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 23, 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 D		DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	
FRANK	OLIVER	8	42	63	69	
ROBER	T S. MINTO	N 72	118	161		

EXHIBITS

	For	ID In Evidence
Defendant's Exhibit No. 1A, Photographs	B C 85	86
Defendant's Exhibit No. 5 "Fair Game Policy"	13	14
Defendant's Exhibit No. 6 Cancel of "Fair Game"	13	29
Defendant's Exhibit No. 9 Excerpt from book	64	65
Defendant's Exhibit No. 10 Video	101	102
Defendant's Exhibit No. 11 Photograph	109	110
Defendant's Exhibit No. 12 Photograph	92	93
Defendant's Exhibit No. 13 Photograph	92	93
State's Exhibit No. 7 Excerpt from book	44	44
State's Exhibit No. 8	47	48

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Counsel approach for a second.

I've just something for you all to be looking at during the course of the day.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Jury instructions?

THE COURT: I am taking no position. This is just a think-piece, for you all to kind of go through, we like this. we don't like this. Just something for you to be thinking about when we get to the charging conference.

Is there anything that we need to do before we get underway this morning?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I just need to get Ms. Rivellini. My brother is in another courtroom. We can start without him. He has got a pre-trial.

THE COURT: That's fine. Take your time. We are fine. Let me know when you are ready. Is everybody ready go.

MS. RIVELLINI: We are actually still waiting on the first witness. I would like to take a moment to clarify. I think that I am still having trouble understanding your ruling from the proffer yesterday morning and I do not want to do anything that you are going to take in violation of that proffer. We are all here to run a clean trial. So if I could ask you what

you are specifically letting in, and you recall what you absolutely heard and do not want to hear again. I plan getting in from Mr. Oliver his background, and his training and experience in Scientology in the general mode. Going over the courses that he took, and some the training he took without going into the whole heart of what he believes as a Scientologist. I plan on going into his experience with the Office of Special Affairs and the way he was taught to carry out what he knows to be the "Fair Game Policy". And I plan to bring out the "Fair Game Policy" and its subsequent cancellation, and how it was still used in lieu of that cancellation.

I plan in getting into the reward system, points and certificate, how you can lose those. And how testifying contrary to what Scientology deems to be proper would result in a demotion of Scientologist in OSA. I planned on bringing out evidence of the carrying out of "Fair Game" in the videos tapes he watched. Not to formulate an opinion, but to point out specific instances of "Fair Game". For instance, that's a twin, that's this, that's that, and I was taught to carry out those exact drills.

THE COURT: I think what you would like me to do is basically, tell you what to ask. I can't do that, of course. What I said would be appropriate, I did

not accept him as an expert for the reasons that I explained. So his background information is marginally relevant. Obviously, there has got to be some explanation as to why he is in a position to know what he knows. But because you are not qualifying him as expert I don't expect to go on in tremendous detail about every course that he took, everything he did, everything he knows.

I expect that you are going to establish that he was a member of the Church of Scientology, that he knows what the "Fair Game Policy" is, how he knows of his personal knowledge "Fair Game Policy", what the "Fair Game Policy" exactly is, what the expressed policy is in other words. And what penalties, if any, there may be for violations for church members carrying out the "Fair Game Policy". I wrote that down then, and I read from my notes now. That's exactly verbatim what I said last time.

Beyond that I will leave it to your good judgment and to stay within the parameters and I will rely on Mr. Tyson to jump up when he thinks you have strayed and I will make that call when, and if those happen.

MS. RIVELLINI: Do you have any problem me asking him if he saw evidence of "Fair Game" being

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

MR. TYSON: Judge, that is an expert opinion.

THE COURT: It is.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, the way I see it is this, and you can tell me how you feel about it, if Mr. Oliver were a football player and he practiced on a team for years, left that team and then watched a game and could say, "Oh, look they carried out what we used to do as the A to Z plan." Or, "Look they carried out such a play." That's the analogy that I make, rather than him having expertise, and making an expert opinion, but just identifying, "Oh, look, we used to wear red jerseys, there's a red jersey."

MR. TYSON: Judge, this isn't a NFL show and color announcer. This a court of law where someone needs to qualified as an expert before they can render those types of opinions.

THE COURT: I agree with Mr. Tyson. I think if there is going to be a connection made in this regard, that's what closing argument is all about. Okay.

MS. RIVELLINI: I am going to find out if my witness is here yet. If I could just go check?

THE COURT: That's fine, take your time.

1	Bring in the jury.
2	(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)
3	THE COURT: Good morning ladies and
4	gentlemen of the jury. As you recall we ended last night
5	with the State resting. This is the time in the trial
6	where the Defendant has an opportunity to make a
7	presentation should the Defendant choose to do so. You
8	will recall that the Defendant has no obligation to do
9	anything. Okay?
10	Mr. de Vlaming, how would you like to
11	proceed?
12	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, the defense would
13	call Mr. Frank Oliver.
14	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)
15	Whereupon,
16	FRANK OLIVER,
17	a witness, was called for examination by counsel for the
18	Defendant, and having been duly sworn, and was examined
19	and testified as follows:
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
22	Q Good morning, would you tell us your name
23	please?
24	A My name is Frank Oliver.
25	Q And what city do you live in?

1	A I live in Miami, Florida.
2	Q How long have you lived there?
3	A I lived there since 1979.
4	Q What do you do for a living?
5	A I am a graphic designer.
6	Q How long have you been doing that?
7	A About ten years.
8	Q At one point were you also a member of the
9	Church of Scientology?
10	A Yes, I was.
11	Q What years were you a member of the Church of
12	Scientology?
13	A I joined Scientology in June of 1986. I was a
14	member until 1992.
15	Q Were you also a graphic designer artist while
16	you were a member?
17	A Yes, I did that part-time as well.
18	Q Did you also do some graphic art design for
19	them while you were a member?
20	A In 1989 I was doing some graphic for the Office
21	of Special Affairs.
22	Q You mentioned the Office of Special Affairs, do
23	you call that OSA?
24	A Yes, we do.
25	Q All right, and you were particularly a member

1 of OSA?

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A I was recruited for OSA in late 1989 and I worked as an investigations officer in OSA until I left in 1992.

- Q When you were a member were you actually member down in Miami?
 - A Yes, I was, and in California as well.
 - Q So you did some traveling for the church?
- A Yes.
 - Q Was that for some training?
 - A Yes, it was for upper level training as an investigations officer.
 - Q Can just anybody become a member of OSA or do you have to go through any particular courses?
 - A No, they recruit specific individuals for the Office of Special Affairs, it's not something that you join within the organization. They have to select you and qualify you in order to become a member of the Office of Special Affairs.
 - Q Is it a way of working your way up the ranks?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - Q What kind of things do you learn when you become a member of OSA?
 - A I learned that organization perceives that it has a great number of enemies in the world. When I went

out to Los Angeles I also learned that many of the things that are done by the Office of Special Affairs are not known to the general membership of the Scientology. A lot of the activities are kept in secret.

Q What exactly is the purpose of the Office of Special Affairs?

A That is a little bit of a difficult question because there is a stated purpose and then there is an actual purpose.

Q What is the stated purpose?

A The stated purpose if to handle the legal and public relations of the Church of Scientology as it perceived by the public.

Q What is the actual purpose?

A The actual purpose is to investigate and to impede the forward progress of any tries to stop Scientology or to criticize Scientology.

Q That's the actual purpose?

A That's the actual policy of the investigation division of the Office of Special Affairs, yes.

Q Does that policy have a name, or did it have name that you learned?

A It's actually the stated, it's like the product of the Office of Special Affairs. It's like, what it does. Every single department in Scientology has like,

1	it's product or what it does, it's description. That
2	would be the description of the Office of Special
3	Affairs.
4	Q Was there not a code name, but a special
5	name that you understood codified those policies?
6	A There were different policies that we opera

a There were different policies that we operated under Scientology. And when you are doing a specific thing then that has -- then that is referred to as something. A lot of the activities that we were involved in, confidential operations, operations against individuals that we targeted, that came under a policy that was called "Fair Game".

- Q "Fair Game", is that actually a written policy?
- A Yes, it was.
- Q And was something that you relied upon when you were a member of Church of Scientology?

A That is just something that you had to do. I mean that's what you are assigned to do.

MS. RIVELLINI: Your Honor, may I approach the witness please?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, I'm going to show you two documents that have previously been marked as Defense Exhibit for identification, numbers and 5 and 6. I am going to ask

1	you to take a look at them and tell me if you recognize
2	what they are?
3	A This is
4	Q Just tell me first if you recognize what both
5	documents are?
6	A Yes, I recognize both documents.
7	Q Now, could you tell me what the documents are?
8	A Okay. This one here that says, "Penalty for
9	Lower Conditions." If someone is
10	Q Before describing the contents, can you tell me
11	if you know what it is?
12	A Yes, I do know what it is.
13	Q What would you call this?
14	A That's a policy letter on penalties for lower
15	conditions, it's "Fair Game". It talks about how to
16	treat someone that has been classified as an enemy of the
17	organization. They are subject to the "Fair Game
18	Doctrine".
19	Q This is actually a written policy of "Fair
20	Game"?
21	A Yes, it is an excerpt of "Fair Game" is in that
22	section there.
23	(The documents hereinafter
24	referred to were marked as
25	Defendant's Exhibits Nos. 5

1	and 6 for identification.)
2	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
3	Q Is this something that you have had a chance to
4	review and highlight?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And who wrote this "Fair Game Policy"?
7	A L. Ron Hubbard.
8	Q Were you required to read this during your
9	tenure at OSA?
10	A Yes, you are required to read it and know the
11	policy, not just read it. You have to have an
12	understanding of it and be able to apply anything that
13	you read.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this time I
15	would like to introduce what has previously marked for
16	identification Defendant's Exhibit Number 5, and go over
17	the portion described by the witness with the jury.
18	MR. TYSON: Judge, I would have a standing
19	objection.
20	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
21	marked.
22	(The document heretofore
23	marked as Defendant's
24	Exhibit No. 5 for
25	identification was received

into evidence.)

MS. RIVELLINI:

Q First tell me, Mr. Oliver, who is "Fair Game" applied to?

A It's applied to anyone who is considered an enemy of the organization or identified as a suppressive person of the organization.

Q Is suppressive person synonymous with enemy then?

A Yes.

Q Can you describe exactly what the "Fair Game Policy" is and how it is used?

A Basically, if someone is categorized as being suppressive person and they are subject to "Fair Game" the gloves are off so to speak, just about anything can be done to the individual because they are viewed by the organization as being a person who is trying to impede the goals and purpose of Scientology.

Q And if you can read the screen can you tell us exactly "Fair Game Policy" order is?

A Well, it says here an "SP Order" which is a Suppressive Person Order on someone is "Fair Game". That person is now subject to "Fair Game". It says there, they may be deprived property, or injure by any means, by any Scientologists without any discipline of the

Scientologists. If for example, someone in the organization has been decreed to be "Fair Game" or someone outside of the organization --

Q I am going to ask you speak a little bit louder.

A Okay. If someone within the organization or outside the organization has been categorized as a suppressive person and they are subject to "Fair Game" just about anything done to them without any fear of retribution by the organization to the person doing that to them.

Q Okay.

A For example if they were cheated in some way, then you are not subject to any of the ethics of the organization as having done anything wrong, because that person has been classified as "Fair Game".

Q What else does it tell you that you can do to a suppressive person?

A They can be tricked, sued, lied to, or destroyed. That pretty much opens the door, you can do just about anything to the person.

Q Okay, there is a line in there that says a Scientologist can do anything to any of these individuals without any discipline of that Scientologist. Is discipline something that is common?

A Throughout different levels of the organization, discipline varies from someone losing a position maybe, even something much more severe.

Q Is there a place where people who are disciplined go to?

A Yes. If you are a member of the Sea

Organization, which is an internal organization within

Scientology, it's like a fraternal organization that runs

Scientology.

Q Is that the organization that is down in Clearwater?

A Yes, Flag Land Base. Those people can be sent to what is called the RPF, which stands for Rehabilitations Project Force. It is basically a gulag, or boot camp where they send dissidents or people that have failed at something, too. They send them there to pretty much anything they want them to do. You are subjected to harsh treatment, corporal punishment, manual labor.

Q Is Scientology essentially based upon rewards and punishments?

A Yes, it is.

Q So when it says, "Not to be subject to any discipline." That is understood by the members?

A Correct.

	Q	All right.	You	actua	ally	were	a	member	of	OSA
and	you	actually follo	wed	this	poli	icy?				

A Yes, we did.

Q It specifically says, "May be tricked, sued, or lied to, or destroyed." Were you taught certain skills on how to trick, sue, lie, or destroy individuals?

A Within the Office of Special Affairs some of the training that we received, that we drilled, were things that an ordinary member of the organization wouldn't know about, however anyone within the Office of Special Affairs would know about what we were taught.

Q When you say drilled, what do you mean by drilled?

A When you drill it means that you receptively go over something with someone else, maybe a twin that they hook you up with, so that you have two people.

O A twin?

A A twin is let's say for example, if you and I were in the Office of Special Affairs and we were going to have to do this project, you and I would twin, we would get together and I would practice on you and you would practice on me until we both had a full understanding of what we going to do.

Q Would these practice drills go on for big complex points to carry out, or for a variety of events?

A It could be something small, it could be something within in group of individuals. It wouldn't necessarily be a -- we wouldn't have fifty people drilling on something. Normally, it is something that would happen within an academy, a teaching setting, if you will. It would be for smaller groups.

- Q Was this constantly going on?
- A Yes.

Q So you learned specifically from the directors in OSA how to trick?

A We learned several different techniques. They teach you things, and they have names for them. For example, if they wanted me to go in somewhere and impersonate someone, or say that I was someone that I wasn't, that's called a suitable guise. And they actually showed you how to do a suitable guise. How to go in and say that you are somebody else. Or how to ask a question without them thinking that you are really digging for information on someone.

Q You also mentioned that one of your duties while you were in OSA is to carry out investigations. Would you tell us a little bit about that?

A Anyone identified by the organization as an enemy the first action that is taken is intelligence gathering. That's used -- there are different methods

that they teach you gather intelligence on an individual. Some are legal, some are not.

Q What would be an example of something that you would want to find out about a critic?

A If for example there was someone that was identified as a critic that was saying something against Scientology the first thing that would be done would be a complete check on the person, what they called an ODC, which stands for Overt Data Collection. What that is, you would get all the information on the individual, name, address, you would obtain their social security number. You would check all court records. Any kind of information that would be publically available would be in ODC.

Q And that would be something that you would actually go after?

A Yes, I did many of these. There was something also called a CDC, which is Covert Data Collection. CDC were obtained by other individuals that had access to private information on individuals. We would obtain credit card information, all your credit information, copies of your phone bills, private investigators would be hired, and they would go through your garbage. They would talk to your neighbors. They would talk to your friends. They would previous employers.

0 What about travel arrangements?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α Absolutely.

We would try and obtain any information there Α was on the individual and if they were put on, if we were running a surveillance operation where we were actually watching the individual, we would try and find out exactly what they were doing and when they were doing it. There was even a document that was sent down from senior management to us that listed all the airlines on it, and showed us how to obtain information on an individual by using the frequent flyer miles programs of major airlines. You would pretend that you would be that individual, you would call up and give the name and social security number and the airlines would provide you with all that person's travel, itinerary, anything that they might currently have on the record. You would just pretend that you are that person and say, "Yeah, I want to know how many frequent flier miles I have." And they would say, "You just got an extra thousand for your trip you are taking next week." "Oh, yeah, can I confirm that with you." They would give you all the information and we would have the intelligence information in the subject that we were trying to get the information on.

Q So you learned how to obtain itinerary information for travel?

Q For example, when someone was going to arrive in an airport?

A Yes.

Q You mentioned that you sometimes hire outside personnel, what kind of people would you hire?

A The actual hiring of private investigators was done by the senior management of the Office of Special Affairs in conjunction with the attorneys at the church.

Q Were you actually taught how to use them as an in-between from Scientology?

A Well, the way that it works is this, the private investigator should, in essence, work for an attorney, however, within the Scientology organization that was not the way it was done. They were paid by the attorneys but the actual people running the operations and giving the marching orders to the investigators were the people in the Office of Special Affairs. Some of the training I received when I went to Los Angeles was on how to run a PI, or private investigator. We were actually given a check sheet, if you will, of the project that we were going to do. It delineates on there exactly which things we want the private investigator to do. The private investigator is given a description of what his targets are and he reports back to me, and I would write reports, send them up to senior management, and there

were different people in my capacity doing this with different private investigators.

Q Why are these outside sources used, and why are the lawyers used as shields?

A The organization itself, it would be deemed inappropriate in any other setting, that an organization like a church, if you will, would be doing an investigation on someone. So a shield needs to be created in order to justify the investigation of a private individual. So they bring in the attorneys and say we need so many PI's, we need some investigators from inside the organization to obtain intelligence information on a private individual. How can we do this? Well, this is one way we can do it.

- Q Is that more for public relations?
- A Completely.
 - Q Who is really in charge?
- A The Office of Special Affairs, actually the Sea Org. senior management is in charge.
 - Q How long did you actually practice in the Office of Special Affairs?
 - A Two years.
- Q During those two years was there ever any discretion on your part about what you might do and carry out?

A No, you can come up with an idea, but you have to go up the chain of command to make sure that they want you to do, your idea may be great, or your idea cannot be so great. So everything has to get cleared with whoever your senior is, or whoever is right above you. And maybe even several steps above that.

Q So while you were in the Office of Special
Affairs if you wanted to go check out where someone was,
could you just leave the building and go check it out, or
would you have to clear it first?

A No, I would have to be given instructions, check this person out, and then I would check them out. If I discovered that someone was saying something about the organization I would have to write a report, send it up the line, and they would tell me what to do next.

Q Why work under that strict of a policy, was there some benefit of doing that, did you actually get some rewards?

A Well, if you do what you are told, naturally you move up. Your statistics, you are measured in the organization by statistics, just like you would anywhere else. You do good, your statistics go up, you are regarded better. If your statistics are up you are rewarded with more time for study, maybe more time for spiritual counseling that they call. If you are in the

23

24

25

1	Sea Organization, which is their internal fraternal
2	organization, it's run like a military organization, you
3	may be, if your statistics are going up, then maybe you
4	are given liberty that weekend and you can actually go
5	out, or do something outside of the organization.
6	Q Okay, at one point I take it that these rewards
7	were extremely important to you?
8	A Yes, they were.
9	Q You took it to heart, you found it very
10	important?
11	A Yes, I did.
12	Q Now, for example in a workplace your rewards
13	might be based on money?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Is that fair?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Maybe if you do well for a year, you get a
18	raise at the end of the year?
19	A Correct.
20	Q Is that how it was in Scientology?
21	MR. TYSON: Judge, I am going to object to

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- it has gone on for quite awhile now.

this continual line of leading questions here. I'd ask -

Q In Scientology is the reward system more on an annual long-term basis, or is based on something more quickly?

A Yeah, it's sporadic and it's pretty much, what have you done today kind of thing. What have you done this week kind of a thing. If you do something that is instantly then you are rewarded pretty much at the same time. Cumulatively it may help you ultimately move up in the organization.

Q How are these point systems or these statistics charted?

A It's different for each different department.

If for example --

Q How is for OSA, for example?

A Okay, if the Office of Special Affairs there are about a dozen statistics that measure our performance when you are in the Office of Special Affairs, they could be identifying threats to the organization, could be one statistic. Number of threats against the organization that we do a successful operation against. Number of inches of positive writing in the newspaper. A negative statistic would be number of inches of negative writing in the newspaper about the organization. Number of operations carried out successfully. Number of national -- let's say there are different categories for our

enemies of Scientology, they could be local, regional, or national. If someone that is nationally attacking the organization gets downgraded to someone who is not doing it nationally any longer, maybe they are just identified as a local, then those statistics go down. Your personal statistics go up. This person is being neutralized in some way.

Q Is that something that you continuously worried about?

A That was how my performance was measured.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: You may.

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

MR. TYSON: Judge, based on your prior ruling you said that you were going to let him say that he was a member Scientology, the "Fair Game Policy" say what it is, the penalties and violations. You said that you were not going to let them put the religion on trial. He said everything that he needs to say. From here on out it is cumulative, and they are putting the religion on trial. He has already said that they can be lied on, trick, cheated, sued. It's all cumulative from here on out.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, the "Fair Game

Policy" and I didn't read it. We are just talking about specifically the words punishment and points. I thought that was one of the things that could get into.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there is a limit to it.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there is a limit to it.

You said that it was very limited. I sat there, let them

put it all out there according to your ruling. I am

suggesting that they should be done by now.

THE COURT: I have a strong tendency to agree with Mr. Tyson. You are well into this, and well beyond, frankly, what I envisioned.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that is where I don't understand where you are drawing the line, and why I tried to clarify. If you are saying the line is drawn then I will move on.

THE COURT: I am saying that you are close to the line. And you need to move through this and get to something that's more directly relevant.

MS. RIVELLINI: Okay. May I approach the witness, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, you testified that this is a policy that you practiced while you were in OSA organization?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And you have also said that you recognized a

1	second document here.
2	A Yes.
3	Q Can you take a look at it and tell me what the
4	document is called?
5	A It's called the "Cancellation of Fair Game."
6	Q This is something that you also read and
7	practiced and understood while you were in Scientology?
8	A Yes.
9	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this time I
10	would move the second document, what has previously been
11	marked for identification as Exhibit Number 6 for the
12	Defense and ask that it be entered into evidence.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
14	MR. TYSON: I have an outstanding
15	objection.
16	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
17	marked.
18	(The document heretofore
19	marked as Defendant's
20	Exhibit No. 6 for
21	identification was received
22	into evidence.)
23	MS. RIVELLINI:
24	Q This document, Mr. Oliver, is called
25	"Cancellation of Fair Game"?

22

23

24

25

- A Correct.
- Q Could you go ahead and read that to me?
- A It says, "This PL" which means policy letter --
- Q Well, actually the practice of --

A Oh. "The practice of declaring people "Fair Game" will cease. "Fair Game" may not appear on any ethic order, it causes bad public relations. This PL, which stands for policy letter, does not cancel any policy on the treatment or the handling of an "SP".

- Q Who wrote this?
- A That was also written by L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q And that done obviously before he died?
- A Yes.
- Q And he has since died?
- A Yes.
 - Q Do you remember about what year that was?
 - A 1986, I believe.
 - Q Tell me how it is if that says it cancels "Fair Game" that you actually practiced "Fair Game" while you were in the Office of Special Affairs?

A The way that it is actually written, if you take a good look at it, says that it doesn't cancel any policy on the treatment or handling of a suppressive person, all it basically does is eliminate the badge of "Fair Game". So we are not to call it "Fair Game" any

longer. Nor is it to supposed to appear on any document as "Fair Game". However, there are still policies in place how someone that is declared a suppressive person is treated, and that is basically "Fair Game". We just can't call it that any longer.

