Of course. Here is a summary list of the inconsistencies and narrative evolutions from the forensic interview, formatted to be used as an exhibit. As you requested, I have organized the points we have discussed, and you can add the specific timestamps and citations for your final legal document.

### **EXHIBIT [X]: Summary of Inconsistencies, Contradictions, and Narrative Evolutions in the Complainant’s Forensic Interview**

This exhibit details the material inconsistencies and evolving narratives within the forensic interview of the complainant, B.J., conducted on July 22, 2019. These points, when viewed in their totality, demonstrate a pattern of unreliability and suggest external influence.

#### **Part I: Material Evolution of the Alleged Criminal Acts**

The core allegations materially changed from their initial reporting to and throughout the course of the forensic interview.

1. **Allegation of Location:**
   * **Initial Report to Police:** The incident occurred **on the couch in the living room**.
   * **Forensic Interview:** The incident occurred **on the bed in the master bedroom**.
2. **Allegation of Touching the Penis:** The narrative evolved from an unsuccessful attempt to a completed act of force.
   * **Initial Report to Police:** The complainant stated the defendant "**tried to get her to touch his penis**" but that she "**did not touch**" it.
   * **Forensic Interview (Initial Statement):** The complainant first described the act as an attempt: "he **tried to make me touch his penis**."
   * **Forensic Interview (Later Statement):** The narrative changed to a completed act: "**He grabbed her [my] hand and made her [me] touch it**."
3. **Allegation of Digital Penetration:** The description of penetration directly contradicted itself between the forensic interview and later trial testimony.
   * **Forensic Interview:** The complainant explicitly stated there was no internal penetration: "**Like he didn't actually go inside inside.** He like did like between the skin..."
   * **Later Testimony (Trial):** The complainant testified that his fingers did go "inside [her] vagina."

#### **Part II: Contradictory and Evolving Reasons for Non-Disclosure**

The complainant provided numerous, expanding, and logically inconsistent reasons for her year-long silence.

1. **Direct Contradiction Regarding Parents' Relationship:** The complainant offered mutually exclusive reasons for her fear of telling her mother.
   * **Reason A (They Were Unhappy):** She first stated she was sad and afraid because she heard them arguing and realized "**that they weren't happy**."
   * **Reason B (They Were Happy):** Moments later, she stated she was afraid to tell because "**they were happy at that point. And they're about to get married.**"
2. **Logical Impossibility of "Mother's Trauma" Explanation:** The complainant claimed she was afraid to tell her mother about the abuse because her mother had also been a victim of abuse as a child, a fact she claimed **"she just told me about it."** This recent disclosure by her mother could not logically have been a reason for the complainant's silence for the entire preceding year.
3. **Expanding List of Reasons:** The reasons for not telling expanded from a single reason in the initial report (fear of harm) to at least seven distinct reasons during the interview, including fear of not being believed and fear of getting her mother in trouble.

#### **Part III: Indicators of External Influence and Coaching**

The complainant’s narrative contained multiple hallmarks of having been coached or influenced by conversations with others prior to the interview.

1. **Contradiction of Awareness:** The complainant's knowledge of the interview's purpose was a key contradiction.
   * **Later Testimony (Trial):** The complainant testified she **did not know** why she was at the "blue house."
   * **Forensic Interview:** She **immediately knew** the purpose of the interview, telling the interviewer she was there because her mother's ex-boyfriend had "touched her in the wrong place."
2. **Evolution of Terminology:** Her language evolved from age-appropriate and vague to specific and clinical.
   * She initially used terms like "**wrong place**" and "**it**."
   * Only after prompting by the interviewer did she begin using the clinical terms "**vagina**" and "**penis**."
3. **Nature of Description (Visual vs. Tactile):** Her description of the alleged touching of the penis lacked authentic sensory detail.
   * She did not use tactile words (e.g., "hard," "soft") to describe what the touching *felt* like.
   * Her description was exclusively visual: it was "**up straight**." This suggests a recounted story rather than a personal memory of a physical sensation.