# IN THE COUNTY COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY

STATE OF FLORIDA, Plaintiff,

vs

Case No: 99-21857

MMANO-E

ROBERT S. MINTON,
Defendant.

PROCEEDINGS:

Trial for Charge of Battery

BEFORE:

Hon. Robert J. Morris County Court Judge

DATE:

May 22, 2000

PLACE:

Criminal Justice Center 14250 49th Street North Clearwater, Florida 33762

REPORTED BY:

Pamela Jenkins, VR Court Reporter

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

TAMPA AIRPORT MARRIOT HOTEL (813) 224-9500
ST. PETERSBURG - CLEARWATER (727) 821-3320



## APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM JOSEPH TYSON, ESQUIRE Assistant State Attorney

Criminal Justice Center Clearwater, Florida 22762

and

DENIS M. DE VLAMING, ESQUIRE DOUGLAS M. DE VLAMING, ESQUIRE

KYM B. RIVELLINI, ESQUIRE

1101 Turner Street

Clearwater, Florida 22756 Attorneys for the Defendant

## CONTENTS

WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
FRANK OLIVER	14	25,45	57	61
RICHARD HOWD	210	226	258	260
MARK BEAUDETTE	264	269	one end	

# EXHIBITS

	For ID	In Evidence
State's Exhibit No. 1 (sign)	215	216
State's Exhibit No. 2 (Photograph)	220	220
State's Exhibit No. 3 (video)	222	225
State's Exhibit No. 4 (video)	222	225
State's Exhibit No. 5 (video)	223	225
State's Exhibit No. 6 (video)	224	225

## PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Let's talk a little bit before we start a proffer, because in the motion we talked about a lot of things. And you all touched on some of these things. The reason that I reserved ruling on them is because we really did not with specificity identify them. It may be that each of you can identify these things, tell me what they are, and some of them I can rule on with what you tell me they are, others I may say, no, I need to hear witnesses. Why don't we do that? Who would like to go first?

MR. TYSON: Judge, I filed a motion in limine, I am not sure what they are going to come forward with.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I think our witness, Frank Oliver, will the person testifying to the bulk of the policies and procedures, and beliefs that might be relevant in this trial. Not every belief involving Scientology, obviously, that is not relevant and that would take too long. The policies that we did not specifically identify and did not go into depth about go a little bit beyond "Fair Game". As a matter of fact, Frank Oliver has with him some credentials that show he was a member of Scientology. He was in the Office of Special Affairs, which you will hear referred

to as OSA, and was involved for a number of years. He went through numerous training activities and then actually practiced these beliefs and these policies.

So we plan on putting on Mr. Oliver for you and firming up his --

THE COURT: I will probably need to hear from him. We will probably need to hear about that.

MS. RIVELLINI: Okay. We planned on introducing some of his certificates of completion of those classes that teach the policies that we would be getting into under the Office of Special Affairs.

You heard a little bit about "Fair Game", and we actually have it delineated for you. It's actually in writing, and it was published by L. Ron Hubbard, "Fair Game" being a suppressive person order on how to treat the enemy. "Fair Game, may be deprived of property, or injured by any means by any Scientologist without any discipline of the Scientologist. May be tricked, sued, or lied to, or destroyed." That was what was referred to as "Fair Game" on how to treat the enemy.

Now, the actual "Fair Game Policy", the written policy was very quickly thereafter canceled. When they canceled that policy what they said in the cancellation of "Fair Game" is, "The practice of declaring people "Fair Game" will cease. "Fair Game" may

not appear in on any ethics order. It causes bad public relations. This policy letter does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of a treatment of a suppressive person."

So, although the State's witnesses may testify that they don't know what "Fair Game" is and they don't implement it, the cancellation order clearly shows that the policy of treatment is still in place, they just don't say anything about it. And Mr. Oliver will testify about that.

We told you and you ruled upon it in your order on the motion in limine about our posture that the entire policy per Scientologist and their treatment of critics is to prove them up to be a criminal. We found a lot of that documented in the Scientology paperwork and in their books. We brought with us some books written by L. Ron Hubbard, that are relied upon by Scientologists, and by people in OSA. We have paperwork that shows how critics of Scientology are to be treated.

What they state is that every time they have investigated the background of a critic of Scientology we have found crimes for which that person agreed to be imprisoned under existing law. We do not find critics of Scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we have proved this. If you oppose

Scientology we will promptly look up and will find and expose your crimes. If you leave us alone, we will leave you alone. All of these beliefs and policies are what the Scientologists follow to expose someone who is against them, as a criminal, and goes to our theory of defense, which is this was set up so that they could therefore call Mr. Minton a criminal.

There is some documentation in their

Department of Governmental Affairs books that talk about
how to manufacture threats, use the court system to
harass, and to threaten. There is some paperwork on how
to stop attacks and how their belief is to attack,
attack, attack.

There is more documentation on suppressive persons, and "Fair Game". "Outright or covert acts knowingly designed to impede or destroy Scientology or Scientologists is what is meant by acts suppressive of Scientology or Scientologists." It goes to the theory that Mr. Minton is the main suppressive person right now targeted by Scientology. That their goal is to create him into a criminal and quiet him.

Along another line, we talked about why
Mr. Howd would have done this in the first place, why he
would have had good motive to invent this situation. And
then why he would have motive to not be truthful with

your Honor under oath while giving testimony. We told you that because of the reward and punishment system laid out by Scientology he would have a motive other than to tell the truth. There is documentation to that as well that Mr. Oliver can testify to. He learned when he was acting with Scientology and it's what the entire religion is based on.

Now, again we are not going to get into the religious aspects, whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, but the fact that it exists, the point system. It talks about you get points for attacking, one point for a local attack, five points for a regional attack. You will hear about what they call stats, statistics, which is when you do something that considered positive by Scientology, your statistics goes up. If you do something that is frowned upon they drop and you receive punishment by they way you are made to dress, what privileges you have, what doors you can enter, and so forth.

Mr. Oliver will testify that upon his leaving the church he was declared a suppressive person, and he has been the target of such attacks as well.

There is actually a Department of Special Affairs, this OSA Department that Mr. Howd is a member of. Check lists on how to carry out such drills as targeting someone,

turning them into a criminal, and creating an engagement upon which they can rely for their propaganda. You will hear him testify about how a twin was used, and you will actually see this in the videos. Where you see two females together, that is actually part of their tactics on using a twin. You will hear him testify about the way everybody had scanned outside, be a witness, assumed the action took place, and then turned around. That this is not all coincidental, it's part of their tactics. They are actually taught this and they rehearse this. Mr. Oliver will testify to that.

As far as Mr. Howd's reasons for not being honest in court, you will find that there was a non-disclosure bond and release form that he was made to sign, and that if he were to ever say anything negative about Scientology that he would be fined in the amount of one million dollars, and punished by the church.

There is also numerous checks lists on how to create these episodes, how to practice them, the drills and so forth. And that would be the bulk of his testimony. We are going to keep it tailored as closely as possible to your Honor's ruling.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we are probably going to proffer his testimony. Is that the only area that you want to proffer?

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: No, your Honor, we also have a witness, Jesse Prince, who is a former member of the Church of Scientology. He also was a member of OSA, the Office of Special Affairs. He has personal first-hand knowledge on how the Office of Special Affairs worked, and how they target individuals. And we did supply the Court with a copy of the September 10, 1998 Boston incident. And he intends to explain how the tactics that he was taught were used against Mr. Minton in that particular incident.

THE COURT: Anybody else? Is that it?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes, that's it?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's it, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Well, we probably need to hear from both of these witnesses, but I am going to tell you right now, you all have opened the scope far beyond anything that I had in my mind when I wrote that order. Okay. But I am going to listen to your witnesses with a mind of trying to figure out what part of this comes in and what part of it doesn't. It sounds like you plan to bring far beyond what I envisioned in my ruling. I am going to tell you right now.

So, who do you want to call right now?

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, we would start with Mr. Oliver. We can either start from scratch, or you want to clarify which issues you thought were beyond the scope?

Game Policy." I expected there to be a succinct explanation of what that is, and how it was connected to this incident. I am not sure that I expected to have a two-part witness, long explanation of it. I ruled on the -- said that the Boston, Massachusetts incident was admissible, but I did not intend to make that a feature of this trial. It merely comes in for the purposes for which you addressed and argued in your motion, and which I addressed in writing my order. We are not trying the Boston incident here today.

MS. RIVELLINI: That's correct, Judge.

What we intend on tailoring it to was the fact that it

was set up and it could be proven so based on Mr.

Oliver's experience in the church and that he was taught

to do this. We really did try to tailor it down as

closely as possible to those issues to what would affect

Mr. Minton's state mind.

THE COURT: That really is the issue, right?

MS. RIVELLINI: Correct. And what would

go towards Mr. Howd's manufacturing of this incident and that it was not an intentional touching on Mr. Minton's part, but in fact, an invited touching by Mr. Howd for the purpose of declaring him a criminal.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TYSON: May I address you on the

issue, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, of course.

MR. TYSON: While you listen to the witnesses I would like you take into account, obviously relevance; number one.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TYSON: Number two; state of mind is an issue on self-defense of the case. I would like to remind you on the videos Mr. Minton is heard telling the police that this was an accident, Mr. Howd walked into the sign. So state of mind relevancy is a pretty big hurdle for him to shift gears, and it would be an inconsistent defense. It's allowed under the law, but you can't have a defense of bad faith. There is a difference.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. TYSON: I would like you take that into account when you are considering the testimony.

THE COURT: Before we get underway, I in

reviewing my own order I may not have been completely clear on one point, and if you all were confused, you would have a reason to be, and that addresses the video taken by Mr. Minton and someone with him of the Slaughter home in Largo. That's in. I don't know if you all understood that from my ruling, but my intention was the predicate can be laid. I expect that it can from what I heard. That's in.

Let me ask a question about the July

Clearwater segment of the video. I ruled on that

understanding that it was Mr. Minton who was the vidoer?

Am I correct about that?

MR. TYSON: Judge, if we look we confused, it is because we have so many videos right now.

THE COURT: I know that, I understand.

Let me explain it, the videos that I saw --

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: The --

THE COURT: Forget that one, I am not talking about that. What I am talking about is the video that starts with an incident in California that doesn't have anything to do with either of these parties, and it is very actually hard to follow it, but it looks like it breaks to a Clearwater incident. I had understood that that July Clearwater incident Mr. Minton was either the videoer or was present for it. Am I correct about that,

or not?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Present, you can see him in the video.

THE COURT: I don't recall that you do.

MS. RIVELLINI: Not the taken --

THE COURT: I don't recall seeing him in that segment. We might want to look at that one again, because I ruled that that comes in with the understanding that he was there. Okay, and if I am confused about that I want to make sure that we clear that up. Okay. Slaughter video comes in, the Slaughter part of the Clearwater incident, and I ruled and said that all of those come in, but I wasn't specific about that part of it, and that was made an issue in that hearing. intention is that it happened that day, it's part and parcel, it goes to state of mind, it comes in. relevant. Okay. I want to make sure that you all are clear on that point, because I was not sufficiently clear in my order. Okay. All right, well, let's hear from Mr. Oliver. I think that is where we go.

MS. RIVELLINI: It is, Judge. The only issue that we have not had time to address because we didn't know that you would let us proffer this early is I have some documentation that I would asking Mr. Oliver to identify and perhaps introduce. So I have not had time

1	to get those pre-marked.
2	THE COURT: That's fine. That's okay.
3	This is a proffer. The jury is not here. I'd rather hear
4	it all so that I can determine what part of this should
5	be a part of this trial, and what part shouldn't. So
6	don't worry about that. Don't worry about that, I
7	understand.
8	MS. RIVELLINI: The defense would call Mr.
9	Oliver.
10	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
11	THE WITNESS: Good morning, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Good morning, sir. Please
13	proceed.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: Thank you, Judge.
15	Whereupon,
16	FRANK OLIVER,
17	a witness, was called for examination by counsel for the
18	Defendant, and having been duly sworn, was examined and
19	testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
22	Q Would you state your name please?
23	A Frank Oliver.
24	Q Mr. Oliver, how old are you?
25	A I am thirty-seven years old.

1	Q What city do you live in?
2	A I live in Miami, Florida.
3	Q When did you move there?
4	A 1979.
5	Q What do you do for a living?
6	A I am a graphic designer.
7	Q How long have you been doing that?
8	A I have been doing graphics for about ten years.
9	Q Were you also a member of the Church of
10	Scientology?
11	A Yes, I was.
12	Q When was that?
13	A I joined the Church of Scientology in June of
14	1986. I left the Church of Scientology officially in
15	1992, I believe, November.
16	Q Did you leave on general good terms or bad
17	terms?
18	A I left on what would be considered by the
19	church on bad terms.
20	Q Do you know that reason?
21	A I was given a document by the Church of
22	Scientology, which is called a "Declare", which states
23	that I can no longer be a Scientologist because of some
24	type of offense that they believe I committed.
25	Q Okay. Did you actually receive a document

1	stating	so?
---	---------	-----

- A Yes, I did.
- Q What was the nature of the offense that they said that you committed?
- A According to the Church of Scientology my offense was that I had secretly made plans to leave the Church of Scientology.
  - Q Okay. Were you not allowed to just leave?
- A Under Scientology's rules and policies you don't secretly make plans to leave. It has to be something that has to be done by a certain procedure. I had been following that procedure, so it came as a shock to me when I received a document when it said that I had done something, when, in fact, it was done very much in the open.
- Q How did you receive that order declaring you a suppressive person?
- A It was handed to me by Eric Arnet, who is the Director of Inspections and Reports at the Church of Scientology in Miami.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, may I approach?
THE COURT: You may.

#### BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, we haven't had a chance to pre-mark these exhibits, but I am going to show you something.

1	Can you tell me if you recognize it?
2	A Yes, that is the Suppressive Person Declare on
3	me.
4	Q This has a seal on it, and this is photocopy?
5	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I could have one
6	second.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. TYSON: Ms. Rivellini has given me all
9	of these documents, if she could just show me.
10	THE COURT: Ms. Rivellini, the jury is not
11	here so move about the courtroom as you feel the need to.
12	Don't ask, just move.
13	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
14	Q Mr. Oliver, this has a seal on it, but this has
15	a seal on it. Can you just take a look and tell me if
16	this is substantially the same situation as the original?
17	A Yes.
18	Q A suppressive person that this declares you as,
19	what is that?
20	A A suppressive person means that I am
21	suppressive to the aims and goals of the Church of
22	Scientology, and to mankind in general as well.
23	Q Is that what they call an enemy of Scientology?
24	A Yes, I am now considered an enemy of

Scientology, actually as of that date.

	Q	Okay.	Now when	you were	with	Scientology	did d
you	actua	lly have	e identif:	ication ca	ards?		
	A	I was	issued an	identific	cation	card when	I wa

A I was issued an identification card when I was sent to Los Angeles to work in the Office of Special Affairs in the CAN Unit.

## Q CAN being?

A Cult Awareness Network Unit. It was a unit established, that I was brought in to help establish for the Church of Scientology to help destroy the Cult Awareness Network.

Q Okay. And I am going to show you three photocopies of identification cards. Can you just tell me if you recognize them?

A Yes. This is the one that I was issued in California that allowed me access to secured areas of the building. This is a card that I received in 1987, it was a temporary card that I was given for being a member of the International Association of Scientologists.

Q And keep in mind that the court reporter has to repeat each and every word that you say.

A I'm sorry. And this last card was issued to me

MR. TYSON: Judge, if it will speed matters up, I am not going to dispute that he was a member of Scientology.

# THE COURT: Okay.

## 2 BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q While you were in Scientology did you actually have to take some courses?
- A Yes. The purpose of the indoctrination of Scientology is all based on the person taking certain courses and acquiring information that way. It is not a lecture type of indoctrination.
- Q Do you actually receive certificates for these courses?
- A Yes, for every course that you complete you receive a certificate.
- Q About how many courses would you say that you have completed?
- A Over the course of seven years in Scientology it is probably over a dozen courses I did.
- Q Do you have a sample of some of these certificates here, and are these copies of them?
- A Yes, these are photocopies of the originals that I do still have in my possession.
- Q Okay. Does it take quite a bit of studying to obtain these certificates?
- A Yes, some of these courses, depending on whether you are full-time or whether you have a job, and go there on a part-time basis, do take -- some courses

people have been on for several years.

Q Okay. Other than reading materials does it require any other specialized training or knowledge?

A You have to listen to video tapes and actually demonstrate that you have understood the materials that you have listened to to show your confidence in that particular area of what ever course that you have done.

- Q Okay, and you did that?
- A Yes, I did.

Q When you are part of Scientology and you take these classes, and you receive these certificates do you move up, what I will call a ladder?

A Yes. The structure of Scientology is two-fold. On the one side is what they refer to as processing, which is their type of spiritual counseling, and you move up different levels. They call this a bridge. The other side is the training side, which trains you in the processes and techniques, and that the other side of the bridge where you receive -- you go up different levels there.

- Q Did you essentially move up the ladder in both?
- A Different individuals move more or less on different sides, depending on what your side is. Because I was in an administrative position I moved up on the counseling side, if you will. But the training I

received was specific to the areas that I worked in.

Q So you were higher up on the hierarchy?

A On one side I was what is known as clear, and on the other side my training was in an administrative capacity, and I was considered a Status II, which is what is called in Scientology when you are a fully trained staff member. Then you take an additional course in your particular area of expertise, for example mine was in the Office of Special Affairs. So I was an investigations officer, and I took a course on being an investigations officer, and any related course to that I had to take.

- Q Do you actually have some documentation on what the Office of Special Affairs is, and how it is run?
  - A Yes.

Q Could you just briefly explain what this packet contains?

A Every course in Scientology, if you will, a curriculum, and it identifies the different materials that are required for study in order to achieve the certificate in that area. This is a check-sheet, and this check sheet is for the Office of Special Affairs. They call it a HAT check sheet.

Q Is a HAT essentially the job that you have?

A Yes, exactly. What this does, it explains what it is that the objective to the course that you are

completing. It delineates the materials that need to be covered, what you need to know and understand, what you need to read. There are different things you have to do here. For example, in order to have a full understanding you may be asked to demonstrate something you have learned here on a table made of clay using figures, just so that you can explain to someone else that you do have a full understanding of it.

So, that it is very clear that you when you complete the course you are considered an expert, or qualified in that area.

Q And you did that?

A I completed probably two-thirds of this course here before I left Scientology.

Q So Scientology themselves would have considered you an expert in the areas that you completed?

A I was already doing the job while I was taking the course. They don't have you finish the course and then start doing the work. You immediately start doing the work. They do something called a Mini-HAT, which is basically a smaller version of this that you complete, and then you immediately are put in so that you can start producing for the organization.

Q Okay. Do you have to learn these materials very thoroughly?

A Absolutely.

- Q And do you have repeat them back on a consistent basis?
- A You are constantly being drilled on different things. If there is a particular area that you show some kind of weakness on they send you to a specialist, who is called a cramming officer. What they do is they go any materials or any deficiency that you might have in any area.
- Q Okay. Now, you left the Church of Scientology in what year?
  - A 1992.
- Q Have you continued to follow news and occurrence that deal with the Church of Scientology?
- A From '92 until '94 I limited my exposure to what was going on because of the way in which I left, and how I felt about the organization, and why I left. I became more involved after '94. Because of the Internet's proliferation of information in the current scene, and I have kept very much up to date on what is going on.
- Q Have you talked to people who have left the Church of Scientology to keep up on what goes on inside the church?
- A I have --

1	MR. TYSON: I'm going to object on the
2	hearsay. I know it is a proffer, but I just want you
3	consider that.
4	THE COURT: I understand. Thank you.
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, I have talked to
6	individuals who are still in, and individuals who have
7	recently left.
8	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
9	Q Are you involved with any litigation involving
10	the Church of Scientology?
11	A I am personally not involved in any litigation.
12	Q Do you follow it and keep up to date on it?
13	A Yes, I do.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this time I
15	would ask that Mr. Frank Oliver be declared an expert in
16	the field of Scientology based on his training.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
18	MR. TYSON: Judge, may I voir dire the
19	witness?
20	THE COURT: Yes, please.
21	VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. TYSON:
23	Q Mr. Oliver, when did you leave Scientology?
24	A 1992.
25	Q When were you in OSA?

A	I was in OSA I started doing things for	OSA
out of	the Church of Scientology in Coral Gables in ]	late
1989.	I was officially brought into the department i	in
1990.		

- Q Okay, and you left in 1992 you said?
- A Correct.

- Q Can you show me any documents you have post-1992, post-1992 showing any of the policies and practices of OSA?
  - A No, I can't. I wouldn't need to.
- Q You wouldn't need to, that's your opinion, correct?
  - A Yes.
- Q So if you don't have anything, then you don't know if anything has changed there, do you?
- A I do know one thing, that since the founder of Scientology passed, no document or policy of the Church of Scientology can be changed by any individual other than L. Ron Hubbard. That is in policy. So it would be some kind internal Scientology crime for someone to change the written word of L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q So in perpetuity no more doctrines or memos can ever come out, according to your knowledge?
- A No more policy letters can be issued, other than L. Ron Hubbard, yes.

1	Q Things change over time, don't they, Mr.
2	Oliver?
3	A I believe things do change.
4	Q Policies change over time, don't they?
5	A No, they don't.
6	Q Any that you're aware of?
7	A I have never seen a policy change since L. Ron
8	Hubbard passed.
9	Q Now, you are on the outside, right?
10	A Even when I was. Hubbard died in 1985, I
11	believe.
12	Q Mr. Oliver, that is not my question. You are
13	on the outside looking in from 1992 to the year 2000. In
14	those eight years you haven't been involved in the
15	internal workings or policy decisions of the Church of
16	Scientology?
17	A No, I have not.
18	MR. TYSON: That's all I have, Judge.
19	Judge, I'd ask that he not be declared an expert. It has
20	been eight years since he has had any dealing with the
21	internal policies at work with Scientology.
22	THE COURT: Ms. Rivellini, do you want to
23	respond to that?
24	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, based on Mr.
25	Oliver's answer to the prosecutor's question that

policies cannot change, the testimony that he can offer is still relevant as to what was going on when he was there as to what is going on here. Also, Judge, you will have enough evidence before you in the form of testimony and video tapes to show that what he can testify to is still consistently carried out. So he is not testifying necessarily in theories, but he is going to tailor down his testimony to explain why what you see on video happened, and the fact that it is so consistent with what he testifies to in the written policies at the time that there will be no question about the relevance.

THE COURT: But his testimony will consist of the fact that he was a member of the Church of Scientology from some period of time. That he knows what the "Fair Game Policy" is. He is going to explain how he knows what the "Fair Game Policy" is. And then is going to explain what the policy is, right?

MS. RIVELLINI: Correct.

THE COURT: And that is really all he is going to testify to, is that it in a nutshell?

MS. RIVELLINI: Well, not quite, Judge. I asked that he be declared as an expert so that I can move into my next area of questioning.

THE COURT: And I guess my question is, why does he need to be an expert for purposes of the

testimony that I have just hit on?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. RIVELLINI: I am going to ask him to rely on some documentation in order to give his testimony, and rely on documents, and to give some opinions as to what he thinks is going on the video, and why. He will also give specific testimony about the Office of Special Affairs, which Mr. Howd is a member of. Mr. Howd has given previous testimony that he has never heard of "Fair Game". That he was never directed to go out and do the things that he did, and this witness could testify that that could never happen based on the way the office is run.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. de Vlaming? MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I don't mean Maybe I can shortcut this. to interrupt. Based on what you just said when you laid out what our purpose is, you are real close to the mark on what we intend to use this witness for. If the hangup of the Court is as to whether or not we need to declare him an expert so that when you look to the tape we can use the "Fair Game Policy" as he knows and what he was taught to say, "You see when they went in there, you see when this happened, this is all part of the policy." Then I don't need to declare him an expert. If however, Mr. Tyson jumps up and says, "Objection, opinion." Then of course we are back into

1 this area.

THE COURT: I am reluctant to cloak him with the mantle of being an expert based on what I have heard.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's what I understand.

THE COURT: So I am going to be real ginger in this area. If you would like to continue to question him I will reserve ruling on that until I have heard everything that you would like him to say. Then I will go back and address the notion of whether he is an expert or not.

MS. RIVELLINI: Okay, Judge, and keeping in mind that it is hard to be an expert that you just do everyday. I know Mr. de Vlaming himself has been declared an expert in the practice of defense law, and it is along the same lines that we are asking that he be declared an expert. He was entrenched in the study of it. He actually did study and rely on treatises, and for that purpose we are asking that he be declared an expert.

MR. TYSON: May I address that?

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. TYSON: Mr. de Vlaming is here everyday. Mr. de Vlaming has been continually involved in the practice of the law. You have eight years on the

outside. Judge, one other thing I would like to point out before we move on, is the intent to argue that their actions are consistent with the "Fair Game Policy" you have seen enough of these videos now, and have been educated enough to know that this is both sides of the street working here. They may be inflamed because of what Mr. Minton or any other anti-Scientologists are doing. So if they are inflamed, they get these people are worked up, and then the argument would be invoking "Fair Game" when it is a two-way street. I want you to understand that.

THE COURT: I am acutely aware of that. Please proceed.

## BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, you said that you were involved with the Office of Special Affairs?
  - A Yes, I was.
- Q In a nutshell, what are the duties of someone involved in the Office of Special Affairs, you said that it was to carry out investigations?
- A Yes. That is one of the functions of the Office of Special Affairs, yes.
- Q What does that mean, to carry out an investigation?
  - A Anyone that is identified by the Church of

Scientology as an enemy, or someone that is a potential threat to the Church of Scientology is investigated. This investigation is carried out one of several ways. It can be carried out using legal methods of obtaining information on an individual, or illegal methods of obtaining information on an individual.

Q This is something that you were actually trained to do, and told how to do by policy?

A Yes.

Q Is that an actual written policy that teaches you how to do that?

A The legal things are written, the illegal acts are told to us by seniors.

Q Do you actually have check lists that you follow to make sure that are doing them to the plan of Scientology?

A Yes, if the project is to obtain information on an individual there is a program or a project that is written out, and it delineates all the steps that need to be taken to arrange for whether it is a surveillance, whether the person is to be investigated, followed from where ever they go, followed from work, from home, investigate their friends, talk to neighbors. Whatever is part of the program are what we have to accomplish. All this information is then sent up lines in Scientology

to higher level individuals within in the department for analysis for implementation of another part of the program, or for orders to be sent back down for additional investigation to be done.

- Q What kind of discretion was there on your part to carry out these plans? Could you just come up with your own plan on how to do an investigation?
  - A No, no.

- Q Was everything delineated out specifically?
- A Yes, and one of the steps in the check sheet was for certain actions to be side-checked by the legal division of Scientology.
- Q Are you saying there are random acts in the course of an investigation?
- A Not unless you are prepared to deal with the consequences of whether your random act is unsuccessful.
- Q Let's talk about dealing with the consequences. How are you rated in Scientology? And keeping in mind that we don't want to get into what the whole religion is about, just specifically is there a point system, or some system that you are rewarded by in the Church?
- A Like in any job, you are measured by what you can actually accomplish. In Scientology if someone is a counselor they are measured by how many hours of counseling they give for example. If you are in the

office of Special Affairs and you work in intelligence investigation there are about ten specific things that are used to measure your performance. If your job is to combat the enemy or keep negative things to be written about the organization, then those are things that they have identified, using their own terminology as to how to get the points that you need. Everything is graphed and the statistical analysis determines what your particular condition is. If your statistics are down you are given — you are told that your statistics are in emergency, for example, which means that you need to get your statistics up. If your statistics are up, then you are regarded as being a better Scientologist almost. You are paid actually more.

Q How important is this on a daily basis?

A In some cases it is important on an hourly basis, when things are extremely critical, whatever project that you are working on they want to monitor what your progress is, sometimes every hour, sometimes every fifteen minutes. What have you done? What have you got? They are just on top of you to make sure that you are achieving the projected goals, whatever that program or project is.

Q So you are either rewarded or punished on a constant basis, and is that the most important that goes

on in Scientology?

A That is the most important thing in Scientology.

- Q You said that they actually keep graphs and reports on this?
  - A On everything.
- Q If somebody fails, I call it a mission, if somebody fails a task, what are some of the consequences that can happen, and do they ever get to serious levels?
- A Depending on where you are within the organization, for example I was originally based in what is called a Class Five Organization in the church, and the penalties there are you can be downgraded in your particular position in the organization. You can be denied your auditing or counseling that you receive. Yo can be sent they can have you washing the toilets if you fail on a mission.
  - Q Do they actually ever send you away?
- A In well -- in different areas of the organization, if you were for example a member of the Sea Organization, which is their own internal fraternal organization, if you will, of Scientology that actually runs Scientology, there the penalties are more harsh, because those people actually live there, work there, they don't have any life outside of the organization. It

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1

is basically like being interned in the organization.

- Q Is that what we have here in Clearwater?
- A Yes, this is one of the main centers of the Sea Organization.
- Q What is the punishment if you fail a task in the Sea Organization?
- A Depending on what the severity is you could lose certificates, you could lose privileges, you could be subject to doing manual labor. They could have you out picking weeds. I have heard cases where it has been much worse than that.
  - Q Did they ever send you off --

MR. TYSON: Judge, I am going to object to the hearsay, and ask you to consider that.

THE COURT: Okay, that is an ongoing objection, and I understand that has been your objection.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Did they ever send you away to what I call the equivalent of a boot camp?
- A Within the Sea Organization the most extreme level of punishment is called the RPF, which stands for Rehabilitation Project Force. What they feel that the individual going there will somehow redeem himself by doing the most menial grueling labor that they can subject the individual to. Much more than just physical

duress, it is the emotional and mental duress that the people are put under when they are sent to the RPF.

- Q When somebody is a member of the Office of Special Affairs is one of their jobs to handle critics?
  - A Yes.

- Q Is there a policy that is known to the members of the Office of Special Affairs on what a critic is and how to handle them?
- A There are several policies that delineate critics, attacks on Scientology and who the defined enemies are of Scientology. There are many policy letters.
- Q Have you heard of something called the "Fair Game Policy"?
  - A Yes, I have.
  - Q What is that?
- A That was a policy that was originally written by Hubbard and it delineated that anyone that is identified as a member of Scientology that has committed any of these acts, or someone that is suppressive, or someone that is harmful to the organization they can be lied, cheated, tricked, sued, anything can be done to the individual without that individual -- without you suffering any kind of penalty for having done these things to someone else.