- Q It is still practiced then?
- A Of course.

- Q Even well after that was issued?
- A All that says is to stop calling it "Fair Game" and that they can't -- that "Fair Game" cannot appear on an ethics order, but the things that you can do someone, it says it does not cancel any policy on the treatment or the handling of an SP. The treatment of an SP --
 - Q Suppressive person?
- A Yeah, a suppressive person, as defined in "Fair Game" is not canceled, just the name "Fair Game".
- Q Who can actually change a policy in Scientology?
 - A L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q How about once he has passed on, can any policy be changed?
- A There are policies written, the first policy that is in every single document, every single course in Scientology is called keeping Scientology working. It appears on the front of every single course that you do

	2%
1	in Scientology. In there it delineates that no one has
2	the authority to change policy, but L. Ron Hubbard.
3	Q So if a written document were to come out in
4	the '90's after he has passed on, which would rule?

A It couldn't come out. No one can rewrite the bible today. So no -- according to the dogma of Scientology, unless L. Ron Hubbard comes back to life again, no one can rewrite the policy of the Church of Scientology, but L. Ron Hubbard.

Q Okay, if a written document were to be sent around it would not have the effect that this --

A No, they would investigate who was issuing an illegal order, or creating a policy letter without issue authority.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, if I may have a moment?

THE COURT: You may.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Now the terms suppressive person and enemy are used as being synonymous?

A Yes.

Q What exactly makes somebody a suppressive person?

A Anyone that has committed an act that is contrary to or against the beliefs of the Scientology

1	ammand and desired
	organization.
2	Q So if I didn't believe in Scientology that
3	would SP necessarily?
4	A No, not unless you actually shared that view
5	with someone, or made it public, or did something to the
6	organization.
7	Q Would Mr. Minton be considered a suppressive
8	person?
9	A According Scientology, he would.
10	Q Are the practices and beliefs of Scientologists
11	supposed to be kept in
12	MR. TYSON: Judge, objection, a continuing
13	objection. And I would ask if we can approach?
14	THE COURT: Please approach.
15	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
16	outside the hearing of the jury.)
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, are we over the line
18	yet?
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, in the
20	proffer she asked him, and I think she is doing a pre-
21	emptive question. He asked him whether not he signed a
22	non-disclosure form and cross examined on that.
23	MR. TYSON: I am not getting into that.
24	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Oh, you are not.
25	MR. TYSON: Not unless she does. I only

1 got into because you did.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, you did tell us that we could go towards Mr. Howd's reasons to be completely honest in his testimony. I was going to ask him if he signed a non-disclosure form when he was a member of the Office of Special Affairs.

MR. TYSON: Judge, the reason why I crossed examined him is because they brought all that up. My initial position was that they were going to put the religion on trial, and it's relevant, and I think we are way past that now.

THE COURT: I agree with everything you said, but what Ms. Rivellini said that she wants to do is get testimony and demonstrate a basis as to why Mr. Howd's testimony would be less than truthful. I cannot prohibit her from doing that.

MR. TYSON: I don't think it is allowable to have one witness to testify on another witness' truthfulness. I think that is exactly what she is going.

THE COURT: I don't think she is going to do that.

MS. RIVELLINI: No.

THE COURT: I think she is going to demonstrate that there may be policies that would motivate him to do that, and I do not believe that she

will go beyond that. Am I correct?

MS. RIVELLINI: That's correct. My next question was going to be, did you sign a non-disclosure form, and would you have been able to come out and say anything against Scientology that was not prescribed to you, and is there a penalty for doing so.

MR. TYSON: I am just wondering how far, because we just keeping further and further.

THE COURT: Your points are very well taken. But I am going overrule the objection on this point.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, are most of the policies of Scientology supposed to remain internal?
- A Yes, there is a great deal of information, according to the organization, maintained confidential.
- Q Did you actually have to sign a form stating that you would keep everything a secret, a non-disclosure form?
- A When I joined the Office of Special Affairs, a non-disclosure form, and a complete life history on my part was required.
 - Q And tell me what that form required of you?
- A The non-disclosure required that I not divulge any of the secret information that I would be privy to

the Offi	ce c	of S	Speci	al Af	fairs	under	penalty	of,	I
believe,	it	is	a mi	llion	dolla	ars pe	r infract	ion	•

Q Were there also penalties from the organization itself about your rank?

A You would be -- if you violated those policies you would be subjected to the internal ethics of the ethics practices of the organization. You are subject to lose any ranking that you had, any position, your certificates, and the organization felt that your spiritual freedom was at stake as well, if didn't have access or availability Scientology practices.

Q If you were still a member of the Office of Special Affairs or when you were still a member of the Office of Special Affairs, if you were called in to testify would you be free to testify?

MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, would there have been a penalty -MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let her finish her question.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Based upon the non-disclosure form that you signed if you had come into court, or any arena and testified contrary to what Scientology wanted you to,

based on that form would there be a penalty for doing so
freely?

A Yes.

MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, may I have a

moment.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You may.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

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

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: We are about through. The only other area that I wanted Ms. Rivellini to ask is as to what happened on the tape. There is a policy of "Fair Game" that they want to have them labeled as criminals. I think that you heard that in the proffer. I think it goes right to the defense of allowing the touching so that he could be arrested and declared a criminal. She wasn't sure whether you would permit that area of inquiry. It would be brief, but I think it goes to the heart of the defense.

MR. TYSON: That is his opinion, and that is going straight to what is in the province of the jury.

MS. RIVELLINI: It's not an opinion, it's a fact.

THE COURT: It sounds to me like it is part and parcel of the "Fair Game Policy", and to the extent that it is I will overrule, but let's make sure we understand what we are doing. You are merely going to elicit information from him that the "Fair Game Policy" includes efforts to have someone as a criminal.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's fine.

MS. RIVELLINI: Correct. The only other question that I had planned on asking him, because they made a point during Mr. Howd's testimony that "Fair Game" is not currently in place, and not being used, is if he knows — how recently he knows "Fair Game" has been used. And if he has personal knowledge about it. And that goes to them contacting his family as recently as within a week ago. Because it goes to impeach Mr. Howd's testimony.

MR. TYSON: Judge, it is prejudicial. That's hearsay as the contacting his family.

MS. RIVELLINI: The fact that he knows a call was made goes to his knowledge that "Fair Game" is still being implemented and it contradicts what Mr. Howd testified.

MR. TYSON: Judge, that is highly

1 | inflammatory to the jury.

THE COURT: I agree with Mr. Tyson. You are not going to go there for the reasons that he just stated.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Mr. Oliver, in line with the "Fair Game Policy" and the labeling of someone as an enemy, suppressive person, or a critic, telling about the understanding that you have about criminality comes into place, and why it is important that someone is labeled a criminal?

A There is different policies within the organization where "Fair Game" and the practices "Fair Game" are delineated, it's not just limited to this one particular policy letters. There are other policies within the organization.

Q Tell me what it means to be labeled by Scientology, not what it means out common knowledge?

A Any one who attacks Scientology is a criminal according to Scientology.

Q Is that a word that is used over and over again?

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

A Yes, if a minister were to speak out against Scientology he would be labeled a criminal, and if he didn't have a crime they would dig into his past and find

1 one. No matter who.

Q It is important for Scientology to expose a critics crimes?

- A Absolutely.
- Q Were you taught to do this?
- A Yes.
 - Q How would you go about it?

A Using investigative technique. We would obtain any kind of information that would be on an individual, his background. We would talk to neighbors, we would have private investigators sent out. We would obtain any kind of information that would either prove that the person had been a criminal, link them to criminal activity, or if that failed then to try and create criminal activity.

Q Would you stop until you had created that criminal activity?

A I saw things done when I was in the Office of Special Affairs, which I personally didn't participate in, however, I did see them done, I did hear of them when I was in the Office of Special Affairs, and the higher the threat level of the individual, the subject was, the more efforts that would be expended on proving that that person was a criminal.

Q If you were told to manufacture a crime, to

make that critic a criminal, okay if that was your job that day --

MR. TYSON: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q If that was your job that day and the event were about to end and you had not completed that task, would there be sanctions?

A There would sanctions on anyone who accepts that task and not complete it successfully. I was fortunate that I was never placed in a position of having had to do it. I felt bad for anyone that was in that position, people that I saw that were subjected to having to do that.

- Q Is that why you left the church?
- A That was one of many pivotal reasons why I left the organization.
 - Q Okay, when you left were you handed a document?
- A I tried to leave the organization the right way through using their own policy, however, in the end I was handed a document by Scientology, it was as Suppressive Person Declare.
 - Q What does that mean?
- A I was declared an enemy of Scientology because I wanted to leave the organization for that reason.

1		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, if I may have just
2	a moment.	
3		THE COURT: Okay.
4		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that's all I have.
5		THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, cross examination?
6		MR. TYSON: Judge, if I could have a
7	moment.	
8		CROSS EXAMINATION
9		BY MR. TYSON:
10	Q	How are you doing, Mr. Oliver?
11	A	Very good, sir.
12	Q	Now, you left there in 1992, right?
13	A	Correct, sir.
14	Q	Does this book look familiar to you?
15	A	Yes, I have seen that book before.
16		MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach?
17		THE COURT: You may.
18		BY MR. TYSON:
19	Q	You have seen this book before?
20	A	Yes, sir.
21	Q	What is that chapter on?
22	A	That says, "Suppressive Acts, Suppression of
23	Scientolo	gy, and Scientologists."
24	Q	That's what we are talking about here, right?
25	A	Yes, sir.

Q I want you to look into the chapter and tell me
what the last thing it says in there is, starting with
"nothing"?

A It says, "Nothing in this policy letter shall
ever or under any circumstances justify any violation of
the laws of the land or --"

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to object to him reading it without it being entered into evidence first, and then being published to the jury.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I can enter a copy it.

I have a copy. That's not my book.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RIVELLINI: We would ask that he go ahead and do it.

MR. TYSON: I will go ahead and do it now.
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, under the rule of completeness we would ask that the entire section be entered, not the entire book.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I am offering it only to impeach him as to whether that policy does still exists, that's all I am offering it for.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to accept what has selected from that book to use for feature. So you objection is overruled.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Oliver, I want you to look at this, this is a same thing as that photocopy? Can you give me the book back?

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, that is Exhibit

Number?

MR. TYSON: Number 7.

THE COURT: Okay, State's Exhibit Number seven is admitted into evidence.

(The document hereinafter referred to was marked and State's Exhibit No. 7 for identification and was received into evidence.)

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Oliver, please look at 7, that is in evidence. Read that please to the jury?

A It says, "Nothing in this policy letter shall ever, or under any circumstances justify any violation of the laws of land, or intentional illegal wrongs. Any such offenses shall subject the offender to penalties prescribed by law, as well as ethics injustice actions."

Q Now, that says that you can't do anything illegal, right?

A Yes.

1	Q Were you aware of that?
2	A I see this document, and I see what it says.
3	Q When was the last time you have seen that
4	document you have never seen that document, have you?
5	A I don't recall ever seeing this particular
6	document.
7	MR. TYSON: Judge, may I approach the
8	witness?
9	BY MR. TYSON:
10	Q Mr. Oliver, you don't know Richard Howd, do
11	you?
12	A No, sir, I don't.
13	Q And you have never been in the Clearwater
14	office, have you?
15	A Yes, I have.
16	Q Were you stationed there?
17	A No.
18	Q When were you there?
19	A In Clearwater?
20	Q Uh-huh.
21	A The last time I was inside Flag, the Flag Land
22	Base was in 1990, I believe. It may have been '91.
23	Q Is it fair to say that you no longer
24	Scientologists?
25	A No, that is not fair to sav.

Q

1	Q Could you tell me why on February 6th of this
2	year you were shining a laser light pen, similar to this
3	one, with a laser dot in their face when you were across
4	the street from them in Clearwater?
5	MS. RIVELLINI: I am going to object to
6	him testifying. The facts are not in evidence. I think
7	he first has to ask him if, in fact, he was doing so, and
8	then ask him why?
9	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
10	BY MR. TYSON:
11	Q I'll repeat it, why are you showing the laser
12	light pen you do admit that you did that, right?
13	A No, I don't recall shining it anyone's eyes,
14	sir.
15	Q Shining it around their face and their camera?
16	A No, I remember shining it specifically into
17	someone's camera, who was videotaping.
18	Q With their eye right behind, which means that's
19	right where their face is, doesn't it?
20	A No, they were holding it down around their
21	waist.
22	Q If I showed you a video, would that maybe help
23	you?
24	A It might, it's been some time.

Let me ask you this, Mr. Oliver, have you ever

1	given them the finger?
2	A Sure.
3	Q What does that mean?
4	A That means that I don't like them.
5	Q Does it mean, fuck you?
6	A It might.
7	Q Is it fair to say that the average person that
8	when you give somebody the finger it means fuck you, is
9	that fair to say?
10	A Yeah, if someone did it to me, I would know
11	what it would mean, and I would probably do it right
12	back.
13	Q That would be a provocative act, wouldn't you
14	agree, something that would provoke people?
15	A If somebody did that to me I would consider it
16	provocative.
17	Q Also a laser light pen in their face would be
18	provocative, too, wouldn't it?
19	A It might.
20	MR. TYSON: Judge, I can mark this State's
21	Exhibit Number 8 for identification.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	(The video hereinafter
24	referred to marked as
25	State's Exhibit No. 8 for

1	identification.)
2	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I can publish it to
3	the jury?
4	THE COURT: Are you admitting that into
5	evidence.
6	MR. TYSON: Yes, Judge.
7	THE COURT: Any objection?
8	MS. RIVELLINI: No, sir.
9	THE COURT: Okay, it will be admitted and
10	you can publish it.
11	(The video heretofore
12	marked as State's Exhibit
13	No. 8 for identification
14	was received into
15	evidence.)
16	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to
17	assume that there are no other contents other than what I
18	have viewed.
19	MR. TYSON: Judge, may we approach on
20	that?
21	THE COURT: Approach.
22	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
23	out of the hearing of the jury.)
24	MR. TYSON: There is a little bit of him
25	picketing, but if the jury wants to see that tape we can

1	bring them back and let them look just at the portion.
2	MS. RIVELLINI: I couldn't remember what
3	else was on there. We looked about five videos.
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I have never
5	seen this.
6	MR. TYSON: He gave them the finger.
7	MS. RIVELLINI: Right, and then shining
8	the light.
9	MR. TYSON: The laser light in the face.
LO	MS. RIVELLINI: Right.
11	MR. TYSON: And then he just walking
L2	around picketing. I will stop it, and I will stop at the
13	laser light, and then if they want to see the video again
L 4	we can bring them into court and play that relevant
L 5	section. I just can't edit it this quick.
L6	MS. RIVELLINI: Is there anything else on
L7	the video besides him even picketing?
18	MR. TYSON: No.
L9	MS. RIVELLINI: The whole video is only a
20	couple of minutes?
21	MR. TYSON: It's not even that long, about
22	thirty seconds.
23	THE COURT: Are you okay with that?
24	MS. RIVELLINI: Yes. I just didn't know
25	if there was any second part to the video.

1	(Whereupon, the video was played for
2	jury.)
3	BY MR. TYSON:
4	Q You are giving them the finger, aren't you?
5	A Yes, I am.
6	Q That's you with a laser pen, isn't it?
7	A Yes, I believe so.
8	Q Is Mr. Minton with you?
9	A Yes.
10	Q You are across the street from the
11	Scientologists?
12	A Yes.
13	Q They are not up in your face with the video,
14	are they?
15	A No, they aren't.
16	Q It is going right in the camera, isn't it, Mr.
17	Oliver?
18	A Yes, it is.
19	Q And your testimony is that the camera is down
20	to their side?
21	A I believe he had it down by his waist.
22	Q You are flashing it all around, wouldn't it be
23	fair to assume that you got it in his face?
24	A No, sir.
25	Q I didn't see the Scientologists picking on

22

25

- 1 anybody there, were they? 2 Α Not at that particular moment, no, sir. 3 0 You're messing with them though, aren't you? Α If that is how you choose characterize it, sir. 5 Q Laser light in somebody's face, that's not a 6 good thing, right? 7 Α No. 8 If I put it in the Judge's face I am going out Q 9 of here in handcuffs. Would you agree? 10 Yeah, but I haven't shined it anyone's face. Α 11 You just shined it at them? Q 12 A I didn't shine it in anyone's face. I was very 13 clear when I was doing it in anyone's eyes. I wouldn't 14 want that done to me. 15 Would it be safe to assume that the average 16 person may be provoked with somebody doing that? 17 Α They may be. 18 Okay. Your intention was to provoke them, Q 19 wasn't it? 20 No, it wasn't. I objected to being videotaped. Α
 - Let's talk about that. Wait a second. Q If I play it back, Mr. Bunker, part of your group is holding a

23 videotape on them, isn't he?

24 Uh-huh.

> Q Do you want to see it again?

1 Α No, I don't need to see it again. 2 Okay, but you object to them videotaping you, 0 3 but it's okay for your group to videotape them? Is that what you are telling this jury? 5 The technique of videotaping is someone that --6 from my understanding you can do freely in this country, 7 however, I don't need my life chronicled. 8 So is it fair to say that when you do it, you Q 9 10 chronicling your life? 11 12 Q 13 14 Α I can if choose to be. 15 Q 16 17 though? 18 Α Define provoke. 19 Q 20 21 A 22 Q 23 you gave them the finger, didn't you? 24 25

1	Q Okay. Much like we all have clips of videos,
2	right. We will get into that later. You were shining
3	the laser light at them though, right?
4	A I was shining it into the camera of the person
5	recording me.
6	Q Now, have you ever received any money either
, 7	directly, or indirectly from Mr. Minton?
8	A I believe we went out to dinner and Mr. Minton
9	bought everybody in the restaurant dinner that night. I
10	think that would be direct.
11	Q You are involved in the Lisa McPherson civil
12	suit, aren't you?
13	A Yes, I am.
14	Q And you plan on testifying for the Lisa
15	McPherson family, I guess is the best way to describe
16	that?
17	A Actually, no.
18	Q What do you plan on doing there?
19	A I am a legal consultant on that case.
20	Q Are you being paid for that?
21	A No, I am not.
22	Q Okay. But the case is being funded by Mr.
23	Minton, isn't it?
24	A I believe so.
25	Q Mr. Minton is paying for a third party to sue

1	the Church of Scientology, isn't he?
2	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I am going to object
3	if the answer calls for hearsay.
4	MR. TYSON: He has already basically
5	answered it, Judge.
6	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
7	BY MR. TYSON:
8	Q Mr. Minton is funding a third party to sue the
9	Scientologists, isn't he?
10	A I believe so.
11	Q Okay. The Lisa McPherson Trust, do you have
12	any knowledge about that at all?
13	A Yes, I am on the advisory board.
14	Q You are on the advisory board. That Trust is
15	funded by Mr. Minton, isn't it?
16	A Yes, it is.
17	Q And that Trust in turn is funding the civil
18	suit, isn't it?
19	A I don't know that to be a fact.
20	Q Well, you are on the board, where is the money
21	going?
22	A Sir, I don't know that for a fact.
23	Q I don't quite understand your answer.
24	A I haven't
25	Q You said that you don't know for a fact, is

this	working	
------	---------	--

A No, not at all, I haven't seen any documentation of that sort, so I can't honestly answer the question. My capacity is an advisory capacity.

Q I am not talking about documentation. I am talking about day-to-day talk around the Lisa McPherson Trust as to where that money is going. How many people are involved in that?

A There may be a dozen or so. I am not there everyday. I live in Miami.

Q I understand that, you understand the gist of my question though?

A You are asking me to speculate on something that I have no first-hand knowledge of.

Q Let's leave at that then. Basically, you have told this jury that you are trained in dirty tricks.

That is basically what you are telling them, right?

A I was trained in specific investigative technique.

Q You can call it that if you want. You don't mind if I call them dirty tricks, do you?

A I don't know, would you categorize what I did as a dirty trick?

Q Putting a laser light on somebody.

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

A Is that a dirty trick?

	50
1	Q If you are trying to provoke them it is.
2	A You are assuming that I was trying to provoke
3	them.
4	Q Have you ever met Richard Howd before?
5	A I don't believe I know Mr. Howd.
6	Q You don't know anything about Mr. Howd?
7	A Only what I have heard thus far.
8	Q Hearsay, right, all you have heard is from
9	other people talking about him?
10	A In the courtroom here, too.
11	MR. TYSON: Judge, if I could have a
12	moment please.
13	THE COURT: Yes.
14	BY MR. TYSON:
15	Q You say the church brings in attorneys to mess
16	with people, is that what you said?
17	A No, I didn't say that.
18	Q What do they bring them in for?
19	A The attorneys that I worked with for the Church
20	of Scientology are in-house counsel. Moxon, Kobrin.
21	Q When you were involved in these activities, or
22	alleged activities that you testified to, you chose to be
23	involved in those, didn't you?
24	A It was what I was required to do as a member of
25	the Office of Special Affairs.

can quit your

Is that what

23

24

25

1	Q Well, I am required to be here in court today,
2	but you know what, I can turn around and walk right out
3	the door.
4	A True.
5	Q I can quit my job the same as you can quit you
6	job, right?
7	A I
8	Q But you made a choice, didn't you? If that is
9	even true and this stuff even happened, that would have
10	been your choice to that kind of stuff, wouldn't it?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And as far as illegal activities, you are
13	saying that you were never involved in any. Is that wha
14	you are telling this jury?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Okay. You are not going to dime yourself out,
17	are you?
18	A Nope.
19	Q Of course not, of course not. So any illegal
20	activities that you are telling this jury about is stuff
21	that other people may have told you?
22	A No, not exactly right, sir.

MS. RIVELLINI: Yes, sir, but we need to

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

THE COURT: Redirect?

1 approach before we do that.

THE COURT: Okay.

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

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I believe Mr. Tyson clearly opened the door for me to get out the point that there have been ramifications for him leaving the church, and that, in fact, he has been followed and harassed. He asked him, "Well, they didn't go around provoking you, did they? They didn't do anything to you, did they?"

And, in fact, he asked, "If you didn't like it, you could just leave and walk out?" Like there would be no repercussions, and in fact, there have been.

MR. TYSON: Judge, there wasn't any response to him saying he couldn't leave. I didn't open any door there. I was very careful about that. I didn't mention the videos, I didn't mention what Mr. Minton did on the videos and whether that was "Fair Game" what he did. I kept the door very tight so that we wouldn't get in that part.

MS. RIVELLINI: He wasn't responding to questions that I asked him. He was responding to questions asked of him by the prosecutor.

