IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ROOSEVELT

BARRY ALLAN BEACH,) Case No.: 1068-C) August 1 – 3, 2011
Petitioner,) // // // // // // // // // // // // //
-VS-))
STATE OF MONTANA,	
Respondent.))

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner: PETER A. CAMIEL

Attorney at Law 710 Cherry St. Seattle, WA 98104

TERRANCE L. TOAVS

Attorney at Law 429 2nd Ave. South Wolf Point, MT 59201

For the Respondent:

BRANT LIGHT TAMMY K. PLUBELL Assistant Attorney General 215 N. Sanders, 3rd Floor P.O. Box 201401 Helena, MT 59620-1401

> DEIDRE DIETRICH, COURT REPORTER 10th Judicial District 55 Windy Ridge Trail, Ryegate, MT 59074 (406) 535 – 1081, (406) 208 - 1526

PROCEEDINGS

CLERK: All rise please.

COURT: Please be seated. All right. Good morning everyone.

ATTORNEYS: Good morning Your Honor.

COURT: We have Mr. Four Star present so I would think that that might be the next best step in terms of presentation.

MR. TOAVS: Yes Your Honor.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, once again the State will renew its hearsay objection. They intend to present statements against interest through Mr. Four Star, alleging that Sissy made a third party confession, or a confession to a third party. And, we don't think it is appropriate. In the other instances, you allowed the testimony of the deceased witnesses in without Sissy Atkinson calling first; being called first. But, there is no reason to do so in this instance. And, with respect to the exception that they are trying to get it in under, there has to be a statement tending to expose the declarant to criminal liability and offer to exculpate the accused is not admissible unless corroborating circumstances clearly indicate the trustworthiness of the statement. This wasn't even a statement to Mr. Four Star. This was supposedly a statement that Sissy Atkinson made to a co-

9

1011

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

worker, William Balbinot, who is also known as Stubby. There is no corroborating circumstances and it is not the appropriate way to do so.

COURT: So, you are saying that Mr. Four Star did not receive this statement from Ms. Atkinson.

MS. PLUBELL: He claimed to overhear the statement at work.

COURT: Yes sir.

MR. CAMIEL: Good morning Your Honor. The vehicle through which we believe that this is admissible is not evidence Rule 804, but 803-24, which the Court cited to yesterday. The statements that, or the testimony that Mr. Four Star is going to give; there are two parts to the testimony. He overheard her discussing her involvement in the Kim Nees murder with a co-worker. But she also made direct statements to him about having committed the perfect crime, or the perfect murder. So, she first made statements to the co-worker who was nearby, then approached him and made statements to him. The statements about being involved in the Kim Nees murder or having committed the perfect crime are clearly against her interest which makes them reliable because somebody wouldn't normally make a statement against their interest. The statements that were admitted yesterday through the former testimony of the deceased witnesses helped to corroborate the fact that she would have made a statement that Mr. Four Star would have overheard. If she made a statement to her friend Vonnie Brown, if she made a

statement to her brother J.D. Atkinson incriminating herself in the Kim Nees murder, then that corroborates and is a circumstantial guarantee of trustworthiness that she may have also made a statement to a co-worker and a statement to Mr. Four Star. So, we believe that there are sufficient circumstances through which the Court can find that there are guarantees of trustworthiness and under the rule that the Court relied on yesterday 803-24, which is the catch-all exception, availability or unavailability is immaterial because Rule 803 deals with the availability of the declarant immaterial and so that is the vehicle by which we think this is admissible.

COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, there still has to be corroborating or, I think the exception they claim they are relying on. There still has to be circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness and they keep citing you to, I presume, United States Supreme Court precedent. And, I also presume that the cases that they are relying upon are *Chambers and Green*. And we have analyzed those in several of our pleadings, but the kinds of guarantees of trustworthiness that are discussed in those cases are not present in this case. For example, I believe it was in the *Chambers* case the United States Supreme Court did say that the Court wrongly excluded hearsay statements. But, they addressed the considerable assurance of their reliability and in that case the person made the statements spontaneously to a close acquaintance shortly after the murder occurred. Of course, they are trying to say

24

25

that she made the statement to Mr. Balbinot who they are gonna claim is a close acquaintance. But, Mr. Four Star said the statement happened in 1984 and they weren't really acquainted in 1984 and he didn't work there then.

COURT: Who is they? You are using pronouns. You say they were acquainted. Who is 'they'?

MS. PLUBELL: Stubby and Sissy Atkinson who she supposedly made this statement to were not acquainted in 1984.

COURT: Well, you can call her and ...

MS. PLUBELL: But why should we have to do that when it is their burden Your Honor?

COURT: Because I think you would be challenging the accuracy of their representation of evidence. I don't see that as shifting of the burden.

MS. PLUBELL: They are circumventing the Rules of Evidence.

COURT: Well, that is for me to determine.

MS. PLUBELL: Well, that is true Your Honor.

COURT: I may make a mistake, but it is still ...

MS. PLUBELL: That is true Your Honor.

COURT: It is not fair to say they are circumventing until I rule it.

MS. PLUBELL: In the State's estimation Your Honor. I would also like to point out the other factors. Each statement was corroborated by some other

evidence in the case, such as *McDonald*. The person who supposedly made the third party confession actually signed a sworn confession. There was an actual eye witness who testified to the shooting that he saw *McDonald* who signed a sworn confession with the gun. And, each confession was, in a very real sense, self-incriminatory and unquestionably against interest. We think it is just important to keep those factors in mind when you are looking at the guarantees of trustworthiness as the United States Supreme Court has defined them. And, the case of *Green* is not any better Your Honor. It doesn't help them anymore than *Chambers* does.

COURT: It seems like I remember reading yesterday that in this particular rule did not follow the federal rules for a specific purpose that they didn't want to so constrain it as to make it lifeless. And, they wanted to basically add an organic feature to the law. The circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness include statement against interest, but also includes to a disinterested party. Is there any representation that this Mr. Four Star is not a disinterested party? Hopefully that is not a double negative. In other words, is he a disinterested party or does the State claim that he is an interested party?

MS. PLUBELL: He claims he was a co-worker and he claims that he was disinterested.

COURT: There are two circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness under the Montana interpretation of the rule. Therefore, the Court will allow this testimony. You may proceed.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor. The petitioner calls Carl Four Star.

CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the statements you are about to make in the matter will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God?

MR. FOUR STAR: I do.

COURT: Come on over here sir. Good morning.

MR. FOUR STAR: Good morning.

COURT: Scoot on up to that microphone and we will see if everybody can hear you.

MR. TOAVS: Good morning Mr. Four Star. Let's start by having you state your first name and spell your last name please.

MR. FOUR STAR: It is Carl Four Star. F-o-u-r-S-t-a-r Jr.

MR. TOAVS: Carl where do you reside?

MR. FOUR STAR: In Wolf Point.

MR. TOAVS: How long have you lived in Wolf Point, Montana?

MR. FOUR STAR: Since Nineteen Seventy-six (1976).

MR. TOAVS: Since?

COURT: I will sustain.

MR. TOAVS: And so, why is it then that you had initially determined not to appear for this hearing?

MR. FOUR STAR: Because I felt threatened. I sought help, I called the parole board and I didn't get any help from anybody as far as any sort of help.

MR. TOAVS: What kind of help are you referring to?

MR. FOUR STAR: Well, some sort of police protection I guess. Maybe even just having the police officers go by and say something to these people. None of that happened.

MR. TOAVS: Did you report this to the police? What happened to you?

MR. FOUR STAR: I don't recall. I did go and fill out a complaint with the Tribal Court, but nothing ever happened of it.

MR. TOAVS: Where is the tribal court?

MR. FOUR STAR: The tribal court. I went to Poplar, Montana, to fill the complaint out.

MR. TOAVS: And what did this complaint that you filled out, what was the purpose of that?

MR. FOUR STAR: The purpose was, was that I was jumped by four people in Wolf Point and I went to file a complaint. The complaint was that I was received physical harm by these people.

MR. FOUR STAR: No. When the altercation was taking place, he was telling me that I had no business in doing what I did and testifying at the clemency hearing.

COURT: This is the hearsay the State has objected to and I do have to exclude that.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor. So, in any event Mr. Four Star you are here now.

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: And, let me take you back to the period of time in Nineteen eighty-five (198)5. Were you employed in 1985?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes I was, by A&S Industries.

MR. TOAVS: When did you graduate from high school?

MR. FOUR STAR: Nineteen eighty-three (1983).

MR. TOAVS: And then after that did you start employment with A&S Industries right away?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes I did. Right out of high school.

MR. TOAVS: What was your job out of high school with A&S Industries?

MR. FOUR STAR: I had several jobs with them. It was all in the netting department.

MR. TOAVS: What is A&S Industries?

24

25

MR. FOUR STAR: A&S Industries was a company that was partially owned, well, owned by the Fort Peck tribes and they had military contracts with MR. TOAVS: So, what kind of work did A&S Industries do? MR. FOUR STAR: Well, they made camouflage netting. That is the department that I worked in and they also made military cans. MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah, medical chests; that sort of thing. MR. TOAVS: So, the company A&S Industries was involved in MR. TOAVS: And, beginning when you graduated from high school you MR. TOAVS: And, how long did you work in the netting department? MR. FOUR STAR: Until Nineteen eighty-seven (1987), Nineteen eighty-MR. TOAVS: What kind of job did you do in that department? MR. FOUR STAR: I was what was called a hex cutter.

MR. FOUR STAR: It was big sized, at least a couple blocks long; a block long.

MR. TOAVS: And, what else was located on the east side of the building besides the hex netting department, hex cutting department?

MR. FOUR STAR: There was a partition, a big partition, and there were sewing machines in the other part of the building.

MR. TOAVS: What kind of partition was there?

MR. FOUR STAR: The building that I worked was a quonset that was added on to the back part of the building and the sewing department was through a garage door.

MR. TOAVS: And that is the partition that you were ...

MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah, yeah. It was a building that was added on.

MR. TOAVS: Now, while you worked for A&S Industries in 1985, did you have any contact with an individual by the name of Sissy Atkinson?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah. She worked back where I did.

MR. TOAVS: Where did she work? In the same department?

MR. FOUR STAR: She worked in the netting department. She worked on the edge cord.

MR. TOAVS: What is that?

MR. FOUR STAR: That was the cord that was sewn onto the netting.

MR. TOAVS: And, at the time you heard this statement from Sissy Atkinson, or these statements, who was located next or in the vicinity where she was talking?

MR. FOUR STAR: William Balbinot was standing next to her and Alfred was at the other end of the table and I was standing at the table that I worked at.

MR. TOAVS: And, the table you worked at was how far away from the table where Sissy Atkinson was located at the time?

MR. FOUR STAR: It was about twenty-five (25) feet.

MR. TOAVS: Now, describe for the Court what it was you heard Ms. Atkinson say?

MR. FOUR STAR: She said that she and a few other women had beaten Kim Nees up and that they did quite a number on her. And that Barry was, Mr. Beach was falsely charged. They got the wrong guy is what she said.

MR. TOAVS: Who was she saying this to?

MR. FOUR STAR: She was saying it to William Balbinot.

MR. TOAVS: Do you know William Balbinot?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah I do. I haven't seen him for quite some time, but I do know him.

go on would you say?

25

MR. FOUR STAR: Maybe five minutes.

MR. TOAVS: And then what happened?

MR. FOUR STAR: Well, I just went about my job and finished the day off.

MR. TOAVS: Was there any point in time when Sissy Atkinson made any statements to you?

MR. FOUR STAR: She didn't make it specifically at me, but she was walking down the table and she said that they got away with the perfect crime and I just asked her to stay away from me.

MR. TOAVS: During this incident were you able to gather any information about who else was involved in this crime?

MR. FOUR STAR: I didn't know any of the people that she had mentioned.

There were a couple of names mentioned, but I didn't know any of the people. I had never heard any last names; I only heard one or two first names.

MR. TOAVS: Can you remember any of them?

MR. FOUR STAR: I believe one of them was Maude and I don't recall any others right off hand.

MR. TOAVS: Do you remember giving a sworn declaration to an investigator from Centurion Ministries in February of Two thousand seven (2007) concerning this incident that happened at A&S Industries?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: Whose signature is that?

MR. FOUR STAR: It is mine.

MR. TOAVS: Is this a true and correct copy of the sworn statement that you gave on February 8, 2007, Mr. Four Star?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes it is.

MR. TOAVS: Your Honor I will move the admission of Exhibit Nine (9).

MS. PLUBELL: May we please see that copy? No objection Your Honor.

COURT: Admitted.

MR. TOAVS: Mr. Four Star, in reviewing paragraph number six on page one of Exhibit Nine, does reviewing that paragraph refresh your memory about the names that you heard Sissy Atkinson in connection with this statement about how she had been involved in the Kim Nees murder?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: What do you recall now?

MR. FOUR STAR: Well, I recall that she did mention Maude and Rose, but like I said I have no idea who these people were and I don't recall any other names that were mentioned.

MR. TOAVS: Do you know Barry Beach?

MR. FOUR STAR: No I don't.

MR. TOAVS: Did you know Barry Beach back ...

MR. TOAVS: You didn't know him back in Nineteen eighty-five (1985)? MR. TOAVS: And previous to that, you didn't know who he was either? MR. TOAVS: Do you know any of Mr. Beach's family? MR. TOAVS: Mr. Four Star, there is a question about if you were twenty feet away how could you hear Sissy Atkinson say something at A&S Tribal Industries. Are you aware of that question? MS. PLUBELL: Objection to the form of that question Your Honor. MR. TOAVS: I will withdraw the question. MR. TOAVS: Mr. Four Star, describe what was the noise level on this particular day in 1985 when you heard Sissy Atkinson make these statements? MR. FOUR STAR: At that time period the only thing that was of any level of noise was the radio that was played. There was no machinery back there. There MR. TOAVS: How loud was the radio playing?

wasn't so loud that it muted everybody out.

MR. TOAVS: In petitioners Exhibit Nine in paragraph four (4) you say that

MR. FOUR STAR: Loud enough that people could hear it, but I mean it

MR. TOAVS: In petitioners Exhibit Nine in paragraph four (4) you say that you heard the statement in the spring of 1984. Do you see that?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: Do you have an explanation for why you are now saying that it was in 1985?

MR. FOUR STAR: It was just before my daughter was born and she was born in August of 1985.

MR. TOAVS: So, this is a mistake?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah. It is a mistake.

MR. TOAVS: Now, following this conversation that you overhead between Sissy Atkinson and Stubby Balbinot, did you report what had been heard by you to law enforcement?

MR. FOUR STAR: No I didn't.

MR. TOAVS: Why didn't you?

MR. FOUR STAR: Well, I didn't really have much faith in law enforcement back then. For example, I went and filed a complaint over this incident that happened when I got jumped and nothing came out of that. So I don't have much faith with the Tribal Police. I didn't think anything would happen.

23

24

25

MR. TOAVS: Did you report what you had heard to anyone else besides the police? MR. FOUR STAR: I may have mentioned it to a minister, a priest at the church that I was attending. MR. TOAVS: And where was that? MR. FOUR STAR: That was at the Immaculate Conception Church in Wolf Point, Montana. MR. TOAVS: What was the context when you mentioned that to the ... MR. FOUR STAR: I had just mentioned that I had overheard something that had really bothered me. I didn't really get into much detail of what I had heard, just that I was troubled by it.

MR. TOAVS: How did it come about that you gave this sworn declaration to the investigator from Centurion Ministries?

MR. FOUR STAR: They came up to my mom's house; they were looking for William Balbinot and I had mentioned it to them what I had heard.

MR. TOAVS: And, do you remember who it was that you had mentioned, had told about the conversation? Do you remember who it was from Centurion Ministries?

MR. FOUR STAR: It was Richard Hepburn and I don't recall the other fellow's name.

MS. PLUBELL: I am sorry Your Honor, I didn't have it marked. I am sorry MS. PLUBELL: He would like to read it and we don't have an extra copy. MS. PLUBELL: Are you aware that there was also an incident report? Is it all right if I continue? I am sorry. Are you aware that there was also an incident report on this matter filled out by the Roosevelt County Sheriff's Office? MS. PLUBELL: Carl, I am handing you what has been marked as State's Exhibit Two (2). Can you please look at that for me? Can you identify that? MR. FOUR STAR: Yes. It is a statement that was filled out at the Fort MS. PLUBELL: What is the date on that statement?

COURT: Do you want to admit this exhibit?

MS. PLUBELL: Oh, I am sorry Your Honor. Yes. The State moves to admit State's Exhibit Two (2).

MR. TOAVS: Your Honor, if that is an attachment to a Court document that is going to be admitted, I would just as soon the whole document be admitted.

COURT: Any problem with that Ms. Plubell?

MS. PLUBELL: I don't think so. No. It was attached to this from the Fort Peck Tribe.

