STATE OF WISC			
		CIRCUIT COURT BRANCH IV	OUTAGAMIE COUNT
STATE OF WISC			
Plaint	iff,		
vs.			CASE NO. 00-CF-40
KENNETH A. HU	JDSON,		
Defend	dant.		COPY
	TRANSCRI	PT OF JURY TRIAL - March 5, 2001	DAY 1
before the HC Judge, Branch County Justic	ot of the DNORABLE 1 IV, Out ce Center	HAROLD V. FROEHLIC agamie County, hel	n the above action H, Circuit Court d at the Outagamie ppleton, Outagamie
APPEARANCES:	CARRIE Attorne	R. BISKUPIC, Dist A. SCHNEIDER, Depu y, Outagamie Count of the Plaintiff.	

INDEX								
NANCY VAN DYN HOVEN								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic							Page	197
DAVID J. CARNOT								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic Cross-Examination by Mr. Hudson Redirect Examination by Mr. Biskupic							Page Page Page	246
LISA CARNOT								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic	•		•	•	٠	•	Page	255
MIKE BORCHERT								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic Cross-Examination by Mr. Hudson .							Page Page	
JAMES SPRANGERS								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic Cross-Examination by Mr. Hudson .							Page Page	
JAMES VANDER LOOP								
Direct Examination by Mr. Biskupic Cross-Examination by Mr. Hudson .							Page Page	
2								

1				EXHIBITS			
2					IDENT'D	OFR'D	REC'D
3	#	A	- State Crime Lab	report	9		
4	#	В	- Photo		9		
5	#	C	- Photo		9		
6	#	1 .	- Photo		206	215	215
7	#	2 -	- Photo		206	215	215
8	#	3 .	- City of Kaukauna	a map	199	215	215
9	#	4 .	- Aerial photo		200	215	215
10	#	7 .	- Photo		220	223	223
11	#	8 -	- Photo		220	223	223
12	#	9 .	- Photo		220	223	223
13	#	10 -	- Photo		220	223	223
14	#	11 .	- Photo		220	223	223
15	#	12 -	- Photo		220	223	223
16	#	13 -	- Photo		232	254	254
17	#	14 -	- Photo		232	254	254
18	#	15 -	- Photo		233	254	254
19	#	16 -	- Photo		233	254	254
20	#	17 -	- Photo		233	254	254
21	#	18 -	- Photo		231		
22	#	19 -	- Photo		245	254	254
23	#	20 -	- Photo		245	254	254
24	#	21 -	- Photo		246	254	254
25	#	22 -	- Photo		244		
				3			

1		EXHIBITS			
2			IDENT'D	OFR'D	REC'D
3	# 23 - Photo		244		
4	# 24 - Photo		244		
5	# 98 - Photo		229		
6	# 99 - Photo		229		
7	#121 - Photo		247	251	251
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
		4			

MR. HUDSON: I have --

trial Exhibits 1 through 120.

MR. BISKUPIC: We've got numbers for the

23

24

was no other marks besides the scratch on my elbow.

Now, that clearly shows that there was another injury to me. You can see on the elbow there that mark. Why didn't the hospital put in their report about the dig mark on my face? And when the police officers took me in, they asked me where I got the -- where I got the dig marks on my shoulders and on my face. And if the dig marks are on the back of my shoulder, they wouldn't show up on that because I'm wearing that gown that they had on me.

isn't showing that, but the hospital says that there

And in Dr. --

MR. BISKUPIC: That's fine.

MR. HUDSON: -- Coffey's report, you know, it said again, The records from the emergency room also indicate that he had slight scratches on his right shoulder -- or his right elbow as the only obvious signs of injury. This is inconsistent with Mr. Hudson's report.

Now, she's -- obviously, they didn't give her all the information. And then it goes on to say that, While Mr. Hudson reports that he drank an excessive amount of beer on the day of the crime, emergency room records after his offense indicate that his blood alcohol level was .04, not legally intoxicated.

This is Dr. Ralph Baker, medical doctor, report to Vince Biskupic. It's his appointed doctor. And on page nine, at the bottom of the page, this is what the doctor states: Drug and blood alcohol levels were drawn at St. Elizabeth Hospital approximately five to six hours after the alleged criminal activity.

Projecting those levels back in time would indicate Mr. Hudson had a significantly higher blood alcohol level and level of the drug Diazepam. However, it is also possible he was using crack cocaine at the time of the alleged criminal activity, and it would not necessarily show up in the drug screen. Thus, by his own admission and by the blood levels, there is every indication that his mental functioning was impaired by drugs at the time of the alleged criminal activity.

Now, in Dr. Coffey's report, she believes that I'm lying about this stuff. She was never told -- or, obviously, she's thinking that, that these were taken six hours earlier from the time of the hospital. And she thinks that I was lying about the dig marks because there was no medical report stating that there was. And she believes I was lying through this interview, and I believe that affected that interview.

And then I have a problem with -- on page ten of Dr. Coffey's report, The fact that he reported more

memories of the event to police when he first -- when he was first apprehended, inconsistent with his current reports, suggests that he may be attempting to use a lack of recall of events as an excuse for his behavior.

Now, there's a lot of things in the police reports that they're saying I stated at the time of my confession are not true.

Now, this is a report from the Kaukauna Police Department, case number 0006279; date, 6/25/2000.

Officer Sergeant Patschke, Joe Rosche, Rex Swanson, Manion and Shepardson.