THE COURT: Give me a for example. If you go into this line of questioning, what do you expect to

MS. RIVELLINI: He asked him if what he was doing, standing out there picketing was just because he hates Scientologists and the fact is that they didn't do anything to provoke you, and in fact, they have done things to provoke him. Also, Judge, he specifically said, "When you were there you were there of your own free will, and you could have just left, just like I could quit my job." And that is not the case. And he is misleading them by leaving them on that point.

MR. TYSON: He has already testified about

MS. RIVELLINI: It was upon your line of questioning. I didn't ask him if he was there of his own freewill.

RPF, whatever that stuff is, he has already been there.

It's all what you put out.

MR. TYSON: I went no further than yours was.

THE COURT: I am going to let you hit it real brief. Real briefly.

MS. RIVELLINI: That's all I need. That's all I need.

THE COURT: I don't want to dwell on it, because we have already gone way far beyond it. Let me make sure that I understand what it is you expect to get

out.

MS. RIVELLINI: I plan on asking him, "The prosecutor asked you, if you were there of your own freewill." "Yes, I was." And when you stopped liking what was going on, you tried to leave? Just like the prosecutor said you could? "Yes, I did." And you weren't allowed to leave peacefully, were you? "No." So, in fact, it is not just like Mr. Tyson leaving his job, you, in fact, were harassed? "Yes, I was."

MR. TYSON: In 1992. Relevance, and I didn't do anything else other than to comment on the fact that he didn't have to do anything that he wanted to do. He said that he didn't do any of those activities.

MS. RIVELLINI: You asked him specifically

_

THE COURT: We are going further and further. He can say yes, he was harassed. And I don't want to hear about what those harassments were.

MS. RIVELLINI: That's why I phrased it that way, so I could cut it off just there.

THE COURT: I don't want to hear all the gory stories.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I would ask if he starts going into it that you would interrupt so that I don't look like I am trying to hide anything.

1 MS. RIVELLINI: That's fine with me. 2 THE COURT: She is not going to do it. 3 MS. RIVELLINI: If he responds further than I've asked then I have no problem with how you conduct the courtroom. But I would only the question the 5 6 way that I just phrased. 7 MR. TYSON: My question is that she may 8 ask a very simple question, he may just ramble on. 9 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 10 MS. RIVELLINI: I don't know if you want 11 to argue that at the bench. He entered only one page of 12 a document. 13 THE COURT: I've already ruled. 14 want to argue that again? 15 MS. RIVELLINI: You ruled that only he had 16 to enter it. I would like to enter it under the rule of 17 completeness. And we can either argue that now, or come 18 back up. 19 MR. TYSON: I don't know how it is 20 completeness, Judge. He just testified it is for the 21 limited purpose of showing that they have -- showing that 22 they can't do anything illegal. I didn't go into any of 23 the policy. I did nothing about that. 24 THE COURT: Is there anything in that 25

document that you find to be relevant to the issue that

Mr. Tyson was addressing, other than the portion that he used?

MS. RIVELLINI: Yes, sir, on page 883 where it talks suppressive acts, anybody who does those things, any person who agrees that would do such thing, a suppressive act, out of self-interest, only to the detriment of all others they cannot be granted the rights ordinarily accorded rational beings. So this paragraph within its own policy completely contradicts that you can't do someone. They don't even treat them like a human being.

THE COURT: But his paragraph pertained to violations of the law. I am not sure those two things are congruous.

MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, I think if you look at one versus the other, to take just his portion out of context is completely misleading as to what their real policy is, which is if you don't treat someone like a rational human being --

THE COURT: So you want to enter just one page?

MS. RIVELLINI: I will be happy to limit it to that.

MR. TYSON: I will object to that. It is putting the religion on trial. It's obvious from the

THE COURT: I am drawing the line.

MR. TYSON: They keep going and going and going.

THE COURT: I am going to let you put that one page in, and I am let you ask that one question. If he goes beyond, yes, I was harassed, then I will interject and stop it.

MS. RIVELLINI: I will be happy to ask it as a leading question.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

- Q Mr. Oliver, the prosecutor asked you if you disliked Scientology or Scientologists, and you told him
 - A Yes, that is true.
- Q Okay, but then you expressed that you have gone out and picketed and some things against Scientology.

 How do you reconcile that?

A I don't have anything against Scientologists, a lot of them don't really know what goes on within the organization itself. My problem, if you will, or my concern is the abusive practices of the organization as deemed and carried out and told to be done by the management. Individual Scientologists I have no qualm

referred to was marked as

25

T	with them. A lot of people are my friends in Scientology
2	that I can't talk to anymore because of the situations.
3	Q So is it fair to say that the anger, or the
4	discontent that you seem to express on that video is not
5	with the people, but with the policies?
6	A Absolutely. It's with their abusive and
7	hurtful policies. Not with the individuals. Some of
8	them don't even know what is really going on in there,
9	they don't.
10	Q You weren't trying to mislead this jury?
11	A Not in any way.
12	Q Now, Mr. Tyson showed you the last paragraph of
13	a policy.
14	MS. RIVELLINI: If I can approach the
15	witness?
16	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
17	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
18	Q Just one other page from that policy, and it's
19	in Defendant's Exhibit Number 9 for purposes of
20	identification. Can you just take a look at it, and take
21	a look at the cover page to see where it comes from. Do
22	you recognize that chapter?
23	A Yeah.
24	(The document hereinafter

1	Defendant's Exhibit No. 9
2	for identification.)
3	BY MS. RIVELLINI:
4	Q Okay, turn directly to the page that I have
5	pointed out and highlighted. Can you just read the
6	highlighted paragraph and tell me if you understand what
7	it means?
8	A It says
9	Q Read it to yourself and tell me if you
10	understand it?
11	A I understand it.
12	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, at this point I
13	would like to enter into evidence only page 883 from the
14	same chapter that the prosecutor entered the page from.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson?
16	MR. TYSON: I would renew my relevance
17	objection, Judge.
18	THE COURT: I understand it will admitted
19	as Defense Exhibit Number?
20	MS. RIVELLINI: Number 9.
21	THE COURT: Number 9. Okay.
22	MS. RIVELLINI: And only this section will
23	be published to the jury and entered it into evidence.
24	THE COURT: You may go ahead and publish
25	it.

(The document heretofore marked as Defendant's Exhibit No. 9 for identification was received into evidence.)

MS. RIVELLINI:

Q Would you go ahead and read the highlighted portion from page 883, from the Chapter of Suppressive Acts?

A It says, "Suppressive Acts are clearly those covert, or overt acts knowingly calculated to reduce or destroy the influence, or activities of Scientology or prevent case gains, or continued Scientology successes, and activity on the part of a Scientologist. As persons or groups that would do such a thing act out of self interest, only to the detriment of all others. They cannot be granted the rights ordinarily accorded rational beings."

Q And you said that you understood that paragraph?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q Is there anything in that paragraph that contradicts what you learned as "Fair Game"?
 - A No. It's just phrased nicely.
 - Q In fact, the prosecutor showed you that this is

1 dated 1991, correct?

A Yes.

Q Could anything that is written here directly conflict or change "Fair Game" as it was done by L. Ron Hubbard?

MR. TYSON: Judge, I am going to object.

He is incompetent to answer that question. He has been out of the organization for eight years. How he would even know about this. He has never seen this before.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. RIVELLINI:

Q From what you learned when you were involved so heavily in Scientology, from what you learned can a policy later after L. Ron Hubbard died be changed?

A No, it can't. That one, in fact, you showed me didn't seem to be written by L. Ron Hubbard. It was another author listed underneath the name on the bottom.

- Q That makes a big difference?
- A Big difference.
- Q The fact that it says that people who commit suppressive acts that they cannot granted ordinarily accorded rational beings. Is that essentially saying that you don't treat them like they are humans?
 - A That is how I interpret it.
 - Q Now, the prosecutor kind of made the connection

- in your involvement in Scientology and his job here with the State of Florida. When you were in Scientology, no one forced you to become a member?
 - A No one forced me to become a member.
- Q Okay, no one forced you at the time you were there to stay a member, is that right?
 - A No one forced me to stay a member.
 - Q And for a while you liked being a member?
- A Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q You even have a tattoo and it meant a lot to you?
- 12 A Yes.
 - Q At some point to you did that change?
 - A Yes, it did.
 - Q Did you try to take the steps that were taught to you to properly leave the church?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q When you tried to do that were there any repercussions?
 - A Yes, there were.
 - Q In fact, it is not just like for Mr. Tyson if he were to quit his job, and he said he could walk out the door. You couldn't just walk out the door and say that I am done with you all and never hear from them again?

1	A	I could, and suffer the consequences, sure.
2	Q	So there were consequences when you left the
3	church?	
4	A	Yes, there were.
5		MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, that's all I have.
6		THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, anything further?
7		RECROSS EXAMINATION
8		BY MR. TYSON:
9	Q	You do recognize that book there, right?
10	A	Yeah, I've seen that book.
11	Q	So Mr. Hubbard, he is dead?
12	A	Yeah, he's dead.
13	Q	Are you sure, we are not talking about Elvis
14	being ali	ve? He is dead, right?
15	A	As far as I know, sir, he is dead.
16	Q	That's the typical book that you all have in
17	Scientolo	gy?
18	A	It's typical, yeah.
19	Q	Now, you said the reason for activities, you
20	are not m	ad at the people, but the policies, but you
21	aimed the	laser light at the people, right?
22	A	Yeah, a particular security guard, yes.
23	Q	That's a person, right?
24	A	Excuse me?
25	Q	That is a person though, right?

A Correct.

Q And for lack of a better term, I am not going to claim ignorance here, but I really don't know that much about Scientology, I really don't. I don't know that much about you guys. That's why I say Scientology and anti-Scientology. I am not trying to offend you when I say that. But your message for lack of a better way to describe it, to simply it would be anti-Scientology?

A No, I wouldn't say that. I don't have a problem with people being Scientologists.

Q I am talking about anti-Scientology policies.

I mean that is why you are picketing and protesting, to
get your message out against Scientology, you want to
expose them, right?

A I want to expose the abusive practices.

Q Okay, fair enough. Let me ask you this question, how is shining a laser light on them sending a message to the rest of the public that you want to expose their policies, tell the jury that?

A That particular person that was filming me --

Q I asked you a question, how does that send your message to the public, your protest, if I go to a car dealership I get a lemon, I am out in front holding a sign, right, that's protest, right? I am shouting in the street, they're bad. Okay? They are bad, that is why

25

1	you are holding signs, right?
2	MS. RIVELLINI: Judge, there hasn't been a
3	question. I am going to ask that he stop editorializing
4	and just phrase one simple question.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, please ask your
6	questions.
7	BY MR. TYSON:
8	Q You were there to protest to get your message
9	out, aren't you?
10	A Correct.
11	Q And your message that you want to get out is
12	to the public, isn't it?
13	A No, not necessarily. It's also to the
14	Scientologists.
15	Q For them too, but also to the public, would it
16	be fair to say them, too?
17	A Well, whatever public would be there at 10:30
18	at night, or 11:00, whatever time it was.
19	Q You picket during the day too, right?
20	A Yes, I do.
21	Q And speaking of nighttime, there's not a lot of
22	people there at night. I mean it's 12:00 at night you
23	are doing that laser pen, isn't that?
24	A There are a lot of people walking in and out,

they were all Scientologists.

1	Q My question to you is, you have a message that
2	you want to get out, how is putting a laser light on an
3	individual, on a person, aiming it right at them in the
4	camera, how is that getting your message out?
5	A It wasn't. The picket sign in my other hand
6	was getting the message out.
7	Q That's right it wasn't, was it?
8	MR. TYSON: No further questions.
9	THE COURT: Any further questions of this
LO	witness?
l 1	MS. RIVELLINI: Juste a moment, Judge.
L2	No, sir.
L3	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please step
L 4	down.
L5	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
L 6	THE COURT: We are going to take a fifteen
L 7	minute recess. We will be adjourned until 10:15.
L8	(Brief break)
L9	(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)
20	THE COURT: Counsel for the Defendant
21	please call your next witness.
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, your Honor, at
23	this time Bob Minton would like to take the stand in his
24	own defense.
25	(Whereupon, the witness was sworn.)

1	THE COURT: Please proceed.
2	Whereupon,
3	ROBERT MINTON,
4	The Defendant, was called for examination by counsel in
5	his own behalf, and having been previously duly sworn,
6	was examined and testified as follows:
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
9	Q Tell us your name?
10	A Bob Minton, M-I-N-T-O-N.
11	Q Mr. Minton, where do you live?
12	A I live in Sanddown, New Hampshire, and Boston,
13	Massachusetts.
14	Q Tell us your age?
15	A Fifty-four.
16	Q What do you do for a living?
17	A I have retired. I retired about seven years
18	ago. I previously was involved in an investment banking
19	business that was active in the trading of Third World
20	debt instruments.
21	Q It suffices to say, you were successful in that
22	endeavor, financially successful?
23	A Yes, sir. I did achieve some degree of
24	financial success, and reached a level where I wanted to
25	pursue other interests outside of working

Q Is one of those interests somewhat the subject of what this trial has at least revolved around?

A Yes, a couple of years after I retired I did -the Church of Scientology's actions on the Internet were
brought to my attention and it has been since that time a
fairly consuming part of my activities.

Q By consuming part of your activities, has it taken you literally around the world?

A Yes, not only around the world, but particularly here in the United States I have traveled all over the country and met former Scientologists, former high ranking Scientologists. I am currently in dialogue with large numbers of current Scientologists. I've been to Europe, to Germany as guest of the German government to discuss how their view, and out views here in the United States coincide and to learn from the experience, because they have had a lot more experience dealing with Scientology under their democratic form of government than we have.

Q Mr. Tyson made a comment in his opening that you do not like Scientologists. Is that accurate?

A It's not accurate. There a number of people at the top of Church of Scientology who I believe are directing the abusive and deceptive practices of Scientology. And you know, I am not particularly

enamored with them, and I don't particularly think there is much chance to rehabilitate them any time in the near future. But the rank and file Scientologists, which certainly ninety-five percent Scientologists at least are extremely nice decent people. Some of the nicest people — I have said in speeches that I have given at various conferences that the nicest people that I have ever known have been Scientologists. Most of them now are former Scientologists. But the Sea Organization and the Office of Special Affairs are the sections within Scientology that I have a lot of problems with.

Q Very briefly, what is your purpose in coming to Clearwater and doing these protests and speaking out, and so forth?

A The principle purpose of me coming here to Clearwater, and I think I maybe need to just back up a little bit to tell you how I have come here to Clearwater.

Q Okay.

A If that is acceptable. There has never been an organization that was specifically set up to expose the deceptive and abusive practices of Scientology. There have been many organizations who have been in this sort of anti-cult area that have been established and who Scientology has made their enemy. The most recent was

the Cult Awareness Network, which was a very large national group that was exposing the abusive practices of all cults.

1.

The Church of Scientology took it on as their own project to destroy this organization, and did so successfully after nine years of very serious and expensive litigation on behalf against the Cult Awareness Network. So what Scientology has essentially done is sued all of the organizations that have ever been set up out of existence and they did that with the Cult Awareness Network.

Having been involved in this anti-cult movement for a little over five years now I wanted to set an organization here in Clearwater to specifically expose Scientology's deceptive and abusive practices, right here in their own back yard. Getting the message out to the public, but to local city government people who have been embracing the Church of Scientology in a way that hasn't been seen in these parts for twenty-five years.

In the last couple of years that there have been some serious changes in the way the government has embraced Scientology. And to communicate to the young Sea Org. members who you see going around the streets of Clearwater.

Q Those are the ones in uniform?

A Yes, that's correct. And to work with current
Scientologists here in Clearwater who have the goal of
reforming from inside the organization, but they don't
have the political power within the organization to do
that. They realize that they need external help to
reform this organization's deceptive and abusive
practices. And they have come to me to help them, and
the organization that I helped set up here.

Tie

- Q Let me stop you here. Does that organization have a name?
 - A Yes, it is called the Lisa McPherson Trust.
- Q Did that involve someone, the death of a Scientology member by that name?
 - A Yes.

- Q Is that who it was named after?
- A Yes, it was in honor of Lisa McPherson, who was a young woman who was thirty-six years old. She spent eighteen years or so of her life in Scientology. She ended up being --
- MR. TYSON: Judge, may I object briefly.

 I don't mind Mr. de Vlaming asking some of his questions,
 but he is testifying --
- THE COURT: Objection sustained.
- 24 BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
 - Q The organization that you started for the

	purpose	you	just	told	the	jury	is	the	Lisa	McPherson
?	Trust,	corre	ect?							

Jak.

A Correct.

- Q Were you privy to watch some video in this case while this trial proceeded yesterday?
 - A Yes, I did.
 - Q You heard it?
 - A I saw it all.
- Q We heard you on the video, Mr. Minton, talk about Lisa McPherson and where she was, and other things of that nature, is that correct?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q And did you yourself bring a lawsuit involving Lisa McPherson?
 - A No, I did not.
- Q Had that begun before you had come into town to start the Lisa McPherson Trust?
- A Several years before, in fact the lawsuit, Lisa McPherson died on December 5,1995, and I believe the family's lawsuit against the Church of Scientology was filed in -- sometime in '96. I believe it was before the middle of the year, I'm not sure when it was actually filed.
- Q And when had you started coming into town to form this organization?

A	We started to try to setup in Clearwater as
early as	September of '99, but we didn't get to
Clearwate	r for a variety of reasons until January of this
year.	

July .

- Q Have you been able, however, based upon your success in your previous profession to help fund the Lisa McPherson Trust and its goals that you just said?
 - A Yes, I have.

- Now, on the basis of that, Mr. Minton, has that caused you some, for lack of a better term, problems with the Office of Special Affairs, or the practices of the Church of Scientology?
- A Well, I have had a lot of problems with the Church of Scientology and the Office of Special Affairs for a lot of years now. But clearly, the Lisa McPherson case and my funding of it is according to the New York Times, the reason Scientology hates me the most.
- Q Are you, for lack of a better term, enemy number one to the Church of Scientology, to your knowledge?
- A Several newspapers and NBC Dateline, for example, have referred to me that way.
- Q Now, do you from time to time, and you have already told us other things that you do to get out the message, but do you as one of them, protest up and down

the public sidewalk of The Fort Harrison Hotel, where the alleged spiritual headquarters are located?

A Yes, I do.

- Q And when you come to town do you bring placards from time to time to get out the message?
 - A Yes, I do.
 - Q Who do you hope to reach by doing that?
- A A combination, it depends on the particular time, and the place, and where, and what message is on the sign. It can be current Scientologists, it can be the public, it can be the OSA people even, who are out there generally hassling you.
- Q To your knowledge, have you been investigated by the church, your background, you life?

A Yes, I have. The Church of Scientology didn't have folders on me, PC folders they call them, which they have on their own members, because their own members confess everything and it's put in a folder. So the way they had to deal with me is create the same information they have on their own members on me. So then they could apply the same type of policies that they would apply against their own members on me. And they started investigating me sometime in the summer of 1997, which was the first time I gave money to the Estate of Lisa McPherson, to her attorneys, so that they could prosecute

the	case		or	continue	prosecuting	the	case	against
Sci	entolo	ogy	•					
					بهادي			

- Q Mr. Minton, did you hear the testimony, the witness that testified just before you took the stand?
 - A Yes, I did.

- Q Did you hear him describe what the term "Fair Game", did you hear him testify as far as that?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q Based upon your treatment at the hands of the church, have you been labeled, to your knowledge, "Fair Game" and treated as such?
 - A Yes, without any doubt. Without any doubt.
- Q Now on the 31st of October, of last year, 1999, did you fly into Clearwater?
 - A Into Tampa.
 - Q Into Tampa?
- A Yes.
- Q Was your stated purpose to come to the Lisa McPherson Trust and perform the duties that that organization has?
- A Well, not at that time. Stacy Brooks was meeting me in Tampa. She flew, I believe, from Atlanta and we met here in Tampa. Ms. Brooks had been looking for office space in Clearwater during September and October. We had in every major office building in

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

downtown Clearwater -- we were eventually rejected for office space. Not because of lack of any financial wearwith-all to pay for the office, but because in each and every instance the Church of Scientology, which was following me around all the time then, were going to these office building and providing booklets like they provided to the prosecutors office on all the individuals involved in this Lisa McPherson Trust, and persuaded these office buildings that we were troublemakers, that they shouldn't rent to us, that there will be pickets outside of their building by the Church of Scientology and they all refused to rent to us. So there were also people who were called by the Assistant City Manager's office in Clearwater suggesting that they should not be dealing with Stacy Brooks, Bob Minton, or Jesse Prince. We believe that this was due to pressure by the Church of Scientology on these officials.

Q Was that purpose for coming into town, to try to shore up a place for the Lisa McPherson Trust?

A Well, the purpose was to try to find a place.

At that stage we were not able to because even though

some of these buildings were a third empty, nobody had a

lack of space, it's just they wouldn't let us rent

because of these reasons. I decided the only way we

could go forward down here was to buy a building. So I

had came -- Ms. Brooks had been down here the week before, she had looked at some available buildings downtown, and since we were going to have to act quickly in terms of concluding a deal, I came down here to try to strike a deal to buy an office building for the Lisa McPherson Trust.

Q When you landed in Tampa was there anybody there to meet you?

A Yes, when you go from the gate you take a shuttle bus, not a shuttle bus, a train. And as soon as the door opened I walked out and there is two Scientologists, well, two ladies which I subsequently determined were Scientologists, but they said to me when I had taken maybe three steps off the shuttle, "Bob Minton, what are you doing in our town?" I immediately assumed that they were Scientologists, because throughout my life before, until I got in this battle, strangers never walked up to me and mentioned me by name, or said anything to me like that. So I said to them at the time, "Maybe this used to be your town, but I am here to help liberate this town." And that was reported in the newspapers.

Q Did you thereafter rent a vehicle to leave Tampa International?

A Yes, I did.

- Q And as you left Tampa International was Stacy Brooks with you?
 - A Yes, we were in the car together.
- Q Was there a time, Mr. Minton, when you realized that you were being followed?
 - A There was.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q About where were you or when did you --

A Just coming out the parking lot of the rental car place, there was a van there. At various times, just to put this in perspective, at various times when I have come to the airport, you know, Tampa police officers have been there to meet and see whether we were being followed. This particular time we hadn't taken any particular precautions about -- of any security nature. And you know being followed by the Church of Scientology is something that I am pretty accustomed to. You sort of develop an eye to spot these people. The way they typically do it, they have two cars who are following you. And they go back and forth. Sometimes will pass But we saw this van who was behaving in strange way, and he wasn't inside the Hertz or Avis place, he was just kind of lurking at the exit of it. Sure enough that car proceeded behind us. Not at close distance. assumed that was one of the cars that would be in the cavalcade of cars that might be following us.