COURT: All right. Let's have the whole thing identified then and we will

MS. PLUBELL: I didn't believe he could identify the rest of it Your Honor.

COURT: What is to be gained by having these cover pages?

MR. TOAVS: Well Your Honor, the reason is the format of these documents is that the handwritten.... I admitted to practice in Tribal Court.... The handwritten portion is generally stapled on to the case report as an attachment.

There was some questioning about the date on which this statement was signed and I wanted to see what the file stamp date was on the document and it is different. I would request the document be submitted as a complete document.

COURT: All right. Any problems from the State?

MS. PLUBELL: No.

MS. PLUBELL: And that occurred back in, I believe you said two thousand (2000) or two thousand-one (2001) when you first met with Centurion Ministries, correct?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yeah. It was the first time that I met with them.

MS. PLUBELL: And, that was when they came to your mom's house and they were looking for Mr. Balbinot, right?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And so, you knew why they were there?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes. They told ...

MS. PLUBELL: You knew what they were doing?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: You met with their investigators and did you know that they were investigating their belief that Mr. Beach was innocent?

MR. FOUR STAR: They may have mentioned it.

MS. PLUBELL: So, that was really your opportunity, the perfect time to finally disclose all of the details of this conversation you overheard which had been troubling you since the spring of 1984 when you heard it, right?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: So you told Mr. Hepburn exactly what you heard?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes I did.

MR. FOUR STAR: It says it here, but I am not so sure that I was ... I am not so sure why her name was brought up. I don't recall it because I never heard Sissy say any last names when I heard her say all this.

MS. PLUBELL: So, you are denying that you said Grayhawk?

MR. FOUR STAR: No, I am not denying that. I am just saying that I don't recall why the name Grayhawk was brought up.

MS. PLUBELL: Do you recall what your testimony was back on June 13th of 2007, about whether it was Maude or Maude Grayhawk; back at the clemency hearing?

MR. FOUR STAR: No ma'am.

MS. PLUBELL: Didn't you testify that that it was just Maude at that point?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes ma'am, I may have.

MS. PLUBELL: So which is it you heard her say?

MR. FOUR STAR: I heard her say Maude; I don't recall ...

MS. PLUBELL: Not Maude Grayhawk.

MR. FOUR STAR: I don't recall her saying any last names and I don't know why I would have said Grayhawk here.

MS. PLUBELL: Would you explain a little bit again about where you worked at ... You said you did a number of jobs in the netting department of A&S Industries. What were those jobs?

MR. FOUR STAR: Screening. And what we would do as screening, we would repair the netting; we would fix all the holes in it. Another job that I did was thumbing, which was sewing the nets together with a needle and some string and I also hex cut.

MS. PLUBELL: What were you doing when you heard this particular statement Mr. Four Star?

MR. FOUR STAR: I was the hex cutter.

MS. PLUBELL: And is it now your position that you heard the statement in 1985?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And is there a reason you have changed the date?

MR. FOUR STAR: I mentioned earlier that it was right before my oldest daughter was born and she was born in August of 1985.

MS. PLUBELL: And when was it that you went to see the priest?

MR. FOUR STAR: I don't recall. It must have been sometime after that, 1986.

MS. PLUBELL: Do you recall testifying at the clemency hearing that you went and saw the priest in August of 1985?

MR. FOUR STAR: No ma'am, I don't recall.

25

MS. PLUBELL: One moment Your Honor. You don't recall testifying that you saw the priest before your daughter was born in August of 1985? MR. FOUR STAR: My daughter was born August 1st of 1985. Any statements made said; that I made where I said I went to see a priest in August of 1985 would have obviously been sometime after August 1st. MS. PLUBELL: And, do you recall testifying that your wife, your girlfriend was pregnant at the time you went and saw the priest? MR. FOUR STAR: No, I don't recall. MS. PLUBELL: And, you indicated at the clemency hearing that Sissy made the statement three months before that, right? MR. FOUR STAR: I don't recall specifying any date that Sissy made the statement. MS. PLUBELL: Except in your original statement to Centurion Ministries? MR. FOUR STAR: I am looking at it here. I don't see a date on there anywhere. MS. PLUBELL: Does it say spring of 1984? MR. FOUR STAR: Yes it says 1984. COURT: Just a minute. Your question was, does it say spring of 1984. Does it say spring of 1984 or does it just say 1984?

MR. FOUR STAR: It says 1984. It doesn't say spring or anything else.

MS. PLUBELL: I am sorry. Your Honor, may I approach and look at that because my copy says spring.

COURT: Sure.

MR. FOUR STAR: I was looking at paragraph thirty (30). Okay, it does say spring.

MS. PLUBELL: And, are you aware ... You also indicated that Mr.

Lawrence Red Eagle was right there when ... Next to you when Sissy made that statement, correct?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Are you aware that Mr. Red Eagle didn't work there in the spring of 1984?

MR. TOAVS: Objection Your Honor. That question assumes facts that are not into evidence.

MS. PLUBELL: Would you disagree with employment ... I am sorry Your Honor.

COURT: Sustained.

MS. PLUBELL: If there were employment records from A&S Industries that establish that Mr. Red Eagle did not work there in the spring of 1984, would you disagree with that?

MR. TOAVS: Same objection.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. Would you agree that what you said you heard in the spring of 1984 you couldn't have heard at that time since Mr. Four Star, or you couldn't have heard it when Mr. Red Eagle was there, correct?

MR. TOAVS: Again Your Honor, I object that assumes facts that are not into evidence.

COURT: Well, and I am confused myself about the nature of the question.

MS. PLUBELL: I will withdraw the question. If the employment records from A&S Industries showed that Stubby Balbinot didn't work at A&S Industries in 1984 would you have any reason to dispute that?

MR. FOUR STAR: No I wouldn't.

COURT: Do they show that he worked in 1985?

MS. PLUBELL: I have to review the records Your Honor. I am sorry. But, we know that you couldn't have heard in the spring of 1984 if Stubby didn't work there; you couldn't have heard the statement then, correct?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes ma'am.

MR. TOAVS: Objection. That has been asked and answered.

COURT: I am sorry.

MR. TOAVS: I object that the question is asked and answered.

COURT: Well, I think overruled. I am not sure if we got an answer or not.

MR. FOUR STAR: Kim Nees name is not in this statement. I don't see it.

Just Mr. Beach's name is.

MS. PLUBELL: And, you also testified at the clemency hearing, well actually, you just testified a little while ago that she also gestured with kicking motions correct?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: As if she was kicking someone when she was making this statement.

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Do you recall testifying at the clemency hearing that actually what the gestures were was her bending over someone sitting, gesturing that she was hitting someone?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes I recall that.

MS. PLUBELL: And now today ...

MR. FOUR STAR: No. I am not making any changes. She made several gestures. Kicking was one of them and it looked like she was striking somebody.

MS. PLUBELL: All right. And none of those that the reference to her making gestures appears in that written statement that you signed to Centurion Ministries does it?

MR. FOUR STAR: No it doesn't.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor. We have just a request that Your Honor take judicial notice of the date when Barry Beach's appeal was decided by the Montana Supreme Court. The date is referenced in pleadings. It is a matter of record in this case and we think it is proper subject for judicial notice.

COURT: For what purpose? Not that it wouldn't be appropriate anyway, but what purpose?

MR. TOAVS: The purpose is, Your Honor, to establish the date of when the appeal was decided in reference to the discussion that was subject to some cross-examination by Ms. Plubell.

COURT: Well, it is certainly part of the procedural record that the Court would have to include as its factual basis, so I will take notice of that.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor.

MS. PLUBELL: I would just ask that you also take judicial notice that he was convicted in the spring of 1984 on April 13, 1984 and was sentenced in May of 1984.

COURT: You bet.

MR. TOAVS: And, the date for decision of Mr. Beach's appeal was July 25, 1985. And, that is contained in the file as well as in the State's Response and Opposition to Motion to Substitute Judge at page forty-five (45) .

In any event Mr. Four Star, Ms. Plubell asked you a lot of questions about dates, do you remember that?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: Now, when you were working at A&S Industries during this time frame when you heard Ms. Atkinson's statements, were you keeping track of what date it was?

MR. FOUR STAR: No I wasn't.

MR. TOAVS: Were you writing this down on a calendar or keeping any other form of record to remember what the date was later?

MR. FOUR STAR: No I wasn't keeping any records of it.

MR. TOAVS: And when you completed your statement for Centurion Ministries, how did you come up with initially, the spring of 1984?

MR. FOUR STAR: It was just a general date that I came up with, a general year. I don't recall anything specific.

MR. TOAVS: Excuse me. I don't mean to cut you off, but since you gave your statement to Centurion Ministries, Ms. Plubell indicated that you had undergone questioning by the Montana Attorney General's office.

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes.

MR. TOAVS: And did you voluntarily submit to that interview?

MR. FOUR STAR: Yes I did.

24

25

MR. TOAVS: Why is that significant to you, the birthdate for your daughter in relation to the date when this statement was made Mr. Four Star? MR. FOUR STAR: Well, it was the biggest thing that took place in my life at that time. MR. TOAVS: Do you remember having that date in mind as in reference to having heard these statements by Sissy Atkinson? MR. FOUR STAR: I recall it being approximately around that date. Like I said earlier, I did not write anything down on the calendar or make any other sort of notes about it. MR. TOAVS: May I have the exhibit? May I approach the witness Your Honor? COURT: You may. MR. TOAVS: Mr. Four Star, let me hand you State's Exhibit Number two (#2). Do you have that? MR. FOUR STAR: Yes. MR. TOAVS: Okay now, you were asked some questions about the last

MR. TOAVS: Okay now, you were asked some questions about the last page of State's Exhibit Two. Could I ask you to turn to the third page please? Do you see that?

MR. FOUR STAR: I see the third page, yes.

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

COURT: Oh yes. That's not good. Oh maybe it is good. This thing just

we are talking about ...

(RECESS)

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. Let's have breakfast.

got a lot more efficient didn't it? We got it all solved folks.

COURT: Any objection from the State?

MR. FOUR STAR: Thank you Your Honor.

COURT: You are good to go. Thank you very much.

COURT: All right. Let's take a brief recess please.

MS. PLUBELL: No objection.

CLERK: All rise please.

COURT: All right. If I am understanding correctly, I believe we are at the spot where I want to initiate again this colloquy between Court and counsel about the amended petition and exhibits and witnesses that are being related to in the petition. Are we at that point from your perspective Mr. Camiel?

COURT: Please be seated. Okay. Now I believe we are at the point where

MR. CAMIEL: I am sorry Your Honor. We are missing State's counsel.

MR. CAMIEL: We are Your Honor. We have called or presented prior testimony of all the witnesses that we are allowed to call that are named in the original petition.

54

COURT: Okay. Speaking of which; give me one minute. I got some documents this morning. Okay, what I have here were on my desk this morning is a transcript of what appears to be Mr. Atkinson, J.D, and Ms. Vonnie Rae Brown and Roberta Louise Ryan. I do not see any exhibits attached which I know the State had some concern about. What I would like to do is I would like to give these to the State and see if these are accurate representation of what you want the Court to review.

MS. PLUBELL: May I approach?

COURT: Yes. Let me just give her a minute or two to look these over and then we will launch into the post, or the amended petition issues.

MR. TOAVS: Your Honor, may we be heard?

COURT: Let's let them review these documents first just so they can pay attention when we are discussing things. Does that look like the full Monty?

MS. PLUBELL: Yes, aside from the exhibit.

COURT: Okay. Could we get that exhibit and could you review that with the State so that I make sure that I have that?

MR. CAMIEL: We are trying to locate a copy of it. Counsel had a copy, but it was in Volume One (1) and it was not copied and so we are trying to get a complete copy.

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

COURT: State's response please.

MS. PLUBELL: Well, Your Honor ...

COURT: Okay. All right. So, that is a good step forward. Now Mr. Toavs, you had some concern?

MR. TOAVS: Right Your Honor. Thank you. Before Your Honor takes argument concerning amendment to the petition, there is one more matter that we would like to raise and that is yesterday Your Honor did not allow us to present evidence of Dr. Richard Leo who is the false confession analyst, and didn't agree with our arguments concerning that should be heard as a result of the Fifth Clark factor. Your Honor, last evening I spent some time reviewing our original petition and at this point we would request that Your Honor consider hearing Dr. Leo's testimony. How it was presented in the original petition was that he was a witness that would testify concerning the ineffective assistance of counsel claim. One of the claims, one of the procedural claims, that is presently time-barred that we had argued in our petition, is that part of what defense counsel should have done was done a better job of highlighting for the jury the differences between the confession and the known facts of the crime scene. At this point Your Honor, we would like to make an offer to call Dr. Leo to testify, not under the same theory that we proposed yesterday, but under the theory that his testimony would be relevant for your consideration of the ineffective assistance claim if you get to that point.

COURT: You can make him do it.

MR. LIGHT: What's new?

MS. PLUBELL: For point of clarification, Richard Leo does not appear in the verified petition. They referenced some information from Mr. Leo in their memorandum, but he is no- where in the verified petition as listed as a witness.

And ...

COURT: Well, that is a concern Mr. Toavs. I thought you just said he was.

MR. TOAVS: No. His analysis is contained in the amended petition under the category of procedural defects at trial. Mr. Leo is listed as a witness to be called in our prehearing memorandum that was filed where Your Honor required that we identify our witnesses. Richard Leo is listed as a witness in the prehearing memorandum where we were asked to identify our witnesses, He is one of them.

COURT: But, he is not in the petition?

MR. TOAVS: Well, he is not new evidence Your Honor. He is not listed as a witness that would present new evidence and I think we have covered that ground yesterday.

COURT: Well, I am confused. How is this different than what I ruled on yesterday?

MR. TOAVS: Well, yesterday we were talking about Dr. Richard Leo along with two other witnesses to testify about what evidence would look like at a new

COURT: So, it is all record based except.

MR. CAMIEL: That is true.

trial. And, through the context of that discussion I did not realize yesterday, Your Honor, that how he is presented and he also has relevance in Your Honor's consideration of the ineffective assistance of counsel claim that is in the original petition. He, like I said, is listed as a witness in our prehearing memorandum. He testified at the clemency hearing. He has got a report. All of that information has been supplied to the State's attorneys' office. He was subject to cross examination then. He is not a surprise witness Your Honor.

COURT: Yesterday the petitioner argued to the Court that the procedural constitutional innocence issue was a matter of record that the Court would evaluate once we got through the gateway of the actual innocence. Do I remember that wrong?

MR. CAMIEL: No Your Honor. You remember correctly and as we rethought this last night we realized that Mr. Leo's testimony was also relevant. When I was addressing Court, I was focusing on prosecutorial misconduct errors that we claimed and hadn't contemplated what we hadn't actually laid out in our actual petition as we rethought about this last night. As Mr. Toavs indicated, we believe that his testimony is relevant to the issue of ineffective assistance of counsel with regard to how the confession was handled at trial.

MR. LIGHT: The only problem with that Your Honor is if we are going to get to the stage, and I think you went there with your last order, we are going to get to the stage where we are going to start arguing those constitutional claims then we don't want to do that right now. We are not prepared for that. That is why we talked about a continuance for that. That's when we want to get an order to talk about Timer. That's when we want to possibly get another expert on false confessions. That's when we want to have Mr. Racicot here. Is simply because, you know, we need an opportunity and that should be allowed to us especially in relation to Mr. Moses. Plus, quite frankly, we relied on what you said yesterday Your Honor and thought that Leo was off the table. Now, at the last minute they want to put him back on the table and quite frankly, they want to bring him through the back door. We relied on the Court's decision yesterday.

COURT: Well, I don't know if there is any prejudice overnight. Well, what is persuasive to the Court is the State's concern about the need to be prepared for a hearing that we deal with constitutional procedural innocence. And so, I am not going to allow this testimony at this time. What then remains is whether the Court would schedule a hearing based solely on constitutional procedural innocence. Frankly, I am a little reluctant because the petitioner basically told the Court it is all procedural and now we have one exception and it seems like it is an inappropriate use of judicial resources of a wrongheaded way to tackle the remand

situation, but I haven't made a decision yet. We will have to kind of put that into the hopper, as they say in the legislature, and see how this unfolds before the end and then take that up finally and make a decision.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor.

COURT: All right. Now, with regard ...

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor I am sorry, but just for clarification where does that leave us for Mr. Leo?

COURT: He is not going to testify. At least today, or in this proceeding.

MS. PLUBELL: Thank you Your Honor.

COURT: If he does testify, it would be at another proceeding where the State has an opportunity to do what they think they need to do.

MS. PLUBELL: Thank you Your Honor.

COURT: All right. Now, with regard to the amended petition. Counsel gave me a reasonable stab I believe yesterday, at the due diligence argument which is the Court's chief concern from the Clark factors. What I would like to do is just revisit that; just assume that the Court would like basically a rehearing on those arguments to make sure that I have them all in hand and don't get them confused with what has come before. So, let's start there and then we may have to move on to some of the other Clark factors. But, all right. Mr. Camiel.