Q	Okay.	At	some	point	was	that	"Fair	Game
Policy"	canceled?	?						

A There is an issue that cancels the term "Fair Game". The policy itself, from my understanding was never canceled, because the things are still done to this day. So had the policy been completely canceled these things wouldn't be done. I wouldn't have done the things that I did when I was in the organization had that policy truly been canceled, because I wouldn't have been ordered to do it.

Q Was that policy issued and then canceled by L. Ron Hubbard?

A Yes.

Q And that policy insofar as it practices was even carried out in the '80's and '90's when you were there?

A Yes.

Q What kind of things did you do to carry out that policy?

A We investigated individuals using legal, and depending on which individual was needed, illegal, credit reports were drawn on individuals by use of suitable guises. Their phone numbers and the phone records were obtained by us. We had private investigators going through people's garbage.

_ <del>-</del>		Q	Are	people	consistently	followed
----------------	--	---	-----	--------	--------------	----------

A Yes. I myself was on a surveillance of two subjects for three days non-stop while I was in California.

Q When somebody is followed are they given one of those check lists on exactly what to carry out?

A The lead person, whoever is handling the investigation on the individual is the one that runs the program out in the field and they actually at that particular time are telling people what they have to do. For example, when we were on a surveillance in California we were three teams of private investigators and we spent three days outside of a home surveilling two subjects that were identified as suppressive persons by the Church of Scientology.

Q Okay. You have had a chance to review some video tapes depicting Mr. Minton picketing on several occasions, is that correct?

A Yes, I have.

Q Could you tell from watching those videos what was going on as far as by the members of Scientology?

A Because there is such a potential for litigation anything that has to do with the type of activities Mr. Minton is involved in, such as picketing the organization, the members themselves don't make any

decisions whether they are going to go out there, or whether they are going to show outrage. Everything is handled in that area by the Office of Special Affairs. They have overriding control of the situation. So they determine everything that goes on. Any interaction that there may be between the potential attacker and the organization. No one acts independently on their own. Everything goes through OSA. If someone were to show up to picket one of the organizations and there might be members outside OSA immediately comes on the scene and takes control. Members are told to go inside. OSA handles the operation from that point on. There is no individual action by anyone.

Q Okay, how can OSA ensure that what goes on outside is consistent with what they want to go on?

A They have a policy where they never defend and they always attack. If someone comes at the organization they will attack. They don't defend, they don't go out there and try to talk to someone or talk them out of doing what they are doing. They are on the attack, because the only way to defend, according to the Doctrine of Scientology, is to attack.

Q How can members high up in OSA ensure that it is going to be carried out in manner they want it to, do they actually practice these exercises?

A Absolutely. Anything that is done to an individual, or anything that is done by the organization, if they want to ensure that they are going to obtain the desired result it is drilled, what we call drilling. I am sure that term is used in the military as well. Where something is gone over by individuals to ensure that they both have an understanding of what they are going to do.

Q Is each person on the scene given a specific task?

A If there are multiple individuals that are needed for a particular thing, yes. Anybody that is going to be a part of any particular action has to be there and present because they need to recreate the scene exactly as it is going to be implemented, or carried out.

Q And does the Church of Scientology have a policy or a belief that if anybody is a critic of Scientology they must also have committed crimes?

A That's a known fact, and is reiterated over and over when you are in Scientology. Only criminals attack Scientology because they feel it is the savior for mankind.

Q Is there any motivation for Scientology to expose a critic as a criminal?

A The motivation is to ensure that their dogma is correct, they have to be right, so they will do whatever

they have to do to maintain the fact that they are right.

Q If the church were to investigate what they call a critic and look into his history for years and years and not come up with a known crime?

A They will and have been known to go so far as to manufacture something to pin on the individual.

Q Would someone be rewarded for doing so?

A If that is the project, if that is acquired result and that is what is done, and they obtain the acquired result, naturally they are rewarded. They have obtained their objective.

Q If someone were -- let me back up. When you became a member of the Church of Scientology did you have to fill out a form of non-disclosure?

A Not when I was a member, only when I joined the Office of Special Affairs.

Q Okay, and tell us about that non-disclosure form, what was the purpose of it? And what did you understand the purpose to be?

A I was told that I had to sign the form. The only way that I was going to continue in what I was doing was to sign this form. They told me because of the sensitive nature of what I was going to be dealing with that they had to have some kind of protection. Based on the fact that I was trying to move up in the organization

24

25

Α

Q

1	the only way I was going to move up or stay in was to
2	sign this form, because that was the particular
3	department that I was in at the time.
4	Q And what were you essentially promising not to
5	disclose?
6	A Any of the information about any of the inner-
7	workings of Scientology in the area that I was in.
8	Q Now, if you were still a member of OSA having
9	signed that form would you be able to testify to the
10	things that you are telling us today?
11	A Absolutely no.
12	Q What if you were under oath in a courtroom?
13	A Well, that again is up to the individual.
14	Q What would the church tell you to do?
15	A Whatever they wanted me to do. If they wanted
16	me to say something then that is what I would have to
17	say.
18	Q So it wouldn't be up to you as to what you
19	disclose?
20	A No, because I would have to put the
21	organization first.
22	Q Does that disclosure form set out punishments
23	if you do disclose what goes on in OSA?

Yes, breaches of a million dollars, or more.

Would there also be ramifications within the

1	church, and your position there?
2	A Absolutely, they wouldn't be pleasant.
3	Q Have you actually seen for yourself people who
4	have been disciplined by the church?
5	A Yes, I have talked to individuals who have been
6	disciplined by the organization.
7	Q Is there an understanding on how the law and
8	the court system is to be used by Scientology?
9	A It's just another tool that is used to harass
10	individuals, and if the individual doesn't have money and
11	you really want to get somebody you can bankrupt somebody
12	in a court.
13	Q Is that commonly done?
14	A Yes, it is.
15	Q What about the criminal law system?
16	A Anything they have to do.
17	Q And that's actually taught to you?
18	A Yes.
19	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, if I can have a
20	moment.
21	THE COURT: You may.
22	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
23	Q Mr. Oliver, I asked you previously if you had a
24	chance to watch the films and see the pickets that Mr.
25	Minton was involved in?

	-
1	A Yes.
2	Q Were you able to form an opinion about what was
3	going on as the Scientologists actions versus Mr.
4	Minton's actions?
5	A Yes.
6	Q What is that opinion?
7	A The opinion is that Mr. Minton is identified as
8	their largest critic, their most dangerous threat, and so
9	they need to really do something about it. What I was
10	able to see in the tape is a particular series of events
11	were staged to ensure that their objective was gotten.
12	Q What did it look like the objective was?
13	A To get Mr. Minton arrested.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that is what I
15	have for purposes of the proffer.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
17	MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge.
18	CROSS EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. TYSON:
20	Q How are you doing, Mr. Oliver?
21	A Very good, sir.
22	Q I am Bill Tyson. I should have introduced
23	myself before. I'm sorry.
24	Mr. Oliver, you talk almost as fast as I do.
25	7 Commu

Q Not a problem because I talk fast too. So I was only able to write down as fast I could get. If I misunderstand something correct me now.

A Okay.

Q Did I understand you to say that when they thought you were leaving, they threw you out of Scientology?

A No, that wasn't exactly it.

Q Okay. Can you explain that again?

A When I returned back from Los Angeles having been working with hierarchy of the Church of Scientology I was very disillusioned at what I had discovered there working there in the Office of Special Affairs. At that time I had made a decision to make my exit from Scientology, however still fearing the repercussions of my action of doing such a -- what is considered a drastic thing in Scientology after being having been in the position of trust that I was in, I had to be very cautious on how I left.

In late '91 I made the decision to go to the Ethics Officer, which is a particular post within the organization and make my intention known that I wanted to leave the organization. I wanted to try and leave using the appropriate policies and procedures of the organization for someone leaving. There is a particular

check list that a person does when leaving the organization, it is called "Leaving Staff Routing Form". Once you make this declaration that you want to leave the organization the Ethics Officer acknowledges it and puts you on this form. So then you become something that they have to do. So they are put on notice basically that you want to leave.

It is the proper and correct way to leave per the policy. Once I made this known I was stripped of my keys to the building, and I was told that I would now need to report to the Ethics Office in the organization to follow the procedures of this particular check list.

It took many months for me to come into the organization on a weekly basis. Sometimes I would go, sometimes I wouldn't. I really wanted to get through this, and they were putting up road blocks to have me complete this procedural exit.

In '92 -- it took probably six months for me to get out of the organization. In '92 I went in one of these times and I was handed by the Director of Inspections and Reports, Eric Arnet, I was handed this document which she showed me, which I provided her copies of, which is my "Suppressive Person Declare." I was basically being expelled from the organization. The reason listed troubled me because it said I was leaving

because I had made secret plans to leave the organization, when in fact, there was never a secret plan to made. I was very much in the open, and in fact, they had acknowledged that I was leaving already. So it surprised me that they would expel me for something that I didn't commit.

However, since I had not committed any infraction within the organization they needed something to expel me for, and they chose to say that I was leaving in secret, when, in fact, I wasn't.

- Q Sounds like someone trying to get out of the U.S. military?
  - A Something like that.
- Q You say that you are not personally involved in litigation. Are you a witness at all in the Lisa

  McPherson case?
- A I am a trial consultant in the Lisa McPherson case.
  - Q Which side are you with?
  - A Lisa McPherson's.
    - Q Okay. So you are against the Scientologists?
- 22 A Yes, sir.
  - Q Now you said that involvement with Scientology, if I got this right, were for you to carry on
  - investigations on anybody that is identified as an enemy

or a threat. Would it be fair to say that U.S. military does that too, don't they?

- A From what I know, yes.
- Q And actually companies -- you are a business man, right?
  - A Yes, sir.

- Q Do you compete with other companies?
- A Yes, well, I am in a similar business -- my field is so broad there is not that kind of competition you see between AT&T and Sprint. It's not like that.
- Q The bottom line though, you need to keep ahead of the competition to make a profit, don't you?
  - A Yes.
- Q So you have got to keep an eye on what the competition is doing, don't you?
- A Sure.
  - Q So it is not unusual to check out what anybody else is doing, investigate what they are up to, is it?
  - A Not to the extreme level that I carried out when I was in Scientology though. But, yeah.
  - Q But that begs the question, what type of military or company experience do you have on how they conduct their investigations?
  - A On how --
    - Q You said not the to the extreme level, you know

Q

1	that they don't go to the extreme level that Scientology
2	does. How extreme does the military go, are you even
3	able to testify to that?
4	A How the military investigates?
5	Q Yes.
6	A No, I have never been in the military.
7	Q Okay, so it is difficult for you to make that
8	comparison. You said that you don't know anybody that
9	goes to the level that Scientologists do. You really
10	don't know if that is true or not?
11	A Not businesses, sir. You asked me about
12	business.
13	Q Oh, really, is that a fact? What business
14	experience do you have on their investigations?
15	A On Scientology investigations?
16	Q Businesses investigating other businesses,
17	corporate spying, what do you know about that?
18	A I have read some articles on it.
19	Q Do you consider yourself an expert on that?
20	A No, not at all.
21	Q So obviously you can't testify on what exactly
22	they do, can you?
23	A No, not what a corporation does. No, I have
24	never done that type of work.

If I understand your testimony you said that

25

A

Q

1	they had documents telling you the legal methods to
2	investigate?
3	A Correct.
4	Q Okay. And the illegal methods were told you
5	verbally by a senior person?
6	A Yes.
7	Q So there is nothing in writing on the illegal
8	methods?
9	A No, nothing in writing, but there is plenty of
10	documentation to substantiate it.
11	Q Okay. It's fair to say that it would be some
12	rogue supervisor who wants to get ahead in the
13	organization having you do illegal activities, wouldn't
14	it be fair to say?
15	A No, I don't think that would be fair say at
16	all, sir. There are too many people in the chain of
17	command that see all the data that is gathered. Even the
18	attorneys.
19	Q It also begs the questions, you had no problem
20	performing illegal activities, did you?
21	A I never performed an illegal activity when I
22	was a member of the Church of Scientology.
23	Q You did not?

You said that your position in Scientology is

No, sir, I did not.

	<b>52</b>
1	measured by work product performance?
2	A Correct.
3	Q Isn't it true that a lot places do that?
4	A Sure.
5	Q Isn't it true that just about any place does
6	that?
7	A As far as I know you are measured by what you
8	actually get done.
9	Q So that's not unusual for them to do that, is
10	it?
11	A It's not unusual for them to do it. I found it
12	unusual that I was being rated on certain things that
13	I was being rated on like identifying enemies, and number
14	of attacks that I committed on individuals.
15	Q Well, you said attacks. Were these legal
16	attacks, or illegal attacks?
17	A It depends on what you mean by legal, or
18	illegal.
19	Q Is that true the meaning of the word, is is?
20	A Is is.
21	Q You just told me a minute ago that you didn't
22	do anything illegal.
23	A I never did anything illegal.
24	Q Okay, I don't quite understand your last
25	answer.

A	Well, I	am sure that	someone is	measured by	the
number of	illegal	acts that the	ey commit.	I, however,	was
measured	by the n	umber of lega	l things tha	at I did.	

- Q And you said that there are penalties you fail a task, right?
  - A Correct.

- Q And it would be fair to say that there are penalties pretty much everywhere if you fail a task? If I don't do my job, and I don't come to work, then I would get fired?
  - A Correct.
- Q She is a business woman, and she is selling a product and she doesn't perform, she may lose her job?
  - A As far as I know that is correct, sir.
- Q You said as far as handling critics, they may sue them?
- A Correct.
- Q Have you ever heard of false advertising, one company defames another company's products and they get sued?
  - A Yes, I have.
    - Q So that is really not that unusual, is it?
- A If they have got a legitimate reason for it, I quess it is not that unusual.
  - Q But your opinion is it is illegitimate?

1	A
2	Q
3	them?
4	A
5	Q
6	A
7	· Q
8	of the
9	some of
10	A
11	seen ti
12	tapes.
13	Q
14	on vide
15	Harriso
16	we all
17	A
18	all hav
19	Q
20	be in y
21	A
22	Q
23	peacef
24	that I
25	that w

A	Ιt	depends	on	the	circumstance,	sir.
---	----	---------	----	-----	---------------	------

- Q Now the video tapes, you said that you watched them?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q You watched the four that we have of the scene?
  - A Excuse me?
- Q You watched the four that we have at the scene of the Fort Harrison, or you have the Boston incident and some other tapes?
- A I watched the four video tapes. I have also seen the Boston tape, but I have seen the four video tapes.
- Q I guess my question to you, is your expertise on video based on the four that you saw at the Fort Harrison, and the Boston one, or all the other ones that we all have? Because we have tons of these things?
- A No, I didn't see all the video tapes that you all have.
- Q Okay, but what you see on that video tape would be in your opinion "Fair Game", what they are doing?
  - A I know what an operation looks like, sir.
- Q Okay. So if I was a Scientologist and you were peacefully picketing and I was to come up to you and say that I had sex with your mother, but I wouldn't say it that way, if I got up in your face and did that, would

1 | that be an example of "Fair Game"?

A Sure, I guess that would be an example of "Fair Game."

- Q You talk about they have been known to manufacture crimes against people. I need you tell me when, where, and we need to know who that innocent person was?
- A Have you ever heard of something called "Operation Snow White", it's well documented?
- Q When, where, and who is the person sitting in jail that shouldn't be?

Well, fortunately she was exonerated, but the woman's name was Paulette Cooper. It happened sometime I believe in the late '70's. She was set up by Scientology. This was later found to be true when the Church of Scientology were raided by the FBI. They obtained copies of the operation on how they were going to set her up. Ms. Cooper was subjected to two polygraph tests to try to prove her innocence. Eventually, she was completely exonerated when they found the documentation after they raided the Churches of Scientology. That is one specific example.

- Q This is 1970, so that would be at least six years before you were there?
  - A Excuse me?

1	Q	At least six years before you were even there,
2	so we are	talking
3	A	You didn't ask me
4	Q	So this would be at least twenty years ago?
5	A	Sure. But it did happen.
6	Q	And you know that from first-hand knowledge?
7	A	No, I know that from reading the documentation.
8	Q	From who?
9	A	It's available on the Internet, it's in court
10	records.	It was published in major news records. It was
11	published	in national magazines.
12	Q	You had signed a non-disclosure form?
13	A	Correct.
14	Q	Under penalty of a million dollars?
15	A	Uh-huh.
16	Q	Have you ever heard of signing an agreement to
17	not releas	se trade secrets under penalty of a suit?
18	A	Yes, I have heard of that.
19	Q	Have you ever heard of signing an agreement
20	with the m	military to keep certain things secret under
21	penalty of	imprisonment?
22	A	I think I have heard of that also.
23	Q	So this policy is not that unusual, is it?
24	A	I thought it was unusual because I was a member
25	of what I	thought at the time to be a church.

1	Q How old are you?
2	A Thirty-seven.
3	Q How old were you in 1986?
4	A I've got to do math. I was in my twenties. I
5	was in my twenties.
6	MR. TYSON: Judge, I have no further
7	questions.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Rivellini anything
9	further?
10	MS. RIVELLINI: Just very briefly.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MS. MS. RIVELLINI:
14	Q Mr. Oliver, the prosecutor asked you about
15	whether it was unusual for companies to sue other
16	companies legitimately?
17	A Yes, he did.
18	Q Do you remember when he asked you that?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And you tried to make the distinction between
21	legitimate suits and non-legitimate suits?
22	A Correct.
23	Q I want to show the cover of a pamphlet called
24	"Ability, the Scientologists, a manual on the
25	dissemination of material, by L. Ron Hubbard." Do you

recognize what that material is?

A Yes, I do.

Q Is that something that you studied and relied upon as a Scientologists?

A Not that particular pamphlet, no, but the contents are used in different things. They are presented to us in different ways. In Scientology you could hear them as a transcript, you could hear them as a separate issue. They take the information and pull it apart and use it for specific things.

Q In this pamphlet I notice that you have had time to look through it and make some highlights. Did you notice anything that talked about the purpose of filing suits?

A Yes.

Q Can you just read what you have highlighted down here, what the purpose of suit is?

A "The purpose of a suit is to harass and to discourage rather than to win. The law can be used very easily to harass. And enough harassment on somebody who is simply on the thin edge, while knowing that he is not authorized will generally be sufficient to cause his professional decease. If possible, of course, ruin him utterly."

Q Did you find that to be a little different than

1	what you	consider	to be	a l	Legitimate	suit,	or	a
2	legitima	te lawsuit	:?					
3	A	Yes.						
4	Q	Have you	ı also	had	l a chance	to re	lv c	n

Q Have you also had a chance to rely on some book by L. Ron Hubbard and the following of Scientology?

A Yes.

Q I am going to show you two volumes here, the Organization Executive Course. HCM Division I and VII by L. Ron Hubbard, do you recognize these?

MR. TYSON: Short stack or big stack?

MS. RIVELLINI: Actually both volumes.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q These books, Mr. Oliver, do they set policies and procedures for the organization?

A Yes, those two books are part of a larger volume of books that are used to run and administer the policies of the organization.

Q Okay, this book, Rules and Regulations on how to carry out anything from being a member of the Sea Org. to, how to open up mail?

A Yes, they -- Scientology is very bureaucratic in that there is a policy for just about everything.

- Q So not much is left to individual discretion?
- A No, not much is left to individual discretion.
- Q Mr. Tyson also asked you about the way an

	00
1	investigation is carried out, and do a lot of agencies do
2	that, and you said that you didn't necessarily know what
3	the military and other companies do, is that correct?
4	A Yes.
5	Q But you do find that some of the investigations
6	tactics going a little bit over the edge?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Okay, in fact, you were listed as a witness for
9	Mr. Minton just several days ago, is that correct?
10	A That is correct.
11	Q And since that time have you learned that
12	certain people have been contacted in your family and
13	prior employment?
14	A Yes, as soon my as soon as I was notified
15	that my name had been put on the witness list, my ex-wife
16	and my landlord were contacted by a private investigator.
17	Q Any prior employers?
18	A Not that I know of thus far, not since
19	Wednesday. But I haven't talked to any prior employers
20	yet. I am sure I will be hearing. If that did, in fact,
21	happen I will be hearing about it when I get back home.
22	Q Okay, do you recognize those tactics?
23	A Absolutely.
24	MS. RIVELLINI: Just a moment, Judge.
25	DV MC DIVETTINI.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	Q Individual tactics are expressed by higher-ups?
2	A What do you mean?
3	Q Check lists?
4	A Oh, yeah, all that is issued from senior
5	management.
6	Q Okay, and that is derived from the policies
7	that are still in place?
8	A Yes.
9	Q And those can't be changed?
10	A No.
11	MR. TYSON: Judge, I have just one follow
12	up question since this is a proffer, I would be allowed
13	to go back and go outside the scope of the redirect a
14	little bit, if you will allow me?
15	THE COURT: No problem, go ahead.
16	RECROSS EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. TYSON:
18	Q If you were filming me right now and I was
19	putting a little laser pen-light right in your face while
20	you are filming me, do you know what I am talking about?
21	A Uh-huh,
22	Q Do you know what a laser pen is?
23	A Yes, sir.
24	Q Would that be "Fair Game"?
25	A No.

Q Even though you are the one that did it, right?

A I don't see how it would be "Fair Game". I am not lying, cheating, suing, or tricking you.

Q Neither is someone when they said that they had sex with your mother?

A Yeah.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MS. RIVELLINI: No, Judge.

THE COURT: We are going to take fifteen minutes. We are adjourned.

(Brief break)

as an expert by this court, I have listened to his testimony and both sides in their examination of him. I think as we all know as to whether or not someone is to be qualified as an expert is in the sound discretion of the trial court. And really the question is whether or not he meets the appropriate criteria, would assist the trier of fact in any way, whether he has got specialized knowledge to support an opinion. Well, let's take this one at a time.

First of all, we heard the testimony and that Mr. Oliver is clearly not detached. He is not impartial. He is not what we typically, of an expert, someone who comes in who has no axe to grind, had no

interest in the outcome of the case. He does not fall into that category. His training and expertise is not common, not readily understood, or ascertainable.

Moreover, we have the unusual situation in this case, we don't have one video, we don't have two videos, we don't have three videos. We have four videos of the incident itself. The question is how much help can he give the trier of fact who is going to be able to watch four videos. So I find him not to be an expert. And do not allow him to testify in his opinions in that regard.

Now, as far as I am concerned what I have heard is that his testimony could be and would be, he was a member of the Church of Scientology, he knows that there was a "Fair Game Policy". He will testify as to his personal knowledge as to how he knows, and not hearsay knowledge. What it is, and what penalties there may be for violation of it. Period, that's all.

While I am on this area let me make it really clear here, because I think there is some confusion in this courtroom. The Church of Scientology is not on trial here today and will not be on trial here today. This is a battery. That is all it is going to be. Those things that relate to this are strictly relevant insofar as they may explain some of the actors behaviors, period. We are not going to digress onto what

the Church of Scientology does, what it doesn't do, what it believes, what it doesn't believe. I hope that I am clear on that, because I opened the door a crack and it sounds like we are trying to drive a platoon through it, and it's not going to happen. Okay. Who would you like me to hear next?

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Judge, as previously mentioned Jesse Prince who is present here in the courtroom. He was present during the videotaping. The Court has already agreed with it coming in and that's the September 10th incident of the Boston.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: He is a former member of the church. He was the number two person in the church and his title was Deputy Inspector General and External, meaning all external press. He was responsible for the Religious Tech Center, which is the highest Ecclesiastical Organization within Scientology. He reported directly to David Miscavige who is the leader of Scientology at the present time. He has firsthand knowledge of capers that were organized by him and others and participated in them and would be able to testify that what went on in the Boston video was not an accident, but it was a well orchestrated caper as referred to in the world of Scientology. He was actually

present at the Boston incident.

submitted and argued that it should be admissible, and was ruled on as being admissible to show Mr. Minton's state of mind as to why he believed certain things would occur and were relative to his various defensive theories, which include, but are not limited to self-defense. So help me understand what you just told me is relevant, and if so how it is probative value is not offset by any prejudicial impacts it is going to have, because I am having a hard time seeing it.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Judge, as you mentioned there are going to be numerous videos shown in this particular case. The October 31st video shows Mr. Minton picketing and it shows two members of the Church of Scientology filming him. Also, there is the July 9th video tape, and also a video tape taken earlier that day at the church. Mr. Minton --

THE COURT: Hang on, stop just a minute.

Do you mean earlier that day at the church?

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: No.

THE COURT: At the Slaughter house?

MR. TYSON: Judge, maybe I can help. If you think I am planning on playing that, I'm not, because there is nothing really unusual about that.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: I think the point I am trying to make here, Judge, it is clear in these video tapes that Mr. Minton is being agitated by the fact that the camera is being stuck in his face. It was no accident that on October 31st, the evening of there were two videographers present. One, to capture to what was going on and to document the event. The other one, to do nothing but to harass Mr. Minton by placing the video camera in his face. That is part of what we consider the "Fair Game Policy", what Mr. Prince would certainly testify to was going on at that particular time. went on in Boston in the form of somebody getting up and intimidating him by screaming in his ear, and putting spittle on his face.

THE COURT: But isn't that obvious from the video? One can watch the video and come to all those conclusions.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: But, Judge, if it is an orchestrated event we believe we are entitled to show that that is the policy of the Office of Special Affairs of Scientology and this was a directed course of conduct which invited the conduct of Mr. Minton. That is a pivotal portion of our defense.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: We believe that

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

if we are not entitled to go into what the "Fair Game Policy" is, and how it works --

THE COURT: Well, I said that you could do that. I have said that you could do that. We are in that threshold. Now whether or not we need some analysis of the Boston video, other than to see it, that is the issue that I guess you are offering Jesse Prince for?

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Right, that this

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Right, that this was no accident.

THE COURT: Well, it doesn't really look like an accident when you view it. But you are thinking that you need somebody to tell people -- is that what I am understanding?

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Yes, your Honor, why this is an orchestrated event, and why it is the actions of the church to attack their critics and use the criminal justice system in an effort to silence their critics.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes, sir, of course.

MR. TYSON: Judge, you have heard my argument on that, the Boston video is two years ago. It is 1,500 miles away, different victim, a different set of circumstances. I think that it is irrelevant. In other

words when start talking bringing in -- number one, the video is narrated, which I have a huge problem with, but you have already watched it. They narrate their side of the story. Mr. Bunker who is in the courtroom narrates it and plays it back the clips that he wants. It hurts bad enough getting that in, much less having another person come in. You have got the play by play, and you have the person doing the analysis of the game, and that's what they want here. I think just have the videos put in, I respect the Court's ruling and will abide by that, but I think they want the whole thing here. I think it's getting to the point that there is going to be a side show just at that video and they are going to spring back around and put the religion on trial again

THE COURT: I agree. The video itself I think speaks for itself. It is abundantly clear what it is and what it isn't. Any testimony in that regard is cumulative and not relevant and take the focus off of this incident and put the focus on that incident. I don't think it is appropriate.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Judge, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Judge, I don't think it is going to out the focus on that incident.

It's going to help explain to the jury what was going on on October 31st. It is no accident that it happened in a similar way, and if it goes to showing to why the incident ended the way it did. And there are other things that will help explain that as well, but I think that it is very important that we be allowed to get into that area.

THE COURT: I think what you want to do with Jesse Prince is cumulative, not relevant. It will take the focus off of this incident and make that Boston incident a feature of this trial, it should not be. That video is appropriate to explain the behavior, what was in Mr. Minton's mind on the day in question. And I think beyond that it goes farther than is necessary is go.

What else do we need to do?

MR. TYSON: Judge, as far as October 31st, the afternoon video. I hadn't planned on playing it, mainly because it is a picket like they always do.

THE COURT: The afternoon video?

MR. TYSON: Yes, the afternoon of October 31st Mr. Minton was in front of the Church of Scientology picketing.

THE COURT: I don't think that I have seen that one.

MR. TYSON: You haven't?

1	THE COURT: Everything I have seen was at
2	night.
3	MR. TYSON: They picket all the time.
4	THE COURT: But it is on the day in
5	question, is that correct?
6	MR. TYSON: Yes, it is earlier in the day.
7	I hadn't planned on playing that one. I'm not sure where
8	we are going with that.
9	THE COURT: Is there any intention of
10	anybody using that video? It sounds like you are not
11	going to use it. Do you all intend to use it?
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, first of all
13	it is not inflammatory, so I don't think it is the kind
14	of one that you are going to see right away.
15	THE COURT: It is also the day in question
16	between the parties, so I think it is a relatively easy
17	call.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's exactly
19	right. So I don't want to be committed right now. Right
20	now I don't plan on playing it, but I don't want to be
21	committed.
22	THE COURT: That's fine. Then let's not
23	address it unless it becomes and issue and then we will
24	address it then.

What else do we need to do?

thought.

MR. TYSON: Before we pick a jury,
determine as far as opening statements what we can use
and can't use, Judge.
THE COURT: We have kind of done that, I

MR. TYSON: I'm not sure. We still haven't talked about whether the coming to Mr. Minton's house is relevant. The order says --

But tell me what else we need to talk about.

on those things, and unless and until you want me to -because I don't have enough specificity to know what is
involved in those things. You have merely mentioned them
in a very cursory fashion at the last hearing.

MR. TYSON: My theory is that they are going to bring that up until you realize that it is not relevant. And it is quite frankly --

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: This might shortcut this. I am not going bring in the fact that they went to Minton's house, opening statement is not going to into that. Anything else?

MR. TYSON: That's it.

THE COURT: Okay. It sounds like we are where we need to be. It sounds like we are ready to bring a panel and start the jury selection process. I am going to go off the bench. We are going to seat the

panel. I will go back on the bench and we will get started. We are adjourned until the panel is seated.

(Brief break)

(Whereupon, the jury panel was sworn and seated.)

THE COURT: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I am Judge Robert Morris. I will presiding over the trial of this case today. As you have been told this is the State of Florida versus Robert Minton. This is a criminal trial, the charge is battery.

Before we get underway I want to cover a few things with you. First of all, I want to welcome you all here. I recognize that many of you may have never sat on a jury before, you may have never been part of a judicial proceeding before. In fact, you may have never been in this building before. Consequently, I realize that these surroundings and these proceedings may be very unfamiliar to you and you might be nervous about that. Please don't be. Part of my responsibility as a judge is to make sure that you have the information you need to perform function, and I will try to make sure that I give you that information as we go along.