	85
1	Q Was there a time that you saw a white vehicle
2	that you later determined was being operated Richard Howd
3	after you left Tampa International?
4	A Yes, that was somewhere on Gulf to Bay, before
5	the split, you know, where Cleveland Street goes one way,
6	and I guess, Court Street, if you continued straight, you
7	go down Court Street, I believe.
8	Q Is that when you realized that you were being
9	followed by Mr. Howd?
10	A I didn't know Mr. Howd's name at the time, but
11	I said Stacy Brooks, I said, "Hey, that's the Ybor City
12	guy who is following us."
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: May I approach the
14	witness?
15	THE COURT: Yes, you may.
16	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
17	Q Mr. Minton, let me show you what has been
18	marked as Defendant's Exhibits 1A, B, and C, and tell me
19	whether you can recognize first of all tell me what
20	you can recognize of those exhibits? Just yes or no
21	whether you can?
22	A Yes, I can.
23	(The photographs
24	hereinafter referred to
25	were marked as Defendant's

were marked as Defendant's

1	Exhibits No. 1A, •B and C
2	for identification.)
3	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
4	Q Were they taken while you were present?
5	A They were, and I believe I am the one who took
6	the pictures.
7	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: At this time I
8	would offer into evidence Defendant's Exhibits 1A, B, and
9	c.
10	THE COURT: Any objection?
11	MR. TYSON: No.
12	THE COURT: They will be admitted and so
13	marked.
14	(The photographs heretofore
15	marked as Defendant's
16	Exhibits No. 1A, B and C
17	for identification was
18	received into evidence.)
19	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
20	Q Whose vehicle was that?
21	A That was the car that Mr. Howd was driving that
22	day.
23	Q Tell the jury why it was taken in this
24	particular position, and if you can testify as what is in
25	the background, tell us some landmarks there?

A Okay, that	's the when you go towards the
	otel, you go around a large curve to
	you are progressing along there is a
big curve to the left	t to go into the Belleview Biltmore.
	c there is a road called Alexander
Road, which forks down	vn to the right. That is on Alexander
Road, the van that yo	ou see there in the top left part of
the picture that appe	ears to be going into the Belleview
Biltmore.	led.

Q Were you going to be staying at the Belleview Biltmore Hotel?

A Yes, I was.

Q Did the driver of this vehicle, Mr. Howd, did he follow you from Gulf to Bay to where you were going to be staying?

A Just to clarify, there's a little sequence issue here.

Q Go ahead, tell us about it.

A We were on our way to the Belleview Biltmore from the airport and because we were being followed we decided to go The Fort Harrison Hotel and do a picket. The reason we decided to do that in response to being followed is that, you know, we didn't want these guys working for Scientology, or Scientology who we knew they were reporting, to think that we were intimidated or

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 scared by their harassing tactics of constantly following 2 And we went to the parking lot across the street from The Fort Harrison Hotel on Fort Harrison Avenue, 3 parked the car. Actually I dropped Ms. Brooks off at the 4 front of The Fort Harrison Hotel and I drove around to 5 6 the parking lot to park. Then I came over with a camera and Ms. Brooks was out with the picket sign and I was 7 just taking photographs of her. From there we left and 8 9 went to the Belleview Biltmore and from The Fort Harrison Hotel, yes, we were followed by two cars. And in order 10 11 to take -- I did try to take some evasive action around 12 the area of Morton Plant Hospital and turn right off of -13 - at South Fort Harrison Avenue there. And turned right 14 into some of the back streets behind and around Morton 15 Plant Hospital in an attempt to a lose them, because I 16 didn't want them following us to the hotel.

Q Did you know at that time that they knew you were staying there already?

A No, I didn't. So on the way we ended up getting back on South Fort Harrison Avenue to go up to, I believe it is Belleview, or Biltmore, I forget what the name of the street is there, but you make a right past their golf course and you go down to where the Belleview Biltmore Hotel is. So as we rounded that big curve there is Mr. Howd standing out in the street up against --

somewhere near where that van is, probably just a little bit to the right. He is standing there in the street there with his camera pointed right at the car as we came around the corner.

- Q Was that before or after this photograph was taken? It must have been before this photograph was taken?
 - A Yes, that was before.
- Q Did you then go into the Belleview, or did you make a turn?
- A We turned into Alexander Road and parked behind his car. Then I got out and took pictures, because the pictures that -- the reason that I was interested in taking pictures inside his car is he had all the picket signs of the picketers who were there, who spontaneously appeared with picket signs provided by Mr. Howd when Stacy Brooks showed up in The Fort Harrison that afternoon as we were on our way from the airport.
- Q Did you while you were there also take a photograph of his license plate?
 - A I did, yes.
- Q And at that point in time you didn't know Mr. Howd, or know his name?
 - A No, I didn't.
 - Q So you wanted to at least preserve it by the

license plate that you took?

A Yes, I wanted to at least be able to find out who this was who was following us.

- Q Was there a second car involved in following you?
 - A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Do you remember the color of that car?
- A I just remember it was an older Volvo. And I can't remember the color right now. Now that car was only following us from The Fort Harrison, it didn't --
 - Q Was there a woman in that car?
- A Yes, there was.
 - Q Did you end up taking her picture?
- A Yes, I did.
 - Q Is this the woman that was following you in the second car?
 - A Yes.
 - Q We see that same post in there, was that taken on or about the same time these photographs were taken of the car?
 - A Soon thereafter. The reason being is that she wasn't there when we first got there. Her car wasn't there. We subsequently found out from the guard at Belleview Biltmore gatehouse that she had gone in through gatehouse and come out again -- and subsequently came

91
out. When she came out she then came up and parked there
on Alexander Road as well.
Q Did she get out of her car, obviously?
A She did, yes, and that's when I took that
picture.
Q Any dialogue between you and her, or you and
Mr. Howd? Did you talk back and forth, or were they
saying anything?
A I don't think there was anything of consequence
that I particularly remember.
Q Mr. Minton, when you talked to member of the
Office of Special Affairs and you ask them questions, be
it about Lisa, or any of the doctrines of the Church of
Scientology, did they ever give you an answer?
A No, not in response to any question. I mean
give
MR. TYSON: I object to the relevance of
this. I don't know what this has to do with the battery
that night. I'm not sure where we are going here.
THE COURT: Counsel approach.
MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I will move
on unless you want us to still approach.
THE COURT: Objection sustained. Please
move on. Thank you.

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

25

Q

1	92
1	Q Mr. Minton, you made a comment that you
2	recognized him as the man you had seen in Ybor City a few
3	minutes ago. Had you seen Mr. Howd before once he got
4	out of that vehicle? Had you recognized him?
5	A Yes, I did recognize him. First I recognized
6	him from having appeared in Ybor City, sometime I believe
7	it was December '97.
8	Q Were you there having something to do with
9	educating about or protesting, however you want to put
10	it, the practices of Scientology?
11	A Yes, I was.
12	Q That was your purpose of being in Ybor City?
13	A Yes, I was there together with a group of maybe
14	a dozen people.
15	Q Did Mr. Howd appear there and photograph you as
16	well, and videotape you?
17	A He did, yes.
18	Q Have you brought with you photographs of Mr.
19	Howd videotaping you on that occasion?
20	A Yes, I did.
21	Q Let me show you what has been marked as
22	Defendant's Exhibit 12 and 13 for identification,
23	specifically number 12, are you in that photograph?
24	A Yes, I am.

Is Mr. Howd in that photograph?

1	A He is.
2	(The photographs
3	hereinafter referred to
4	were marked as Defendant's
5	Exhibits No. 12 and 13 for
6	identification.)
7	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
8	Q Is he videotaping you?
9	A I don't think he is actually videotaping me,
10	but he is taping somebody else who is there. I am
11	standing real close to him.
12	Q And in the other photograph that is before you,
13	is he shown videotaping you at that time?
14	A I think that is what he is doing, yes.
15	Q I'm not being overly technical. I don't know
16	whether it was on or not, but he has got a video camera?
17	A Yes.
18	Q And did he videotape you on that occasion as
19	well?
20	A He did.
21	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, at this
22	time I would offer into evidence Defendant's Exhibits 12
23	and 13.
24	THE COURT: Any objection?
25	MR. TYSON: No, Judge.
	The state of the s

23

24

25

-	The Cook!: They will be admitted and so
2	marked. Thank you.
3	(The document heretofore
4	marked as Defendant's
5	Exhibits Nos. 12 and 13 for
6	identification were
7	received into evidence.)
8	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
9	Q Did you later that evening, of October 31,
10	1999, did you go to woman's house named Benetta
11	Slaughter?
12	A Yes, I did.
13	Q Was Ms. Brooks there?
14	A She was.
15	Q And I think we saw that videotape that Mr.
16	Tyson had played about her property and so forth?
17	A Yes.
18	Q What was you purpose, Mr. Minton, of going to
19	Ms. Slaughter and very briefly, who is she?
20	A Benetta Slaughter is the president of a company
21	called AMC Publishing, which is where Lisa McPherson

the Church of Scientology who is most responsible for

worked, first in Dallas, and then Benetta Slaughter moved

the company to Clearwater, and Lisa McPherson moved here

with here. Benetta Slaughter is the single person within

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

driving Lisa McPherson crazy.
Q Did you believe there was any activity going on
in her house when you over there that evening?
A Yes. What the last picture of Lisa alive is
a picture at a Halloween party at Benetta Slaughter's
house. Apparently, from what I had heard
MR. TYSON: Objection.
BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
Q Don't go into what you heard.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
Q Did you believe there was some function going
on when you went over there, when you recently went
there, did you think there was a function going on?
A A Halloween function we thought was going on.
Q When you go there what did you learn?
A It was the night before, on Saturday, not the
Sunday.
Q And just to shorten things, as on Mr. Tyson's
tape that he played, you made comments about that, there

A That's correct, yes.

before, and so forth?

Q What was your purpose then in staying there and filming the way that you did? Why did you do that?

is the tent that was there for the party the night

25

public property?

Α

1	A Ms. Brooks was she was amazed at the size of
2	Benetta's house. Ms. Brooks was in Scientology for a
3	very long time at the upper levels and she never saw the
4	types of money that Scientologists made by using Sea Org.
5	staff members to work.
6	Q So you wanted to film the
7	MR. TYSON: Objection, leading.
8	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I didn't finish.
9	THE DEFENDANT: Rephrase it if you will.
10	Can I correct it? I think I said something incorrectly
11	there.
12	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
13	Q I will.
14	A I didn't mean Sea Org staff members. I meant
15	public Scientologists, some of which are in the Sea
16	Organization.
17	Q So the purpose was to photograph the grounds?
18	A Yes.
19	Q But what the grounds there encompass?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Did you go on the private property?
22	A No.
23	Q You stayed either on the right-of-way or on

That's correct.

Q There is one part on there, Mr. Minton, where it seems as if we hear a gate make a clanking sound. What was that?

A Yeah, at the very back of the property there was a gate that was partially open. It had a big chain on it with a lock on the chain. I was -- at one stage I was holding the camera up along the top of the gate, and you know, I hit the gate and chain, which was sort of bunched up dropped down and clanked against the thing. The door opened a little bit, simply because it was, you know, it was just chained, it wasn't chained tight. You could open it.

- Q You never intruded into her property?
- A No.

Q I think we hear you say something on that video to the effect of spontaneous picket, or something. What is that? What did you do?

A Well, what I was referring to by spontaneous picket is Scientology refers to things -- like the picket that they had in front of the church that day when Stacy Brooks went out there and picketed, they said this was a spontaneous picket by church members, who were supplied the picket signs by Richard Howd out of his car. You can't get terribly spontaneous with that. So that's -- it was just kind of a joke.

- Q A take off on that?
- 2 A Yeah.

- Q And you walked up and down a little bit, and then ultimately left. Did you ever try to go on the property to ring the doorbell, knock on the door, anything like that?
 - A No.
- Q So there is nothing off that video that would establish that you intruded onto the property, the physical property?
 - A No.
- Q After that was there a decision made to go the Church of Scientology property at The Fort Harrison?
- A Again this -- yes, a decision was made. At some stage during that film I referred to the van. I said the van went down the street.
 - O Yes.
- A That turned out to be one of the private investigators or OSA people who were following us. That van as it turned out was parked at the end of that deadend street where Benetta Slaughter lived. The way we found that out is when we went to leave we had to go down to that end to turn around and go out. The van hurriedly left as we came down there. Eventually, we met up on Belcher, where Belcher intersected with Benetta

Slaughter's road, which it was mentioned on the videotape what the name of that road was. I don't recall it. But the van had gone, it was a street that was sort of catacorner across from Benetta Slaughter's road on the other side of Belcher, and the van had gone in there with another car. The van was facing in, and the other car was facing out. The other car that was facing out was parked on the side of the road and flashed its lights, you know, towards us, it seemed. Seemingly just to taunt us, that you know, here is another car load here. So again I said if they are going to all this trouble to these guys follow us all night let's just go down The Fort Harrison and do another quick picket before we go back to the hotel.

Q Mr. Minton, when that starts you and Stacy
Brooks are walking towards a building, which is not The
Fort Harrison building and a van appears to come around
and jump out of the way. Do you remember that part?

- A I do.
- Q Tell us about how that occurred?

A You know, I really wasn't paying a lot of attention, which is probably why -- I don't know how it occurred, other than the fact that I wasn't paying attention and this was alley way which a van came out of. I just wasn't paying attention.

- 1 Q You don't -- do you know what the Flag insignia
 2 is?
 3 A I don't remember whether it had that or not.
 - Q Then you go and do the picket in front of the Scientology building and it was captured by Ms. Brooks as well as the others on videotape?
 - A Right, we have seen all of those tapes.
 - Q And are they fairly accurate as far as what occurred?
 - A Yes.

- Q Let's go back a little bit of time, Mr. Minton, to establish in part what your state of mind was at the time that this incident occurred around the corner between you and Mr. Howd and you are saying, "Hit me one more time."
 - A Yes.
 - Q That area?
- A Yes.
 - Q And then what you did after that until the time you put the placard out.
 - A Uh-huh.
 - Q Was there an incident about the manner in which a member of the Office of Special Affairs act towards you when you are criticizing the church in that quorum that occurred back in Boston the year before?

1	MR. TYSON: Objection, relevance, Judge.
2	THE COURT: Overruled.
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
4	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
5	Q Is that in part how you were treated did
6	that impact you on how Mr. Howd was acting towards you at
7	the time on the assault on you and later your actions
8	towards him?
9	A It did.
10	Q And, Mr. Minton, have you viewed what has been
11	marked Defendant's Exhibit 10 for identification, and I
12	will just tell you that purports to be the Boston
13	incident, have you seen this?
14	A Yes, I have.
15	(The videotape hereinafter
16	referred to was marked as
17	Defendant's Exhibit No. 10
18	for identification.)
19	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
20	Q Are you in this video?
21	A I am.
22	Q Does it accurately reflect what happened and
23	what was said at the time it was happening?
24	A It does.
25	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, I would

```
1
      offer into evidence Defendant's Exhibit Number 10.
 2
                     THE COURT:
                                 Any objection?
 3
                     MR. TYSON: Same objection I had,
 4
      relevance, Judge.
 5
                     THE COURT: Objection overruled.
                                                        It will
 6
      be admitted and so marked.
 7
                                     (The videotape heretofore
 8
                                    marked as Defendant's
 9
                                     Exhibit No. 10 for
10
                                     identification was received
11
                                     into evidence.)
12
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: May I publish it to
13
      the jury?
14
                     THE COURT:
                                 Yes, you may.
15
                BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
16
                Mr. Minton, what I am going to do at this point
17
      in time, and I want you to understand the purpose of
18
      this, it is going to be segments, okay, and they are
19
      going to fade out. If you need to say anything based upon
20
      that segment okay, just give me a sign and I will --
21
                     MR. TYSON: Judge, I would prefer that he
22
      ask questions.
23
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
                                             I will do it that
24
      way.
25
                     THE COURT: Okay.
```

1 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I am going to stop 2 it after each segment then and do it that way. 3 (Whereupon, the videotape was played for 4 the jury.) 5 BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

0 First of all, what time of day was this, and tell us the location where this was shot?

This is on Beacon Street in Boston, the corner A of Beacon and Harriford Street. The Church of Scientology's Org as they call it, organization. it's about 3:00 in the afternoon.

Approximately, how long did this particular Q picket take place, in time?

Α Gosh, I mean it was really short, fifteen minutes, ten minutes, something like that.

Was there a time when it began to escalate until the where ambulance was called and you were then accused of a crime? Did it start to escalate to that direction?

Jesse Prince and I arrived there and started picketing in front of the church and it escalated the second two guys from the Church of Scientology, Kevin Hall and Frank Offman ran out the front door and started screaming at us. I mean Frank Offman mainly screaming at And the other guy, Kevin Hall, mainly photographing

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 and talking with Jesse. 2 Q Okay, I am going to identify Offman in a 3 Is that the one that is going to be, for lack of a better term, yelling at you, or in your face? 5 Α Yes. 6 And who was the one holding the video camera at 0 7 the end? What is his name? 8 Α His name is Kevin Hall. 9 What is he in the Church of Scientology, do you 10 know? 11 Well, he is a minister, but he's OSA, he is in 12 charge of their department for dealing with psychiatric 13 groups. He heads a up the activities of a group called 14 CCHR, which is Citizens Commission on Human Rights, which 15 is Scientology main group to attack psychiatry, which 16 they feel is one of their major enemies. 17 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Let's go ahead and 18 take the next segment. 19 (Whereupon, the videotape was played for 20 the jury.) 21 BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: 22 Q Okay, now in particular in that segment, the

Is he a member of the Lisa McPherson Trust, or

Black man, what is his name?

Q

Jesse Prince.

does he somehow do some work for them?

A Yes, he does. He was formerly the number two man in the Church of Scientology worldwide.

- Q And now he is on?
- A On the board of the Lisa McPherson Trust.
- Q In that segment we see this man, what appears to be, and the video will speak for itself, blocking Mr. Offman?
 - A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

- Q What was going on at that point in time? What was Offman trying to do at that time?
- A Well, Offman had been right at me, and yelling and screaming, and you know Jesse could see that Offman was getting really heated there. He was trying to keep him away from me.
- (Whereupon, the videotape was played for the jury.)
- BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
- 19 Q The walking backwards --
 - A Yes.
 - Q As you are walking forwards --
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Okay. How did that occur, and what
 significance on your state of mind as far now bringing it
 to Clearwater did that have on you?

A Well, you can't move. You are just you have
got a guy who is right on top of you. It you know,
it's like claustrophobia, you are just locked in there.
You can't if you turn around he will get on the other
side in front of you. You turn around again he gets back
where he was. That's the state of siege that these guys
have done on occasion to me when I am picketing.

Q Now we see Mr. Offman being like bumped up onto a planter, and then we hear a voice saying, "Did you get that, did you get that? Call them now." Is that an OSA's voice, or that your group's voice?

- A That's Kevin Hall's voice.
- Q Kevin Hall is from Church of Scientology?
- A Right.
- Q Saying, "Did you get that, did you get that?"
- 16 A Yeah.

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

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

- Q Was that indicative of which Offman conducted himself toward you that day?
 - A Yes.
- (Whereupon, the videotape was played for the jury.)

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

	107
1	Q Is that your voice, "Did you see that guy hit
2	me?" Was that your voice?
3	A Yes, that was my voice.
4	(Whereupon, the videotape was played for
5	the jury.)
6	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
7	Q What had he done just then?
8	A He knocked my camera down.
9	Q Had you done anything to him at that point in
10	time?
11	A No.
12	Q Is that the minister from OSA?
13	A That's right, yes. Offman is also a minister.
14	(Whereupon, the videotape was played for
15	the jury.)
16	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
17	Q Were the police called?
18	A They were.
19	Q By OSA, Church of Scientology side?
20	A Yes. No, actually I called them. I am
21	standing there talking on the cell phone. I called them.
22	Q And when they got there this fellow, Offman,
23	had we hear a stick hit the ground?
24	A Yes.
25	Q What was that stick made out of?

	108
1	A Balsa wood.
2	Q A light wood? When we see you go like that to
3	him, was that a piece of balsa wood?
4	A Yes, that's right.
5	Q Was the ambulance called in that situation?
6	A It was, yes.
7	Q Did it take that man that was in your face
8	before away?
9	A It did, yes.
10	Q Did he ever hit the ground or fall as if he was
11	injured?
12	A No.
13	Q But he complained of injury and asked to
14	hospitalized?
15	A Yes, he did, and they stiffed the ambulance for
16	the charges.
17	MR. TYSON: Judge, we need to approach on
18	this.
19	THE COURT: Approach, please.
20	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
21	outside the hearing of the jury.)
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I didn't know he
23	was going to say that.
24	MR. TYSON: If I had a witness do that you
25	Would throw this case out right now

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Well, he wouldn't
2	do that.
3	THE COURT: Probably not, but I understand
4	your
5	MR. TYSON: You better believe that he
6	would be jumping down He would tear me apart.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, are you here for a
8	reason other than to tell me what I might do in another
9	circumstance?
10	MR. TYSON: Yes, Judge, I'm sorry. Sorry,
11	I apologize, I lost my temper a little bit.
12	THE COURT: What would you like me do?
13	MR. TYSON: Judge, I would like for you to
14	instruct the jury, and I'd like you to instruct the
15	witness to answer the question and no other question.
16	I'd like to apologize for what I said.
17	THE COURT: That's all right. I have no
18	problem instructing the jury or the witness. Okay.
19	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury you are
20	to disregard the last comment made by the witness. Mr.
21	Minton, please answer the questions only.
22	THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor.
23	THE COURT: That's all right. Please
24	proceed.
25	RV MD DENIC DE UTAMINO.

1	Q Let me show you what has been marked as
2	Defendant's Exhibit Number 11 for identification. Do you
3	recognize that?
4	A I do, yes.
5	(The photograph hereinafter
6	referred to was marked as
7	Defendant's Exhibit No. 11
8	for identification.)
9	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
10	Q Were you present when it was taken?
11	A I was.
12	Q Are you in the photograph itself?
13	A I am.
14	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: At this time, your
15	Honor, I would offer into evidence Defendant's Exhibit
16	11.
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. TYSON: No.
19	THE COURT: It will be admitted and so
20	marked.
21	(The photograph heretofore
22	marked as Defendant's
23	Exhibit No. 11 for
24	identification was received
25	into evidence.)

BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:

- Q Was this photograph taken sometime during the time that this video was also taken?
 - A It was.

