STATE OF	WISCONSIN,	
	PLAINTIFF,	JUDGE'S DECISION
vs.		Case No. 05 CF 381
STEVEN A	AVERY,	
	DEFENDANT.	
DATE:	AUGUST 22, 2006	
BEFORE:	Hon. Patrick L. Willis Circuit Court Judge	5
APPEARAN	· Ces:	
ii i mitti		
	KENNETH R. KRATZ Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	of Wisconsin
		or wisconsin.
	THOMAS J. FALLON Special Prosecutor On behalf of the State	e of Wisconsin.
	DEAN A. STRANG	or wisconsin.
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the Defer	ndant.
	JEROME F. BUTING	
	Attorney at Law On behalf of the Defer	ndant
		iuaiic.
	STEVEN A. AVERY Defendant	
	Appeared in person.	
	* * * * * * TRANSCRIPT OF P	
	Reported by Diane T	esheneck, RPR
	Official Court	Daniella

THE COURT: At this time the Court calls

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

381. Will the parties present state their

appearances for the record, please.

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

ATTORNEY STRANG: Steven Avery is here in person and he's represented by Jerry Buting of Buting and Williams. And Dean Strang of Hurley, Burish and Stanton. Good morning.

THE COURT: All right. We're here this morning for the Court to issue its decision on a number of motions that have been filed. Following the decisions on those motions, the Court will take a summary of the motions that are still outstanding, just to make sure that they are all being dealt with.

Court will first issue its decision on the defendant's motion to dismiss on the grounds that the State has made a trial in Manitowoc County impossible. The basis for this motion is alleged that the State has taken actions to make

a fair trial in Manitowoc County impossible.

Specifically, the defendant refers to eight press conferences that were conducted primarily by the Calumet County District Attorney and Sheriff. Four of these press conferences occurred after the defendant's arrest in this case. The defendant also cites comments made in a two-part news story in May of this year by the Manitowoc County Sheriff.

The defendant asserts that his constitutional rights under Article 1, Section 7 of the Wisconsin Constitution, as well as his due process rights under the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8 of the Wisconsin Constitution were violated by the State's participation in pretrial publicity.

The defense brief concludes on Page 11, that, taken together, the State's actions effectively have destroyed Avery's opportunity to obtain an impartial jury in Manitowoc County.

That is, the basis for requesting dismissal as a sanction is the claim that participation by agents of the State in pretrial publicity has precluded the defendant from receiving a fair

trial in front of Manitowoc County jurors. The Court has reviewed the media account -- accounts referenced by the motion.

The defendant cites no Wisconsin case which has ever granted the remedy he requests; that is, no Wisconsin case has ever found that a defendant is entitled to dismissal of a criminal charge because of the State's participation in pretrial publicity.

The defendant does cite two Wisconsin cases as being relevant: State ex rel. Schulter v. Roraff, a 1968 Wisconsin Supreme Court case, and Briggs vs. State, a 1977 Wisconsin Supreme Court case.

In neither of these cases did the Court order that the criminal charges involved be dismissed. In fact, the Court specifically rejected the remedy in *Schulter*, the one case in which the defendant actually requested dismissal. Continuance and change of venue have been the only remedies approved, to date, where prejudicial pretrial publicity threatens the defendant's right to a fair trial.

The Court is not prepared to say that the State's participation in pretrial publicity

could never justify dismissal of criminal charges; indeed, there's language from the <code>Schulter</code> decision which suggests that the Court did not rule out the possibility entirely.

There's a sentence that reads as follows: In <code>State vs. Woodington</code>, we considered the problem of pretrial publicity and concluded that the remedy was not necessarily the dismissal of charges, but a change of venue, or continuance of the trial, and the careful selection of the jury on voir dire.

So it may be possible that, in an appropriate case, the Supreme Court could justify dismissal as a sanction. However, since no reported decision ever -- ever sanctioned the remedy of dismissal, this Court concludes that a remedy as drastic as dismissal could only be justified by very egregious behavior on the part of the State.

The Court concludes in this case that the State's role in pretrial publicity was not egregious, or designed to jeopardize the defendant's right to a fair trial. The Court has reviewed the participation of the State complained of by the defendant and makes the

following observations:

The first four of the eight cited press conferences were more informational in nature and also related more to the missing person report, not to the involvement of the defendant in the crimes that have been alleged in this case. The last four press conferences did involve a detailing of the accusations made against the defendant, in some cases with more detail than the Court believes was necessary.

But the content was largely confined to information contained in the Complaints against Mr. Avery, and the co-defendant in this case, Brendan Dassey. While the content was somewhat inflammatory in nature by virtue of the very allegations of fact, similar to the situation described in the *Briggs* decision, the information was largely available to the press and the public anyway, from the Complaints, which already were, or were soon to become, public information.

The Court notes that the press in this case has given publicity to a number of pleadings and motions that have been filed, even before the court proceedings dealing with those pleadings.

So, it is unlikely that the news conferences

resulted in the disclosure of any meaningful information that would not have been publicized in any event.

The Court also notes that, especially early in these proceedings, there were media reports that the defendant and members of the defendant's family believed the police were unfairly picking on him and suggested that the defendant was being framed; indeed, the defense in this case has filed motions indicating that such a defense may be pursued at trial.

Supreme Court Rule 20:3.6(d) permits a district attorney to make a statement reasonably required to protect the State from the adverse effects of publicity not initiated by the State. Early in these proceedings, such adverse publicity existed. The State was reasonably entitled to respond to public allegations that it was basing its decisions on bias rather than the evidence obtained.

With respect to the two-part news story involving the Manitowoc County Sheriff, the Court notes that that took place in May, a number of months before the scheduled trial date. At the outset, the Court does conclude that a number of

the comments made by the Sheriff were ill-advised and the Sheriff should not have participated in the interview, even in the absence of a prohibition order issued by the Court. The Court does conclude, however, that his participation was not so egregious or prejudicial as to justify dismissal of the charges.

First, it had been previously reported, and the May reports reiterated, that the Sheriff was involved in the wrongful prosecution of Mr. Avery back in 1985. The Sheriff's testimony at the July 5 hearing in this case suggested he may still not be convinced that Gregory Allen is guilty and Steven Avery is innocent in the 1985 sex assault. But the Sheriff appears to be largely alone in that belief.

As has been widely reported for some time, the State has not only conceded that Mr. Avery did not commit the 1985 crime, but the State has concluded that another man, Gregory Allen, did. Thus, any viewer of this report would have serious reason to question the Sheriff's objectivity.

To further balance the report, it included prior statements from members of the

defendant's family that law enforcement representatives were unfairly picking on the defendant's family.

Sheriff's explanation as to why his department would have had no reason to frame the defendant may have been unfortunately worded, but the Court is satisfied that the Sheriff was trying to explain, in an admittedly awkward way, why the allegation that his department was trying to frame Steven Avery should not be believed. As the Court has already noted, while the Sheriff should not have granted the interview, his participation is somewhat mitigated by a perceived need to respond to publicized frame-up allegations on the part of the defendant and his family.

A person viewing the report may well have come away with the impression that the Sheriff believed the defendant is guilty of the crimes charged in this case. That should not be any more surprising than that the defendant's family, friends, and his attorney in a civil case, Stephen Glynn, publicly expressed their belief in his innocence in the same report.

If law enforcement officials did not

believe the defendant was guilty, this Court would certainly expect the State to move to dismiss the charges against the defendant. The Court gives the public more credit than to be too unduly influenced by comments from either side. The report was balanced and not so inflammatory that persons who viewed it months ago could still not provide the defendant a fair trial if selected as jurors.

Finally, the Court notes that while the defense is requesting dismissal because he asserts the State's participation in pretrial publicity has made a trial in Manitowoc County impossible, the defendant acknowledges in another motion that if the Court grants an adjournment of the trial date to early next year, a fair jury composed of Manitowoc County citizens could be selected. At least, the Court believes that's a fair inference for the Court to draw from the defendant's contingent change of venue request.

The bottom line is that while there may be a set of facts which would warrant the relief the defendant seeks, there are no such facts present here. The complained of publicity occurred many months before the scheduled trial.

Early news conferences focused on the search for Teresa Halbach, not the charges against the defendant.

Later press conferences with the Calumet County District Attorney and Sheriff were mainly confined to information available in public records. The Manitowoc County Sheriff's participation in the May interview was ill-advised, but not so prejudicial as to justify the remedy the defendant seeks.

The defendant's own contingent change of venue request demonstrates his belief that, with adequate precautions, a fair jury can be selected in Manitowoc County. For all these reasons, the defendant's motion to dismiss is denied by the Court.

Before I proceed to other motions, I will note that there have been motions filed relating to change of venue and scheduling of the trial date. And it's my understanding that the parties have a stipulation on those issues to propose to the Court this morning; in fact, I have been handed a written stipulation. Counsel, does one of you care to put it on the record for the Court?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I certainly can, Judge. I don't know how much in detail the Court wants me to go. We have provided the Court a two-page stipulation. That stipulation attempts to deal with the issues of change of venue, as well as trial schedule. The stipulation, and I will read at least the part of the stipulation that is being proposed towards the bottom of Page one.

The parties, that is, the defense and the State, have agreed to the following: Number one, that the jury trial in this case will commence on or about February 5, 2007. The parties continue to believe that the trial itself will last approximately six weeks. I note for the record that I'm paraphrasing, when appropriate, in parts of the stipulation.

Number two, that the jury trial will physically be held in the Calumet County Courthouse.

Number three, that the Court has agreed upon the county in which the jury will be selected. The parties have identified and have agreed upon that jury pool, and the Court may wish to comment on that thereafter.

The stipulation is proposed by myself

and Mr. Strang, both as lead counsel for the relative parties. The stipulation includes acquiescence by Mr. Avery, and a statement as to waiver of right to be tried physically here in Calumet County. And also includes the agreement of the Halbach family, by Tim Halbach, a representative of the Halbach family.

I should note that the purpose of the stipulation, or at least in part, as well as the Halbach's acquiescence, is based upon the Halbach family's ability to now fully participate, if they choose, in all aspects of the jury trial, as the physical location would be within Calumet County.

Attached to the stipulation includes proposals from Sheriff Pagel, with the agreement of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department.

This sets forth reasons why Calumet County is a preferred venue, or preferred place of trial in this case, as to issues of security, transport, and the physical evidence which is being held in the Calumet County Courthouse.

Lastly, there is correspondence from Mr. Rollins, who is Corporation Counsel, acting on behalf of Manitowoc County. This county, that

is, Manitowoc County, has requested this Court adopt the stipulation, based upon the physical amenities that the Calumet County Courthouse may have, Mr. Avery's location, the physical evidence, again, and the participation of the Halbach family.

For all of those reasons, and reasons previously provided in more detail to the Court, including this proposal having been made by me back in, I believe it was February of this year, the parties jointly, that is, Mr. Avery, his lawyers, and the State, is asking the Court adopt the stipulation.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Counsel recited the stipulation's terms, in their essence. He did it fairly. He did it accurately, but for one small item on which he misspoke, innocently, and that is simply that Mr. Avery has agreed in writing here, not to be tried in Manitowoc County, physically. The trial will take place in Calumet County, but it would be Manitowoc County in which he had a right to insist upon the physical location of the trial. And he's agreed instead to try the case in the Calumet County Courthouse, just as counsel explained.

THE COURT: All right. I will note there were some written modifications to the third paragraph in the stipulation, that after the parties approached the Court, I indicated I had a concern with. At one point, it was my understanding the parties wished the county from which the jury would be selected to not be disclosed at this time. But I understand the parties do not have an objection to disclosure as of today.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY STRANG: That's true.

THE COURT: And I think that is important, for the Court to make sure that Mr. Avery -- and I'm going to conduct a brief colloquy with him on the record today -- that everybody understands and agrees what is being proposed here and, specifically, that the parties both agree that the jurors are to be selected from Manitowoc County. Is that correct?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Avery, is that your understanding of the recommendation that the parties are proposing to the Court today, and that you have

agreed to?

2 MR. AVERY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I do have some questions to ask of you, to make sure that you understand it, and I want to make sure that you are knowingly agreeing to this proposal.

First of all, do you understand that you have a constitutional and statutory right to keep venue in Manitowoc County, if you wish; that is, a right to be tried not only by a jury of Manitowoc County residents, but also, at least arguably, to a trial physically held in Manitowoc County. Do you understand that?

MR. AVERY: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that the venue statute, Section 971.225, only permits the Court to order the trial to be held in another county if I make a determination that an impartial trial could not be held in Manitowoc County? That is, if you were not requesting it, the Court would not be ordering that this trial be held in Calumet County; do you understand that?

MR. AVERY: Yes.

THE COURT: Is it your wish to be tried in Calumet County in this case, with a jury composed of

Manitowoc County residents? 1 2 MR. AVERY: Yes. THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises or 3 threats to you, to get you to request this 4 5 provision? MR. AVERY: No. 7 THE COURT: Have you had adequate time to discuss this decision with your attorneys? 8 MR. AVERY: Yes. 9 10 THE COURT: And do you have any questions at this time? If you do, I would go off the record 11 12 and permit you to discuss the matter further with 13 your attorneys. Do you have any such questions? 14 MR. AVERY: No, I don't. 15 THE COURT: Very well. The parties had 16 alerted the Court a few days ago that this 17 stipulation would be being presented today, so I 18 have had some time to give it some thought. I also 19 took the opportunity, a few days ago, to travel to 20 Calumet County in order to tour the courthouse facilities. 21 22 I agree that there are some advantages 23 to holding the trial in Calumet County, in terms 24 of security relating to both the defendant and to

the jurors. There also appears to be more space

25

at the courthouse for the media.

And the Court has been informed that Manitowoc County officials believe it would be more economical to hold the case in Calumet County. That is not a major request, obviously, in the Court's decision, but the Court is aware that Manitowoc County officials concur in the move. And I also understand that the victim's family has joined in this request; in fact, Calumet County, I believe, is closer to their home than Manitowoc.

Based on those considerations, the request that's been made by the parties, I'm going to grant the joint request that's been made here. I will also note the request calls for a delay in the trial date, that will further alleviate any prejudicial effects of any pretrial publicity, avoid any potential conflicts with the Thanksgiving holiday that might have occurred had the trial started in mid-October, and allow the defense more time to evaluate the evidence in this case, which is somewhat voluminous. The Court has been informed of such requests on the defense in the past. So I will grant the request.

The trial date here will be scheduled for February 5, of 2007. I cannot foresee anything at this time that would result in a further continuance of that trial date, and the Court will agree to hold the trial in the Calumet County Courthouse.

The jury will be selected, composed of Manitowoc's residents. Jury selection, I think, will take place here. It will be more convenient for everyone. But once the trial begins, it will take place in Calumet County. Is there anything further from either party on that matter?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge.

THE COURT: If not, then the Court will move on to the defense motion to exclude members of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department from testifying in this case. That motion initially included a request, also, to prevent members of the Sheriff's Department from overseeing the jury in this case. But, Mr. Strang, it's my understanding that with the move of the physical site of the trial to Calumet County, that portion of the defense motion is being withdrawn.

ATTORNEY STRANG: It is in the sense that I think it's mooted. There are a number of logistical

details attending the stipulation just presented to the Court, and adopted by the Court, that we have not laid out here today, but on which the parties are in accord. And one of those, in sum, is that with a trial conducted in the Calumet County

Courthouse, the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, in the ordinary course, would take charge of jury assembly, jury management, the role of bailiff, custody of Mr. Avery, if in fact he's in custody at the time of trial.

And we see that as mooting the request for relief as to a role with the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, in prospective or actual jurors, because under this proposal the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department will have no role with, or contact with, actual or prospective jurors.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. As the Court noted, the defense has filed a motion to exclude all members of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department from testifying on behalf of the State, as part of the State's case in chief.

The sole basis for the defense motion arises out of comments made in an interview

Sheriff Kenneth Peterson provided to FOX 11 News

in Green Bay, portions of which were aired in a two-part report on May 11 and 12 of this year. The Court is not going to detail the Sheriff's comments further here, other than to note that they related to the Sheriff's involvement with Mr. Avery in the past, including the Sheriff's role in the prosecution of Mr. Avery back in 1985, relating to a sex assault charge, for which he was subsequently exonerated. The Sheriff also relayed in the report some of his own opinions concerning the defendant's personality.

The defendant contends that he is entitled to the remedy he seeks because the Sheriff's's comments were calculated to interfere with the defendant's right to a fair trial in Manitowoc County, before a Manitowoc County jury.

The Court has reviewed the two-part news report in it's entirety and I have also read and heard the party's arguments; that is, the written argument submitted by Mr. Strang, with his motion; the written response submitted by Mr. Fallon; as well as the arguments made at the July 5, 2006 hearing. The Court makes the following observations:

The Court has accepted, today, the

stipulation of the parties that the trial will be held in Calumet County, with a Manitowoc County jury. So the defendant has not lost his constitutional right to a trial in the county where the crimes are alleged to have been committed. The place of the trial is being moved at the joint request of the defendant and the State.

Earlier in these proceedings, the parties agreed, informally, to eliminate out of court comments to the press; the State, through the attorneys or representatives of the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, and the defense through defense counsel or the defendant himself. There was, and is, no order at this time to support this agreement. But it came about as a result of the Court's reluctance to issue a gag order, which the Court regarded as an extreme remedy. The Court felt that this agreement, along with the admonition to the parties to comply with Supreme Court Rule 20:3.6 would address the concerns initially raised by the defense.

The informal agreement has proven largely effective with respect to the parties

involved. No party mentioned any concern at the time with comments originating from the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department. The Court did not issue any type of gag order, and the Sheriff's comments in this case did not violate any such order.

There is no evidence that the Sheriff initiated contact with FOX 11 News.

Representatives of that organization apparently contacted him for the interview.

Nevertheless, the Court does believe that the comments were inappropriate coming in the context of these court proceedings. And the Sheriff should not have -- should have used his own discretion to avoid such comments. Those comments fell within the scope of the type of publicity the parties had agreed to stop and had the potential to jeopardize the defendant's right to a jury of Manitowoc County jurors.