I also understand that all of you gave up something to be here today. All of you would be at work, you would be attending to family matters or business

matters, or things that are very important to each and every one of you, and it was a sacrifice to be here. We recognize that. We appreciate that. We will try not to inconvenience you any more than is necessary. But it is important that you realize that it is Monday morning across all of America today and that in every jurisdiction in this nation people like you were summoned to the courthouses in the big cities and the small towns to sit in a courtroom to talk to a judge like me. And this is one of the unique things about our system of justice. We are unique in the world about the way we resolve disputes.

You, like all of these other citizens, are going to be asked questions by the Court, by each of the sides, so that there can be an opinion developed on your ability to fair and impartial in a case like this.

Because that is the way that we decide disputes in America. Juries of the peers, the parties are impaneled to listen to the evidence and make these determinations. We are unique in the world in this regard.

So your involvement in this process is vital. If you didn't come here today, if people you all didn't come to the courthouses as they did today the judicial branch of government couldn't function, because it is an important ingredient in what we do. So we

appreciate you being here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, as we go forward I want to explain a couple things that are going to occur here. The lady in the middle of the courtroom here, speaking into what looks like a mask, she is the court reporter. She basically is responsible to make a record of these entire proceedings. She will take down everything that is said. When I am speaking now she is taking it down. When you speak she is taking it down. When the lawyers speak she is taking it down. It is important for us to be mindful of that when we have an opportunity to speak, we need to speak loudly, slowly, clearly so that she can understand what we say. Please be sensitive to that when you have an opportunity to speak. Speak so that she can hear you, so that she doesn't have to say, sir, ma'am, I can't hear you. Also understand that she can't take down shakes of the head or nods. She has to have an oral articulation of a response. Be sensitive to that.

We humans communicate in a variety of different ways, and it's not always orally, but we need to communicate for that purpose. Because she will take down these entire proceedings we will do things from time to time, or say things that may appear obvious to you, but we will have to say them so the record will reflect who is in and out of the courtroom, for example, and what

is going on.

I am going to do one of those things right now. One of the things that I have to do is confirm that both sides are ready to proceed to trial. So I am going to do that now. Counsel for the State, are you ready to proceed?

MR. TYSON: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Counsel for the defense, are you ready to proceed?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We are ready, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Now, as you all know from viewing the material down in the central jury room, the purpose of the jury selection is for us to try to select six jurors who can fairly and impartially try the issues in this case. Understand that we need to ask you questions in order to that. No one is going to ask you questions to try to embarrass you, or pry into your personal lives, or put you on the spot in any way. But we have to ask you questions so that an opinion can be developed as to your ability to be fair and impartial relative to the people seated around you.

Please understand, and you know this, life is a collection of experiences, how we view the world, how we make decisions, who we are is largely a product of

where we have been. Because of that no human is uniquely situated to be fair and impartial in every type of situation. There may be things in your background that would make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial in certain situations. That is why we have to ask you questions.

If you are not asked to sit on this jury no one has said anything bad about you. Your integrity has not been impugned in any way. Merely a decision has been made about you in a relatively short period of time, with a relatively small amount of information about your ability to be fair and impartial with the people seated around you.

The fact of the matter is, we might even be wrong. But that is what our effort is, is to try to give both sides a fair trial here today. That's all both sides are asking for here today. We need to try to select a jury that can give them that opportunity.

Now, what I am going to do, I want to go through is have you identify yourselves for us. We have questionnaires on you. We know who you are. We know some important things about you. It's important that we are able to put names with faces, and I do that for a lot of reasons. First of all, I'd like to try to identify the names and faces. Second of all, some of you have

difficult to pronounce names. So I view it as my job to mispronounce your name first to save the lawyers the embarrassment of having to do it. So bear with me as we sort of go forward and do this. What I am going to do is ask each of you to stand in place and briefly tell us your name. Tell us where you live in the county. We don't need to know your address, just generally what part of the county you live in. What you do for a living. If you are retired, what you used to do. What your significant other does, if that person is retired, what they used to do. If you have grown children, what they do.

The reason that we want to do that is to try to understand the expertise in your immediate circle, and these are the things that you might draw on in your decision making process, and it is helpful for us to know that.

I am going to go from my left to right, first row, second row, et cetera. So, Mr. Donald Fuller, that makes you first, sir, and I appreciate you doing that for me.

MR. FULLER: No problem. My name is Don Fuller. I live in Clearwater near Countryside Mall. I work for the State of Florida, Agency for Health Care Administration. My wife does accounting type work,

1	accounts payable, accounts receivable. No children.
2	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mary Maggard?
3	MS. MAGGARD: My name is Marianne Maggard.
4	I live in Seminole and I have been in the real estate
5	title business for a long time.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Kolba?
7	MS. KOLBA: Deborah Kolba. I live in
8	Clearwater. We have our own family business. My grown
9	child works in the family business and goes to school.
10	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Degenhart?
11	MR. DEGENHART: My name s James Degenhart.
12	I live in Clearwater. I do quality assurance for a
13	technology company. I have four children.
14	THE COURT: Do I know you, sir?
15	MR. DEGENHART: I don't believe so.
16	THE COURT: Ms. Santacroce?
17	MS. SANTACROCE: Yes, sir.
18	THE COURT: Not even close?
19	MS. SANTACROCE: Beautiful. Rose Marie
20	Santacroce, Palm Harbor. Retired school teacher and
21	educational service employee. My husband is deceased.
22	Grown children. Thank you.
23	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Robinson?
24	MS. ROBINSON: Katrina Robinson. I work
25	as a claim's administrator. I live here in Pinellas

1	County. My husband is a air conditioning technician, and
2	I have three step-sons and one son.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Lindstam?
4	MR. LINDSTAM: Scott Lindstam. I am a
5	service technician for Huffy Service First, a Division F
6	Huffy Corporation. My wife is a marketing manager for
7	AAA Auto Club South. I have three children, thirteen,
8	ten and two.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Sanchez?
10	MR. SANCHEZ: My name is Felix Sanchez. I
11	live in Oldsmar and I a barber.
12	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Ms. Baldwin?
13	MS. BALDWIN: My name is Paula Baldwin. I
14	live in Northeast (inaudible). My husband is retired.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Stewart?
16	MR. STEWART: My name is Aaron Stewart I
17	work at a restaurant as a waiter. I live in Palm Harbor.
18	No kids, no wife.
19	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Ms. Ortiz?
20	MS. ORTIZ: June Ortiz. I am a CNA. I
21	have three grown married children, one teenage son, and
22	six grandchildren.
23	MR. DENIS DEVLAMING: What city?
24	MS. ORTIZ: Clearwater.
25	THE COURT: Ms. Burke?

1	MS. BURKE: Stephanie Burke, I live in
2	Clearwater. I am not married. No children.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Pellegrino?
4	MS. PELLEGRINO: My name is Tina
5	Pellegrino. I live in Pinellas Park. I am a server at
6	IHOP, and a hairdresser. I am a single parent, and I
7	have a sixteen year old daughter.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Linde-Powers?
9	MS. LINDE-POWERS: I am Melissa Linde-
10	Powers. I work AECHON Equity Group in the law
11	department. I am a single parent with three children in
12	a daycare situation.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Mr.
14	Lovegrove?
15	MR. LOVEGROVE: My name is Don Lovegrove.
16	I live in Clearwater. I work at Clearwater Christian
17	College. I am an advisor there. My wife also works at
18	the college as a secretary. We have four children, all
19	grown.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr.
21	McAllister?
22	MR. MCALLISTER: My name is Michael
23	McAllister. I am a director of construction for a local
24	construction company. I have a wife, and two adult
25	children. My wife is a managing supervisor for an

1	insurance benefits organization.
2	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Joiner?
3	MR. JOINER: My name is Leroy Joiner. I
4	live in Clearwater. I work for Pinellas County. My wife
5	also works for Pinellas County. We have four grown
6	children.
7	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Barnum?
8	MR. BARNUM: My name is Gerald Barnum. I
9	live out in Feathersound. I am the owner of an air
10	conditioning wholesale company. My wife is a housewife.
11	My son works with me in the business. My daughter is a
12	student.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Baker?
14	MR. BAKER: George Baker. I work as an
15	electrician. My wife is retired. We have three grown
16	children.
17	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
18	MR. DENIS DEVLAMING: City please?
19	THE COURT: Where do you live, sir?
20	MR. BAKER: Seminole.
21	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Haley, Ms.
22	Haley, excuse me.
23	MS. HALEY: Sharon Haley. I live in
24	Clearwater. I am a technical support person for a
25	research company. (Inaudible.) No kids.

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Green?
2	MS. GREEN: My name is Joyce Green. I
3	live in St. Pete. No kids.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Grover?
5	MS. GROVER: Hi, my name is Josefine
6	Grover. I own and operate an auto repair shop with my
7	son, and have two daughters, which are both married. I
8	live in Largo.
9	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Donizetti?
10	MS. DONIZETTI: Maria Donizetti. I am
11	employee of Tech Ed. Corporation. At this time my
12	husband is unemployed. He is an entrepreneur. I have
13	three stepchildren, twenty-five, twenty-three, and
14	nineteen. I reside in Tarpon Springs.
15	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Palmieri?
16	MR. PALMIERI: My name is Peter Palmieri.
17	I reside in Largo. I retired from Breckman Aircraft. I
18	worked on a government contract for military engines. I
19	do volunteer work for Largo Police Department. I have
20	two grown children.
21	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Now that you
22	have had an opportunity to introduce yourselves I am
23	going to ask the parties to introduce themselves. I will
24	start with counsel for the State, if you would.

Thank you, Judge. My name is

MR. TYSON:

24

25

recognize each other.

I work for the State Attorney's Office. 1 Bill Tyson. 2 THE COURT: Counsel, for the Defendant 3 please introduce yourselves and your client. 4 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, my name is 5 Denis de Vlaming. This is Douglas de Vlaming, my 6 brother; and an associate in my law office, Kym 7 Rivellini. We are here with the Defendant, Robert 8 Minton, here to my left. 9 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the 10 panel, at this time we would like to try to understand 11 who might know each other in the courtroom. My first 12 question to you as a group is, do any of you know each 13 other? 14 (No response) 15 THE COURT: Are we all strangers back 16 there? There should be twenty-four of you, and everybody 17 is a total stranger? 18 (No response) 19 THE COURT: Okay. It's not bad that you 20 all would know each other. We would just need to know 21 that if you did. Okay. The next question is, do any of 22 you know any of us? And sometimes we don't need to

Yes, sir, Mr. Fuller?

MR. FULLER: I served on a jury before you

1 | about a year ago.

THE COURT: Okay, you know me because you were a juror before, is that right?

MR. FULLER: Correct.

THE COURT: Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.

MS. BURKE: I had a client here. You were

filling in for Judge Ramsberger. I had a client here.

THE COURT: So you know me again in a professional capacity?

MS. BURKE: Yes.

THE COURT: Any one else?

(No response)

THE COURT: Okay, so we are all strangers here, and that is perfectly fine. What I want to do is try to understand a little bit about you and I am going to ask some general questions of the group. I am going to ask you to raise your hands in you have information to give me in response to my questions. You will get the hang of this as we go along. Some of my questions might involve a lot of hands coming up, so bear with me. I will go through the first row, then the second row, then the third row, and I will start from my left or right. So if you initially raise your hand you might want to just put it down until I start getting close to you and then you raise it again. Okay, so you will get the hang

of this as we go along.

What I want to try to understand first, how many of you have ever been on a jury before? Okay, a lot of hands. Mr. Fuller, I know about you. So I am not going to ask you any questions about it. Ms. Maggard, yes, ma'am. Was it a criminal or civil jury that you were on?

MS. MAGGARD: It was petty theft.

THE COURT: Was it here in this

jurisdiction?

MS. MAGGARD: Yes.

THE COURT: Was it in this courthouse?

MS. MAGGARD: Yes.

THE COURT: And how long ago would it be?

MS. MAGGARD: Quite a while ago.

THE COURT: Anything about that you think might make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial here today?

MS. MAGGARD: No, I don't think so.

THE COURT: I just thought I would ask. I wasn't there, and I don't know. And you all are going to have to bear with me a little bit because that is the question of the morning. And you are going to hear this over and over again. Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial

1	here today? That's really what we need to know. So I
2	will probably follow almost every question up that I ask
3	with that question, and when I am through beating that to
4	death the lawyers will probably do something similar.
5	But that is what we need to know.
6	Is there anybody else in the first row
7	with hands that I need to identify?
8	(No response)
9	THE COURT: Nobody else has been on a jury
10	in the first row. Second row? Yes, Ms. Baldwin, tell
11	me, was it civil or criminal?
12	MS. BALDWIN: Criminal.
13	THE COURT: Was it here?
14	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Was it recently?
16	MS. BALDWIN: A while ago.
17	THE COURT: What kind of case was it, do
18	you remember?
19	MS. BALDWIN: (Inaudible)
20	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
21	that would make it difficult for you to fair and
22	impartial here today?
23	MS. BALDWIN: No.
24	THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else?
25	Yes, ma'am, that is Ms. Ortiz.

1	MS. ORTIZ: Criminal, it was about two
2	years ago.
3	THE COURT: What kind of charge was it?
4	MS. ORTIZ: Criminal.
5	THE COURT: And you don't remember the
6	specific charge?
7	MS. ORTIZ: No.
8	THE COURT: That's okay. That's fine.
9	Anything about that experience that would make it
10	difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?
11	MS. ORTIZ: No.
12	THE COURT: Anybody else in the second
13	row? Ma'am, I missed you in the first row. Ms.
14	Santacroce, yes, tell me about your experience.
15	MS. SANTACROCE: It was in New Jersey
16	quite a while ago.
17	THE COURT: Anything about your previous
18	New Jersey experience that would make it difficult for
19	you to fair and impartial here today?
20	MS. SANTACROCE: No, sir.
21	THE COURT: Thank you. And that was a
22	criminal case?
23	MS. SANTACROCE: Civil.
24	THE COURT: It was civil. Thank you. I
25	appreciate that. I have found my first civil juror. Do

you understand that the burden of proof in a civil trial is different than it is in a criminal trial? In a civil trial the Plaintiff must prove their case a preponderance of the evidence. In a criminal trial the State must prove their beyond and to the exclusion of every reasonable doubt. Do you understand that there is a difference there?

MS. SANTACROCE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, because you have civil experience will you be able to set that civil experience aside and listen to the criminal instructions that you will hear at the end of this case?

MS. SANTACROCE: I believe so.

THE COURT: I think I got everybody in the first row. I am jumping back to the second row. And then, Mr. Lovegrove, are you next?

MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes. I was in a criminal case in Escambia County.

THE COURT: How long ago was that.

MR. LOVEGROVE: About twelve years ago

probably.

THE COURT: Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MR. LOVEGROVE: (Shaking head)

1	THE COURT: And you shook your head, you
2	did what we all do a lot, but this lady can't take down
3	shakes of the head.
4	MR. LOVEGROVE: No.
5	THE COURT: Thank you, sir, I appreciate
6	using you as an example here for all of us. Anybody else
7	in the second row. Yes, sir, Mr. McAllister?
8	MR. MCALLISTER: Yes, it was a criminal
9	case. It was a burglary.
10	THE COURT: Here in this county?
11	MR. MCALLISTER: Yes, it was.
12	THE COURT: How long ago, sir?
13	MR. MCALLISTER: About twenty years ago.
14	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
15	that would make it difficult for you to fair and
16	impartial here today?
17	MR. MCALLISTER: No.
18	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Third row.
19	Anybody? Mr. Joiner, yes, sir, tell me about your
20	experience.
21	MR. JOINER: It was a homicide case.
22	THE COURT: Was it in this county?
23	MR. JOINER: It in Clearwater about
24	seventeen years ago.
25	THE COURT: Seventeen years ago. Anything

1	about that experience that would make it difficult for
2	you to fair and impartial here today?
3	MR. JOINER: No.
4	THE COURT: Okay, thank you, sir. Mr.
5	Barnum, did I see your hand?
6	MR. BARNUM: No.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Baker? I thought I saw
8	another hand in that area. Mr. Baker?
9	MR. BAKER: I believe mine was civil. It
10	was a condemnation case down in St. Pete.
11	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
12	that would make it difficult for you to fair and
13	impartial here today?
14	MR. BAKER: No.
15	THE COURT: And you heard my discussion
16	with Ms. Santacroce about the difference between a
17	criminal burden of proof and a civil burden of proof,
18	didn't you?
19	MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.
20	THE COURT: Did you understand what I was
21	trying to explain to her?
22	MR. BAKER: Yes, sir.
23	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Anybody else
24	in the third row? Yes, sir, Mr. Palmieri?
25	MR. PALMIERI: Yes, about twenty/thirty

1 years ago in Connecticut, civil.

THE COURT: Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MR. PALMIERI: No.

is similar but not exactly the same. I asked you about your prior jury experience. My next question is, have any of you ever been involved in a judicial proceeding of any type, in any capacity, whether it is a witness, a party, whether it is a traffic matter, a military matter, a domestic matter, a civil matter, criminal matter? I just want to know those among you have had any exposure to this process at all in any way, shape or form. I am going to go through the same process, first row first.

Ms. Maggard, yes, ma'am?

MS. MAGGARD: I was involved in a case where I was defrauded of a considerable sum of money.

THE COURT: So you were the victim?

MS. MAGGARD: Yes.

THE COURT: Was that a civil case or a

22 | criminal case?

MS. MAGGARD: I'm not sure that I understand the difference.

THE COURT: A civil case is usually an

action between private individuals and the result that is sought is money. A criminal case that is brought by the State to enforce criminal laws of the given jurisdiction.

MS. MAGGARD: It was civil then.

THE COURT: It was which one?

MS. MAGGARD: Civil.

THE COURT: Civil, okay. Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MS. MAGGARD: Other than it was a horrible experience.

THE COURT: Okay, but are you going to hold that against either the parties here today?

MS. MAGGARD: No.

THE COURT: I'm sorry that I have to ask these questions, but I do. Thank you, ma'am. Anybody else in the first row have an experience we need to know about?

## (No response)

THE COURT: Nobody else in the first row has ever been involved, even gotten a speeding ticket and went down to court to challenge it? Yes, ma'am, you are Ms. Robinson?

MS. ROBINSON: It was a criminal case, I was the Plaintiff, and I don't wish to discuss the

details.

THE COURT: That's fine. It was a criminal case, and you said that you were the Plaintiff, which maybe means that you were a victim?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MS. ROBINSON: I don't think so.

THE COURT: Thank you. Okay, everybody in the first row I got. I'm sorry, Mr. Lindstam?

MR. LINDSTAM: I don't know if this relates, but it was a very nasty divorce and there were a lot of accusations.

THE COURT: That's kind of what we are talking about. Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MR. LINDSTAM: No.

THE COURT: Thank you. And, Mr. Fuller, that brought a memory or something?

MR. FULLER: Yeah, a long time ago I was called as a witness, it actually didn't go to court, but I had to go before the State Attorney and give a deposition on a case up in Illinois.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that
2	experience that would make it difficult for you to fair
3	and impartial here today?
4	MR. FULLER: No.
5	THE COURT: Okay, thank you, sir. Second
6	row. I will start with Mr. Stewart, I think you are
7	first.
8	MR. STEWART: I was pulled over and
9	harassed by a cop. He gave me a paraphernalia charge. I
10	had to go to court, at that time it was thrown out.
11	THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that
12	experience that would make it difficult for you to fair
13	and impartial here today?
14	MR. STEWART: No.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Ortiz?
16	MS. ORTIZ: Criminal case against a member
17	of my family.
18	THE COURT: Were you a witness in that
19	criminal case?
20	MS. ORTIZ: (Shaking head)
21	THE COURT: You were just aware of it, it
22	was in your immediate family circle, so you had knowledge
23	of it, right?
24	MS. ORTIZ: (Nodding head)
25	THE COURT: Ma'am, you have got to speak

1	for this young lady. You are nodding, and we all do
2	that, but I have to remind you.
3	MS. ORTIZ: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
5	that would make it difficult for you to fair and
6	impartial here today?
7	MS. ORTIZ: No.
8	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Burke?
9	MS. BURKE: I had a speeding ticket that I
10	took to court in Hillsborough County.
11	THE COURT: Anything about that experience
12	that would make it difficult for you to fair and
13	impartial here today?
14	MS. BURKE: No.
15	THE COURT: So you think that you can put
16	that aside, and it's not going to be a problem?
17	MS. BURKE: No.
18	THE COURT: Sometimes these little matters
19	have a tendency to incur our ire more than bigger
20	matters, and that's why we ask about things like traffic
21	matters. Anybody else on this side of the room?
22	Yes, ma'am, Ms. Pellegrino?
23	MS. PELLEGRINO: Just traffic court.
24	THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that
25	experience that would make it difficult for you to fair

1	and impartial here today?
2	MS. PELLEGRINO: No.
3	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Linde-Powers?
4	MS. LINDE-POWERS: A civil matter down in
5	St. Pete, also a divorce.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that
7	experience that would make it difficult for you to fair
8	and impartial here today?
9	MS. LINDE-POWERS: No.
10	THE COURT: Okay, same question, you are
11	okay with both of those things, they are not going to get
12	in your way of your ability to just listen to the
13	evidence and make the decision today?
14	MS. LINDE-POWERS: I don't think so.
15	THE COURT: Anybody else? Did I get
16	everybody else? Mr. McAllister?
17	MR. MCALLISTER: Yes, it is a criminal
18	case, and it is still ongoing.
19	THE COURT: Are you a witness?
20	MR. MCALLISTER: No, I am not a witness.
21	It deals with a family member, and yes, it is bothering
22	me.
23	THE COURT: So it is a family member and
24	you are not a witness, and you are not a party, but it's
25	inside your immediate family circle, and you are

1	disturbed by it?
2	MR. MCALLISTER: Yes, I am.
3	THE COURT: Are you disturbed to the point
4	where you could not give both sides a fair and impartial
5	trial?
6	MR. MCALLISTER: That's correct, I surely
7	am.
8	THE COURT: I appreciate knowing that.
9	I'm sorry that you are going through that, but I
10	appreciate you sharing that with us because we need to
11	know these things.
12	Last row, anybody have something that they
13	need to tell me about? Yes, Mr. Baker?
14	MR. BAKER: I was in the military police
15	in the service. There were several uncomfortable
16	situations.
17	THE COURT: So, these are previous
18	experiences that you have had. I guess the guestion is.

experiences that you have had. I guess the question is, are any of these experiences going to make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial here today?

MR. BAKER: Some of these experiences bother me, and they tend to stay with me.

THE COURT: So you are concerned about

THE COURT: So you are concerned about them, is that right?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't mean to probe, and I'm not trying to do that, but I need to get the \$64,000 question answered, and that is, whether these things are going to be impacting on your ability to sit here and listen to the evidence, and give both sides a fair trial this morning?

MR. BAKER: It's a possibility.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. That's probably the best answer that you can give me, and I appreciate that. Anybody else in the back row that I need to -- yes, sir, Mr. Palmieri, tell me about experience?

MR. PALMIERI: Divorce and a motorcycle accident. A woman pulled out in front of me, and I had nowhere to go. I was injured and that went to court. A parking citation that my partner had issued and the person brought it to court and I was there as a witness.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything about any of those experiences that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MR. PALMIERI: No.

THE COURT: Did I get everyone? I didn't get everybody.

MS. LINDE-POWERS: Right now I am involved in a lawsuit regarding a car accident.

25

1	THE COURT: Okay. Is that going to be a
2	problem for you to be fair and impartial here today?
3	MS. LINDE-POWERS: It could possibly be,
4	yes, sir.
5	THE COURT: And that is a civil matter,
6	though, isn't it?
7	MS. LINDE-POWERS: Well, right now it is
8	in mediation it was in mediation. It is scheduled to
9	go to trial.
10	THE COURT: It is weighing on your mind
11	though, and you are not sure that you can listen to the
12	evidence and give both sides a fair trial, is that what I
13	am hearing?
14	MS. LINDE-POWERS: Quite possibly, yes,
15	sir.
16	THE COURT: Okay, did I get everybody?
17	Next question. Anybody here have anybody with a close
18	friend, or in their close family circle who make their
19	living in the judicial system? I am going to expansively
20	include in that police officers, sheriff's deputies,
21	lawyers, court clerks, judges, things of that nature. Do
22	you understand my question? I just need to go through
23	this process and identify you all and these

I have an uncle who is a

MR. FULLER:

relationships. Mr. Fuller?

1 | sheriff up in Iowa.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Anything about that experience that would make it difficult for you to fair and impartial here today?

MR. FULLER: No.

THE COURT: The thing that we worry about in these situations, there is somebody in your close circle of friends, and you get asked to sit on this jury, when you are thinking about this case things start creeping into your mind and say, Boy, I better make the right decision because when I see so and so, my close friend, or my brother, or my father-in-law, who is a sheriff's deputy, judge, or the lawyer I don't want them to say boy, you did something stupid here. Do you understand my point? I don't want anybody sitting here and have somebody outside this courtroom who is going impact on this decision. We worry about relationships like this that could be so close, and so strong that you would feel that you would be searching your mind to make sure that you did what they thought you should do. don't want that to occur. So that is why we ask these questions. All right. Anybody else in the first row? Yes, Ms. Maggard?

MS. MAGGARD: I work with a lot of attorneys in my dealings with real estate title. I also

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have several clients in the Pinellas County Sheriff's
Department.

THE COURT: Anything about those relationships that would be so strong that we should be concerned about what I just explained?

MS. MAGGARD: I don't think it would. I am honestly not sure.

THE COURT: Okay, as we go along we are going to ask a lot of questions. And some of you may have answers like this from time to time. We certainly understand that. Sometimes you have got to search your mind a little bit. I understand that. When, Ms. Maggard, in your case in particular and others of you in general, if you have a situation like this I only ask that you consider it while we are asking questions. And don't rely on us to come back to you. If you get to a point in this question and answer process where all of the sudden it becomes real clear in your mind, you have had a change to think about it, and you can now clearly take a position on it, would you just raise your hand and say, "You know, I have thought about that question that you asked me and this is really how it is." Okay?

And for those of you that have these soul searching kind of responses please do that for us. There is a lot of you, and we would not want to inadvertently

1	not get back to you and give you a chance to really take
2	a firm position. Okay?
3	MS. MAGGARD: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Anybody else in the first row?
5	Yes, ma'am, Ms. Kolba?
6	MS. KOLBA: I have a distant family member
7	who is detective in Clearwater, and also a close friend
8	who is police officer in Clearwater.
9	THE COURT: Anything about those
10	relationship that is going to be difficult in the areas
11	that I have described?
12	MS. KOLBA: I don't believe so.
13	THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Anybody
14	else? Yes, ma'am, Ms. Robinson?
15	MS. ROBINSON: My father-in-law is a
16	retired police officer and my sister-in-law is an active
17	police officer, and I don't think that it will have any
18	bearing.
19	THE COURT: Any of them agencies in this
20	county?
21	MS. ROBINSON: My father-in-law retired
22	from the St. Petersburg Police Department several years
23	ago.
24	THE COURT: And you don't think it will
25	have anything to do with your ability to be fair and

1	impartial, is that correct?
2	MS. ROBINSON: No.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else in the
4	first row? Did I get everyone? Second row, does anybody
5	have something that they need to tell me? Yes, ma'am,
6	Ms. Ortiz?
7	MS. ORTIZ: My brother is retired from the
8	Sheriff's Department in Pasco County.
9	THE COURT: Which county?
10	MS. ORTIZ: Pasco.
11	THE COURT: Pasco. Anything about that
12	will make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial?
13	MS. ORTIZ: (Shaking head)
14	THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else
15	second row? Yes, sir, Mr. Lovegrove?
16	MR. LOVEGROVE: I have a son who is
17	employed by Escambia County Sheriff's Department. He is
18	a corrections officer.
19	THE COURT: Anything about that is going
20	to make it difficult for you to be fair and impartial?
21	MR. LOVEGROVE: No.
22	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Did I get
23	everybody in the second row? Third row, please. Does
24	anybody have any of these relationships that we need to
25	discuss? I don't see any hands on this side of the room,

and I think the first hand that I see is Ms. Donizetti?
Yes, ma'am?

MS. DONIZETTI: I have a good friend who is a bailiff in Pinellas County in civil court.

THE COURT: In civil court, okay.

Anything about that relationship that is going to make it difficult to be fair and impartial?

MS. DONIZETTI: I do not believe so.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Palmieri?

MR. PALMIERI: I have a cousin who is an attorney in Connecticut, and two nephews who are police officers in Connecticut.

THE COURT: Any problems in this area?

MR. PALMIERI: No.

everybody? Okay. Other questions that I am now going to shift to are really designed to give you some information that you need to help you understand this process a little bit. What I would like to do, you will get the hang of this as we go along. It would be helpful -- or it is important that you give me an audible response as a group. And you will see how this works as we go forward. Okay.

Okay, Do each of you understand that the defendant in every criminal case is presumed to be

innocent unless, and until the State proves each material allegation of the charge, and that guilt is established the evidence to the exclusion of and beyond every reasonable doubt? Do all of you understand that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you understand that the Defendant's presumption of innocence stays with the Defendant throughout all stages of the trial until this burden has been met? Do you understand that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you are chosen as members of this jury you will be the sole judges of the weight, and sufficiency of the evidence, and the credibility of the witnesses? Do you understand that that is the juries functions?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: You are the sole judges of the weight and sufficiency of the evidence, and the credibility of the witnesses? Everybody understands that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you understand that in determining the believability, and the credibility of the witnesses you may properly consider the demeanor of the witnesses, the frankness of the witness, the intelligence

of the witness, any interest that the witness may have in the outcome of the case, the means and opportunity of the witness to know the matters about which they are testifying, the ability of the witness to remember about which they are testifying, and the reasonableness of the testimony considered in light of all the other evidence in the case. Do you understand that these are some things that you should consider in performing your function?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you are chosen members of this jury you must disregard the consequences of any verdict that you may render? Do you understand that the consequences are not the province of the jury? That is what the Court does. Does everybody understand that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you also understand that you must lay aside any personal of sympathy, bias, or prejudice and that those things play no role in an American court? Do you understand that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: You lay aside all feelings and sympathy, bias, or prejudice, they play no role in this process. Everybody understands that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you understand that at no time in the United States of America is a defendant in a criminal case required to prove his or her innocence, or to furnish any evidence whatsoever, and that this right is guaranteed to everyone under our constitution? Does everybody understand that?

(Jury panel responded yes.)

THE COURT: Do you promise that if you are chosen as members of this jury you will follow the instructions on the law that the Court gives you at the end of the trial, and that you will follow and apply this law, even if you don't like the law, even if you don't agree with the law? The Court tells you that that is the law applies to this case that you will follow it. Will anyone have any difficulty in doing that?