MR. CAMIEL: You would like me to start with our due diligence with regard to the amended petition witnesses?

COURT: Correct.

MR. CAMIEL: Thank you.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, just for a point of clarification. I wasn't sure if you would go through all the witnesses or if there are some left out.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, I will list all of the witnesses that we would intend to call and make argument with regard to each witness as to the due diligence factor that I think the Court is interested in.

Your Honor, the first witness that we would call is a woman named Stephanie Eagle Boy who is from Poplar, Montana. Ms. Eagle Boy grew up in Montana. She was raised by her grandparents and her aunt who had a home on the bluff above the train bridge park where the Kim Nees murder occurred. She would testify that in the summer of 1979 when she was 10-years-old, it was very common for her and her cousin to go sit on the bluff near a big rock which sits on the edge of the bluff and listen to the teenagers and young adults who would come down into the park and party at night. In the summer they would go down there and her aunt would let them stay out pretty late and they could tell when it was bar closing time because they could see all the cars come down into the park after the bars closed. On the night of Kim Nees murder, Ms. Eagle Boy was sitting out there

23

24

25

with her cousin who is now deceased and she would testify that while sitting there she saw two pickup trucks drive into the park and stop. She was, because of the darkness, not able to particularly see in detail the people that were there, but she could tell from the lights and the silhouettes that these were two pickup trucks. She then heard low voices and eventually screaming and she would be very specific about the screaming that she heard about, 'get her, hit her, kick her', and some profanity used. She also heard a woman pleading for help and for people to stop. They heard this for several minutes and then it became quiet. Shortly after that, as she and her cousin were sitting on this bluff they saw a police car with its lights on drive down into the park over to where these trucks were parked. She could hear some, what sounded like some discussion, but couldn't make out any words. Now, all of the voices that she will testify that she heard during the yelling and screaming and pleading were all female voices. She then saw one of the trucks pull forward around closer to the area of, actually closer to her. She will testify that the truck again stopped, people got out. She heard clinking sounds and what sounded to her like digging. After a period of moments the truck took off and left. She and her cousin weren't sure what they heard at that point and time. Eventually they were called in. The next day her aunt would not let them go over by the hillside. There was a lot of activity down in the park. There was police activity and her aunt kept them away from there. She and her cousin never told anyone

21

22

23

24

25

what they had seen. They talked about it amongst each other, but didn't tell anyone about what they had seen and she lived with this. She will testify that it has bothered her and she had nightmares about it, but didn't trust anyone enough to go tell them. She will testify that in, I think it was in 2008, she, like a lot of the residents in the Wolf Point and the Poplar area watched the Dateline television program. When she watched that she realized she needed to tell someone. She searched around and found out there was a telephone line, essentially a tip line, and she called that line and left her contact information. Now, she didn't do that until after the petitioner had already filed his original January 18, 2008 petition. Shortly after she left her information, she was contacted by an investigator from Centurion Ministries. They talked to her on the phone initially and then she was visited. She actually took the investigators out to the area where she observed this and she gave a statement that we have produced as an exhibit which is dated July 27, 2010. There was no way at the time that we filed the January 18, 2008 petition to know that she even existed, let alone what she had seen. Once we got the remand from the State Supreme Court and were allowed a new hearing, we got a statement from her and she was listed in the amended petition as one of our amended petition witnesses.

The second witness ...

COURT: I tell you what. I think it would be better, because these may vary, each individual may vary based on the dates and the timing and stuff, let's just take them individually. I think the Court will rule on them individually. Rather than ... And then maybe take a look at the whole amended petition as a whole. All right. Let's hear the State's perspective on this particular individual with regard to ... Now there is a statutory right to amend. The Court has the factors, the Clark factors. Due diligence is obviously a key one, but there are other ones of course. So, what is the State's perspective?

MR. LIGHT: Well, obviously Your Honor we are concerned that this has come to light thirty (30) years after the fact. The court admitted some testimony from one of our witnesses about how the area was combed and people were asked if they knew anything about it and this arises up at the last minute. So, we are not sure why this was not discovered earlier and clearly we will be presenting some reliability questions as well. Whether or not this, in fact, is even reliable testimony and whether or not the Court should look at Clark, all of the Clark issues; whether or not Court should accept this. As far as due diligence we don't have any doubt that they just got it when they said they did, but clearly there is some questions we will have as to why they didn't come forward earlier Your Honor.

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

COURT: All right. With regard to this individual the Court is going to tentatively rule that the due diligence factor is satisfied. Does the State have any argument about the other factors, cumulative, etc.

MR. LIGHT: One thing I would like to mention Your Honor, before we move on, if in fact the Court is going to allow this testimony, that is fine Your Honor. But, we would like to have a brief opportunity to speak with her. We have never had an opportunity to interview her. It wouldn't take very long, but we would like to do that before she is allowed to take the stand.

COURT: Absolutely. But, the State still does object?

MR. LIGHT: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Yes.

COURT: It is just that if the Court rules, you are just being courteous.

MR. LIGHT: That is correct.

COURT: All right. Next one.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the next witness we call is a gentleman named Kevin Hall. Mr. Hall gave us a statement July 25, 2010. Mr. Hall is a resident of Great Falls. His testimony would ... The subject of his testimony would be statements that Sissy Atkinson made to him while she was living in Great Falls and he was living in Great Falls. There was never any testimony offered at trial about any statements made by Sissy Atkinson or Maude Grayhawk or JoAnn Jackson or

22

23

24

25

any other female regarding any involvement, participation or presence at the Kim Nees murder. So, this would not be either impeaching or cumulative to anything that was offered at trial. It is certainly material in that Mr. Hall will testify that he had a relationship with Sissy Atkinson and her then boyfriend, a man named Les Wright. It was a relationship that involved drug use. They were both involved in using drugs in the Great Falls area and that they frequently visited each other and used drugs together. Les Wright, Sissy Atkinson's boyfriend, was arrested on a criminal charge and was in the jail in Great Falls where he committed suicide. Following his suicide, Sissy Atkinson came over to the Hall's residence and was very despondent and she said that this was bad karma that she felt; that she felt responsible for Les Wright's death and she blamed her bad fortune on what she had been involved in earlier in her life. She described that she and some other girls beat a girl with a tire tool and rolled her into the river. She brought this up on more than one occasion. How we first learned of Kevin Hall because after the Dateline program he contacted the Great Falls Tribune and spoke to a Great Falls Tribune reporter. It was through that that we learned of Mr. Hall's existence. The Dateline program aired after we had filed our petition. I think it aired in April of 2008. We filed the original petition in January of 2008. So, we had no ability to know anything about Mr. Hall prior to filing the original petition. We contacted

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

Mr. Hall, talked to him, and once the Supreme Court remanded for a hearing we got a statement from Mr. Hall and named him in our Proposed Amended Petition.

COURT: State's response please.

MR. LIGHT: Well Your Honor, we certainly think that the Court will find that this is cumulative. We think the Court will find it is not reliable when we have an opportunity for cross examination and for lack of cooperation. I think as far as due diligence, we don't have an argument. I have to mention Your Honor, I find it somewhat unusual they talk about filing their petition in January 2008 because they were not aware that they could only proceed until the fundamental miscarriage of justice thus they couldn't include all these witnesses. But, two months later they get our reply that tells them that. Then they wait two and a half years until November of 2010 to do their, to file their amended petition. I just think there should be ... You talk about due diligence. That is surprising and I think a lot of these witnesses could have been included in that. But, as far as this particular witness Your Honor, if they indicate that they just found out in July of 2010, then I understand as far as due diligence is concerned. But, I do think the Court will subsequently find it cumulative, not reliable and a lack of cooperation. So, if the Court is going to accept it, I would ask that it be accepted tentatively at this time Your Honor.

COURT: Yeah good points. You know, Mr. Light raises an argument that we sort of touched on yesterday about this one year, five year deadline. I need to hear from counsel why that just wasn't poor lawyering frankly.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, at the time that we filed Mr. Beach's petition, we included all the evidence we had. This case had been investigated for quite some time. That investigation led to the hearing in front of the parole board. Following the denial we continued to collect evidence and then file the petition. There is always a dilemma in doing post-conviction work as to do you keep investigating and hoping that you are gonna eventually find something new before you file or do you file based on what you have? Mr. Beach was in his situation in terms of what statute applied. It was not clear to us. It may not have been clear to us because of poor lawyering but ...

COURT: I didn't mean that ...

MR. CAMIEL: No, I understand. We were confused. At the time Mr. Beach was first convicted the statute in place didn't even have an exception for newly discovered evidence, but there was a five year statute of limitations for filing motions for new trial without that written exception. Over the years that has changed. There has been litigation about when the time limit applies to somebody who was previously convicted. At the time that we filed the petition we were fearful that we might be held to the one year statute of limitations. And, if we were

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and we missed it, that would also be poor lawyering, because all this evidence that we developed you couldn't use.

COURT: Agreed.

MR. CAMIEL: So, we went forward at the last possible time. I would also just point out that then we had the State Supreme Court consider the case for fourteen months. Their decision didn't come down until November 24, 2009. So, during that time period rather than just sitting and waiting for the decision, when we learned about potential new witnesses, we went out and we interviewed them and we followed up. When the decision came down we were granted a new hearing and our belief was that based on statute that allows one amendment as long as it is made thirty (30) days before the hearing, that we would file an amended petition. But, we didn't want to do that right away because we were concerned, we only get one shot at an amended petition and we wanted to make sure we have all of the witnesses we can possibly find before we do that. If the Court recalls we filed the Motion for Discovery indicating that we intended to amend, but we wanted to see if the discovery would lead to anything before we did that so that we wouldn't be shut out of those additional witnesses that we might find.

COURT: Then, the Court didn't allow you to do that.

MR. CAMIEL: That is true. So we then, in October, had the hearing with the Court; the phone conference at which time the Court told us to file a Proposed

Amended Petition which we did. So, we have tried to be as diligent as we can and at the same time continue our investigation and take advantage of what we believe the statute allowed us to do which was a one-time amendment thirty days prior to hearing. Now, with regard to the argument of cumulativeness, I think that counsel is interpreting that Clark factor differently than we do. I don't think that the Supreme Court is saying that the evidence can't be cumulative. It is talking about new evidence being cumulative to other new evidence. They are talking about, is it cumulative to something that was already presented at trial. And, there was never any evidence presented at trial that other people were down there or participating in the crime.

COURT: Do you have any legal citation to support that position?

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, I think we covered it in our brief, but it seems to me that it is also logical that if there was already evidence presented on a subject at trial, for example, if you had an alibi witness that you presented at trial and then sometime down the road you found another alibi witness, that would be cumulative. But, if there was never an alibi witness presented at trial and you could get over the other Clark factor hurdles and you came up with an alibi witness, then it wouldn't be cumulative to anything at trial. The other comment I want to make on this whole cumulative argument is one of the things the Court has to consider, is the circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. If Ms. Atkinson is

making statements to a whole group of different people that are similar statements that makes it more reliable than if there was only one person coming into Court claiming she made the statement. And so, we think that the Court needs to consider all the different people she made the statements to in its analysis. So, we don't think that the cumulative argument is being interpreted correctly by the State.

COURT: All right. With regard to the diligence concern of the Court, the Court is going to tentatively grant this witness. All right. Next one.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the next witness that we would call is a gentleman named John Strom. S-t-r-o-m. Mr. Strom is also, or was, a Great Falls resident who, like Mr. Hall met and was in a relationship with Sissy Atkinson that involved drug dealing and drug use. He would testify that he would visit her apartment; she lived near where he lived, and that on an occasion when he was visiting her and they were using, they were all using drugs, she began describing an incident from Poplar, Montana, when she was younger. She described it as happening on the edge of town. She mentioned that the wrong guy was in prison. She said things like "we committed the perfect murder". In her account she said that there were girls fighting and chasing a girl around a truck with a tire tool. She said that she passed out at one point. Now, she didn't tell Mr. Strom that she directly participated in beating this girl. She says that she was there, she passed out and when she woke up the girl was dead. She said that during this same

3

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

conversation Sissy Atkinson was bragging that she had scared a co-worker at a factory where she worked with this story. Mr. Strom, also like Mr. Hall, and many others saw the Dateline program and there were two things that he saw during the program that triggered his recollection of this. When he heard Carl Four Star's testimony and his interview when they also showed part of his clemency board testimony and he also observed J.D. Atkinson, it struck him that is exactly what she had told him. Now, at the time she told it to him he didn't credit it as being anymore than some kind of puffing or bragging. But, when he heard others had received the same story and found out that there really was a murder in Poplar, Montana, under the circumstances that she had described, he contacted a television station in the Great Falls area. Initially he wanted to keep his identity a secret. They interviewed him. I believe the reporter who interviewed him asked for his permission to contact Centurion Ministries to let them know that there was this additional witness who had information and that is how we got to him, but again, it was after the Dateline airing in April of 2008. He gave us a statement I believe in July of 2010 after the Supreme Court remand.

COURT: Mr. Light?

MR. LIGHT: Well, Your Honor we don't have a problem with the due diligence. We do believe that after the Court hears the cross, Court will have a problem with the reliability, with the cooperation and that this is nothing more for

11 12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

revenge against Sissy Atkinson so, we would ask the Court to again take this tentatively and decide later based on the entire testimony.

COURT: Agreed. All right. I agree with regard to due diligence and this witness so tentatively, we will allow this one. Next.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor the next witness that we would call is a gentleman named Michael McIntire. Now, Mr. McIntire was a neighbor that lived in an apartment right next door to Sissy Atkinson in Great Falls in the years between two thousand two (2002) and two thousand five (2005). I think she was actually his neighbor in two thousand four (2004) and 2005. He had a daughter that he was raising at the time by himself. He became concerned because there was a lot of drug activity taking place at her apartment. He was fearful about the safety of his daughter. People were coming by at all hours and he eventually confronted her after there was an altercation outside her apartment where somebody was waving a gun around. He would testify that he approached her. He told her this has to stop; take it elsewhere and he threatened to call the police. She told him you don't know who you are dealing with. I already killed a girl up on the reservation and I'm not afraid to kill you. Now, he ignored what she said. He thought she was just blowing off steam. He actually left the State and was living in Maryland, but would read the local paper, the Great Falls Tribune on line. He read about the hearing at the parole board concerning the Kim Nees murder and he saw

9

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

that Sissy Atkinson's name was mentioned and he realized that that statement that she made wasn't just puffing or blowing off steam and that this was serious. He will testify that he contacted the Great Falls police about the statement that Sissy Atkinson had made to him and talked to a police officer there, but the police officer appeared to have no interest, indicating that as far as he was concerned the case had already been solved. In two thousand nine (2009) he read again about the story in the Great Falls Tribune and contacted John Adams, one of the Great Falls Tribune reporters. He gave a statement to John Adams and that lead to us learning of his existence and contacting him, and we got a statement from him in July of 2010. I don't think there is any question that the statement that he received from Ms. Atkinson that she killed a girl up on the reservation is against her interest. I don't think there should be any question that this is not cumulative to anything presented at trial. It certainly is material, and is the sole issue at trial, who killed Kim Nees and we used as much due diligence as we possibly could in getting this witness and getting a statement from him.

COURT: Mr. Light?

MR. LIGHT: Well, same thing Your Honor. We don't have a problem with due diligence. We would ask that you tentatively allow it subject to cross examination and examination of the other Clark factors.

COURT: All right. Agreed. Next witness.

6

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the next witness is a woman named Billie Marie Smith and she is a Missoula, Montana, resident. She worked for many years at a nursing home in Missoula, Hunter's Glen, as a Certified Nursing Assistant. She worked there from 2003 to August of 2008. One of her co-workers who was a Certified Nursing Assistant was a woman named JoAnn Todd. JoAnn Todd is also known as JoAnn Jackson. She is a former Poplar, Montana, Wolf Point area resident. She will testify that during a cigarette break she was outside with JoAnn Todd and JoAnn Todd began talking about her teenage years back up on the reservation. She indicated that she was present when a group of girls took another girl down by the water and beat her severely and things got out of hand and the girl died. JoAnn Todd told her that while she was present these girls dragged her out of the pickup truck. JoAnn Todd told her that she didn't participate in the assault or the beating, but she was present when it happened. She also said that the reason that this happened was over jealousy. She didn't mention any boys or males being present when it happened. Now, JoAnn Todd talked about this on two occasions to Billie Smith. On one of the occasions, another co-worker, a woman named Susan Mohler was present. Billie Smith has never lived in Roosevelt County, doesn't know any of the people involved and when she first heard the story she didn't know anything about the Kim Nees murder. In April of 2008, before April of 2008 and the airing of Dateline, JoAnn Todd had left the employment of Hunter's Glen.