Whatever the Court's decision is on the defense motion, the Court believes that care should be taken to make sure such comments do not occur again before the trial in this case. The Court notes that the comments involved were those of the Sheriff alone.

His department does not have control of this investigation. And the Court has not been presented with any evidence to suggest that any other member of the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department who participated in the investigation in this case has been directly, or indirectly, influenced in any way by the Sheriff. The Court notes that the Sheriff has announced his intention to retire at the expiration of his term in early January of next year.

The Court makes the following conclusions: The Court is unaware of any precedent for granting the remedies the defendant seeks where no court order was violated. The cases cited by the defense, which sustain the drastic remedy of exclusion of evidence, involve violation of either a court order or a discovery statute.

Participation by representatives of the State in pretrial publicity has only been used in reported cases as a grounds for change of venue or a continuance. There is even less reason in this case to exclude evidence from members of the Sheriff's Department who did not themselves participate in any allegedly improper comments.

The Court further notes that the report was a one time, in two-part, news item on one television station in May, approximately nine months before what will now be the scheduled start of the trial.

The Court agrees that the comments made were inappropriate in the context of these court proceedings and did constitute a threat to the defendant's right to fair trial before a

Manitowoc County jury; although, the Court has earlier today accepted a stipulation of the parties to have this case heard by a Manitowoc County jury.

While the attorney's did not cite concern over comments from the County Sheriff's Department, that is, the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, at the time they reached their informal agreement to refrain from public comment in this case, the comments should not have been made.

To make sure there are no further problems of this nature, the Court is going to issue an order prohibiting members of either the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, or the Calumet County Sheriff's Department, from making

any further public comment concerning this case, or the defendant, Steven Avery, until the trial is concluded.

The Court is satisfied that adherence to the attorneys to Supreme Court Rule 20:3.6 precludes the need for any such order to apply to counsel. I'm directing the counsel for the defense to draft the order and submit it to counsel for the State before submitting it to the Court for signature.

Because the Court concludes that the other remedy sought by the defense, that is, the exclusion of testimony by members of the Sheriff's Department of Manitowoc County is not warranted, that portion of the defense motion is denied.

ATTORNEY STRANG: As a matter of clarification, your Honor -- and I'm happy to draft the proposed order -- I will intend to include proceedings related to Brendan Dassey within the Court's definition of this case, even though, technically, the Dassey proceedings are under a case number different than the Avery proceedings.

THE COURT: Any objection from the State?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm not sure you have

authority over the Brendan Dassey case, Judge.

THE COURT: I don't have authority over the case, but -- and the Court's order would have no affect in his case -- but I think it could extend to comments relating to his role in this case. I will -- I will do this, I will let it up to the parties, in the form of your proposed order, to attempt to resolve that matter. If it still winds up being contested and the parties have alternative versions of the proposed order to submit, I will review them, give the parties a chance to be heard, before I issue the Court's order.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: The Court will next move on to the State's motion in this case to admit statements of Teresa Halbach to co-workers. The State seeks to admit certain statements which Teresa Halbach allegedly made to co-workers in October of 2005, relating to her observations during an earlier visit to the defendant's property and her state of mind based on those observations.

The defense opposes the admission of these statements. The admissibility of evidence which the State seeks to introduce involves issues relating to hearsay, relevance, and the

defendant's right to confront his accusers. The Court will address each of these issues independently, as they relate to the statements which the State seeks to introduce.

First of all, with respect to hearsay, the State asserts that Teresa Halbach's statements relating to both her perceived observations and to her state of mind fall under the hearsay exception contained in Section 908.045 (2). That statute provides in relevant part as follows:

The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule, if the declarant is unavailable as a witness. A statement which describes an event or condition recently perceived by the declarant, not in contemplation of pending or anticipated litigation and while the declarant's recollection was clear.

The statements which Teresa Halbach may have made to her co-workers describing observations from her earlier visit to the defendant's home could fit within this hearsay exception, subject to adequate foundation. At this point, the State has not provided the Court with a date the observations were allegedly made

by Ms Halbach, nor when the observations were relayed to her co-workers.

However, it appears that any statement relating to her observations may well constitute a statement which describes an event she recently perceived. Indeed, the defense does not seriously dispute, that with proper foundation, the hearsay exception in Section 908.045 (2) could apply to statements relating to Ms Halbach's observations.

The statements relating to her state of mind, as opposed to her observations, do not fall within the exception of Section 908.045 (2). A statement of recent perception is exactly that, it is a statement of something which the declarant has perceived. It does not include opinions of the declarant relating to her perceptions or her state of mind.

Now, there is a hearsay exception not advanced by the State which could arguably apply to the defendant's state of mind; that is, Section 908.03 (1), which reads, in relevant part, as follows. The following are not excluded by the hearsay rule: A statement explaining an event or condition made while the declarant was

perceiving the event or condition, or immediately thereafter. While the statements made by Ms

Halbach relating to her then existing state of mind could arguably fall within this exception, they would still have to be relevant before they could be admitted.

In order for a statement of Teresa

Halbach relating to her state of mind to be
relevant, the statement would have to relate to
an element of the crimes which the State seeks to
prove. A similar issue was addressed by the

Court of Appeals in the case of **State vs. Kutz**, a

2003 Court of Appeals case.

The defendant in that case was charged with first-degree intentional homicide, hiding a corpse, and stalking, arising out of the disappearance of his wife. The State sought to introduce a number of statements attributed to the wife in the time leading up to her disappearance involving threats which the defendant made to her. The State sought introduction of the of statements as evidence of her fearful state of mind at the time she made the statements, shortly before her disappearance.

The Court of Appeals ruled that the

statements were not admissible, because while they were evidence of the declarant's state of mind, her state of mind was not relevant to the charges in that case. The Court recognized that the primary purpose of introducing the evidence was to demonstrate that the threats were actually made to the wife, not that she was in fear because of the statements.

That is similar to the situation here.

While any statement of Teresa Halbach involving her state of mind made a few weeks before her disappearance would certainly be relevance as evidence of her state of mind, her state of mind is not really at issue in this case.

The State has suggested that her state of mind has a relationship to the elements which the State must prove on the kidnapping charge.

However, the Court views the probative value of her sate of mind weeks before the crime as very marginal. The Court does not believe that her state of mind has sufficient probative value or relevance to justify admission of the evidence.

The State asserts that the personal observations of Theresa Halbach, as opposed to her state of mind, have relevance as to the

defendant's intent and plan to sexually assault her in the future. The Court has heard references in prior arguments of the parties to allegations that Mr. Avery specifically requested Teresa Halbach to return to his residence.

Depending on what other facts are introduced her observations, which were relayed to her co-workers, may have probative value which could justify their admission. However, the Court is unable, based on the current state of the record, to resolve that issue at this time.

Should the observations of Teresa
Halbach fall within the hearsay exception of
Section 908.045 (2) and have sufficient probative
value to justify their admission, the question
remains as to whether the admission of such
statements would violate the defendant's
constitutional rights under the confrontation
clause of the constitution.

The United States Supreme Court expanded the scope of the confrontation clause in *Crawford vs. Washington*, a 2004 case. The Court ruled in *Crawford* that where testimonial statements are involved, the defendant is entitled to confront his accusers, regardless of the reliability of

the statements or whether they fall in firmly rooted hearsay exceptions.

For purposes of the State's motion, the key question is whether the statements offered for admission are testimonial in nature. The issue of what is a testimonial statement was recently addressed by the United States Supreme Court in *Davis vs. Washington*, a case decided on June 19th of this year. The case involved the question of whether statements made by an emergency 911 caller were testimonial in nature.

The Court ruled that some of the statements made in the course of a 911 call were testimonial, while others were not.

Specifically, the Court ruled as follows:

Statements are non-testimonial when made in the course of police interrogation, under circumstances objectively indicating that the primary purpose of the interrogation is to enable police assistance to meet an ongoing emergency.

They are testimonial when the circumstances objectively indicate that there is no such ongoing emergency and that the primary purpose of the interrogation is to establish or prove past events potentially relevant to later

criminal prosecution.

Of particular significance to our case is the following language, which the *Davis* opinion quoted from the *Crawford* case: An accuser who makes a formal statement to government officers bears testimony, in a sense that a person who makes a casual remark to an acquaintance does not.

With this example the Supreme Court comes very close to describing the statements

Teresa Halbach purportedly made to her co-workers as a textbook example of what is not testimonial.

The observational statements which the State seeks to admit were not made to the police and were certainly not made in the context of any investigation by anyone. They are much more in the nature of a casual remark to an acquaintance, which is not testimonial.

The Court concludes that the statements by Teresa Halbach of her earlier observations of Mr. Avery are not testimonial in nature and their admission would not implicate confrontation clause concerns.

In conclusion, any statement made by Teresa Halbach to her co-workers concerning her state of mind at an earlier point in time are not admissible. Subject to proper foundation establishing relevance and probative value, statements that she made involving prior observations may be admissible under the hearsay exception contained in Section 908.045 (2).

Finally, for today's hearing, the Court will address the defendant's motion challenging the search of November 5, on the basis that it violated the rule in *Franks vs. Delaware*. I'm not addressing, today, the additional challenge to the search based on alleged multiple executions of the search warrant, because the Court has not yet received from the briefs of the parties on that issue.

As part of his challenge to obtaining —
to the obtaining and execution of the search
warrants, the defendant challenges the
November 5, 2005 search warrant on the basis that
it was obtained as a result of false statements,
knowingly and intentionally made, or with
reckless disregard for the truth, that were
included in the affidavit supporting the search
warrant request.

Under the rule of Franks vs. Delaware, a

1978 United States Supreme Court decision, if the defendant makes a substantial preliminary showing, and proves that such false statements were made, and that they are necessary to the finding of probable cause, a search warrant can be voided and the fruits of the search suppressed.

Initially, the defendant's motion alleged that three separate knowingly false statements were made in the affidavit of Detective Mark Wiegert supporting the request for the November 5, 2005 warrant. First, the defendant alleged that Pamela Sturm and her daughter, the two citizens who initially located Teresa Halbach's vehicle on the Avery property, were incorrectly characterized as volunteer searchers, when in fact they were acting on behalf of law enforcement.

Following the evidentiary hearing,
defense counsel acknowledged that the evidence
did not demonstrate that Ms Sturm and her
daughter were anything but volunteer searchers.
The motion goes on to allege, however, that the
affidavit falsely claimed that the volunteer
searchers located a vehicle matching the

description of the vehicle owned by Teresa Halbach, at the Avery auto salvage.

Further the defendant alleges that the affidavit falsely represented that the searchers provided a complete VIN from the vehicle, when in fact the searchers were only able to identify 10 of the 17 characters of the vehicle identification number.

While acknowledging that Detective
Remiker was able to obtain the full VIN of the
vehicle when he responded to the scene, the
defendant's motion further alleges that Detective
Remiker did not have a search warrant, or consent
to be on the property, and his complete
identification of the VIN can, therefore, not be
considered because it was illegally obtained.
The defendant concludes that if the false
information and Detective Remiker's
identification are excised from the affidavit, it
lacks the required level of probable cause to
justify the issuance of the November 5 warrant.

The State asks the Court to deny the motion for the following reasons: First, the allegations made in the defendant's motion do not constitute a substantial preliminary showing

justifying an evidentiary hearing under the holding of the *Franks* case.

Second, that Steven Avery lacks standing to challenge the searches of any portions of the Avery Auto Salvage Yard, other than his trailer residence and the detached garage, because he has not demonstrated a reasonable expectation of privacy in the other portions of the Avery Salvage property.

Third, that no intentional misrepresentations were made in the affidavit.

Fourth, even if the challenged information is excised from the affidavit, it still contains sufficient probable cause to justify the issuance of the November 5 warrant.

And, finally, that Steven Avery lacks standing to challenge the information gathered by Detective Remiker when the detective responded to the scene on November 5, because whether or not Detective Remiker was legally on the premises, Mr. Avery had no reasonable expectation of privacy, either in Teresa Halbach's vehicle, or the portion of the Avery Salvage property on which Detective Remiker was present.

The Court will first address the State's

claim that the defendant has not made a substantial preliminary showing entitling him to a hearing on the alleged *Franks* violations. When a defendant alleges that a search warrant is based on knowingly false information, the United States Supreme Court held in *Franks vs. Delaware* that the following procedure governs:

Where the defendant makes a substantial preliminary showing that a false statement knowingly and intentionally, or with reckless disregard for the truth, was included by the affiant in the warrant affidavit, and if the allegedly false statement is necessary to the finding of probable cause, the Fourth Amendment requires that a hearing be held at the defendant's request.

In the event that at the hearing the allegation of perjury, or reckless disregard, is established by the defendant, by a preponderance of the evidence, and with the evidence -- with the affidavits false material set to one side, the affidavit's remaining content is insufficient to establish probable cause, the search warrant must be voided and the fruits of the search excluded to the same extent as if probable cause

was lacking on the face of the affidavit.

In this case the defendant's motion alleged, first, that the two citizens who found the RAV-4 were not truly volunteer searches, but persons who Detective Wiegert told Detective Remiker were willing to go to the Avery property on Avery road to search the junkyard salvage area.

The quoted language presumably was obtained by the defendant as part of a discovery from a police report. One possible inference from the language could have been that the volunteer searchers had in fact met with Detective Wiegert and expressed their willingness to assist the police in searching the Avery property.

While neither party has argued the point at any length, it is at least arguable that if they had been enlisted to assist law enforcement, the searchers may have had to disclose that fact to Earl Avery when they obtained his consent to enter the property, in order to conduct the search. The State has not argued otherwise as a reason for which the motion should be denied.

The defense also characterizes as an

intentional false statement, or one made with reckless disregard for the truth, the assertion in the affidavit that the searchers claimed they had located a vehicle matching the description of the vehicle owned by Teresa Halbach. The basis for this assertion is that Pamela Sturm was told to be looking for a green vehicle, but she informed police that the vehicle was, quote, "bluish green, though it's more blue than green", end quote.

In addition, while the affidavit indicates that Sturm provided the entire 17 character VIN, Sturm was actually able to report only 9 or 10 of the 17 VIN characters. She was not in a position to see the remaining characters.

Detective Wiegert acknowledged in his testimony that the portion of his affidavit indicating that Patricia Sturm provided the entire VIN was incorrect. He acknowledged that while he obtained the full VIN from Detective Remiker, Ms Sturm was only able to make out 10 of the 17 characters.

In addition to the inconsistencies listed in the defendant's motion, the defendant

also asserts that the State was not assisted by Detective Remiker's ability to read the full VIN because he did not have authorization or consent to be on the property.

The Court was initially inclined to conclude that the defendant's motion did constitute a substantial preliminary showing that false statements had been intentionally included in the search warrant which called into question the level of probable cause needed for the issuance of a warrant. Had Patricia Sturm -- or I believe it's Pamela Sturm -- and her daughter been acting as agents of the State, their discovery of the RAV-4 and it's identifying information, which formed an important basis for the issuance of the warrant, may have been subject to suppression.

As the State correctly points out, however, a close reading of the defendant's motion reveals no substantial preliminary showing that the Sturms were acting as agents of law enforcement. The motion does refer to a scheduled meeting of volunteers, which apparently never took place.

But there is no assertion that the

Sturms had any specific relationship with any member of law enforcement. Indeed, the defense conceded at the conclusion of the hearing that no evidence introduced added anything to the allegations in the original motion.

In addition, while the motion describes

Detective Remiker's entry on the property as

unauthorized and non-consensual, which apparently

it was, there's no assertion in the motion that

Steven Avery had any legitimate expectation of

privacy over either Teresa Halbach's vehicle or

the portion of the Avery salvage property on

which the vehicle was located.

If Detective Remiker's presence on the property had violated Steven Avery's reasonable expectation of privacy, it could perhaps be argued that the failure of the affidavit to disclose his unlawful presence was a material an intentional omission, which could support a Franks claim under the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in State vs. Mann.

However, since there was no assertion in the motion that the defendant had a legitimate expectation of privacy over the area in which the Halbach vehicle was located, Detective Remiker's

lack of permission to be on the property does not measurably contribute to the substantial preliminary showing required as a prerequisite for a hearing on the defendant's *Franks* motion.

The Court concludes that the State is correct, the motion does not make a substantial preliminary showing entitling the defendant to a hearing on the *Franks* claim. While the defendant may not have been entitled to a hearing on his *Franks* motion, the Court, nevertheless, conditionally granted one.

The evidence introduced at the hearing further supports the conclusion that there was no <code>Franks</code> violation in this case. The defense acknowledges that the volunteer searchers referred to in Detective Wiegert's affidavit truly were volunteer searchers; thus, there is no basis upon which to delete their discovery of Teresa Halbach's vehicle, from the Wiegert affidavit.

While one can argue whether or not

Detective Wiegert was justified in using the term

"matching" in the affidavit, the Sturm's clearly

did discover a vehicle, which was very similar in

appearance to Teresa Halbach's vehicle, and which

turned out to be an exact match.

While Detective Remiker's entry on the property may not have been authorized by an owner or person in control of the property, there is no evidence to suggest that the defendant had any ownership interest or other expectation in the area upon which the vehicle was located, or the vehicle itself. Thus, the information provided by Detective Remiker is also appropriately included in the affidavit.

With all of this information included, there is no question but that the affidavit was sufficient to justify the issuance of the November 5, 2005 search warrant.

The State also asserts in it's written argument that Steven Avery has no standing to challenge any of the searches that were subsequently conducted at the Avery Auto Salvage Yard, including searches of the burn barrel, burn pit, the RAV-4, or any of the other buildings located on the property, with the exception of Mr. Avery's residence and detached garage.

Resolution of this argument is not necessary to the Court's decision on the **Franks** issue. The Court concludes that this argument is

more appropriately addressed in the portion of the defense motion challenging the multiple executions of the original search warrant.

For the reasons stated, the defense motion to suppress the fruits of the November 5, 2005 search warrant on the grounds that it was issued in violation of *Franks v. Delaware* is denied.