On page 15 of 34, at the bottom, last paragraph, at approximately 11:00 p.m., I did read Hudson his Miranda warnings from a card. After I was done reading the card to him, I asked him if he understood what I just read to him. Page 16: Did acknowledge me by saying yes. I then asked him if he was willing to answer questions that we had, and he again stated yes.

At 11:08 p.m., eight minutes later, Officer

Krueger did read the Informing the Accused form to

Hudson in pursuit of an operating while intoxicated

procedure. Hudson refused at this time to give a

sample of his blood at this time, and it was indicated

on the form.

At this point Hudson says, Don't I have a right to

talk to an attorney? What's going on here? Officer Sanderfoot responds, saying, Not at this time.

The procedure then continues.

Well, eight minutes earlier when he read me my Miranda warnings, he said, you have a right to an attorney.

MR. BISKUPIC: Judge, that's beyond the scope of his motions. I mean, just to cut to the chase, he's arguing factual issues that are disputes between witnesses, and those are what cross-examination is for. If we're going to cut to his motions on the fingernail scrapings, our response is, is that if they were sent to the Crime Lab, he has the ability to cross-examine the analyst that handled those, whether there was any material that was actually tested or not, and that's a cross-examination issue regarding contradictory statements between Dr. Coffey and Dr. Baker. I mean, once again, that's an issue for him to cross-examination -- cross-examine those witnesses on.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. BISKUPIC: And argue to the jury, hey, give them little credibility or no credibility because of these inconsistencies.

Regarding the blood alcohol test, the person that did the test for the .04, or the .037 from the State

Crime Lab, can be asked questions about figuring backwards in time per hours, and I see the defendant has a chart that is consistent with the State Department of Transportation chart to say, wouldn't it have been a higher level four or five hours earlier? Those are fair game questions for those witnesses and don't, you know, necessarily have to be the subject of a motion. You know, they're factual disputes. They're not motions to exclude type of material. And to belabor this motion hearing when we're waiting to pick a jury with a recitation of what's in the report versus what's in the doctor's report is, I believe, a waste of time.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, the thing that I'm trying to get at is, I want my statement to the police squashed (sic). Obviously, the -- the recording of my interview is gone. They said it was erased. It's their responsibility to make sure that those procedures are handled properly. In here it says the interview of Kenneth A. Hudson at 1:35 a.m., 6/26/2000. Prior to us starting to ask questions to Hudson, I did remind him of his Miranda warnings and asked him if he remembered them from when I read them to him earlier at the hospital.

Well, from my -- I asked him, Do I have the right

to an attorney? And from when they stated earlier at 11:08, when he said I did not have the right to talk to an attorney, but eight minutes earlier he read me my Miranda warnings, saying that you have a right to an attorney. And I was under intoxication at the time of the confession? I would ask that the Court have that squashed from the -- you know, from the record.

MR. BISKUPIC: Well, Your Honor, there were prior counsel on these issues that evaluated the record, and any ambiguous inquiry regarding an attorney is not an indication of rights. There's case law, including State v. Long, wherein a person inquires, do you think I need an attorney, issues along those lines, and I think in this particular case, the records bear out that there was no unambiguous request for an attorney.

And regarding the taking of the blood, that was pursuant to a search warrant, so it was unnecessary even to read the Informing the Accused on that because it technically wasn't a drunk driving case. So to try and revisit these things at the eleventh hour is simply a delay tactic. I mean, if the officers -- regarding the statement, if you need to have a foundation laid for that, I suggest right before they testify, the jury be excused and that be brought up. But this should

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have been the subject of motions earlier.

I remember talking to at least Attorney Bartman about that, and he indicated that, from their review of the record, they weren't going to seek a suppression. Obviously, the defendant's in a position of representing himself now, but I still think the records are the same. The reports he refers to show an unambiguous inquiry regarding an attorney and, in fact, in follow-up questions by Shepardson and Manion, it's made clear that the defendant wanted to talk to them. So he's revisiting issues that have already been evaluated by his prior counsel on the eve of trial. And if the Court thinks at some point there needs to be a record made on that potential issue, I suggest that it be prior to those officers testifying.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to deny the motion to quash the confession and deny the motion to require something to be done now regarding the fingernail scrapings of both parties. That can be handled on cross-examination.

MR. HUDSON: Excuse me, Your Honor. When I was in court last week, I -- I've been asking for these results now for a long time, the Breathalyzer test, the fingernail scrapings, the blood and alcohol test on Shanna Van Dyn Hoven.

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

904.01, State versus Sullivan, 576 N.W.2d 30, 217 Wis.2d 768.

I'm charged with first degree intentional homicide, and when Dr. Coffey did her reports, she's stating that she -- she's indicating that because there was no records done in the hospital of any fingernail scrapings or any injuries on me, it -- it has to pertain to my intent at the time of the crime.

Now, I'm stating that the victim had attacked me and scratched me and dug me, and that's what caused me to react in that way. And I have a right to present that evidence. As a constitutional right, whether a defendant's right to present a defense was violated is a question of constitutional fact that we review as de State versus Heft, 185 Wis. 2d 288, 517 N.W.2d 494, 498 (1994). The due process rights of a criminal defendant are, in essence, the right to fair opportunity to defend against the state's accusations.