23

24

25

Billie Smith continued to work there with her co-worker Susan Mohler. When Dateline first aired she didn't see it. But, when she came to work one day she was told about the show, told that one of her former co-workers, JoAnn Todd, was on the show and she watched the show and saw the interview of JoAnn Todd and realized that this conversation she had during a cigarette break with JoAnn Todd was directly related to what the murder case and what this show was about. Billie Smith didn't want to come forward at all. She heard this, but she was frightened by what she heard. She told her husband and that is the only person that she told. Her husband however, told a friend of his. That friend called me and although she wasn't happy about it, Billie Smith got a call from Centurion Ministries and ultimately agreed to meet and be interviewed and gave a statement in July of 2010. Again, this is discovered after trial. We believe due diligence was shown as there was no way to know of her existence prior to her husband's friend coming forward and contacting us. It is directly material in that JoAnn Todd is placing herself down at a murder and I would point out that she has always denied that she was ever down there. But, she placed herself down at the scene of a murder and gave a very detailed description of what happened. So, even though she doesn't say that she participated, she has disclosed herself to criminal liability by being with this group of girls who participated in this murder. It is certainly material in that respect. It is also a statement against interest and I suggest should be admitted

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

under the same parameters as the Sissy Atkinson testimony. Now, JoAnn Todd is not unavailable. She is under subpoena. She is here just as with Sissy Atkinson. So, she is available to the State if they wish to call her. This gets into the same hearsay argument that I anticipate the State will make. But, we would ask the Court, using the same guidelines and the same evidentiary rule, to find that her statement has sufficient guarantees of trustworthiness, and the reason I say that is, this was a spontaneous statement by JoAnn Todd to a co-worker who had no.....; this is a disinterested co-worker just having a cigarette break with her. There was another party Susan Mohler, who we didn't list in our petition, but she is here because she was present at one of the times that JoAnn Todd talked about her and she would be the last witness that we would seek to call. But, I will stick with Billie Smith for the moment. We believe that all of the Clark factors are met with her and she would be allowed to testify.

COURT: Mr. Light?

MS. PLUBELL: I think our position is more or less the same with respect to diligence. We don't have doubt about when Mr. Camiel came across the information. But, just as a point of clarification I think it is important to reflect that JoAnn Jackson was actually called to testify at Mr. Beach's trial. I think it is also important for historical purposes to be aware that Mr. Beach has claimed that right after the homicide, he was with JoAnn Jackson and Kaleb Gornot and it

the homicide. They chose not to present that at trial and I just also would like to note that all of these witnesses apparently came forward after watching Dateline.

COURT: Don't you love television? All right. Well, with regard to the due diligence the Court will find that petitioner has satisfied that part of the Clark

necklace and so there have been accusations against her since apparently right after

appeared that she had been in a fight and that she might have had Kim Nees

factor. Obviously the other factors will have to be determined after testimony, but that witness would be acceptable. Next witness.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor the next witness that we would seek to call is Susan Mohler. Now, she wasn't named in our amended petition and we wouldn't be calling her because she wasn't named in our amended petition; we wouldn't be able to call her as a new witness, but we would call her as evidence of a circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness because she was present with Billie Smith. Susan Mohler was also a Certified Nursing Assistant at the same Hunter's Glen Nursing Home in Missoula and she was present during one of the occasions where JoAnn Todd talked about this event and she heard things very similar to Billie Smith, that is that JoAnn Todd was describing being present when this girl was beaten. I would point out that there is no surprise to the State in terms of calling Susan Mohler. She is listed in our prehearing memorandum and so the State certainly has known about her for quite some time.

COURT: All right. The State's perspective? If it is just the same you can repeat that.

MR. LIGHT: Yeah, it is the same Your Honor. I guess I am a little puzzled why it wasn't in the amended petition and it wasn't and it sounds like they are calling her to simply support the prior witness and I am not sure if that is appropriate until after she has been challenged.

MR. CAMIEL: I can tell the Court why she wasn't in the amended petition is because when we contacted her she didn't want to talk to us and when we prepared the Proposed Amended Petition at that time, because she was fearful of getting involved, she declined to give us a statement. Without a statement, which is required, a sworn statement as part of the amended petition, we couldn't include her. By the time of the prehearing memorandum she had finally decided to give us a statement and so we named her in the prehearing memorandum.

MR. LIGHT: But, they are calling her simply for cumulative, it is cumulative Your Honor if it is exactly ... If they are gonna say well, yeah, that is what she said, then that is cumulative and I don't understand how it is relevant to this hearing.

COURT: All right. Well, I think we could take that up as we get to that particular witness. With regard to diligence, I will rule that petitioner has met his obligation for that particular factor of Clark. Whether the Court would allow that

particular testimony will remain to be seen. All right. We are still dealing with whether I am going to grant the amended petition. Go ahead Mr. Light.

MR. LIGHT: One thing. If you do grant the amended petition Your Honor, I mean, obviously we are going to want a continuing objection to the hearsay.

COURT: I don't grant continuing exceptions.

MR. LIGHT: Okay. We will be glad to make it.

COURT: Here is the problem. If I grant a continuing exception, how do I know to what it applies? How does the reviewing Court know to what it applies?

MR. LIGHT: Well, that is fine Your Honor.

COURT: And, I don't have any problem with you all popping up and down because I think it is better to rule on each and every particular than it is to open up a can of worms that the review Court says, "What was going on there?"

MR. LIGHT: Well, this is my point and maybe we can still accomplish this Your Honor was, you know, obviously they are going to say, which they have said for two days now, that these are statements against interest. And, you have heard us repeatedly indicate that if it is being offered to exculpate then they have; then it is only admissible if there is corroborating circumstances which clearly indicate the trustworthiness of the statement. All I am saying is upon cross examination, if you, at the end find that it is no longer trustworthy, then I am going to object at that time and ask that that be stricken. That is all that I am advising the Court.

COURT: Agreed. Absolutely. Because, that would be within the Clark factors.

MR. LIGHT: Yes.

COURT: And, the Court gave specific instructions about what to be accepted or not accepted based on those factors so, you betcha. All right. Any other witnesses for purpose of the amended petition?

MR. CAMIEL: No Your Honor.

COURT: All right. Based on the fact that the statutes do allow amendment of the petition, based on the Court's determination this morning that there was due diligence with regard to each and every one of the witnesses, the Court is going to grant the filing of the amended petition. The Court is going to allow the petitioner to proceed with these witnesses and the appropriate exhibits, subject to objections and subject to the Court applying the Clark factors to these witnesses, just as it would to the witnesses in the original petition. All right. Any concerns from the State at this perspective?

MR. LIGHT: No Your Honor.

COURT: Ms. Plubell I see a concern.

MS. PLUBELL: Well sorry, but the wheels are turning. My only concern is based upon the ... I want to make sure that I make record of any objection and based upon allowing in the testimony from the clemency hearing of the deceased

witnesses. At that particular hearing of course, the Clark factors were not at issue. That was nowhere on the table. So, we want to, of course, be able to argue that some of those factors have not been allowed.

COURT: On the witnesses that I have those transcripts of?

MS. PLUBELL: Exactly.

COURT: How would you propose we do that?

MS. PLUBELL: Well, I guess you would have to read the testimony Your Honor, the direct and the cross. But with respect ...

COURT: But you are asking me that you want to weigh in on how the Clark factors apply so it wouldn't be fair for the Court to not give you an opportunity to do that, but how would we shape that opportunity?

MS. PLUBELL: As long as we have the opportunity, we don't care how it is shaped Your Honor. Whatever is convenient to the Court. I can think about that if you would like.

COURT: Yes, would you?

MS. PLUBELL: Yes. We have argued about it in our Prehearing Memorandum. We went through every factor and every witness.

COURT: Including those that I have this testimony from?

MS. PLUBELL: Including those witnesses, yes Your Honor. I misstated that. That was in response to Mr. Beach's prehearing Memorandum. But, we did

go through that. I just wanted to make sure there was a record of that because that clemency proceeding had nothing to do with the five Clark factors.

COURT: Right. Just so I am clear, do you believe that the Prehearing Memorandum satisfactorily addresses the Clark factors as *visa vie* these three transcript witnesses?

MS. PLUBELL: I believe it does Your Honor.

COURT: Well, I will allow you to check.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. Thank you.

COURT: If you don't raise the issue again with the Court I am going to assume that you all have had your opportunity to weigh in and the Court would use that Prehearing Memorandum as that opportunity. If you raise the issue again then I will take up whatever other considerations you want.

MS. PLUBELL: Thank you Your Honor. I appreciate it.

COURT: Be sure. Now remember, you have got those transcripts and you are going to try and attach an Exhibit. I do not have them.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. Well, I think I returned the transcripts back.

COURT: Oh, yes you did. We are going to get an Exhibit. Okay. How about at least a stand and stretch. All right. Witness?

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the first witness that we would call would be Stephanie Eagle Boy.

MS. PLUBELL: Excuse me Your Honor, we haven't had a chance to interview her.

COURT: Oh, that is right. How about we do this. We take an early lunch break. That would give you reasonable opportunity. We will reconvene, say at 1:15. Two hours seem adequate to get a break and take lunch?

MS. PLUBELL: Yes.

COURT: We will reconvene at 1:15. Wait a minute. I think I have a hearing at 1:15. Let me just check.

MR. TOAVS: I just have a question Your Honor. I didn't mean to interrupt. Will we have the opportunity to be present during the interview?

COURT: This is not a deposition.

MS. PLUBELL: And they are not representing them.

COURT: I don't see any particular reason why you should be. Why do you?

MR. TOAVS: Well, I would like to know what she says too.

MS. PLUBELL: We will tell you.

MR. TOAVS: Well then, I am going to request that it be recorded Your

Honor and I have an opportunity to at least listen to it before she is on the witness stand and subject to cross examination about an interview that takes place and we

interfere with the examination.

MS. PLUBELL: Well, they shouldn't have any worries about what the

have no idea what was said. I am willing to sit there and be quiet. I won't

COURT: Well, let me think about that while I check and see if I have a 1:15 hearing. Please be seated. Thank you. Well, I don't think that the granting of this to the State should preclude the petitioner from at least being present. I won't allow the petitioner to ask questions or to interfere in any way, but I think it is appropriate that they be able to sort of hear the responses.

MR. LIGHT: That is fine.

witness is going to tell us Your Honor.

MR. TOAVS: Thank you Your Honor.

COURT: Well, I am reconsidering this. Yeah, I think that that is appropriate. If for some reason it changes the nature of the testimony that just goes to the Court's application of the Clark factors and I don't think that will cause a real problem. So, we will allow the petitioners to be present. Unfortunately, I have got a return of a search warrant at 1:30 so rather than get everybody in here and get started and then have to stop, let's just start at say, 1:35 to 1:40. Be prepared to go at 1:35 as soon as the ... I am going to be doing it by video. It will take two seconds to swear the officer in and check out his return and then we will be ready to go. All right. So, we will reconvene then.

(LUNCH BREAK)

CLERK: All rise please.

COURT: Please be seated. All right. Petitioners now are prepared, I believe, to bring forth a number of witnesses from the amended petition granted by this Court. Yes sir?

MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, we have talked to defense and have requested that we be able to take a witness out of order. We have an individual here that showed up. He is a single father. He has got his kids here; he has got a dog here and for convenience sake we would like to take him out of order and go first.

Now, it is my understanding that defense counsel wants to make an argument that we shouldn't be able to call anybody and that's okay. But, after that we would like, if possible, to call him out of order.

COURT: Yes sir.

MR. CAMIEL: Thank you Your Honor. It's not our position that they can't call anybody, but the Supreme Court clearly indicated that what was going to go on at this hearing was this Court was going to take a look at the new evidence to see if it met the Clark test for new evidence. The Supreme Court also said that it wasn't this Court or any Court considering a motion for new trial role to get in to determining ultimate credibility of a witness. That is for the fact finder on a new trial. So, we think that the State should be allowed to call witnesses if they are

going to give testimony related to the Clark factors, as to whether it is, in fact, 1 discovered since trial; the due diligence issues, materiality and also if they are able 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

22

23

24

25

to present evidence challenging the admissibility of our new evidence. But, as to putting on any witnesses to challenge the credibility of our witnesses it seems to me that the Supreme Court has said that that is the role of a new fact finder if there is a new trial and that evidence should be presented at any new trial. This Court's role is to see if we get through each of these Clark factors. And, I am drawing this from, it is paragraphs forty (40) and forty-one (41) of the Beach decision, and they refer to both Clark I and Clark II and Crosby. They specifically talked about the Crosby case. Now, that was a recantation case where the trial Judge denied a motion for new trial because he said he didn't believe their recanting witness. And, the Supreme Court said that the trial Judge went beyond his role. They said we determined that the Court erred when it improperly placed itself in the role of fact finder. And, what they said was, as noted in *Crosby*, once a petitioner who alleges newly discovered evidence has satisfied the five Clark factors, the trial Court must leave determination of whether to actually believe the newly discovered evidence to fact finder on retrial. We interpret that to mean that the State's role at this proceeding is to challenge the Clark factors, but not to get into ultimately credibility as if we were back in a new trial because that is for the new jury.

COURT: That seems like a very narrow vision of ...

MS. PLUBELL: May the State respond Your Honor.

COURT: Yeah. I am expecting it.

MS. PLUBELL: Are you ready or would you like ...?

COURT: Not just yet.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay.

COURT: Well, I agree with the petitioner's notion about the use of *Crosby*. You know, the Court, this Court, cannot place itself in the role of fact finder, but the Court is also very clear in paragraph thirty-nine (39) that it is the trial Court's role to determine the weight and credibility of the new evidence. And, if it lacks credibility, then it would not be admitted and would not be allowed as a consideration under the Clark factors. I think the idea is the Court is to look at the weight and credibility of the evidence, determine if that evidence is sufficient to meet the Clark factors. If it doesn't have the weight and credibility, it shouldn't even be in the consideration underneath the Clark factors for determining a new trial. That is this Court's sort of sense. But now I will hear from the State.

MS. PLUBELL: Well, Your Honor, I happen to be very familiar with both Clarks I and II because I handled both of the cases on direct appeal. And actually, what happened in Clark I, and it wasn't argued by either side, is the Court recognized that there was a tension ... It had always ... It had relied upon the

24

25

Greenough test which was based upon on Georgia Supreme Court case, State vs. Barry which is a very old case. And, to consider motions for new trial based on new evidence. But then, the case of State vs. Perry came along and State vs. Perry was a recantation new evidence case. The Court did something funky in that State vs. Perry case and said that the Judge had to believe that the recantation was true in order for it to grant a new trial. So, in State vs. Clark it was a sexual abuse case and he did have a recantation, but the circumstances of the recantation were highly questionable. None the less, the Court decided to clarify, it felt that there was this great tension between the Greenough test and the Perry test and that it didn't make sense; they didn't make sense together. So, the Court developed the five factors set forth in Clark and they remanded for a hearing. The one thing that I think is very important to note is in paragraph thirty-six (36) of State vs. Clark, In Clark I they are referring to that fifth factor; the reasonable probability, and the Court says the reasonable probability standard adopted herein properly leaves to the trial Judge considering the motion for new trial determinations of weight and credibility of the new evidence and to consider what impact, looking prospectively, that would have on the new trial. The Court has reiterated that in the case of State vs. Crosby which also happened to be a recantation case and it, in fact, went on to clarify that there is a difference between that reasonable probability and weight and

credibility determinations and finding veracity of a witness. One is commanded by the Clark and the other is prohibited.

COURT: Well, what do you think about this Court's sense that I am to evaluate weight and credibility for purposes of applying the Clark factors, but not for getting in the way of a jury determining whether those ought to be given to them as consideration?

MS. PLUBELL: I am sorry Your Honor. I am not sure I understand the question.

COURT: I am not sure I do either. Let me try again.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay.

COURT: The more I look at this case, the more I have a sense that this

Court's role is to look at the weight and credibility of this new evidence. If for

some reason some of this evidence does not have a degree of weight and credibility
that persuades this Court, then it would not be factored into my consideration of
the Clarks five features and for determining whether a new trial ought to be
granted.

MS. PLUBELL: Yes, because it would fail on factor five.

COURT: Yes. Well, it would fail on that and ...

MS. PLUBELL: Well, it might fail on another factor as well, but yes, the State concurs with that interpretation Your Honor.

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

COURT: But, that consideration is not to go so far as to exclude evidence that might be presented at a future trial. It is just to look at that evidence and see whether it amounts to the kind of, has a weight and credibility, that would give this case the basis for granting a new trial.

MS. PLUBELL: Based on the fundamental miscarriage of justice exception. COURT: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Correct. I don't think this Court has the ability to rule on what would be admissible at a new trial.

COURT: Right, right.

MS. PLUBELL: I think that would be for another day.

COURT: Okay. So, where does that leave us?

MR. CAMIEL: Well, there is still this language in the Beach decision that says the Court has to analyze whether we meet the Clark test, but has to leave the determination of whether to actually believe the newly discovered evidence to the fact finder. So, it seems like the Court would be admitting any evidence offered by the State for a limited purpose. And the Court is in more of a gate-keeping role.