Those are all the decisions on motions the Court has today. I did want the take a brief inventory of what I understand to be the outstanding motions and confirm the status of those motions at this time.

The State has filed a motion concerning the admissibility of DNA evidence. And it's my understanding that at least at one point the parties were working on a stipulation to resolve that motion. Counsel, where are we on that motion?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I understood, Judge, if there was going to be a challenge to whatever it was that Mr. Gahn had presented, that Mr. Buting was going to alert us to that.

ATTORNEY BUTING: That's correct, Judge, and Mr. Gahn has been trying to compile some

additional requests that I had made regarding those tests and has not yet complied with that. And once we receive that, I anticipate we'll either -- we'll be in a position to either agree or not agree.

THE COURT: All right. I would like to have a date by which the Court will be notified either that the motion is going to be contested, or that it's resolved.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, would the Court be willing to adopt a scheduling plan that Mr. Buting has 30 days after the receipt of our discovery?

Mr. Gahn is meeting with Mr. Fallon and myself tomorrow. We should have an idea as to that date, certainly won't be any later than perhaps mid-September. Nonetheless, Judge, Mr. Buting believes that he can have that done within 30 days after receipt.

THE COURT: When you say receipt, is that what's going to happen in the next couple of days?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Mr. Gahn will be meeting with us. And what I'm suggesting is that we can -- if you wanted to set a date certain for that, we can have that to him, let's say by the 15th of September; Mr. Buting alerting the Court as to any challenges by the 15th of October. That should give

us plenty of time.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Buting, with the understanding that you are going to get the information by September 15th, the October 15th is acceptable to the defense?

ATTORNEY BUTING: Yes, that's fine.

THE COURT: Very well. The State has filed a number of other acts motions. The Court has received written arguments and I'm going to be issuing a written decision on those motions. Do I have all of the briefs that are going to be filed.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, you have three from the State, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang.

ATTORNEY STRANG: You have everything the defense anticipates submitting.

THE COURT: Okay.

ATTORNEY STRANG: I think the most recent was Friday, August 18. We submitted a brief on one aspect of Paragraph 6 of the State's motion.

THE COURT: All right. And I understand that each party has filed a motion. The defense has filed a motion to admit evidence regarding the defendant's prior wrongful conviction. The State has filed a motion to exclude it. Where are the

parties on those motions?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I note that a stipulation was proposed, Judge. I think even Mr. Strang may have provided us with his first suggestion as to that stipulation. This kind of goes on the same track as the stipulation regarding evidence of victim history. That stipulation is to exchanged as well. Would the Court allow us to exchange and then perhaps alert the Court by, again, the 15th of October, if we have a resolution. If we don't, we can certainly tell the Court before that time.

THE COURT: Does that work for both parties?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes. I followed the Court's lead, I submitted a proposed stipulation on the wrongful conviction evidence that really also looks like an offer of proof. It's fairly detailed and I gave the State a written draft of that document either on August 9 or August 10, when we were last here in Court. I don't -- I don't see any difficulty in leaving that issue unresolved until October 15 on the present schedule.

THE COURT: All right. So with respect to that issue and the issue of the victim's history, the parties will notify the Court by October 15th

either that you have an agreement, or that you don't, and if it requires Court resolution --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm sorry, we should probably be using the 16th, the 15th is a Sunday.

THE COURT: All right. The 16th.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I don't if it makes that much difference. The 16th I think is --

THE COURT: I will use that for the DNA evidence issue as well.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Okay.

THE COURT: With respect to the suppression motion regarding Marinette County statements, I have received briefs from both parties, but it's my understanding that there may be a related issue the parties want to alert the Court to.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Yes, Judge. After reviewing counsel's brief on the matter, the thought occurred to me that I think each counsel would like to be heard. If the Court for one reason or another decides to suppress the statement obtained by the Marinette County Sheriff on Saturday, November 5th, from the point on -- from the point of contention, we would like to be heard as to whether the subsequent statements obtained on November 6th ought to be suppressed as well. And that's because

there's a different set of arguments and issues presented.

Neither party really briefed those this time around, waiting and preferring to see if there was a need to. So we -- I think each counsel would reserve our right, if we may, to address further those issues if, and only if, the Court finds anything suppressible on the November 5th statement.

THE COURT: Mr. Strang, is that a fair statement?

intention from the start, both on the motion to suppress statements after the point of contention, as Mr. Fallon puts it, on November 5, 2005. And I might add on the Fourth Amendment suppression motions, as to which Mr. Buting took the lead role, I think the Court properly ought to decide on, is the exclusionary right -- exclusionary role rightly invoked here? Does it have a role to play? If it does, we can be heard later, both parties, on the scope of exclusion, or what potential evidence would derive from any unconstitutional conduct by law enforcement.

And I will add, it's not out of the

realm of possibility that the State or the defense might wish to offer some evidence on the scope of application in the exclusionary rule; although, it's also quite possible that just would be a matter of written or oral argument. So not only am I in agreement with Mr. Fallon on this point, it's really been my intention from the start as I think a much more orderly and measured way to proceed on those issues.

THE COURT: All right. So the -- Whether or not the parties are going to be looking to make further argument, or possibly even introduce additional evidence, will depend on the Court's decision. And the parties are both asking the Court at this time to only make a decision with respect to the November 5 statements. Is that a fair summary?

ATTORNEY FALLON: Yes.

ATTORNEY STRANG: And there -- Yes, it is.

And there, just to endorse the suggestion the Court made during the August 9 and August 10 evidentiary proceedings, there's no challenge to the admissibility of Mr. Avery's statements on November 5 prior to, again, as Mr. Fallon puts it elegantly, the point of contention, and we have both briefed where exactly that arises in the recorded

interview.

THE COURT: All right. There is a defense motion, filed some time ago, entitled -- it's actually not a motion, but a notice concerning interference with right to counsel. I have been led to believe a number of times that's been resolved, but it's still technically hanging out there.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Well, it is resolved. It was not a motion or a request for relief, it was a notice of a concern. Since I had it -- had the concern on June 16, I treated that deadline as one by which I ought to raise the concern in good faith. I did.

The State provided me the information it promised about the inmate at issue, his name is Orville Jacobs. I'm satisfied at this point with the information I have gotten from the State. I don't perceive a Sixth Amendment right to counsel concern arising with respect to Mr. Jacobs. Of course, if future information comes to light, or future events warrant it, I will raise the concern again, but I don't anticipate either of those events coming to pass.

THE COURT: All right. Since it was entitled a notice and not a motion, I don't believe

there's any need for a formal withdrawal document or anything like that.

ATTORNEY STRANG: But neither is there any need for a ruling.

THE COURT: All right. Then with respect to the defense motion to suppress the fruits of the search, or searches, based on multiple executions of the search warrants, those written briefs are due September 13.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes, it's a simultaneous exchange, as I understand it, of one round.

THE COURT: For my benefit, and I haven't seen the written arguments yet, but it appeared to me possible, based on the way the evidence came in, that there could be different lines of arguments relating to different individual searches. Are the parties -- Are the briefs going to be structured such that different searches are addressed individually?

ATTORNEY BUTING: I suppose we could do it that way. I anticipate -- Really, if the Court can recall from the testimony, I anticipate that the major point of contention is going to be after that first three hours or so search was made on the night of the 5th, Saturday night. Thereafter, there was a

number of entries and -- and I can address each one of those separately, but I think the primary issue is going to be on that.

THE COURT: Let me just ask this, I don't want to tell each party -- either party how to argue their case, but if you have arguments that relate to some searches and not others, please let those be differentiated in your briefs so that I know what you are trying to argue.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Okay.

THE COURT: And then there's also a State's motion regarding statements to other inmates. I believe I have recently received a written brief from the defense on that. Is there anything more coming from the State, or do I have everything I'm going to have on that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We just talked about that, Judge. We will discuss that in detail tomorrow and if the Court would allow us an opportunity, perhaps to the 13th of September, we can get that to the Court as well.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection from the defense?

ATTORNEY STRANG: I don't. That's an issue that's under seal, or we have treated it as sealed

to date.

THE COURT: Very well. I will give the State until September 13 then to respond.

ATTORNEY BUTING: Judge, could we return for just one moment to the multiple execution of the search warrant issue. As the Court framed it, I don't know whether that -- the way these -- the arguments may come out then might really be more amenable to a reply by either party as well.

In the event that there are -- that the State has certain arguments on certain searches and not others, or that I have likewise, it might be easier to just reply to them, rather than try and anticipate -- each of us anticipate what the arguments of the others would be. We have a little bit more time to do that now and I just raise that as one way of resolving that.

THE COURT: Mr. Fallon.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Yes. Thank you. It seems to me that the way -- excuse me -- the way the defense pled the issue and proceeded with its proofs, that the issue has been fairly well narrowed to complain of the searches occurring to Mr. Avery's trailer and garage, starting on Sunday, the 6th, until the second or subsequent warrant was obtained

late afternoon, I believe on the 9th.

Those were the issues which were the subject of the testimony and it seems to me that that's the context in which the case is going to be argued. So I'm not really sure that we need to separate out the searches per se other than, as the testimony reflected, there was, you know, an entry on Sunday, for instance, and one or two on Monday, and then one on Tuesday, that type of itemization or reflection.

I'm not sure it's to our benefit to separate them out any further, because as I reviewed the case law in preparation for writing this brief, it's not much -- it's not the issue, really. And I don't -- I don't know if we really need to reply, and counter-reply, or what have you. It seems to me it's been narrowly pled and the testimony was narrowly produced. So I'm not sure we have a whole lot of range of other searches at issue, so to speak.

THE COURT: Let's do this, after each party receives a copy of the other party's brief, if either party feels there's a need to reply, you can ask the Court for permission, in writing, just fax it to me, I will take it up at that time.

ATTORNEY STRANG: Thank you.

THE COURT: I would ask also on that issue,
I think I mentioned it before, I did not have access
in our law library, or my online law library, to all
of the secondary sources that necessarily relate to
that issue. So if you have -- if you're going to be
citing any secondary sources, please give me copies.
I have got ALR and Amger and those types of things,
but I think it was --

ATTORNEY BUTING: La Fave.

THE COURT: -- La Fave I do not have.

Right. I'm not looking to make the file any bigger than it is, but if you cite to La Fave, give me a copy. I think I have already gotten one from the State.

ATTORNEY FALLON: I think you got the copy.

I think, unless counsel disagrees, I think we have
got the relevant portions of La Fave for the Court.

ATTORNEY BUTING: I believe so. If there are any -- so the Court has access to case law.

THE COURT: Other jurisdiction case law is fine, I have got Lexus Nexus, but La Fave is not on there.

ATTORNEY BUTING: So anything like Law Journals, Law Reviews, things of those nature that

1 might -- you do not have access to?

THE COURT: If you have got access to Lexus and it's on Lexus, you don't have to send it to me.

ATTORNEY BUTING: I use Lexus.

THE COURT: Right. So, if it's not on

Lexus, send it, otherwise you don't have to. I

certainly have access to case law from all other

jurisdictions and a number of secondary sources, but

not La Fave.

ATTORNEY FALLON: Your Honor, may I have just a moment to talk to Mr. Buting on this.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

ATTORNEY FALLON: I thought we might have one other point of interest for the Court, but I guess we'll have to defer comment until we consider it further.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything further from either party today?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Yes. One, just a point of clarification. This may have been implicit in the Court's rulings both on the motion to dismiss and the motion for sanctions to exclude the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department, since the Court referred to having reviewed the eight news conferences, but I just want to make sure that the

record is complete and that, in fact, a viewable, either VHS tape or DVD arrived from WFRV-TV to the Court as I had arranged to happen.

THE COURT: Yes, the VHS tape arrived and that's workable.

anticipate some further motions, not just motions in limine. Conceivably, for example, some discovery that I received -- was received at my office, I have lost track of the dates now, but it's more than a week and less than two weeks ago. Some new discovery suggests a further non-evidentiary motion.

It's also entirely possible, as

Mr. Dassey's case proceeds here, that an issue

may arise under *Samuels* -- under *State vs*. *Samuels* in this case. We can't know that at this

juncture of the proceedings in Mr. Dassey's

separate case.

But what I would propose is that I treat the October 16 deadline as a good time to file any other motion, other than an in limine issue properly addressed much closer to trial, you know, that has arisen with new discovery, or new information, or new events since June 16.

For that matter, September 13, I also

could treat as a date for raising any new issues. I know there's at least one that I intend to raise so, that's disclosure. And I guess also jointly request that the Court set a date, fix a date for me to do that, or accommodate new issues that have arisen.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz.

attorney kratz: We are going to need a scheduling conference anyway, Judge. We talked about jury questionnaires. We talked about exchange of experts and some other more definite scheduling order from the Court. And whether the Court wants to do that by a phone conference, to at least schedule that meeting, or wants to set that meeting, we're certainly amenable to that.

THE COURT: All right. Because of the contemplated adjournment of the trial date, I didn't give that as much attention as I might have before today. I agree that we're going to need a scheduling conference at some point to establish timelines for filing motions in limine, jury questionnaires, those types of things. Do either of the parties have any suggestions about when that could be effectively accomplished?

ATTORNEY STRANG: Well, we'll know where we

1	are on some things on October 16, particularly DNA,
2	and the wrongful conviction, and victim's history
3	information.
4	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Perhaps later that week,
5	Judge, we know it's blocked off our calendar so.
6	THE COURT: I know I have got time that
7	week. All right. I'm having the clerk get me my
8	calendar.
9	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Could either be that
10	Thursday or Friday, those work best for us, Judge.
11	THE COURT: Thursday the 19th, morning or
12	afternoon?
13	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Morning would be just
14	fine.
15	THE COURT: Should we say 10:00.
16	ATTORNEY BUTING: That's fine.
17	ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's good, Judge. Thank
18	you.
19	THE CLERK: What date was that?
20	THE COURT: October 19th.
21	ATTORNEY KRATZ: Will that be on the record
22	or in chambers, your Honor?
23	THE COURT: I will notify you about that a
24	little closer to the date, whether it will be on the
25	record, or simply a scheduling conference, or

1	something that involves going on the record. For
2	now, it will be an off the record scheduling
3	conference, but I'm going to hold the time in the
4	event there is anything to deal with on the record.
5	Does either party have anything else that needs
6	addressing?
7	ATTORNEY STRANG: So we'll address
8	deadlines for further motions and the whole sort of
9	schedule before trial at that point?
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	ATTORNEY STRANG: Fine.
12	THE COURT: Anything else today?
13	ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: If not, we're adjourned for
15	today.
16	(Proceedings concluded.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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 29th day of January, 2007.		
16			
17			
18			
19	Diane Tesheneck, RPR Official Court Reporter		
20	Official Court Reporter		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