Now, I have a right to defend myself against this intent part, and with those fingernail scrapings and with her -- my skin, if they were under there, they sent them to the Crime Lab, and then he goes and says last week, oh, well. They never did the testing. Why? You know.

> THE COURT: You're going to have to ask the

THE COURT: You put that in your motion.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. But I want to go over a lot of the reports that I have that I want to enter in as evidence as why I want that done. I have considerable research on the drugs that I was using before and how it affects a person's brain and tests that were going to be done.

This is from Nila Robinson to Ed Carns. I obtained authorization to get an MRI and neuropsychological examination in order to determine whether Ken was suffering from something on the order of an organic brain disorder or frontal lobe trauma. The -- that diagnosis would not depend on his credibility.

And then it goes on to state, But the authority is there to use if you wish. Dr. Kaplan would remain available to do the work and is qualified. And this has to do with the crack cocaine issue.

I have -- these are all places where I went to for the substance abuse issue, and it's dated -- these are dated back from 1990, 1992. I had drug overdose; almost died from the crack cocaine use and -- from having such a long, extensive history.

And Dr. Patricia Coffey's report on the bipolar disorder, this is what she states, at the second

paragraph. The defendant's claim that some of his family members have bipolar disorder would not affect my diagnosis on the defendant in this case. He did not report these symptoms during the evaluation. However, it should be noted that he has such an extensive substance dependency history that it would be difficult to completely rule out the possibility of a mood disorder. Individuals with substance abuse issues frequently display mood swings associated with the use of substances and withdrawal from those substances. This evaluator does not have evidence of bipolar disorder symptoms during the time period he has been incarcerated and not abusing substances.

Now, at the time of the crime, I was in a withdrawal state. I have -- I have evidence -- and this is from the State Supreme Court ruling. A voluntary induced state of intoxication by drugs or alcohol or both does not constitute a mental disease. A temporary mental state, which is brought into existence by the voluntary taking of drugs or alcohol, does not constitute a mental disease. However, chronic use of drugs or alcohol may produce a condition that can constitute a mental disease if the condition has become permanent.

Now, there is some research that was done by Deb

Cudworth. She's a social worker that was on the case for Brian Figy and Eugene Bartman, and then later she was working for Nila for a period of time. And this is from the Indiana Prevention Resource Center. And it talks about the effects that cocaine has on long-term use. The use of cocaine may cause psychological changes in user. These effects may be a sense of increased self-esteem, confidence, depression, intense anxiety, confusion, hallucinations, irritability, repetition of tasks and a tendency to withdraw from normal activities. Cocaine psychosis is paranoid behavior that occurs as a result of overstimulation of the fright centers of the brain. Irrational violence can occur at even the slightest provocation.

And then this one is from National Institute on Drug Abuse, Research Report Series, Cocaine Abuse and Addiction. And it goes on to show the effects that it has on a person's brain over the long-term. Here it says, short-term effects of cocaine, and then here it says, what are the long-term effects of cocaine use? Cocaine is a powerful, addictive drug. Once having tried cocaine, an individual may have difficulty predicting or controlling the extent to which he or she will continue the use of the drug. Cocaine stimulant and addictive effects are thought to be primarily a

result of its ability to inhabit the re-absorption of dopamine by nerve cells. Dopamine is released as a part of the brain's reward system and is either directly or indirectly involved in addictive properties with the major drug of abuse.

Long-term effects of cocaine: Addiction, irritability and mood disturbances, restlessness, paranoia, auditory, hallucinations.

Now, at the time of the crime, I was in a withdrawal state from cocaine. And that's why Nila Robinson wanted to do this test. She had an authorization to have this test done on my brain. And that would -- I have a right to that defense under the State Crime -- or under Supreme Court ruling; that chronic use of drugs or alcohol may produce a condition that can constitute a mental disease if the condition has become permanent.

Now, I had -- when I was 14 years old, my family had gotten me doing drugs. My father got me into selling drugs, and there is evidence to that. And if I was, at that age, 14, as a minor, and I was addicted at that time -- because there's all kinds of reports that I was being taken care of from these situations -- that over 18 years of the use of cocaine, it had to have some kind of effect on my brain. There's considerable

research, and I have a lot more than that, too, and that I have a right to this expert on crack cocaine.

I talked to Dr. Lewis. He said he had some background on cocaine, but he said you need an expert on the crack cocaine issue. I don't know if his -- any of his -- I'm not an expert, and I don't know if -- I -- you know, the Court or any of their doctors are experts specifically on crack cocaine and what it does to the brain.

THE COURT: You can make those inquiries on cross-examination, and you can -- you can use those two documents as expert -- as information in the field -- writings in the field.

MR. HUDSON: But, Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: We're not going to continue this case. We are not going to stop to get experts. We are going to go out there and do the case now. Do you have any other motions? That motion is denied.

MR. HUDSON: I have a couple other things I'd like to discuss. I'm not pleased -- once I'm done saying what I got to, I will not disturb the Court any whatsoever during the whole trial.

THE COURT: Are you going to stand mute or are you going to participate?

MR. HUDSON: No, I'm going to talk, but I

the -- the effect of the Valium.

Now, with these three drugs in my system at that time of the crime, how does it affect a person's brain? That's why I wanted to hire the expert, because of the intent part. And I have a right to that defense under a voluntary intoxication defense. If I don't have these experts -- now I talked to Ed Carns about these experts a long time ago, and he wasn't telling me anything about it. So I called my appeal attorney in Madison. His name is Michael Yovovich. He said, I'll call Carns and find out what's going on with those experts.