COURT: Yeah. I think that that is what I am trying to say is that it is a limited purpose for looking at the weight and credibility of this evidence for application of those five Clark factors.

7

9

1011

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

does have to deal with and has been dealing from day one of this hearing, with admissibility because we have to show it's new, but we also have to show it's admissible to even be called evidence. That is why we have been having these arguments about the hearsay rule. The State has been arguing it shouldn't come in because it is inadmissible and we think that the language about weight and credibility goes actually toward admissibility. Do we have new admissible evidence? If the Court determines that we have new evidence and it is admissible, then the Court can't get into do I believe this witness or don't I believe him. The Court has to take a look at the totality of the evidence we present and weigh that in its factor five analysis in determining what the reasonable probability is that a new jury would do. But, the Court and I go back to the Crosby case. The Judge there went further than that. He determined that he didn't believe the witness and denied the motion and the Supreme Court said that is wrong and it seems to me that that is telling the Court you have a gate keeping function, but you have to leave ... But if it is admissible you have to factor it in in your analysis of that fifth factor.

MR. CAMIEL: But I think that our interpretation of that is that the Court

COURT: Yeah but, admissibility is only for purposes of this hearing. It is not admissibility for purposes of a future jury trial.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor ... I am sorry.

MR. CAMIEL: It seems to me that the whole exercise we have been going through and fighting about whether something is gonna be heard by the Court as substantive evidence rather than hearsay or impeachment deals directly with admissibility. If we were coming in and we couldn't pass through these hearsay objections, we wouldn't have admissible evidence and we wouldn't even get it into the calculus in the fifth factor. So, it seems to me ...

COURT: But, once you pass that hurdle it still is, all of that is accumulative, is evidence that accumulates on a plate that the Court then begins to chew on to determine whether a new trial, whether he is actually innocent, or whether a new trial ought to be granted. Do you agree with that?

MR. CAMIEL: I do agree with that.

COURT: And so, the State, it would seem to me, would have the right to challenge credibility and weight of evidence so this Court doesn't mistakenly consider incredible or unsubstantial evidence for purposes of determining whether he is actually innocent or whether a new trial is deserving.

MR. CAMIEL: I understand the Court's ...

COURT: But you don't agree?

MR. CAMIEL: Well, I am having a hard time with the language of the Supreme Court that seems to say you have to leave the ultimate determination of

credibility of any witness to a new jury. I don't think that they put that language in there without purpose.

COURT: No, they never, hopefully never, do anything without purpose. It isn't for our District Court to say they don't.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, we are looking at page thirteen (13), paragraphs forty (40) and forty-one (41) of the Supreme Court decision.

COURT: I think that that ... I think that they were ... In trying to interpret this opinion it seems to this Court that the Supreme Court was establishing an outer boundary. Be careful not to go past this boundary about becoming a true fact finder. But, when it comes to weight and credibility which they say only two paragraphs before that you got to be there. You got to weigh in on those. And so, they are trying to figure out what these boundaries are and Judge, you can't become a fact finder, but you got to weigh weight and credibility. So, you sort of find that ground in there where you can apply weight and credibility, but not really be a fact finder. Yes ma'am?

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, I think it is important ...

COURT: Are you agreeing with the Court or are you disagreeing?

MS. PLUBELL: I primarily am agreeing with the Court. But, I do think it is important to keep the historical context of how Clark came to be in mind because I think what used to happen in recantation cases is the Judge was not going

to grant relief unless he actually believed the recantation. That is what the Court wanted to get away from. I also want to bring to the Court's attention that in Clark II, after it went back for a remand, the District Court did not find that there was a reasonable probability that the latest recantation would result in a different outcome. And, the Court said the District Court did not succumb to the error we cautioned against in *Crosby* and based decision on whether the recantation is true. Instead, it examined the entire context in which this recantation would be presented to the jury in light of the testimony and evidence presented during the original trial. So, the circumstances of the recantation which were many in the Clark case were significant and were heard at that hearing on remand and ...

COURT: And then the Judge looked at it; how would this affect a potential jury sworn in with proper instructions, etc.

MS. PLUBELL: Right. Right. And the other thing that I feel compelled to point out at this time is that we have not stipulated to the admissibility of a lot of the stuff that has come in in this hearing. We respect the Court's ruling, but with that stated you can bet that we would make objections at trial on issues like the unavailability of Maude Kern and the way that they have gone about presenting the hearsay testimony.

COURT: Sure. Yeah.

3

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, one paragraph that I think is somewhat helpful. It is in Clark II. I have a copy of it. The Court talks about different scenarios and it says one possible scenario might be one in which the District Judge finds the recanting witness highly credible, but none the less denies a new trial under the Clark test in light of the strength of the testimony five other prosecution witnesses presented at the original trial. Alternatively a Judge might find a witness not particularly credible, but none the less grant a new trial under Clark because there is a reasonable probability given the paucity of other evidence introduced at the first trial that a new jury on retrial would acquit the defendant when presented with new evidence. And so they seem to be limiting the role of the Judge's fact finding by giving an example both where the Judge believes the witness and doesn't.

COURT: Yes ma'am.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, with that being said, it doesn't appear that we even had a right to cross examine any of these witnesses then. I am not even sure why the State was invited to this hearing.

COURT: Oh, good question. All right. Well, here is how I am going to rule. For better or for worse, this Courts rule is this: That the remand on Beach instructs this Court to examine the weight and credibility of evidence and then to look at that evidence in the light of how it would affect or its likely outcome with a

new jury properly instructed with the standards of beyond a reasonable doubt; guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Clearly the Supreme Court wanted to warn the District Court, don't become a fact finder, don't decide this is a good fact, that is a bad fact, this is a good one, that is a bad one, but examine the weight and credibility and then apply the evidence after you have examined the weight and credibility and apply those determinations; then apply that to whether a new trial ought to be granted or whether he is actually innocent. So; I am gonna ... That is how I am going to proceed and under those general parameters I am going to allow the State to present evidence that would go to the weight and credibility of evidence presented by the petitioner solely for the purpose of the Court weighing weight and credibility; not for determining whether it is true or false, but just its weight and credibility. Okay. So, now where are we?

MR. TOAVS: We don't object to taking the witness out of order Your Honor.

COURT: Oh, yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Your Honor, so the State will call Richard McDonald. He is waiting across the hallway.

CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the statements you are about to give in this matter will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

MR. MCDONALD: It did.

MS. PLUBELL: What kind of rooms?

MR. MCDONALD: There was one large area where they had ... That I had worked at primarily. It was called deep tough. (1:59:58) It was, they had large, tall, tall, probably thirty (30) or forty (40) feet steel machines that formed these aluminum canisters and then there was other parts that were later added on to the building that they built the netting and things like that in.

MS. PLUBELL: Were you familiar with every aspect of the building? I mean all the areas of the building?

MR. TOAVS: Your Honor, I am going to object as to this line of questioning lacks a time frame.

COURT: Sustained.

MS. PLUBELL: I am sorry. That was in 1983, was that correct?

MR. MCDONALD: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: Did you work there sometime after 1983 as well?

MR. MCDONALD: I did. I believe it was in 1988 or 1989, I was out on law enforcement for a short time and I went there for another job, and it was called quality control. What my job was then was to go about the different places in the factory to make sure that the items that were being made were up to spec. I went in both the netting and the deep trough at that time.

MR. TOAVS: I object to lacks a time frame Your Honor. MS. PLUBELL: All right. Between 1983 and 1989 when you returned MS. PLUBELL: In 1983, what was the ventilation like? MS. PLUBELL: And, did the employers, A&S Industries address that? MR. MCDONALD: Well, there were large garage type doors that were opened with weather permitting and then there were also big fans. Probably the fans had I would say a four foot radius that were large metal fans that were MS. PLUBELL: And, was that the same in 1989 when you worked there? MS. PLUBELL: Were there fans in the netting area in 1989? MR. TOAVS: I object. The question is vague as to time. COURT: Yeah she did. Give her a chance to finish. Go ahead. MS. PLUBELL: Were there fans in the netting area in 1983?

MR. MCDONALD: There were probably more fans in the netting area because there was a terrible smell that came off of them. I don't know if it was from the paint or what it was, but the fans were used to move the air about away from those. I guess to kind of clean the air out because it was smelly.

MS. PLUBELL: What was ... In 1983 what was the noise level like in A&S Industry?

MR. MCDONALD: It was loud. Like a normal ... I mean, it was ... To give you an idea there were hundreds of people working there and there was at least three shifts a day working. There was a morning, there was an afternoon and there was a night. Each of those shifts had hundreds of people working, so it was people busting about. The manufacturing was going on. I know in the netting part itself there was, the more that the people did the more product that they made, the more they got paid. So, that was especially busy. It was kind of amazing to watch some of the people that were working there. They would actually sew these nets together and you know, it was just amazing to watch them how fast they could put these things together and then move on to the next and the next. It was loud.

MS. PLUBELL: Did some of the employees that worked at A&S Industry
... Well let me back up, I am sorry. In 1989 was it still noisy?

MR. MCDONALD: It was.

MS. PLUBELL: And, in 1983 did some of the people that worked at A&S Industries actually wear ear protection of some sort?

MR. MCDONALD: There were. I did.

MS. PLUBELL: You did?

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And, what about in 1989?

MR. MCDONALD: They did.

MS. PLUBELL: Would you say that there was any part of A&S Industries that was so quiet you could hear a pin drop?

MR. TOAVS: Objection, it is vague as to time.

MS. PLUBELL: In 1983?

MR. MCDONALD: I would say no. I mean unless maybe in the offices where the administration worked, but not out in the factory part, no.

MS. PLUBELL: Would it be difficult to overhear just a normal conversation in 1983?

MR. MCDONALD: It would because, well, where we worked it was loud and if we were gonna talk we were shouting. And then, as far as where the, what I noticed about the netting area that they worked so fast and there was different product they would be loading big boxes onto pallets and then they were always

forklifts moving about you know moving that product to a different area for packing and things like that. It was never very quiet at all anywhere there.

MS. PLUBELL: Mr. McDonald, in this case Mr. Toavs presented an Affidavit to the Court explaining why someone name Carl Four Star did not want to come and testify. Do you know Mr. Four Star?

MR. MCDONALD: I do.

MS. PLUBELL: How do you know him?

MR. MCDONALD: Well in my experience as a law enforcement official, we had run-ins.

MS. PLUBELL: In that particular Affidavit it indicates that Mr. Four Star was identified to relatives of the Atkinson family by Richard McDonald. And then was subsequently beat up by those members of the Atkinson family. Did you do that Mr. McDonald?

MR. MCDONALD: No. The situation that he was referring to, there is in Wolf Point, Montana, which is one of the towns in our county seat, Roosevelt County, there is a big rodeo, carnival type thing called the Wild Horse Stampede. The bars on Main Street, all the bars in town are filled to capacity. So much so that they leak out into the street and they do away with the open container law and so the whole town, the whole downtown area is pretty much, I would almost say chaos. You know, I mean there seems to be an overflow of testosterone all the

21

20

22 23

24

25

time and people from different towns, you know, there are two different tribes on our reservation. There is the Assiniboine and the Sioux and they are traditionally enemies. And, that still carries on somewhat today. Different towns come and they meet at the stampede and there are fights and then there are guys just wanting to prove how tough they are and it is crazy. You know, it is almost, like I said, it is almost chaos. At that particular time there was a fight and I noticed that, well I saw one of our deputies there, and then I didn't see him because it was just a mob of people. I went rushing over there. We could see it almost starting from where I was and you could just see that was almost getting ready to start. I went rushing over there to help, to get in the middle of it to break it up and it was too late, it had already started. I just started grabbing people and throwing them off. One guy I grabbed and I pulled him off and it was Carl Four Star and I threw him back and he rushed back toward where we were. There were still, my people were still on the ground in the middle of this fight. I said you need to back up, you need to back up or you are going to be arrested. And so he backed up and I went back to getting these people off our people and one of the deputies told me that he had been hit by one of the guys that they had down. So they were handcuffing him and I was keeping all these other people back.

MS. PLUBELL: Were you pretty busy at that time?

twenty (20) to thirty (30) to one (1). And it was starting to calm down and people were backing off and all the sudden Carl Four Star breaks through the crowd and he said there is a fight over there, or I just got hit or something like that. And I thought to myself, oh crap here we go again. I couldn't see where this fight was and I said where? And he said it is right there and I looked again and I didn't see anything. He stormed off into the crowd. And I guess he went up to ...

MR. TOAVS: Objection Your Honor. There is no foundation for this.

MR. MCDONALD: It was crazy. I mean we were outnumbered probably

WR. 10Avs. Objection four Honor. There is no foundation for this.

COURT: Sustained.

MS. PLUBELL: Mr. McDonald did you file, eventually file an incident report on this?

MR. MCDONALD: I did.

MS. PLUBELL: From that particular evening and included in that did you document that Mr. Four Star's told you that someone had punched him?

MR. MCDONALD: He did.

MS. PLUBELL: And do you have any idea what ultimately happened with that information?

MR. MCDONALD: It was my understanding that ...

MR. TOAVS: Objection. Lacks foundation.

COURT: Sustained.

MR. TOAVS: And so, depending on whether or not A&S had a contract to fill they would be more busy or less busy, isn't that how it went there?

MR. MCDONALD: You know, at that time, in 1983, it was, they must have had a lot of contracts, they were busy. It was busy three shifts a day in both the netting and the ... And it seemed to be ... You know, it seemed to be that way when I was there the second time too. It seemed like it was ...

MR. TOAVS: In fact, A&S had a history of gearing up more employees during busy times when they had a lot of contracts and then scaling down with less employees during times when there weren't as many military contracts.

MR. MCDONALD: You know, I think toward the end of A&S, I think that is what happened, but back in that era in the 1980s I think it was ... There must have been a lot of ...

MR. TOAVS: I am sorry to stop you, but let's just talk about the years when you worked there and you would know. During your few months of employment in 1983 or your few months of employment in 1988 or 1989, isn't it true that A&S would be busier or less busy depending on the amount of contracts that it had.

MR. MCDONALD: It seemed to me that it was busy all the time. I don't

MR. TOAVS: Okay. Now, you don't have any personal knowledge about what the noise level was in the netting area in 1985 do you?

MR. MCDONALD: I don't know.

MR. TOAVS: I have no further questions Your Honor.

COURT: Ms. Plubell?

(REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF RICHARD MCDONALD)

MS. PLUBELL: One question Mr. McDonald. When you said at the end of A&S, their existence, and about when would that have been?

MR. TOAVS: Objection. Foundation.

MS. PLUBELL: Is A&S still ...

COURT: That is what she is trying to establish. Overruled.

MS. PLUBELL: Is A&S still in business?

MR. MCDONALD: You know, I don't know. There may be something still going on there, but it just ... After Desert Storm, you know, when the military took more of a, you know we are going to bomb you and there wasn't so much ground soldiering, there wasn't so much hand to hand and the infantry type. I believe that is when it actually started to scale down.

MS. PLUBELL: All right. Thank you.

COURT: Any re-cross?

MR. TOAVS: No Your Honor.

MR. CAMIEL: From the rock could you see down into the little park near the train bridge and the river?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: What time of day would you and Tina go and sit out by the rock?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Sometimes early evening, sometimes at night time, late at night.

MR. CAMIEL: During the summertime when you were not in school would, you stay out late?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And play with Tina?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: And, were there any rules in terms of where you could go late in the evening?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, we had to go back and check in. When I was staying with my aunt we would go home and check in with her and let her know that we will be outside and she would tell us to stay in the yard. Where the rock was, it was like our backyard.

MR. CAMIEL: Would you pay attention when you were sitting out by the rock to activities that were going on down in the park by the train bridge?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Would we pay attention?

MR. CAMIEL: Yeah. Did you see people come down there? Did you watch what they were doing from time to time?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: Was that like a party area?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: What kinds of things just generally would you see go on down there?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, there would be drinking, you know, it wasn't really mainly by the train bridge or at the train bridge all the time. It was always like right below the hill where all the trees were because they would have bonfires, whatever. I mean, just what teenagers do back then I guess.

MR. CAMIEL: And you weren't a teenager yet, you were, in 1979 ...

MS. EAGLE BOY: I was only ten years old.

MR. CAMIEL: How old was Tina at that time?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Eleven.

MR. CAMIEL: So, would the two of you sit and watch these older teenagers when they were down there partying?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: Or listen to them? Now, the summer of your tenth year which is 1979 after your grandfather had died, did there come a time where you and Tina were out by the rock one night?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: And you saw something unusual?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: Do you have any idea what time it was that you and Tina went out to the rock that night?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No I don't.

MR. CAMIEL: Was it after dark?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah it was dark.

MR. CAMIEL: Had it been dark for quite awhile?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: And, was anybody else out there with you and Tina, or was it just the two of you?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It was just us two.