(Jury panel responded no.)

THE COURT: Everybody understand that law is not made in the judicial branch of government, it is made in the legislative branch of government. What we do here is interpret and apply the law, and if we tell you that is what the law is, you must use the law. Is anyone going to have a problem with that.

(Jury panel responded no.)

THE COURT: Let's cover now our schedules,

because there are some things that we need to understand here. Counsel, is it fair to tell this panel that this case will not be concluded today?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes.

THE COURT: Everybody agrees with that.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, Judge, and I think Mr. Tyson might agree it might be wise for the Court to inquire, it might even spill into Wednesday.

need to understand your schedules and the impact that this trial could have on it. You just heard that we expect that it is possible that this could be a three day trial. Is anybody going to have a problem with that?

Let's identify those of you now, and let's go through them. I am going to have it discuss it with you, so bear with me with your hands.

Mr. Fuller, as always you are first, sir. Tell me what your problem is.

MR. FULLER: In my position at work I have three days a month in which a report has be generated for Tallahassee, and that starts tomorrow and it has to be completed by Thursday.

THE COURT: And there is no one who could cover you and do that?

MR. FULLER: No. I am the only one who has

them?

1	the security to do that.
2	THE COURT: No way that could be
3	postponed?
4	MR. FULLER: No.
5	THE COURT: It has absolutely got to be
6	done tomorrow, and you are the only person that can do
7	it?
8	MR. FULLER: It has to be finished by
9	Thursday and I am the only one there who has the security
10	clearance to do that report.
11	THE COURT: And you couldn't do it on
12	Thursday? I don't mean to pressure you, but I have got
13	to ask these questions.
14	MR. FULLER: Not in one day, no. If I was
15	on the jury I would have to work at night to finish it.
16	That would be a problem.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Who was the next hand?
18	Mr. Degenhart?
19	MR. DEGENHART: My wife and children were
20	involved in an accident on Friday where they had to Bay-
21	flighted out and they are basically they got released
22	and they are home now, but they are pretty much
23	bedridden.
24	THE COURT: So they need you to care for

1	MR. DEGENHART: Pretty much.
2	THE COURT: Who is there now?
3	MR. DEGENHART: One of my friends is there
4	now until I get back. They had to take off work to get
5	there.
6	THE COURT: And that couldn't continue
7	three days?
8	MR. DEGENHART: No, definitely not.
9	THE COURT: All right. Did I skip
10	anybody? I thought I saw a hand. Yes, Ms. Maggard?
11	MS. MAGGARD: I am in the process of
12	closing down a business and right now I am the only one
13	there. It would be difficult, not impossible. But it
14	would be difficult to be away three days.
15	THE COURT: And you are closing a
16	business? Is the business not open right now?
17	MS. MAGGARD: In my business you don't
18	just stop. It takes months to close it down. And I am
19	in the process of that.
20	THE COURT: And three days would just be a
21	real undue hardship, is that what I am understanding?
22	MS. MAGGARD: It would difficult, not
23	impossible.
24	THE COURT: I appreciate your candor.
25	Thank you very much. Anybody else in the front row? Ms.

1	Santacroce, tell me what you are worried about?
2	MS. SANTACROCE: My things are medical.
3	THE COURT: So for medical reasons being
4	here three days is a bad thing for you?
5	MS. SANTACROCE: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Is it a serious thing?
7	MS. SANTACROCE: I wont' know until the
8	tests.
9	THE COURT: I see, you have tests that you
10	are waiting to hear about?
11	MS. SANTACROCE: No, I am having the tests
12	Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and the results of that
13	depends on surgery scheduled on the 31st.
14	THE COURT: I see, thank you. Who else?
15	Ms. Robinson?
16	MS. ROBINSON: I work for a small
17	entrepreneurial company. I am the only one that does my
18	specific job. And it would be a major hinder to business
19	for me to be out for three days. One day they can work
20	around.
21	THE COURT: Three days is going to be a
22	hardship in the people that you work for?
23	MS. ROBINSON: Yes, it's going to be a
24	hardship on my company.
25	THE COUDT. Okay Who also? Mr Tindstam?

1	MR. LINDSTAM: Financial-wise I have three
2	children to support. The job that I am in is paid piece
3	work, that would be three days that I would be out of
4	work without pay.
5	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Anybody else
6	in the first row? Second row? Ms. Ortiz?
7	MS. ORTIZ: I work for hospice and I do
8	long-term care. People who I take care of are at the end
9	stages and they would have a very difficult time to find
10	anyone to replace me.
11	THE COURT: Three days is too much?
12	MS. ORTIZ: It's difficult for them. They
13	get very upset. They are in the end stages, and it is
14	difficult for them if someone else has to come in.
15	THE COURT: Okay, thank you. Who else?
16	Ms. Pellegrino?
17	MS. PELLEGRINO: I am a single parent. I
18	need to get my daughter to school and work.
19	THE COURT: And you can't be covered at
20	work?
21	MS. PELLEGRINO: Not my work, her work.
22	THE COURT: So when do you pick her up and
23	take her?
24	MS. PELLEGRINO: I take her to school in
25	the morning, she goes to school in Largo.

1	THE COURT: What time is that though?
2	What time of day are we talking about?
3	MS. PELLEGRINO: 7:00.
4	THE COURT: So that doesn't sound like it
5	would be a problem at that end. It must be the other end
6	that is the problem.
7	MS. PELLEGRINO: I pick her up at 12:30
8	and I take her to work, and then I pick her up at night
9	after work.
10	THE COURT: There is no one else that can
11	do that?
12	MS. PELLEGRINO: I have no family here.
13	THE COURT: How old is your daughter?
14	MS. PELLEGRINO: Sixteen.
15	THE COURT: She does not drive herself?
16	MS. PELLEGRINO: No.
17	THE COURT: Anybody else? Ms. Linde-
18	Powers?
19	MS. LINDE-POWERS: I am also a single
20	parent. My children I don't know if it will have any
21	bearing on the court, my children have to be picked up at
22	6:00 at night. I am the only one, I have no family here.
23	Also, I have two herniated discs which makes sitting very
24	difficult, I have a doctor's note that says that I cannot

sit for any length of time over thirty minutes.

THE COURT: At any time that you want to stand, please do that, you are not going to upset anybody here. I don't want you be in any discomfort. I wish you had told me that right away. You have been sitting longer than thirty minutes.

MS. LINDE-POWERS: Yeah, I know.

THE COURT: You can stand right now if you want to. Thank you. And you can stay standing as long as you would like. Please don't feel the need to sit down if your comfort level is enhanced by that.

Anybody else in the second row? Mr.

McAllister?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCALLISTER: Yes, sir. It would impact on my responsibility as the director of construction for our company. One of my duties is, I am charged with the responsibility for out of town work. have a number of projects that are out of town, and they are not receiving my attention as I sit here today. And then for the next two or three days would be an even greater burden. I don't have anybody that is able to take over my position at the moment. The only other people that would be available would the president and vice-president of the company, and each of those individuals have tasks that involve the operations in their side of the house. So based on that I feel that

that is a burden on me right now.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Sheriff, we have a padded chair for Ms. Linde-Powers. We can pull that up next to Ms. Pellegrino, and I know she would be more comfortable in it. So why don't we do that.

MS. LINDE-POWERS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Third row please. Those of you who have problems with being here for three days.

Anybody in the third row please? No hands in the third row. Yes?

MS. DONIZETTI: I would just like to get approval of my employer, I think it would be okay.

THE COURT: So, you think it would okay, but you just need to clear it?

MS. DONIZETTI: I think it would be okay,
I just want to make sure.

THE COURT: So you need to make a phone call. All right, did I get everybody? Thank you. You heard it will be three days. Sometimes we go into the evening, it's difficult to anticipate how late we would go. A trial like this I would try to break it around the 6:00 hour, but we like to break logically. As evidence is being presented sometime we might run beyond that. But I would try not to let it be egregiously beyond that. Is there anyone who would have difficulty with that who

1	has not already said they can't be here for the three
2	days? And you are Ms. Green?
3	MS. GREEN: Are you saying that the trial
4	would go on after 6:00?
5	THE COURT: It is possible that it might,
6	but it's not my intention to let it go well beyond 6:00.
7	Just once in a while it may be the wrong time to break
8	because we are in the middle of something that should
9	finish before we break. Okay. Is 6:00 a concern for
10	you?
11	MS. GREEN: Yes, because I catch the bus
12	out here.
13	THE COURT: When is the last bus, do you
14	know?
15	MS. GREEN: I think about 5:00 or 6:00.
16	THE COURT: Does anybody know? Nobody
17	knows.
18	THE SHERIFF: We have the schedule
19	downstairs.
20	THE COURT: We will figure that out,
21	ma'am. I appreciate you telling me that. Anybody else
22	that we need to hear from on these issues? Ms. Linde-
23	Powers brought a very good point. We brought you down
24	here, we are going to ask you to sit here for three days.
25	I sure hate to do that and torture somebody

unintentionally because they had some physical thing that if I had known about I could have accommodated. Is there anybody here who has anything like that makes it difficult to sit in these hard benches, you don't hear well, you don't see well? Do you have something about you that if I knew I could be sensitive to and make it easier for you to be here? Does anybody have anything like that?

I asked that question once of a panel and we tried the case well into the night, about 9:00 at night two jurors let me know then that they were diabetic and because they hadn't eaten that this was a problem. I said, I asked you these questions, tell me these things. I don't want anybody to be in that situation. Yes, sir, Mr. Baker?

MR. BAKER: I am a diabetic.

THE COURT: So you just need to eat in regular intervals? Is that right.

MR. BAKER: It is at the point now where they are controlling it with a special diet at home that I take and three prescriptions that I do take. I have to monitor my blood sugar three or four times a week. From what the doctor tells me it is kind of important that I eat about the same time everyday, not to vary too much from it.

THE COURT: Okay. I am glad to know these things. I appreciate you telling me. Anybody else?
Yes, ma'am? Well, you have kind of told us, right?
Unless you want to add to that, but you don't necessarily have to. You have explained to me that you have some health concerns. Is that right?

MS. SANTACROCE: And I tried to express them prior to coming here.

THE COURT: You raised these before in hopes that you wouldn't have to come, and then it didn't work out, is that right?

MS. SANTACROCE: Yes.

THE COURT: I appreciate it, ladies and gentlemen. I just ask counsel to approach the bench briefly. I don't need the court reporter at this time.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held out of the hearing of the jury panel that was not reported at this time.)

THE COURT: What I want to do is read a list of potential witnesses. I don't know if some or all of these people are going to testify, but this is a list of people who could. I read this because if you know any of these people we need to know that. So, please listen carefully.

I am going to butcher these names too, so

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Officer Mark Beaudette, Clearwater Police. Officer Ron
Heck, Clearwater Police. Officer James Moore, Clearwater
Police. Officer Michael Stewart, Clearwater Police.
Richard Howd. Stacy Brooks. Jessica Burns. Philip
Dellar. Ken Kramer. Jesse Prince. Frank Oliver. John
Lenz. Ray Emmons. Does anyone know any of these people?

(Jury panel responded no.)

THE COURT: What I would like to do is give you all a momentary opportunity to stretch your legs, go to the restroom, get a drink of water. But I am going to ask the Deputy Sheriff make sure that there is no one else out there so that you might accidently bump into a witness, and have an improper conversation. If there are witnesses in the area I need them to go into the witness rooms so that members of the panel can do this very briefly. This is going to take about ten minutes. It will give you chance to stretch a little bit before we proceed to the next process. Are we all clear? All of the witnesses are in a room somewhere? Okay. The only people that are going to leave the courtroom are members of the panel. Everyone else is here who is not on this panel will remain here with us, so we don't have any intermingling of the panel with anybody else. Okay. Thank you. You are excused for about ten minutes.

1	Please stay close by because we will need you right back.
2	(Jury panel was excused for a brief break)
3	THE SHERIFF: The panel is out of hearing
4	of the Court, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Thank you, Sheriff. Counsel,
6	ordinarily what I would do is turn it over to the State
7	to ask their questions and then Defense could do it. Is
8	there any reason any of you would like to discuss cause
9	challenges now though, and if not we will proceed to the
10	next stage.
11	MR. TYSON: If you would like we can do it
12	now. If you want to use the time.
13	THE COURT: Do you want to do them now?
14	MR TYSON: We can do some of them if you
15	like, Judge. It would seem to me that there are some
16	clear, and we agree there is no sense in keeping them
17	here, and belaboring the point.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's a good idea.
19	Let's use the time.
20	THE COURT: If the other side wants to go
21	first, if you heard somebody?
22	MR. TYSON: Judge, I wrote down what they
23	said. I guess it's up to you to make a decision.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We might be in
25	agreement, go ahead.

1	MR. TYSON: Number one, the first guy, a
2	problem with his work, Mr. Fuller.
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: He has got a
4	problem, does he? I say cause him.
5	THE COURT: Everybody agrees, Mr. Fuller
6	is stricken for cause. What I will do, and again, let's
7	talk about how we handle this, when they come back my
8	intention is to announce that to them right now, and let
9	them ago, unless you all would like me not to do that.
10	MR. TYSON: No use wasting their time,
11	Judge.
12	THE COURT: That's what I am thinking.
13	MR. TYSON: Judge, I believe Ms. Maggard,
14	I'm not sure how you pronounce her name, closing down her
15	business. She is the only one there. It's extremely
16	difficult, but not impossible.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Cause, good, I mean
18	if we are in agreement about there is no sense in us
19	arguing.
20	MR. TYSON: Yeah.
21	THE COURT: Agreed, if everybody agrees no
22	point in beating it to death. She had two good reasons
23	and that was one of them.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes.
25	THE COURT: What else?

1	MR. TYSON: Judge, I believe the gentleman
2	number four was saying that his wife and children were
3	Bay-flighted Friday.
4	THE COURT: Mr. de Vlaming, do you agree?
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I agree, cause.
6	THE COURT: Number four is gone for cause.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Santacroce,
8	Judge.
9	THE COURT: She has tried repeatedly to
10	get out of it.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Well, not only
12	that, I think she should get out.
13	MR. TYSON: I agree.
14	THE COURT: I agree. Everybody agrees,
15	Ms. Santacroce is gone, number five. Who is next?
16	MR. TYSON: Ms. Robinson is saying that
17	there is a hindrance to her business. It is a small
18	company. I am not sure where we will go on that one.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you have a
20	problem with excusing her?
21	MR. TYSON: I am not sure we are going to
22	get a panel, that's my problem.
23	THE COURT: Does everybody agree, is she
24	gone or not?
25	MR. TYSON: Judge, can we hold off on that

1	one at this point in time?
2	THE COURT: That's fine. Who is next?
3	MR. TYSON: Mr. Lindstam says it is a
4	financial burden. I'm not sure that rises to the level
5	of cause.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: It probably
7	doesn't. We might hold a little bit on him. We will see
8	how he exercise preempts, and if it is we might be able
9	to let him go.
10	THE COURT: Okay, who is next?
11	MR. TYSON: Ms. Ortiz, long term hospice
12	care with patients during the last stages of death. I
13	don't have a problem with releasing her either.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I don't either.
15	THE COURT: She is gone. Who is next?
16	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Pellegrino I have
17	next.
18	MR. TYSON: I say hold on to her. Her
19	daughter is sixteen, Judge.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Single parent,
21	nobody else in the state of Florida and I don't think
22	that we can accommodate that type of scheduling without a
23	tremendous interruption.
24	MR. TYSON: She is sixteen, can we hold
25	off on that, Judge?

23

24

25

Τ.	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Un.
2	THE COURT: That's fine. Let's hold off
3	on that one. Who is next?
4	MR. TYSON: Ms. Linde-Powers, the one that
5	has the special chair. She can't sit for thirty minutes.
6	I'm not sure she is going to be pay attention to this
7	trial, Judge. If she is standing up that will be a
8	problem, Judge.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: She also has minor
10	children, no husband, or no family in the area. I wrote
11	that down.
12	THE COURT: She has health problems, she
13	has got work problems, she has got child problems. Any
14	reason that we want to keep her?
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No, cause.
16	THE COURT: Okay, she is gone. Who is
17	next?
18	MR. TYSON: Judge, Mr. McAllister. I had
19	a problem with him says that he can't be fair and
20	impartial in this case. Maybe we need to talk to him at
21	the bench and discuss what that is about. I didn't catch
22	everything he was saying.

appeared that he is concerned that other people would

have to do what he would do if he were there, and they

THE COURT: He had a work problem, and it

1	already had full plates. He did indicate that he had a
2	family member that was involved with the criminal justice
3	process in some way and we was clearly upset about it and
4	said that he couldn't be fair. I wrote down, "can't be
5	fair."
6	MR. TYSON: I say we cause him also.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I agree.
8	THE COURT: I agree. Number sixteen, he
9	is gone also. Who else?
10	MR. TYSON: Number twenty-three, she says
11	if okay with employer, we can keep her, too.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I had marked
13	nineteen. Let's see.
14	MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Military
15	policeman he had some problems
16	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yeah, being fair
17	and impartial, that's what I had written down.
18	MR. TYSON: Judge, I would like to bring
19	him to the bench and ask what those are before we release
20	him.
21	THE COURT: That's fine.
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's fair.
23	THE COURT: He said that he has some
24	health concerns as well. That's fine, we can talk him to
25	fumbbon the along

MR. TYSON: That's all I have.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's all I have.

THE COURT: What I propose to do then is bring the ones that we all agree are challenges for cause, thank them, release them. I will rely on you all to proceed with the others that we did not release in any way that you all see fit. If you want someone to approach the bench then we can cover it all at that time.

Let's bring them back in, and go forward.

Is everybody okay, does anybody need a break? Ladies and gentlemen, let's take a five minute break, and let those of us who need a break, quickly take one.

(Brief break)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the following people will be excused at this time. Please listen carefully. And as you go I want to make sure that you know that you go with my sincere thanks. You have spent a long time with us already, but we have determined that there is no reason to detain you any longer and we would like to tell you that sooner rather than later. Okay.

Donald Fuller, Mary Maggard, James

Degenhart, Rose Santacroce, June Ortiz, Melissa Linde
Powers, Michael McAllister, you are excused at this time.

You go with my sincere thanks. Please be careful going

home.

(Potential jurors excused.)

THE COURT: I'm going to turn this over to the lawyers to ask questions. The last thing I want to do at this time in this process is read the information to you. This is the charge against Mr. Minton. This is not evidence, but it helps you understand a little bit about why we are here. It reads as follows:

State of Florida and Robert S. Minton,
Battery, in the name and by the authority for the State
of Florida, Bernie McCabe, State Attorney for the Sixth
Judicial Circuit of Florida, in and for Pinellas County,
prosecuting for the State of Florida, in the said County,
under oath, information makes that Robert S. Minton in
the County of Pinellas, State of Florida, on the 31st day
of October in the year of our Lord, 1999, in the County
and State aforesaid did then and there actually
intentionally touch, or strike, or cause bodily harm to
Richard Howd, against the will of Richard Howd, contrary
to Chapter 784.03, Florida Statutes, and against the
peace and dignity of the State of Florida.

This is the charging instrument. It is not evidence. It is the instrument upon which the State has moved this case forward. So I turn it over now to the State Attorney to ask their questions. Mr. Tyson?

1	MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge. Good
2	afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, it's a little after
3	12:00 right now. The Judge has asked you a lot of
4	questions. I've already got a lot of the answers. So I
5	will be a little briefer. As Mr. de Vlaming told the
6	Judge, you heard that this may be a two, maybe a three
7	day trial that we have here. One question I have, we
8	already have who were prior jurors. On this side who was
9	a prior jury, raise your hands?
10	(Jury panel responded as requested.)
11	MR. TYSON: Okay, that is Ms. Baldwin.
12	Was that criminal?
13	MS. BALDWIN: Yes, sir.
14	MR. TYSON: I don't need to know the
15	verdict. Were you able to reach a verdict in that case?
16	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
17	MR. TYSON: Were you the foreman in that
18	case?
19	MS. BALDWIN: No.
20	MR. TYSON: Mr. Joiner?
21	MR. JOINER: Yes.
22	MR. TYSON: You said that that was a
23	homicide case seventeen years ago?
24	MR. JOINER: Yes.
25	MR. TYSON: Did it get all the way through

			129
1	to a jury verdic	et?	
2	M	AR. JOINER:	Yes.
3	М	MR. TYSON:	Was the jury able to reach a
4	verdict?		
5	м	MR. JOINER:	Yes.
6	М	IR. TYSON:	Were you the foreman of that
7	jury?		
8	М	IR. JOINER:	No.
9	М	IR. TYSON:	Anyone else on this side of
10	the courtroom?	Anybody on	this side of the courtroom?
11	I'm sorry, Mr. B	Baker?	
12	М	IR. BAKER:	Yes.
13	м	IR. TYSON:	You sat on a jury, sir?
14	М	IR. BAKER:	Yes.
15	м	IR. TYSON:	Was that in Pinellas County?
16	М	IR. BAKER:	Yes, it was.
17	м	IR. TYSON:	Criminal case?
18	м	IR. BAKER:	No, civil.
19	М	IR. TYSON:	Were you able to reach a
20	verdict in that	case?	
21	м	IR. BAKER:	Yes, we did.
22	м	IR. TYSON:	Were you the foreman of that
23	jury?	y · ma	
24	м	R. BAKER:	No, sir.
25	м	R. TYSON:	Anyone on this side of the

1	courtroom?
2	(Jury panel raised their hands.)
3	MR. TYSON: Okay, Mr. Lovegrove.
4	MR. LOVEGROVE: It was a criminal case.
5	MR. TYSON: How long ago?
6	MR. LOVEGROVE: About twelve to fifteen
7	years.
8	MR. TYSON: Were you able to reach a
9	verdict in that case?
10	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
11	MR. TYSON: Were you the foreman of that
12	jury?
13	MR. LOVEGROVE: No.
14	MR. TYSON: Mr. Palmieri?
15	MR. PALMIERI: Civil in Connecticut, and
16	they reached a verdict.
17	MR. TYSON: Were you the foreman?
18	MR. PALMIERI: No.
19	MR. TYSON: How long ago was that?
20	MR. PALMIERI: Twenty/thirty years ago.
21	MR. TYSON: You will learn in this trial
22	that the victim in this case is a Scientologist. That
23	will come out. Obviously I need to know, there are some
24	strong feelings in Pinellas County about Scientologists.
25	We are starting from this side of the room.

1	Ms. Kolba, do you know anything about
2	Scientology?
3	MS. KOLBA: Just a little, what I have
4	read.
5	MR. TYSON: Do you have any feelings one
6	way or the other against Scientologists?
7	MS. KOLBA: Not really.
8	MR. TYSON: Would you agree with the
9	proposition then that nobody is above the law, and that
10	the law protects everyone?
11	MS. KOLBA: I'm sorry?
12	MR. TYSON: Nobody is above the law, and
13	the law protects everyone, would you agree with that?
14	MS. KOLBA: I agree with that.
15	MR. TYSON: Will you keep that in your
16	mind when you are considering if you are picked for the
17	jury today?
18	MS. KOLBA: Yes.
19	MR. TYSON: Let's talk about the people in
20	the second row. Ms. Burke, do you know anything about
21	the Scientologists at all?
22	MS. BURKE: Not much. I don't agree with
23	what they believe in.
24	MR. TYSON: Do you believe that the law
25	should protect them as well as everybody else?

1	MS. BURKE: Yes.
2	MR. TYSON: If you find that a battery was
3	committed against Mr. Howd, who is a Scientologist, will
4	you be able to render a verdict based on the evidence, or
5	will your feelings interfere with that?
6	MS. BURKE: I don't think so.
7	MR. TYSON: There are a lot of religions
8	out there, and we don't necessarily agree with different
9	religions. We all agree that you respect the right of
10	people to be protected by law. Ms. Baldwin, what do you
11	think about that?
12	MS. BALDWIN: I really don't have an
13	opinion.
14	MR. TYSON: Excuse me?
15	MS. BALDWIN: I really don't have an
16	opinion one way or the other.
17	MR. TYSON: But do you believe that
18	everybody should be protected by law?
19	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
20	MR. TYSON: Mr. Joiner?
21	MR. JOINER: I don't know that much about
22	Scientology.
23	MR. TYSON: Okay. Mr. Stewart, what do
24	you think about it?
25	MR. STEWART: It's not a religion that I

	155
1	follow, but it wouldn't affect on my decision.
2	MR. TYSON: Mr. Stewart, you said at one
3	point in time you had a problem with the police. Was
4	that the Clearwater Police Department?
5	MR. STEWART: Yes. It was an illegal
6	search, and a false charge. They charged me with
7	paraphernalia. I had to take it court, and the charge
8	was dismissed.
9	MR. TYSON: Let me tell you this, a
10	Clearwater police officer, at least one will testify
11	today. It's Officer Beaudette, you heard several other
12	names. Did any of the names of that you heard, were they
13	any of the officers involved in that?
14	MR. STEWART: No.
15	MR. TYSON: Would it influence the way you
16	judge their credibility on the witness stand today?
17	MR. STEWART: Excuse me?
18	MR. TYSON: If Officer Beaudette from the
19	Clearwater Police Department testifies today, which he
20	will, will your prior experiences come into play when you
21	judge Officer Beaudette's credibility?
22	MR. STEWART: No, sir.
23	MR. TYSON: Mr. Barnum, do you know
24	anything about Scientology, or do you know any

Scientologists?

25

-	rm. baknom. I don t believe that I know
2	any Scientologists, but I know what I read about
3	Scientologists.
4	MR. TYSON: Could you tell me what you
5	read?
6	MR. BARNUM: I put it in the same category
7	as a cult.
8	MR. TYSON: Regardless of that, I
9	represent the State of Florida as you know. I don't
10	represent the Scientologists, I don't represent Mr.
11	Minton. Mr. de Vlaming does. I represent the State of
12	Florida, and we are here to prosecute for violation of
13	the law. If you find that a law was violated can you
14	convict, or will your feelings interfere with that?
15	MR. BARNUM: Knowing it was a
16	Scientologist I feel that my feeling may interfere with
17	that.
18	MR. TYSON: Fair enough. Thank you.
19	Judge, may I have a moment?
20	(Brief pause)
21	MR. TYSON: Mr. Baker, what do you think
22	about Scientology, do you know anything about it?
23	MR. BAKER: I don't know that much about,
24	but what I have read about it and everything, I kind of
25	think it is a cult myself.

1	MR. TYSON: Okay. Regardless of what you
2	think, would you put whatever your feelings aside and if
3	you find that Mr. Minton has violated the law, would you
4	let that interfere with your decision, or can you make a
5	fair and impartial decision in this case?
6	MR. BAKER: I am not sure.
7	MR. TYSON: Okay. Ms. Haley?
8	MS. HALEY: I have heard all about
9	Scientologists. It is a religion. It is their choice
10	what they want to do. I have no problem with that.
11	Nobody is above the law.
12	MR. TYSON: Thank you. On this side of
13	the courtroom, Ms. Robinson, do you know anything about
14	Scientology or Scientologists?
15	MS. ROBINSON: No.
16	MR. TYSON: Since you don't know anything,
17	I guess it is fair to say that you can be fair and
18	impartial regardless of who they are?
19	MS. ROBINSON: Yes. I have a question
20	though?
21	MR. TYSON: Certainly.
22	MS. ROBINSON: Was the dispute involving
23	religion? I don't understand why it is being brought up.
24	MR. TYSON: Well, we are not supposed to

get into the facts of the case, but it some way, yes.

1	That's why it is being brought up. It will come into
2	play during the trial.
3	Mr. Lindstam, do you know anything about
4	Scientology, do you read anything in the paper?
5	MR. LINDSTAM: Yeah, just what I hear. It
6	is supposed to be like a cult.
7	MR. TYSON: What do you think about that?
8	MR. LINDSTAM: They leave me alone, and
9	don't bother me.
10	MR. TYSON: Do you believe that they
11	deserve the protection of the law as everybody else?
12	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
13	MR. TYSON: Mr. Sanchez, do you know
14	anything about Scientologists at all?
15	MR. SANCHEZ: Not very much.
16	MR. TYSON: Do you believe that the law
17	should protect everyone?
18	MR. SANCHEZ: I agree.
19	MR. TYSON: Do you agree that nobody is
20	above the law also?
21	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
22	MR. TYSON: Ms. Pellegrino?
23	MS. PELLEGRINO: I have no idea.
24	MR. TYSON: You have no idea about
25	Scientology and it won't play a role at all?

1	MS. PELLEGRINO: No.
2	MR. TYSON: Mr. Lovegrove?
3	MR. LOVEGROVE: I don't know a whole lot
4	about it. I would categorize it as a cult as well.
5	MR. TYSON: Okay, let's say that you feel
6	that way, regardless of how you feel, do you believe a
7	member of that organization, and religion is entitled to
8	the same protections of the law as everyone else is?
9	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
10	MR. TYSON: Will you promise that you will
11	put aside any feelings of bias or prejudice that you have
12	in this case and decide it on the facts?
13	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
14	MR. TYSON: Ms. Green?
15	MS. GREEN: Don't know what it is.
16	MR. TYSON: It looks like you were hiding
17	behind there, when I turned my head you don't know
18	what it is?
19	MS. GREEN: No.
20	MR. TYSON: Regardless, do you have any
21	feelings one way or the other about any religions? Is
22	there any religions? Is there any religions that you
23	don't agree with?
24	MS. GREEN: No.

MR. TYSON:

Ms. Grover?

MS. GROVER: Yes. I don't know too much about it, but I look at it, to each their own, their choice, and it's fine with me.

MR. TYSON: Okay. Ms. Donizetti?

MS. DONIZETTI: I have no feelings whether it is religion or a cult, or anything like that. I don't feel that it will influence my decision either way.

MR. TYSON: Okay. Mr. Palmieri?

MR. PALMIERI: I don't know anything about them.

MR. TYSON: Okay. The charge here is battery and the Judge read that to you. I am going to talk to people on this side of the courtroom. Does anybody here believe that if someone is intentionally pushed, but there is not much injury then that is not a crime? Okay, if I intentionally push Mr. de Vlaming a little bit right here, technically in the technical sense that would be a battery. But we know more in the common sense world that an intentional touch would be pushing or hitting in anger, or whatever. Does anyone believe that if there is not a lot of injury, like if I don't bust his head open it's not a crime?

(No response from jury panel.)