Now, when I called that attorney back, he said, I talked to Ed Carns, and Ed Carns has gotten two doctors that he had talked to that they're going to be -- he was going to be checking into getting those doctors for me.

When I talked to Ed Carns, it was before the February 8 hearing, and I asked him, where are these experts? He says, well, I called them and I left a message. They never got back to me. And I said, well, look. I need these experts. I have a right to this defense by constitutional right. And he said, well, I don't know where they are, and I'm done with that.

And that's when I filed the motion to have him

withdrawn. I said, well, my attorney in Madison talked to you, and you told him that you had these -- these experts. And when I addressed the Court on February 21 on these experts and I needed to know this information about those doctors, you had told Vince Biskupic that you find out who those doctors are and get those to Mr. Hudson so he can find out.

Now, yesterday Mr. Peter Roth came to see me, and this is one day before trial, Your Honor. I've been talking to Peter Roth about getting these doctors because he was ordered to help me with any information that I need to get. You ordered that in court. Right?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HUDSON: I've been asking him, where are these doctors? I want to get in touch with these doctors so I can have this neurological test done on my brain to see if there's a mental defect. It wouldn't have anything to do with these tests or anything. And he says, I called some -- and this was a couple weeks ago -- and I'm waiting for them to get back to me.

Now, this is two weeks ago.

Yesterday I come -- he comes and sees me, date given, 3/4/01. Did you give me this yesterday?

MR. PETER ROTH: Yes, I did.

MR. HUDSON: There's three doctors on here.

No area codes, nothing. He just says, I talked to these doctors and I'm waiting for them to get back to me.

I don't believe he even ever contacted these doctors. He just hands this to me a day before trial. I'm in a cell where I can't have access to get in touch with these doctors. That's why you ordered him and Vince Biskupic to find out what these doctors' names were and everything so I can contact these people.

And -- and I haven't -- I haven't been able to do that.

I have a right to expert witnesses on my defense. And he told that lawyer a long time ago, and I could subpoena that lawyer to court to testify. He did talk to Ed Carns, and Ed Carns told him he had contacted these doctors.

Did you have a conversation with that lawyer and tell him that?

MR. CARNS: Do you want me to comment here?

THE COURT: You have his permission. Go
ahead.

MR. CARNS: Well, the attorney did call me, and we did talk about this case. Again there is some lawyer-client privilege here, but what we talked about was, at that time I felt that there were two experts that may help Mr. Hudson. One was Dr. Lewis on Mr.

Hudson's case in chief. And I talked to Dr. Lewis about it. Dr. Lewis reserved the time, and he was willing to testify during the case in chief, if the Court thought it was relevant, as to the post-traumatic stress and his diagnosis and how that affected Mr. Hudson's state of mind. As far as I know, Dr. Lewis is still available. I had given that information to Mr. Hudson.

As to another expert, I suggested to him that I was looking for an expert in terms of long-term effects of cocaine, crack cocaine, as Mr. Hudson's explained. I never did in fact -- I did talk to a couple experts that were unavailable for this trial, and I was on the -- I had placed a call to Bellin Hospital, and the person wasn't there that I needed to talk to because I felt that we could find an expert on the long-term effects of crack cocaine out of some drug rehab center, AODA center, Bellin Hospital, whoever has a good rehabilitation center. He did call me back a couple days later. It was on my answering machine. At that point I was relieved of the responsibility.

I gave that information to Mr. Hudson. This was whenever this -- this withdrawal/firing episode began. So that's where it was left. I gave him what information I did have. And the other expert is Dr.

1.5

brother.

Lewis. And as far as I know, he's still on tap so -MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I do have Dr.

Lewis's report, and he said this: I will testify to
the following: Based on interview and psychological
tests, Mr. Hudson has long-term chemical dependency to
multiple substances, including alcohol, benzodiazepines
and crack cocaine, and that he suffers from
post-traumatic stress disorder, post-traumatic stress
disorder secondary to childhood abuse by his mother and

And I talked to him if he had, because he stated to me about Dr. Lewis had background in cocaine; that I could just have him talk about the effects of cocaine. Then when I got — they had arranged for me to use the pay phone, and I called Dr. Lewis — or as a matter of fact, Dr. Lewis called the jail at a specific time, at eleven o'clock one day, and I talked to him about this long-term effect of cocaine and if he was qualified as an expert in that area, and he says, no, I'm not. You would have to hire an expert that specifies in that area. And he said that Ed Carns just said that, you know, I needed this expert. And now it's a day before trial.

THE COURT: No, it's the day of trial.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. The day of trial. I'm

sorry. And I have never been able to get in touch with these experts to my defense. Okay?

And there's one other issue that I would like to address, and that will be it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. Do you want to respond to this one at all?

MR. BISKUPIC: That one, yeah. Specifically case law, State versus Guiden, G-U-I-D-E-N, and Gibson v. State, he wouldn't even, under the offer of proof, qualify for a voluntarily intoxication instruction.

Those cases make it clear that it's not enough for a defendant to establish that he was under the influence of a beverage or even a drug. It must be shown by the offer of proof that he was utterly incapable of forming the intent requisite to the commission of the crime.

That's under Guiden.

But more importantly, under <u>Gibson</u>, it does not -that instruction is not afforded where a defendant
voluntarily takes drugs or -- and I would include
alcohol also and that the facts demonstrate that there
was an intent to conceal a crime.