0	accusers [2] 28/1 32/25	50/5 52/10 53/2 53/24 54/5 55/22
05 [2] 1/5 2/2	acknowledged [3] 36/20 41/17 41/20	58/4 59/7 59/17 61/16 62/7 allegation [2] 9/9 39/18
1	acknowledges [2] 10/14 44/15	allegations [6] 6/16 7/18 9/15 32/4
10 [5] 27/5 41/14 41/22 40/10	acknowledging [1] 37/9	37/24 43/5
10 [5] 37/6 41/14 41/22 49/19 52/20	acquaintance [2] 34/8 34/17 acquiescence [2] 13/3 13/10	allege [1] 36/23 alleged [8] 2/25 6/6 22/5 35/12
10:00 [1] 62/15	acting [4] 13/24 36/17 42/13 42/21	36/9 36/13 39/3 40/3
11 [4] 3/18 20/25 21/2 23/8 12 [1] 21/2	actions [2] 2/25 3/19	allegedly [4] 24/25 27/18 28/25
13 [3] 54/9 56/3 60/25	acts [1] 48/8 actual [2] 20/13 20/16	39/13 alleges [3] 37/3 37/12 39/4
13th [1] 55/20	actually [4] 4/19 31/6 41/13 53/4	Allen [2] 8/13 8/21
14th [1] 3/13 15 [1] 49/22	add [2] 51/16 51/25 added [1] 43/4	alleviate [1] 18/17 allow [3] 18/20 49/8 55/19
15th [7] 47/23 47/25 48/4 48/4	addition [3] 41/11 41/24 43/6	alone [2] 8/16 23/25
49/9 49/25 50/4 16 [4] 53/11 60/20 60/24 62/1	additional [3] 35/11 47/1 52/13	along [1] 22/20
16th [3] 50/4 50/5 50/7	address [7] 22/22 28/2 35/8 38/25 51/7 55/1 63/7	ALR [1] 58/8 already [3] 6/19 9/11 58/14
17 [4] 37/7 41/12 41/14 41/23	addressed [5] 30/11 33/7 46/1	also [25] 2/7 3/7 6/4 7/4 13/5
18 [1] 48/19 1968 [1] 4/12	54/18 60/22 addressing [2] 35/11 63/6	16/11 16/15 17/18 17/25 18/8 18/15 19/18 21/9 21/18 40/25
1977 [1] 4/13	adequate [3] 11/13 17/7 28/23	42/1 45/9 45/15 49/16 52/4 55/11
1978 [1] 36/1	adherence [1] 26/4	58/2 60/13 60/25 61/3
1985 [4] 8/11 8/14 8/19 21/8 19th [3] 33/9 62/11 62/20	adjourned [1] 63/14 adjournment [2] 10/15 61/17	alternative [1] 27/9 although [2] 25/10 52/4
2	admissibility [3] 27/23 46/15	am [1] 52/6
2003 [1] 30/13	52/22 admissible [3] 31/1 35/2 35/5	amenable [2] 56/9 61/15 amendment [4] 3/13 39/14 51/16
2004 [1] 32/22	admission [7] 27/22 31/22 32/9	53/18
2005 [6] 27/18 35/19 36/12 45/14	32/15 32/16 33/5 34/22	amenities [1] 14/3
46/6 51/15 2006 [2] 1/9 21/23	admit [4] 27/15 27/17 34/14 48/23 admitted [1] 30/6	Amger [1] 58/8 announced [1] 24/8
2007 [3] 12/12 19/2 64/15	admittedly [1] 9/8	another [4] 8/20 10/14 16/17
20:3.6 [3] 7/12 22/21 26/5 22 [1] 1/9	admonition [1] 22/20	50/19
29th [1] 64/15	adopt [3] 14/2 14/12 47/10 adopted [1] 20/2	anticipate [7] 47/3 53/22 54/21 54/22 56/14 56/14 60/7
3	advanced [1] 29/20	anticipated [1] 28/16
30 [2] 47/11 47/16	advantages [1]	anticipates [1] 48/16 any [47] 7/1 7/3 8/21 9/21 17/3
381 [2] 1/5 2/3	advised [2] 8/1 11/9	17/10 17/13 18/17 18/17 18/18
5	affect [1] 27/4 affiant [1] 39/12	23/1 23/4 23/5 24/3 24/3 24/7 24/12 24/25 26/1 26/6 26/24 29/3
5th [3] 50/21 51/9 54/25	affidavit [18] 35/23 36/10 36/24	31/10 34/15 34/24 38/4 40/18
6	37/4 37/19 38/11 38/13 39/12	43/1 43/1 43/10 45/5 45/17 45/20
6th [2] 50/24 56/24	40/1 41/3 41/11 41/18 43/17 44/16 44/20 44/23 45/10 45/12	47/14 47/24 49/20 51/23 54/1 54/3 55/22 57/12 58/7 58/12
9	affidavit's [1] 39/22	58/20 60/21 61/1 61/23
908.03 [1] 29/22	affidavits [1] 39/21 after [8] 3/6 15/3 47/11 47/17	anyone [2] 17/3 34/16 anything [12] 19/3 19/11 36/22
908.045 [5] 28/10 29/8 29/13	50/16 51/14 54/23 57/21	43/4 51/8 54/2 55/14 58/24 59/17
32/14 35/6 911 [2] 33/11 33/13	afternoon [2] 57/1 62/12	63/4 63/5 63/12
971.225 [1] 16/16	again [5] 14/5 23/23 49/9 52/23 53/22	anyway [2] 6/19 61/9 apparently [3] 23/9 42/23 43/8
9th [1] 57/1	against [4] 6/8 6/12 10/3 11/2	Appeals [3] 30/12 30/13 30/25
A	agents [3] 3/24 42/13 42/21 ago [5] 10/7 17/16 17/19 53/3	appearance [1] 44/25 appearances [2] 1/11 2/4
ability [3] 13/11 42/2 64/14	60/11	appeared [2] 1/21 54/13
able [4] 37/6 37/10 41/13 41/22 about [8] 12/12 22/16 53/15 55/17	agree [6] 15/18 17/22 19/5 47/4	appearing [2] 2/7 2/7
61/10 61/10 61/23 62/23	47/4 61/19 agreed [8] 12/10 12/20 12/23	appears [4] 2/5 8/15 17/25 29/3 application [1] 52/3
absence [1] 8/3 acceptable [1] 48/5	14/19 14/24 16/1 22/10 23/17	apply [3] 26/6 29/9 29/20
acceptable [1] 46/3	agreeing [1] 16/6 agreement [8] 13/5 13/16 22/16	approached [1] 15/4 appropriate [2] 5/13 12/16
access [5] 58/3 58/20 59/1 59/2	22/19 22/24 25/18 50/1 52/6	appropriate [2] 3/13 12/16 appropriately [2] 45/9 46/1
59/7 accommodate [1] 61/5	agrees [2] 15/17 25/6	approved [1] 4/21
accomplished [1] 61/24	ahead [1] 59/12 aired [1] 21/1	approximately [2] 12/14 25/3 are [40] 2/18 2/19 10/23 15/19
accord [1] 20/4 account [1] 4/2	alert [3] 46/23 49/9 50/15	15/25 16/5 17/22 19/25 20/4 22/5
account [1] 4/2 accounts [1] 4/2	alerted [1] 17/16	25/21 26/22 28/12 29/23 32/6 32/23 33/5 33/16 33/21 34/16
accurately [1] 14/17	alerting	32/23 33/5 33/16 33/21 34/16 34/21 35/1 36/4 37/19 46/9 46/18
accusations [1] 6/8 accuser [1] 34/5	15/1 16/7 20/18 20/19 28/5 45/11	48/3 48/11 48/25 52/11 52/14
	46/9 47/5 48/2 48/11 48/21 49/23	54/8 54/16 54/17 54/18 55/9

Α are... [4] 56/10 58/20 61/8 62/1 area [3] 40/8 43/24 45/7 arguable [1] 40/18 arguably [3] 16/12 29/20 30/4 argue [3] 44/21 55/5 55/9 argued [4] 40/17 40/23 43/17 57/5 argument [6] 21/20 45/16 45/23 45/25 52/5 52/12 arguments [11] 21/19 21/22 32/3 48/9 51/1 54/13 54/15 55/6 56/8 56/11 56/15 arise [1] 60/15 arisen [2] 60/23 61/6 arises [2] 20/24 52/25 arising [2] 30/16 53/19 around [1] 51/4 arranged [1] 60/3 arrest [1] 3/6 arrived [2] 60/2 60/4 **Article [2]** 3/11 3/14 as [89] ask [4] 16/4 55/4 57/24 58/2 asking [2] 14/12 52/14 asks [1] 37/22 aspect [1] 48/20 aspects [1] 13/12 assault [3] 8/15 21/8 32/1 assembly [1] 20/8 assertion [5] 41/2 41/6 42/25 43/9 43/22 **asserts [6]** 3/10 10/12 28/6 31/23 42/1 45/15 assist [2] 40/15 40/19 **assistance** [1] 33/20 assisted [2] 42/1 64/10 at [49] 1/17 1/19 2/1 7/11 7/24 8/12 10/18 12/6 13/9 15/5 15/7 16/11 17/11 18/1 19/3 20/9 21/22 22/7 22/15 23/1 24/9 25/17 28/23 30/23 31/14 32/11 35/1 37/2 39/15 39/17 40/18 40/18 43/3 44/12 45/18 46/13 46/16 46/16 52/15 53/15 53/16 57/20 57/25 60/9 60/16 61/2 61/13 61/20 63/9 **Attached [1]** 13/15 attempt [1] 27/8 attempts [1] 12/4 attending [1] 20/1 attention [1] 61/18 attorney [7] 1/17 1/19 2/6 3/4 7/13 9/22 11/5 attorney's [1] 25/14 attorneys [4] 17/8 17/13 22/12 26/5 attributed [1] 30/18 AUGUST [6] 1/9 48/19 49/19 49/19 52/20 52/20 August 10 [2] 49/19 52/20 August 18 [1] 48/19 August 9 [2] 49/19 52/20 authority [2] 27/1 27/2 authorization [1] 42/3 authorized [1] 45/3 auto [3] 37/2 38/5 45/18 available [2] 6/18 11/6 AVERY [37] 1/6 1/20 2/2 2/10 6/13 8/11 8/14 8/19 9/10 13/3 14/11 14/19 15/14 15/23 20/9 21/6 21/7 26/2 26/23 32/4 34/21 36/15 37/2 38/3 38/5 38/8 38/16 38/21 38/23 40/6 40/7 40/15 40/21 43/10 **buildings** [1] 45/20

43/12 45/16 45/18 **Avery's [6]** 3/20 14/4 43/15 45/22 52/22 56/23 avoid [2] 18/18 23/15 aware [1] 18/6 away [1] 9/18 awkward [1] 9/8

back [3] 8/11 14/10 21/7 **bailiff [1]** 20/8 balance [1] 8/24 **balanced** [1] 10/6 barrel [1] 45/19 based [9] 13/10 14/2 18/12 27/21 32/10 35/12 39/5 54/7 54/14 basing [1] 7/19 basis [8] 2/24 3/22 20/23 35/9 35/19 41/5 42/15 44/18 Bay [1] 21/1 be [87] bears [1] 34/6 because [15] 4/8 10/11 20/14 21/13 26/11 31/1 31/8 35/13 37/16 38/6 38/19 42/3 50/25 57/12 61/16 become [1] 6/20 been [36] 2/16 4/20 6/6 6/23 7/2 8/8 8/17 9/6 11/18 11/23 14/9 18/2 18/13 18/14 18/23 22/5 24/2 24/6 24/20 25/20 40/12 40/19 42/8 42/13 42/16 44/9 45/3 46/25 51/12 52/7 53/5 53/6 56/22 57/17 59/20 64/8 before [19] 1/10 6/23 7/24 10/25 11/17 21/16 23/23 25/4 25/9 26/9 27/12 30/5 30/24 31/11 31/19 49/11 58/3 61/18 63/9 begins [1] 19/10 behalf [7] 1/13 1/15 1/17 1/19 13/25 20/21 36/18 **behavior** [1] 5/18 being [10] 2/19 4/11 7/9 12/7 13/21 15/17 17/17 19/23 22/6 27/9 **belief [3]** 8/16 9/24 11/12 believe [13] 10/1 12/13 14/10 18/3 18/10 23/11 31/20 42/12 53/6 53/25 55/13 57/1 58/19 believed [3] 7/7 9/10 9/19 believes [4] 6/10 10/18 23/21 47/16 benefit [2] 54/12 57/11 **best [2]** 62/10 64/13 bias [1] 7/19 bigger [1] 58/12 bit [1] 56/16 blocked [1] 62/5 blue [1] 41/9 bluish [1] 41/9 both [11] 13/1 15/18 17/24 28/7 49/12 50/13 51/13 51/21 52/14 52/24 59/21 bottom [2] 10/21 12/8 BRANCH [2] 1/1 64/5 Brendan [3] 6/14 26/20 27/1 brief [8] 3/18 15/15 46/10 48/19 50/17 55/13 57/14 57/22 briefed [2] 51/3 52/25 briefs [6] 35/14 48/11 50/13 54/8 54/17 55/8 Briggs [2] 4/13 6/17

Burish [1] 2/13 burn [2] 45/19 45/19 but [39] 5/9 6/11 8/15 8/19 9/6 11/9 14/17 14/21 15/7 16/11 18/6 19/10 19/20 20/3 22/16 27/3 27/4 36/22 40/4 41/7 42/25 45/12 50/13 53/4 53/7 53/22 54/3 54/13 55/2 55/6 58/9 58/13 58/22 59/8 59/14 59/25 60/10 60/19 63/3 **BUTING [10]** 1/18 2/11 2/12 46/22 47/10 47/15 47/24 48/2 51/17 59/11

calculated [1] 21/14 calendar [2] 62/5 62/8 call [1] 33/13 called [1] 42/9 caller [1] 33/11 calls [2] 2/1 18/15 Calumet [25] 2/6 3/4 11/4 12/18 13/5 13/13 13/18 13/22 14/3 14/21 14/24 16/21 16/25 17/20 17/23 18/4 18/10 19/5 19/11 19/22 20/5 20/6 22/2 22/12 25/25 came [2] 22/16 54/14 can [14] 11/13 12/1 36/5 37/15 44/21 47/16 47/22 47/23 49/11 51/21 54/21 55/1 55/20 57/23 can't [1] 60/16 cannot [1] 19/2 care [2] 11/24 23/21 careful [1] 5/10 carefully [1] 64/8 case [62] 1/5 2/2 3/7 4/4 4/6 4/12 4/14 4/18 5/13 5/20 6/6 6/13 6/22 7/10 8/12 9/20 9/23 12/11 13/20 14/24 16/25 18/4 18/22 19/17 19/20 20/22 23/5 23/23 24/6 24/23 25/12 25/19 26/1 26/21 26/22 27/1 27/3 27/4 27/5 27/15 30/12 30/13 30/14 31/4 31/14 32/22 33/8 33/9 34/2 34/4 38/2 40/2 44/14 55/6 57/4 57/13 58/20 58/21 59/7 60/14 60/16 60/18 cases [5] 4/11 4/15 6/9 24/15 24/21 casual [2] 34/7 34/17 cause [7] 36/5 37/20 38/14 39/14 39/23 39/25 42/10 certain [4] 27/17 47/22 56/11 56/11 certainly [8] 10/2 12/1 31/12 34/15 47/14 49/11 59/7 61/15 certify [1] 64/6 CF [2] 1/5 2/2 **challenge [7]** 35/11 35/16 38/4 38/17 45/17 46/21 52/21 challenged [1] 38/12 challenges [2] 35/18 47/25 challenging [2] 35/8 46/2 chambers [1] 62/22 **chance [1]** 27/11 change [7] 4/20 5/9 10/20 11/11 11/19 12/5 24/21 character[1] 41/13 characterized [1] 36/16 characterizes [1] 40/25 characters [4] 37/7 41/14 41/16 41/23 charge [4] 4/8 20/7 21/8 31/17 **charged [2]** 9/20 30/14 **charges [7]** 4/16 5/2 5/9 8/7 10/3

C **charges... [2]** 11/2 31/4 chief [1] 20/22 choose [1] 13/12 CIRCUIT [3] 1/1 1/10 64/5 circumstances [2] 33/18 33/22 cite [3] 4/10 25/14 58/13 cited [2] 6/2 24/15 cites [2] 3/7 4/4 citing [1] 58/7 citizens [3] 10/17 36/14 40/3 civil [1] 9/22 claim [4] 3/23 39/1 43/20 44/8 claimed [2] 36/24 41/3 clarification [2] 26/18 59/20 clause [3] 32/19 32/21 34/23 **clear [1]** 28/18 clearly [1] 44/23 clerk [1] 62/7 close [2] 34/10 42/19 closer [3] 18/10 60/22 62/24 co [8] 6/13 27/16 27/18 28/20 29/2 contemplation [1] 28/16 32/8 34/11 34/25 co-defendant [1] 6/13 co-workers [7] 27/16 27/18 28/20 29/2 32/8 34/11 34/25 colloquy [1] 15/15 come [2] 9/18 56/8 comes [2] 34/10 53/20 coming [3] 23/12 53/23 55/15 commence [1] 12/12 comment [4] 12/24 25/19 26/1 59/15 comments [19] 3/7 8/1 10/5 20/24 21/4 21/14 22/11 23/2 23/5 23/12 23/15 23/16 23/22 23/24 24/25 25/6 25/15 25/19 27/5 commit [1] 8/19 **committed** [1] 22/6 compile [1] 46/25 complain [1] 56/23 complained [2] 5/25 10/24 Complaints [2] 6/12 6/19 complete [3] 37/5 37/14 60/1 **complied** [1] 47/2 comply [1] 22/21 composed [3] 10/17 16/25 19/7 computer [1] 64/10 computer-assisted [1] 64/10 computerized [1] 64/9 conceded [2] 8/18 43/3 Conceivably [1] 60/8 concern [8] 15/4 23/1 25/15 53/10 53/11 53/12 53/19 53/22 concerning [5] 21/11 26/1 34/25 46/14 53/4 concerns [2] 22/22 34/23 conclude [3] 7/25 8/5 42/6 concluded [4] 5/7 8/20 26/3 63/16 concludes [8] 3/18 5/16 5/20 26/11 34/19 37/17 44/5 45/25 conclusion [3] 34/24 43/3 44/13 conclusions [1] 24/12 concur[1] 18/7 condition [3] 28/15 29/25 30/1 conditionally [1] 44/11 conduct [3] 15/15 40/22 51/23 conducted [3] 3/3 20/5 45/18 conference [5] 61/9 61/13 61/20 62/25 63/3 conferences [8] 3/3 3/5 6/3 6/7 6/25 11/1 11/4 59/25 current [1] 32/10

confined [2] 6/11 11/6 confirm [1] 46/12 conflicts [1] 18/18 confront [2] 28/1 32/24 confrontation [3] 32/18 32/21 34/22 consensual [1] 43/8 consent [3] 37/13 40/21 42/3 consider [1] 59/15 considerations [1] 18/12 **considered [2]** 5/6 37/16 constitute [4] 25/8 29/4 37/25 42/7 constitution [4] 3/12 3/14 3/15 32/19 constitutional [4] 3/11 16/8 22/4 32/18 contact [2] 20/16 23/8 contacted [1] 23/10 contained [3] 6/12 28/9 35/6 contains [1] 38/14 contemplated [1] 61/17 contends [1] 21/12 content [3] 6/11 6/14 39/22 contention [4] 50/22 51/14 52/24 54/23 contested [2] 27/9 47/7 context [4] 23/13 25/7 34/15 57/4 contingent [2] 10/20 11/11 continuance [4] 4/20 5/9 19/4 24/22 continue [1] 12/13 contribute [1] 44/2 control [2] 24/1 45/4 convenient [1] 19/9 conviction [3] 48/24 49/16 62/2 **convinced** [1] 8/13 **copies** [1] 58/7 **copy** [3] 57/22 58/14 58/16 Corporation [1] 13/24 corpse [1] 30/16 correct [5] 15/10 15/20 44/6 46/24 64/12 correctly [1] 42/18 correspondence [1] 13/23 could [22] 5/1 5/13 5/17 10/7 10/17 16/19 27/4 28/22 29/9 29/20 30/4 30/6 32/9 40/12 43/16 43/19 54/15 54/20 56/4 61/1 61/24 62/9 counsel [16] 11/23 13/1 13/24 14/15 14/25 22/14 26/7 26/7 26/9 36/20 46/18 50/18 51/6 53/5 53/18 58/17 counsel's [1] 50/17 counter [1] 57/16 counter-reply [1] 57/16 county [74] couple [1] 47/19 course [4] 20/7 33/13 33/17 53/20 court [149] Court's [10] 18/6 22/17 23/20 26/21 27/3 27/12 45/24 49/15 52/13 59/21 courthouse [8] 12/19 13/22 14/3 14/25 17/20 18/1 19/6 20/6 Crawford [3] 32/21 32/23 34/4 credit [1] 10/4 crime [2] 8/19 31/19 crimes [4] 6/6 9/20 22/5 30/10 criminal [4] 4/7 4/16 5/1 34/1