MR. TYSON: Different people from different parts of the country, let me give you and

example, I am from Baltimore, sometimes when people get in fights, when you hit somebody it's not that big a deal. I'm not saying that it is right or it's wrong, but people bring different things into their lives about what is -- the way the law is too picky. Does anyone on this side of courtroom understand, will factor that in, do you understand that it doesn't matter, the level of injury in this case? You will hear that there is injury. But does the level of injury matter to any of you?

(No response from the jury panel.)

MR. TYSON: What about this side of the courtroom, does the level of injury matter to anybody over here?

Could you repeat that again? MS. TYSON: The charge of battery is intentional touching. Regardless if you are injured. Mr. Lindstam, if I was in anger to push you, just push you back, and there is no injury there, would you agree?

If I am to come up to you in anger right now and push you, everybody saw that. But you are not really injured,

21 would you agree that I have committed a battery?

MS. GREEN:

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Objection, Judge, that is asking a juror to commit to a specific factual situation.

> THE COURT: Sustained.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

1	MR. TYSON: Would anybody need to show
2	substantial injury before they will convict somebody of a
3	battery?
4	(No response by jury panel)
5	MR. TYSON: The law says that I don't have
6	to show any injury. Would anybody here make me show
7	substantial injury?
8	MR. LINDSTAM: I feel pretty strong about
9	that.
10	MR. TYSON: You would make me show
11	substantial injury?
12	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
13	
14	MR. TYSON: Do you think that it is okay
15	for somebody to come and push somebody in anger?
16	MR. LINDSTAM: I don't say that it is
	okay, but I don't perceive that it should be a lawsuit.
17	MR. TYSON: Well, this isn't a lawsuit
18	here. Nobody is suing anybody. Everybody is clear here,
19	this isn't Scientology against Mr. Minton, and Mr. Minton
20	against Scientology. This is the State of Florida
21	enforcing the laws in the State of Florida against Mr.
22	Minton. Does everybody understand that? I do not
23	represent the Scientologists.
24	Mr. Baker you said that there were some
25	Drior experiences that you had when you an MD that may

1	influence in your decision making process today.
2	MR. BAKER: It was just a lot of what we
3	are discussing right here.
4	MR. TYSON: Would you like to approach and
5	we can talk to the Judge in private at the bench so we
6	can get some more information on that? Could you
7	approach?
8	THE COURT: Why don't you come forward,
9	Mr. Baker?
10	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
11	out of the hearing of the rest of the jury panel.)
12	THE COURT: Is everybody ready? Mr. Baker
13	we just asked you to come forward because I think the
14	parties would like to know a little bit more about it,
15	and we would like to respect your privacy as much as
16	possible. So I am going to let either side ask you some
17	questions, okay?
18	MR. BAKER: Okay.
19	THE COURT: And understand that this is
20	all on the record, but you need to respond to the
21	questions as best you can.
22	MR. BAKER: Okay.
23	MR. TYSON: Could you please express the
24	concerns about being fair and impartial and prior

background that may influence that?

MR. BAKER: Well, in some cases in the military families were involved in it, somebody not doing supposedly what they are supposed to be doing. It was kind of getting in the middle of a domestic dispute in some cases. In other cases it was a case where just somebody went out to a lounge or something and things got out of hand. It just makes me very uncomfortable.

MR. TYSON: The fact that we are charging him at all makes you uncomfortable?

MR. BAKER: Well, if somebody does something wrong, that's fine. I think the biggest thing that bothered me was a lot of times, I am not a violent person, and I don't like to see families -- That is the part that really bothers me. Especially women and children.

MR. TYSON: This isn't a domestic violence case, there are no children involved. Do you think that you can be fair and impartial in this case?

MR. BAKER: I honestly don't know how I would feel about it. I honestly don't.

MR. TYSON: That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. de Vlaming?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Baker, if you were told that this has to do with an incident between two grown men, not children, and not women, and that you

1	would be asked and called upon to find out and give us a
2	verdict based on whether you believe he is guilty or not
3	guilty in accordance with the laws could you do your best
4	to do that for us?
5	MR. BAKER: I think that I could handle
6	that part of it.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If you knew it did
8	not involve children, and knew that it didn't involve
9	families or women, would that make it a little easier for
10	you?
11	MR. BAKER: Probably.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Thank you, Mr.
13	Baker.
14	THE COURT: Anything further?
15	MR. TYSON: No.
16	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please go and
17	retake your seat. Are we all set? Mr. Tyson?
18	MR. TYSON: Thank you for your time.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, are you through?
20	MR. TYSON: Yes, Judge, I'm sorry.
21	THE COURT: I didn't realize that.
22	Counsel for the Defendant you may proceed.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Thank you, your
24	Honor. If it please the Court. I think members of the
25	panel, once I finish and the Judge makes come comments to

you we will probably break for lunch. You should know that in Florida this is a six person jury so the fact that you are remaining doesn't mean that everybody is going to be on the jury. A lot of people think that there is a twelve person jury, it is not. So many of you will not remain, in case that was a concern about who is already gone.

Mr. Tyson was correct that we cannot go over the facts in detail about this case in Voir Dire, it is not proper. However I need to tell you a few facts so we can find out whether you know anything about this case, because what we don't want is to get in middle of this or opening statements and you go, "I read all about that." Then all of the sudden we have got a problem. So if you will bear with me.

Ms. Kolba, let me just start with you, and let me tell the panel, this has to do with an alleged battery that took place outside of the Church of Scientology on Halloween of last year, October 31, 1999, while Mr. Minton was picketing, going up and down in protest in front of the church. The incident happened between Mr. Minton and another member of the Church of Scientology. That's about all I am going to tell you right now, just in case it jogs a memory about Mr. Minton or about the publicity that it might have generated.

1	Ms. Kolba, do you remember anything about
2	this case?
3	MS. KOLBA: I remember basically hearing
4	or reading about something. Mr. Minton does look a
5	little familiar to me, but that's about it.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: In other words you
7	might have seen his picture in the paper that way?
8	MS. KOLBA: Yes.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: It sounds as if you
10	are rather nebulous about what you remember. Would it
11	affect your verdict in any way based upon what you
12	recall?
13	MS. KOLBA: I don't remember the facts.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, that's all we
15	want to know, is whether or not you know enough, ladies
16	and gentlemen, that you say I can't be fair and impartial
17	in this case.
18	Ms. Baldwin, how about you?
19	MS. BALDWIN: (Shaking head)
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Don't remember the
21	case or the incident?
22	MS. BALDWIN: I saw very little coverage,
23	if at all.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Mr.
25	Stewart?

1	MR. STEWART: I don't remember it.
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Burke?
3	MS. BURKE: No.
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Ms.
5	Pellegrino?
6	MS. PELLEGRINO: No.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Robinson, do yo
8	remember anything about the case, and for that matter,
9	the name Robert Minton, I will throw that out, in case
10	his name is familiar to you? I am not saying that it is,
11	but no to both, don't know about the incident, don't know
12	about the man?
13	MS. ROBINSON: No.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Lindstam, how
15	about you?
16	MR. LINDSTAM: No. He just looks familiar
17	from somewhere. I don't know where.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: He's got that
19	familiar kind of face?
20	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
21	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: But nothing about
22	the facts that I just told you, the limited facts that
23	you recall reading about?
24	MR. LINDSTAM: No.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Sanchez, how

1	about your sir?
2	MR. SANCHEZ: No.
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Lovegrove,
4	anything about it?
5	MR. LOVEGROVE: No.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Ms.
7	Green? Nothing about the case Minton, anything like
8	that?
9	MS. GREEN: No.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Grover?
11	MS. GROVER: I don't remember anything
12	about it.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Donizetti, how
14	about you, ma'am?
15	MS. DONIZETTI: No, nothing.
16	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Mr.
17	Palmieri?
18	MR. PALMIERI: No.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No, sir. Ms.
20	Haley, Mr. Baker?
21	MS. HALEY: No.
22	MR. BAKER: No.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Barnum?
24	MR. BARNUM: I am familiar with it.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You are familiar

1 | with it?

MR. BARNUM: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Based upon your familiarity with of it, and we don't want you to tell us all of it, or we would be defeating the purpose for this dialogue, do you feel that you would have an opinion or it would affect your ability to serve on this particular jury?

MR. BARNUM: Yes, I do. I think he was baited.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We won't get into that. Mr. Joiner, how about you, sir, do you remember anything about the case?

MR. JOINER: No, I don't.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ever heard the name, Robert Minton?

MR. JOINER: Not that I can remember, no.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Anybody in the panel remember about Mr. Minton, go ahead?

MS. BURKE: I don't remember the name, but
I do remember reading an article in the paper about
someone that had devoted their life to fighting
Scientology.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If it is, would that affect your ability to sit on the case based upon

what you have been told or what you have learned?

MS. BURKE: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Has anybody ever been to either a seminar or a program where the Church of Scientology principals have been discussed?

(No response)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, I see no hands. Has anybody studied anything about the Church of Scientology, wherein you feel that you know some of their principals, and dogma about the church itself, other than what you read cursory in the newspaper?

(No response)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Has anybody picked up a book by L. Ron Hubbard and read it, let me ask you that?

(No response)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No one? I see no hands. Okay. You just heard me talk a little bit about what the case was about so that I could find out about it. I want to know your opinions now about a person's right, constitutional right to protest. And we have all seen that, walking up and down street with a placard in protest. Ms. Kolba, what are you feelings about a person's right to do that?

MS. KOLBA: It's a free country. They

have a right to do that.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Does that offend you, that someone may want to protest, or walk up and down the street with a placard, whether they go lousy service at an air conditioning place, or a care repair place, or a lousy lawyer for that matter, and go up and down the street?

MS. KOLBA: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Baldwin, how about you, does that offend you in any respect?

MS. BALDWIN: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Do you think that in this country that citizens have the right to do that?

MS. BALDWIN: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you think while they are doing that, Ms. Baldwin, that they have a right to be left alone, that is not people invade that --

MR. TYSON: Objection, your honor, may we approach?

THE COURT: Please do.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held out of the hearing of the jury panel.)

MR. TYSON: Judge, I understand that he has to get into a little bit of the facts of the case,

but I think now we are getting into a defense in front of the jury.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, with all due respect, I think I am entitled to ask a few limited questions about whether or not they can go along with a defense in this case and what defense we are going to put forward. If these people say that they will reject a defense of a person agreeing to be touched, or that they are entitled to be assaulted if they are walking up and down on private property I need to ferret those people out.

THE COURT: It's pretty much the same as where Mr. Tyson asked if they need an injury, isn't it?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I am going to try not to be fact specific, but I would like to ask some general questions about the defense.

THE COURT: I think you can do it. I am going to overrule the objection.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I just talked about the law in mine though.

THE COURT; Well, that is what he is doing, too. These are legal defenses.

MR. TYSON: I just don't want him to try the case in voir dire.

THE COURT: I would just ask that you keep

1	your remarks limited to this. Okay.
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, sir.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Are we all set?
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Please proceed.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Baldwin, I
7	think I was asking you a question at this particular
8	time. It might be easier if when you give an answer I
9	ask the panel if they agree or disagree with you, rather
10	than go up and down the lines like we have in this case.
11	I think I asked you whether or not agreed that citizens
12	have a constitutional right to protest if they so desire?
13	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And what one person
15	may protest another person may embrace. Do you agree
16	with that, different strokes?
17	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Does everyone agree
19	with her in that?
20	(Jury panel answered yes.)
21	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: While are you
22	exercising that right to protest, do you feel that person
23	should also be free from being assaulting or accosted?
24	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
25	MR. DENTS DE VLAMING: Does everyone agree

1	with Ms. Baldwin in that respect?
2	(Jury panel answered yes.)
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Walk up and down,
4	let alone?
5	MR. STEWART: I believe the opposition or
6	the other side of that protest has the same right to
7	protest in the same place.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Absolutely. Okay.
9	But do you understand the question that I asked her, in
10	other words do you feel as if that individual has a right
11	in order to stop your protest, to either assault you or
12	go after you?
13	(Jury panel answered no.)
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Lindstam, is
15	that how you pronounce your last name?
16	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes, that's it.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Did you hear the
18	Judge when the Judge read the charge in this case, it has
19	to do with touching, striking, or harming another person
20	against their will, did you hear him say that that is
21	battery to do that?
22	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If you are told by
24	the Court that there are certain elements to battery, in

other words that he has to prove certain things, if the

	124
1	definition of battery is something that is different than
2	what you might think, but the Judge tells you what the
3	elements are, will you follow the dictates of the Judge?
4	In other words, will you follow the law?
5	MR. LINDSTAM: Right, yes.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And if you are told
7	that one of those elements that it was against the will
8	of somebody, can you hold the State to the burden of
9	proving that the person did not want to be touched?
10	MR. LINDSTAM: I don't understand the
11	question.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me ask you
13	this, did you ever play basketball?
14	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Did you ever watch
16	NBA basketball?
17	MR. LINDSTAM: Yes.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Someone is driving
19	towards the hoop, the only one to stop them is to stand
20	in front of them. It's called a foul. Okay, he does it
21	for the cause, right. He takes the foul. He is on his
22	fanny on the floor, right?
23	MR. LINDSTAM: Correct.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Did he want to be
25	touched?

1	MR. LINDSTAM: Obviously.
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, because he
3	wanted to take the foul and stop the shot, right?
4	MR. LINDSTAM: Right.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If an element in
6	this case is that the person did not want to be touched,
7	and the defense establishes that he did, do you
8	understand that that is a defense in this case? Think of
9	the NBA thing.
10	MR. LINDSTAM: Okay.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I am getting some
12	wrinkled foreheads. Ms. Robinson, you are one of my
13	wrinkled foreheads. I go up and I touch somebody, all
14	right? It would have to be against this man's will in
15	order for it to be a crime, correct?
16	MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If he didn't mind
18	being touched, or he invited to be touched, then what?
19	MS. ROBINSON: No crime.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, okay. Does
21	everybody understand that, and agree with that?
22	(Jury panel answered yes.)
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: It has to be
24	against your will. Uncle come around you, puts his
25	hands over your shoulder, no problem. A stranger,

1	problem. Okay. Does anybody have a problem with that
2	element, that there is an element in every case that it
3	has to be against the expressed or implied permission to
4	be touched? Does everybody understand that precept of
5	law? Ms. Burke, Ms. Haley?
6	MS. BURKE: Agree.
7	MS. HALEY: Sure.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Can you envision
9	cases where conduct may be invited?
10	MS. HALEY: It depends on what the
11	situation is.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, you have to
13	hear more about it to make that determination, correct?
14	MS. HALEY: Yes.
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you think that
16	every citizen has a right to defend themselves?
17	MS. HALEY: Yes.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you feel
19	strongly about that?
20	MS. HALEY: It depends on what the
21	circumstances are.
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If a person has
23	reason to feel threatened do they have a right to defend
24	themselves?
25	MS. HALEY: It depends on the situation.

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You would prefer
2	that they try to retreat first before they have to defend
3	themselves perhaps in certain circumstances?
4	MS. HALEY: Try to work it out.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And if you are
6	attacked after that, do you think that a citizen has
7	right to defend themselves?
8	MS. HALEY: Yes.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Burke, how
10	about you?
11	MS. BURKE: I agree.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Other than the
13	amount of force used, do you think there are any
14	limitations on a person's right to defend themselves or
15	their children, or their wife, or spouse?
16	MS. BURKE: Other than
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Other than the
18	amount of force used, do you think there are any
19	limitations, for example I am not going to use any
20	examples. Do you think there are any limitations in that
21	respect?
22	MS. BURKE: I don't agree with someone
23	killing someone because they got pushed.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Right. Okay. So
25	there are limitations in that respect. But other than

1	that you believe in right of self-defense?
2	MS. BURKE: Yes.
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You were hesitant,
4	Ms. Burke?
5	MS. BURKE: Because it conflicts with what
6	I teach the kids that I work with. That's the only
7	thing.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: When they are this
9	big you say when you are pushed don't push back, just go
10	over there and shake his hand, right?
11	MS. BURKE: Or go tell someone, or just
12	walk away.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you understand
14	that there are times if you walk away that you may still
15	have to use defense?
16	MS. BURKE: Yes.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If there is an
18	assault or an attack?
19	MS. BURKE: Yes.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Kolba, do you
21	understand that?
22	MS. KOLBA: Yes.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you understand
24	that occasionally there is a need to defend yourself?
25	MS. KOLBA: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you think that somebody can pick a fight without throwing the first punch? Do you understand my question?

MS. KOLBA: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Stewart, I can look over her shoulder and see you nodding your head. Do you think there are occasions where that can happen?

MR. STEWART: Yes, it can be instigated.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Say it again.

MR. STEWART: If you push someone a little too far just by words a lot of people will step over the line with words and instigate a fight.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Does anybody disagree with Mr. Stewart? Do you understand what he said? That somebody can pick a fight, instigate it without throwing the first punch? I am seeing all nods, shake your head -- raise your hand if you say, "No, I don't think that could happen." Ms. Green raised her hand. Go ahead, ma'am.

MS. GREEN: No, I was agreeing with what he was saying.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Now, that you have raised your hand, that will teach you. It went out of my head. Let me take a look. Oh. Did you ever hear the expression "somebody's personal space." Has anyone ever

1	heard that expression? Ms. Robinson, you have heard it?
2	MS. ROBINSON: Yes.
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Green, have you
4	ever?
5	MS. GREEN: Yes.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Burke, okay.
7	Did you ever hear the expression that somebody is
8	invading your personal space?
9	MS. BURKE: Yes.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me start with
11	Ms. Green since she is the one that raised her hand.
12	What does that mean to you? If I invaded your personal
13	space, what does that mean to you?
14	MS. GREEN: How do I say it?
15	THE COURT REPORTER: Judge, I can't hear
16	her.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: She said, "How did
18	I say it?" She hasn't said yet.
19	MR. GREEN: You are saying
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I am going to
21	invade your personal space, what am I doing? How about
22	getting in your face?
23	MS. GREEN: Yeah.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Pretty close?
25	MS. GREEN: It's wrong.

1 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: It's wrong, what do 2 you take by that, Ms. Robinson? 3 MS. ROBINSON: I see either verbal 4 comments, just the closeness, threatening gesture, or 5 threatening words, or words that are politically 6 sensitive, shall we say. Certain words should not be used in front of certain groups of people, or it will 7 8 incite violence. 9 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about invading 10 personal -- well, I never thought of it that way, and now 11 that you say it, I understand it. In a physical sense, 12 invading your space. Ms. Pellegrino, do you know what I 13 mean? I am a stranger to you, if I came up and got in 14 your face --15 MS. PELLEGRINO: Touching. 16 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Touching you. about getting real real close to you? You know, when you 17 18 are talking to somebody you might do it. You might talk 19 this way. "Get out of my face." Yes, no? Yes? 20 Grover? 21 MS. GROVER: I don't like someone being so 22 close to me. 23 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Ms. 24 Donizetti, have you heard that term, personal space?

MS. DONIZETTI: Absolutely.

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you have
2	personal space yourself?
3	MS. DONIZETTI: Absolutely.
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Lovegrove?
5	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Are you a
7	professor, sir?
8	MR. LOVEGROVE: No.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I know you work at
10	Clearwater Christian College.
11	MR. LOVEGROVE: I am Director of Christian
12	Services.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you know an
14	individual there named Puckett?
15	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
16	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Is he an
17	administrator there, Mr. Puckett?
18	MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Palmieri, how
20	about you, personal space?
21	MR. PALMIERI: If someone gets too close
22	to me.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Right. What do you
24	do if he gets real close to you, up in your face?
25	MR. PALMIERI: I would try to back off.

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Back off. Either
2	you would take a step back or you would try to back him
3	off. Are we all in agreement? Mr. Joiner, how about
4	you, sir?
5	MR. JOINER: Yes, I agree.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you have
7	personal space?
8	MR. JOINER: Most definitely.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you like it when
10	people invade it?
11	MR. JOINER: No.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Does anybody like
13	it when it is invaded? Anybody?
14	(Jury panel responded no.)
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Robinson, have
16	you ever I don't know how to put this. Have you ever
17	felt as if someone is staring at you?
18	MS. ROBINSON: Sure.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ever have that in
20	your life, and you look over and they are staring at you?
21	How does that make you feel?
22	MS. ROBINSON: Curious and slightly
23	uncomfortable.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If it is the
25	opposite sex, don't know them, and it's not in a social

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	setting where you might expect that type of conduct,
2	would that make you feel uneasy? Or could it make you
3	feel uneasy?
4	MS. ROBINSON: Mostly curious.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay.
6	MS. ROBINSON: Mostly curious, why are
7	they staring at me? Do they think they know me? Do I
8	resemble somebody else? Is there something amiss about
9	me.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's your first
11	thought.
12	MS. ROBINSON: First thought.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: What if it
14	continues throughout the day, and the person follows you
15	and stares at you, would that make you uncomfortable?
16	MS. ROBINSON: Yes. I would have a
17	problem with that.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me talk to the
19	ladies first, and it's not a gender question, but I am
20	going to ask the ladies first. Raise your hand if you
21	agree with Ms. Robinson that it would make you feel
22	uncomfortable if someone stared at you and then followed
23	you.
24	(Ladies in jury panel raised their hands.)
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I see no ladies

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

I see no ladies

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	165
1	with their hands down. Okay. Men, with either another
2	man or woman staring at them and then following you,
3	raise your hand if it would make you feel uncomfortable
4	if you didn't know why they were staring at you? We have
5	two, three. All right. I only have one that with no
6	hand up. It would not bother you, sir?
7	(Men in the jury panel raised their
8	hands.)
9	MR. PALMIERI: No, I don't believe that
10	would bother me.
11	MR. DENIS DE VIAMING: Okay Let me agk a

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Let me ask a question about following now. Okay. Ms. Pellegrino, what are your feelings about if somebody that you did not know was following you around town, would that make you feel in any way uneasy? If you didn't know the reason why they were following you?

MS. PELLEGRINO: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you feel that rises, if it continues, to the level of either harassment or stalking, or could it?

MS. PELLEGRINO: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Robinson?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, sir.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Ms.

Grover?

1	MS. GROVER: Yes.
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Would it frighten
3	you?
4	MS. GROVER: Yes.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Donizetti?
6	MS. DONIZETTI: Unless I could get away.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Well, let's say
8	that you probably could get away, let's say if you wanted
9	to run to the police you could. Let's say that after you
10	reported it and guess who you saw in the rearview mirror,
11	same person?
12	MS. DONIZETTI: Then I would bothered.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. How about
14	you, Ms. Green? Would it bother you to be followed by
15	somebody that you did not know? Would it cause you any
16	kind of fear, or concern?
17	MS. GREEN: Yeah, it would bother me.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Burke?
19	MS. BURKE: Yes.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How about you, Ms.
21	Haley, yes?
22	MS. HALEY: Yes.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Baldwin?
24	MS. BALDWIN: Yes.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me do a

	167
1	housekeeping matter. There were some of you that did not
2	indicate where you lived, what city you lived in. So let
3	me ask you, Ms. Robinson, what city?
4	MS. ROBINSON: St. Petersburg.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You are in St.
6	Pete. Mr. Lindstam?
7	MR. LINDSTAM: Pinellas Park.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You are in Pinellas
9	Park. Ms. Powers is gone, Mr. McAllister is gone. And,
10	Ms. Haley, I didn't get from you?
11	MS. HALEY: Clearwater.
12	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You are a
13	Clearwater resident?
14	MS. HALEY: Yes.
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I suppose I should
16	ask you, have you ever been in a job or profession where
17	anybody protested against your company, or you? In other
18	words, were you ever protested against?
19	(No response)
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I see no hands.
21	Mr. Baker, let me ask you, I lived through the '60's, you
22	lived through the '60's. There was a time when people
23	protested the military, right, I mean there was?
24	MR. BAKER: That's true.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I am not saving

that they did, or if you were in the service at the time, I'm not saying that, but that would be what I am talking about, is whether or not you had ever seen -- maybe I should ask it that way. Has anybody ever seen protesters on the street?

(Jury panel answered yes.)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me start with you, in what capacity, Mr. Baker? Were they carrying a sign, for example?

MR. BAKER: They were carrying signs and maybe protesting some of the company policies.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's right, pickets are an example of that, wouldn't they be up and down in front of the airlines, or something like that?

MR. BAKER: Pickets, union, non-union, if it is something they are uncomfortable with they displayed it with signs and a picket.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Any problem with that?

MR. BAKER: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Who else has seen protesters? Mr. Joiner, in what capacity?

MR. JOINER: I have seen Scientologists walking up and down the street. Telephone company.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You said that you

1	and your wife both worked for the city?
2	MR. JOINER: For the county.
3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: The county, in what
4	capacity?
5	MR. JOINER: I work for the maintenance
6	department.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay. Yes, Ms.
8	Haley?
9	MS. HALEY: I saw a protest against
10	abortion on 19, lots of people out there.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Again, if they want
12	to spend their time doing that, no problem?
13	MS. HALEY: Yes.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Who else has seen
15	protesters walk up and down the street?
16	MS. ROBINSON: I have been a protester.
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You have been a
18	protester.
19	MS. ROBINSON: I have been a protester
20	from everything from the Vietnam war on up.
21	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Oh, you are the
22	'60's, too. You don't look old enough. Who else in the
23	front row? In what capacity?
24	MR. LINDSTAM: A friend of mine, his dad
25	used to work for General Electric, and they had picketers

1 out front. They stretched across, her dad drove through, 2 they shattered his windshield. 3 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Did that have 4 affect on your feelings about the first amendment? Ι 5 mean do you feel --6 MR. LINDSTAM: I mean as long as it 7 doesn't affect -- I mean, if they want to protest that's 8 fine, but as far as stretching a cable across, that hurt 9 somebody, and I don't agree with that. 10 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Of course, and we 11 understand that. But beyond that, there is no ill 12 feelings about protesters, or somebody's first amendment 13 rights to protest. Who else had their hand up? Yes, Ms. 14 Pellegrino? 15 MS. PELLEGRINO: On abortion. 16 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: What are you feelings when you see that? What do you think? Do you 17 18 have a feeling about it? 19 MS. PELLEGRINO: If they want to do it. 20 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: But nothing further

than that, like they shouldn't be doing that, or why don't they just stay in their house? You have no problem

23 | with that?

21

22

24

25

MS. PELLEGRINO: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Anybody else in

there that has actively seen any kind of protest? Mr
Lovegrove?

MR. LOVEGROVE: I seen people protesting, my feeling is if they cross the line and antagonize people it's wrong, but as long as it peaceful and organized properly then I don't have a problem with it.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: So what you are saying is that the protester basically should remain peaceful as he doing his protest, right?

MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: People inside the building should also remain peaceful, and not come out and get in people's faces too, or not? Both ways?

MR. LOVEGROVE: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I have got to ask this question and then I'm done. Everybody brings in to court lifetime personal experiences, okay. You may be a great jury for one kind of case, and not a good jury for another. Let me give you an example. If this was a DUI case, Ms. Burke, okay, and you lost your sister to a DUI, it might be pretty tough to ask you to be fair and impartial, right?

MS. BURKE: Yes.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Now, my question is this, this has to do with an alleged battery, or assault,

172 1 If that has occurred to you in your life where you 2 were battered or you were assaulted that might have an 3 effect where you look through the evidence in this case. 4 If that has happened to you, in other words you were the 5 victim of this, I need to know it. Even if it is just a 6 hand raise. If it is further than that you might want to 7 come on up to the bench. Okay, would you feel more 8 comfortable to come up to the bench? 9 MS. ROBINSON: Uh-huh. 10 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Do you mind doing 11 that?

> MS. ROBINSON: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, may I?

THE COURT: Please.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held out of the hearing of the full jury panel.)

THE COURT: Does anybody want to ask her some questions?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I kind of figured based upon what you said before, and I didn't want to embarrass you, could you tell us very briefly --

Very briefly. I was eight MS. ROBINSON: years old and I was gang raped, and I really don't want to say any more about it.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You don't have to.

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

	1,73
1	Let me just ask you this, do you feel that because of
2	that happening, it was a very large invasion upon you,
3	that you would in any way
4	MS. ROBINSON: I would tend to side with
5	the victim.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: With the victim.
7	MS. ROBINSON: Sure.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Now, knowing that
9	this a battery case, having nothing to do with sex do
10	you feel that you would still me more sympathetic so that
11	you may lean towards the victim's side, or do you think
12	that you could still be fair?
13	MS. ROBINSON: I'm not sure if I could be
14	fair. I would be tossed up between my own personal
15	feelings, and wanting to be fair to all parties, not
16	wanting to go too extreme either way. I not sure that I
17	could be fair.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I appreciate you
19	being honest with me.
20	THE COURT: Any questions?
21	MR. TYSON: No questions.
22	THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Before she goes,
24	could I just ask a question from here?
25	THE COURT: Sure.

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I think Ms.
2	Pellegrino had her hand up? Ms. Pellegrino, could you
3	very briefly, without going into a lot of detail, tell us
4	how you might have been a victim in an assault?
5	MS. PELLEGRINO: It was just a domestic
6	thing with me and my ex.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: He might have hit
8	you?
9	MS. PELLEGRINO: Yes.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: The reason why we
11	are doing this, is not to embarrass you, is if you would
12	be more prone to be sympathetic towards a victim as you
13	were a victim in your husband's case, with all due
14	respect I would have to know that. If you would say I
15	would call balls balls, and strikes strikes then I would
16	
17	MS. PELLEGRINO: No, it wouldn't matter.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You wouldn't.
19	THE COURT: Thank you.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ms. Pellegrino,
21	this is not a sensitive question. Was the office of the
22	State Attorney here in any way involved with what you
23	shared with us?
24	MS. PELLEGRINO: Not this county.
25	MR. DENTS DE VLAMING: Not Pinellas

## County?

MS. PELLEGRINO: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's all I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the panel I am going to give you another chance to stretch and take a break here. Please, just as before, stay in the immediate area. Sheriff, just as before, please make sure all witnesses are in rooms so that the panel members won't inadvertently have contact with witnesses and have a well intentioned, but inappropriate conversation.

And as before, all the panel members as soon he clears will and must leave.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I almost overheard a juror -- all I heard was on the basis of the last question, probably my error, I talked to the two ladies about whether they have ever been victims of assault, and I probably left a gentleman out. Is that what you wanted to tell us.

MR. LINDSTAM: I wanted to be a part of talking to you about it, yes.