When you look at the number of stab wounds, the efforts for concealment and flight in a calculated fashion, this is a case where that type of instruction would not even be relevant. So he can go on and on

7 8

about speculation as to things when he was 14 or 15 or 16. The fact is that the state of the law and the relevant case law that exists wouldn't even afford the jury being instructed under 939.42, the voluntary intoxication defense.

So he's made his record. We believe the Court should deny the request for a continuance to get that type of expert. And once again we feel that the facts will establish that he's not even to the position where a voluntary intoxication instruction is appropriate.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I just have one comment. On the voluntaryiness, again I stated between the ages of 13 and 14, I was under the influence of those drugs from family members, and my mother's coming here and she's going to testify to the fact that my father and my uncle had me doing crack cocaine, acid, at the age of 13 and 14 years old. I'm a minor at that time.

Now, from then all the way up until 31, I've never been able to get off this drug. Was that a voluntariness at that age? I got clear evidence dating all the way back into my adolescence age of that; that I was on these drugs all the way up until now. I have doctors here from the jail stating that I have cocaine dependency, alcohol dependency, and --

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

state my facts. That's all I'm trying to do.

THE COURT: State them.

MR. HUDSON: This is a -- page seven of Dr. Kenneth Smail's report, and this is the fourth paragraph, the middle of the paragraph, While he may have had an abusive relationship with his mother and while he may have had considerable emotional conflict about that relationship, there is no other history to -- to substantiate a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder applying to Mr. Hudson at the time of the offense.

Back in December I had a couple phone conversations on the phone with my mother here at the jail, and on -- in those conversations she stated facts of why she wanted to kill me when I was younger, because it was my father, and a lot of other graphic details about why she had my brother do the things that he did to me.

Now, my brother was arrested when I was the age of 19 and 20 for him trying to stab me to death, for him trying to blow me up with bombs. Now, there was a SWAT team -- the FBI was involved in this -- and he was arrested and charged with these crimes that he did against me. Now -- and this is a hearing on the 22nd when I was firing Nila. There are records of just

basic light history materials that are pretty significant to the nature of the defense, not all of which are in. Now, when we are talking about the bipolar disorder with my brother and that, but what she's meaning is -- now, those pertain to my brother being arrested, charged with those crimes that he did to me.

Now, I just want to -- this is a published opinion, and Mr. Ed Carns had got this. It's a case No. 93-2611-CR, petition for review file, complete title of case: State of Wisconsin, plaintiff-respondent, v. Felicia Morgan, defendant-appellate; submitted on briefs July 7, 1994; oral argument, Court of Appeals of Wisconsin; opinion released June 20, 1995; opinion filed June 20, 1995; source of appeal, appeal from a judgment. Full name of judge --

THE COURT: Let's get to the facts, not -- MR. HUDSON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- the boiler plate.

MR. HUDSON: The facts: Evidence of
Felicia's past experiences with violence was relevant
to demonstrate the existence of the post-traumatic
stress disorder which caused her to unintentionally act
on October 26, 1991. Expert testimony as to the
effects of those violent experiences on her conduct was

4 5

also essential to assist the jury's understanding of how her perceptions have been shaped by the years of violence that she had endured, and not just by the events surrounding the night of the homicide. Again the cumulative effect of the violence caused the post-traumatic stress reaction evidenced on the night of the homicide.

And back to Dr. Kenneth Smail, he states, While he may have had an abusive relationship with his mother and while he may have had considerable emotional conflict about that relationship, there is no other history to substantiate a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder applying to Mr. Hudson at the time of the crime. That's why I needed those things that my brother was charged with to prove that he did those kinds of crimes to me. He was charged with this in a court of law. There are records in New York. And when Mr. Peter Roth first came on my case, he said he had talked to Nila and they needed to get those records, and I would like to address Peter Roth, if I may.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HUDSON: Did I tell you that there was evidence of those crimes that were committed against me by my brother?

MR. PETER ROTH: You said that.

relevance, and I think the Court, in its discretion, has the ability to weed out alleged expert defenses that have little or no relevance to a case. And what he's trying to present in his offer of proof something ten years ago that may have happened to him is of little or no value to a homicide regarding a 19-year-old girl.

If this was a domestic case where a wife shot a husband because of years of abuse, maybe that would have a higher relevance value, but the courts are in a position regarding expert testimony or these types of more creative defenses or rare offenses to weed these things out.

He's stated his record. I think we should move on, and I'd object to any continuance to try and get any other materials from New York.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, these reports were done by Investigator Roth. This report prepared and submitted by Terry Young, public defender investigator, Appleton trial office. This was my brother's wife. Okay? And this is what she states: Gregory was physically and mentally abusive to her when the police would be called because he was beating her. She would refuse to press charges in order to avoid being beaten later. He also hid her birth control pills because he

wanted to have another child, even though she didn't. When she had become pregnant, she had an abortion. When he wanted to have sexual relations, he would just take it whether she wanted it or not. He beat her constantly. Even through her pregnancy, he was very abusive. He would also hit her with nun-chucks and throw things at her. When Kenneth or anyone, for that matter, would come over, if Gregory didn't want her present for their conversation, he would tell her to go. If she complained or refused, he would hit her and beat her. He was also verbally abusive, and he would call her names and tell her she was no good and that no one else wanted her.