- Q What does it depict?
- A It depicts Mr. Offman just sort of up like this just forcefully making a point of screaming in my face.
- Q Let's go back now to October 31st, and let's specifically go to you and Mr. Howd and the manner in which that picket took place. The video will speak for itself. But I want you to tell the jury what happened as you rounded that corner, and I think you here say the statement, "What if I pull this out of hour hand?" Or whatever that is, do you know that area of the tape?
 - A Yes.
- Q Tell us what was happening then and then put it into focus about what had happened earlier, and your state of mind?
- A Well, you know, Mr. Howd was -- this had been going on all day, this effort by them to intimidate myself and Ms. Brooks into stopping the activity we were trying to do, namely to protest against Scientology.
- Mr. Howd, as you've seen on the videos, his close, his close proximity, you know whenever he's around me during the day with that camera. He's at my hotel, you

know, when I came to Clearwater that weekend, the weekend of October 31st, the Friday, I learned that the Church of Scientology had followed my 14 year old daughter to Long Island and this is -- I have been constantly, since 1997, under siege by these people. I do not wish to shuddered into silence which is what they want me to be, shuddered into silence. Their top executives, their number two man, their number three man, the head of OSA, they have pleaded with me, they have put agreements in front of me to settle my differences with Scientology, but most importantly, to stop giving money for this Lisa McPherson case.

Q Mr. Minton, I guess that begs the question, if Mr. Howd as Mr. Offman was in your space so to speak, why not just walk off, why not just walk across the street and get away from him?

A That's the point that I am trying to get to, that's what they you want to do. They want you to go away and stop being a critic of Church of Scientology. It is my right as an American citizen to demonstrate against something that I see is wrong. The abusive and deceptive activities, that they perpetrate within this OSA.

Q Let's get back to around the corner then.

Okay, we see what we see as far as how close he was.

Tell me what happened when you rounded the corner?

A You know he was close, I am holding this sign like this. I've got my left hand out on that sign. The strap is right there. I put my thumb on the strap like this, "What if I take this out of your hands?" Then I turned away. In the videotape what you see when I turned away is something causes me to turn around and say, "Oh, you think so." You know, there was -- I can't imagine that I turned --

Q The video will speak for itself. Okay. Then you say, "Oh, you think so." You turn towards him.

A Yeah.

Q And then what does he do that causes this sign to buckle?

A Howd comes pushing into me with his camera right into that sign that causes it to buckle, not crack, but you know, because it is foam cord, it doesn't break. It cracks the spine of it, sort of. You know, as far as I am concerned he was assaulting me. You know there is no reason to think on my part, given the stuff that has gone on with these guys before in Boston and elsewhere, you know, there is no reason to think that these guys are not going to do the same thing.

Q Is that what caused you to say what you did on tape, and that is, "You are assaulting me." You were

	1.	14
1	accusing him of assaulting of you?	
2	A Yes.	
3	Q This is State's Exhibit Number 1 in evidence,	
4	and is this the placard?	
5	A It is, yes.	
6	Q Were you holding it so the red hands were out?	•
7	A Yes, that's right.	
8	Q Was this the area, the creased area that Howd	
9	had hit?	
10	A It would appear so.	
11	Q This wasn't there in the photographs before	
12	that?	
13	A No, it wasn't.	
14	Q After that happened, after you said, "You	
15	assaulted me, you assaulted me." We hear you say, you	
16	walk back to the corner and say, "It's time to call the	
17	police." Or words to that effect?	
18	A Yeah.	
19	Q Correct?	
20	A Yes.	
21	Q And we see you take out your cell phone?	
22	A Right.	
23	Q Were you calling the police?	
24	A I was.	
25	Q Why were you calling the police at that point?)

	115
1	A Well, it had just gotten out of hand. You
2	know, it was getting out of hand. They were coming after
3	me and coming after me, it was out of hand, and I wanted
4	the police to come there. The police come there and they
5	stop them from doing this.
6	Q As you began to make the call we see you step
7	off the curb and head across the street, or north. Why
8	were you going in that direction?
9	A First of all the car is parked over there

First of all the car is parked over there behind the Peace Memorial Presbyterian Church.

Your car?

Yes, my car. And so I am crossing the street number one, to get away from him. Number two, to be able to talk in private to the police.

Okay, and as you started to leave and go back to your car for that purpose what did you notice behind you?

A Howd.

And what were your thoughts at that point as to why he would continue to follow you off that property? What was your thought process then?

That he could be coming to do the same thing Α that Offman did.

And when you picked the sign up, I think the words were, "Don't you follow me." I am paraphrasing,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the video will be the best. Do you recall making that
statement?

- A Yes.
- Q And your intentions at the time that you held the sign saying, "Don't you follow me." Were what?
 - A To keep him away from me.
 - Q Did you ever mean to hurt the man?
- A No.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Based upon him coming in contact with the sign, were you surprised that he went to the ground?

- A Yes, I was really surprised.
- Q Did you see a familiar pattern as far as the calling of ambulances and that type of thing?
- A I wasn't watching that side of it very much, because the police car came fairly quickly, so I was talking to the police officer, but yes, I did see the ambulance show up.
 - 0 Just like Boston?
 - A Right.
- Q Based on that incident, Mr. Minton, was there an injunction filed against you to keep you away from almost twenty areas of church property around the city?
 - A Yes, there was.
 - Q Is it still effect to keep you away from those

areas a certain distance?

A Yes. First there was a temporary restraining order that was filed ex parte, which means without any notice to the party. And so they got a rather wide ranging 450 feet away from every Scientology property in Clearwater.

Q But there is currently an injunction in place that went through system, correct?

A Yes. That original temporary injunction was modified once a hearing was held.

Q I don't need you to go into details, Mr.

Minton. I am just asking you, there is one in effect.

Was it the same way from Howd, or stay away from Howd, as well as all church properties, whether he was on them or not? What did they ask for?

A Scientology asked for an injunction to stay away from all Scientology properties. I didn't ask for anything, but the court granted an injunction to keep Howd 20 feet away from me. And me 10 feet away from Scientology properties.

Q All Scientology properties in the city, correct?

- A The major ones, yes.
- Q Were there lines painted by Scientologists to make sure that you kept 10 feet away?

	
1	MR. TYSON: Objection, relevance, Judge.
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
3	THE COURT: How is it relevant, Mr. de
4	Vlaming?
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Just as a follow up
6	to the injunction.
7	THE COURT: Objection overruled.
8	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
9	Q Mr. Minton, based upon the manner in which you
10	have been treated at the hand of this organization have
11	you stopped getting the word out?
12	A No, sir.
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's all I have.
14	THE COURT: Cross examination, Mr. Tyson?
15	CROSS EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. TYSON:
17	Q So you can still picket in Clearwater, correct?
18	A That's correct.
19	Q And you can still picket in front of The Fort
20	Harrison?
21	A No, I can't.
22	Q Why not?
23	A There's no point on that sidewalk that's 10
24	feet away from the building.
25	Q That's not the issue today. Mr. Minton, is it

fair to say	that you	and your	followers	have ar	abiding
hatred of t	he Church	of Scient	tology?		

- A First of all, Mr. Tyson, I don't have any followers. Secondly --
 - Q Mr. Prince or Mr. Oliver, or Stacy Brooks --
 - A I am not a cult leader.
 - Q I didn't say that you were.
- A I have no followers. I have people who share the same viewpoint concerning Scientology. To answer the second part of your question first, I have no hatred towards the Church of Scientology and its members. I do not hate their belief system. I find it to be an extremely colorful belief system among new age religions.
 - Q Do you recognize it as a legitimate religion?
 - A No, I don't.
- Q You say that you have a right to demonstrate, correct?
- A Correct.

- Q Do they have a right to practice what they believe as their religion?
- A They do. But they don't have a right to practice the type of investigative services that the Office of Special Affairs carries out.
- Q I didn't ask you that question. Do they have a right to practice their religion?

- A They do.
- Q Has the church ever sued you?
- A No, it hasn't.
- Q So all of this time the church has never once sued you personally, correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q But you have financed a civil suit against them, which you are not even a party to, wouldn't that be correct?
 - A I am going to explain what finance means.
- Q Let me clarify, I am asking the questions here.

 Does the Lisa McPherson Trust give money --
 - A No.
- Q How does Mr. Dandar in the civil suit, do you provide directly or indirectly any money to him to help him go through the suit?
- A I have given money to the family of Lisa
 McPherson to pay Mr. Dandar the expenses of prosecuting a
 lawsuit, which is extremely expensive, and the family
 doesn't have the money to get the truth out about what
 happened to Lisa McPherson.
- Q Fair enough. So, whether directly or indirectly you are helping to finance the civil suit against the Church of Scientology, is that correct?
 - A Approximately a year and a half after it

started, yes, I did start at the suggestion of one of the Church of Scientology lawyers.

Q I am not trying to play games with you. The answer to that would be, yes, you are financing it, correct?

A I really think that it is important to characterize what financing is. I am giving the money to them to do it. They don't have to pay me any interest, they don't have to do anything if they lose the case. If they win the case --

Q Okay. I am not trying to put words in your mouth. You give them money, whether you expect anything in return or not, you are giving them money to further the suit?

- A Absolutely.
- Q Let's talk about that Boston video. It's rather inflammatory?
- A Yes.
 - Q It is, isn't it?
- 20 A Yes.

- Q Mr. Howd isn't there, right?
- 22 A He's not.
 - Q The two middle-aged women, and this about a year before the incident occurred at The Fort Harrison that we are doing here today?

	122
1	A This Boston incident, yes.
2	Q 1998, somewhere around 1998?
3	A September '98, I think it was.
4	Q It's about a year prior to this incident?
5	A That's right.
6	Q Mr. Howd is not there. The two middle age
7	women that we see on the videotapes that are in evidence
8	at The Fort Harrison are not there either, are they?
9	A No.
10	Q The gentleman, the tall guy who has got his
11	hands in his pockets at The Fort Harrison?
12	A No, he is not there.
13	Q Mr. Minton, based on that altercation there,
14	now before you go there to demonstrate you have to notify
15	the police beforehand?
16	A No.
17	Q You don't have to notify anybody beforehand?
18	A No.
19	Q At one time did you have to notify anybody
20	before you would go there to protest, after this
21	occurred?
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Objection,
23	clarification. Do you mean in Clearwater?
24	MR. TYSON: No, Boston.
25	BY MR. TYSON:

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

picket.

12
Q Before you go to Boston are you required
have you ever been required to notify the police or the
Scientologists before you come picket?
A The prosecutor dropped this case in Boston on
the condition that for 120 days I would give the Church
of Scientology in Boston an hour notice before coming to

- So it was an agreement to try and resolve that Q situation somehow, is that fair to say?
 - Yes, that's right. Α
- Now, we see somebody narrating that. Mark Bunker doing that?
 - A It is, yes.
- Now, obviously he is not narrating while it's Q happening. This film was pieced together?
 - That's right.
- Does Mr. Bunker work for you, or does he Q receive money directly or indirectly from you, whether out of your pocket, or the Lisa McPherson Trust?
 - He works for the Lisa McPherson Trust, yes.
 - Do you fund that? Q
- I among others fund it, but I am the principal Α contributor.
- Q When you say the principal funder of that, can you tell what percentage that would be?

Α

1 Seventy-five percent. Α 2 Q And Mr. Prince is in the video. Does he get 3 any money from the Trust, or from you at all? 4 Α He does, he is a paid employee of the Trust. 5 Q It is fair to say that that tape is edited and 6 narrated, isn't it? 7 Α Yes. 8 We just saw there are little clips of it? Q 9 Α Yes. 10 Q What was the purpose of making that, because 11 you have had that for awhile, right? Why did you make 12 that and narrate the tape, why was it done? 13 A I believe Mr. de Vlaming instructed Mr. Bunker 14 to make it. 15 And there's more footage that the jury hasn't 16 seen, isn't there? 17 Α There is, yes. 18 Q And, in fact, on that footage, isn't true that 19 we don't see that you were calling them fucking ass 20 holes? 21 Α That's correct. 22 Q Isn't it true that on that video the jury hasn't seen you calling them, excuse my language, cock 23 24 sucking little motherfuckers?

I don't think I did.

I don't think I did.

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

Q Is it poss

A A lot of things were said out there on that sidewalk.

Q So when you watch this tape it is really not that fair of depiction of what happened, there are only statements by the people from Scientology that you have on the tape. There are a lot of statements that you made and Mr. Prince made that jury hasn't had the opportunity to hear, wouldn't it be fair to say?

A There are a lot of statements that they made that the jury didn't have a chance to hear either.

- Q Fair enough. But there are a lot that you said
 - A That's correct. That's correct.
 - Q -- and Prince said that's not on there?
 - A That's correct.
- Q In and of themselves they are extremely inflammatory, wouldn't you agree?
 - A Uh --
- Q The statements that you and Mr. Prince made were very inflammatory, wouldn't you agree with that?
- A Well, I want to characterize something here because --
- Q If you call somebody a cocksucker, is that inflammatory or not?

- A Did you hear on the videotape when they accused Jesse Prince of fucking my twelve year old daughter? Did you hear that too?
 - Q I am the one who is asking the questions.
 - A I'm sorry.

- Q I get to ask them. Mr. de Vlaming asked the questions.
- A There were a lot of inflammatory statements made.
- Q Let me finish. Mr. de Vlaming got to ask the questions, you provided the answers. If I had an objection I objected, approached the bench, the Judge made a call. I get to ask the questions now.
 - A I'm sorry.
- Q I don't want to get contentious. On that video, Mr. Prince is on there. He is protesting with you that day, right?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Doesn't he say while he is there to the Scientologists, which we don't see on this video, "I fucked your mother." Doesn't he tell people, "I fucked your mother." That is a favorite phrase of his, isn't it? "I fucked your mom, and I'm you daddy."
 - A Yeah, he did say that to Frank Offman.
 - Q We didn't see that on your tape, did we?

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

	127
A	No.
. Q	Would it be fair to say that when somebody
tells some	ebody, "I fucked your mother." That they would
be mad?	Would it be fair to say that?
A	The purpose of Mr. Prince obviously, it was
inflammat	ory and it wasn't encouraging Mr. Offman to be
civilized	either, but Mr. Prince was trying to get Offman
on him and	d not on me, to get him off of me.
Q	The question was, isn't that inflammatory when
you	
A	It is inflammatory, there's no doubt about
that.	
Q	Would it make somebody mad? It would make
somebody,	wouldn't it?
A	It wasn't making him mad.
Q	That guy was pretty upset?
A	He was upset before. He was upset the second
he walked	out the door.
Q	Calling somebody a fucking asshole, or saying
somebody :	fucked your mother, that may set somebody off,
wouldn't	it?
A	Not him.
Q	So, I guess would it be fair to say Mr. Minton

that you guys were there provoking them, but we don't see

that in the video? We just see your sanitized version

that is narrated? The jury doesn't have the full benefit of knowing exactly what happened there?

A Mr. Tyson, when we went there we went there with the intention of picketing, having a peaceful picket.

Q That's not my question. The jury has seen a sanitized version of what happened that day. There's a lot more that happened and isn't true that you were there to provoke them by calling them cock suckers, mother fuckers, I fucked your mother, isn't that true?

- A Mr. Tyson, that is so far from the truth.
- Q So if you weren't doing that, you weren't calling those names to provoke them?
 - A Absolutely not.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may I have a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

BY MR. TYSON:

- Q Okay, Mr. Minton, let's talk about the picketing activities, okay. Would you agree that when somebody is protesting or picketing that they are not allowed to do whatever they want? Is that a fair statement?
 - A That is correct, yes.
- Q So if I was to picket outside a car dealership because they sold me a lemon, would it be fair to say it

wouldn't be picketing if I was going to the dealership at night?

A I'm sorry, say that again.

Q Would it be fair to say that if I was picketing a dealership during the day I would be getting my message out. Would it be really picketing if I went there at night and let's say damaged their cars with my picket sign, that wouldn't be picketing, would it? Just because you have a picket sign in your hand doesn't mean that you are picketing?

A No, it wouldn't be smart to go to their place at night and that, no, or effective.

Q You want a crowd there, don't you, when you are picketing? I mean you want to have as many people as you can to hear your message?

A That's the ideal, yes.

Q So making obscene gestures while you are picketing, would that be effective picketing? Is that lawful picketing in your mind?

A It's lawful picketing. Whether it is effective is probably doubtful.

Q You have that picket sign in your hand, do you think it would be fair for you to make at the car dealership racially offensive remarks if they have a Black mechanic or a Black car salesman there?

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, may we
2	approach?
3	THE COURT: Please approach.
4	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
5	outside the hearing of the jury.)
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, the
7	record doesn't know this, but now it will, there are two
8	African American jurors on this jury. I think to ask a
9	question as to whether or not any kind of hypothetical
10	whether or not it would be racist to picket a business of
11	bad automotive whatever it is, is totally improper.
12	MR. TYSON: Judge, I was going to go
13	through different religions, ages, Jewish, Black, if
14	their White, if they Christian, give him a whole list to
15	see what Mr. Minton has to say. Because according to him
16	he knows what lawful picketing is, and that's what he is
17	doing.
18	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Aren't we getting
19	far afield from the incident.
20	MR. TYSON: We are far, Denis, and you are
21	the one that started this.
22	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I object to this
23	area.
24	THE COURT: I'm uncomfortable with the
25	area. Tannregiate the objection. But you have given me

a decent reason why I should let you do it, and please be respectful. Don't take it any farther afield than this trial has clearly gotten.

MR. TYSON: I will.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, is the Court going to allow him to ask about racism?

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Minton, would you agree that if you found somebody prowling around in your living room in the dark and they have got a picket sign in their hand, that doesn't mean they are picketing? Would that be a fair statement?

A If you found somebody prowling around in your living room?

Q In your living room at night, you wake up and there they are, I am picketing?

- A That would be --
- Q First amendment right, I am picketing?
- A It's not their right.
 - Q So there are certain time, manner, and place limitations on picketing, would you agree with that? For lawful picketing, time, manner, and place?

A I wouldn't see that time is a particular issue.

Manner, I wouldn't see as a particular issue. Place, you

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

know, is obviously an issue in the example you gave.

Q Now, we see you in your video, and this the one that Stacy Brooks took, you walking up to The Fort Harrison Hotel at 10:30 at night on October 31st.

Obviously, you are there. I am not trying to put words in your mouth, and I talked to Mr. Oliver about this, and I am not trying to belittle your cause, but I don't know that much about either organization, so when I say anti-Scientologists, just take it for what it is worth when I say that.

- A I will take it --
- Q You are trying to get that type of message out?
- A I will strongly object to anti-Scientologists,

 I am not going to let you adopt that in characterizing me
 as anti-Scientologists.
- Q I don't want to mis-state what your purpose is.
 You know, I don't care what you are picketing for.
 - A We are a Scientology watch-dog group. '
- Q Okay. That's fair enough. So as Scientology watch dog group when you are walking up there with your sign, as you are walking up to the building, what message are you giving out the public, because you want the public to hear the message, when you call those people cockroaches?
 - A Well, I'll give you an example --

	Q	No), I	just	asked	you a	ques	tion.	What	kind	of
messa	age	are	you	send	ing ou	t. Yo	u are	walki	ng up	with	the
sign	say	ing,	"Go	o ahea	ad and	run 1.	ike c	ockroa	ches.	" Wha	at
kind	of										

A Like the cockroaches that fed off of Lisa McPherson's body is what I said.

Q Sir, you analogizing those people as cockroaches, what message are you sending?

A The messages I said is they were scurrying like the cockroaches that fed off of Lisa McPherson's body, on the cockroach feeding sites inside that hotel they were going into.

Q What message were you sending to the public when you said that?

A There were no public on that sidewalk.

Q But you felt a need to say that anyway? Wasn't it true that you said it to provoke them?

A No, it wasn't to provoke. They don't even know what happened to Lisa McPherson.

Q Sir, you are shown on one of the tapes that have seen earlier back on February 6, 2000. I guess it is a little after midnight. You are there with Frank Oliver, and he has the laser pen, and you are standing right beside him when he is doing it?

A Right.

Q And you are picketing to get your message out and he is with you. What kind of message is being sent at that point in time to further your cause?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I am going to object the question. Does he mean Mr. Oliver's conduct, or of his conduct?

MR. TYSON: Judge, they were together doing it. There was a group doing this. There always is a group doing this. If the Scientologists are group when they are against them, then he is a group when he is against Scientologists.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, the basis of my objection, your Honor, is it calls for a conclusion if he is asking him what another person is doing, or what is in the mind of the other person.

THE COURT: I didn't understand his question to do that, but to the extent that you feel the need to rephrase it, please do that.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q What kind of message are you sending when your group is out there shining a laser light at people, how are you furthering your message, sir?

A I just want to explain one thing to you to answer your question, what Mr. Oliver was doing had nothing to do with me. I didn't tell Mr. Oliver to bring

a laser light, I don't even know what a laser light is,
Mr. Tyson.

Q You saw me in court with it in court earlier, right?

A Yes, I saw the red dot up here. Now I know when a camera is pointed at somebody a red light hits them too.

Q No, wait a second. That's a little bit different. That points right on the person.

A No, I am not minimizing what a laser light is.

I am just saying now I understand what that means. But

Mr. Oliver, you know, I had nothing to do with Mr. Oliver

using that laser light. It is not something that I would

have done.

Q So you are distancing yourself from on that occasion. That wouldn't be what you would do?

A Everybody has a right to handle their own view of protest. I am not telling Mr. Oliver what to say. He doesn't tell me what to say. Ms. Brooks doesn't tell me what say. Mr. Bunker doesn't tell me what to say. My sign had two messages on it.

Q Sir, you said as a group, your whole defense is as a group the Scientologists are harassing you?

- A The Scientologists as a group are harassing me.
- Q Now, as a group anything that one Scientologist

does, like Mr. Offman up there from Boston, he is painted with the same brush here in this courtroom as you painted Mr. Howd. Okay, let me finish my question.

How is that Mr. Oliver is with your group, your group against the group, how is that sending out the message?

A Mr. Howd and Mr. Offman are interchangeable, they are part of the Office of Special Affairs. They are different than Lisa McPherson, they are different than any other public Scientologists. They are in a group that is designed to go after people they consider enemies.

Q It almost sounds as if you think of them as machines, robots, is that what you are saying? Is that the way you think of them, or do you think of them as people?

A Like I said, I've got a lot a good friends who used to be OSA, and former Scientologists are among the nicest people that I have ever known in my life.

Q I am not talking about former Scientologists.

A I don't believe that those Scientologists are fully in control of their actions. I believe that their actions are being controlled by someone else.

Q So, basically they don't know any better, and you are there to tell them what they need to think?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

differently?

	137
	A They don't think for themselves, they follow
	the policies, that's the nature of OSA.
3	Q And your job is tell them what to think, that
4	they don't need to think that way, they have got to think

You know, getting across to OSA is not part of Α my message by and large. Getting across to those people -- it's too, you are not going to break through that shell to OSA. Our message is not designed to get to OSA.

Sir, what type of message do you send when you are protesting, when you go the Church of Scientology and start taunting the members, what is your message that you are putting out there? What is your message to the public that you are trying to get out?

