conversation with people.

And having -- having undertaken that very special and stylized credibility assessment, I think it's unlikely that a juror would reconsider the credibility assessment, once arrived at, as a matter of judgment, as a judge of the facts. And that, objectively, this looks like someone who comes in with an opinion on the credibility of a witness, that has been cast by a very special prior intense experience, with a heavy responsibility for weighing credibility in that earlier role, and now being asked to do so

again under the same pattern instruction and with the same special and stylized considerations that apply, in a trial, to the judges of the facts, who fill out the array of 12 people in a jury box.

We don't think, reasonably, she could be expected, entirely, to set aside that prior, not just experience with the witness, but conclusions about credibility that she endorsed and drew after deliberations with -- with a group of 12 in that case and affirmed with her verdict.

THE COURT: All right. I take it at this point the defense is not asking to argue the merits of its request, but rather simply asking the Court to have the file transmitted here tomorrow.

argued the merits earlier. I anticipate I will argue the merits again, but for today, if we can get the file and all counsel can have whatever opportunity they wish to avail themselves of to look at the file, will be in a better position to discuss the issue on the merits tomorrow, or at the Court's convenience.

THE COURT: Anything from the State?

ATTORNEY FALLON: I would simply say that

we don't oppose that suggestion and would certainly like the Court to examine the file at its leisure.

I will no doubt be heard tomorrow regarding any renewed motion for the recusal of the juror. I will save my argument until then.

THE COURT: Very well, the Court will make sure the file is here tomorrow. I don't know how much leisure time I will have to review it, but I will make sure that it does get reviewed.

Anything else before we bring the jurors back in? All right. You may bring the jury in at this time.

(Jury present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Mr. Strang, at this time the defense may call its next witness.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Your Honor, Mr. Buting and I jointly have elected to rest at this time on behalf of Steven Avery.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Kratz, does the State have any witnesses or testimony to offer in rebuttal?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, that concludes the evidence portion of this trial. I have a couple of notices to read to you.

I can tell you that the parties informed me earlier today that they expected the evidence to end some time early this afternoon. They have also requested that they have tomorrow to prepare closing arguments and address some other matters that must be addressed before we have jury instructions and closing arguments of the parties and I have granted that request.

So I'm going to, at this time, excuse you for the rest of the day and also notify you that you won't have to report to court tomorrow. You should report at the normal time on Wednesday morning. And when you get here we will then proceed with final jury instructions and also closing arguments of the parties.

I do have a few notices to read to you before I excuse you for the day. As you know, the Court's decision not to sequester the jury during the trial is dependent on the jurors not listening to, watching, or reading any news accounts of the case, nor discussing it with anyone including members of your family or other jurors.

For these reasons it is vital that you do not listen to any conversation about the case,

do not read any newspaper or internet reports, or listen to any news reports on the radio or television about this trial.

To assure that you are not exposed to improper media coverage, the Court has ordered that, for the duration of the trial, that you do not watch the local news on television, nor listen to the news on radio, nor read any newspaper accounts, unless you first have someone remove any articles about this case from the newspaper.

In addition, do not visit any internet websites or web logs which may include any information about the case. I should add at this point that although the evidence portion of the trial is complete, the Court's order remains in affect. It is especially important at this time that you not be exposed to any information about the case.

The Court is asking that for those of you who are employed, that you not report to work tomorrow. I will make sure that you get paid a full day's jury pay, even though we're not asking you to be here tomorrow because of the request that I'm making.

Make sure that you do not disclose your status as a juror to anyone, if anyone attempts to discuss the case with you, politely but firmly notify them that you are prohibited from discussing the case. If you are involuntarily exposed to any information about the case from any source, take steps to immediately avoid any further exposure.

Should you be exposed to any reports or communications from any source concerning the case during the trial, or should you become aware of anything that you believe may affect your ability to serve as a juror, you should not discuss your concerns with any jurors, but report any concerns to the jury bailiff.

I also have a -- prepared a memo, which the jury bailiff will give to you before you leave today. There is a copy for each of you. As I think the parties disclosed during the jury selection process, it's difficult to predict -- difficult to predict how long jury deliberations may take, as disclosed in the memo, the Court is requesting that you pack some luggage, overnight belongings, in the event deliberations go on for more than a day and it's required that you stay

1 over.

If deliberations do go on more than a day, we'll put you up at a hotel, make sure you get all your meals taken care of and everything else. There is further information in the memo that you will be receiving. With that I'm going to excuse you for today.

(Jury not present.)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Counsel, is there anything further either party wishes to put on the record at this time?

ATTORNEY STRANG: The defense moves now, at the close of all evidence, for a judgment dismissing, with prejudice, the remaining three counts of the second Amended Information. I ask the Court, without further argument, to consider all of the evidence now received and to conclude that, even in the light most favorable to the State and drawing all reasonable inferences in the State's favor, the evidence is insufficient, as to each one of the three counts, to justify a reasonable jury concluding that the State has proven all essential elements as to each of those counts.

And I acknowledge, again, that as to one of the counts, Count 3, the felon in possession

of a firearm count, we did stipulate to one element, so as to that element, the status as a convicted felon on the relevant date, there the evidence is sufficient because stipulated. But as to the other charges and their essential elements, I ask for judgment of dismissal for want of sufficient evidence.

THE COURT: Anything from the State?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Just that the actual legal standard the Court is supposed to apply at this stage, not in the light most favorable to the State, but could a reasonable juror find guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt. We do believe that that slightly higher standard has also been met regarding the three remaining counts. Would ask the Court, without further argument, deny that motion.

THE COURT: For many of the reasons which the Court gave this morning, the Court believes that it has already had adequate opportunity to address this motion and the Court is going to deny the motion to dismiss the remaining three counts against the defendant at this time. Anything else before we adjourn this afternoon?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes. Mr. Buting was concerned that I was unclear, and I often am, as to

the felon in possession count. I meant to concede only that one of the essential elements of that count is established, not concede that any of the other essential elements of that count are established. And second --

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: That's how I understood your argument.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Well, then, the Court's become accustomed, perhaps, unfortunately, to my clumsy way of speaking. I also had, before this trial started, I think on February 2, suggested that a mistrial may be warranted, if, in fact, the State sought to proceed on the false imprisonment count and then fell short in its case-in-chief. That's what happened. I am not at the moment moving for a mistrial, because I want to think long and hard about whether necessity for that really is manifest. And there's nothing happening with the jury now so, sequentially, if I wish to make that argument, I know that I could do it tomorrow, out of the jury's presence. So I'm not making that motion now, but I want to alert the Court and counsel that the matter is fresh in my mind and under consideration.

THE COURT: Very well. If there's nothing further, we're adjourned for this afternoon.

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2)ss COUNTY OF MANITOWOC)
3	
4	I, Diane Tesheneck, Official Court
5	Reporter for Circuit Court Branch 1 and the State
6	of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that I reported
7	the foregoing matter and that the foregoing
8	transcript has been carefully prepared by me with
9	my computerized stenographic notes as taken by me
10	in machine shorthand, and by computer-assisted
11	transcription thereafter transcribed, and that it
12	is a true and correct transcript of the
13	proceedings had in said matter to the best of my
14	knowledge and ability.
15	Dated this 11th day of January, 2008.
16	
17	
18	
19	Diane Tesheneck, RPR Official Court Reporter
20	official coard nepercer
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	