custody [2] 20/9 20/9

Dassey [4] 6/14 26/20 26/22 27/1 Dassey's [2] 60/14 60/17 date [19] 1/9 4/21 7/24 10/16 11/20 18/16 19/1 19/4 28/25 47/6 47/13 47/22 56/1 61/1 61/4 61/5 61/17 62/19 62/24 **Dated [1]** 64/15 dates [1] 60/10 daughter [3] 36/14 36/22 42/12 Davis [2] 33/8 34/3 day [1] 64/15 days [5] 17/16 17/19 47/11 47/16 47/19 deadline [2] 53/11 60/20 deadlines [1] 63/8 deal [2] 12/4 63/4 **dealing [1]** 6/24 **dealt [1]** 2/19 **DEAN [2]** 1/16 2/12 decide [1] 51/18 decided [1] 33/8 decides [1] 50/20 decision [15] 1/4 2/15 2/21 5/3 5/15 6/17 17/8 18/6 23/20 36/1 43/21 45/24 48/10 52/14 52/15 decisions [3] 2/17 7/19 46/9 declarant [5] 28/13 28/15 29/16 29/17 29/25 declarant's [2] 28/17 31/2 defendant [53] 1/7 1/17 1/19 1/21 3/2 3/7 3/10 3/25 4/4 4/7 4/10 4/19 5/25 6/5 6/9 6/13 7/6 7/9 9/6 9/15 9/19 10/1 10/3 10/8 10/14 10/23 11/3 11/10 17/24 21/12 22/3 22/7 22/14 24/13 26/2 30/14 30/21 32/24 35/18 36/2 36/13 37/3 37/17 39/1 39/4 39/8 39/19 40/10 41/25 43/23 44/7 44/8 45/5 defendant's [32] 2/22 3/6 4/23 5/23 7/7 9/1 9/3 9/21 10/20 11/11 11/15 21/11 21/15 23/18 25/9 27/20 28/1 28/22 29/21 32/1 32/17 35/8 36/8 37/12 37/24 39/16 40/2 41/25 42/6 42/19 44/4 defense [37] 3/18 7/9 7/11 10/11 12/9 18/21 18/24 19/15 19/22 20/19 20/23 22/13 22/14 22/23 23/21 24/15 26/8 26/12 26/15 27/22 29/6 36/20 40/25 43/2 44/14 46/2 46/4 48/5 48/16 48/22 51/12 52/2 53/2 54/6 55/14 55/23 56/21 defer [1] 59/15 definite [1] 61/11 definition [1] 26/21 degree [1] 30/15 **Delaware [4]** 35/10 35/25 39/6 46/7 **delay [1]** 18/16 **delete [1]** 44/18 demonstrate [2] 31/6 36/21 demonstrated [1] 38/7 demonstrates [1] 11/12 denied [4] 11/15 26/16 40/24 46/8 deny[1] 37/22 department [21] 2/9 9/5 9/9 13/17 19/16 19/19 20/6 20/13 20/15 20/20 22/13 23/3 24/1 24/5 24/24

25/16 25/17 25/24 25/25 26/14

drastic [2] 5/17 24/16 exactly [2] 29/14 52/25 D example [3] 34/9 34/12 60/8 draw [1] 10/19 department... [1] 59/23 exception [9] 28/9 28/23 29/8 due [2] 3/12 54/8 depend [1] 52/13 during [2] 27/19 52/20 29/13 29/19 30/4 32/13 35/6 **DVD [1]** 60/2 **Depending** [1] 32/6 45/21 derive [1] 51/23 exceptions [1] 33/2 described [1] 6/17 exchange [3] 49/8 54/11 61/10 describes [3] 28/14 29/5 43/6 each [8] 28/2 48/22 50/18 51/5 exchanged [1] 49/7 describing [2] 28/20 34/10 55/1 55/5 56/14 57/21 excised [2] 37/19 38/13 description [2] 37/1 41/4 Earl [1] 40/21 **exclude [5]** 19/15 20/19 24/23 designed [1] 5/22 48/25 59/22 earlier [6] 22/9 25/11 27/19 28/21 destroyed [1] 3/20 34/20 35/1 excluded [3] 28/12 29/23 39/25 exclusion [3] 24/16 26/13 51/22 exclusionary [3] 51/19 51/19 52/3 detached [2] 38/6 45/22 early [5] 7/5 7/16 10/16 11/1 detail [5] 6/9 12/2 14/8 21/3 55/18 24/10 detailed [1] 49/17 easier [1] 56/13 excuse [1] 56/20 detailing [1] 6/8 economical [1] 18/4 execution [2] 35/17 56/5 details [1] 20/1 effective [1] 22/25 executions [3] 35/13 46/3 54/7 detective [21] 36/11 37/9 37/12 effectively [2] 3/20 61/24 existed [1] 7/17 **existing [1]** 30/3 37/18 38/18 38/18 38/20 38/24 effects [2] 7/15 18/17 exonerated [1] 21/9 40/5 40/5 40/14 41/17 41/21 42/2 egregious [3] 5/18 5/22 8/6 eight [3] 3/3 6/2 59/24 43/7 43/14 43/25 44/16 44/22 **expanded [1]** 32/20 45/2 45/9 either [20] 10/5 19/12 24/17 25/23 expect [1] 10/2 determination [1] 16/18 38/22 43/11 47/3 47/4 47/7 49/19 expectation [6] 38/7 38/21 43/10 Diane [3] 1/24 64/4 64/19 50/1 53/22 55/5 56/9 57/23 59/18 43/16 43/24 45/6 experts [1] 61/11 did [21] 4/15 5/4 6/7 8/19 8/21 60/2 61/22 62/9 63/5 9/25 14/16 14/17 23/3 23/5 24/24 **elegantly** [1] 52/24 expiration [1] 24/9 25/8 25/14 36/21 37/13 42/3 42/6 element [1] 30/10 **explain** [1] 9/8 44/24 46/10 53/13 58/3 elements [1] 31/16 **explained** [1] 14/25 didn't [1] 61/17 eliminate [1] 22/10 explaining [1] 29/24 difference [1] 50/7 else [2] 63/5 63/12 explanation [1] 9/4 different [5] 26/23 51/1 54/15 emergency [3] 33/11 33/20 33/23 **expressed [2]** 9/23 40/14 54/16 54/18 enable [1] 33/19 extend [1] 27/4 extent [1] 39/25 differentiated [1] 55/8 end [1] 41/10 endorse [1] 52/19 difficulty [1] 49/21 **extreme** [1] 22/18 dire [1] 5/11 enforcement [7] 9/1 9/25 36/18 directing [1] 26/7 40/19 42/22 43/2 51/24 face [1] 40/1 directly [1] 24/6 enlisted [1] 40/19 disagrees [1] 58/17 enter [1] 40/22 facilities [1] 17/21 disappearance [4] 30/17 30/20 entire [2] 41/12 41/20 fact [10] 4/17 6/16 11/22 18/9 20/9 36/17 37/6 40/13 40/20 60/1 entirely [2] 5/4 60/13 30/24 31/12 entirety [1] 21/18 disclose [2] 40/20 43/18 facts [3] 10/22 10/23 32/6 disclosed [1] 15/7 entitled [7] 4/7 7/18 21/13 32/24 failure [1] 43/17 disclosure [3] 7/1 15/9 61/3 44/9 53/3 53/25 fair [12] 3/1 3/25 4/23 5/23 10/8 discover [1] 44/24 entitling [2] 39/2 44/7 10/16 10/19 11/13 21/15 25/9 51/10 52/16 discovery [8] 24/17 40/10 42/14 entries [1] 55/1 fairly [3] 14/17 49/17 56/22 44/18 47/11 60/8 60/12 60/23 entry [3] 43/7 45/2 57/8 **discretion [1]** 23/15 especially [1] 7/4 faith [1] 53/12 essence [1] 14/16 establish [3] 33/24 39/23 61/20 discuss [3] 17/8 17/12 55/18 dismiss [4] 2/22 10/3 11/15 59/21 fall [5] 28/8 29/12 30/4 32/13 33/1 FALLON [8] 1/14 2/8 21/22 47/12 51/15 52/6 52/23 56/18 dismissal [10] 3/22 4/7 4/19 5/1 established [1] 39/19 5/8 5/14 5/16 5/17 8/7 10/11 establishing [1] 35/3 false [10] 35/20 36/3 36/9 37/17 dismissed [1] 4/17 evaluate [1] 18/21 39/5 39/9 39/13 39/21 41/1 42/8 even [7] 6/23 8/3 24/22 26/21 |dispute [1] 29/7 falsely [2] 36/24 37/4 disregard [4] 35/22 39/11 39/18 family [9] 7/7 9/1 9/3 9/16 9/22 38/12 49/3 52/12 event [8] 7/3 28/14 29/5 29/25 13/6 13/7 14/6 18/9 41/2 district [4] 2/6 3/4 7/13 11/5 30/1 39/17 56/10 63/4 family's [1] 13/11 DNA [3] 46/15 50/8 62/1 Fave [6] 58/10 58/11 58/13 58/18 events [4] 33/25 53/21 53/23 do [25] 15/8 16/3 16/7 16/13 58/22 59/9 60/24 16/14 16/15 16/22 17/10 17/11 ever [4] 4/5 4/6 5/15 5/15 fax [1] 57/24 everybody [1] 15/16 fear [1] 31/7 17/13 23/22 27/6 29/12 37/24 48/10 54/20 55/15 56/16 57/21 everyone [1] 19/10 fearful [1] 30/23 58/11 59/1 61/5 61/13 61/22 64/6 everything [2] 48/15 55/15 February [3] 12/12 14/10 19/2 February 5 [2] 12/12 19/2 document [2] 49/19 54/1 evidence [29] 7/20 13/21 14/5 18/21 23/7 24/3 24/16 24/23 feels [1] 57/23 does [17] 4/10 7/25 8/5 11/24 27/23 30/22 31/2 31/5 31/13 fell [1] 23/16 felt [1] 22/19 23/11 24/1 29/6 29/16 31/20 34/8 31/22 36/20 39/20 39/20 43/4 42/22 44/1 44/6 49/12 51/20 44/12 45/5 46/15 48/23 49/6 few [3] 17/16 17/19 31/11 51/21 63/5 49/16 50/9 51/22 52/2 52/13 file [2] 58/12 60/20 don't [18] 12/2 17/14 27/2 49/10 49/20 49/20 50/2 50/6 53/18 filed [12] 2/16 6/23 7/10 11/18 54/14 53/22 53/25 55/4 55/24 56/7 evidentiary [4] 36/19 38/1 52/20 20/19 46/14 48/7 48/11 48/22 57/15 57/15 59/3 59/6 60/12 48/23 48/25 53/3 done [1] 47/16 ex [1] 4/11 filing [1] 61/21 **exact [1]** 45/1 draft [3] 26/8 26/18 49/18 **finally [3]** 10/10 35/7 38/16

F	grant [2] 18/14 18/24	his [34] 3/10 3/12 8/5 9/4 9/9 9/12
finding [2] 36/5 39/14	granted [3] 4/5 9/12 44/11 granting [1] 24/13	9/15 9/22 9/24 11/12 14/11 21/10 21/20 22/3 23/14 24/1 24/8 24/9
finds [1] 51/8	grants [1] 10/15	27/4 27/5 28/1 30/17 32/5 32/25
fine [6] 27/13 48/6 58/22 62/14	green [4] 21/1 41/7 41/9 41/9	35/16 37/14 38/5 40/21 41/17
62/16 63/11	Gregory [2] 8/13 8/20	41/18 43/18 44/9 49/4 53/15
firmly [1] 33/1	grounds [3] 2/22 24/21 46/6 guess [2] 59/15 61/3	history [3] 49/7 49/24 62/2 hold [3] 18/4 19/5 63/3
30/15 36/12 37/23 38/25 40/3	quilty [3] 8/14 9/19 10/1	holding [2] 17/23 38/2
49/4 54/24	H	holiday [1] 18/19
first-degree [1] 30/15		home [2] 18/11 28/22
fit [1] 28/22 fix [1] 61/4	had [28] 8/8 9/5 14/22 15/4 17/7 17/15 17/18 18/19 23/17 23/17	homicide [1] 30/15 Hon [1] 1/10
focused [1] 11/1	38/21 40/13 40/19 40/20 41/4	Honor [3] 26/18 59/10 62/22
followed [1] 49/14	42/8 42/11 43/1 43/10 43/15	hours [1] 54/24
following [11] 2/16 6/1 12/10 21/24 24/11 28/12 29/23 34/3	43/23 45/5 46/22 47/1 53/10 53/10 60/3 64/13	how [2] 12/2 55/5 however [8] 5/14 8/5 29/3 31/18
36/19 37/23 39/7	Halbach [22] 11/2 13/6 13/6 13/7	32/9 36/23 42/19 43/22
follows [4] 5/5 28/11 29/23 33/15	13/10 14/6 27/16 27/17 28/19	Hurley [1] 2/12
foregoing [2] 64/7 64/7	29/1 30/3 30/8 31/10 31/24 32/5	ı
foresee [1] 19/2 form [1] 27/7	32/13 34/11 34/20 34/25 37/2 41/5 43/25	l'm [18] 12/15 15/14 18/13 26/7
formal [2] 34/5 54/1	41/3 43/23 Halbach's [8] 13/10 28/6 29/10	26/18 26/25 35/10 47/21 48/9
formed [1] 42/15	36/15 38/22 43/11 44/19 44/25	50/3 53/16 55/15 57/5 57/11
forth [1] 13/18	handed [1] 11/23	57/18 58/12 62/7 63/3
found [2] 4/6 40/3 foundation [3] 28/23 29/7 35/2	hanging [1] 53/7 happen [2] 47/19 60/3	idea [1] 47/13 identification [3] 37/8 37/15 37/19
four [3] 3/5 6/2 6/7	happy [1] 26/18	identified [1] 12/22
Fourth [3] 38/12 39/14 51/16	has [58] 2/23 2/25 3/24 4/2 4/5	identify [1] 37/6
FOX [2] 20/25 23/8	4/6 5/23 6/22 7/10 8/17 8/18 8/20	identifying [1] 42/14
frame [3] 9/5 9/10 9/14 frame-up [1] 9/14	9/11 10/13 12/20 14/1 14/19 17/3 18/2 18/9 18/23 20/19 21/17	if [44] 9/25 10/8 10/15 13/11 16/9 16/18 16/20 17/11 19/14 20/9
framed [2] 7/9 56/6	21/25 22/3 22/24 24/2 24/6 24/8	27/8 28/13 36/1 37/17 38/12
Franks [12] 35/10 35/25 38/2 39/3	24/20 25/10 28/24 29/16 31/15	39/12 39/25 40/18 43/14 46/20
39/6 43/20 44/4 44/8 44/10 44/14 45/24 46/7	31/16 31/21 32/2 35/14 38/6 39/1 40/17 40/23 45/16 46/10 46/14	47/22 49/10 49/10 50/2 50/6 50/19 51/4 51/6 51/7 51/7 51/20
Friday [2] 48/19 62/10	46/25 47/2 47/11 48/7 48/8 48/22	53/20 54/21 55/6 55/19 57/15
friends [1] 9/22	48/22 48/25 56/11 56/22 58/20	57/22 58/6 58/6 58/13 58/19 59/2
front [1] 4/1	60/23 64/8	59/5 63/14
fruits [4] 36/6 39/24 46/5 54/6 full [3] 37/10 41/21 42/2		ill [2] 8/1 11/9 ill-advised [2] 8/1 11/9
fully [1] 13/11		illegally [1] 37/16
further [20] 8/24 17/12 18/16 19/4	he [16] 4/5 8/12 10/11 14/16 14/17	immediately [1] 30/1
19/12 21/4 25/1 25/21 26/1 37/3		impartial [2] 3/21 16/18
37/12 44/13 51/7 52/12 57/12 59/16 59/18 60/7 60/12 63/8	37/11 38/6 41/20 41/21 42/3 47/16	implicate [1] 34/22 implicit [1] 59/20
future [3] 32/2 53/20 53/21	he's [3] 2/11 14/24 20/9	important [2] 15/13 42/15
G	heard [7] 21/19 25/12 27/11 32/2	impossible [3] 2/24 3/1 10/14
gag [2] 22/17 23/4	50/19 50/23 51/21	impression [1] 9/18
Gahn [4] 46/22 46/25 47/12 47/20	hearing [13] 8/12 21/23 35/7 36/19 38/1 39/3 39/15 39/17 43/3	improper [1] 24/25 in [235]
garage [3] 38/6 45/22 56/24	44/4 44/8 44/9 44/12	inappropriate [2] 23/12 25/7
gathered [1] 38/17	hearsay [11] 27/25 28/5 28/9	inclined [1] 42/5
gave [1] 49/18 get [4] 17/4 48/3 55/20 62/7	28/13 28/22 29/8 29/19 29/24 32/13 33/2 35/5	include [2] 26/19 29/16 included [7] 8/25 19/18 35/23
give [7] 17/18 27/11 47/25 56/2	52/13 53/2 53/3 held [9] 12/18 13/21 16/12 16/17	39/11 42/8 45/10 45/11
58/7 58/13 61/18	16/19 16/21 22/2 39/6 39/15	includes [3] 13/2 13/5 13/15
given [1] 6/22	her [37] 27/19 27/20 28/7 28/8	including [3] 14/9 21/6 45/19
gives [1] 10/4 Glynn [1] 9/23	28/20 28/21 29/2 29/4 29/11 29/12 29/17 29/18 30/3 30/8	inconsistencies [1] 41/24 incorrect [1] 41/20
go [4] 12/3 17/11 40/6 59/12	30/19 30/21 30/23 30/24 31/3	incorrect[1] 41/20
goes [2] 36/23 49/5	31/11 31/11 31/13 31/13 31/15	indeed [4] 5/2 7/9 29/6 43/2
going [22] 15/15 18/14 21/3 25/22	31/19 31/20 31/25 32/2 32/7 32/8	independently [1] 28/3
46/21 46/23 47/7 47/19 48/3 48/9 48/11 52/11 54/17 54/23 55/3	34/11 34/20 34/25 34/25 36/13 36/21 42/12	indicate [1] 33/22 indicated [1] 15/4
55/16 57/4 58/6 61/8 61/19 63/1	here [15] 2/10 2/14 10/24 13/4	indicated [1] 13/4 indicates [1] 41/12
63/3	14/19 15/17 18/15 19/1 19/9 20/3	indicating [3] 7/10 33/18 41/19
good [4] 2/13 53/12 60/20 62/17		indirectly [1] 24/6
got [6] 58/8 58/16 58/18 58/22 59/2 62/6	hereby [1] 64/6 hiding [1] 30/15	individual [1] 54/16 individually [1] 54/19
gotten [2] 53/17 58/14	him [5] 7/8 15/15 23/10 39/2	inference [2] 10/19 40/11
government [1] 34/6	47/23	inflammatory [2] 6/15 10/6
governs [1] 39/7	himself [1] 22/14	influenced [2] 10/5 24/7