THE COURT: Come forward. We are sorry about that, sir.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I apologize.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held

1	out the hearing of the rest of the jury panel.)
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Lindstam is at
3	the bench.
4	THE COURT: Would anyone like to inquire,
5	or do you just want to tell us?
6	MR. LINDSTAM: I just basically want to
7	tell out that I was involved in a very nasty divorce. I
8	was falsely accused of molesting my children. I just
9	felt that during the whole thing I had to prove myself.
10	I was more or less accused, and I had to prove my
11	innocense, where you are always told that you are
12	innocent until proven guilty. In that case everything I
13	did I had to prove myself. I felt fairly strongly
14	against that, so I figured that should be brought in this
15	consideration.
16	THE COURT: Does anyone want to ask any
17	questions?
18	MR. TYSON: Would you find it difficult
19	being fair to either side?
20	MR. LINDSTAM: Sometimes, it depends. It
21	is a very touchy subject.
22	MR. TYSON: Is there anything about what
23	you have heard so far?
24	MR. LINDSTAM: Not so far. I just, like I
25	said. I just wanted to be open, that you are aware of

1 this.

THE COURT: We appreciate you coming forward. It's important that we know this. Does anybody want to ask more?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Just one question,
Judge. Do you feel as if you could keep an open mind and
listen to the evidence of the case and bring back a
verdict that --

MR. LINDSTAM: That's where I am unsure about it because there was evidence supposedly against me, but nothing came up in court, but yet I still had to prove myself, when there was no evidence. So evidence isn't as strong as you would think.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me ask you this, could you provide what was not provided to you to Mr. Minton, that is that he is presumed to be innocent, and if you were a juror could you make sure that that precept is followed?

MR. LINDSTAM: Possibly.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, the jury panel was excused.)

THE COURT: Counsel, what I would like to do is give you the time that you need to sort out your notes. Let me know when you are ready. It's ten after one, getting people to lunch is my objective at this

1 point. So I am open to discussion as to how we go 2 I'd like to go through and see if we can get a 3 jury out of this panel, and I think we can do that in a 4 reasonable period of time. If you think it is going to 5 be protracted let me know. 6 MR. TYSON: I don't believe it will. 7 There will be a couple of causes. Let's pick and the 8 ones that are picked can go to lunch. And then send the 9 rest --

THE COURT: That's what I am thinking. What I want to do is give the court personnel a chance to take a break right now while you all sort out your notes. I am going to go off the bench for ten minutes and let them leave. We will come back at twenty after, and hopefully go through this as quickly as we can.

(Brief break)

THE COURT: Is everybody ready.

MR. TYSON: Can we go with causes first?

THE COURT: Yeah, let's go back through

causes. Mr. Tyson, are there any other challenges for causes?

MR. TYSON: Judge, I think both may agree with this, Ms. Robinson, I think she said that she tends to side with the victim. I assume Mr. de Vlaming agrees.

THE COURT: Everybody agrees?

24 25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

also.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yeah, right.

THE COURT: She's gone. Who else?

MR. TYSON: Number seven, Mr. Lindstam.

What his statement was, that he has some concerns, the

best he could come up with, "I possibly can. I will try.

Maybe I can be fair and impartial." The best he did was

"possibly". I would ask that we strike him for cause

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I think that he did indicate, however, that he felt that system is that you are innocent until proven guilty. That is a precept that we all want to accept. He wasn't treated that way. However, when I asked him whether he could apply the law to this case as the Court gives him, I believe he indicated his assent.

MR. TYSON: He indicated that he was falsely accused. The strongest he said was "possibly" that he could be fair and impartial.

THE COURT: I wrote down "not sure and be fair". I also very early in the ball game made notes about his ability to follow the law, which I have doubts about based on things he has said. I find there to be a two-fold basis to strike him for cause. I think the case law says that I have the totality of what he says, and if I can in good faith determine that there may be a cause

issue I should err on the side of caution, and I have, I will, and I did. Go on.

MR. TYSON: Judge, number eighteen, Mr. Barnum, he has already from the start he says that he might not be able to fair and impartial. He said that he has heard of facts of the case. He has already made up his mind, he believes the Defendant was baited.

THE COURT: Any issue there?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We like him.

THE COURT: He's gone. Who is next?

MR. TYSON: Judge, the only one I have concern about is number nineteen, Mr. Baker. I still don't think we are really clear about what his concerns are about the trial, and his prior experiences. I'm not sure Mr. de Vlaming --

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I don't want him challenged for cause. I agree with you that it was a little bit nebulous, but he had some concern over when he was an MP dealing with domestic matters, and when husbands go after wives, and children. When I indicated that this case had nothing to do with children or spousal problem and asked if he could be fair, he indicated yes. I don't think he is for cause.

MR. TYSON: I don't have any strong reasons other than his uncertainty, Judge.

24

25

number nine.

1	THE COURT: He didn't rise to the level of
2	cause. I agree, so we will leave him alone. Anybody
3	else?
4	MR. TYSON: No.
5	THE COURT: Mr. de Vlaming, you agree with
6	Mr. Tyson's choices, you don't have any to add?
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I have nothing more
8	to add.
9	THE COURT: That's fine. Peremptory
10	challenges, three per side. I don't care how you use
11	them. You can back strike them. You can use them any
12	way you want to right up to the moment that we swear the
13	jury. I just want a fair jury and let you all determine
14	how you want to strategically use your causes. Let's go
15	through and see if I am clear on who is left.
16	We have juror three, juror eight, we have
17	nine, ten, twelve, and thirteen. Mr. Tyson, I am going
18	to let you tell us how you feel about those first six.
19	MR. TYSON: Judge, the State will strike
20	number twelve.
21	THE COURT: Number twelve. Then we have
22	number three, eight, nine, ten, thirteen, and fifteen.
23	Mr. de Vlaming, to you?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We will excuse

_	THE COURT: Nine. So we have three,
2	eight, ten, thirteen, fifteen, seventeen. Mr. Tyson,
3	back to you?
4	MR. TYSON: Judge, I will strike number
5	ten.
6	THE COURT: Number ten. We have three,
7	eight, thirteen, fifteen, seventeen, and nineteen. Mr.
8	de Vlaming, to you?
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let me just see,
10	Judge, we have got three, eight, thirteen, fifteen,
11	seventeen, nineteen. No challenges.
12	THE COURT: No challenges. Mr. Tyson?
13	MR. TYSON: Strike number nineteen, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Number nineteen is gone. So
15	are your preemptory challenges. So we have three, eight,
16	thirteen, seventeen, twenty, twenty-one. Mr. de Vlaming?
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, you just
18	included fifteen?
19	THE COURT: Yes, I did, he is still in.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We are going to
21	excuse twenty.
22	THE COURT: Twenty is gone. That leaves
23	three, eight, thirteen, fifteen, seventeen, and twenty-
24	one.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How many do I have

1	left?
2	MS. RIVELLINI: One more.
. 3	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I have one left?
4	THE COURT: Yes.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: How many does the
6	State have?
7	MR. TYSON: I'm out.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You out?
9 -	MR. TYSON: I am out of bullets, Denis.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We will strike
11	number eight.
12	THE COURT: Number eight is gone. Let's
13	see what we have left. We have three, we have thirteen,
14	we have fifteen, we have seventeen, we have twenty-one,
15	and we have twenty-two, which means that juror number
16	twenty-three would be the alternate.
17	MR. TYSON: Strikes and challenges for
18	cause. I will strike number twenty-three for the
19	alternate.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You strike number
21	twenty-three, that leaves us with twenty-four. We will
22	take it.
23	THE COURT: Twenty-four is the alternate.
24	Mr. de Vlaming, for the record, your client has been
25	present for this process. I assume that he satisfied

1	with the jury, is that correct?
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's correct.
3	THE COURT: What I would like to do is
4	bring them in, give them preliminary instructions and
5	send everybody to lunch for an hour. Is everybody okay
6	with an hour.
7	MR. TYSON: Can we swear them after we
8	come back? Would that be fine?
9	THE COURT: That's fine, we can do that.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, there is a
11	small housecleaning matter. Pellegrino is the one, you
12	may recall, that
13	THE COURT: With the daughter.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And Ms. Green with
15	the bus.
16	THE COURT: The bus I can work with, I
17	don't know how to handle the daughter. Does anybody got
18	any suggestions. I guess she is going to have to sort it
19	out. Hopefully she can work it. Let's bring them in and
20	get them seated.
21	(Whereupon, the jury panel was brought
22	in.)
23	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the
24	panel we have a jury. If your name is called please come
25	forward, the deputy sheriffs will escort you to the jury

box, and give you your assigned seats. Deborah Kolba,
Tina Pellegrino, Donald Lovegrove, Leroy Joiner, Joyce
Green, Josefine Grover. Peter Palmieri, you will be the
alternate juror, but please come forward as well.

Ladies and gentlemen of the panel, those of you who remain, it's 1:30. You have been very patient with our questions. We appreciate that very much, however, your jury service is complete. You are free to go. You have my sincere thanks. Please be careful going home.

Okay, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, what we are going to do is give you some instructions, let you go to lunch. Then you will receive the oath as jurors when you return from lunch. What I am going to do now is give you what is called preliminary instructions. Please pay attention. Okay.

You have been selected and sworn as the jury to try the case of the State of Florida versus Robert Minton. This is a criminal case, as you know. This Defendant has been charged with battery, as we have already told you. The definition of the elements of this crime will be explained to you later. It is your solemn responsibility to determine if the State has proven its accusation beyond a reasonable doubt against this defendant.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence, or lack of evidence, and the law. information is not evidence, and it is not to be considered by you as any proof of guilt. It is the judge's responsibility to decide laws apply to this case, and then explain those laws to you. It's your responsibility to decide what the facts of the case may be, and then apply the law to those facts. Thus, the province of the jury and the province of the Court are well defined. They do not overlap. This is one of the fundamental principles of our system of justice. proceeding further it will be helpful for you to understand how a trial is conducted.

At the beginning of the trial the attorneys have an opportunity, if they want to, to make an opening statement. The opening statement gives the attorneys a chance to tell you what evidence they believe will be presented during this trial. What the lawyers say is not evidence. And you are not to consider it as such. Following the opening statements witnesses will be called to testify under oath. They will be examined and cross examined by the attorneys. Documents and other exhibits may also be produced as evidence. After the evidence has been presented the attorneys will then have an opportunity to make their final or closing argument.

Following the arguments by the attorneys, the Court will then instruct you on the law that applies to this case. After the instructions are given you will then retire to consider your verdict.

You should not form any definite or fixed opinions on the merits of this case until you have heard all of the evidence, all of the arguments of the lawyers, and the instructions on the law by the judge. Until that time you should not even discuss this case among yourselves. During the course of the trial we are going to take recesses, and I told you, we will take one shortly for lunch, but there will be others during the course of this trial. During these times you will be permitted to separate and go about your personal affairs. During these recesses you should not discuss this case with anyone, or permit anyone to say anything to you or in your presence about this case.

or in your presence about this case, tell them that you are on the jury trying the case, and ask them to stop.

If this person persists, leave them at once, and immediately report them to the deputy sheriffs that you see working this courtroom so they can tell me what has occurred, and I can determine what, in the interest of justice, needs to be done about it.

This case must be tried by you only the evidence presented during the trial, in your presence, the presence of the Defendant, the lawyers, and the judge, in other words we have to hear all together for the first time.

Accordingly, you must not visit any of the places described in the evidence, and you must not read or listen to any reports about this case. Further, you must not discuss this case with any person. And you must not speak with the attorneys, the witness, or the Defendant about any subject whatsoever until your deliberations are finish.

In every criminal proceeding the Defendant has an absolute right to remain silent. At no time is it the duty of a defendant to prove his or innocence. From the exercise of a defendant's right to remain silent a jury is not permitted to draw any inference of guilt. And the fact that a defendant did not take the witness stand must not influence your verdict in any manner whatsoever.

The attorneys are trained in the rules of evidence and trial procedure. It's their duty to make all objections they believe are proper. When an objection is made you should not speculate on the reason why it was made. Likewise, when an objection is

sustained or upheld by me, which means I stop the testimony because of the objection, if I do that, you must not speculate on what might have occurred had the objection not been sustained, nor what the witness might have said had the witness been permitted to answer.

It's 1:35, what I would like to do is resume at quarter to three, that gives you a little more than hour. It gives you a chance to make the phone calls that you need to make and now further arrange your lives a little bit because you now know that you will be with us for awhile. It gives you a chance to figure some of these things out. It gives you a chance to get something to eat and just kind of stabilize things, and let people know where you are, and what's going to happen.

So we are adjourned until quarter to three. Have a good lunch.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: Is there anything that we need to do before we break?

(Whereupon, court was recessed for lunch from 1:35 p.m. until 2:45 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the jury was brought in and sworn.)

THE COURT: Is counsel for the State ready to proceed with opening statement?

MR. TYSON: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please do so.

MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. You have heard a lot of preliminary stuff. Now you know what the facts are. October 31, Sunday night, Halloween 1999, about 10:30 p.m. the Defendant, Robert Minton took, what he alleges was a protest sign, and shoved it in the face of Richard Howd.

Now, before we get into that, let's start at the beginning of the day. Early in the day Mr. Minton comes into town. It will no be secret here that Mr. Minton doesn't like the Scientologist and vice versa. They don't like each other. No doubt about that. Mr. Minton shows up at The Fort Harrison Hotel about 3:00 Sunday afternoon October 31st. He is holding a sign. I will show what he has got. I am sure that you will be seeing this quite a bit today.

He is walking with a protest sign. A little banter back and forth, people getting close. Close to each other on purpose. He is walking holding the sign. He leaves The Fort Harrison after a period of time protesting. Then Mr. Howd and some other Scientologists find out that he is at the Belleview Biltmore, so they go down. They want to keep an eye on

him. You will learn that they believe he is harassing them.

You will learn that through this trial that Mr. Minton thinks they are harassing him. There won't be any secret of this. They go down to the Belleview Biltmore to check him out. He finds out they are there, and there is a little confrontation there.

Later in the night, however, and this something I want you to understand, it is now 10:30 at night, on a Sunday, and now he is returning back to The Fort Harrison. Just prior to getting there, you will see a video, we have four videos. You will see through the course of this trial that everybody has got a video camera. You will see shortly before that Mr. Minton, along with a woman named Stacy Brooks, who is a friend of his, goes to the residence of an executive of Scientology's house. They go to her house late at night.

They are filming around her house, you will see them knocking into the gate. They are talking about Scientology, saying that is a spontaneous picket. It will be up to you to decide whether that is a proper time to be picketing outside of somebody's residence, at 10:00 at night.

They then leave there to go down to The Fort Harrison at 10:30 p.m. on Sunday night to picket.

Again, you can leave that up to your decision making process whether at that point in time it is a lawful picket.

You will see as Mr. Minton is walking along side The Fort Harrison and his friend Stacy Brooks has a video too, so she will tape what you see in here. You will see her tape. Richard Howd has got a tape. There is a building security tape. Philip Dellar, who is a Scientologist has a tape. You will see all four of them.

As Mr. Minton is walking, coming down the side of The Fort Harrison you will hear him yell, "That's right, scramble and go hide you cockroaches, just like the ones that ate Lisa McPherson." You will see somebody, it's a little difficult to see it in these videos because it is a little blurry, but you will see a couple people go around the side of the building.

Mr. Minton then comes around The Fort
Harrison and Mr. Howd is there with a video camera. They
had spotted him in the area driving by shortly before, so
he figured he was coming. So Mr. Howd has got the video
camera in his hand. Then Mr. Minton is carrying the
sign, you will see him pull it over like this, so it goes
right towards Mr. Howd's head. Okay, Mr. Minton is
walking down the sidewalk, he is telling people what he

thinks about Scientologists. You will hear them say, "Go home, Bob, and go away." You will not be hearing a whole lot other than that.

The one thing that you will see is that Mr. Howd is very close to him with the video. Mr. Howd is close to him with the video at varying times. You will see between the four videos it is almost like the NFL here, where is he out of bounds or not, let's check the different videos. Well, you will see on the one video Mr. Minton is walking, Mr. Howd is walking backwards. He intentionally walks in the path of Mr. Howd.

Mr. Minton tells Mr. Howd, I hope that you got that on video, and tells him to get of his way. Mr. Minton is taunting Mr. Howd at that point in time. You will hear on the video of Stacy Brooks, who is a friend of Mr. Minton's, tell the Scientologists when they say, "Go home, Bob. Go home, Bob." She will say, "Is that the best you can do? Is that all you can say is, "Go home, Bob. Go home, Bob." You will hear that.

You will then see on video Mr. Minton go around the dark side of the building a couple of times.

You need to think about what the purpose of that was. At one point in time on the video it's only him and Mr. Howd on the side of the building. You will see on Mr. Howd's

video Mr. Minton say, "What if I grab that?"

When you see Philip Dellar's video, when he comes around the corner, Mr. Howd has a camera strap there. He's talking about grabbing that strap. Mr. Howd's hand goes out as a natural reaction, but Mr. Minton says, "Oh, you are pushing me now." And then pushes him against the wall. He is pinned against the wall.

Mr. Minton shortly thereafter says, "I'm sick of this, and I'm calling the police." Even though during the course of the time you will see that he is the aggressive one. Mr. Howd never says a word. It is Mr. Minton in the taunting of Mr. Howd. There is no taunting by anyone else there.

Mr. Minton gets on the cell phone and calls a detective of the Clearwater Police Department.

Mr. Howd has got the video up to his eye, in a nonthreatening manner. It's up to his eye, he is backed up four feet. Mr. Minton steps off the curb with his cell phone and is walking, he turns around, and says, "Don't follow me across the street." And shoves it in his face. You will see that Mr. Howd has a cut above his eye and bruise on his face. He falls down in the street.

Unbeknownst to Mr. Minton there is a Clearwater police officer sitting on Fort Harrison Avenue

aimed in the northbound direction and he sees that. So on the videos you will see a police car come around the corner pretty quick. He stops Mr. Minton. And when he stops Mr. Minton you will see Mr. Minton on the video says, "I told him I'm calling the police." Which is true, it was about fifteen seconds before that. Then he says, "I told him, I want you to stay away from me. And then he walks right into the sign." I want you to look at the videos carefully. You will be determining whether he walked into that sign or not. I submit to you that he did not. The sign was shoved into this face.

Basically, Mr. Minton is telling the police officer seconds after the incident, when there is no real time for reflection, basically it was an accident. That was Mr. Minton's statement, seconds after this happened. I want you consider that during this trial, also.

Officer Beaudette who was northbound on Fort Harrison and stopped Mr. Minton gathered up the videos at the scene, after listening to Mr. Minton's statement that Mr. Howd had walked into the video [sic], he gathered three videos at the scene. The fourth one is a surveillance camera on the building. He watched the videos. After he watched the videos he arrested Mr. Minton for battery.

Now Mr. Minton may believe that he was protesting at night, 10:30 at night. It is up to you decide whether that is proper. It is not a crime that we are charging him with, but it is a part of the circumstances that I want you to consider, 10:30 at night on a Sunday night. How much of the message is really getting out. I want you to consider the demeanor of Mr. Minton and the Scientologists. You will see it all.

I think when this is done you will agree that Mr. Minton is the one who lost his cool. Mr. Minton was the one who was provoking people that night. I am going to ask you to find him guilty of battery. Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel for Defendant, opening statement.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, if it please the Court. Members of the jury this is my opportunity to give an opening statement on behalf of Mr. Minton. In doing so I too would like to recap the evidence in this case, and to a certain extent the video says what the video says, and the video shows what the video shows. However in order to fully understand the facts in this case we have to go back in time. You will learn to a very limited degree a little bit about the Church of Scientology and one particular aspect of their

1 policy. That will be described to you by me in a moment.

As far as the incident is concerned what you are going to learn is that Mr. Minton came in town, flew into town and he was greeted by members of the Church of Scientology at the airport. Mr. Minton had no idea as to how they could have possibly known that he was on that flight. They did. As he exited the airplane they said, "Go home, Bob. What are you doing here? Get out of here."

Mr. Minton and Ms. Brooks gathered their belongings, their luggage and they got in the vehicle on their way to a local hotel. As they drove down the road they realized that there were people following them. Mr. Minton is tuned to that. He has been followed before. He realized that member of the Church of Scientology in a unit called the Office of Special Affairs.

Mr. Tyson, if I may digress, said that Mr. Minton doesn't like Scientologists. That's not the truth. You are not going to hear anything about Mr. Minton not liking Scientologists. I think the evidence in this case is going to show that he lives and let live. If that is what their personal beliefs are, you are going to hear from the evidence then that is fine. His quarrel is to get out the word about the Office of Special Affairs, and about certain natures and the manner in

which the church is run. Not the members, but the manner in which it is run, its doctrine, it dogma.

That is essence one of the reasons why he was holding this sign, "Lisa's blood on Scientology hands." We are not going to go into this Lisa McPherson, but I think very generally, she is the woman who died at the church, and part of Mr. Minton's reason for protesting is to establish that the practices of the church caused her death.

But beyond that, this was an avenue for him to bring this to light to the citizens of Clearwater. To march up and down the street in protest so that they will look into this doctrine and this dogma. So is it to the members that he has a quarrel. The evidence will establish not at all. But rather it is to that dogma.

Now, when Mr. Minton came into town, as I indicated, he realized that someone was behind him. They were following him. In fact, at one point in time -- at one point in time a vehicle stopped in front of Mr. Minton's automobile when it reached the Belleview Biltmore Hotel and a vehicle stopped behind his vehicle at the Belleview Biltmore Hotel, so that he was sandwiched between the two of them. Mr. Minton got out of the vehicle. As the other people got out of the vehicle, a woman and a man, they began filming Mr.

Minton. They filmed as he was on the grounds in the
place in which he was going to stay. One car sandwiching
his car on the grounds of the Belleview Biltmore.

Mr. Minton, after leaving went to the guardhouse at the Belleview Biltmore Hotel and he told the guard that he was being followed. He gave them the tag, which he had photographed. He got the tag number of the car that was following and said that these people are not guests at the hotel, do not let them on the premises.

Now, as Mr. Tyson said, he did go to this woman's house named Slaughter. She is a high ranking official of the Church of Scientology. It was Halloween night. He had heard that Scientology hierarchy were going to be at a Halloween party that night. He was wrong. When he showed up there, there was nobody there. You will see this footage. He talks back and forth with Stacy. There's no confrontation. There is no yelling or screaming, or going to the individuals house to knock on the door. Look at it for what it is worth, or what have you.

Fort Harrison Hotel for the purpose of continuing to protest, which is his first amendment right to do that. He began walking up and down the street. What you are going to find is that Richard Howd, and you are going to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

see him on the video, was already there. He didn't know the time that Mr. Minton was going to be there, or even if he was going to be there. But you are going to see Mr. Minton being filmed by Ms. Brooks as he got out of his vehicle. You are going to see them walking from a parking lot around the corner to where the church is located on Fort Harrison. It is The Fort Harrison Hotel.

You are going to see Mr. Howd already there with a camera in his hand, a video digital camera in his hand. From the moment that Mr. Minton stepped on that property, as he walked up and down that public sidewalk Richard Howd was within inches of Robert Minton's face. You are going to see his video, that is from what he was taping. You are going to see it on occasion so close that you can see the pores in skin, that you can see the sweat on his cheeks, and you can see time after time Mr. Howd doing this as he walked up and As Minton moved he was right in his face, as close as he could get. To document what was happening? There was another Scientologist documenting what was happening down the street a little bit, a comfortable distance away, just like Ms. Brooks was a comfortable distance away, filming without getting in his face. Without getting in his face.

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

Howd, up and down the street, up and down

21

22

23

25

1

the street, camera in the face, camera in the face. Can you let me picket, can you get out of the way? No Up and down the street. Until at one point Mr. Minton went around the corner of The Fort Harrison Hotel. When he went around the corner is when the police officer was parked on the road. The officer did not see what happened around that corner. What happened around that corner is Mr. Howd assaulted Mr. Minton. Mr. Tyson said that he put his hand out and touched his -- no, no. You are going to see it in a minute. I am going to throw it up on that screen. But you are going to see that there is a crease here. So this wasn't slapped. going to see the force that Howd used on this sign as he came back to Minton and knocked him back. What you are going to see in a moment is a piece of evidence that is going to be introduced in this trial. It is from the vantage point of somebody that came around the corner after the assault took place. This is not what the officer said, but this is right after the assault took place.

Your Honor, could you flip on the sound?

THE COURT: It is on.

(Whereupon, the video tape was played for

24 | the jury.)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Howd on the left,

24

25

Minton on the right. Okay, now, as Mr. Tyson said, it is, it is almost like an NFL game. We are going to have different views in different areas. What you are going to see Mr. Howd's camera view of what happened in that assault that just preceded this. Remember the Church of Scientology shot this. He was running to try to get the footage, when he comes around the corner he saw Mr. Minton say, "You do that one more time, you hit me now. You do that one more time." Now you are going to see what happened which caused those statements to be made. What you are also going to see on this tape, ladies and gentlemen, is after Mr. Minton was assaulted he walked down to the end of the corner and he says, "It's time to call the police." He had just been assaulted. members of the Office of Special Affairs of the Church of Scientology were there as witnesses, and when he says it you watch what they do. You will see some women that are going to be described to you as members of the Office of Special Affairs, and other people. They turn right around, they go to the entrance of the Church of Scientology and they go in there and take a right. Actually, that is on the video. What you are going to see now is what happened, what happened when Minton and Howd went around the corner. The assault had taken place. Minton then saying it is time to call the police.

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then you are going to see him retreat across the street, getting away from the church property, and 3 leaving it. You are also going to see instead of Mr. Howd, a member of the Office of Special Affairs, saying, "Fine you are leaving." He didn't do that. 6 right after him. He followed him. He took his step off the roadway, and went after him as Minton was retreating. This is what happened when he did.

(Whereupon, the video was played for the jury.)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You are going to have an opportunity to see these whole tapes in total. What is important for take into context however is Robert Minton's state of mind. And what you have to do, the evidence is going to show, and what the Judge is going to instruct you at the conclusion of this case, if somebody acts in self-defense, what is their state of mind. were they thinking? What went through their mind earlier in the day? What went on in their lives? And most importantly, what did he believe that the Office of Special Affairs was capable of doing to him? do that, and for only this purpose, because is not in the video that I am going to show you right now, and this is specifically to establish the state of mind of Mr. Minton, to show you an incident that happened in Boston,

Mass --

MR. TYSON: Judge, I want to object at this point in time. May we approach?

THE COURT: Please do.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held out of the hearing of the jury.)

MR. TYSON: There is going to be some arguments about the relevancy later on of that thing. Have you already ruled that it is definitely coming in?

THE COURT: I have ruled that it is relevant, but it is subject to predicate which from what I have heard is likely to be laid. So if that is your objection I am going to overrule it, because based on what I have heard, I have heard enough evidence to believe that they can establish that foundation.

MR. TYSON: Okay.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: What Mr. Tyson said is true, Mr. Minton has been a thorn in the side of the administration of this organization for quite some time. The Office of Special Affairs and the manner in which they conduct their business had made him a target. What you are going to see now has given him the state of mind of what Howd was capable of doing and what he was about to do. That's the purpose of this short tape. It was approximately thirteen months before this incident in

question this was shot. This was shot in Boston,

Massachusetts. It was shot in front of the Church of

Scientology unit up there. You will see the man, for

lack of better term that is in Mr. Minton's face, is a

member of the Office of Special Affairs. At the end of

the tape you will hear, "Minton, you are just a fucking

mental patient." That is a minister of the Church of

Scientology.

(Whereupon, the video was played for the jury.)

MR. TYSON: I have a continuing objection to the narration.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled, as previously stated.

(Whereupon, the video was continued.)

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Minton had his camera knocked from him so that he could no longer film. He was assaulted and he was later accused by that man you saw in his face of assaulting him. If you heard a piece of wood fall in that case, it was a balsa wood, and it was with that piece of balsa wood that member of the Office of Special Affairs said that he had committed a battery against him.

When the police were called so was an ambulance, for a piece of balsa wood being thrown in the

direction of that member. The significance is in this case with what you saw the ambulance was called. He is laying on the ground for an inordinate period of time while they call the ambulance. Why did they do that? Why is it done that way? That is what we are going to tell you. That is what is going to be a part of this trial.

Because you see, one of the witnesses in this case is someone who used to be a member of the Church of Scientology the Office of Special Affairs. He is a young man who was there for approximately seven to eight years. He was a member of the Office of Special Affairs, but he left the Church of Scientology.

What he is going to do is he is going to tell you about a policy that this organization has, an that it is carried out by the Office of Special Affairs. The policy was once called "Fair Game" by its founder L. Ron Hubbard. What this witness is going to tell you briefly is this is the goal of "Fair Game". A suppressive person, that is somebody like Bob Minton to the Church of Scientology, a suppressive person is someone who doesn't go along with the doctrine, someone that criticizes the church. That's a suppressive person.

A suppressive person order is "Fair Game".

"He or she may be deprived of property, or injured by any

1 means, by any Scientologists, without any discipline of 2 the Scientologists. He may be tricked, sued to, lied to, 3 or destroyed." In 1967 L. Ron Hubbard made that edict. 4 A year later this is what he did in another policy 5 "The practice of declaring people 'Fair Game' will cease. 'Fair Game' will not appear on any ethics 6 7 It causes bad public relations." Naturally. 8 This policy letter does not cancel any policy on the 9 treatment or handling of a suppressive person. 10 Hubbard did was, he said, "Let's not call it 'Fair 11 Game'." But the policy remained. Get them arrested, 12 silence the critic, file an injunction against them, 13 which they did in this case, you will hear about that. 14 Prosecute them if you can, and that will make them a 15 criminal, and will neutralize them as a critic. 16 don't have to watch them walk up and down the street 17 anymore. Because they were a 'Fair Game' target and we 18 neutralized them.

We are not going to make a feature of this trial anything about Scientology, with the exception of this policy of the Office of Special Affairs. What the members of that church do is no concern to Mr. Minton, or anyone else in this courtroom. But it is the manner in which they silence critics.

You might say what does that have to do

19

20

21

22

23

24

with this? It is two-fold as the defense in this case. You probably realized that from the voir dire questions. The evidence is going to show number one, that Mr. Minton based upon his knowledge of their tactics, based upon Boston, based upon the way he was treated, based upon getting in your face, that is exactly what was going to happen to him as he retreated and walked across the street Howd came after him, followed him, left the church property to go after him. "Don't you follow me" as the thing went out. He had a right to defend himself. He had an absolute right to stop him from getting in his face or in his face any further.

The second defense in this case may sound strange to you. That is his actual conduct by Mr. Howd, according to the individual who will testify about the Office of Special Affairs, was invited conduct. He wanted it to occur. I believe that we are going to be able to prove that. He wanted it to occur for the benefit of the cause to neutralize this man, and stop him as a critic of the Church of Scientology. Like the man on the NBA court, he will take the foul to stop the shot. And that is exactly what Howd did here.