Which members are you talking about taunting? The OSA members that are on the sidewalk in front of the hotel that night?

- 0 The ones that you are telling run and hide.
- Α Those are all Sea Org members too.
- So does that make them "Fair Game"? 0

No, they are not "Fair Game". But they are Α part and parcel of the policies that go on within that organization that are wrong.

- According to you?
- Α According to common acceptable behavior.

always said if the Church of Scientology wants to be treated like a church they need to act like a church. I don't have any problems with their beliefs. I have problems with their actions.

Q Their beliefs don't conform with yours then you have problem with it, would that be fair to say?

A No, this is not what I am saying. You know, would you like for me tell you their beliefs so that you can make that decision yourself? I don't have any problems with their beliefs. I have a problem with their actions.

Q Sir, I get to ask the questions. What kind of message did you sent, what kind of message are you putting out, because that is why you have got the sign. What kind of message do you send when you tell church members that you have had sex with their mother? What kind of message are you trying to send out when you are protesting?

- A No message.
- Q There's none. In fact, that's provoking them, isn't it?
 - A It could be provocative, yes.
- Q Could be?
- 24 A Yes.
 - Q That is some heavy-duty stuff now when you are

	13
1	talking about having sex with somebody's mother, and
2	that's not the way you are saying it on the tapes.
3	That's not the way you say it. Is it fair to say that I
4	had sex with your mom, right?
5	A That's right.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I object, this has
7	been asked and answered. This is the second time we have
8	gone over this.

MR. TYSON: Judge, we are going over now the message that is being sent out, his lawful protest.

THE COURT: Objection is overruled.

BY MR. TYSON:

- Sir, it is message of hate, isn't it? Q
- 14 Α No.

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

20

21

22

24

- 15 It's not?
 - I don't put out any messages of hate toward Α Scientology.
- 18 But you will agree that it is a message or Q 19 provocation, isn't it?
 - The quote that you are referring to, there was no Scientologist even around.
 - I'm talking about Boston?
- 23 I didn't say that. Α
 - Jesse Prince is saying that, and he is with you? You made other statements and then you cocksuckers,

fucking assholes, motherfuckers. Provocative statements, 1 2 wouldn't you agree? 3 The way Mr. Offman was attacking me, he was all of those things. 5 Now, you went to Benetta Slaughter's house at 6 night time, correct?

Correct.

And that is so Stacy Brooks could see what a Q nice house she had, right?

That was one of the purposes. The principle purpose was to picket this Halloween party.

Q Wouldn't you agree that when you start going to somebody's resident where their family is that is a provocative act also, and that will provoke people?

I'm trying to think whether it has provoked my wife, my children when they were followed.

Sir, you have already testified to that with Mr. de Vlaming. Now it's my turn. Now it's my turn. This isn't a one-way street, you don't get say how they provoked and you didn't do anything.

Α Benetta Slaughter, as was stated by Mr. de Vlaming, she is not a high-ranking official of Church of Scientology. She is a public Scientologist.

All the more reason not to go to her house?

Α Not in my opinion.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Not in your opinion, a lot of things are not in your opinion, are they, Mr. Minton? It's either your way or the highway, isn't that true?
 - A That's not true, Mr. Tyson.
- Q Now, you went to Ms. Slaughter's house at night. Now whether you think that she did something wrong or not, you still went to her house at night where she lives?
 - A That's correct.
- Q That's correct. And one of the reasons you said is so that Stacy Brooks could see her house?
 - A Yes.

- Q The other reason that's on the tape is a spontaneous picket, right? That's what you said on the tape?
 - A Right.
- Q I saw one car drive down the road on that tape. What kind of message were you delivering in your picket when you are standing in front of that woman's house at 10:00 at night, a Sunday night?
- A That spontaneous picket and the purpose of taking any photograph of it was to document it.
- Q You could have went during the day, and in fact, it's easier to see during the day, isn't it?
 - A That's right.

- Q It looks like a pretty nice house, I would like to see it. The problem is you got it when it's dark.
 - A Right.

- Q You could have easily went there during the day, you are down here in Clearwater all the time, aren't you?
- A At that time, no, I wasn't. I mean, I did come that day, yes. I had not been here, until we set this office up in January I was not down here all the time.

 And I'm still not down here all the time, I spend at least half a month away from here.
- Q You went there that night, would it be fair to say that when you realized -- your intent also was you said that they had a Halloween party, you said that you wanted to go there, would it be fair to say that if they were having that party there your purpose would have been to picket those people in their private residence at a party?
 - A That's correct.
- Q It sort of begs the question then when you go there and it's all dark, why didn't you just leave?
 - A Excuse me?
- Q Why didn't you just leave? The people that you are there to picket aren't there.
 - A We just took pictures. I don't really see

anything wrong with that.

Q I know you don't. You see something wrong when they follow you, but you see nothing wrong when you go in front of The Fort Harrison and make statements analogizing them as cockroaches, and you go to their private residences at night, you don't see anything wrong with that, do you?

A I don't.

Q Is it fair to say, Mr. Minton, that when you conducted those type of activities, and the words you say against their church members, that they are going to keep an eye out on you? Wouldn't that be common sense? They would want to know when you are coming? I mean you are going to people's houses?

- A No, I don't think that is ordinary behavior.
- Q So you don't think that it is ordinary behavior for them to protect their church members?
- A Yes, I think it is reasonable to have security in Clearwater. Yes.
- Q I mean the Pope has to switch guard, he is protected.
 - A Yes.
- Q He has intelligence?
- 24 A Yes.
 - Q So it is not unusual for religions to protect

24

25

	_
1	people. I mean ever since the beginning of time people
2	have fought about religion, haven't they?
3	A They have fought about religion.
4	Q So actually it is a good idea to keep an eye on
5	you if you are coming after them, wouldn't you agree?
6	A You know, I haven't gone after any
7	Scientologists.
8	Q Mr. Minton, you didn't expect that that tape of
9	Benetta Slaughter's house would end up in this courtroom
LO	today, did you?
11	A No, I didn't.
L 2	Q In fact, you don't want it in this courtroom
L3	today, do you?
L 4	A I never objected to it.
15	Q You don't want anybody to see the activities
L6	that you are up to, do you?
L 7	A They are here. You know, we didn't object to
L8	having any of these videotapes. They accurately
L 9	reflected what happened.
20	Q So it's all right, no matter what you do as it
21	accurately reflects what happened?
22	A I didn't say that, Mr. Tyson, you are putting
23	words in my mouth.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may I have a moment?

BY MR. TYSON:

Q I'm going to get off of this Benetta Slaughter thing. But just to wrap this up, it's fair to say that you were there in hopes of having some type of altercation or contact with somebody at that residence, weren't you?

A Altercation, no. Contact, yes. Contact with the people that we expected to be there, which would have been several hundred Scientologists.

Q Uninvited contact at their personal residence, right? It was uninvited, you didn't have an invitation?

A We weren't on her property, or in her house, or inside the gate. We were on the public street, you know, in the bypass that goes along the side of her house.

Q So that's fine then? At least Mr. Minton didn't get onto the property of the Belleview Biltmore, did he, he stayed outside the property?

- A You've got the name wrong, you mean Mr. Howd.
- Q Mr. Howd, I'm sorry. You are up at the fence, you are opening her gate?

A I am not opening her gate, I made that real clear that I didn't open her gate, it was chained.

Q Have you ever notified the Clearwater police when you are going to picket at The Fort Harrison or any other properties of Scientology?

A I have.

Q In fact, would it be fair to say that Detective Tom Miller at one point would be a contact for you to let him know when you were coming? I'm not trying to put words in your mouth.

A To let me know what?

Q So you can let them know when you are coming, or you are in town?

A The Clearwater Police Department has advised in the past that Scientology, their view towards me is so bad that they would like to know sometimes.

Q There is nothing wrong with having a contact person there, nothing at all. You feel that you are threatened by these people and you want to get your word out.

A The Clearwater police have received threats concerning me about -- from Scientology they think.

Q There is nothing wrong with calling the police and letting them know that you picketing there, is it fair to say that, because you are exercising your first amendment right to free speech?

A Correct.

Q And you do have contacts there, you can either call the Clearwater Police Department, or Detective Tom Miller, who you know. I don't know how well you know

him. That's not really the point. But there is contact there just for you make sure if you think there is going to be a problem that the police can standby?

A I have got to clarify because in October, sometime in early October the City of Clearwater started disallowing -- they disbanded the department that monitored Scientology. And Tom Miller was part of that.

- Q Sir, I'm not asking you a question.
- A They don't want anymore calls about this.
- Q They didn't disband 911, did they?
- A No.

- Q Okay.
- A I'm not going to call --

THE COURT: Gentlemen, gentlemen. Let each other finish, the court reporter can only take down one of you at a time, please.

THE DEFENDANT: You said that they didn't disband 911. I am not going to call 911 just because I am going to go show up to picket. And the Clearwater Police Department that they don't like to receive these annoying phone calls. They consider them annoying.

BY MR. TYSON:

- Q Sir, they are there on numerous occasions though when pickets are occurring, aren't they?
 - A Only -- they have typically only been there

when there was organized picketing. For example, the only organized that has been done in front the Church of Scientology here in Clearwater has been December 1999, December 1998, December 1997, March 1997, and March 1996. Those are the only organized pickets that have ever been done where the Clearwater Police Department came out there.

- Q On October 31st, that was a Sunday night?
- A It was.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q You got there about 10:30 or so?
- A Approximately, I don't know the time.
- Q Is it fair to say not a lot of foot traffic around to get your message out to, or vehicle traffic, there is some, but not a lot, is there?
 - A That's right, not a lot.
- Q You were there on October 31st, the night of this incident, at The Fort Harrison, when you were there, I believe one of those women, and I don't know which one, called you a bigot, right?
- A Yes, sir.
 - Q Did they call you any other names besides that?
- 22 A I don't think so.
- 23 Q Just a bigot?
- 24 A Yes.
 - Q By the tapes, and you can correct me if I am

- wrong, it doesn't appear that they are really raising their voices, it's more of a conversational tone, would you agree with that?
 - A That's right.
 - Q The only person who is loud is you, isn't that correct?
- A That's correct.
 - Q And Mr. Howd doesn't say a word that I can recollect?
- 10 A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q In fact, most people that are there are pretty polite to you, they are just telling you to go home, would you agree with that?
- A Yes.
 - Q So the night of October 31, 1999, is no where near, it is the other side of the spectrum from Boston in 1998, isn't it?
- 18 A It's not.
- 19 Q Okay. Now, we had two middle-aged women there, 20 right?
- 21 A Correct.
- Q And there is a guy that just stands there with his hands in his pockets, the tall guy?
- 24 A Right.
- 25 Q And mainly the women are just telling you go

1	home, and	go away?
2	A	Correct.
3	Q	Isn't it true that when you were there nobody
4	threatened	i you?
5	A	I consider Mr. Howd's behavior threatening.
6	Q	Do you consider your behavior right before you
7	got there	at Ms. Slaughter's house threatening?
8	A	Do I consider whose behavior?
9	Q	Your behavior before you got there, when you
10	were at Ma	S. Slaughter's house at night, on Sunday night,
11	do you cor	nsider that threatening?
12	A	No.
13	Q	No one told you anything other than to go home,
14	did they?	
15	A	That's right.
16	Q	Nobody called you a cockroach, did they?
17	A	No.
18	Q	Nobody called you a murderer, or an adulterer,
19	or any otl	her name, or a bigot, did they?
20	A	No.
21	Q	Do me a favor and stick out your arm, your
22	right arm	, straighten it. How far would say that you can
23	reach?	
24	A	Twenty-four inches, thirty inches.
25	Q	Extend it all the way now.

- A That's not the way it was, it was this way.
 - Q How far can you reach now, you can get me at quite a distance can't you?
 - A Yes.
 - Q And you know when you are looking at the videotape Mr. Howd is close sometime, pretty close?
 - A Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q But also when you look at those videotapes you see you walking down the sidewalk and -- let's put the tapes together now, like I say we are talking this NFL reverse-angle stuff, and you were intentionally walking in front of him, don't you? You change course?
- A No, there was that one time on the sidewalk in front of The Fort Harrison that it appeared like that happened, either I was moving or he was moving, it could have been both of us.
- Q All right. When you hit Mr. Howd you had to turn and lunge at him to get him, didn't you?
 - A I didn't think that I lunged.
- Q Well, the video will speak for itself, won't it?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q And after you hit him, you walked away?
- 24 A I did.
 - Q Now, on that video the first words out of your

mouth to the police before you had time to really reflect is he walked into that sign. He didn't walk into that sign at all, did he?

A Not after I saw the videotape, but Ms. Brooks said, I heard her say that he walked into the thing, and that's the first thing that I said.

Q Now, Ms. Brooks said that he walked into the sign, but you are the one has the sign doing the hitting, right? So you would have been in good position that he didn't walk into sign either, wouldn't you?

A At the time I thought I was pushing, not hitting.

Q Okay. But when you review the videotape would you agree that he didn't walk into the sign, that you hit him?

A A combination of the -- I mean he is making forward progress and the sign is coming towards him.

Q Okay. He's got that video camera up to his eye when you hit him, doesn't he?

A Yes.

Q And is it a free country, it is free for you to protest, right? Is it free for him to walk behind you in the street, even if he goes off the Scientology sidewalk that in front of Scientologist's place, he can do that, can't he? It's a free country.

- A Under the circumstance, you know, I don't think he should have been doing it. I was -- he had been in my face with the camera.
 - Q Do you think that you should have hit him?
- A I tried to push him away. It is what it was on the camera.
- Q But your story to the police -- you didn't expect Officer Beaudette to be right there, I mean he is right on you?
 - A I wasn't looking, no.
 - Q You didn't know he was there?
- 12 A No.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q As he comes around, he gets there pretty quick, doesn't he?
- 15 A Yes.
 - Q Within fifteen/twenty seconds, maybe?
- 17 A I mean he was there really quick.
 - Q So you agree that you wouldn't enough time to really reflect on making something up, so you just said he walked into the sign?
 - A Yes, that's what I said. That's what I said to him on the videotape.
 - Q Isn't it true that you made that up when you told him that?
 - A No, I didn't.

Q You were walking in front of The Fort Harrison, and I notice when you are walking in front, this is the front of The Fort Harrison, I notice every once in awhile you want to go down that side street where it is dark. We watch you walk down the side street with the sign and back?

A Yes.

Q At one point you walk down the street there two -- one is Jessica Burns, and I don't know the other middle aged woman's name, they are there, they are telling you to go home. There's a guy with his hands in his pockets?

A Right.

Q You talk to them there. They are in front of the building though originally, and they walk around with you?

A Yes, they did.

Q Then your walking down the front, and then you go walking around the side, just you and Mr. Howd.

A Uh-huh.

Q Just you and Mr. Howd, and as soon as you turn around the side of that building that's when you say, "How about if I grab that strap?" It's only you and him around there when you did that, isn't that true?

A That's true, it wasn't just around the corner,

1 it was the second window.

- Q Are we talking about five feet, ten feet?
- A Twelve feet.

- Q All right, a little further than this. It was only you and him around that corner at that time, wasn't it?
 - A That's right.
- Q What type of message during your protest were you sending out when you walked around that corner holding that protest sign with Mr. Howd, and reached for that strap, what kind of message were you sending out in your protest, your lawful protest?
 - A For Mr. Howd to get that camera out of my face.
- Q And you had to do it where no one else would see you, didn't you?
- A The camera, I am holding the sign like this, the strap is right on my thumb almost. I catch it with my thumb there. I don't even grab it. It doesn't pull his camera down, there's now a single downward thing in his camera. I am not pulling it, it is in my thumb. Then I turn around and leave.
- Q Is it fair to say that you didn't have to round the corner of the building to do that?
 - A At that particular moment I was going to leave.
 - Q And leave Stacy behind?

A No. She would come, we are only fifty feet across the street at the Presbyterian Church parking lot.

Q It is fair to say since this trial was coming up both of sides have seen these videos at least a zillion times?

A Yes.

Q I know I have. When Stacy is filming she is lagging behind at that time too, there is nobody blocking her, you should be able to hear something on her video?

Nobody blocks her at all, do they?

A No.

Q But you waited to tell Mr. Howd about that at the opportune moment when you go around the corner, don't you? You didn't want Ms. Brooks to film that, did you?

A I didn't know where Ms. Brooks was. I didn't know where the other camera guy, Crock was either. I didn't know the policeman was there on the corner. I am not looking around to see where everybody else is.

Q When you go around that corner, it is fair to say that you knew you were alone with Howd at that time, didn't you?

A Yes, I did. I mean Howd and I were there, I didn't see who was behind me.

Q Mr. Minton, when somebody approaches you and reaches for you it's a natural reaction to move your arm

1 away, isn't it?

- A I didn't reach for Mr. Howd.
- Q You said, "What if I grab that strap?" Do you got a strap in your hands?
- A I think you are exaggerating something that is a thumb on a strap.
 - Q But you grabbed his strap, didn't you?
 - A No, I didn't grab the strap.
 - Q What did you grab?
 - A I touched the strap.
- Q So you just touched the strap after you told him, "What if I take this out of your hand?"
 - A Right.
- Q Would you consider that an offensive move on your part, you are on the offense when he has got this up to his face?
- A It was a demand to get sort of to get this camera out of my face. That's really what it was.
- Q Have you ever heard the term, Mr. Minton, and people -- video cameras are everywhere nowadays, people are filming their kids, they go to sporting events, and while they are filming they are looking through one, almost looking through eye of a straw. And somebody says, "Did you get that?" "Well, no, I didn't see that, I had the camera up to my eye." Even though they are

filming it, you are at a unique disadvantage when you have got a camera up to your eye as to what is going on, wouldn't you say that? It's like looking at the world through a straw, isn't it?

A Yes.

Q So, Mr. Howd was at a disadvantage when you are taking those offensive steps towards him, aren't you -- isn't he, he is very much at a disadvantage?

A I don't think so.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may I have moment?
THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q Mr. Minton, we talked about it being a natural reaction if somebody reaches for you to put your arm out. Would you agree that that is a natural reaction? It's not unusual, I mean that happens.

A Not necessarily.

Q Not necessarily. It's a fair reaction, it's not an unusual reaction is it?

A No.

Q Okay. And not being an unusual reaction you still at that point taking the second affirmative, and offensive step to back him against that wall, don't you?

A I think if you look at the video, Mr. Tyson, you have got the sequence incorrect. That is not what

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

happens.Q

- Q It will speak for itself, won't it?
- A It will.
- Q I believe it will.
- A I believe you will see I turned away, took a step forward, and then I turn around and say, "Oh, you think so."
- Q It is clear on that video, wouldn't you agree, Mr. Minton, that you were on the offensive at that point in time once you round that corner?
 - A No, sir, I don't think so.
- Q Mr. Howd has got this camera up to his face when you round the corner and all he has got is this, that's all he's got. You are not trying to tell me that he was on the offensive, are you?
- A He was on the offensive, he was on the offensive by being in my face.
- Q Okay. But when you do it it's different. Your activities are different. When you go to people's houses it is different. Is that what you are telling the jury?
- A No, I'm not telling them that, and I'm not saying that -- I don't think I am on trial here for going to Benetta Slaughter's house.
- Q You are on trial here because you committed a battery, and your defense is --

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

1	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I object to
2	the characterization of counsel, because he committed a
3	battery. That's for the jury to determine, not this
4	lawyer.
5	THE COURT: Objection sustained.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Thank you.
7	BY MR. TYSON:
8	Q Mr. Minton, you are on trial here today, right?
9	A Yes.
10	Q And you are on trial for the charge of battery?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And throughout the trial you have been trying
13	to put the religion of Scientology on trial as your
14	defense saying that they have been provoking you. Isn't
15	that true? I mean you had Mr. Oliver here
16	A Can I answer the question?
17	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Objection, Judge.
18	THE COURT: Sustained.
19	BY MR. TYSON:
20	Q Answer the question.
21	THE COURT: Do you want to rephrase the
22	question.
23	BY MR. TYSON:
24	Q Mr. Minton, this whole trial you have been
25	trying to put the religion of Scientology on trial as

your defense, the "Fair Game Policy", isn't that true?

A No, we haven't been trying to put the Church of Scientology on trial.

Q But you found it necessary to produce Mr.
Oliver as a witness to testify about the alleged "Fair
Game Policy" back when he was there seven or eight years
before this even occurred. You did proffer him up here
as a witness, and he did testify. And he testified, sir,
that the church could provoke you, sue you, among other
things, right?

A Uh-huh, yes.

Q Now we know that the church hasn't sued you.

But you have financed a suit -- given money to the family to sue the church.

A To continue the suit.

Q You have provoked them by calling them names, which is not on your video that you have produced here. You are provoking them on October 31, 1999. You weren't putting your message out there, were you? You were there to provoke them, you were there to pick a fight, you were to get another video like Boston that you could parade around and go, "Look what they did to me." Isn't that why you were there?

A That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. TYSON: Judge, may I have a moment?

1	THE COURT: Yes.
2	MR. TYSON: That's all I have.
3	THE COURT: Any redirect?
4	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: I just have a
5	question.
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. DENIS DE VLAMING:
8	Q Mr. Minton, when Mr. Tyson asked you whether or
9	not the Catholic Church has a policy to protect its Pope
10	you said yes. Do you know any religion, other than
11	Scientology that has a policy to silence its critics?
12	A The Moonies.
13	Q That's a cult?
14	A It is.
15	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: That's all I have.
16	MR. TYSON: I have no question, Judge.
17	THE COURT: Thank you sir, please step
18	down.
19	(Whereupon, the witness stood aside.)
20	THE COURT: It's approximately ten minutes
21	after twelve. It is as good a time as any to take a
22	break for lunch. Does anybody disagree with that?
23	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Is an hour sufficient for
25	everyone? We are okay with an hour? Let's round it off.

```
Let's just be back here at ten minutes after one and
 1
 2
      proceed from there. Okay, we are adjourned for lunch.
 3
                     (Whereupon, court was recessed for lunch
 4
      from 12:10 to 1:10 p.m.)
 5
                     THE COURT: Counsel for Defendant, where
 6
      do we go from here?
 7
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, we are going
8
      to rest. We can go through instructions.
 9
                     THE COURT: That's probably a good thing
10
      to do. Okay, so you are going to rest, and you would
11
      probably like to do that in the presence of the jury or
12
      not?
13
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: And we can go right
14
      into our closings as far as I am concerned.
15
                     THE COURT: That sounds good. Have you
16
      all had a chance to review the instructions that I gave
17
      you?
18
                                 Yes, Judge, I have them.
                     MR. TYSON:
19
                     THE COURT:
                                 That being the case, Mr. de
20
      Vlaming, do you want to go first and comment on them?
21
                     MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, Judge, I don't
22
      have -- I want to let Ms. Rivellini take a look at this
23
      and see if I missed anything. I think the Court
24
      chronicled it correctly, with the exception I don't see
25
      any single fact evidence that was introduced about common
```

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scheme or plan, and therefore we are not requesting it. 1 So are you?