I	item [2] 14/18 25/2 itemization [1] 57/10	Lastly [1] 13/23 late [1] 57/1
informal [2] 22/24 25/18	its [4] 2/15 2/21 7/19 56/21	later [5] 11/4 33/25 47/14 51/21
informally [1] 22/10	itself [2] 12/13 45/8	62/4
information [18] 6/12 6/17 6/20	1	law [17] 1/17 1/19 9/1 9/25 36/18
7/2 11/6 37/18 38/13 38/17 39/5	J	40/19 42/21 43/2 51/23 57/13
42/15 45/8 45/11 48/4 53/14 53/17 53/20 60/24 62/3	Jacobs [2] 53/16 53/19 January [2] 24/10 64/15	58/4 58/4 58/20 58/21 58/24
informational [1] 6/3	jeopardize [2] 5/22 23/18	58/25 59/7 lawyers [1] 14/12
informed [3] 18/2 18/23 41/8	JEROME [1] 1/18	lead [3] 13/1 49/15 51/17
initially [5] 19/17 22/22 36/8	Jerry [1] 2/11	leading [1] 30/19
36/14 42/5	joined [1] 18/9	least [8] 10/18 12/6 13/9 16/11
initiated [2] 7/15 23/8 inmate [1] 53/15	joint [2] 18/14 22/7 jointly [2] 14/11 61/4	40/18 46/16 61/2 61/13 leaving [1] 49/21
inmates [1] 55/12	Journals [1] 58/25	led [1] 53/5
innocence [1] 9/24	Judge [19] 1/10 12/1 15/10 19/13	legally [1] 38/20
innocent [1] 8/14	27/1 46/20 46/24 47/9 47/15	legitimate [2] 43/10 43/23
innocently [1] 14/18	48/13 49/3 50/16 55/18 56/4 61/9	length [1] 40/18
insist [1] 14/23 instance [1] 57/8	62/5 62/10 62/17 63/13 JUDGE'S [1] 1/4	less [2] 24/22 60/11 let [3] 27/6 55/4 55/7
instead [1] 14/24	July [2] 8/12 21/23	let's [2] 47/23 57/21
insufficient [1] 39/22	July 5 [2] 8/12 21/23	level [2] 37/20 42/10
intend [2] 26/19 61/2	juncture [1] 60/17	Lexus [5] 58/22 59/2 59/3 59/4
intent [1] 32/1	June [3] 33/9 53/11 60/24	59/6
intention [3] 24/9 51/13 52/7 intentional [4] 30/15 38/10 41/1	June 16 [2] 53/11 60/24 June 19th [1] 33/9	library [2] 58/4 58/4 light [1] 53/20
43/19	june 1901[1] 33/9 junkyard [1] 40/7	like [6] 47/5 49/17 50/18 50/23
intentionally [3] 35/21 39/10 42/8	jurisdiction [1] 58/21	54/2 58/24
interest [2] 45/6 59/14	jurisdictions [1] 59/8	likewise [1] 56/12
interest for [1] 59/14	jurors [7] 4/1 10/9 15/19 17/25	limine [3] 60/8 60/21 61/21
interfere [1] 21/14 interference [1] 53/5	20/14 20/17 23/19 jury [24] 3/21 5/10 10/16 11/13	line [1] 10/21 lines [1] 54/15
interrogation [3] 33/17 33/19	12/11 12/17 12/21 12/23 13/12	listed [1] 41/25
33/24	15/6 16/10 16/25 19/7 19/8 19/19	litigation [1] 28/17
interview [6] 8/3 9/12 11/8 20/24	20/7 20/8 21/16 22/3 23/19 25/10	little [2] 56/16 62/24
23/10 53/1 into [1] 42/9	25/13 61/10 61/21 just [16] 2/19 14/25 20/1 52/4	located [7] 36/14 36/25 41/4 43/13 43/25 45/7 45/21
introduce [4] 27/24 28/4 30/18	52/19 55/4 55/17 56/5 56/13	location [3] 13/13 14/4 14/23
52/12	56/16 57/24 59/11 59/19 59/25	logistical [1] 19/25
introduced [3] 32/7 43/4 44/12	60/7 62/13	looking [3] 41/7 52/11 58/12
introducing [1] 31/5 introduction [1] 30/22	Justice [1] 2/9 justified [2] 5/18 44/22	looks [1] 49/17 lost [2] 22/3 60/10
inventory [1] 46/11	justified [2] 3/18 44/22 justify [10] 5/1 5/13 8/6 11/9	lot [1] 57/19
investigation [3] 24/2 24/5 34/16	31/22 32/9 32/15 37/21 38/15	M
invoked [1] 51/20	45/13	
involve [2] 6/7 24/16 involved [6] 4/16 8/10 23/1 23/24	justifying [1] 38/1	machine [1] 64/10 made [40] 2/23 3/7 6/8 8/1 10/13
32/24 33/9	K	14/9 17/3 18/13 18/14 20/24
involvement [2] 6/5 21/5	keep [1] 16/8	21/22 25/6 25/20 27/18 28/20
involves [2] 27/24 63/1	Ken [1] 2/6	28/25 29/25 30/2 30/21 30/23
involving [4] 7/22 30/20 31/10	KENNETH [2] 1/12 20/25	31/7 31/11 33/10 33/13 33/16
35/4 is [121]	key [1] 33/4 kidnapping [1] 31/17	34/11 34/14 34/15 34/24 35/4 35/21 36/4 36/10 37/24 38/11
issuance [5] 37/21 38/15 42/11	kind [1] 49/5	39/1 41/1 47/1 52/20 54/24
42/16 45/13	know [11] 12/2 55/8 56/7 57/7	mainly [1] 11/5
issue [29] 2/15 2/21 22/17 23/4	57/15 60/16 60/23 61/2 61/25	major [2] 18/5 54/23
25/23 27/12 30/11 31/14 32/11 33/6 35/15 45/25 49/21 49/24	62/5 62/6 knowingly [5] 16/5 35/21 36/9	make [15] 2/19 2/25 7/13 15/14 16/4 16/5 16/18 23/22 25/21
49/24 50/9 50/14 53/15 55/2	39/5 39/10	41/22 44/6 52/11 52/15 58/12
55/24 56/6 56/21 56/22 57/14	knowledge [1] 64/14	59/25
57/20 58/2 58/6 60/14 60/21	KRATZ [3] 1/12 2/6 61/7	makes [8] 5/25 21/23 24/11 34/5
issued [2] 8/4 46/7 issues [11] 11/21 12/5 13/20 27/25	Kutz [1] 30/12	34/7 36/2 39/8 50/6 making [1] 25/25
28/2 51/1 51/7 52/9 57/2 61/1	L	man [1] 8/20
61/5	La [6] 58/10 58/11 58/13 58/18	management [1] 20/8
issuing [1] 48/10	58/22 59/9 Jack [1] 44/1	MANITOWOC [42] 1/1 2/23 3/1 3/9
it [74] it's [27] 11/20 19/20 19/25 21/18	lack [1] 44/1 lacking [1] 40/1	3/21 4/1 7/22 10/13 10/17 11/7 11/14 13/17 13/25 14/1 14/20
41/9 42/12 42/14 45/15 46/15	lacks [3] 37/20 38/3 38/16	14/22 15/19 16/9 16/11 16/12
47/8 49/17 50/13 51/25 52/4 52/7	laid [1] 20/3	16/19 17/1 18/3 18/7 18/11 19/16
53/3 53/7 54/10 57/11 57/14	language [4] 5/2 34/3 40/9 40/12	20/12 20/14 20/20 21/16 21/16
57/14 57/17 59/3 59/5 60/10 60/13 62/5	largely [4] 6/11 6/18 8/16 22/25 last [3] 6/7 12/14 49/20	22/2 23/2 23/19 24/4 25/10 25/12 25/16 25/24 26/14 59/23 64/2
00/19 02/9		25, 10 25,27 20,17 35,23 07,2
	·	

Μ Manitowoc's [1] 19/8 Mann [1] 43/21 many [1] 10/25 marginal [1] 31/20 Marinette [2] 50/12 50/21 Mark [1] 36/11 match [1] 45/1 matching [3] 36/25 41/4 44/23 material [2] 39/21 43/18 matter [9] 17/12 19/12 26/17 27/8 50/17 52/5 60/25 64/7 64/13 may [29] 3/8 5/12 7/11 7/23 8/9 8/13 9/6 9/17 10/21 11/8 12/23 14/3 21/2 25/3 28/19 29/4 32/8 35/5 40/20 42/16 44/9 45/3 49/3 50/14 51/6 56/8 59/10 59/20 60/15 me [18] 12/2 14/9 50/18 53/14 54/14 55/4 56/20 56/20 57/3 57/17 57/25 58/7 58/13 59/3 61/5 62/7 64/8 64/9 meaningful [1] 7/1 measurably [1] 44/2 measured [1] 52/9 media [3] 4/2 7/5 18/1 meet [1] 33/20 meeting [5] 42/23 47/12 47/21 61/14 61/14 member [2] 24/4 43/2 members [8] 7/6 8/25 19/15 19/18 20/20 24/23 25/23 26/13 mentioned [2] 23/1 58/3 met [1] 40/13 mid [2] 18/20 47/15 mid-October [1] 18/20 mid-September [1] 47/15 might [8] 18/19 51/16 52/2 56/8 56/12 59/1 59/13 61/18 mind [18] 27/20 28/8 29/12 29/18 29/21 30/4 30/8 30/23 31/3 31/3 31/11 31/13 31/13 31/16 31/19 31/21 31/25 35/1 misrepresentations [1] 38/11 missing [1] 6/4 misspoke [1] 14/18 mitigated [1] 9/13 modifications [1] 15/2 moment [2] 56/5 59/11 Monday [1] 57/9 months [4] 7/24 10/7 10/25 25/4 mooted [1] 19/25 mooting [1] 20/11 more [19] 6/3 6/4 6/9 9/21 10/4 14/8 17/25 18/4 18/21 19/9 34/16 41/9 46/1 52/8 55/14 56/8 56/16 60/10 61/11 morning [5] 2/13 2/15 11/22 62/11 62/13 most [1] 48/18 motion [56] 2/22 2/24 4/3 10/15 11/15 19/15 19/17 19/23 20/19 20/23 21/21 23/21 26/15 27/15 33/3 35/8 36/8 36/23 37/12 37/23 37/24 40/2 40/24 41/25 42/6 42/20 42/22 43/5 43/6 43/9 43/23 44/4 44/6 44/10 46/2 46/5 46/14 46/18 46/19 47/7 48/20 48/22 48/23 48/25 50/12 51/13 53/3 53/4 53/9 53/25 54/6 55/12 59/21 59/22 60/12 60/21

motions [18] 2/16 2/17 2/18 6/23

7/10 11/17 11/18 46/9 46/12 46/13 48/8 48/10 49/1 51/17 60/7 60/7 61/21 63/8 move [5] 10/2 18/8 19/15 19/21 27/14 moved [1] 22/6 Mr [2] 21/6 21/7 Mr. [46] 6/13 8/11 8/19 13/1 13/3 13/24 14/4 14/11 14/14 14/19 15/11 15/14 15/23 19/20 20/9 21/20 21/22 32/4 34/21 38/21 45/22 46/22 46/22 46/25 47/10 47/12 47/12 47/15 47/20 47/24 48/2 48/14 49/3 51/10 51/15 51/17 52/6 52/22 52/23 53/19 56/18 56/23 59/11 60/14 60/17 61/7 Mr. Avery [12] 6/13 8/11 8/19 13/3 14/11 14/19 15/14 15/23 20/9 32/4 34/21 38/21 Mr. Avery's [4] 14/4 45/22 52/22 56/23 Mr. Buting [7] 46/22 47/10 47/15 47/24 48/2 51/17 59/11 Mr. Dassey's [2] 60/14 60/17 Mr. Fallon [6] 21/22 47/12 51/15 52/6 52/23 56/18 Mr. Gahn [4] 46/22 46/25 47/12 47/20 Mr. Jacobs [1] 53/19 Mr. Kratz [1] 61/7 Mr. Rollins [1] 13/24 Mr. Strang [8] 13/1 14/14 15/11 19/20 21/20 48/14 49/3 51/10 Ms [5] 29/1 29/9 30/2 36/21 41/22 much [7] 12/2 34/16 50/7 52/8 57/14 60/22 61/18 multiple [4] 35/12 46/2 54/7 56/5 must [2] 31/17 39/24 my [12] 11/20 15/5 19/20 46/15 50/13 52/7 54/12 58/4 60/9 62/7 64/9 64/13 myself [2] 12/25 47/12

name [1] 53/15 narrowed [1] 56/22 narrowly [2] 57/17 57/18 nature [8] 6/3 6/15 25/22 33/5 33/11 34/17 34/21 58/25 necessarily [2] 5/8 58/5 necessary [4] 6/10 36/4 39/13 45/24 need [10] 9/14 26/6 51/5 54/1 54/4 57/5 57/16 57/23 61/8 61/19 needed [1] 42/10 needs [1] 63/5 neither [4] 4/15 40/17 51/3 54/3 never [2] 5/1 42/24 nevertheless [2] 23/11 44/10 new [6] 60/11 60/23 60/23 60/24 61/1 61/5 news [9] 3/8 6/25 7/21 11/1 20/25 21/17 23/8 25/2 59/24 next [4] 10/16 24/10 27/14 47/19 Nexus [1] 58/22 **night [2]** 54/24 54/25 nine [1] 25/3 no [33] 1/5 2/2 4/4 4/6 5/14 9/5 10/23 17/6 17/14 19/13 20/15 22/15 23/1 23/7 24/14 25/21 27/3 33/23 38/10 38/21 42/20 42/25 43/3 43/9 43/22 44/13 44/17 45/4

45/12 45/16 47/20 52/21 63/13 non [3] 33/16 43/8 60/12 non-consensual [1] 43/8 non-evidentiary [1] 60/12 non-testimonial [1] 33/16 Nonetheless [1] 47/15 nor[1] 29/1 not [109] note [7] 11/18 12/14 13/8 15/1 18/15 21/4 49/2 noted [2] 9/11 20/19 notes [8] 6/21 7/4 7/23 10/10 23/24 24/8 25/1 64/9 notice [3] 53/4 53/10 53/25 notified [1] 47/6 notify [2] 49/25 62/23 November [14] 35/9 35/19 36/12 37/21 38/15 38/19 45/14 46/5 50/21 50/24 51/9 51/15 52/16 52/23 November 5 [10] 35/9 35/19 36/12 37/21 38/15 38/19 46/5 51/15 52/16 52/23 November 5th [2] 50/21 51/9 November 6th [1] 50/24 now [6] 13/11 25/4 29/19 56/16 60/10 63/2

number [15] 2/16 6/22 7/23 7/25 12/10 12/17 12/20 19/25 26/23

30/18 37/8 48/8 53/6 55/1 59/8

O

objection [3] 15/8 26/24 55/22 objectively [2] 33/18 33/22 objectivity [1] 8/23 observational [1] 34/13 observations [16] 6/1 21/24 27/19 27/21 28/8 28/21 28/25 29/1 29/4 29/10 29/12 31/24 32/7 32/12 34/20 35/5 obtain [2] 3/21 37/10 obtained [9] 7/20 35/20 37/16 40/10 40/21 41/21 50/20 50/24 56/25 obtaining [2] 35/16 35/17 **obviously [1]** 18/5 occur [1] 23/23 occurred [4] 3/6 10/25 18/19 50/18 occurring [1] 56/23 October [10] 18/20 27/18 47/25 48/4 49/10 49/22 49/25 60/20 62/1 62/20 October 15 [1] 49/22 October 15th [2] 48/4 49/25 October 16 [2] 60/20 62/1 October 19th [1] 62/20 off [3] 17/11 62/5 63/2 offer [2] 49/17 52/2 offered [1] 33/4 office [1] 60/9 officers [1] 34/6 Official [3] 1/25 64/4 64/19 officials [3] 9/25 18/3 18/7 Okay [5] 16/3 20/18 48/17 50/10 55/10 omission [1] 43/19 on [115] once [2] 19/10 47/2 one [28] 4/18 11/24 12/8 12/11 14/17 15/5 20/4 25/2 25/2 39/21 40/11 41/1 44/11 44/21 46/16 48/19 50/19 53/11 54/11 55/1 56/5 56/17 57/8 57/9 58/14 59/14