Gregory liked weapons, like guns and knives. He was also apparently building bombs. She recalls when he was arrested one time, she was told by the police that they found explosive stuff in a room in a house which was strictly used by him.

Now, this is the time that he was arrested for trying to blow me up. I had to sit in my house with a shotgun to protect myself. I had years and years of abuse by my brother, and I was afraid. The doctors say that I never went to doctors and stuff because I was scared to go and talk to anybody. Now, there was tests done and MMPI and that showed that I didn't -- there is

high indications that I couldn't trust anybody. Now, because of the extensive abuse that I had by him, I never went to any doctors because I didn't trust anybody.

And here's one more report. And this is by my other half-brother. This report prepared and submitted by Terry M. Young, public defender investigator,
Appleton trial office. Gregory, also known as Phillip, was another half-brother. He was okay until he went into the US Army Reserves. Then he started collecting weapons. He was aware that Phillip used to carry guns. He had killing on his mind, and he kept homemade bombs in his residence. He also did not like Arnold, Senior. That's my father. Phillip was Lorraine's protector. That's my mother. He recalls one time Phillip put Kenneth in his place for something he did. Kenneth and Phillip didn't get along well. He cannot say if Kenneth -- Phillip involved Kenneth in anything or not. Phillip's wife Valerie was nice and seems she was okay.

Now, there's a lot of evidence of the things that he used to do to me, Your Honor, and it is relevant because these doctors didn't have all that information to back up their theory of a post-traumatic stress disorder. At the time of the crime, I stated that after I was attacked -- that I was scratched and dug by

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

1718

19

20

2122

23

24

25

the victim, that I got images of my mother because at times when me and my mother would argue, she would call my brother up and he would come over and beat me unconsciously. And --

MR. BISKUPIC: Once again, Your Honor, this is not relevant. I mean, he's made his record. wants to bring those questions up for the doctors in the second phase regarding mental health issues, I think that's fair game for cross-examination; that if, under a hypothetical, you were to presuppose that the defendant had a history of abuse ten or more years ago, would that change your opinion or could that affect your opinion? You know, those are types of questions that cross-examination can involve. But, you know, he has records from Terry Young. Those were provided through Nila Robinson, and these doctors had access to those things, and he can ask him, did you consider this report? And to belabor that point pre-trial and pre-jury selection really doesn't accomplish much. time for those questions are during cross-examination.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, one more report.

And this is a doctor report from Dr. Wood, on page three. Psychological testing could not be completed. The results of such testing may have provided additional information regarding the mental state and

concomitant capacity that Mr. Hudson alleged he experienced at the time of the murder. That additional information may have supported Mr. Hudson's allegation of mental disorder.

And then down here he says, File documents did not reveal any family or personal history of mental illness. You know, he was willing to look at those things, but he didn't have them.

And he -- and the only person that did a psychological test, this MMPI, was Patricia Coffey and my doctor, Lewis.

Now, when Dr. Fosdal came up to see me one time the first time, he said, I'm going to be doing some psychological tests on you, and we'll be going over the case, but that was when the D.A. had hired the three doctors, and then Nila said, don't talk to them. Then when we went to the hearing, the Court said that he would hire two doctors; and then when Dr. Fosdal came back, he never did those psychological testings. And Dr. Kenneth -- Ed Carns told me that he arranged for Dr. Kenneth Smail to have that psychological test done. And he never did the psychological test either.

Please give me a minute, Your Honor.

MR. BISKUPIC: While he's collecting his

thoughts, I guess our response is, once again, he can pick out parts of the doctors' reports that he has gripes with and things that he thinks they should have done and question them, you know, along the lines of, Doctor, wouldn't it have been more appropriate to do this or that so you'd have a more informed decision?

And so, once again, at pre-trial, cluttering of the record is -- doesn't really accomplish a lot. He's got the opportunity to question these doctors if we're in a phase two and ask them questions that have to do with materials they considered and whether additional tests could have been done, and I think we're belaboring the process by having him recite different things from those doctors' reports.

THE COURT: You can ask all those questions as to why you didn't do this and why you didn't do that to weaken the position of the doctors during cross-examination, but your motion for continuance is denied. Let's go on to the next motion.

MR. HUDSON: This is a motion to -- this is dated March 4, 2001. Dear Judge Froehlich: I'm filing this motion with the Court in regards to the Court to hire me a new investigator.

Your Honor, I have a witness in the courtroom that I would like to have testify on my behalf right now of

I would like to file a motion for ineffective stand-by counsel. While in court on February 8, 2001, Mr. Edmund Carns clearly stated to the Court that if the Court forced him to stay on my case with me for trial, there would be no way he could give me a fair trial. He also stated to the Court that he didn't even want to sit next to me. Plus, him coming up here to the jail and stating to me he didn't want to be on my case in any way whatsoever, and he didn't care what happened with my case anymore.

That being said, I don't feel in any way that I can get effective advice from him or have him work on my case without him being prejudiced against me.

Now, Mr. Ed Carns came up last week after court, and when I addressed him about the doctor issue, where these experts were and everything, he said, I don't even care anymore. He says, do whatever you got. He said, you got yourself in this position. You're handling it now. And I said, I don't even want to be on this case. And I put my motion in to the Court, and they refused for me -- for me to let me withdraw. And he sat there and laughed at me. He laughed in my face. And he -- and he stated at one time that I would have never got myself in your predicament, and he was -- there's a conflict. And now I don't have anybody for

advice. He lied to me by -- Peter Roth, that he was never related to the victim. David Carnot's father's a police officer. His wife is first cousins with David Carnot's father, which is a police officer where this crime took police.