> MR. TYSON: No.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No.

THE COURT: Nobody wants it, that certainly makes that it easy. I am going to move a couple of things around in here. Nobody cares too much about the order I would imagine, but after the battery charge I would do the self -- the lawful use of nondeadly force instruction right there. I'd follow the battery charge with that.

Then, of course, I have taken out the part about the Defendant not testifying, because that clearly is not the case here.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Correct.

THE COURT: What about weighing the evidence? Do you all want all those items in? I circled a few that may be questionable, 6,8,9, and 10.

MR. TYSON: Judge, I would like 6 to be in.

THE COURT: I can understand that. understand that. I will leave 6 in.

MR. TYSON: I don't believe that we have an inconsistent statement that we are aware of, 8,9 and 10 are out?

	1112 GOOK! 0,9, and 10 out?
2	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: 8 is inconsistent
3	statements, no convictions you are right 8, 9, and 10
4	out.
5	THE COURT: 8,9, and 10 are out. Okay.
6	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I think
7	Defendant's statements
8	THE COURT: I took that out also.
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Oh, you did?
10	THE COURT: Yes, I did. I knew there was
11	something else that I took out and I couldn't find it.
12	But there were no out of court statements that I am aware
13	so I see no need to give that instruction unless, Mr.
14	Tyson, you saw something or heard something we didn't.
15	Anything else?
16	MR. TYSON: You are taking out the
17	Williams' Rule, correct?
18	THE COURT: I am, yes, because both of you
19	have asked me to.
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, quite
21	obviously the closing argument statement that is what you
22	give in advance of closing arguments, obviously not as a
23	jury instruction at the time you give the rest of them.
24	THE COURT: You must have an earlier
25	edition. That's not part of mine, and you are right.

1 | That is absolutely correct.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I haven't tried a case this Court, do you send the instructions back or not?

THE COURT: I do.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: You do.

THE COURT: I am going to have these changed as per what we have just discussed, my judicial assistant is standing by to do that now. I will have them changed. I will give each of you copies as changed. I will give one copy to go back with the jury when they retire.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Okay, do you have them read it while you read it, or not?

them. I then explain to them, I then explain to them after I am through that I realize they don't do these things everyday, and that some of these things they want to reflect on. If they would like to do that they will have the opportunity to that, and if they don't feel the need to that, they have to. But they will have them if they want to use them. Okay.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, how do you handle the aspect of the videotapes? Obviously, the equipment --

THE COURT: That will go back. Tapes will go back.

MR. TYSON: Judge, that one tape, since I don't have the box for it, and since we showed it and stopped it, I believe we ought to leave it in here. If they jury wants to watch they will have to come back and watch it.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Which one is that?

MR. TYSON: That's the one with Frank

Oliver with the laser pen.

THE COURT: Is there other things on that tape, is that the concern?

MR. TYSON: Just some picketing, but I would prefer --

THE COURT: How do you all want to handle that, because all the rests of the tapes are going to go back. That one can't go back because of this. I will explain to them that, and if they would feel the need to review that tape they will have to let us know, and we will reconvene in the courtroom and they will get to see that section of the tape.

MR. TYSON: Judge, if you would instruct them, if you would, that there is stuff on that tape that is irrelevant to today?

THE COURT: I will. Does anybody have a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

problem with that procedure? It is awkward, but that is probably the best we can do, unless somebody wants to redact that tape.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: So that it doesn't look clumsy from my standpoint, is there are very limited aspects of certain tapes that I would like to play in my final argument, you know literally four or five seconds, I think if I had to try to find them after Mr. Tyson has rewound them it's going to take an inordinate period of time. So I have the identical tapes, you know, last night I went ahead and found the areas so -- is that all right with you?

> MR. TYSON: Yes.

THE COURT:

THE COURT: Pretty much like you did opening, right?

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, sir.

Yes, that's fine. What else do we need to talk about? How much long do we need? MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Judge, I am not a big windbag. Forty-five minutes, but I don't intend to take it all.

> THE COURT: Forty-five a side?

MR. TYSON: Forty-five.

THE COURT: The State opens and closes,

defense is in the middle?

1	MR. TYSON: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, what I customarily
3	do is whoever speaks second as they approach the podium
4	let you know by my calculations how much time you have
5	left. If you want me to do that I will. If you would
6	like me not to
7	MR. TYSON: I would ask you to.
8	What I want to do is take ten minutes and
9	get these changed, let you all kind of get your thoughts
10	together. We will bring the jury in. The defense will
11	rest. I will give them closing argument instruction and
12	we will proceed. Okay. We are adjourned.
13	(Brief break)
14	THE COURT: Everybody has seen the verdict
15	form I presume?
16	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Yes, your Honor.
17	MR. TYSON: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And no objections to the
19	verdict form?
20	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Right, no
21	objections.
22	MR. TYSON: No.
23	THE COURT: Why don't you all take just a
24	second to scan them to make sure that it happened just

the way you expected it to happen and then we will bring

1	the jury in.
2	I see that we still have a paragraph on
3	the very last page that shouldn't be there. I will have
4	that eliminated. We can go forward though.
5	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: The closing
6	argument?
7	THE COURT: Yes, I can't seem to get rid
8	of it. Anything else that any saw?
9	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No.
10	THE COURT: Let's bring in the jury.
11	(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)
12	THE COURT: What says the defense?
13	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Your Honor, the
14	defense rests.
15	THE COURT: Counsel, approach just
16	briefly.
17	(Whereupon, a bench conference was held
18	outside the hearing of the jury.)
19	MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: At this time I
20	renew my motion for directed judgment of acquittal and
21	incorporate the arguments previously made.
22	THE COURT: My ruling will be the same.
23	Denied, thank you.
24	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, both the
25	State and Defendant have now rested their cases. You

have heard all the evidence you will ever hear in this case. The attorneys now will present their final or closing arguments. Please remember that what the attorneys say is not evidence. They will be commenting on the testimony that you have heard and the evidence that's been presented, and they as you, will be recalling the evidence that has been presented. They will not intentionally try to mislead you. However, if their recollection of the evidence differs from what your recollection is you must follow your own recollection.

Please listen closely to their arguments. They are intended to aid you in understanding this case. Each side will have equal time, and we have agreed on forty-five minutes a side. Counsel for the State is entitled to divide this time between opening remarks and he may follow counsel for the Defendant after they are through speaking. So counsel for the State will speak first, he will use whatever portion of their forty-five minutes that they choose to use in their opening remarks, after which counsel for the Defendant will speak for up to forty-five minutes, when they sit down counsel for the State may then return to the podium and use whatever portion of their forty-five minutes remains.

Okay. Mr. Tyson, are you ready?

MR. TYSON: Good afternoon, ladies and

KANABAY COURT REPORTERS

gentlemen. Now trial is over except for closing arguments, there is one thing that you need to go back there to decide, and that's did Robert S. Minton intentionally touch or strike Richard W. Howd against his will on October 31, 1999. That's what you are deciding.

There has been some defense issues raised, one of them was self-defense. Of course, now we saw on the video that Mr. Minton told the police that Mr. Howd walked into the sign. I'm not sure how you want to square out that with self-defense. And according to Mr. de Vlaming, Mr. Howd took one for the team. He took one for the team that night, that's the defense. He wanted to set him up.

I submit to you Mr. Minton is on a crusade. He doesn't know where the line is. I think it is obvious by his testimony. It is a contentious relationship between the Scientologists and Mr. Minton. That's not in dispute. Nobody disputes that. They don't like each other. Just because you don't like each other doesn't mean that the law doesn't apply. I told you before the law applies to everyone. It is there to protect everyone. No one is above the law.

To believe the defense in this case, and it boils down to this if you really think about it, to believe the defense you have to believe that a multi-

millionaire, worldwide banking investor, that's some heavy-duty stuff, I can't handle that. That's some heavy-duty stuff. He's a smart guy, no doubt about it. No doubt about it. A lot of intelligence there. A lot of intelligence. He has spent millions of dollars of discretionary income fighting this thing. That's just his choice and that's fine. That's his right. But you have got to believe to believe their defense that Mr. Howd, a man, no disrespect to him, of ordinary intelligence, outsmarted him. You've got to believe that to buy their defense.

And not only do you have to believe that, you've got to also to understand the fact that Mr. Minton because of these activities, in the past year or two, you've got to believe that he didn't know any better, to know something like this would possibly happen. To buy their defense that is what you have got to believe. That a multi-millionaire, early retirement, international investment banker, worldwide traveler was outsmarted on the street corner in Clearwater by Mr. Howd.

According to Mr. Minton he doesn't like the way they think, they don't know any better. That was a comment on Mr. Howd's intelligence that he doesn't know any better, to belong to them, and be a slave to them, that's what his statements were.

Mr. Howd took one for the team and outsmarted Mr. Minton. That's what you have got to believe. That's a huge hurdle in this case. That's a gigantic mountain to jump. You will be asked to weigh the credibility of the evidence and the witnesses. Mr. Minton, you saw him testify. I saw your faces when he played the Boston video. I have seen that a plenty of times. I don't have to see that anymore. I looked at everyone of your faces, and everyone of you was disgusted at the Scientologists when you saw that video.

Rightfully so. Rightfully so. Then you learned what Mr. Minton's activities were. It changed things a little bit. I was watching your faces too when you learned what else happened that you didn't see on that video.

His actions were bad also. That's not what we're here for. Okay. Mr. Howd wasn't in Boston two years ago, 1,500 miles away. He wasn't there. Okay. Mr. Howd was not there. Those two ladies, who according to Stacy Brooks, "Is that the best you can do?" Are saying "Go home. Go home." That video has one purpose only, to inflame you against Scientology. I want you to understand something. I don't represent Scientology, I know nothing about Scientology, and I don't need to know anything about Scientology.

I don't need to know anything about them.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't care. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter at all. This is a contentious relationship. But you don't need to see what they stand for, you can see with your own two eyes what is on those videos because that is what we are here for. Okay. If they are provoking each other elsewhere that's fine. I don't care. But this is Pinellas County. This is Pinellas County and they are both going to abide the law. And on that night Mr. Minton broke the law.

Another day, another time we may prosecute And you better believe we will. You better believe we will. Another day, another time. Today it is that incident. And on that date, you know they were following, but now I think you know why. Now you now why, why would they do that? Why would this organization, this cult, as they call it, follow these people, get all of these documents on him? They think he is a danger, they think he is a threat. Quite honestly hearing his statements up here, you've got to admit it sounds like he has gone over the edge now. There is a difference between believe your cause and throwing everything to the side because of your cause. There's a difference, a huge difference. You got to see it. You got to see him go to a church member's house that night. Now what purpose is that for? The church isn't there. What is the purpose

of that? Provocation, that's what it is for. The same thing that he is accusing them of. Provocation. Why when he is walking around the side of the building, he is telling them to run and go hide like cockroaches, why is he doing that, provocation.

Look at the videos. How did they provoke this man that night? Richard Howd is close with the video. I already told you, that's not a problem, he is close. I admit that. You will see it on the tapes. The women, the man with his hands in his pockets, does that look like a bunch of goons set out to rough Mr. Minton up? I don't think so. Mr. Minton is a competent man. Mr. Minton is a successful man. Mr. Minton goes there. He is not in fear. You watch those videos. He is in no fear whatsoever, none.

He provokes them when he is there. He walks around the side of the building, in the dark. Tell me what kind of protest that is? Why is he doing that? Watch the video, he was going around the side of the building, no one else is there, that's when he grabs at Mr. Howd's camera strap. Provocation. If he is so scared of them why is he going around the side of the building. He says I was thinking about leaving at the time. Believe that if you want to. If you want to buy that, buy that. I was thinking about leaving at the time

I walked around the side the building.

Mr. Minton and defense team go over the facts. It's a contentious relationship, how they sue people to silence them. He hasn't been sued. Nobody is suing him. Yet he has financed -- I am sorry, he has given money to a family to continue a lawsuit, which he has no interest in. He has no legal interest in that lawsuit, other than it is against Scientologists. You can consider that when you consider of the parties here. Motive. He is there to stir them up. No doubt about it.

It's hard to argue self-defense when you're the one there picking the fight. It's hard to argue self-defense when you are the one there picking the fight. Mr. Minton even admitted on cross examination that he did not have to hit him. He did not have to hit him. When he hit him with that video rolling right up to his eye, how was Richard Howd a threat to Robert Minton at that time?

The judge is going to read you a jury instruction on self-defense. I want you to think about that. He had to reach out to hit him with the sign. He didn't hit with his hand. He had to use an extension of the sign to get him. The Defendant, Robert S. Minton, must have reasonably believed that such conduct was necessary to defend himself against the eminent, eminent

use of unlawful force against himself. The eminent use of unlawful force. That's quite a stretch to buy that, isn't it? I man with a video camera up to your face and you have to reach out with a sign to hit him.

Remember Mr. Minton came to them. We have heard all this evidence about "Fair Game" and dirty tricks. Realize they follow him when he is in town because, as you now know, he is going to their houses looking for trouble. Makes sense doesn't it? He is doing the same thing. He is with the people shining laser lights in everybody's eyes. I am not going to go into the obscenities that were called, because it is not necessary anymore. You all heard them. Okay. I have already been through that. I'm not going to do that anymore. There's no sense in it. But you know what he is doing. He is accusing them of doing that to them. Find me not guilty because look what they are doing.

If you want to hate them for what they did before. It doesn't matter. What matters is that night. Regardless of how contentious that relationship may be for the past two or three years, that night Mr. Minton crossed the line. I think when he took the stand you saw what his attitude really is about all of this. They don't think the right way. He doesn't agree with their religion, they don't think the right way. He is there to

change them.

Is anybody trying to silence Mr. Minton?

I don't care if he goes out there tonight. He can't get his sign back, it's already in evidence, but he can make another one. He can go out there tonight. I don't care. You have already heard about the injunction. He can't come within ten feet of the buildings. He can still picket. He is not enjoined from going out there and picketing, he can go all he wants, but his right to picket doesn't trump their right to practice their religion, which means you can't start messing with them. That's exactly what he did on October 31st.

What was his message that night. And if you think about it, think about, when you talk about suppressing free speech, think about that for a minute, all that does is stir the undercurrent. There is an undercurrent of hate. Wouldn't you rather have Mr. Minton on the street protesting after you heard his message in here? You hear his message in here and you discard it. You understand that it is bigotry. It is well known what his message is. Everybody can take him for what he is and what you saw. No, I don't want to shut him up. No, no. I want him out there tonight. I want him out there every night, and every night after that, and every night after that

him and judge for themselves what they think of him, and what they think of what his team is doing. Because in this country you can stand for whatever you want. You can practice whatever religion you want.

He has the right to protest, but the one thing that he doesn't have the right to do is break the law. And that's exactly what happened on October 31st.

Manage to keep your eye on the ball. You have got to keep your eye on the ball. If you are at a ballgame you have got to figure what is happening in the game is where is the ball at. Keep your eye on the ball on October 31st. This is what happened. Thank you.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: If it please the Court, Mr. Tyson. It looks like we are going to be ending a bit earlier than what the possibility of a Wednesday end. This is my opportunity to give a closing statement to you about the facts of this case, which you learned, and also put together the what the law is that establishes the defense.

As I told you in the opening statement, the State is going to have to prove -- before you can find the Defendant guilty of Battery the State must prove the following element beyond a reasonable doubt, it's part of the jury instructions that you will have an opportunity to take back with you. That Robert S. Minton

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did intentionally struck Mr. Richard W. Howd against his will. Now, does that always mean that if somebody says I didn't want him to touch me, that a crime always occurs? It's funny how we bring our experiences into a courtroom. And those of who are parents know that when kids are growing up, you have little kids, and one is heckling the living daylights out of the other kid, poking on him, getting in their face, calling them names until finally that one child, who wants nothing to do with the other, pushes the kid. The little kid that falls down on the living room floor goes running to his mother and says, "Mommy, mommy, he hit me." And the mother said, "You know, I heard the whole thing. You want to know something, (son or daughter), you deserved it. I saw the way you treated your sister, your brother, and quess what, I would have done the same thing to you. I would have pushed you and put you right down on your fanny." Which is exactly what Mr. Minton did. He had it. He had it. He had it in Boston, he had itfrom the Office of Special Affairs. He knew the way they operated.

He knew very well what was going to come up. He knew that he was being provoked. Mr. Howd, did you Mr. Howd set this up and practice it, knowing this was what you were going to provoke. No, I didn't. Mr. Howd, are you wearing glasses? Yes, I am. Mr. Howd, we

can see on these videotapes you weren't wearing those glasses when you were videotaping. I don't wear glasses when -- I have two video cameras, Mr. de Vlaming, and one has an eyepiece, which this one did, I don't usually wear my glasses. I wear my glasses when I use the other videotape, which has the little screen that would cause someone to need the glasses. Are you sure, Mr. Howd? Yes, I'm sure. Because you see, Mr. Howd, if you would have put those glasses where they were it would have been obvious what he was trying to provoke.

Mr. Howd, from seeing him in this courtroom needed those glasses. Nobody wants to get hit with glasses. This is Mr. Howd in Ybor City.

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

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: There he is. There he is. Eyepiece on the camera, that's the digital camera. We are going to talk about the digital camera in a minute. That's him videotaping, glasses and all, because there is no program. There is no practice. There was no intent to throw him into a confrontation. He can wear the glasses and not clip them in the shirt the way he did. This is the one that Mr. Minton said that Mr. Howd was filming. There is Mr. Minton, Howd following him Ybor City, Howd following him to the

Belleview Biltmore, Howd waiting for him.

Don't think for one minute, ladies and gentlemen, that Howd didn't encourage this conduct. And yes, he did take one, just like the basketball player takes one for the cause. Just like Mr. Oliver said, you get credit when you can carry something else like this. What else tells us the whole thing was a setup? What other evidence shows us that he knew it was practiced so well. Do you remember what those women said, they never answered one question, the Office of Special Affairs women, do you remember that? "Go home, Bob. Go home, Bob." Over and over, almost robotic.

That's all they were allowed say, and according to Mr. Oliver that's exactly the way it was programed and practiced. Do you remember when Mr. Minton asked them questions, Why don't you tell us about -- "Go home, Bob." They never ever ever answered any questions.

How orchestrated is it? Let me show you how orchestrated it was. And this will all make sense to you.

This is re-wound just to a particular area. This is Stacy Brooks' video, and I have rewound it the area where you are going to see all the members of the Office of Special Affairs just before Howd rounded that corner. Watch what they do just before he rounds

24

25

1 I am going to play another segment to you. that corner. 2 Watch where they go, and then we will show how they come 3 back. I am going to show you just five or six seconds. (Whereupon, the video was played for the 5 jury.) 6 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: They didn't hear 7 that. Now, it's time to call the police. So they are 8 not going in because of that. They are leaving, look at 9 how they are leaving, the three of them, you see the man 10 and the two women. 11 This is just before Howd walks around that 12 I ask you to use your common sense. Was there a 13 signal, was there a sign? Why did three of them at that 14 very time decide to this. 15 Now, here is that stationary video. 16 what happens after he gets hit. Watch where these same 17 three people come out all together, as if they were in 18 just a little cubby hole, having practiced that. Watch 19 this. 20 (Whereupon, the video was played for the 21 jury.) 22 MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Watch. This has

the identical time after having gone back in that

got sound. Do you hear anything, no. Now watch this.

The same three people. The same three people come out at

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

building and run down there and stand over him. Not one of them say how are you doing. Not one of them said a word. What they wanted to say was congratulations.

Now, Howd hits the ground. Look. Before I show you, let me tell you the significance of this. Howd hits the ground. I used a basketball analogy before. There is a great football one, anybody who watches football, and the kicker that kicks the punts, what he would love nothing more is to have the other team and interfere with his kicking. And sometimes you see these people, they kick, they fall to the ground, they grab their knee. When you look at the replay the guy wasn't anywhere near them, because he would love to have that foul, so he can take it over again. That's exactly what he did in that case. He wanted to dramatize it as much as possible. But watch what happens. He knows that Crock, now that is the other Scientologist, was standing over him. He knew it. Watch what he does with his eye. Watch what he does with his eye as he pretends to be out cold.

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

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Opens it, takes a look at Crock, shuts it, and I could let it go on for awhile because he doesn't -- he said on the stand that he

left it open, now all of the sudden it is closed. Opens up takes a look at him, eyes closed. At some point an officer says do you got any ID? And with his eyes closed as if he is unconscious he reaches in his left pocket.

Look at him, out cold. Need an ambulance. Boston needed an ambulance too for the balsa wood.

Now, why, why was it that those other members of the Office of Special Affairs decided to go back into the Church of Scientology when they did? Did they get a signal, get a sign? Did they get something? Something caused them all to leave, because something was going to happen around that corner. Howd was going to do something at that time.

What I want you to look at next, and I want you to pay attention is when Mr. Minton turns around says, How would you like me to grab this, or something like that, and he has it in his thumb. He turns around to continue to walk. Listen to what he says.

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

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Did you hear that?

Oh, you think so. Right after that, you are attacking

me. What caused Minton to say, Oh, you think so? He has

already turned around. He said, Oh, you think so? I

think this is a fair comment from the evidence, when

Officer Beaudette was the following questions, he was asked about the videotapes, they were all given to him, except one. Was Mr. Howd's videotape handed over to you immediately, as was Mr. Minton's, they couldn't seem to find it. How long did it take to find it? A considerable amount of time. The only videotape running was Howd's around that corner. The only one that could have picked up what caused this man to say, Oh, you think so, was Mr. Howd's. Not orchestrated, not encouraged, not expected, not wanted, oh, no.

Mr. Tyson said that he is such a smart man and he is intelligent and he made a good living, all those things are true. But you want to know what else he is? He is a human being. He is a human being like the rest of us that if we are pushed to the limit, that if we are harassed, that if things are said to us to provoke us then he is going to act like a human being, regardless of what he does in life.

Mr. Tyson obviously had listened to the entire Boston tape because he cross examined Mr. Minton about the foul language on it. He could have played that tape if he wanted to play that tape, and frankly, so could have I played that whole tape if necessary, but we chose not to do that. Again, if he thought it was necessary, he certainly could have done it. Do you

really need to hear the profanity that Mr. Minton might have said to make a decision in this case. Did you really need to hear a minister, a minister of the church say to him, are you f'ing your twelve year old daughter. He brought it up. Okay, fine that is what was said. And we didn't want to play that for you.