I believe the evidence is going to show that. He is going to show that he didn't want to get hit, but when this trial is over you are going to find

209 1 out he was rewarded for taking that hit. I believe that 2 without question at the conclusion of this case, once you 3 listen to the facts, and yes the tapes show what they 4 show, and they say what they say, but when you put 5 everything together about the practices of this 6 particular aspect of the Church of Scientology you will 7 agree that Mr. Minton acted the way he should have acted 8 under the law. He acted in self-defense and this man got 9 exactly what he wanted. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Counsel, approach the bench 11 just briefly. 12 (Whereupon, a bench conference was held 13 out of the hearing of the jury.)

THE COURT: Just a matter of procedure, are we invoking the rule on witnesses?

> MR. TYSON: Yes.

THE COURT: I want to make sure both of you are aware. Rule is invoked and you all instruct your own witnesses. Just give everybody a second and then we will get going.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were excluded from the courtroom.)

(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)

THE COURT: Please proceed.

MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge.

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Whereupon,

2

1

## RICHARD HOWD,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a witness, was called for examination by counsel for the State, and having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. TYSON:

- Q Please introduce yourself to the jury?
- Α My name is Richard Howd.
- Q And are you connected with the Church of Scientology?
  - Α Yes, sir.
  - Q I'm sorry?
- Α I work in the Office of Special Affairs, in the legal department where I conduct research and liaise with the security for the church.
- Q You say that you liaise with security, please explain what that means?
- A What that means is that I am contact with security concerning anybody that could pose a threat to the parishioners, staff, or actual physical locations to any of the church properties, anybody that would come from outside the church inside the church to do anybody harm.
  - Q Okay. How long have you been with the Church

1	of Scientology?
2	A I have been a Scientologist for over ten years.
3	I've been employed here in Clearwater for approximately
4	three years.
5	Q In Clearwater for three years?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Do you know who Bob Minton is?
8	A Yes, sir, I do.
9	Q Do you see Mr. Minton in court here today?
10	A Yes, sir.
11	Q Would you please identify what he is wearing
12	and point to him?
13	A Mr. Minton is sitting right over there, wearing
14	the dark blue suit.
15	Q Red and blue tie?
16	A Red and blue tie.
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, let the record reflect
18	that he has identified the Defendant.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No objection.
20	THE COURT: The record will so reflect the
21	ID.
22	BY MR. TYSON:
23	Q I direct your attention to October 31, 1999.
24	Were you at The Fort Harrison Hotel that day?
25	A Yes, I was.

- Q In the afternoon did you see Mr. Minton at The
  Fort Harrison Hotel?
  A Yes, I did.
  - Q Tell the jury what he was doing?
  - A Mr. Minton was walking back and forth in front
    The Fort Harrison with a picket sign screaming
    obscenities about my religion. He was screaming
    obscenities at the parishioners that were coming in and
    out of the building, and pretty much trying to provoke an
    incident at the church.
    - Q Were you filming him?
- 12 A Yes, I was.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

20

22

23

25

- Q Were other members of the church filming him?
- A Yes, there was a couple of other people there filming him as well.
- Q How long was he there for?
  - A He was there approximately an hour.
- Q Did he then leave the area?
- 19 A Yes, he did.
  - Q Did you follow him from the area?
- 21 A No, I didn't follow him from the area.
  - Q Did there come a time when you encountered him at the Belleview Biltmore?
- 24 A Yes, I did.
  - Q Please explain to the jury why you were there,

1 and what the encounter was?

A We received a message at my office that somebody called in to say that Mr. Minton had reservations at the Belleview Biltmore and after Mr. Minton left the front of The Fort Harrison I went to -- near the Biltmore to see if, in fact, that was correct. To see if I could see him driving up into the Biltmore property.

Q Why did you want to do that?

A I wanted to know where he was. Mr. Minton has repeatedly harassed Scientologists whenever he is in Clearwater. He has shown up at unexpected times, since I have been here, to harass Scientologists and do what he did earlier in the afternoon. I wanted to know where he was staying for the safety and security of staff and parishioners.

Q Now, you were videotaping during the day and taping at night?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q Tell the jury why you were videotaping?

A I was videotaping him for a couple of reasons.

Number one was, to make sure that we had a complete
running record of everything that Mr. Minton said and
did. Many times he will threaten Scientologists that are
around him while he is out there with his sign. And also

so that he knew that he was being video taped so that he wouldn't physically assault somebody.

On the evening of October 31, 1999, did you

A Yes, I did.

encounter Robert Minton again?

Q When he first showed up, where were you located?

A I was located -- when he first showed up I was in The Fort Harrison and I was talking with some people in security who said that a security guard at the front door just saw Mr. Minton drive by. I went out to the front and sure enough he comes around the corner and around Pierce with his picket sign.

- Q You had knowledge that he was on his way?
- A No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q No?
- 17 | A No.
- 18 Q Right then, that's when you knew?
- A Oh, that's when I knew.
  - Q You have seen the tapes in this case, is that why you are outside waiting for him?
  - A That's correct. I mean security at this time, they knew he was in the area, so they were looking for him.
    - Q Who was with him when he showed up at night?

1	A Ms. Stacy Brooks.
2	Q And you know who she is?
3	A Yes, I do.
4	Q Was Minton carrying anything when he showed up?
5	A Yes, he was carrying a sign that said,
6	"Scientology Spiritual Death." It had human skulls on
7	the front of it.
8	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I can approach the
9	clerk?
10	THE COURT: You may.
11	MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach the
12	witness?
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	BY MR. TYSON:
15	Q I am going to show what is marked State's
16	Exhibit for identification, number 1. Tell me what that
17	is?
18	A That is the sign that Mr. Minton had that
19	evening.
20	(The sign hereinafter
21	referred to was marked
22	State's Exhibit No. 1 for
23	identification.)
24	BY MR. TYSON:
25	Q Is it in substantially the same condition that

	210
1	it was that night?
2	A Yes, it is.
3	MR. TYSON: Judge, I would tender this as
4	State's Exhibit Number 1.
5	THE COURT: Any objection?
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: None.
7	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
8	marked.
9	(The sign heretofore marked
10	as State's Exhibit No. 1
11	for identification was
12	received into evidence.)
13	BY MR. TYSON:
14	Q Did Stacy Brooks have anything in her hand?
15	A Yes, she had a video camera.
16	Q Did Mr. Minton start protesting on the sidewalk
17	before he said anything about the Church of Scientology?
18	A Yes, as soon as he started walking up to the
19	building he immediately started harassing the
20	Scientologists that were out in front of the building,
21	screaming such things as, "You killed Lisa McPherson.
22	You are all responsible for Lisa McPherson's death. The
23	Church of Scientology murdered Lisa McPherson." And
24	things like that, on and on.
25	Q Okay. People were videotaping that night. Who

was videotaping?

A It was myself and Philip Dellar, and Stacy Brooks was also videotaping.

- Q Was there also a surveillance camera on the building?
  - A Yes, there was.
- Q Would you describe Mr. Minton's demeanor when he showed up that night?
- A He was very aggressive, very threatening. He was getting in people's faces trying to provoke something.
- Q Did there come a time when an incident occurred around the side of The Fort Harrison Hotel?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q Would you please look at the jury and explain what that was?

A I was following Mr. Minton and he turned around the side The Fort Harrison Hotel and turned back to me and grabbed the strap to video camera and said, "How would like it if I pulled this out of your hands?" At that time I grabbed the video camera with my other hand. I was holding it with my right hand to my right eye. I just grabbed it with my other and to hold on. Eventually he let go. When he let go he just turned around with his picket sign and pushed me up against the building. At

1	that time I pushed back on the picket sign to get him
2	away from me. He became very upset, very belligerent at
3	that time and started screaming that I assaulted him.
4	That's when he just rammed the picket sign and me into
5	the building.
6	Q Up to this time had you said a word to him?
7	A No, sir, I did not say a word to him.
8	Q Did you ever say a word to him at all that
9	evening?
10	A No, I didn't.
11	Q What happened after the pushing against the
12	wall, did he then walk around to the front?
13	A Yes, well, he walked around the corner of
14	Pierce and Fort Harrison.
15	Q Let me back up a second. Around the side of
16	The Fort Harrison, is that well lit there?
17	A No, not particularly.
18	Q Is that well trafficked there?
19	A No.
20	Q Is it fair to say that it is dark?
21	A Yes.
22	Q After he left around the side of the building,
23	did he then return to the front?
24	A Yes.
25	O What happened at that time?

1 At that point he said, "I have had it, I am Α 2 going to call the police." He pulled out his cell phone 3 and started dialing a number. 4 0 And then what happened? 5 Α He started to walk across Pierce and I 6 proceeded to follow him. I would say I was about five 7 feet behind him when he spun around and said, "Don't you 8 follow me." And he smashed the picket sign into the side 9 of my face, and the bulldog clip on the edge of the 10 picket sign caught me right over the eye. 11 When he hit you, where did you have the video 12 camera? 13 Α 14

- I had the video camera up to my right eye.
- Q Had you threatened him at all prior to that?
- Α No, sir, I didn't.
  - Q Said anything at all prior to that?
- 17 Α Not at all.
  - Did you make an threatening gestures to him Q prior to that?
  - Α No, I was just there to videotape and ensure that I got a complete running record of everything he said and did.
    - Did you receive any injuries? Q
  - Yes, I did. Α
    - MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach the

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	clerk?
2	THE COURT: You may.
3	BY MR. TYSON:
4	Q I am going to show you what is marked State's
5	Exhibit for identification number 2. Can you tell me
6	what that is?
7	A Yes, that is picture of me in the hospital.
8	(The photograph hereinafter
9	referred to was marked as
10	State's Exhibit No. 2 for
11	identification.)
12	BY MR. TYSON:
13	Q Does it fairly and accurately depict the way
14	your face looked that day?
15	A Yes, sir, it does. There is a cut above the eye
16	and an abrasion below the eye.
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, at this time I would
18	like to enter State's Exhibit Number 2 into evidence.
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No objection.
20	MR. TYSON: And publish it to the jury.
21	THE COURT: It will admitted and so
22	marked, and you may publish it.
23	MR. TYSON: Thank you, Judge. Pass that
24	around.
25	(The photograph heretofore

1	marked as State's Exhibit
2	No. 2 for identification
3	was received into
4	evidence.)
5	BY MR. TYSON:
6	Q Mr. Howd, when he hit you in the face was that
7	against your consent?
8	A Absolutely.
9	Q Did you want him to hit you in the face?
10	A No, I didn't.
11	Q Did there come a time subsequent to this event
12	that you gave a written statement in which you said that
13	it was your right eye hit?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Explain that?
16	A That during the restraining order hearing where
17	the initial injunction it was mistakenly said that
18	I was hit in the right eye.
19	Q And what is on the video you were hit in the
20	left eye?
21	A Yes.
22	Q In the photo you were hit in the left eye?
23	A Yes.
24	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I may approach the
25	clerk?

1	THE COURT: You may.
2	BY MR. TYSON:
3	Q Mr. Minton, I am going to show you what
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Howd.
5	BY MR. TYSON:
6	Q I'm sorry. Mr. Howd, I am going to show you
7	what is marked as States's Exhibit for identification,
8	number 3, and it is marked Richard Howd video. Have you
9	had an opportunity to view that prior to court today?
10	A Yes, sir, I did.
11	(The video hereinafter
12	referred to marked as
13	State's Exhibit No. 3 for
14	identification.)
15	BY MR. TYSON:
16	Q Tell the jury who took that and what's on it?
17	A That's the video that I took of Mr. Minton
18	protesting that evening.
19	Q Does it fairly and accurately depict the events
20	that night?
21	A Yes, it does.
22	Q I show you what is State's Exhibit for
23	identification number 4, and it is marked Stacy Brook's
24	video. Have you had an opportunity view that today?
25	A Yes, I did.

1	(The video hereinafter
2	referred to marked as
3	State's Exhibit No. 4 for
4	identification.)
5	BY MR. TYSON:
6	Q Does it fairly and accurately depict what was
7	taking place at The Fort Harrison?
8	A Yes, it does.
9	Q Also on this tape does it show Benetta
10	Slaughter's house?
11	A Yes, it does.
12	Q Are you familiar with her residence?
13	A Yes, I am.
14	Q Is that, in fact, her residence on the tape?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Were they wearing the same clothes at her house
17	as they were when they were out in front of The Fort
18	Harrison on October 31st?
19	A Yes, sir.
20	Q Same sign?
21	A Yes, same sign.
22	Q I am going to show you what is marked State's
23	Exhibit for identification, number 5, that's marked
24	Building Video, Building Surveillance Video. Have you
25	had an opportunity to see this?

1	A Yes,	I did.
2		(The video hereinafter
3		referred to marked as
4		State's Exhibit No. 5 for
5		identification.)
6	BY M	R. TYSON:
7	Q Have	you had an opportunity to view this?
8	A Yes.	
9	Q What	does it show?
10	A It s	hows me being struck.
11	Q Does	it fairly and accurately depict you being
12	struck?	
13	A Yes,	it does.
14	Q I wi	ll show what is marked as State's Exhibit
15	for identification	tion, number 6. It is marked Dellar Video
16	for Philip Del	lar. Have you had an opportunity to view
17	this video?	
18	A Yes,	I did.
19		(The video hereinafter
20		referred to marked as
21		State's Exhibit No. 6 for
22		<pre>identification.)</pre>
23	BY MI	R. TYSON:
24	Q Does	it fairly and accurately depict what
25	happened that	night?

25

1	A Yes, it does.
2	MR. TYSON: Judge, at this time I would
3	like to move 3,4,5, and 6 into evidence and publish the
4	entire tapes to the jury.
5	THE COURT: Any objection?
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No, Judge. I am
7	assuming those are the copies or copies from those are
8	the ones that I was provided.
9	MR. TYSON: Yes.
10	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No objection.
11	THE COURT: They are admitted and you may
12	play them.
13	(The videos heretofore
14	marked as State's
15	Exhibits 3,4,5, and 6
16	for identification
17	were received into
18	evidence.)
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Mr. Tyson, before
20	you hit play. I have no problem, Judge, with the court
21	reporter not taking down the sound since it is evidence.
22	THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate that.
23	MR. TYSON: Not a problem, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Everybody agrees, Madam Court

Reporter, you can watch them with the rest of us.

1	(Whereupon, the videos were played for the
2	jury.)
3	BY MR. TYSON:
4	Q The guy in the white shirt who is standing
5	beside the officer who is wearing a black shirt, is that
6	a paramedic?
7	A Yes, it was.
8	Q Was he telling you anything?
9	A He was asking me how I was doing, you know,
10	what happened. If I was hurt anywhere.
11	Q Mr. Howd, is The Fort Harrison in Clearwater,
12	Pinellas County?
13	A Yes, sir.
14	Q When Mr. Minton goes around the side of the
15	building he says something to the effect, "How about if I
16	grab that." Was that the camera strap?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Was there anybody on the dark side of the
19	building? Any traffic, or anybody to get his message
20	out?
21	A No.
22	MR. TYSON: Judge, I have no further
23	questions.
24	THE COURT: Cross examination?
25	CROSS EXAMINATION

1	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
2	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Howd.
3	A Good afternoon, sir.
4	Q What is the Office of Special Affairs?
5	A The Office of Special Affairs deals with all
6	public relations, legal matters, and community service
7	activities related with the church.
8	Q Also security of the church?
9	A Yes, well, we liaise with security in the legal
10	area.
11	Q What department of the church handles the
12	investigation of critics?
13	A Well, the legal department would handle any
14	type of litigation.
15	Q I didn't say litigation. Who does the
16	investigation well, maybe I shouldn't take anything
17	for granted. Are you aware that there is ever any
18	investigations done of critics of the Church of
19	Scientology?
20	A Well, if you mean if there is investigation of
21	people who attack the church, yes.
22	Q Would they include critics, like Mr. Minton?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Is there a file on him?
25	A Is there a file on him?

24

25

correct.

	228
1	Q Yes, sir.
2	A I don't know.
3	Q Didn't you deliver a file to Mr. Tyson last
4	Friday that is marked Robert Minton?
5	A Yes, there is the file that I have on Mr.
6	Minton that would contain all of his Internet postings,
7	postings that he has done of threats that he has made to
8	the church.
9	Q And investigation of him?
10	MR. TYSON: Judge, he is not finishing his
11	answer.
12	THE COURT: If you would just let him
13	finish.
14	THE WITNESS: I do keep a file on Mr.
15	Minton because he has come to my church repeatedly making
16	threats, doing things of this nature, and he does a lot
17	of posts on the Internet. So I do have a lot of his
18	Internet postings where he has bragged about calling the
19	Ecclesiastical leader of the church, calling his mother,
20	leaving threatening messages on her answering machine.
21	Posting her number and phone number to the Internet.
22	Inviting other people to do the same thing. So I do have
23	like a folder of his Internet postings, yes, that is

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

24

25

right?

1 Have you categorized it and gave it to Mr. Q 2 Tyson on Friday? 3 Α That's correct. Q You gave him a file on Stacy Brooks? 5 A That is correct. 6 You gave him a file on Jesse Prince? Q 7 Α Uh-huh, yes. 8 Q Yes? 9 Yes. Α 10 Any other files? Q 11 Α I believe there was a file on Frank Oliver, 12 too. 13 Q Those are all the witnesses that have been 14 listed by the defense to testify in this case, is that 15 accurate? 16 That's correct. 17 Q And the purpose of giving them all of that 18 investigative work that this church did was so that he 19 could cross examine on what the church had found out and 20 kept in these files, correct? 21 Α Well --22 0 To benefit him in cross examining these people,

A That's right, and also to give him a background on these people.

1	Q	Did he ask for that, did the prosecution ask
2	for that?	
3	A	No, he didn't.
4	Q	You brought it up yourself?
	·	

- Q Is that part of the Office of Special Affairs then, to conduct these investigations into critics?
- A These files were obtained from the legal department, where we do keep files on individuals that we have -- or could potentially have litigation with.
  - Q Do you ever do that investigation?
  - A I do legal research.

Yes, I did.

- Q Legal research, let's see now, legal research, does that mean like looking into a person's past, looking into public records and documents, things like that?
- A It means doing court checks, looking into court records, depending on what it could be. It could be like looking into -- researching different medical information, depending on --
  - Q Medical information of Mr. Minton?
- A No, no. Any type of medical information that might be needed for a case, not personal medical information.
- Q Who does the personal investigation and interviews of critics like Mr. Minton? What part of the

## church does that?

A I don't know. I do know, like, attorneys we hire will hire PI's from time to time to interview or investigate people that we have litigation with.

Q Do you know who hired a witness [sic] to talk to Mr. Oliver's ex-wife, and other related individuals within forty-eight hours of him being listed as a witness?

A I have no idea.

Q Do you talk -- do people from the church talk to people's neighbors, their ex-spouses, the ex-employers, and current employers when someone becomes a critic of the church?

A I have no idea. Again, I liaise with security. I will like keep on what Mr. Minton is posting on the Internet because a lot of it is very inflammatory. Prior to this whole incident I was monitoring Mr. Minton quite closely on the Internet because there was a rising escalation of hostility his posts. That's what I do.

Q Who knew that Mr. Minton was coming into town on October 31st? How did you know that he was landing in Clearwater?

- A I didn't.
- Q Who told you?
- A I found out when he showed up in front The Fort

Q

1	Harrison.
2	Q Well, who met him at the airport? Somebody met
3	him at the airport and said, "Go home, Bob." Who was
4	that?
5	A I have no idea.
6	MR. TYSON: Judge, he said that he didn't
7	know.
8	THE COURT: Sustained.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I'll rephrase it.
10	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
11	Q Do you know whether or not any member of the
12	Church of Scientology met Mr. Minton at the airport?
13	A No, I didn't.
14	Q When did you find out and from what source that
15	he was in town?
16	A I don't remember exactly who told me, but it
17	was when he showed up that afternoon in front The Fort
18	Harrison and starting picketing.
19	Q So the first time that you saw Bob Minton on
20	October 31, 1999 was when he was in front of The Fort
21	Harrison, is that what you are telling us?
22	A That afternoon, that's correct, sir.
23	Q You didn't follow him?
24	A No, I didn't.

Did anybody tell you to go to the Belleview

	233
1	Biltmore where he was staying?
2	A No.
3	Q How did you know that he was staying there?
4	A Somebody I received a message, somebody
5	called in and said that Mr. Minton has a reservation at
6	the Belleview Biltmore.
7	Q You are not suggesting that the Belleview
8	Biltmore calls the Church of Scientology and says that
9	Minton is in town, do you?
10	A I have no idea. That was just a message that I
11	received from our receptionist.
12	Q Did anybody ask you then to go out to the
13	Belleview Biltmore to confront Mr. Minton?
14	A No, they didn't.
15	Q Did you do it by yourself?
16	A Yes, sir.
17	Q Did you have your camera?
18	A Yeah, I had my camera with me.
19	Q How long had you lived in this town before that
20	time?
21	A Before that time, about two and a half years.
22	Q Do you own a car?
23	A No.
24	Q In fact, you had a rental car that day, right?
25	A That's correct.

1	Q And that rental car wouldn't even have come
2	back to you if somebody ran the tag, would it?
3	A No, that rental car, I borrowed it from our
4	security consultant.
5	Q And you had a woman with you at the time?
6	A Yes, there was a woman that showed up there.
7	Q Did she have another car?
8	A Yes, she did.
9	Q Was there a time that you had your vehicle on
10	one side of Mr. Minton's car, front or back, and the
11	woman had her car at Belleview Biltmore property in front
12	or behind that behind that vehicle?
13	A I don't when she showed up, she was we
14	were on a public road even before we entered the
15	Belleview Biltmore property. She was parked along-side
16	there with me. I believe that she just showed up there.
17	I don't think that she went into the Biltmore property.
18	Q The woman didn't?
19	A I don't think so.
20	Q Let me show you what has been marked as
21	Defendant's 1, A, B and C?
22	MR. TYSON: Objection, Judge can we
23	approach?
24	THE COURT: Please.
25	MR. TYSON: Are you entering those in?

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I'm going to, but I
2	can wait. I think he is withdrawing his objection.
3	THE COURT: Are you withdrawing your
4	objection?
5	MR. TYSON: Yes, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tyson.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: May I continue?
8	THE COURT: Let her get ready. Please
9	proceed.
10	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
11	Q Is this the vehicle, the rental vehicle that
12	you just talked about?
13	A I believe so, yes.
14	(The photographs hereinafter
15	referred to were marked as
16	Defendant's Exhibits Nos. 1A, B,
17	and C for identification.)
18	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
19	Q Is this the other woman at the Belleview
20	Biltmore Hotel that drove the other vehicle there?
21	A That's correct.
22	Q What is her name?
23	A I'm sorry, I blanked out there for a second.
24	Q Is she a member of the Church of Scientology?
25	A Yes, she is, she is a hairstylist. Cheryl

1	Fester.						
2	Q Are you sure of that?						
3	A Yes.						
4	Q Did you ever follow Mr. Minton that day?						
5	A No, I didn't.						
6	Q Isn't that part of your duties to do that?						
7	A No.						
8	Q Did you ever follow him?						
9	A No, I didn't.						
10	Q Did you ever follow him?						
11	A No.						
12	Q Did you ever follow any critic of the Church of						
13	Scientology?						
14	A No.						
15	Q You never did?						
16	A No.						
17	Q Did you go onto the property of the Belleview						
18	Biltmore Hotel?						
19	A No, I didn't.						
20	Q Did you go near the property of the Belleview						
21	Biltmore Hotel?						
22	A No, not that day. I mean I have been						
23	Q That day?						
24	A No, not at all.						
25	Q Can't you see the Belleview Biltmore Hotel in						

## those photographs?

- A You can see the front entrance to it.
- Q And the purpose of you going there --
- A I'm sorry, not from these photographs you can't, but on the side road, that's a side road, and then the entrance goes over this little bridge where the guard, where they have the guard shack and the gate. You could see it from the corner of the road, but not from these photos.
- Q The purpose, Mr. Howd, of you going there that day, on October 31, 1999, wasn't because you were a resident or a renter, but it was specifically to go and find Mr. Minton, correct?
- A That's correct. I wanted to ensure -- I wanted to find out if Mr. Minton was staying there or not.
  - Q And you found it out?
- 17 A Yes, sir.
  - Q And you filmed him?
- 19 A Yes, I did.
  - Q There is video footage of you filming him that day at the Belleview Biltmore where he had gone to stay, correct?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q And after you filmed you turned that film into the State Attorney's Office, didn't you?

A Yeah, I believe that was -- I believe that I did. I'm not sure if that was part of other film that occurred earlier that day, if that was like the same film of when Mr. Minton was screaming obscenities earlier in the day at The Fort Harrison. I think it might have been all on the same tape.

Q When you went to the Belleview Biltmore did you just happen to meet up with this woman?

A Yes, she was at The Fort Harrison when Mr.

Minton was outside screaming, and after he left I told

her that I was going to go to the Belleview Biltmore to

see if this, in fact, true that Mr. Minton was staying

there.

Q And she went as well?

A Yes, she showed up there after I did, probably about ten minutes I arrive there.

Q And you were there together for awhile. Was there a time when the three cars were lined up with Mr. Minton sandwiched in the middle? We can look at the tape if you need to?

A Yeah, that would -- because what I remember is
I was on the corner. There was a side street and I was
on the corner to where the front entrance goes to the
Biltmore. I had my camera with me. I saw Mr. Minton
come up, and when he saw me he swung his car around,

almost hit me, and then he backed up the street to where I was parked. I'm not sure if he pulled around Cheryl Fester's car and parked in front of mine, or if he parked in front of Ms. Fester's car. Somewhere along the line is when he parked there, came out with his video camera and started videotaping the vehicles of Cheryl Fester and myself.

- Q And you got out with your camera?
- A Well, at that time I had my camera with me. I mean I just wanted to confirm to see if Mr. Minton was, in fact, staying there because it is so close to the church.
- Q Did you need a camera to confirm whether or not somebody is staying at a hotel?
  - A No, not at all.
  - Q So you got out and started filming him, right?
- A No, I didn't. I didn't start filming him at first. I didn't start filming him until he swung around with his car and backed up the street where I was parked, got out of his car and started playing around with his video camera. I figured it would good to have video documentation of whatever he was doing.
- Q So instead of leaving, you stayed, got out with cars in the position that you just indicated and started videotaping him, right?

	2.10							
1	A That's right.							
2	Q Did you say anything to him?							
3	A No, I didn't.							
4	Q So you were quietly doing that? Did you feel							
5	at all that you showing up where he was staying is in any							
6	form of harassment?							
7	A No, not at all.							
8	Q Not at all. What if he was a woman, Mr. Howd,							
9	do you think it							
10	MR. TYSON: Objection, Judge.							
11	THE COURT: Basis?							
12	MR. TYSON: Speculation, Judge, plus it is							
13	not relevant to this case.							
14	THE COURT: Sustained.							
15	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:							
16	Q After you left the Belleview Biltmore did you							
17	go back to The Fort Harrison?							
18	A I think I might have went back to my office,							
19	which is in the Clearwater Bank building.							
20	Q Did you make a report of the incident, did you							
21	call anybody?							
22	A No.							
23	Q You never called a superior?							
24	A Well, no, my boss was there.							
25	Q Where?							

25

0

not a digital?

1 Α At the office. 2 Okay, when you went back did you give him a 3 report about Minton? I told him what happened in front The Fort 5 Harrison. I told him what happened over at the Belleview 6 Biltmore. 7 You said that you went to the Belleview Q 8 Biltmore to see if he was there? 9 Α Yes. 10 You told him that you filmed him? 11 Yeah, that's correct. I told him that this man 12 almost hit me with his car when he spun in, and then 13 backed up down the street, and then he started filming, 14 and I proceeded to film. 15 Do got that on film? 16 No, I don't, because I wasn't filming at that 17 I didn't start filming until after that time. 18 0 What kind of camera do you, that is video-type 19 camera? 20 Α There were two cameras that day. 21 afternoon I was using a Panasonic. 22 0 Is it is a digital camera? 23 Α The Panasonic isn't a digital, no.

You mean of the incident in question, that is

	242							
1	A No, the incident in question where Mr. Minton							
2	struck me, that is a digital camera.							
3	Q That's a digital camera. So you have multi-							
4	cameras?							
5	A I have two cameras.							
6	Q You have two cameras. And on the incident you							
7	were filming that night you were using a digital camera,							
8	correct?							
9	A Yes, sir, that is correct.							
10	Q Just the jury understand, the digital camera,							
11	is that the one where you can plug it into a computer and							
12	show it on a computer screen?							
13	A Yeah, you can do that.							
14	Q Do you do that? How do you show it?							
15	A You could plug it into a VCR, or you can plug							
16	it into a computer.							
17	Q Do you have the ability to plug it into a							
18	computer?							
19	A Yes, I do.							
20	Q Do you also have the ability to edit the tape							
21	once it is plugged into the computer?							
22	A No.							
23	Q You cannot edit?							
24	A Not the tape directly, no.							
25	Q Do you have the equipment at the Church of							

Scientology allowing you to edit digital video equipment?

A Not that I know of.

MR. TYSON: Objection, relevance.

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

## BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

- Q Now did you know that Mr. Minton was going to return at approximately 10:30 at night to the Church of Scientology?
  - A I had no idea what Mr. Minton was going to do.
- Q And yet what we see on these tapes that you watched with the jury, that when Mr. Minton came around the corner after getting there for the first time that night, that night, you were already outside holding the digital video camera?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q So you were waiting for him?
- A No, I was talking to other people security. I had the camera with me, because as in the past, I never know when Mr. Minton is going to show up or not. So I had the camera with me to ensure -- while I was talking to security, there was as security guard out in front of The Fort Harrison, he radioed in saying that he thinks he saw Bob Minton and Ms. Brooks drive by.
- Q So then you were ready then with your camera in the event that they came over?