MR. CAMIEL: Was your aunt home?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Were other people home in your aunt's house?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah, my cousins.

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, out of this pack of girls it was like this other girl was saying don't please. It was like ... I don't know how to describe it; like they were chasing her or something.

MR. CAMIEL: Could you actually see what was going on, or are you just hearing this?

MS. EAGLE BOY: I just heard.

MR. CAMIEL: Could you tell how many different girls there were from the voices?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No I didn't.

MR. CAMIEL: How long did the yelling go on?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It seemed like it only went on for maybe ten or twenty minutes, I don't know.

MR. CAMIEL: While you are listening to this you are sitting near the rock with your cousin Tina?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Then what happened?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Then after that it got quiet. And then ...

MR. CAMIEL: Could you hear voices when it got quiet?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. CAMIEL: Then what happened?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Then it was like ... The next thing you know we seen a police car coming down with its lights on.

MR. CAMIEL: You could tell it was a police car because it had lights on?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: On the roof?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: Could you tell what kind of police car it was, whether it was county sheriff or ...

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. CAMIEL: Where did the police car go?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Where did it go?

MR. CAMIEL: Yeah.

MS. EAGLE BOY: It went down where the other two vehicles were sitting.

MR. CAMIEL: And then what happened.

MS. EAGLE BOY: And then it shut its lights off down there.

MR. CAMIEL: Did it shut its headlights off?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It shut them all off.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. And then what happened?

MS. EAGLE BOY: And then I don't know. It got silent and it was like you could hear a little whispering or something and then the next thing you know one

of the pickups pulls out and goes all the way around by the train bridge and goes by the trees and you could see like two people get out of the truck and ...

MR. CAMIEL: Before we talk about the two people, you had initially described that there were two vehicles that came into this area.

MS. EAGLE BOY: Uh huh.

MR. CAMIEL: And then after the yelling the police car came and then one of the vehicles, you said, started to drive around. Did that vehicle come to a stop?

MS. EAGLE BOY: What do you mean did it come to a stop?

MS. EAGLE BOY: You saw it leave from where it had been stopped. Did it just drive straight out of the park? Or did it stop somewhere?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It stopped on the road that was closest to the train tracks. Because it was on the ... The road was on the other side of some trees.

And, when it drove through it went past the trees and it parked like in a flat place and it had a whole bunch of weeds. There was a road there because that road was coming towards the hill and it stopped right there.

MR. CAMIEL: So, when you say towards the hill, that road was coming toward where you and Tina were up on the hill?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: So it got closer to you? What happened when it stopped?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Because the way the shovel sounds when you dig a hole

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. Could you actually see the two people?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well I couldn't ... I could see them, but I can't identify

MR. CAMIEL: Could you tell whether they were men or women?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It seemed like it only went on for a couple minutes.

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes. I heard like a clinking noise, like they dropped something like tools clinking together when you drop them together.

MS. EAGLE BOY: And then after that, they got back in the vehicle and

MR. CAMIEL: Were you at all fearful about telling anybody what you had 1 seen? 2 3 MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah. MR. CAMIEL: Do you know Barry Beach? 5 MS. EAGLE BOY: No. 6 7 MR. CAMIEL: Did you know Kim Nees? 8 MS. EAGLE BOY: No. 9 MR. CAMIEL: Over the years had you heard rumors that girls were 10 involved in the murder of Kim Nees? 11 12 MS. EAGLE BOY: I didn't hear any rumors like that. I just heard that a 13 girl got killed down at train bridge. That is all I heard. 14 MR. CAMIEL: Did what you had seen and heard, did that bother you over 15 the years? 16 17 MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes, it did. 18 MR. CAMIEL: In what way? 19 MS. EAGLE BOY: My nightmare. 20 MR. CAMIEL: What nightmare? 21 22 MS. EAGLE BOY: It has been a nightmare all my life. 23 MR. CAMIEL: You have nightmares about what you heard and saw? 24 MS. EAGLE BOY: It's mainly what I heard. The girl screaming. 25

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well with Sissy, she got me mad because she couldn't tell the truth.

MR. LIGHT: Your Honor I am going to object at this time.

COURT: What is the basis of your objection?

MR. LIGHT: Well, it is hearsay.

COURT: Sustained.

MR. CAMIEL: Now, when you were looking in the summer of 1979, when you were sitting by the rock on that hill and listening to what was going on, you couldn't see who was down there?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: Objection. Leading Your Honor.

MR. CAMIEL: I am sorry.

COURT: Sustained.

MR. CAMIEL: Did you yourself know any of the voices that were down there?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. CAMIEL: Nothing further.

COURT: Before we get cross I want to just ask a couple questions that might help with cross. Ma'am, you said that you have had nightmares all your life about this incident?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

COURT: And mostly because of the sounds you heard?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah, screaming, yeah.

COURT: I know this is challenging for you, but could you tell me a bit more about those sounds? All you said when you were asked was, "Don't, please". Were there other sounds that you heard?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, I could hear the girls saying to get her and you know kick the bitch.

MR. LIGHT: I'm sorry. What was that last one?

COURT: She said kick the bitch.

MS. EAGLE BOY: And one girl saying, "Please, don't".

COURT: And did you hear screaming?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

COURT: What kind of screaming?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Like a horrible scream.

COURT: You know, there is screaming like when girls are yelling at each other, they can get pretty high pitched, pretty excited. Was it that kind of yelling?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah. To me it was like an angry scream, like a high pitched angry scream. Hollering. It is something that you won't forget.

COURT: Any other ways in which you would describe those screams?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And obviously this was very upsetting to you, is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: Now you were visiting Mabel your aunt, right? Sparvoir. Is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Uh huh.

MR. LIGHT: And you indicated that Mabel was home this summer night in 1979, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, isn't it true that earlier, about a half hour ago the only way you knew it was the summer of 1979 was because it was hot is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: Okay. But, you don't know the date; you don't know exactly when it could have occurred except for the summer of 1979, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, I can't remember.

MR. LIGHT: That's fine. I am just asking. Just confirming that. All you know is it was the summer of 1979, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, in addition to Mabel, your aunt being home, you had other family members who were at Mabel's house as well, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes my cousin Joel.

MR. LIGHT: Joel Sparvoir.

MS. EAGLE BOY: Sparvoir.

MR. LIGHT: I am sorry. I will say Joel. And, on July 27, 2010 you made a sworn statement out to defense counsel, Mr. Camiel who had just questioned you, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Uh huh.

MR. LIGHT: Isn't that right?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, in fact, isn't it true that while your statement is while you and Tina were sitting and listening to what was going on in the park, your cousin Joel was standing in the doorway of the house, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, isn't it true that he heard stuff, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, he was older than you, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: And, you talked to Joel about what you and Tina had heard and seen correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No, we didn't talk to Joel. He heard it on his own.

MR. LIGHT: But, you never talked to Joel about it?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No, because he heard it on his own.

MR. LIGHT: But, you and Joel talked about it, what you had seen and what he had heard correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: Okay. Well, let me show you your statement. May I approach?

COURT: Yes.

MR. LIGHT: I want you to look at this part right here. So, isn't it true that you and Joel talked about what he had heard and what you had heard and seen, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Say that again.

MR. LIGHT: You and Joel talked about what you and Tina had heard and seen, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: When we went back up to the house?

MR. LIGHT: At some point you had to of.

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, the only thing that he said was what it sounded like.

MR. LIGHT: Let me rephrase the question. Did you hear what Joel had seen or heard?

MR. LIGHT: Okay, okay. From where you were sitting on the rock when that truck finally stopped and you said two people got out, how far was that?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It is kind of hard for me to kind of see how far, but it might have been from like where I am sitting to like where these guys are down the hill.

MR. LIGHT: Okay well let's start out. Where the two pickup trucks first stopped how far were you from them at that point when they first started; when they first came in and you saw them down there. How far would you say you were from where you are at to where?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Probably to the wall or further.

MR. LIGHT: To the wall or further?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah. I mean it was a long ways for me.

MR. LIGHT: That's fine. I am just asking ma'am. And then from that point when the truck left, did the truck, and you said the truck took the road and then two people got out. Did it go further away from you at that point?

MS. EAGLE BOY: When the one of the vehicles left?

MR. LIGHT: Yes.

MS. EAGLE BOY: From when it stopped?

MR. LIGHT: Yes.

MS. EAGLE BOY: And left the park? Or what are you talking about?

MR. LIGHT: At one point you indicated that one of the trucks left and it drove around and it got to a spot where two people got out where you said you heard the digging. My question is, how far away from that were you?

MS. EAGLE BOY: It was just like looking down this way.

COURT: So, it was closer to you than it had been before?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. LIGHT: Now, you indicated the next morning that you were aware of all the commotion, the cars and the police that were down by the train bridge, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Oh I just looked out the window and seen all the stuff down there.

MR. LIGHT: And you had already talked to Mabel about you thought you saw a fight down there, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, it sounded like a fight. I don't know.

MR. LIGHT: Okay. And, did you talk to her any further now that you learned that someone had been killed down there?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: And, you indicated that you, at some point, you were aware of all the rumors, the gossip that these girls, some girls were responsible for the death of Kim Nees, is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Like I said the only thing I heard was that a girl got killed down at train bridge. That was a long time ago though. Later on, years and years.

MR. LIGHT: From 1979, how long did you continue to live in Poplar?

MS. EAGLE BOY: I don't know. It was a long time. Until I was probably thirteen or fourteen...

MR. LIGHT: I just want to make sure of this. You are telling me in those thirteen to fourteen years that you lived in Poplar you never heard any rumors or gossip about these girls that were responsible for the Kim Nees murder?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, you hear things but, you know, you don't think nothing of it. I just blocked everything out.

MR. LIGHT: But, you did hear the gossip, that's the question?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well yeah. It was gossip. But gossip is gossip.

MR. LIGHT: Thank you. And, knowing that you had heard gossip and rumors about girls being responsible for the Kim Nees murder and knowing that you believed you had witnessed a fight in the same exact location at the same time it allegedly took place, you did not go and tell anybody, is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: Okay. Thank you. Now, you indicated on cross examination, excuse me, on direct that you didn't trust law enforcement at that time, is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No. I didn't trust anybody.

MR. LIGHT: You certainly could have told family about that couldn't you?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No. I didn't want to tell nobody.

MR. LIGHT: During the time that you lived there you were also aware that Mr. Beach was accused of killing Kim Nees, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Yeah.

MR. LIGHT: And you were aware at that time that you had information about that murder of Kim Nees correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Uh huh.

MR. LIGHT: And, you again, did not come forward and tell anybody, is that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, who am I going to tell? I don't trust anybody. I am not going to tell anybody anything. That's why I kept it to myself.

MR. LIGHT: You didn't tell your mom, correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: I talked to my cousin Tina. We talked it over cause we were both there.

MR. LIGHT: I respect that. Let me ask the question please. You didn't tell MR. LIGHT: Although you had talked to Mabel that night about it, hearing MR. LIGHT: You didn't talk, in addition, to Joel did you? MR. LIGHT: Well certainly, there were people available for you to talk to about this, correct? Other than law enforcement, there were people that you could MR. LIGHT: I understand that. I am saying there were people who you MS. EAGLE BOY: Well maybe, yeah, but I didn't ask around. MR. LIGHT: Do you recall in 1984 when Mr. Beach went to trial?

MR. LIGHT: A couple things I will just quickly ask you. When those two people got out of the truck, you couldn't identify whether they were males or females, isn't that correct?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: You indicated when you talked to the Dateline show, or viewed the Dateline show you talked a little bit about Sissy. Did you know Sissy before the Dateline show?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: You had never known her?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: Did you know who she was before the Dateline show?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Well, I had heard her name around, yeah. But no, I didn't know her personally.

MR. LIGHT: Were you ever aware that she was one of the girls who was rumored or gossiped to have killed Kim Nees?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: You never heard that?

MS. EAGLE BOY: Uh huh.

MR. LIGHT: And you never heard that about Maude either?

MS. EAGLE BOY: No.

MR. LIGHT: If the Court will review the document, the Court will see that it contains hearsay in there which I don't think is appropriate. The statement does. Her written statement does.

COURT: May I see that please?

MR. LIGHT: I would refer the Court to the second page, top first paragraph.

COURT: What is your response to the objection?

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, I agree that that sentence is hearsay, but I think the Court could disregard that sentence and the rest of it is non-hearsay.

MR. LIGHT: Well Your Honor, what is the relevance of offering it. They have already gone through their direct examination. Now, this is redirect. I think her testimony speaks for itself Your Honor. They just want to offer it for what purpose?

MR. CAMIEL: Well, part of our burden is the due diligence and this shows when she signed the statement; that she gave a statement on that date and signed it. She has identified that statement.

MR. LIGHT: She has asked and answered that she made a statement and the date of it. This is simply another back door approach to get in hearsay Your Honor.

COURT: Haven't we already admitted statements of other witnesses?

23

24

25

MR. CAMIEL: Yes. Petitioner's Exhibits One and Two. There were no objections to those. COURT: I am going to admit this over objection. However, the Court will exclude from its consideration any hearsay that might be included in there. MR. CAMIEL: Ms. Eagle Boy, when you would talk to your cousin Tina did the two of you talk about coming forward and telling somebody? MS. EAGLE BOY: Yes we did. MR. CAMIEL: Did you reach any kind of an understanding with her about whether you should come forward? MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, I hope we are not going to get into what Tina said now. COURT: Well, I don't hear an objection. MR. LIGHT: Objection. Hearsay. COURT: Sustained.

MR. CAMIEL: I would offer what Tina told her not for the truth of the matter asserted, but to show both Tina's state of mind and Ms. Eagle Boy's state of mind as to why they didn't come forward.

MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, they are offering it for the truth of the matter and quite frankly, her state of her mind is not in question. It is just not relevant.

MR. CAMIEL: Well, she certainly ...

MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, I don't have anything further. I would like to ask the Court first of all to take judicial notice and the copies that I have here of Mabel Sparvoir and Joel Sparvoir's testimony at trial and based on their testimony, I am going to ask that her testimony be stricken Your Honor. This evidence is not only not new because it was testified to at trial; people in the household, as to what they had heard, but it shows a total lack of due diligence in that this was Mabel and Joel's testimony, was offered by the defense Your Honor. Offered by the defense.

COURT: Well, they wouldn't have offered any testimony by this lady because it would have been hearsay. They might have offered their own.

MR. LIGHT: My point is Your Honor, let's go to due diligence. If the Court wants us to go to constitutional whether Timer Moses did his job or not that is fine Your Honor, but testimony was presented at trial in 1979 by two people who she said she talked to about this and they got up on the stand and said they didn't hear anything but dogs barking. So, I find it hard now that thirty (30) years later they can say that this is, not only is this new, but there has been due diligence to uncover it when family members were interviewed, talked to and so forth by the defense in 1979. I mean I don't ...

COURT: Well, I don't find that very persuasive. This lady was ten years old; cousin was only a little bit older. I don't find that persuasive.

the direct examination of those two witnesses when weighing the credibility of this MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, it is marked as State's exhibit. MR. TOAVS: Well, we haven't had a chance to review that Your Honor. MR. LIGHT: Your Honor, if I could approach? COURT: You may. Do you have any cross of this lady? MR. LIGHT: No Your Honor. That is enough. MR. TOAVS: Your Honor, this is fairly lengthy. Would now be a good COURT: Yes. May this witness be excused? COURT: Thank you ma'am. I know it's difficult for you. COURT: All right. We will take a short recess.

COURT: Please be seated. All right. Next witness petitioner.

MR. TOAVS: Your Honor, in terms of the State's offer of the transcript from the examination at trial conducted of Maribel Sparvoir and Joel Sparvoir, we don't object to the Court taking notice of that and receiving that exhibit. However, for the record, we believe that this testimony speaks for itself and we do object to counsel's characterization of that testimony. We think the Court can review it for itself.

COURT: Does the Clerk have that document?

MR. LIGHT: Yeah. I handed it to you Your Honor.

COURT: You did?

MR. LIGHT: You have got it now.

COURT: All right. Witness.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, our next witness is Billie Smith. I think the State is gonna raise an objection.

COURT: All right.

MS. PLUBELL: For the record Your Honor, the State objects on the manner of presenting the hearsay testimony through this witness instead of calling JoAnn Jackson to ask her if she actually made the statement and also on the grounds that JoAnn did not inculpate herself in the statement, but indicated in the statement that she was present at some point; not through Kim Nees homicide,

5

10 11

12 13

14

15

1617

18

19

21

20

22

23

2425

according to the statement, but present in the events that are apparently, allegedly discussed with Billie Smith.

MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the next two witnesses both Billie Smith and Susan Mohler, as I indicated earlier worked with JoAnn Todd in Missoula at the nursing home and, as I indicated, during a break while talking about their teenager years JoAnn Todd went into a story about being present with a group of girls when this group of girls dragged a girl out of a truck and killed her. And, the witnesses will indicate that she said she didn't participate in that, but she was there. Being there with this group of girls, we believe, is not the type of statement that somebody, it is against her interest. It is not the type of statement that somebody would make casually to people unless it was true. It is not anywhere close to that type of statement. Placing herself at the scene of a murder with a group of girls who were involved in a murder certainly exposes her to criminal liability but, in addition, that same evidence rule talks about exposing somebody to disgrace or ridicule or hatred. And, if she was down there when, and she admits that she was down there when this girl was beaten to death and did nothing and didn't come forward, making a statement like that would certainly expose her to those kinds of things. So, we think that there are certainly sufficient indices of trustworthiness on top of the fact that she made this statement to two co-workers. So, it's not just one person coming in and saying she made the statement. We believe that under those

set of facts it is admissible under 803-24 as the Court admitted other similar statements.

COURT: All right. The Court overrules the objection based on reliability which has been articulated by counsel, but also includes a disinterested person.

Come over here ma'am and stand in front of the Clerk please.

CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the statement you are about to make in this matter will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

COURT: Come on over here ma'am and sit. Scoot on up to the microphone.

(DIRECT EXAMINATION OF BILLIE MARIE SMITH)

MR. CAMIEL: Ma'am, can you tell us your full name and spell your last name.

MS. SMITH: Billie Marie Smith. S-m-i-t-h.

MR. CAMIEL: Billie, where do you live?

MS. SMITH: In Missoula.

MS. PLUBELL: Excuse me Your Honor, I am having a difficult time hearing you.

MR. CAMIEL: Can you hear me now?

MS. SMITH: We helped them get dressed; do their daily ADL's. That's everyday living. Things that they cannot do for themselves anymore, those types MR. CAMIEL: Did you work a particular shift or what kind of schedule MS. SMITH: I worked from six in the morning until two o'clock every day; MR. CAMIEL: And, I take it, there were other CNAs who also worked MS. SMITH: On each shift we had four CNAs. MR. CAMIEL: While you were working at Hunter's Glen did you know a MR. CAMIEL: What kind of position did she have there? MS. SMITH: She was the lead CNA at the time. MR. CAMIEL: So, she was in kind of supervisory role?

MR. CAMIEL: Was that a frequent thing?

MS. SMITH: Every now and then, yeah.

MR. CAMIEL: Did there a come a time where you took a smoke break with JoAnn Todd where the conversation turned talking about teenage years, younger years?

MS. SMITH: Yes there were.

MR. CAMIEL: And, do you recall a particular conversation that you had with JoAnn Todd where she described something that had happened when she was a teenager?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Now do you remember what year that was?

MS. SMITH: I can't remember the exact year?

MR. CAMIEL: I apologize if I already asked this. Do you remember what years JoAnn Todd worked at Hunter's Glen?

MS. SMITH: From 2003 to either 2006 or 2007. I know she was gone by 2007.

MR. CAMIEL: The conversation that I am going to ask you about, did that happen early on when she first started working there or later in her term at Hunter's Glen?

MS. SMITH: Could you repeat that please?

MR. CAMIEL: Did it happen closer to 2003 or closer to when she left? MS. SMITH: Closer to when she got ready to leave I would say, yes. MR. CAMIEL: Now, I want to ask you about that conversation. Where were you and JoAnn Todd at the time that you talked? MS. SMITH: We were out on break. MR. CAMIEL: How long are your breaks? MS. SMITH: Anywhere from ten to fifteen minutes long. No longer than fifteen. MR. CAMIEL: And, was it just the two of you or were other people present? MS. SMITH: There were other people present. MR. CAMIEL: Describe what happened. MS. SMITH: Somebody just started talking about some things that they did when they were teenagers and then she wanted to tell a story about when she was a teenager. MR. CAMIEL: Did she tell you where she was from? MS. SMITH: No she didn't. MR. CAMIEL: Did you ever learn where she was from? MS. SMITH: Not until much later. MR. CAMIEL: And, describe the conversation.

MS. SMITH: She told us about things that happened when she was a teenager, that she and a group of girls took another girl by the water and they dragged the girl out of the truck. She was not ... She had nothing to do with this, but she was present when this happened.

MR. CAMIEL: When she is describing this to you, what did she say she was doing as these girls were dragging this girl out of the truck?

MS. SMITH: She said she was there, but she had no part of it, but she was there.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate whether she knew the girls that were involved?

MS. SMITH: No she didn't. She just said there was a group of girls.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she describe that she was down there with this group?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And, what did she say happened to the girl that was dragged out of the truck?

MS. SMITH: She said they dragged, beat her and things got out of hand and she died and that is all I know really.

MR. CAMIEL: What was your reaction to being told something like this?

MS. SMITH: I didn't know if it was true. I didn't know what to think because at work, no matter where you work, people tell you B.S. stories. You

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate why the girls were jealous of the girl that was killed?

MS. SMITH: No. Just that it was over jealousy.

MR. CAMIEL: Did you ask her any questions about why this happened?

MS. SMITH: I must of because that must have been how the jealousy came up. I must of asked her why and she said jealousy.

MR. CAMIEL: So, Susan Mohler was present the second time that JoAnn told you this?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she ever bring it up again?

MS. SMITH: Not to my knowledge; just those few times.

MR. CAMIEL: When you heard about ... When you heard JoAnn tell you this did you go tell anyone else what she had told you?

MS. SMITH: No. I just talked to Susan and I said what did you think about that. Like I said, you don't know when people tell you stories at any job, I don't care where you work. You don't know if they are telling you the truth or was that B.S. and I didn't know until much later that it was true.

MR. CAMIEL: Let me ask you about that. You indicated that JoAnn told you this during a break and you said it was closer to the time that she left. And she left in either 2006 or 2007?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. Did there come a point and time where you watched the television program the Dateline show?

MS. SMITH: At my job, not when it came out.

MR. CAMIEL: So, you didn't see it when it first aired?

MS. SMITH: I seen it the next day.

MR. CAMIEL: How did that come about?

MS. SMITH: Because I went to work and people said, "Did you watch the program last night", and I said, "What are you talking about?" and that is when they told me about Dateline and then I watched it in my boss's office that morning.

MR. CAMIEL: When they were asking you about whether or not you watched the show, did JoAnn come up?

MS. SMITH: Yes. That's why they wanted me to watch it because they couldn't believe that she was on there.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. And did you see the part of the show where JoAnn was interviewed?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Yes I did. 1 MR. CAMIEL: Now, at the time that JoAnn was working at Hunter's Glen, 2 3 did you have any dispute with her or any fight or any problem with her? 4 MS. SMITH: No. 5 MR. CAMIEL: Have you ever been up to Poplar before? 7 MS. SMITH: No. I don't even know where it is. 8 MR. CAMIEL: Or Wolf Point? MS. SMITH: No. 10 MR. CAMIEL: Do you know Barry Beach? 11 12 MS. SMITH: No I don't. 13 MR. CAMIEL: Do you know any of the members of his family? 14 MS. SMITH: No. 15 MR. CAMIEL: When JoAnn was talking to you about this incident, did she 16 17 say whether or not during the incident with this group of girls any boys were 18 present? 19 MS. SMITH: No. She didn't mention anything about boys being present, 20 just girls. 21 22 MR. CAMIEL: Thank you. 23 COURT: All right. Cross exam. 24 (CROSS EXAMINATION OF BILLIE MARIE SMITH) 25

25

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. And then sometime after that your husband contacted a friend, or your husband told a friend who contacted someone and then finally someone from Centurion Ministries contacted you, correct?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And, you are not really sure when that occurred?

MS. SMITH: No. I can't give you an exact date.

MS. PLUBELL: And initially you talked with them over the phone, right?

MS. SMITH: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: And, did you tell them all what you have testified to over the phone?

MS. SMITH: I am sorry, what?

MS. PLUBELL: When they called you to talk with you over the phone, did you tell them the same things that you have just testified to?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And, at what point then did this sworn statement occur, in relationship to that phone call?

MS. SMITH: A person came to my home. The first one was a draft. I don't remember what date and time that was. And then a second person came and then there were some changes because I noticed some things weren't right.

MS. PLUBELL: So, did they present you with a draft at the first visit?

MS. SMITH: I would have to go to the car and get them. I couldn't see that on here. Maybe I could try. No, I can't see that. I can't tell. I think it is here, but I might be wrong.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. And just since this is difficult since she doesn't have her glasses, could I approach so I can point out where I am at in the statement Your Honor?

COURT: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: Now, on the statement there are things that were typed such as there were three or four girls and that is crossed out, correct?

MS. SMITH: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: And that is changed to a group of girls.

MS. SMITH: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: Where did that three or four girls come from?

MS. SMITH: I have no idea, but I know that was never said. It was always a group of girls.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. And then there is also a part on the statement that the typed words say,"And then dumped her in the water".

MS. SMITH: See, and I was never told that. She never told me ...

MS. PLUBELL: And so did those words ever come from you?

MS. SMITH: I don't know where dumped in the water came from but, I mean, that wasn't right so that is why it is crossed out.

MS. PLUBELL: You didn't tell the investigator that during that phone

MS. SMITH: No.

MS. PLUBELL: And, there is also a word crossed out that says river, down by the river.

MS. SMITH: That was never mentioned to me. She never said anything about river. She said water and at that time I didn't know if that meant a swimming pool, a lake, pond, just water.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay. And so, you don't where river came from because you never passed that information on to anyone, is that correct?

MS. SMITH: That is correct.

MS. PLUBELL: And, when we just interviewed you a few minutes before, you indicated that the written corrections weren't yours either, right?

MS. SMITH: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: Someone else wrote those in, right?

MS. SMITH: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: And you just initialed them, right?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MS. PLUBELL: And, there is an addition; may I approach Your Honor just to show her where it is? There is an addition on the statement that is handwritten that says she did not mention any boys being present, correct? MS. SMITH: Correct. MS. PLUBELL: And that isn't your handwriting? MS. SMITH: No. That is because I was asked that question. MS. PLUBELL: And, my understanding is that the first time JoAnn told you the statement was it just the two of you or were there other people there to? MS. SMITH: There was other people present both times. MS. PLUBELL: Okay, and do you know who those people were? MS. SMITH: Susan Mohler. MS. PLUBELL: She was there the first time too? I thought she was only there the second time. are talking about the first time or the second time.

MS. SMITH: No, she was there the second time. Now, I don't know if you

MS. PLUBELL: Oh, I sorry. I am talking about the first time.

MS. SMITH: There was Sandy Shone. There was a girl named Sandy Shone there.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay.

MS. SMITH: There was me.

COURT: May she be excused? 1 MR. CAMIEL: Yes. 2 3 MS. PLUBELL: Yes Your Honor. Sorry. 4 MS. SMITH: Do I need to leave this paper here? 5 COURT: Yes. Thank you very much. Next witness. 6 7 MR. CAMIEL: Your Honor, the next witness is Susan Mohler. 8 CLERK: Do you solemnly swear that the statements you are about to give 9 in the matter will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you 10 God? 11 12 MS. MOHLER: Yes. 13 COURT: Come on over here ma'am. Scoot on up to that microphone. 14 (DIRECT EXAMINATION OF SUSAN KAY MOHLER) 15 MR. CAMIEL: Ma'am, could you tell us your full name and spell your last 16 17 name? 18 MS. MOHLER: Susan Kay Mohler. M-o-h-l-e-r. 19 MR. CAMIEL: Where do you live? 20 MS. MOHLER: Missoula, Montana. 21 22 MR. CAMIEL: Where did you grow up? 23 MS. MOHLER: Superior, Nebraska. 24 MR. CAMIEL: How long have you lived in Montana? 25

1	MS. MOHLER: Thirteen years.
2	MR. CAMIEL: Would you like a glass of water?
3	MS. MOHLER: Please.
4	MR. CAMIEL: If I can approach Your Honor.
5 6	MS. MOHLER: Thank you.
7	MR. CAMIEL: Are you married?
8	MS. MOHLER: Yes I am.
9	
10	MR. CAMIEL: And do you have children?
11	MS. MOHLER: Yes.
12	MR. CAMIEL: How many kids do you have?
13	MS. MOHLER: We have got five living.
14 15	MR. CAMIEL: Are you employed?
16	MS. MOHLER: Yes.
17	MR. CAMIEL: Where do you work?
18	MS. MOHLER: Hunter's Glen.
19	WIS. WOTILER. Trainer's Gien.
20	MR. CAMIEL: And that is in Missoula?
21	MS. MOHLER: Yes.
22	MR. CAMIEL: And that is
23	MS. MOHLER: Assisted living.
24	
25	MR. CAMIEL: And what do you do there?

1	MS. MOHLER: I am a Med Tech.
2	MR. CAMIEL: So what does that mean? What are your duties?
3	MS. MOHLER: Passing meds.
4	MR. CAMIEL: How long have you worked there?
5	MS. MOHLER: Thirteen years.
6 7	MR. CAMIEL: So you started in what year?
8	
9	MS. MOHLER: 1998.
10	MR. CAMIEL: Do you know Billie Smith?
11	MS. MOHLER: Yes I do.
12	MR. CAMIEL: How do you know her?
13	MS. MOHLER: We used to work together.
14	MR. CAMIEL: At Hunter's Glen?
16	MS. MOHLER: At Hunter's Glen.
17	MR. CAMIEL: And what did she do there?
18	MS. MOHLER: She was a CNA and Med Tech.
19	
20	MR. CAMIEL: And, she no longer works there?
21	MS. MOHLER: No.
22	MR. CAMIEL: Do you know when she left?
24	MS. MOHLER: I am not for sure. I think maybe three years ago.
25	MR. CAMIEL: Do you know a woman named JoAnn Todd?

	104
1	MS. MOHLER: Yes I do.
2	MR. CAMIEL: How do you know her?
3	MS. MOHLER: She used to work at Hunter's Glen.
4	MR. CAMIEL: What did she do there?
5 6	MS. MOHLER: She was a lead CNA.
7	MR. CAMIEL: Do you know what years JoAnn Todd worked at Hunter's
8	Glen?
9	MS. MOHLER: I can't remember for sure.
10	MR. CAMIEL: Do you know how long ago it was that she left?
12	MS. MOHLER: I think about five years ago.
13	MR. CAMIEL: What was your relationship with JoAnn Todd?
14	MS. MOHLER: Just we worked together?
15 16	MR. CAMIEL: Were you social friends outside of work?
17	
18	MS. MOHLER: No.
19	MR. CAMIEL: Did you get along?
20	MS. MOHLER: Yes.
21	MR. CAMIEL: I want to ask you about an occasion when you were present
22	when JoAnn was talking about something that happened in her early years. Let me
23	ask you first, do you remember when that was?
24 25	MS. MOHLER: Not for sure.
23	

MR. CAMIEL: Approximately in terms of how many years ago? MS. MOHLER: I am going to say between five and six years ago. MR. CAMIEL: Okay. And tell us what you remember. MS. MOHLER: I went outside. They were on smoke break and I was coming by the door I saw they were out there. MR. CAMIEL: Let me just stop you for a minute. You are using the word they. Can you tell us who was out there that you are talking about? MS. MOHLER: Billie and JoAnn. MR. CAMIEL: And when you say they were out there, where were they? MS. MOHLER: Outside smoking. MR. CAMIEL: Was there a regular area where employees could go to MS. MOHLER: Out the back door. MR. CAMIEL: So, Billie Smith and JoAnn Todd are out there. Anybody MS. MOHLER: No. MR. CAMIEL: And so what happened? MS. MOHLER: Well, I went out and Billie said, "JoAnn, tell Susan what you just told me." And JoAnn had told us that many years ago when she was young, and she kept saying I was not involved in it, with girls that had killed this

girl. She said they drove down by a river and these girls drug her out of her truck and they beat her. I couldn't believe she was telling me this. I said, "JoAnn, why would they do this?" And she says she was smart and she was going away to college. And I just shook my head. I heard all that I wanted to hear and I went back in.

MR. CAMIEL: So, did you believe what she told you?

MS. MOHLER: I wondered about it for quite awhile and then someone asked us at work, me and Billie, this was after JoAnn was already gone if we had seen Dateline. It was about someone that used to work there. We hadn't so our boss let us use her computer and we brought it up on the computer and we watched the Dateline program and Billie and I just kind of looked at each other and said, "So it was true what she was telling us".

MR. CAMIEL: Now, I want to go back. You went through it kind of fast. When you went out there and Billie asked JoAnn to repeat this story, as best you can remember what exactly did JoAnn say?

MS. MOHLER: She told us it was back when she was in school yet.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate how old she was at the time?

MS. MOHLER: No. They were riding around. But she didn't say who they were. She said a bunch of girls were riding around and they went down by a river.

MR. CAMIEL: She used the word river? You remember that?

MS. MOHLER: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And then what happened?

MS. MOHLER: She said these girls drug this girl out of her truck and they started beating on her.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she say where she was when this was happening?