How shocking it is. Even more shocking than someone who claims to be a minister of the church to be acting that way. To kill psychiatric funding, one minister said, because they are against the use of psychiatry in the Church of Scientology. Who in the world could condone the conduct of that man, that other minister in Boston that was in this man's face. He showed the perseverance of Job not have done something to get in his face.

The reason that we played that for you is so that you realized that that's what he can expect the Office of Special Affairs to act like. That's what he is in for. They want to make it as miserable as they can. And they want to get one thing. They have got to get one thing, and they need you to do it. Remember what the edict of the Church of Scientology is, you've got to make your critics a criminal. You've got to make them a criminal.

What happened in Boston, that guy that got

hit with a balsa stick, that did nothing to him, called an ambulance to come out. Asked the police to arrest him and prosecute him. Of course, the prosecutor took a look at the tape and we know what happened with that case, but they were trying to get him declared a criminal so that they can get the word out, don't listen to him.

Everything he says about our organization is false because he is a criminal. That's what they want you to do.

Everyone has space. Everyone has an opportunity to say, back off, leave me alone, get away from me. I ask rhetorically, how far does a woman have to go who was followed by another man who finally decides to leave an area and as she says, leave me alone, I'm going to call the police, the man follows, she reaches into her purse, puts her finger on the mace. Does the man have to come into contact with him for use to use self-defense? Does he have to grab the woman by the throat or by the hair? Or can she say, that's enough and let him have it.

That's exactly the type of situation that we had. He was pushed, he was pushed, he was setup, and they got what they wanted. Do you want to know something? He got what he deserved, just like those little six year olds that argue in their parents' house.

They got what they deserved.

How much evidence is necessary to convict a citizen on a criminal charge? And make no mistake about this is a criminal trial. This isn't a lawsuit about money or about staying away, or an injunction. This is a criminal trial. The decision here is whether he is convicted of a crime.

That's what this case is about, and that's what they want. It's a conviction, a unanimous conviction for a crime. Before you can get to that, the Defendant has entered a plea of not guilty. This means you must presume or believe the Defendant is innocent. The presumption stays with the Defendant as to each material allegation as to each material allegation in the charge through each stage of the trial, unless it has been overcome by the evidence to the exclusion of, and beyond all reasonable doubt. In other words there can't be any reasonable doubt whatsoever that he didn't act in self-defense. There can't be any doubt, any reasonable doubt whatsoever that Mr. Howd didn't invite the conduct.

We didn't introduce Boston to trash

Scientology, both of the witnesses we called to the

stand, as much as he cross examined them about

Scientology and about the people that are members of that

church, if it is a church, have said I have

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

no quarrel with its members. I have a quarrel with its practices, its deceptive practices. Because the majority of the people in that organization don't know what is going on, and that is what he is here to do.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, in the 1930's there was something incredibly insidious that was happening in another part of our world. It was just beginning and it came as perhaps the biggest black eye that this world has ever known, and I don't know the author of this statement, and I don't know if I have it completely correct, but after Nazi Germany was exposed, he made the comment, "First they came for the trade unions, and I did not stand up because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Protestants, and I did not stand up because I was not a Protestant. came for the Jews, and I did not stand up because I was not Jewish. Then they came for me, and there was no one left to stand up." This case is not about Scientology. I am not here to put a boutonniere in this man's lapel.

All he wanted to do when he came to this town was to be let alone, to conduct his constitutional right to protest, walk up and down that street, do so without people in his face invading his face, following him from an airport, going to the place where he is staying. How can anybody say that wouldn't bring some

fear to you. How can somebody say that if somebody follows your children or your family that that would not bring some fear to you. You can keep the stiff upper lip, and say I am going to continue on, but in the back of your mind always you are asking yourself is it worth it, is it worth it.

All the money he has spent and the time, and exposure to his family, is it worth it. And he has said the word, yes, it is. He knows how this organization works, and hopefully this was a very brief trial, you got a glimpse of that from a man who left that organization. Sure he made a promise that he wouldn't divulge this information. But the necessity to divulge it was more important than the promise he made, he conceded. He told about "Fair Game" that you can lie, you can cheat, you so all the things in order to destroy another person, if they are a suppressive person, someone who speaks out against Scientology.

Here is the number one suppressive person to the church. He is the number one person they want to get. He is the number one person they need you to convict. Don't let them do it. Don't let them do it. Richard Howd invited this conduct, and for that reason alone you should find him not guilty. Richard Howd's conduct, if taken in the light of Boston and the rest of

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the stalking of this man and his family, shows that he acted in self-defense. Listen to one aspect of the selfdefense instruction. If you find that victim had a reputation of being violent and dangerous, now you could easily say that the victim in this case is Richard Howd, alleged victim is Richard Howd. But don't forget the reason that we brought in Boston too was to show what his state of mind was. The people from OSA, what reputation did they have for this conduct. If you find that the victim had reputation of being violent and dangerous person, and that his reputation was known to the Defendant, certainly the practices of OSA was known to him. He knew how far they would go. He knew how far they had already gone with his family. You may consider this fact in determining whether the actions of the Defendant were those of a reasonable person in dealing with an individual with that reputation.

So for either one of those reasons this man should be found not guilty. In closing I will tell you that for two centuries we have agreed to a constitution and to live by the law. And not any one of us has the right to violate rules we all share. Perhaps the greatest constitutional guarantee this country has is the right of protest, the right to be heard. The first amendment that was ever drafted by our forefathers was

that right, that constitutional right. No one has the right to violate those rules of our constitution. Not even Richard Howd.

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, you have thirty minutes of your time remaining.

MR. TYSON: It won't take that long.

According to that first amendment is the right to

practice religion, freedom of religion. Kids pushing

kids, he is fifty-four years old. Some of you have kids,

on a long car trip in the backseat fighting. He is

fifty-four years old. This isn't kids pushing kids. The

women never answered Mr. Minton.

So, does that mean that they are robots, or trained to not answer. What if somebody is saying something to you that you don't like. According to Mr. Oliver I guess I am Scientologist. Let's talk about those ladies who were there, and the guy with his hands in pockets. There are two middle-aged women, you've got a guy very docile with his hands in his pockets. When do they walk away. They are telling Minton to go home, but when do they walk away? They walk away when Mr. Minton became physical.

Now, to them that is a conspiracy brewing.

Use your common sense. When is the time to leave? To

walk away, is that unusual? No, that's a conspiracy.

That plays right into everything they are doing. Could it be that they were afraid of Minton? He showed no fear that night. You can see it. I think it is obvious they weren't afraid of him when he first showed up, but that changed.

And when they're inside, is it natural when you are inside to seek protection, and to keep an eye outside to see what is happening, or was that a conspiracy. You have to got understand something, to buy that theory also, besides having to buy the international investment banker was duped by Mr. Howd, to buy that you have to understand or buy the fact that those women were clairvoyant. That they knew that Mr. Minton was going to hit him. When Mr. Minton hit him, we all know that he is a distance away. He had to use the sign to hit him.

It gets to the point that some people start seeing a conspiracy in everything. Everything is a conspiracy. He is so ingrained in this, so focused they start looking at the world through a straw. That's all they see. They don't get the big picture. Everything is a conspiracy.

Let me ask you a question, tell me the right way to fall down on your head. Have you stubbed your toe, I mean really wacked it good, your wife wacked

it, your kids? You jump around. They don't like the way he fell. Okay, there is nothing I can do about that. Minton grabbing the strap, the point I made on cross examination, Mr. Minton, who took the first offensive act that night? Regardless of going to a parishioner's house, regardless of calling them cockroaches, regardless of calling them all that other stuff, who first took the first offensive physical action. They are denying that, they can't deny that. They cannot deny it. It was him. Of course, now we have got a little twist in this game. We saw the videos, there's a lot of people out there, a lot of people with cameras. So it took the police awhile to get Mr. Howd's camera. Well, if you look there's a woman holding it. She didn't know how to turn it off. Yeah, they are supposed to have gone in there, and you know, they are hinting to you that that video was changed. It's accurate, it's accurate for their purposes, when they say look how close Mr. Howd is to Mr. Minton's face.

But they are hinting to you that it has been changed when Mr. Minton is grabbing the strap, very subtly Mr. de Vlaming did it, very subtle during the trial. He said we will talk about that later. Very, very subtle. Very, very subtle.

The one thing about in the court, did you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

bring evidence in? Look at it all, it's all sitting up
there. Is there any evidence, any evidence, other than a
hint from the defense that that video was doctored? Ask
yourselves that questions, because that is what he wants

you to go back there and talk about.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. de Vlaming is talking about that Boston tape, there is no reason to play that tape. did you learn by that tape? They hate each other. Why did they play it? I submit to you that they wanted to inflame you. You don't need those tapes. Watch them if you want. Watch it if you want, there's more, it doesn't matter. We all know now that Mr. Minton was saying it. And we know on his copy that it is not only edited, but is narrated for whatever reason. I am not sure that it is going to be published or what, it is narrated, professionally done. I don't know what the reason for that is, but the things that Mr. Minton was saying aren't on there. Like I said, I am not going to go into what he said. I've done beat a dead horse in cross examination, you don't need to hear it anymore. That's not on there.

It was brought up again to inflame you. You don't need to play anymore of those tapes, you have heard enough. You were inflamed enough until you heard what the other side was doing. If you think about it, it's different people, different date, time, different

place. Remember I told you about keeping your eye on the ball? You are in the stands watching the game, Mr. de Vlaming said, hey, look back here. You have done missed the play. You done missed the play. That's what they are doing. That's exactly what they are doing. Take their eye off the ball and shift the focus.

Scientologists don't need to make Minton a criminal, he did himself. He is only charged with a misdemeanor battery, that's all this is. This is a misdemeanor. This thing has mushroomed in huge proportions, but it is a misdemeanor battery. The State of Florida is prosecuting him, not Scientologists. The State of Florida is not being duped with this Mission Impossible scenario that he defense has come up with. I am not being duped. Yes, they gave us things to look at. Do you think that is the only thing we knew about Mr. Minton? Do you think the only thing we go with is what they gave us?

This stuff has been going on for a long time, very contentious. A woman being followed by a man, now that's supposed to inflame you, too. You have to understand Mr. Minton and Mr. Howd, Mr. Minton, and the Scientologists always very close in the videos. You saw the other ones, with the laser lights, they are all walking around. That is the way that game is played.

But a woman being followed by a man. That's meant to inflame you. That's what it is meant for. It is not an accurate analogy. That's why that was used, exactly why that was used. They all know each other videotapes. You've seen they were videotaping each other back and forth.

Mr. de Vlaming said that both his witness,
Mr. Minton and Mr. Oliver have no quarrel with the
Scientologists, then why the name calling? Why the laser
in the face? Why are they doing that? If according to
Mr. Minton they don't any better, they don't know they
are slaves, why mess with them? Why mess with those
people?

Mr. Oliver, you can judge his credibility, he was out there playing games, too. You saw him with the laser light. He didn't really remember that, but yeah, that was him with the little laser pen right in somebody's eye. He doesn't think that is a provocative thing to do. Right in somebody's eye, putting that laser dot right there.

You can consider that when you judge Mr. Oliver's credibility. Does Mr. Oliver have a grudge against Scientology, oh, yeah. Does he have a grudge against them, yeah. Should he, I don't know. That was eight years ago.

Whether you believe Scientology is a religion or not, it doesn't matter. They tried to put it on trial. And a religion is something that is very very easy to put on trial. If I was to tell you that there is a man who agrees to take vow of celibacy, and a vow of poverty, a vow of celibacy and a vow of poverty for the rest of his life, I could make him look pretty silly, couldn't I? We all know that's a Catholic Priest, don't we. I am not trying to equate any religion together. I am not trying to be sanctimonious. It doesn't matter. The people who believe that, have a right to believe that, whether you agree with it or not.

People that believe in Judaism have a right to believe in that. People that believe in Scientology have a right to believe in it. Mr. Minton has a right to get the word out, but he doesn't have a right to break the law.

What I want you do to is go back there and talk about it. You already know the contentious nature between the parties, but look at what happened that night. Who is provoking who? Who is telling him to go home? Mr. Howd wants him to go home. These people want to go in for the night. It's 10:30 on Sunday night. Who was provoking who?

Mr. de Vlaming would like to substitute

the conduct of the gentleman in Boston for Mr. Howd.

That's what he wants you to do. He has asked you to do that. Because a member there, 1,500 miles away, how that guy acted, and it was offensive, and Mr. Minton's actions were offensive. They are both offensive. You can't justify what either one them did that on that tape.

Nobody can justify it. I hope both parties are ashamed of it. Both parties should be ashamed of it.

Mr. Howd has to be painted like that, when you consider the reputation. That is what he is asking you to do. Like I told you before, Mr. Minton went there for one purpose, he had already picketed during the day, you want people around so they can hear his message. He can go out there, like I said, tonight, and the next night, and the next night, and I don't care if I go right down to Clearwater ten years from now, if he is out there doing it again, there is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with that. You go out there and do what you have got to do, everyday, and the State will protect you. The State will protect him, much like the State protects Mr. Howd.

On that day he committed a crime. Thank you.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, I thank you for your attention during this trial. Please pay

attention to the instructions that I am about to give you.

The Defendant in the case has been accused of the crime of Battery. Before you can find the Defendant guilty of Battery the State must prove the following element beyond a reasonable doubt.

Robert S. Minton intentionally touched or struck Richard W. Howd against his will.

At issue in this case is whether the Defendant acted in self-defense. It is defense to the offense with which the Defendant is charged if the injury to the victim resulted from the justifiable use of force not likely to cause death or great bodily harm.

The Defendant would be justified in using force not likely to cause death or great bodily harm against the victim if the following two facts are proved:

One, the Defendant must have reasonable believed that such conduct was necessary to defend himself against the victim's imminent use of unlawful force against the Defendant.

Two, the use of unlawful force by the victim must have appeared to the Defendant ready to take place.

In deciding whether the Defendant was justified in the use of force not likely to cause death

or great bodily harm, you must judge him by the circumstances by which he was surrounded at the time the force was used. The danger facing the Defendant need not have been actual, however, to justify the use of force not likely to cause death or great bodily harm, the appearance of danger must have been so real that a reasonably cautious and prudent person under the same circumstances would have believed that the danger could have been avoided only through the use of that force. Based on appearances the Defendant must have actually believed that the danger was real.

If you find that the victim had a reputation of being a violent and dangerous person and that his reputation was known to the Defendant you may consider this fact in determining whether the actions of the Defendant were those of a reasonable person in dealing with an individual of that reputation.

In considering the issue of self-defense, you may take into account the relative physical abilities and capacities of the Defendant and the victim.

If in your consideration of the issue of self-defense if you have a reasonable doubt on the questions of whether or not the Defendant was justified in the use of force not likely to cause death or great bodily harm, you should find the Defendant not guilty.

However, if from the evidence you are convinced that the Defendant was not justified in the use of force not likely to cause death or great bodily harm, then you should find him guilty if the all the elements of the charge are proved.

The Defendant has entered a plea of not guilty. This means you must presume or believe the Defendant innocent. The presumption stays with the Defendant as to each material allegation in the information through each state of the trial unless it has been overcome by the evidence to the exclusion of and beyond a reasonable doubt.

To overcome the Defendant's presumption of innocense the State has the burden of proving the following: The crime with which the Defendant is charged was committed and the Defendant is the person who committed the crime.

The Defendant is not required to present evidence or prove anything.

Whenever the words "reasonable doubt" are used you must consider the following:

A reasonable doubt is not a mere possible doubt, a speculative, imaginary, or forced doubt. Such a doubt must not influence you to return a verdict of not guilty if you have an abiding conviction of guilt. on

the other hand, if after carefully considering, comparing and weighing all the evidence, there is not an abiding conviction of guilt, or, if having a conviction one which is not stable but one which wavers and vacillates, then the charge is not proved beyond every reasonable doubt and you must find the Defendant not guilty because of the doubt is reasonable.

It is to the evidence introduced into this trial, and to it alone, that you are to look for that proof.

A reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant may arise from the evidence, a conflict in the evidence, or the lack of evidence.

If you have a reasonable doubt you should find the Defendant not guilty. If you have no reasonable doubt you should find the Defendant guilty.

It's up to you decide what evidence is reliable. You should use your common sense in deciding which evidence in the best evidence and which evidence should not be relied upon in considering your verdict. You may find some of the evidence not reliable, or less reliable than other evidence.

You should consider how the witnesses acted, as well as what they said. Some things you should consider are:

1	Did the witness seem to have an
2	opportunity to see and know the things about which the
3	witness testified?
4	Did the witness seem to have an
5	accurate memory?
6	Was the witness honest and
7	straightforward in answering the attorney's questions?
8	Did the witness have some interest in
9	how the case should be decided?
10	Does the witness' testimony agree
11	with other testimony and other evidence in the case?
12	Has the witness been offered or
13	received any money, preferred treatment, or other benefit
14	in order to get the witness to testify?
15	Had any pressure or threat been used
16	against the witness that affected the truth of the
17	witness' testimony?
18	You may rely upon your own conclusion
19	about the witness. A juror may believe or disbelieve all
20	or any part of the evidence or testimony of any witness.
21	The Defendant in this case has become a
22	witness. You should apply the same rules to
23	consideration of the Defendant's testimony that you apply
24	to the testimony of the other witnesses.
25	There are some general rules that apply to

your discussion. You must follow these rules in order to return a lawful verdict:

You must follow the law as it is spelled out in these instructions. If you fail to follow the law, your verdict will be a miscarriage of justice. There is no reason for failing to follow the law in this case. All of use are depending upon you to make a wise and legal decision in this matter.

This case must be decided only on the evidence that yo have heard from the testimony of the witnesses (and have seen in the form of exhibits in evidence) and these instructions.

This case must not be decided for or against anyone because you feel sorry for anyone, or are angry with anyone.

Remember, the lawyers are not on trial. Your feelings about them should not influence your decision in this case.

Your duty is to determine if the Defendant has been proven guilty or not, in accordance with the law. It is the judge's job to determine a proper sentence if the Defendant is found to be guilty.

Whatever verdict you render, it must be unanimous, that is, each jury must agree to the same verdict.

It is entirely property for a lawyer to talk to a witness about what testimony the witness would give if called to the courtroom. The witness should not be discredited by talking to a lawyer about his or her testimony.

Your verdict should not be influenced by feelings of prejudice, bias, or sympathy. Your verdict must be based on the evidence and the law contained in these instructions.

Deciding a verdict is exclusively your job. I cannot participate in that decision in any way. Please disregard anything that I may have said or done that made you think that I preferred one verdict over the other.

In just a few moments you will be taken to the jury room. The first thing that you need to do is is to elect a foreperson. The foreperson presides over your deliberation like a chairperson of a meeting. It is the foreperson's job to sign and date the verdict form when all of you have agreed on a verdict in this case. For your convenience we have prepared one for you. You will take it back with you. It read, "We, the jury finds as follows as to the Defendant in this case." You have two choices. A choice "A" the Defendant is guilty of Battery as charged. Choice "B" the Defendant is not

guilty. The foreperson will sign his or her name, then print his or her name under their signature. This will be dated and brought back when you reach a verdict.

Your verdict finding the Defendant either guilty or not guilty must be unanimous. The verdict must be verdict of each juror, as well as the jury as a whole.

In closing, let me remind you that it is important that you follow the law spelled out in these instructions in deciding your verdict. There are no other laws that apply to this case. Even if you do not like the laws, it must be applied, you must use them. For two centuries we have agreed to a constitution and to live the law. None of us has the right to violate the rules that we all share.

Counsel, any objections to the instructions as given?

MR. TYSON: No, your Honor.

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I recognize that you don't do this everyday. These instructions come at the end of two long days. For that reason I reduce them verbatim to writing. You will have them to take back with you the jury room, if you would like to refer to them, you do not need to unless you want to, but you do not need to unless you want

will have them. You will get the verdict form as well.

You are going to get all the items that went into evidence. You will get a television and a VCR to review these items. There is one tape that you will not get to take back with you, because there are other things on that tape that are not appropriate for you to see. If you want to see that tape you will need to let the bailiffs know, we will come back into the courtroom and play that part of the tape with all of us present.

Did I forget anything?

MR. TYSON: Judge, may we approach?

THE COURT: Sure.

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

MR. DENIS DE VLAMING: Why don't you tell them that the tape in question, because you have probably got their curiosity up on what that is.

is the one involving Frank Oliver and the laser light, just so that you are able to sort that out. Just so that you know which one that you don't have. That's the one we have, you may see, just tell the bailiffs and we will make it available to you. Okay. At this time you may retire to deliberate your verdict. Mr. Palmieri, you stay with us. You are the alternate. Please remain with

us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Whereupon, the jury was retired for deliberation of their verdict.)

THE COURT: Mr. Palmieri, the job of the alternate juror sometimes is a long job and a difficult It's difficult because you have sat here for two days and listened attentively and you do not get to now deliberate a verdict. But I want you to understand how important your role is to this process. If we did not have an alternate juror and something happened to one of the other jurors that they could not finish for whatever reason, they get called away, we would have to start all over again. So your service is very valuable to us. are very grateful for your service. I guess a fair way to put it is, the good news is that you get to home now, but they still have to stay. But we very much appreciate your service. You are free to go, sir. Have a nice day. (Whereupon, the alternate juror was

(Whereupon, the alternate juror was excused.)

THE COURT: Counsel, this trial reflected the very highest quality of lawyering I expected. All of you worked very hard. I am very grateful for the very hard work put in by both sides.

We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the jury was brought in.)

24

25

THE COURT: If the jury has reached a unanimous verdict in this case I would ask the foreperson to please hand the verdict form to the bailiff and then take a seat please.

Madam Clerk, if you would please publish the verdict. The Defendant please stand.

THE CLERK: The State of Florida versus

Robert S. Minton. We the jury find as follows as to the

Defendant in this case, the Defendant is not guilty, so

say we all, foreperson of the jury Tina Pellegrino.

THE COURT: Does either counsel wish the clerk to poll the jury?

MR. TYSON: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury you have been with for two days. You have worked hard. It is never proper for a judge to comment on a jury's verdict and I deliberately avoid doing that now. What I want to do though is thank you for your hard work and your good efforts. Justice in America basically is what a jury does, just like you did in this case. You go back and you deliberate, and you make a decision. I appreciate that very much. You work is done now, however, we have kept you long enough. You are free to go. As you go I just want to make you aware of one thing. Many times jurors are confused about whether or

not they can talk about their experience that they had in this matter. Now that this case is concluded you can choose to either discuss with whomever you want, or discuss it with no one. The choice is yours. Thank you very much. Have a good day, and be careful going home.

(Whereupon, the jury was dismissed.)

THE COURT: If you would stand once again.

Robert S. Minton based on a jury finding you not guilty

of the charge in this case, this Court now adjudges you

not guilty and you may go hence without day.

This court is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 p.m. the trial in the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

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