0	61/23	premises [1] 38/20
0	parts [1] 12/16	preparation [1] 57/13
one [2] 59/19 61/2 ongoing [2] 33/20 33/23	party [12] 19/12 23/1 40/17 48/22 51/3 55/5 55/5 56/9 57/21 57/23	prepared [2] 4/24 64/8 preponderance [1] 39/19
online [1] 58/4	59/18 63/5	prerequisite [1] 44/3
only [12] 4/21 5/17 8/18 16/10	party's [2] 21/19 57/22	presence [2] 43/14 43/18
16/16 24/20 37/6 41/14 41/22 51/7 52/6 52/15	pass [1] 53/23 past [3] 18/24 21/6 33/25	present [4] 2/3 10/24 38/24 49/22 presented [5] 17/17 20/1 24/3
opinion [1] 34/4	Patricia [2] 41/19 42/11	46/22 51/2
opinions [2] 21/10 29/17	Patrick [1] 1/10	press [8] 3/3 3/5 6/2 6/7 6/18 6/21
opportunity [3] 3/20 17/19 55/19 opposed [2] 29/12 31/24	pending [1] 28/16 per [1] 57/6	11/4 22/11 presumably [1] 40/9
opposes [1] 27/22	perceive [1] 53/18	pretrial [10] 3/16 3/24 4/9 4/22
or [76]	perceived [5] 9/14 28/7 28/15 29/6	4/25 5/7 5/21 10/12 18/17 24/20
oral [1] 52/5 order [21] 4/16 8/4 16/17 17/20	29/16 perceiving [1] 30/1	prevent [1] 19/18 previously [2] 8/8 14/8
22/15 22/18 23/4 23/6 24/14	perception [1] 29/14	primarily [1] 3/4
24/17 25/23 26/6 26/8 26/19 27/3	perceptions [1] 29/18	primary [4] 31/5 33/19 33/23 55/2
27/7 27/10 27/12 30/7 40/22 61/12	perhaps [5] 43/16 47/14 49/9 55/19 62/4	prior [5] 8/25 32/3 35/4 48/24 52/23
ordering [1] 16/21	33/19 02/4 perjury [1] 39/18	privacy [5] 38/8 38/22 43/11 43/16
orderly [1] 52/8	permission [2] 44/1 57/24	43/24
ordinary [1] 20/7 organization [1] 23/9	permit [1] 17/12 permits [2] 7/12 16/16	probable [7] 36/5 37/20 38/14 39/14 39/23 39/25 42/10
original [2] 43/5 46/3	person [6] 1/21 2/11 6/4 9/17 34/7	
originating [1] 23/2	45/4	probative [5] 31/18 31/21 32/8
Orville [1] 53/16 other [20] 11/17 21/4 24/4 26/12	personal [1] 31/23 personality [1] 21/11	32/14 35/3 problem [1] 5/6
32/6 38/5 38/8 45/6 45/20 48/8	personality [1] 21/11 persons [2] 10/7 40/5	problem [1] 3/6 problems [1] 25/22
55/12 57/6 57/19 57/22 58/21	Peterson [1] 20/25	procedure [1] 39/7
59/7 59/14 60/21 60/21 61/11 others [4] 33/14 55/7 56/12 56/15	phone [1] 61/13 physical [6] 13/13 13/21 14/2 14/4	proceed [2] 11/17 52/9 proceeded [1] 56/21
otherwise [2] 40/23 59/6	14/23 19/21	proceedings [14] 1/23 6/24 7/5
ought [3] 50/24 51/18 53/12	physically [4] 12/18 13/4 14/20	7/16 22/9 23/13 25/8 26/20 26/22
our [6] 34/2 47/11 51/6 57/11 58/4 62/5	16/12 picking [2] 7/8 9/2	26/23 52/21 60/17 63/16 64/13 proceeds [1] 60/14
out [13] 5/4 20/3 20/24 22/10	picking [2]	process [1] 3/13
30/16 41/22 42/18 45/1 51/25	place [7] 7/23 13/19 14/21 19/9	produced [1] 57/18
53/7 56/8 57/6 57/12 outset [1] 7/25	19/11 22/6 42/24 PLAINTIFF [1] 1/4	prohibiting [1] 25/23 prohibition [1] 8/4
outstanding [2] 2/18 46/12		promised [1] 53/15
over [5] 25/15 27/1 27/2 43/11	play [1] 51/20	promises [1] 17/3
43/24 overseeing [1] 19/19	pleadings [2] 6/22 6/24 please [3] 2/4 55/7 58/7	proof [1] 49/17 proofs [1] 56/22
own [3] 11/11 21/10 23/15	pled [2] 56/21 57/17	proper [2] 29/7 35/2
owned [2] 37/1 41/5	plenty [1] 48/1	properly [2] 51/18 60/22
owner [1] 45/3 ownership [1] 45/6	point [16] 15/5 28/24 35/1 40/17 46/16 50/22 50/22 51/14 52/7	property [16] 27/20 36/15 37/14 38/9 38/23 40/6 40/16 40/22 42/4
P	52/24 53/16 54/23 59/14 59/19	43/7 43/12 43/15 44/1 45/3 45/4
	61/20 63/9	45/21
page [3] 3/18 12/3 12/8 Pagel [1] 13/16	points [1] 42/18 police [7] 7/7 33/17 33/20 34/14	proposal [3] 14/9 16/6 20/14 proposals [1] 13/16
Pamela [3] 36/13 41/6 42/12	40/11 40/15 41/8	propose [2] 11/22 60/19
paragraph [2] 15/3 48/20	pool [1] 12/23	proposed [8] 12/7 12/25 15/17
Paragraph 6 [1] 48/20 paraphrasing [1] 12/15	portion [6] 19/22 26/15 38/23 41/18 43/12 46/1	26/19 27/7 27/10 49/3 49/15 proposing [1] 15/25
part [14] 3/8 5/18 7/21 9/15 12/7	portions [4] 21/1 38/4 38/8 58/18	prosecution [3] 8/10 21/7 34/1
13/9 20/21 21/2 21/17 25/2 28/11	position [2] 41/15 47/4	Prosecutor [4] 1/13 1/15 2/7 2/8
29/23 35/16 40/10 participate [2] 13/11 24/25	possibility [2] 5/4 52/1 possible [5] 5/12 40/11 52/4 54/14	prospective [2] 20/13 20/16 protect [1] 7/14
participated [2] 8/2 24/5	60/13	prove [3] 30/11 31/17 33/25
participation [11] 3/16 3/23 4/8 4/25 5/24 8/5 9/13 10/12 11/8	possibly [1] 52/12	proven [1] 22/24
14/5 24/19	potential [3] 18/18 23/18 51/22 potentially [1] 33/25	proves [1] 36/3 provide [1] 10/8
particular [1] 34/2	precautions [1] 11/13	provided [10] 12/3 14/8 20/25
particularly [1] 62/1 parties [37] 2/3 11/21 12/9 12/13	precedent [1] 24/13	28/24 37/5 41/12 41/19 45/8 49/4
12/22 13/2 14/11 15/3 15/6 15/8	precluded [1] 3/25 precludes [1] 26/6	53/14 provides [1] 28/10
15/18 15/24 17/15 18/13 20/3	preferred [2] 13/19 13/19	provision [1] 17/5
22/1 22/10 22/20 22/25 23/17 25/12 27/7 27/9 27/11 32/3 35/15	preferring [1] 51/4	public [7] 6/18 6/20 7/18 10/4
46/17 49/1 49/13 49/25 50/13	prejudicial [4] 4/22 8/6 11/9 18/17 preliminary [8] 36/2 37/25 39/2	11/6 25/18 26/1 publicity [15] 3/17 3/24 4/9 4/22
50/15 51/21 52/11 52/14 54/17	39/9 42/7 42/20 44/3 44/7	4/25 5/7 5/21 6/22 7/15 7/17

D	50/12 55/12	reviewing [1] 50/17
P	regardless [1] 32/25	Reviews [1] 58/25
publicity [5] 10/13 10/24 18/18 23/17 24/20	reiterated [1] 8/9 rejected [1] 4/18	right [33] 2/14 4/23 5/23 13/4 14/22 15/1 16/8 16/10 20/18
publicized [2] 7/2 9/14	rel [1] 4/11	21/15 22/4 23/18 25/9 28/1 47/5
publicly [1] 9/23	relate [4] 28/3 30/9 55/6 58/5	48/2 48/21 49/23 50/5 51/6 51/19
purportedly [1] 34/11	related [4] 6/4 21/5 26/20 50/14	52/10 53/2 53/5 53/18 53/24 54/5
purpose [4] 13/8 31/5 33/19 33/24 purposes [1] 33/3	27/5 27/19 27/25 28/7 29/4 29/9	55/22 58/12 59/5 59/17 61/16 62/7
pursued [1] 7/11	29/11 29/17 30/3 30/8 54/16	rightly [1] 51/19
put [1] 11/24	relationship [2] 31/16 43/1	rights [3] 3/11 3/13 32/18
puts [2] 51/15 52/23	relative [1] 13/2 relayed [3] 21/10 29/2 32/7	road [1] 40/7 role [9] 5/21 20/8 20/12 20/15
Q	relevance [5] 27/25 31/12 31/22	21/7 27/5 51/17 51/19 51/20
question [6] 8/22 32/15 33/4 33/10	31/25 35/3	Rollins [1] 13/24
42/9 45/12 questionnaires [2] 61/10 61/22	relevant [8] 4/11 28/10 29/22 30/5 30/9 31/3 33/25 58/18	rooted [1] 33/2 Roraff [1] 4/12
questions [3] 16/3 17/10 17/13	reliability [1] 32/25	round [1] 54/11
quite [1] 52/4	relief [3] 10/22 20/12 53/9	RPR [2] 1/24 64/19
quote [2] 41/8 41/10 quoted [2] 34/4 40/9	reluctance [1] 22/17	rule [9] 5/4 7/12 22/21 26/5 28/13
	remaining [2] 39/22 41/15 remains [1] 32/16	29/24 35/10 35/25 52/3 Rule 20:3.6 [3] 7/12 22/21 26/5
R	remark [2] 34/7 34/17	ruled [4] 30/25 32/22 33/12 33/15
raise [4] 53/12 53/21 56/17 61/3	remedies [2] 4/21 24/13	ruling [1] 54/4
raised [1] 22/22 raising [1] 61/1	remedy [10] 4/5 4/18 5/8 5/16 5/17 11/10 21/13 22/19 24/16	rulings [1] 59/21
range [1] 57/19	26/12	S
rather [2] 7/19 56/13	Remiker [8] 37/10 37/13 38/18	said [1] 64/13
RAV [3] 40/4 42/14 45/20 RAV-4 [3] 40/4 42/14 45/20	38/20 38/24 40/6 41/22 45/9 Remiker's [6] 37/18 42/2 43/7	salvage [7] 37/2 38/5 38/9 38/23 40/7 43/12 45/18
reached [1] 25/17	43/14 43/25 45/2	same [3] 9/24 39/25 49/5
read [3] 12/6 21/18 42/2	reply [5] 56/9 56/13 57/16 57/16	Samuels [2] 60/15 60/16
reading [1] 42/19 reads [2] 5/5 29/22	57/23	sanction [2] 3/23 5/14
really [9] 31/14 49/16 51/3 52/7	report [12] 6/4 8/21 8/24 9/17 9/24 10/6 21/2 21/10 21/18 25/1	sanctioned [1] 5/15 sanctions [1] 59/22
54/21 56/8 57/5 57/15 57/15	40/11 41/13	sate [1] 31/19
realm [1] 52/1 reason [5] 8/22 9/5 24/22 40/24	reported [6] 1/24 5/15 8/8 8/17	satisfied [3] 9/7 26/4 53/16
50/19	24/21 64/6 Reporter [3] 1/25 64/5 64/19	Saturday [2] 50/21 54/25 say [4] 4/24 47/18 47/23 62/15
reasonable [3] 38/7 38/21 43/15	reports [2] 7/6 8/9	scene [2] 37/11 38/19
reasonably [2] 7/13 7/17 reasons [6] 11/14 13/18 14/7 14/7	representative [1] 13/7 representatives [4] 9/2 22/12 23/9	schedule [4] 12/6 49/22 61/14 63/9
37/23 46/4	24/19	scheduled [5] 7/24 10/25 19/1
recall [1] 54/22	represented [2] 2/11 37/4	25/4 42/23
receipt [3] 47/11 47/17 47/18 receive [1] 47/3	request [17] 10/20 11/12 17/4	scheduling [7] 11/19 47/10 61/9
received [6] 35/14 48/9 50/13	18/5 18/9 18/13 18/14 18/15 18/25 19/18 20/11 22/7 35/24	61/11 61/20 62/25 63/2 Schulter [3] 4/11 4/18 5/3
55/13 60/9 60/9	36/11 39/16 53/9 61/4	scope [4] 23/16 32/21 51/22 52/3
receives [1] 57/22 receiving [1] 3/25	requested [3] 4/19 14/1 32/4	se [1] 57/6
recent [2] 29/14 48/18	requesting [3] 3/22 10/11 16/20 requests [3] 4/5 18/23 47/1	seal [1] 55/25 sealed [1] 55/25
recently [4] 28/15 29/5 33/7 55/13	required [3] 7/14 37/20 44/3	search [23] 11/1 35/9 35/12 35/13
recited [1] 14/15 reckless [4] 35/22 39/10 39/18	requires [2] 39/15 50/2	35/17 35/19 35/23 36/5 36/6
41/2	reserve [1] 51/6 residence [3] 32/5 38/6 45/22	37/13 39/4 39/23 39/24 40/7 40/23 42/9 45/14 46/3 46/6 54/7
recognized [1] 31/4	residents [3] 16/11 17/1 19/8	54/8 54/24 56/6
recollection [1] 28/17 recommendation [1] 15/24	resolution [3] 45/23 49/10 50/2	searchers [10] 36/17 36/22 36/25
record [12] 2/4 11/24 12/15 15/16	resolve [3] 27/8 32/11 46/17 resolved [3] 47/8 53/6 53/8	37/4 37/6 40/13 40/20 41/3 44/15 44/17
17/11 32/11 60/1 62/21 62/25	resolving [1] 56/17	searches [12] 38/4 40/4 45/17
63/1 63/2 63/4	respect [8] 7/21 22/25 28/5 49/23	45/19 54/7 54/16 54/18 55/7
recorded [1] 52/25 records [1] 11/7	50/11 52/15 53/19 54/5 respond [3] 7/18 9/14 56/3	56/11 56/23 57/6 57/20 searching [1] 40/15
refer [1] 42/22	responded [2] 37/11 38/18	second [3] 38/3 56/25 60/6
referenced [1] 4/3 references [1] 32/3	response [1] 21/21	secondary [3] 58/5 58/7 59/8
referred [2] 44/16 59/24	result [3] 19/3 22/17 35/20 resulted [1] 7/1	Section [9] 3/11 3/15 16/16 28/9 29/8 29/13 29/22 32/14 35/6
refers [1] 3/2	retire [1] 24/9	security [2] 13/20 17/24
reflected [1] 57/7	return [2] 32/5 56/4	see [4] 20/11 41/15 49/20 51/4
reflection [1] 57/10 refrain [1] 25/18	reveals [1] 42/20 review [1] 27/11	seeks [9] 10/23 11/10 21/13 24/14 27/16 27/24 28/4 30/10 34/14
regarded [1] 22/18	reviewed [5] 4/2 5/24 21/17 57/13	seems [3] 56/20 57/3 57/17
regarding [5] 47/1 48/23 49/6	59/24	seen [1] 54/13

S selected [7] 10/9 10/18 11/13 12/22 15/7 15/19 19/7 selection [2] 5/10 19/8 send [2] 59/3 59/6 sense [2] 19/24 34/6 **sentence** [1] 5/5 separate [4] 36/9 57/6 57/12 60/18 separately [1] 55/2 **September [7]** 47/15 47/24 48/4 54/9 55/20 56/3 60/25 **September 13 [3]** 54/9 56/3 60/25 September 15th [1] 48/4 serious [1] 8/22 seriously [1] 29/7 set [6] 10/22 39/21 47/22 51/1 61/4 61/14 sets [1] 13/18 sex [2] 8/15 21/8 sexually [1] 32/1 she [6] 29/5 30/23 31/7 35/4 41/7 41/14 Sheriff [20] 3/5 3/9 7/22 8/1 8/2 8/9 8/15 9/7 9/11 9/19 11/5 13/16 20/25 21/9 23/7 23/14 23/25 24/7 24/8 50/21 Sheriff's [25] 8/11 8/23 9/4 11/7 13/17 19/16 19/19 20/6 20/13 20/15 20/20 21/3 21/5 21/6 22/13 23/3 23/4 24/4 24/24 25/15 25/17 25/24 25/25 26/14 59/23 Sheriff's's [1] 21/14 shorthand [1] 64/10 shortly [1] 30/24 should [15] 8/2 9/10 9/12 9/20 13/8 23/14 23/14 23/22 25/19 32/12 40/24 47/13 47/25 50/3 62/15 showing [8] 36/3 37/25 39/2 39/9 42/7 42/20 44/3 44/7 side [2] 10/5 39/21 signature [1] 26/10 significance [1] 34/2 similar [4] 6/16 30/11 31/9 44/24 simply [2] 14/19 62/25 simultaneous [1] 54/10 since [6] 5/14 43/22 53/10 53/24 59/23 60/24 site [1] 19/21 situation [2] 6/16 31/9 six [1] 12/14 **Sixth** [1] 53/18 small [1] 14/17 so [26] 5/12 6/25 8/6 10/6 11/9 17/17 18/24 22/3 48/2 49/23 51/5 52/6 52/10 54/24 55/8 57/5 57/18 57/20 58/6 58/19 58/20 58/24 59/5 61/3 62/5 63/7 sole [1] 20/23 some [19] 6/9 8/17 15/2 16/3 17/18 17/18 17/22 21/10 33/12 46/25 52/2 53/3 55/7 60/7 60/8 60/11 61/11 61/20 62/1 something [2] 29/15 63/1 somewhat [3] 6/14 9/13 18/22 soon [1] 6/20 sorry [1] 50/3 sort [1] 63/8 sought [3] 26/12 30/17 30/21 sources [3] 58/5 58/7 59/8 **space [1]** 17/25 **speak [1]** 57/20

specifically [5] 3/2 4/17 15/18 32/4 33/15 ss[1] 64/1 stalking [1] 30/16 standing [3] 38/3 38/17 45/16 **Stanton** [1] 2/13 start [3] 25/5 51/13 52/8 **started [1]** 18/20 starting [1] 56/24 state [84] State's [12] 3/16 3/19 4/8 4/25 5/21 10/12 20/22 27/15 33/3 38/25 48/20 55/11 stated [1] 46/4 statement [20] 7/13 13/3 28/14 29/3 29/5 29/14 29/15 29/24 30/7 30/9 31/10 33/6 34/5 34/24 39/9 39/13 41/1 50/20 51/9 51/11 statements [36] 8/25 27/15 27/17 27/23 28/3 28/7 28/19 29/9 29/11 30/2 30/18 30/22 30/24 31/1 31/8 32/17 32/23 33/1 33/4 33/10 33/13 33/16 34/10 34/13 34/19 35/4 35/20 36/3 36/10 42/8 50/12 50/24 51/14 52/16 52/22 55/12 **States [5]** 3/14 32/20 33/7 36/1 39/6 **station [1]** 25/3 status [1] 46/12 statute [3] 16/16 24/18 28/10 **statutory** [1] 16/8 stenographic [1] 64/9 **Stephen [1]** 9/23 STEVEN [12] 1/6 1/20 2/2 2/10 8/14 9/10 26/2 38/3 38/16 43/10 43/15 45/16 still [7] 2/18 8/13 10/7 27/8 30/5 38/14 53/7 stipulation [24] 11/21 11/23 12/4 12/4 12/6 12/7 12/16 12/25 13/2 13/9 13/15 14/2 14/13 15/3 17/17 20/1 22/1 25/11 46/17 49/2 49/5 49/6 49/7 49/15 stipulation's [1] 14/16 stop [1] 23/17 story [2] 3/8 7/21 STRANG [10] 1/16 2/12 13/1 14/14 15/11 19/20 21/20 48/14 49/3 51/10 **structured** [1] 54/17 Sturm [9] 36/13 36/21 41/6 41/12 41/13 41/19 41/22 42/11 42/12 Sturm's [1] 44/23 Sturms [2] 42/21 43/1 **subject [4]** 28/23 35/2 42/17 57/3 submit [2] 26/8 27/10 submitted [4] 21/20 21/21 48/19 49/15 submitting [2] 26/9 48/16 subsequent [2] 50/24 56/25 subsequently [2] 21/9 45/18 substantial [8] 36/2 37/25 39/2 39/8 42/7 42/20 44/2 44/6 such [13] 7/11 7/16 10/23 17/13 18/23 23/5 23/15 23/22 26/6 32/16 33/23 36/3 54/18 sufficient [4] 31/21 32/14 38/14 45/13 suggest [2] 24/3 45/5 suggested [3] 7/8 8/12 31/15 **suggesting [1]** 47/21