Now, this witness that I was going to call in was willing to testify that when Peter Roth investigated this person, that he brought up that I'm related to the victim through marriage through my wife, and I have -- still have good relations with my wife, and --

THE COURT: We have gone through that already. Your motion is on Mr. Carns, stand-by counsel.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. And every time I try to talk to Mr. Carns about my case, he just said it's on your own. You know, I can't get any effective advice. You know, he laughs at me. I don't have anybody on my side. Yous (sic) are forcing me into trial without me being able to hire any experts. He contacted the experts. Peter Roth never got the experts. He said he called them. They never called him back. Mr. Ed Carns clearly stated that he didn't even want to work on my case; that if he was forced to, that he couldn't give me a fair trial. Now you're forcing him to stand by as --

prejudicial publicity since Nila Robinson was fired.

B. My own admissions against my interest. C. Full courtroom of presumed Outagamie citizens sympathetic to the victim with extensive network.

Thank you for your special attention to this matter.

Then the second motion, to Honorable Judge Harold Froehlich, from Kenneth A. Hudson, defendant/attorney. Regarding: State versus Kenneth A. Hudson, case No. 00-CF-403. Date: March 4, 2001.

Dear Judge Froehlich: I'm filing this motion with the Court to supplement record. Grounds: Publicity continues. No time to obtain videos or transcript of newspaper articles.

So I don't know what those are, you know, and Ed Carns, he gave me all the stuff that he worked on, and I've never seen one newspaper article.

Now, I know from the time Nila was fired from the case and to Ed Carns, there was a lot of publicity because I watched it on the news. Why wouldn't he be obtaining these things for me? I can't obtain those from in here to -- here, Your Honor, this is what's being said against me.

And of the prejudice that's against me, there's lots and lots of pre-trial publicity right now. I

mean, like I said yesterday, there was a two-page article on the front page talking all kinds of things about this case. And I don't have any time to go over them or present them.

This is a motion filed by the district attorney, and I would just like to state some things.

THE COURT: Let's stay on the motions that you filed.

MR. HUDSON: Okay. And I'm just saying, I wanted some of the things the Court can consider reconsidered.

MR. BISKUPIC: Regarding the venue issue, as you would in any case, you have a ruling on motion to change venue, and then the days leading up to trial, sometimes there's previous stories; and in this particular case, whether there's one or two on the eve of trial, summarizing the positions of the party is one thing, but the issue as stated in the previous case law in our brief on the original venue motion was the nature of the publicity and, obviously, the Court's remedy is to inquire of jurors, you know.

THE COURT: I'll be doing that during the voir dire.

MR. BISKUPIC: So I mean, our position is that the motion should be denied; that the judge should

do some questioning of the jury regarding media attention and focusing on the fact that their duty is to view the evidence just in the case and set aside things that they may have read in the paper because sometimes media reports aren't even accurate.

MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I'd just like to state one newspaper article that I did receive, and this was a while ago. And this is Mayor John Lambie of Kaukauna stating this in the newspaper. Mayor John Lambie doesn't think this incident will harm the city's reputation of being known as a friendly city. It was just a senseless act, Lambie said. This person came from outside the city to do his dirty work. It's a good thing we caught this scum-bag.

Now, I would say that's pretty prejudice.

THE COURT: What is the date of that?

MR. HUDSON: This is dated Thursday, June 29, 2000.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HUDSON: Now, with all this other pre-trial publicity and, Your Honor, there's a lot of prejudice that's going on inside this jail by the way I'm being treated; that I have witnesses to the way I'm being treated. I had called one of the witnesses, and he's a well-reputable person in this community, Kurt

throughout the case. And that's our motion under 906.15. They have actively been involved in preparation with both prosecutors. They have done the bulk of the interviews of the witnesses, and we anticipate, if they do testify, that it would be the last couple of witnesses in this case. So we would like them to be available to assist us during the course of trial, as permitted by statute.

MR. HUDSON: And I object to that, Your

Honor, because they are going to be testifying against

me. And he just stated that they're going to be one of

the last ones to testify against me. And with them

listening to all these people and what they're saying

on the record, that I can't have any of my witnesses in

the courtroom when trial is proceeding and witnesses

are being called in and out. Now, their two witnesses,

Investigator Assistant Chief Manion and Lieutenant

Shepardson, they're the ones that did this

investigation. They're working together. And with

both of them being in the courtroom at the time all

this testimony is being going on, I object to that,

Your Honor.

MR. BISKUPIC: We don't object to Mr. Roth or any other person, Mr. Young or Mr. Smith, who did investigation for the defense from being in there.