1	A	Right, and that's when I went outside to the							
2	front and	was looking around for him when he came around							
3	the corner.								
4	Q Is there a stationary camera overlooking the								
5	sidewalk at the location in question?								
6	A I think so.								
7	Q	One of the videos that we saw a still camera?							
8	A	Yes.							
9	Q	Do you know if there is a still surveillance							
10	camera ove	erlooking Mr. Minton's building, put up by the							
11	Church of	Scientology?							
12	A	I don't know.							
13	Q	As part of security at Office of Special							
14	Affairs y	ou are saying that you don't know?							
15		MR. TYSON: Asked and answered, Judge.							
16		THE COURT: Overruled.							
17		BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:							
18	Q	That is what you are telling me?							
19	A	I don't know.							
20	Q	Say it again?							
21	A	I don't know.							
22	Q	When did you become a member of the Church of							
23	Scientolo	gy?							
24	A	In 1989.							
25	Q	When did you become a member of the Office of							

## Special Affairs?

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

24

- A I became a member of the Office of Special Affairs in 1993.
  - Q 1993?
- A Uh-huh.
- Q Yes?
- 7 A Yes, sir.
  - Q As part of your study with the Church of Scientology do you read and have read the teachings of and procedures of man by the name of L. Ron Hubbard?
    - A Yes, I have read some of it.
  - Q And has some of it included at one time in the '60's a policy entitled "Fair Game"?
    - A No.
      - Q You have never never read about "Fair Game"?
- 16 A That's correct.
- 17 Q Never heard the term?
- A Well, actually I have heard the term. I have
  heard the term, okay I have heard the term where
  attackers of the church have used it in the past. I've
  also during the injunction hearing where we got the
  injunction to enjoin Mr. Minton from the property it came
  up, and I did some research into it. I found that any
- 25 | back in 1967.

policy that mentioned this term "Fair Game" was canceled

1	Q Was it your understanding that the policy was
2	canceled, or the term was canceled?
3	A The policies that mention this term were
4	canceled.
5	Q Okay. Isn't it true, Mr. Howd, that what the
6	directive said
7	MR. TYSON: Objection, he has already
8	testified that he heard about it at the injunction
9	hearing. He is trying to impeach him with something he
10	didn't know anything about.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, he has
12	already testified that he has some knowledge about it,
13	and I think I have an opportunity to impeach him.
14	MR. TYSON: Judge, that is off the
15	Internet and when Mr. de Vlaming was questioning he said
16	it was after the injunction hearing, and he is trying to
17	impeach him with a document that is thirty years old.
18	THE COURT: Objection is overruled.
19	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
20	Q What is an "SP"?
21	A Suppressive person.
22	Q A suppressive person?
23	A That is correct.
24	Q Would Mr. Minton according to the Church of
25	Scientology meet the definition of a suppressive person?

- A He could. I mean I've never analyzed any antisocial characteristics of Mr. Minton.
  - Q Are you aware of -- do you know what "PL" is?
  - A I believe that stands for policy letter.
  - Q Right, a policy letter by L. Ron Hubbard, dated October 1968. "This policy letter does not cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of an "SP" or suppressive person." And that is the policy of "Fair Game." Isn't that true?
  - A Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q Isn't that true?
- 12 A I don't know.
  - Q Let me ask you this, Mr. Hubbard is dead, correct?
  - A That's correct.
    - Q To your knowledge can the church now pass laws, that is internal laws that obliterate the teachings of L. Ron Hubbard?
    - A Pass laws?
    - Q Pass procedure, pass procedures of L. Ron Hubbard, if they are in existence after his death can procedures that he put into effect be changed by the current administration?
- 24 A No.
- 25 Q They cannot?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Α

	240
A	No.
Q	Mr. Howd, now you said that you did not in any
way invit	e this conduct of Mr. Minton, is that correct?
A	That's correct.
Q	When we see you in these video tapes walking
extremely	close to Mr. Minton, correct?
A	At times I was about two feet away from him,
but most	of the time I was about I would say four to five
feet away	•
Q	Was there anyone ever closer to you as he
walked up	and down that sidewalk?
A	Was there anyone I'm sorry I don't
understan	d your question.
Q	Was there anyone closer to Mr. Minton than you,
as he was	walking up and down the sidewalk?
A	No, but the reason why I stayed the distance I
did to Mr	. Minton is because I wanted to ensure that I
had a rec	ording of everything that Mr. Minton said and
did that	morning.
Q	Well, you say said and did, did you see the
other vid	eos taken in this case?
A	Yes, I did.
Q	All right. Mr. Minton talks in terms of one guy
	the name of Crock, did you hear that?
_	·

That is the term that Mr. Minton uses to

25

1 address him, sure. But you know who we are talking about? 2 Q 3 Α Uh-huh. He does a video here? Α Uh-huh. 6 0 Yes? 7 Α That's correct. 8 And you could see everything that is said on Q here, and see everything that Mr. Minton is doing on 9 10 that, can't you? 11 Yeah, I mean some of it is hard to hear because 12 they are a distance away. 13 Q So what you are telling us then is no way did 14 you intend to harass Mr. Minton by the closeness of you, 15 but only to document Mr. Minton, correct? 16 That's correct. 17 0 Why was Crock there? 18 Uh --Α 19 0 He is a member of the Church of Scientology, 20 why do you need two cameras? 21 I don't know, maybe he felt that it would be 22 good to have another recording. 23 Q Isn't it true, Mr. Howd, that everything that

of Scientology between you and other members of the

happened that night was choreographed inside the Church

1	Officer	of	Special	Affairs?
---	---------	----	---------	----------

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A No, that's totally not true.
- Q Nothing was practiced about that night?
- A Nothing at all.
- Q Let me ask you this, do you remember that one scene taken by Ms. Brooks where just before you go around the corner all of the sudden you see those women, do you know who the women were that were out there that day?
  - A Yes.
    - Q Were they members of the Church of Scientology?
- 11 A Yes, they are.
  - Q Office of Special Affairs?
- 13 A Uh-huh.
  - Q Okay. You see them walk back to the front of the church entrance and walk inside. Did you see that part?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - Q Right after that is when you round the corner with Mr. Minton, correct?
    - A It was a little bit after we rounded the corner.
    - Q Right, just a little bit after you rounded the corner. What happened between you and Mr. Minton is preserved on tape?
- 25 A Uh-huh.

Q When he says, "Are you assaulting me? Are you assaulting me?" That part?

A Well, hold on, the first thing that he did was grab the strap to my video camera and try to pull the video camera out of my hands. Then he pushes me into the building with his sign.

Q Wait a minute. Isn't it true that he starts to grab the strap and then he turns around and starts to walk and says, "Oh, you think so?" Isn't that the -- I thought that is way it went?

A No, it didn't. If you watch the video, he grabs the strap and he says, "How would you like me to pull this out of your hand?" And that's when I grabbed onto the video camera with both of my hands. Okay. Then he lets go of the strap and he pushes me into the building. That's when you see the camera jumble. I just push him back so that I could get some room to maneuver out of the way. That's when he starts screaming about me assaulting him and then pushes me back into the building again.

Q Just before that particular complaint, where he says, "You are assaulting me now." Did you say anything to him that provoked him?

- A I didn't say anything at all.
- Q Right after that you hear Mr. Minton say, "It's

1	time	to	call	the	police."	Right?
2		A	Tha	at's	correct.	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q That's when the girls, the ladies, it's at the point in time that they start going back to the front entrance, right?
  - A Yeah, I guess so.
- Q Here is what I want to ask you, they go into, according to these videos, they go into the front entrance, all of them together. When you hit the ground Crock's video show them all coming out at the same time, and walk up to you. Did you see that on the tape?
  - A Yeah.
- Q They all come out at the same time. Did you notice, Mr. Howd, now your camera is rolling, it's on the ground, right?
  - A Right.
- Q Rolling, not one of those people, not one asked you if you were all right, isn't that true? If you want to play it again, I'll play it.
  - A You know, I don't remember.
- Q Isn't it true, Mr. Howd, the reason that they didn't ask you are you all right --
- MR. TYSON: Objection speculation, Judge.
- MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I didn't finish the
- 25 question.

A

1	THE COURT: Finish the question please.
2	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
3	Q Is because this whole scenario was practiced
4	before it happened?
5	A No. Actually the reason why they didn't say
6	anything to me is it is part of Scientology belief tha
7	if somebody is injured you don't say anything to them
8	because that would be a recording that would be entere
9	into a person's reactive mind. So they were just bein
10	very quiet because of that situation.
11	Q Even to the point of saying do you want me t
12	call 911, they don't even say that?
13	A There was no reason to.
14	Q There was no reason to call 911?
15	A Why would they ask me to call 911 when they
16	know there is Philip there, who is with security, and
17	other security members who are trained to handle these
18	situations.
19	Q Were you knocked out?
20	A No, I wasn't unconscious, no.
21	Q Do you recall on Crock's video that when it
22	first starts out you see you open your eyes, look up a
23	the camera and then shut your eyes again? Did you see
24	that, Mr. Howd?

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
Q Is because this whole scenario was practiced
before it happened?
A No. Actually the reason why they didn't say
anything to me is it is part of Scientology belief that
if somebody is injured you don't say anything to them
because that would be a recording that would be entered
into a person's reactive mind. So they were just being
very quiet because of that situation.
Q Even to the point of saying do you want me to
call 911, they don't even say that?
A There was no reason to.
Q There was no reason to call 911?
A Why would they ask me to call 911 when they
know there is Philip there, who is with security, and
other security members who are trained to handle these
situations.
Q Were you knocked out?
A No, I wasn't unconscious, no.
Q Do you recall on Crock's video that when it
first starts out you see you open your eyes, look up at
the camera and then shut your eyes again? Did you see
that, Mr. Howd?

I had blood in my left eye.

I was blinking.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	254
1	Q Okay, you were blinking. Now, you laid there
2	motionless without moving your eyes, or hands, or your
3	arms. And apparently the officer must have said, "Can I
4	have some ID?" Or, "Do you have some ID?" You
5	immediately reach in your pocket and hand up your wallet,
6	do you remember that part?
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q Okay, but your eyes were still closed, but you
9	could still hear him, right? You knew that he needed to

- A No, I think my eyes were open at that time.
- Q Were you having any dialogue with the officer who asked you that?
  - A Yeah.

find out who you were?

- Q Will we be able to hear that on the tape?
- A Yeah, well, I mean you should have heard it.

  He asked me if this was my correct address.
- Q Any other -- because you camera was right there on the ground. So we are going to hear everything?
- A Right. I don't remember if there was anything else. I do remember him taking my wallet, getting my ID and asking me, "Is this your correct address?" And me saying, yes it was.
- Q Along the lines, Mr. Howd, of it being an invited conduct, we see you in your white shirt walking

down the street, you are not wearing your glasses, you have them tucked in right here. But yet we see that you are wearing glasses now.

A That's correct.

Q You weren't wearing glasses while you were videotaping because you didn't want to get seriously hurt when you provoked him, right?

A No, that's not true at all. I have the video camera up to my eye, and it was harder with my glasses on to videotape him. It was just easier if I took them off and had the video -- the peep site right up to my eye.

Q Okay, so what you are saying is that when you videotape you did it without eyeglasses, as opposed to with eyeglasses?

A Yeah, most of the time, when I am using a peep site. There's also -- the Panasonic has one where you can open up to the screen and you could just follow along with the screen.

Q But if it is up to the eye then no glasses, is that what you are saying?

- A Normally, yeah.
- Q How tall are you, Mr. Howd?
- 23 A 5'11".
  - Q And your weight?
- 25 A 210.

- Q Did you go to the hospital over this?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q You rode in ambulance?
- A That's correct.

Q And this foam board knocked you to the ground, keeping you there for fifteen minutes?

A Well, what happened was when he jabbed the picket sign into my eye, you can see on the video that the binder clip catches me right over the eye. It just took me totally by surprise. It snapped my head back. I lost balance. I was pretty much spinning trying to avoid a hard fall at the time. When I fell my back was a little sore. I wasn't sure what else happened. So -- I used to be an emergency medical technician up north a number of years ago. I really didn't want to play around with it if I had an injured back or injured head, so I just laid perfectly still. And then -- I wanted to get checked out to make sure everything was okay.

Q So this blow clearly -- was it the blow itself that clearly knocked you to the ground, keeping you there for fifteen, twenty minutes?

A The blow to my head knocked me off balance, and then in the process I fell to the ground.

Q Mr. Howd, did you hear Mr. Minton when he said, "I'm going to call the police."?

A Yes.

- Q He said the words, "I'm going to call the police." After he accused you of assaulting him around the corner, correct?
  - A That's correct.
- Q And not only did he say, "I am going to call the police." But you saw him take out his cellular phone and begin to dial, correct?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Not did he say, "I'm going to call the police."

  And start to dial the police, but he started to leave the church property by walking across the street away from you and the Church of Scientology property, correct?
  - A Uh-huh, yes.
- Q And instead of allowing him to go back to his car, or meet with the police you made the decision that you were going to continue to follow him, even though he was retreating?
- A I had not idea or indication that he was retreating, or calling the police.
  - O Wait a minute --
- A Please, sir. I had no idea that he was retreating or calling the police. He said that he was calling the police, but how am I to know exactly what Mr. Minton is doing. And up to that point in time I was

seeing a definite escalation in hostilities from Mr.

Minton. That is the particular time that I wanted to

make sure that he was on video tape, to document whatever

he was going to do.

Q Was there anything, Mr. Howd, stopping you from that point, after hearing what he said, and not wanting to be followed, for you to stay back on that sidewalk as he walked away? Was there anything holding you there, so that you could film from afar?

A No, but I mean I was about five feet behind him. I was going to let him go ahead. I mean, if Mr. Minton went from there went to his vehicle and drove away I would have been fine. But he didn't. That's when he turned around in the middle of the crosswalk and smashed his sign into my face.

Q After saying what?

A Immediately after saying, "Don't be following me." Bang, he hit me.

Q "Don't be following me." After you met him at the Belleview Biltmore, after you walked within feet of him as he protested, and after you walked after him as he left the church property he said, "Quit following me." Didn't he?

- A And then bang, he hit me.
- Q That's right. That's right.

it?

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Redirect?
3	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. TYSON:
5	Q Was the Church of Scientology afraid that Mr.
6	Minton would make an assault on some of its members?
7	A Yes, sir, absolutely.
8	Q Back in this policy of 1968 or 1967, how old
9	were you?
10	A I was barely a year old, sir.
11	Q Do you know what the "Fair Game Policy" is? Is
12	there such a policy with the Church of Scientology?
13	A No, I have never read this policy. And again
14	the only time I have ever heard this mentioned is when
15	somebody, some religious bigot is attacking my church. I
16	have never studied this within the church, or for any
17	instruction that I have done.
18	Q Mr. de Vlaming asked you about Mr. Dellar's
19	video, why can't we just use that one. Did that pickup
20	when what occurred when Mr. Minton immediately went
21	around the corner?
22	A No, sir, it didn't.
23	Q So that video wouldn't have picked the sound of
24	Mr. Minton saying, I am grabbing that camera strap, would

Q

	200
1	A No, sir, it wouldn't have. It wouldn't.
2	Q How good can you see without those glasses?
3	A I could read, but I can't see well at
4	distances.
5	Q Do you recall earlier in the day when Mr.
6	Minton was in Clearwater saying, "You guys can follow me
7	all day if you want." Do you recall seeing a tape of him
8	saying that?
9	A Yes, sir.
10	Q So he told you, "You can follow me all day if
11	you want. I don't care."?
12	A That's correct.
13	MR. TYSON: I have no further questions,
14	Judge.
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Very briefly?
16	THE COURT: Yes, please.
17	RECROSS EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
19	Q On the basis of what Mr. Tyson just said,
20	didn't you tell me in direct examination that if Mr.
21	Hubbard created a policy, that after his death that the
22	administration could not change Hubbard Policy, didn't
23	you tell me that?
24	A That's correct.

I want you to listen to this, in October 1967

1	as far as a suppressive person order, "Fair Game", "May
2	be deprived of property, or injured by any means by any
3	Scientologists, without any discipline of the
4	Scientologists. May be tricked, sued, lied to, or
5	destroyed." Signed L. Ron Hubbard, Founder. Are you
6	aware of anything that took away this policy up until the
7	time that this man
8	MR. TYSON: I would object. He has
9	already stated that he has never heard of it. He was one
10	year old when that came out.
11	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
12	THE WITNESS: Actually I was one year old
13	when that policy was canceled and any policies concerning
14	that mentioned "Fair Game" were canceled.
15	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
16	Q What year was that?
17	A 1967.
18	Q So in 1968 it was canceled?
19	A No, I believe in 1967 it was canceled.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: May I approach the
21	witness?
22	THE COURT: You may.
23	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
24	Q I don't mean to quibble about the date.
25	A No problem.

Q	Cancellation	of	"Fair	Game"	would	that	be
accurate?							

A Okay, then it was 1968 that it was canceled. Okay, I was two years old.

Q That's okay. I didn't mean it for your age.
But do you agree that it says, "This policy letter does
not cancel any policy on the treatment or the handling of
a suppressive person."?

A Sure.

Q They only canceled the term, not the policy, correct?

A Okay, that's correct. I've seen plenty of policy that says that with a suppressive person, that you don't communicate with suppressive person, you don't have anything to do with a suppressive person, you just leave them alone. That's probably what it is referring to.

Q Is that why the women on the tape are heard just saying, "Go home, Bob." And never answering his questions, is that part of the policy? They won't answer his questions, they just say, "Go home, Bob."?

A I don't know. I mean I don't know -- they were there, they were telling Bob what they felt. They don't want him here, they want him to go home. I mean we were there to answer. He was accusing them of being killers.

Q Didn't you just say that you do not communicate

1	with a suppressive person? Didn't I hear you say that?
2	A That's true, somebody that has been declared a
3	suppressive person, you don't communicate with.
4	Q So if a suppressive person asks questions you
5	don't communicate with them?
6	A Right, but now, Mr. Minton, I have never done
7	an analysis that says that Mr. Minton is a suppressive
8	person. He obviously he doesn't care for our church.
9	Obviously, we don't care for him. But I mean there is
10	nothing that says he is suppressive person.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's all I have,
12	your Honor.
13	MR. TYSON: No further questions, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Thank you, sir, please step
15	down.
16	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, can we approach?
18	THE COURT: Yes, please.
19	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
20	out of the hearing of the jury.)
21	MR. TYSON: Judge, all I have is Officer
22	Beaudette. I don't think he is going to be more than
23	about five minutes for me. How long do you think? I
24	would like to finish him up today, if we can.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Ten.

1	THE COURT: So rather than taking a break
2	now
3	MR. TYSON: Or a five minute break if they
4	want to go to the bathroom, and then call him.
5	THE COURT: If you are telling me it is
6	only fifteen or twenty minutes let's get this witness
7	done. Please call your next witness.
8	MR. TYSON: Officer Beaudette.
9	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
10	THE COURT: Please proceed.
11	Whereupon,
12	OFFICER MARK BEAUDETTE,
13	a witness, was called for examination by counsel for the
14	State, and having been duly sworn, was examined and
15	testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. TYSON:
18	Q Sir, would you please introduce yourself to the
19	jury?
20	A Mark Beaudette, I am a police officer for the
21	City of Clearwater.
22	Q How long have you been employed there?
23	A About eleven years.
24	Q Are you a patrol officer?
25	A Yes.

- Q I'm going to direct your attention to October 31, 1999, in the evening hours. Were you in the area of The Fort Harrison Hotel?
  - A Yes, I was.

Q Tell the jury what, if anything, unusual you observed at that location? And your vantage point, where you were, also?

A I was northbound on Fort Harrison Avenue at the stop light at Pierce Street. I noticed on the southwest corner there were several people there. I didn't pay much attention. My window was down. I did notice some yelling that started coming from that area. I looked up and I observed Mr. Minton strike Mr. Howd with a protest sign.

- Q Then you -- do you see Mr. Minton at the courthouse right now?
  - A Yes, sir, I do.
  - Q Please identify him.
- 19 A He is right there.
  - MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We will stipulate to his identifying him.

BY MR. TYSON:

- Q You've seen Mr. Howd, you've seen him here in court also today?
  - A Yes, I have.

- Q What did you see after you seen him hit him with the sign?

  A I made contact with him and his companion.
  - Q Was that around the corner from Fort Harrison?
  - A Yes, it was.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Q While you were talking to him, did he describe how the incident happened?

A Yes. He didn't tell me a lot about it. What he said was that he was being hassled by the people from the church there and the guy was following him ever since they got off the plane earlier in the day. And he had told the guy that he was calling the police, I guess, and just to stay away from him.

- Q Did you listen to the video that Mr. Minton had?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q Did you look at and see, did you take his video and look at it?
  - A I looked at a portion of it, yes.
- Q Was it different than what he was telling you was on it? The words that he was saying, did he say I told him not to follow me?
- 23 A No.
  - Q Did he make other statements when he was addressing Mr. Howd?

- The statement that I observed on the video was Α just prior the actual incident and what he has said was, "Don't you follow me across the street." Did Mr. Minton indicate to you when you were
- speaking to him that it was accidental, and that Mr. Howd had walked into the sign?
  - Α I don't recall that.
- Would it be on the video if he said that? Q not going to play that again, but would it be on the video?
  - Α It should be.
    - Q Your conversation with him is on the video?
  - Α Some of it is.
- 14 Q Now, you have seen these videos, right?
- 15 Α I've seen some them. I haven't seen all of 16 them.
- Q Now, the one with Mr. Minton, did you see that 18 one where you are talking to him for a short period of 19 time?
- 20 Α Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

- 21 That is you on there? Q
- 22 Α Yes, it is.
- 23 Q Did you observe Mr. Howd?
- 24 Α Yes, I did.
  - Did he have any injuries? Q

1	A Yes, he had a slight cut above his left eye,
2	and a slight abrasion below it, on the cheek.
3	Q Did you find out that there were three videos
4	of this incident?
5	A Yes, I collected three videos. One actually
6	didn't show the incident though, but one showed the
7	events that were prior to the incident.
8	Q Did you view those videos?
9	A Like I said, I only saw portions of them. I
10	didn't see the entire videos at any time.
11	Q What I am saying is, did you view that Mr. Howd
12	was hit by Mr. Minton?
13	A Yes, I did, on the two videos.
14	Q You viewed those portions of the two videos?
15	A Yes, I did.
16	Q Based on what you viewed and based on your
17	personal observations what course of action did you take?
18	A I made a misdemeanor arrest of Mr. Minton for
19	battery.
20	Q What charge?
21	A Misdemeanor battery.
22	Q Was his sign taken into evidence?
23	A Yes, it was.
24	Q Were all the tapes taken into evidence?
25	A Yes.

1	MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach the
2	clerk?
3	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
4	BY MR. TYSON:
5	Q Officer, just so we are clear, this is the
6	sign?
7	A That's the sign that I took from Mr. Minton.
8	MR. TYSON: Judge, I have no further
9	questions.
10	THE COURT: Cross examination?
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Briefly, your
12	Honor.
13	CROSS EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING:
15	Q Good evening, Officer Beaudette.
16	A Hello.
17	Q You were stopped at the light on Fort Harrison?
18	A Yes, I was.
19	Q Approximately how long were you at the light
20	before you noticed that particular incident that you
21	described?
22	A A minute, maybe two minutes I would say. I
23	observed some people on the corner, but there is always
24	people there, it was nothing out of the ordinary when I
25	first approached the intersection.

- 270 1 From your vantage point at the light could you Q 2 see around the corner and down the sidewalk at Pierce 3 Street? I think I could probably see part of it, but I Α don't think I could see along the entire length of the 5 6 building.
  - Q So you didn't see Mr. Howd assault Mr. Minton?
  - No, I did not. A
    - Q And you wouldn't have known that Mr. Minton was retreating across the street?
    - Α No.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

- You say that you have been a police officer for Q eleven years?
  - Α Yes.
- During your tenure with the Clearwater Police Department you went to the Police Academy?
- 17 Α Yes, sir.
- 18 Q You have been trained in the use of force?
- 19 Α Yes, sir.
- 20 0 You have used force in the past?
- 21 Α Unfortunately.
  - Q You know the type of force that is required to take a man down?
- 24 Α Yes, sir.
- 25 Q And you are trained as a police officer --

MR. TYSON: May we approach, your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.

(Whereupon, a bench conference was held out of the hearing of the jury.)

MR. TYSON: Judge, in the injunction hearing this question was asked about whether this officer thought he took a fall or not, that's speculation on the officer's part I think is what he his leading up to. I object to that line of questioning, it's pure speculation.

MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Ultimately,
Judge, that is where I am going and it is based on the
fact that this officer viewed the actual incident, his
training and experience in the use of force qualifies him
to make a determination on whether or not that type of
force was required to take him down. Judge, he testified
in the injunction hearing that his height is 5'10", his
weight is 190. Mr. Howd testified that his height is
5'11", and his weight is 210. What he testified to at
the injunction hearing is, would the blow that you
observed have been enough to knock you down. He said no.

MR. TYSON: Judge, people are different.

You take your victim how you find them. That's entirely prejudicial.

THE COURT: I agree that it is

1	speculation. The objection will be sustained against the
2	question. I don't think that question has been asked
3	yet.
4	MR. TYSON: But we are getting there, so
5	I' m not sure he wants to stop at this point or not.
6	THE COURT: Please proceed.
7	BY MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING:
8	Q Officer Beaudette, you witness a lot of
9	incidents and accidents during the course of your tenure
10	with the Clearwater Police Department?
11	A Yes, I have.
12	Q You described the injuries to Mr. Howd as
13	slight injuries, is that correct?
14	A They were minor.
15	Q Minor?
16	A Minor.
17	Q When you approached Mr. Minton you asked for a
18	copy of the video tape, isn't that correct?
19	A Not right away.
20	Q There came a point in time when you did that,
21	is that correct?
22	A Yes, he offered to let me see it, I asked if I
23	could keep it, and he said yes.
24	Q And he gave it to you right away?
25	A Yes.

1	Q That wasn't the case when you asked for Mr.
2	Howd's video tape, was it?
3	A Couldn't seem to find it.
4	Q No one could seem to find it?
5	A That's correct.
6	Q In fact, there was a considerable length of
7	time before it was actually produced, isn't that correct?
8	A Yes, sir.
9	MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: May I have a
10	moment, your Honor?
11	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
12	MR. DOUGLAS DE VLAMING: Judge, I have no
13	further questions of this witness.
14	THE COURT: Thank you, any redirect?
15	MR. TYSON: No, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the
17	jury it's time for a break. We are going to take fifteen
18	minutes. We are long overdue and I apologize. We are in
19	recess for fifteen minutes.
20	(The jury was excused from the courtroom.)
21	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, do you plan to call
22	another witness today?
23	MR. TYSON: No, Judge.
24	THE COURT: As far as you are concerned
25	there is nothing further that you want to do at this

1	time?
2	MR. TYSON: No.
3	THE COURT: So I should have just let them
4	go?
5	MR. TYSON: I should rest in front of
6	them. I'm not sure if you want me to do that tomorrow
7	morning.
8	THE COURT: So you are through, is that
9	correct?
10	MR. TYSON: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Okay, what I would like to do
12	is bring them back and let you rest in front of them.
13	Then we can discuss it when we all come back and such
14	things.
15	(Brief break)
16	THE COURT: Sheriff, please joint us.
17	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
18	out of the hearing of the jury.)
19	THE COURT: I am going to let the bailiff
20	tell you what he just told me, so listen carefully.
21	THE SHERIFF: The man in the audience with
22	the full beard, his name is Mark Bogart, he said he saw
23	somebody in the audience either mouthing or hand sign
24	testimony to the witness that was a Scientologist.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yeah, we had heard

	275
1	that too, Judge. My associate is going down to see if
2	they have a tape of it. I know who they are. They are
3	two fairly highly ranking officials in the Church of
4	Scientology. Mark Render is one who was on Dateline, he
5	is pretty high up. My research clerk turned around and
6	saw him.
7	THE COURT: I certainly didn't see it.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And I didn't either
9	for obvious reasons.
10	MR. TYSON: I had my back turned.
11	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And frankly I am
12	not making any motions at this time.
13	THE COURT: We will just leave it alone,
14	and let you look into it. You tell us what you want to
15	do, when and if you want to do it.
16	THE SHERIFF: And there were two other

witnesses besides him that saw it.

THE COURT: Let's bring in the jury. State is going to rest and we will break for the evening.

(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?

The State will rest at this MR. TYSON:

23 time.

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Ladies and gentlemen of the THE COURT: jury, the State has rested their case, which means that

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they are through with their presentation of the evidence at this time. It is twenty-five to six. It is as good a time as any to break for the evening in light of that, so that is exactly what we are going to do. We are going to adjourn for the evening. I'd like to resume at 8:30 in the morning. Is there any reason that that is an inconvenience to anybody? That is the normal time we do things. I would like to just stay on schedule. We will start again at 8:30. That means that you should probably be here at twenty or a quarter after eight. You will meet in the judicial reception and you will be taken back to the jury room that you have been using, and we will start promptly at 8:30 and get underway. At this time you are excused. Please recall the things that I told you in my preliminary instructions about not listening to reports or reading anything, or talking to anyone, or going to any sites or scenes. You remember all those things that we talked about please. Be sure and bear those in mind. We will see you tomorrow at 8:30.

Ms. Green, are you going to be all right with the bus?

MS. GREEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Do not watch TV tonight,
probably the news, any newspapers, please avoid those
things. There may possibly be some reports. Please avoid

1 that. Good evening. I will see you tomorrow. 2 (Whereupon, they jury was excused at this 3 time for the evening.) THE COURT: We can either do the things that we customarily do at this time, or we can do them at 5 8:30 in the morning. What would you all prefer to do? 6 7 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let's do them now, 8 Judge. 9 THE COURT: All right, let's do them now. 10 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, Mr. 11 Minton would move for a directed judgment of acquittal, 12 there are grounds therefore would show that the State has 13 failed to establish a prima facie case of guilt against 14 him. I believe the testimony was such that there is a 15 strong suggestion that this was invited conduct on the 16 part of Mr. Minton, and that as a matter of law he acted 17 in self-defense. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Tyson? 19 MR. TYSON: Judge, on the video the 20 Defendant says it's an accident. It is obvious in the 21 video that it was intentional and unwarranted and the 22 victim said it is un-consented to. 23 THE COURT: I also must view the evidence 24 at this juncture in the light most favorable to the

State, and in that light I am going to deny your motion.

```
278
      Have a nice evening everyone. We are adjourned.
 1
                                                          See you
 2
      all at 8:30.
 3
                      (Whereupon, at 5:45 p.m. the hearing in
      the above-entitled matter was continued to 8:30 a.m. on
 4
 5
      May 23, 2000.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## Certificate of Reporter

I, Pamela S. Jenkins, do hereby certify that I took the audio graphic notes of the foregoing proceedings and the same were reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of said proceedings; that I am neither related to nor employed by any of the parties to the action herein; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel or employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the action.

PAMELA S. JENKINS