Special [4] 1/13 1/15 2/7 2/8

specific [1] 43/1

suggestion [2] 49/4 52/19 **suggestions** [1] 61/23 suggests [2] 5/3 60/12 sum [1] 20/4 summary [2] 2/18 52/16 **Sunday [3]** 50/4 56/24 57/8 support [2] 22/16 43/19 supporting [2] 35/23 36/11 supports [1] 44/13 suppose [1] 54/20 suppress [4] 46/5 50/20 51/14 54/6 suppressed [2] 36/7 50/25 suppressible [1] 51/8 suppression [3] 42/17 50/11 51/16 Supreme [12] 4/12 4/13 5/13 7/12 22/21 26/5 32/20 33/7 34/9 36/1 39/6 43/20 sure [11] 2/19 15/14 16/4 16/5 23/22 25/21 26/25 57/5 57/11 57/19 59/25 surprising [1] 9/21 sustain [1] 24/15

take [7] 2/17 14/21 19/9 19/11 20/7 46/10 57/25 taken [4] 2/25 3/19 23/22 64/9 talk [1] 59/11 talked [3] 55/17 61/9 61/10 tape [2] 60/2 60/4 technically [2] 26/22 53/7 television [1] 25/3 tell [2] 49/11 55/5 Teresa [19] 11/2 27/16 27/17 28/6 28/19 30/7 31/10 32/5 32/12 34/11 34/20 34/25 36/15 37/1 38/22 41/5 43/11 44/19 44/25 term [2] 24/9 44/22 terms [2] 14/16 17/23 Terrific [1] 60/6 Tesheneck [3] 1/24 64/4 64/19 testifying [2] 19/17 20/21 testimonial [10] 32/23 33/5 33/6 33/11 33/14 33/16 33/21 34/12 34/18 34/21 testimony [8] 8/11 26/13 34/6 41/18 54/22 57/3 57/7 57/18 tests [1] 47/2 textbook [1] 34/12 than [16] 6/9 7/19 9/21 10/4 18/11 21/4 26/23 38/5 41/9 47/14 56/13 57/6 58/13 60/10 60/11 60/21 Thank [5] 27/13 56/19 58/1 62/17 63/13 Thanksgiving [1] 18/19 that [313] that's [18] 10/18 15/10 15/12 18/13 18/14 27/13 46/24 48/6 50/25 51/12 53/6 55/24 55/25 57/4 60/5 61/3 62/16 62/17 their [12] 2/3 9/23 14/16 18/10 25/18 32/9 32/15 34/21 40/14 42/13 44/18 55/6 them [3] 27/11 56/13 57/12 themselves [1] 24/24 then [8] 19/14 30/3 49/8 54/5 55/11 56/3 56/8 57/9 there [39] 7/5 10/21 10/23 11/18 13/23 15/1 17/22 17/25 19/11 19/25 22/15 23/7 24/22 25/21 29/19 33/22 42/25 43/22 44/13

44/17 45/4 45/12 46/21 50/14

Т
there [15] 51/5 52/18 52/19 53/2 53/7 54/3 54/15 54/25 55/14
56/10 57/7 58/19 58/23 59/17
63/4 there's [9] 5/2 5/5 43/9 51/1 52/21
54/1 55/11 57/23 61/2
thereafter [4] 12/24 30/2 54/25 64/11
therefore [1] 37/15
Theresa [1] 31/24 these [11] 3/5 4/15 7/5 7/16 11/14
these [11] 3/5 4/15 7/5 7/16 11/14 22/9 23/13 25/7 27/23 28/2 56/7 they [16] 2/19 13/12 21/5 25/17
28/3 30/5 30/5 31/2 33/1 33/21
34/16 36/4 36/17 40/19 40/21 41/3
things [4] 58/8 58/25 61/22 62/1 think [18] 15/13 19/8 19/25 27/4
think [18] 15/13 19/8 19/25 2//4 48/18 49/3 50/7 50/18 51/5 51/18
52/8 55/2 58/3 58/9 58/14 58/16
58/17 58/17 third [2] 15/2 38/10
this [81] THOMAS [1] 1/14
those [26] 2/17 6/24 11/21 14/7
18/12 20/4 23/15 23/24 27/21 46/9 46/13 47/1 48/10 49/1 51/3
51/7 52/9 53/23 54/8 55/2 55/7
57/2 58/8 58/25 61/22 62/10 though [2] 26/21 41/9
thought [3] 17/18 50/17 59/13 threat [1] 25/8
threatens [1] 4/22
threats [3] 17/4 30/20 31/6 three [4] 12/20 36/9 48/12 54/24
through [2] 22/11 22/14
Thursday [2] 62/10 62/11 thus [3] 8/21 44/17 45/8
Tim [1] 13/6 time [28] 2/1 8/18 15/7 17/7 17/11
17/18 18/21 19/3 20/10 22/15 23/2 25/2 25/17 30/19 30/23
32/11 35/1 46/13 48/1 49/11 51/4
52/15 53/3 56/16 57/25 60/20 62/6 63/3
timelines [1] 61/21
times [1] 53/6 today [13] 15/9 15/16 15/25 17/17
20/3 21/25 25/11 35/11 46/10
59/18 61/19 63/12 63/15 today's [1] 35/7
together [1] 3/19 told [2] 40/5 41/6
Tom [1] 2/8
tomorrow [2] 47/13 55/18 too [1] 10/4
took [4] 7/23 17/19 42/24 51/17 tour [1] 17/20
towards [1] 12/8
track [2] 49/6 60/10 trailer [2] 38/5 56/24
transcribed [1] 64/11
transcript [3] 1/23 64/8 64/12 transcription [1] 64/11
transport [1] 13/20 travel [1] 17/19
treat [2] 60/19 61/1
treated [2] 53/11 55/25 trial [46] 2/23 3/1 4/1 4/23 5/10
5/23 7/11 7/24 10/8 10/13 10/16 10/25 11/20 12/5 12/11 12/13

12/17 13/12 13/19 14/21 14/23 16/12 16/17 16/19 16/21 17/23 18/16 18/20 19/1 19/4 19/5 19/10 19/21 20/5 20/10 21/15 22/1 22/4 22/6 23/23 25/5 25/9 26/2 60/22 61/17 63/9 tried [4] 13/4 14/20 16/10 16/24 true [2] 15/12 64/12 truly [2] 40/4 44/17 truth [3] 35/22 39/11 41/2 try [2] 14/24 56/13 trying [4] 9/8 9/9 46/25 55/9 **Tuesday** [1] 57/9 turned [1] 45/1 TV[1] 60/2 two [12] 3/8 4/10 7/21 12/3 12/17 21/2 21/17 25/2 36/14 40/3 57/8 60/11 two-page [1] 12/3 two-part [5] 3/8 7/21 21/2 21/17 25/2 type [3] 23/4 23/16 57/9 types [2] 58/8 61/22

victim [1] 49/7 victim's [3] 18/8 49/24 62/2 viewable [1] 60/1 viewed [1] 10/7 viewer [1] 8/21 viewing [1] 9/17 views [1] 31/18 VIN [8] 37/5 37/10 37/15 41/13 41/14 41/20 41/21 42/2 violate [2] 23/5 32/17 violated [4] 3/16 24/14 35/10 43/15 violation [3] 24/17 44/14 46/7 violations [1] 39/3 virtue [1] 6/15 visit [2] 27/19 28/21 voided [2] 36/6 39/24 voir [1] 5/11 voluminous [1] 18/22 volunteer [7] 36/16 36/22 36/24 40/4 40/13 44/15 44/17 volunteers [1] 42/23

VHS [2] 60/2 60/4

unable [1] 32/10 unauthorized [1] 43/8 unavailable [1] 28/13 unaware [1] 24/12 unconstitutional [1] 51/23 under [14] 3/11 3/13 20/14 26/22 28/8 32/18 33/17 35/5 35/25 38/1 43/20 55/25 60/15 60/15 understand [10] 15/8 16/4 16/7 16/13 16/15 16/22 18/8 46/11 48/21 54/11 understanding [7] 11/20 15/5 15/24 19/20 46/16 48/3 50/14 understands [1] 15/16 understood [1] 46/20 unduly [1] 10/5 unfairly [2] 7/8 9/2 unfortunately [1] 9/6 **United [5]** 3/14 32/20 33/7 36/1 39/5 unlawful [1] 43/18 unless [1] 58/17 unlikely [1] 6/25 unresolved [1] 49/21 until [5] 26/2 49/21 56/3 56/25 59/15 up [5] 9/14 27/6 27/9 30/19 57/25 upon [7] 12/21 12/23 13/10 14/2 14/23 44/18 45/7 us [8] 46/23 47/21 48/1 49/4 49/8 55/19 56/14 62/10 use [2] 50/8 59/4 used [2] 23/14 24/20 using [2] 44/22 50/4

١/

value [5] 31/18 31/21 32/8 32/15 35/3
vehicle [19] 36/15 36/25 37/1 37/5 37/7 37/11 38/22 41/4 41/5 41/7 41/8 43/11 43/13 43/25 44/19 44/24 44/25 45/7 45/8
venue [10] 4/20 5/9 10/20 11/12 11/19 12/5 13/19 16/9 16/16 24/21
versions [1] 27/10
very [8] 5/18 6/15 17/15 31/19 34/10 44/24 48/7 56/2

W

waiting [1] 51/4 waiver [1] 13/4 want [5] 16/5 46/10 50/15 55/5 59/25 wanted [1] 47/22 wants [3] 12/2 61/12 61/14 warrant [21] 10/22 35/13 35/19 35/24 36/5 36/12 37/13 37/21 38/15 39/4 39/12 39/23 42/9 42/11 42/16 45/14 46/3 46/6 53/21 56/6 56/25 warranted [1] 26/15 warrants [2] 35/18 54/8 was [74] Washington [2] 32/22 33/8 way [9] 9/8 24/7 52/9 54/14 54/21 56/7 56/17 56/20 56/20 we [40] 5/6 12/3 20/2 20/11 46/18 47/3 47/13 47/21 47/23 48/19 49/10 49/10 49/10 49/19 50/3 50/23 51/5 51/6 51/21 52/24 54/20 55/17 55/18 55/20 55/25 56/4 56/15 57/5 57/15 57/19 58/17 59/13 59/15 60/16 61/8 61/9 61/10 61/25 62/5 62/15 we'll [5] 47/3 47/3 59/15 61/25 63/7 we're [4] 2/14 61/15 61/19 63/14 week [3] 60/11 62/4 62/7 weeks [4] 12/14 31/11 31/19 60/11 well [17] 3/12 9/17 12/5 13/9 17/15 21/22 29/4 48/7 49/8 50/9 50/25 53/8 55/21 56/2 56/9 56/22 61/25 were [45] 3/3 3/15 6/3 6/19 6/20 7/5 7/7 8/1 9/2 11/5 15/2 16/20 21/1 21/14 23/12 23/24 25/7 28/25 29/1 31/1 31/2 31/6 32/7

33/11 33/13 33/14 34/14 34/15

36/22 37/6 38/11 40/4 40/6 42/21

35/22 36/4 36/10 36/16 36/17

44/17 45/17 46/17 49/20 57/2

what [13] 15/17 25/4 32/6 33/6

34/12 46/11 47/21 51/22 55/8

56/14 57/16 60/19 62/19

57/2

WFRV [1] 60/2

WFRV-TV [1] 60/2

W what's [1] 47/19 whatever [2] 23/20 46/21 when [13] 12/15 29/1 33/16 33/21 36/17 37/5 37/11 38/18 39/3 40/21 47/18 49/19 61/23 where [9] 4/21 22/5 24/14 32/23 39/8 46/18 48/25 52/25 61/25 whether [11] 32/16 33/1 33/4 33/10 38/19 44/21 50/23 52/10 56/7 61/12 62/24 which [51] 4/5 4/19 5/3 6/19 10/22 12/21 13/21 14/18 14/22 15/6 18/22 20/3 21/1 21/8 22/18 24/15 27/17 27/24 28/4 28/14 28/19 29/5 29/15 29/20 29/22 30/10 30/20 31/16 32/7 32/8 34/3 34/13 34/18 38/24 40/24 42/9 42/15 42/23 43/8 43/13 43/19 43/24 44/18 44/24 44/25 45/7 47/6 51/17 53/12 57/2 57/4 while [19] 6/14 9/11 10/10 10/21 25/14 28/17 29/25 30/2 31/1 31/10 33/14 37/9 40/17 41/11 41/21 43/6 44/8 44/21 45/2 who [9] 10/7 13/24 24/5 24/24 34/5 34/7 36/14 40/3 40/5 whole [2] 57/19 63/8 why [3] 9/4 9/9 13/18 widely [1] 8/17 Wiegert [6] 36/11 40/5 40/14 41/17 44/19 44/22 Wiegert's [1] 44/16 wife [3] 30/17 30/19 31/7 will [47] 2/3 2/17 2/21 11/18 12/6 12/11 12/14 12/17 12/21 14/21 15/1 18/15 18/16 18/24 19/1 19/5 19/7 19/9 19/9 19/10 19/14 20/15 22/1 25/4 26/19 27/6 27/6 27/6 27/10 27/14 28/2 35/8 38/25 47/6 47/20 49/25 50/8 51/25 52/13 53/21 55/18 56/2 57/25 62/21 62/23 62/24 63/2 Williams [1] 2/12 willing [2] 40/6 47/10 willingness [1] 40/14 Willis [1] 1/10 winds [1] 27/8 **WISCONSIN [16]** 1/1 1/3 1/13 1/15 2/2 2/5 3/12 3/15 4/4 4/6 4/10 4/12 4/13 43/20 64/1 64/6 wish [4] 12/24 16/9 16/24 52/2 wished [1] 15/6 withdrawal [1] 54/1 withdrawn [1] 19/23 within [8] 13/13 23/16 26/20 28/22 29/13 30/4 32/13 47/16 witness [1] 28/14

won't [1] 47/14 Woodington [1] 5/6 worded [1] 9/6 work [2] 49/12 62/10 workable [1] 60/5

workers [7] 27/16 27/18 28/20

would [34] 7/2 8/22 9/5 10/2 10/22 13/13 14/22 15/6 16/20 17/11 17/17 18/3 19/3 20/7 22/21 27/3 30/5 30/9 31/12 32/17 34/22 47/5 47/9 49/8 50/18 50/23 51/6 51/22 52/5 55/19 56/15 58/2

29/2 32/8 34/11 34/25 working [1] 46/17

60/19 62/13 writing [3] 14/19 57/13 57/24 written [12] 11/23 15/2 21/19 21/21 45/15 48/9 48/10 49/18 52/5 54/8 54/13 55/13 wrongful [4] 8/10 48/24 49/16 62/2

Υ

Yard [2] 38/5 45/19 year [6] 3/8 10/16 14/10 21/2 24/10 33/9 Yes [18] 15/21 15/22 16/2 16/14 16/23 17/2 17/9 48/6 48/12 49/14 50/16 52/17 52/18 54/10 56/19 59/19 60/4 63/10 yet [3] 35/14 47/2 54/13 you [46] 11/24 15/25 16/4 16/4 16/5 16/7 16/7 16/9 16/13 16/15 16/20 16/22 17/4 17/4 17/7 17/10 17/11 17/12 17/13 26/25 27/13 47/18 47/22 48/3 48/12 48/15 50/1 50/1 55/6 55/9 56/19 57/7 57/17 57/23 58/1 58/6 58/13 58/16 59/1 59/2 59/3 59/6 60/22 62/18 62/23 63/13 you're [1] 58/6 your [9] 15/23 16/24 17/8 17/13 26/18 27/7 55/8 59/10 62/22