MS. MOHLER: No. She just kept telling us that she was not involved. She did not do it.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she say she was there when it happened?

MS. MOHLER: She didn't actually say she was there, no.

MR. CAMIEL: From the way she described it, did it sound like she was there?

MS. MOHLER: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she ever say she wasn't there?

MS. MOHLER: No.

MR. CAMIEL: What else did she say?

MS. MOHLER: That they started beating her and then she just kind of stopped there because I don't remember her saying anything else after that or maybe my mind just quit then. Because then I just said, "JoAnn, why would they do this to her?" And that's when she said because she was smart and she was going on to college.

MR. CAMIEL: Is it accurate in terms of what JoAnn told you and what happened?

MS. MOHLER: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: I would offer Petitioner's Eight.

COURT: Any objection?

MR. LIGHT: Again Your Honor, we would ask what is the relevancy. She has just testified. Why do we have to have the prior statement admitted?

COURT: Well, on what grounds would it be for your objection?

MR. LIGHT: Because, we have the actual testimony. It stands for itself. I mean, they are offering the exhibit for a purpose. For what purpose?

COURT: Yeah, what is the purpose?

MR. CAMIEL: Again, my next question to her was going to be the date on the statement. It shows when we contacted her, when we got the statement from her. As a part of the Clark factors that we have to meet in terms of diligence.

COURT: Objection overruled. Exhibit will be admitted.

MR. CAMIEL: What is the date on your statement?

MS. MOHLER: The fifteenth of May, 2011.

MR. LIGHT: Well, if in fact they just admitted that, why does she have to testify to that? If they admitted that for the fact that it shows the date and time, why is she then testifying?

MS. PLUBELL: But you did hear ...

MR. CAMIEL: I am sorry Your Honor I would object to cutting off the answer. I don't think the witness is finished.

MS. PLUBELL: I apologize if I didn't let you finish Susan. Go ahead.

COURT: What we want ma'am is your accurate memory irregardless of that document. We want the most accurate memory you have. If that provides the most accurate memory, great. If you think inside yourself that you have got a more accurate memory then that, you tell us.

MS. MOHLER: Okay. I just remember her saying that they drove down by the river.

MS. PLUBELL: Okay.

MS. MOHLER: And these other girls pulled her out of the truck and they beat her.

MS. PLUBELL: All right. And, I think in your direct examination, you actually indicated that JoAnn never told you she was actually present, correct?

MS. MOHLER: She said ... She never actually said she was present, but she didn't say she wasn't there.

MS. PLUBELL: All right. And, you have no independent knowledge of that, correct?

MS. MOHLER: No.

MR. CAMIEL: You said she didn't say the girl was beaten to death, but I thought I heard you say during cross examination that she told you the girl died?

MS. MOHLER: Yes.

COURT: So, you remember that she discussed, in the conversation when she was telling the story; she eventually said the girl died?

MS. MOHLER: You know, she told us to begin with the girl had died and she said a bunch of girls and I were riding around and we went down by the river and these girls drug her out of the truck and they beat her. But she kept telling us, "I was not involved. I did not do this."

COURT: You use the term a bunch of girls and I were driving around and we went down by the river. Is that what you remember her saying?

MS. MOHLER: She said they ... She was with some girls and they went down by the river.

COURT: All right.

(RECROSS EXAMINATION OF SUSAN KAY MOHLER)

MS. PLUBELL: So Susan, this information that you overheard during your smoke break, this happened at least five or six years ago, right?

MS. MOHLER: Right.

MS. PLUBELL: And so, anything that you are saying today, it is you are remembering back five or six years ago, correct?

MS. MOHLER: Correct. 1 MS. PLUBELL: And that was true when you signed this statement? 2 3 MS. MOHLER: Yes. 4 MS. PLUBELL: On the 13th of May 2011, right? 5 MS. MOHLER: Yes. 6 MS. PLUBELL: And, I think you indicated when we talked, that you and 7 8 Billie have discussed this several times. 9 MS. MOHLER: Yes. 10 MS. PLUBELL: Including this morning, correct? 11 12 MS. MOHLER: Yes. 13 MS. PLUBELL: No further questions Your Honor. 14 COURT: Has any discussions you have had been with people who have 15 tried to convince you to change what you remember? To testify differently than 16 17 you remember? 18 MS. MOHLER: You mean the people that ... 19 COURT: Yeah anybody that you have talked with? 20 21 MS. MOHLER: No, no. 22 COURT: All right. May this witness be excused? 23 MR. CAMIEL: Yes. 24 COURT: Any objection? 25

MR. HALL: At that time I was mostly doing buying more than anything because I used to buy low and sell high.

MR. CAMIEL: And what kind of drugs?

MR. HALL: Mostly pills then, Oxycontin, oxycodone, hydrocodone, Lorcet, Lortab, Vicodin. Pharmaceuticals I thought weren't as dangerous as street drugs. How smart.

MR. CAMIEL: And was ... You were using in addition to doing other things with the drugs, right?

MR. HALL: Correct.

MR. CAMIEL: Was Les Wright also using drugs?

MR. HALL: He would use anything that would spin his melon.

MR. CAMIEL: And what about Sissy Atkinson?

MR. HALL: Definitely.

MR. CAMIEL: Where did they live? Where did Les Wright and Sissy Atkinson live?

MR. HALL: They used to live in a green apartment down by Gibson Park and then when Les died in August of 2005 she moved in with, I believe it was; she told me it was her sister who lived four blocks away from our house. Our address was like 612 6th Avenue South. Her address would have been like 614 or 616 7th Street South.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. Did you actually use drugs with Les Wright and Sissy Atkinson?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. CAMIEL: Did you go over to their place?

MR. HALL: Never.

MR. CAMIEL: Did they come to your place?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Did there come a point and time where you learned that Sissy's boyfriend Les Wright had died?

MR. HALL: There had.

MR. CAMIEL: What did you know about that?

MR. HALL: What had happened was, let me get it all straight now. The way it started was Sissy had gotten her prescription of Oxycontin. Her and Les had gotten in a fight. Lester wanted to get pills from her. In the pill world it is a power trip. I have got the power when I have got the pills. She had the power. She told Les you cannot have any of my stuff. Les got mad, went out, pulled a burglary. Sold the stuff from the burglary to another guy, scored some pills. Went back and let Sissy know, "Ha ha, look at this. I have got some. I didn't need you after all. See you later". She got ticked off that he had done that. She called the police up, informed on her old man. Said that he pulled a burglary. Told the

police where the stolen goods were. They went and collected the stolen goods and returned them or however they do it.

MR. CAMIEL: Now, as a result of all that did Les Wright get arrested?

MR. HALL: He was arrested. He was up on the hill in jail. I had heard within less than a week that he was dead, that he had committed suicide as a result of his arrest and his issues with the law.

MR. CAMIEL: Did Sissy ... Did you have contact with Sissy Atkinson after her boyfriend Les Wright committed suicide?

MR. HALL: A lot of times.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she come over to your place?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Was there an occasion after Les Wright died that she came over to your place and talked about some things in her past?

MR. HALL: Always. Without fail.

MR. CAMIEL: After Les Wright died. I want to focus on after he committed suicide. Was there a conversation where she talked about being involved in a murder in Poplar?

MR. HALL: Not necessarily a murder. What had happened was. What I mean by buzz kill and how she ruined everything is because she would constantly come over to the house. She couldn't hit herself with a needle, you know. And so,

from not treating the needle or the drugs right as they inject them. Sissy almost; for awhile it was daily. I mean she would knock on the door and if Tammy wasn't there I wouldn't answer the door. I mean, I was like, please don't come around me because all she would do is sit and cry about karma all the time to me.

MR. CAMIEL: Well, what was she talking about with regard to karma?

my spouse was really good at taking a needle and shooting people in their veins

and hitting them and not giving them blow outs. Sissy loved to come over there

MR. HALL: Well, with the karma I kept telling her, I says you know, because she kept saying because evidently she had a husband that had died. I don't know how much truth. Just like I never knew then how much truth. She had a husband that had aids and gave himself a hot shot. A hot shot is when, let's say I am used to taking 80 mg of dope, I don't want to deal with life. I know for a fact that 80 mg I can operate. If I give myself 200, 250 I know I will get a real good buzz and soon I will die. That's how you get rid of your problems in that world.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. Did she talk about karma in relation to Les Wright's death?

MR. HALL: Yes she did.

MR. CAMIEL: What did she say about that?

MR. HALL: Everything bad. Les, my husband, died; it was karma. Lester died, it was karma. I got arrested, it was karma. I kept telling her Sissy I am tired of hearing about this. There is nothing that a person does in their life that would create you to justify this much misery in your world. Nothing Sissy. You just got to get off this karma thing.

MR. CAMIEL: Now, when you said that to her, did she describe something that she said she was involved in that gave her this bad karma?

MR. HALL: Definitely.

MR. CAMIEL: What did she say?

MR. HALL: She had told me that because I told her God wouldn't allow a person to suffer that much. I believe that with all my heart. God won't allow us to suffer any more than what we deserve; the spanking we deserved. I had mentioned that to her several times and she kept telling me, "Well, I deserve that kind of spanking", basically.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she say why she deserved it?

MR. HALL: Yes she did.

MR. CAMIEL: What did she say?

MR. HALL: Because she had played a part ... Now the way she put it to me was she had played a part or had known of these girls that played a part in hurting this girl. And I said, "So what, you hurt a girl". And she said, "No, I mean we

really hurt her". I said, "Well okay, you really hurt her". And then she told me she was beaten up and when they beat her up they rolled her in the river. I said, "Well, what do you mean? This is just a regular fight, so what". She said not, and that is when she went into telling me about it. She even told me ... I asked her about a tire tool. I don't know what a tire tool is. I know a lug wrench, I know a star wrench.

MR. CAMIEL: Let me slow you down for a minute. Who mentioned a tire tool?

MR. HALL: Sissy.

MR. CAMIEL: In reference to what?

MR. HALL: To beating that girl.

MR. CAMIEL: Now, in reference to beating that girl did Sissy indicate that she participated in that?

MR. HALL: Yes and no. She participated, as far as the story to me, she participated in the extent that she didn't stop it. But yet, she did know about it. She was trying to minimize her part in it. And the more I talked to her about the karma thing the more she said, "Well, maybe I was more involved. Maybe I did. Maybe I deserve more". I kept telling her you didn't kill nobody you don't deserve family dying on you like that. I said I don't believe in karma. God is not going to spank you like that.

MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate where this event happened with the girl MR. HALL: Now what she indicated, no. At first I had thought, because the first time she had told me, I thought it was at a high school kegger because she said it was where they used to have the keggers at when we were in high school. So, I was assuming it was just a little girl high school fight. MR. CAMIEL: Did she ever indicate where? In terms of the town or the MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate that she was from Poplar? MR. CAMIEL: Did she indicate that the girl that was the victim of this MR. CAMIEL: Did she eventually indicate that the girl died?

MR. HALL: The implication was that you don't take a girl and roll her into

MR. CAMIEL: How many times did she talk about this event?

MR. CAMIEL: When she was talking about it was she under the influence of drugs?

MR. HALL: Always, definitely.

MR. CAMIEL: When she was talking about this event, did she indicate that she was there with these girls when it happened?

MR. HALL: Yes.

(INTERRUPTION BY VIDEOCONFERENCE UNIT)

COURT: Okay. At five o'clock the US District Court is going to be calling in and I think they have more power than I do so we will break at five. Go ahead.

MR. CAMIEL: That is fine. Mr. Hall, I wanted to clarify when I asked you whether or not Sissy Atkinson indicated she was actually involved in the beating of this girl and the killing of this girl. You said yes and no.

MR. HALL: Correct. The way it was presented to me was that these girls were jealous of this girl and evidently this girl had been messing around with some boyfriend or something of Sissy's and some other girl that was involved in this.

MR. CAMIEL: Now this is what Sissy told you?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay.

MR. HALL: And so what had happened was, is these girls, that is what made me know for sure it was high school and it was a kegger party because it

sounds like all girlie girl stuff and they were jealous over it. So, these girls were supposed to lure her over somewhere and then these other girls were supposed to join in on it and they were going to thump her and beat her good because she had it coming for messing with other peoples' boyfriends.

MR. CAMIEL: And on one of the occasions, Sissy went into this kind of detail?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay. Did she indicate that she herself was involved in the beating?

MR. HALL: No. Not the actual physical part. She tried to say yeah, yeah. Then she would go, no I was there, but I mean it changed so many times I can't be positive on either one of those.

MR. CAMIEL: All right. This story that she told you over however many times, it was, did you ever, did you take it to be true or did you think it was just puffing?

MR. HALL: I never took it to be true for at least a couple few months at least because I kept thinking this is just girlie girl stuff. Girls getting in fights, you know. She never actually said anything about somebody being dead.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay.

MR. HALL: And, it wasn't until I thought of a part where she told me about they beat her with a tire tool. Well, I have been in enough fights in my life where I have got my butt kicked and I am seeing stars. I have got in a fight where I have kicked butt and saw stars. When you got somebody kicked and beat up that bad, I mean, there is nothing but blood and mess everywhere and all you do is pick a body up and roll it around. Granted, it is tough to do, but I have been there and seen it.

MR. CAMIEL: I understand. But I want to ask you ...

MR. LIGHT: Your Honor I am going to object as narrative and nonresponsive to the exact question. We seem to be ...

COURT: Sustained.

MR. CAMIEL: I need you to listen to my question. Did she indicate that the girl that was involved was rolled in the river?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And did that suggest to you that the girl was dead?

MR. LIGHT: Leading, Your Honor. Did that suggest?

COURT: Sustained.

MR. CAMIEL: What did you think in terms of whether the girl was dead or alive when Sissy told you she was rolled into the river?

MR. HALL: If a person is unconscious and beat up and rolled into a river, the only thing they are going to suck in is water.

MR. CAMIEL: How was it that you came forward with the information that you had?

MR. HALL: I came to the realization of that.

MR. CAMIEL: Who did you go to with the information?

MR. HALL: First it was just friends; talking to them about what do you do, what do I do? Then I went to the police department asking them about unsolved murders from up around Poplar area. I was told that there were no unsolved murders from up around Poplar area. I blew it off. Later on, Sissy came back with another story and that is when I first heard the tire tool, after I went to the police. Then I thought I will go back to them again. I asked them again.

MR. CAMIEL: Now when you say you went to the police, where did you go?

MR. HALL: Great Falls City Police Department.

MR. CAMIEL: Do you know who you talked to there?

MR. HALL: At first I didn't remember exactly who. I remembered his name began with a "P", like Pringman, Prignats or something like that. I couldn't remember. I was informed, whether it is true or not that there was a fellow named Prigmore and that sounded familiar to me.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay and then after you saw the show, did you go back to the police?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And did they seem interested in the information you had?

MR. HALL: I really didn't have any information. The only thing I had was do you have any unsolved murders. I heard that a girl had killed somebody and beat her with a tire tool up in Poplar. Is anything like that true?

MR. CAMIEL: You mentioned that you went to the Great Falls Tribune?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. CAMIEL: And did you talk to a reporter there?

MR. HALL: The first time I went there I told that story; I was turned away at the desk and I left.

MR. CAMIEL: Okay.

MR. HALL: I started getting mad because I started smelling something stinky. Something is wrong. I went back again and I was more affirmative with them. I told my story. They didn't care. I started to leave. Then a girl came down and said go up to the second floor and talk to, I cannot remember the girl's name at the desk, but talk to her. I left my number and name there. Then somebody called me later on and wanted to ask me what I knew about it and I told them.

MR. CAMIEL: And did you give an interview to a reporter?

MR. HALL: Yes sir. 1 MR. CAMIEL: Okay. And, as a result of that, did you end up getting 2 3 contacted by somebody from Centurion Ministries? 4 MR. HALL: Yes sir. 5 MR. CAMIEL: And did they come and interview you? 6 7 MR. HALL: Yes sir. 8 MR. CAMIEL: Was a statement ever prepared regarding your interview 9 with the people at Centurion Ministries? 10 MR. HALL: No statements, no. You mean like a deposition hearing thing 11 12 or something? 13 MR. CAMIEL: If I could approach Your Honor? 14 COURT: You may. 15 MR. HALL: Oh sure, yeah. This was way later but, yes. 16 17 MR. CAMIEL: Okay. So, after you first talked, did they come back? The 18 people from Centurion Ministries? 19 MR. HALL: Yes. 20 21 MR. CAMIEL: And was this document prepared? 22 MR. HALL: I believe so. 23 MR. CAMIEL: And is this your statement that you gave, that you signed? 24 MR. HALL: Yes it is. 25

CERTIFICATE STATE OF MONTANA) County of Fergus and place specified in the caption hereof. Deidre Dietrich

I, Deidre Dietrich, the official Court Reporter within and for the 10th Judicial District, State of Montana, duly appointed, qualified and acting, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were duly taken by me and before me at the time

Official Court Reporter