1	THE COURT: I did.
2	MR. BISKUPIC: week. And were copies
3	distributed, as far as you know?
4	THE COURT: I have no idea. All I know, I
5	signed them.
6	MR. BISKUPIC: Okay.
7	MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, as far as I
8	didn't
9	THE COURT: Ed will be available Mr. Carns
10	will be available.
11	MR. HUDSON: You're telling him to stay on.
12	THE COURT: Yes, I am.
13	MR. HUDSON: Okay. Can I address an issue
14	off the record?
15	MR. BISKUPIC: We'd object to anything off
16	the record.
17	THE COURT: No. No.
18	MR. HUDSON: All right. That's fine. I
19	will I'll address this issue on the record. This is
20	time 8:31, February 3, 2001. This has to do with an
21	inmate, and it has to do with you, Casey Schneider and
22	a jail staff member. Jeramy Gschwind is an inmate at
23	the Outagamie County Jail. He resides in the same
24	block as I do, 4D block. I'm in cell No. 1 on the
25	lower tier. His cell is on the upper tier. Today at
	58

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

around 8:20 to 8:25 a.m., Mr. Gschwind came up to my cell and initiated a conversation with myself. He said, you know that guy that comes in our block to see you? -- and that would be Malchow -- he is from the D.A.'s office. I said, I already knew that. said, you know, the other day when Officer Bunker took me out to a nurse's visit? Well, it wasn't to a nurse's visit. It was to talk to the guy who comes and sees you. He said they called him out to see them at least on three different occasions, but he said on the last occasion, Mr. Biskupic asked him if he heard Kenneth Hudson's inmate, Jerry Buchanan and Inmate Bowman, discussing about having people following Judge Froehlich, Casey Schneider and Lieutenant Lillie around and planning to plant bombs under their cars so they could blow them up with their families.

He then stated that they were asking him if Hudson was bragging about his case or if he was confessing to his crimes. He told me he didn't have anything that he knew about, me or my case.

I then told him that I'm going to subpoena him in front of the judge to find out what's going on with the D.A. saying those things to him. He said, please, Hudson. Don't get me involved. I don't need to be retaliated against by the D.A.'s office. I have

charges of obstructing and bail-jumping. His statement is -- and your old attorney, Eugene Bartman, is my lawyer, and I discussed with him about your case, and if I did get any information about Hudson, can you get a deal for me from the D.A.'s office? Mr. Bartman told him he couldn't get involved because of attorney-client confidentiality, and that was it. I then told him I was going to subpoena him now. End of conversation.

I do have a witness who is in the cell right next to me, cell two. He heard Jeremy Gschwind talking to me about the D.A.'s office talking with me about my case. And then it's signed.

Then I brought this to the attention of Officer Malchow yesterday, and he said, yeah, I asked him, do you have -- have you had discussions with Jeremy Gschwind, and he said, yes, I did, on several occasions.

Now, this is some pretty serious accusations that I don't know, if you ask Gschwind if I was planning to plant bombs or having people to plant, but I want to address this issue now, and -- and that's all I have to say because there was never anything ever discussed, anything like that with me or the other inmates, and --

THE COURT: It raises a question. And I understand that after Mr. Carns was released, that

Malchow went and had delivered stuff and had talked to the defendant rather than an attorney from your office, Mr. Biskupic. I don't know if Mr. Malchow learned anything from that date. What was it? February 8 or 9, when you were relieved?

MR. CARNS: I think it was about that time.

MR. BISKUPIC: He was instructed just to deliver items, and as far as I know, he did so. The only feedback he ever gave me was that the defendant was preparing a list of people to be subpoenaed. This Mr. Gschwind has never spoken to me or any of my prosecutors --

MR. HUDSON: Okay. But as far as --

MR. BISKUPIC: I'm in the middle of -- Judge, are we going to have decorum in this matter? Because one of us is going to talk.

THE COURT: Let him speak.

MR. HUDSON: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

MR. BISKUPIC: Mr. Malchow did not provide us with any information of relevance to this case regarding any substance other than the delivered materials that Mr. Hudson made requests that we were to forward to Mr. Roth or to arrange for Mr. Roth to be up there. This Mr. Gschwind, I have no personal knowledge of him. I've never met him. And regarding any

1	information that he may have, as far as I know, there's
2	nothing relevant to this case, and he would not be a
3	witness. So any speculation that Mr. Hudson has
4	regarding bombs and things of that sort, I'm not aware
5	of. And in fact, this is the first I'm hearing of any
6	bomb talk.
7	THE COURT: You have Mr. Malchow on your
8	list. You're assuring me that there is nothing that he
9	discovered after February 9 that will be addressed in
10	his testimony.
11	MR. BISKUPIC: Correct.
12	MR. HUDSON: You know, as far as that bomb
13	situation, you know, that this person is saying that
14	Malchow asked him
15	THE COURT: That's fine. But it's not going
16	to be used. It's not part of the case.
17	MR. HUDSON: All right. That's what I wanted
18	to state. I just wanted to get that on the record.
19	THE COURT: Let's go.
20	MR. HUDSON: Because I did see Malchow's name
21	on that list.
22	(Closed hearing concluded at 9:25 a.m.)
23	* * * * * *
24	(In open court commencing at 9:35 a.m.)
25	THE COURT: Please be seated. This is State
	62

of Wisconsin versus Kenneth A. Hudson, case No. 2000-CF-403. Please state your appearances for the record.

MR. BISKUPIC: Vince Biskupic, District
Attorney for Outagamie County, for the State; along
with Deputy District Attorney, Carrie Schneider. The
defendant's present in person. His stand-by counsel,
Attorney Ed Carns, is present, as is defense
investigator, Peter Roth.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, you've been called here to pick a jury. We will pick 14 people, 12 jurors and two alternates. All 14 will be considered jurors until the end of the trial. After instructions, just prior to deliberations, if there are still 14 left, there will be two that will be excused at that point. We expect this trial to take perhaps up to eight days. It's hard to tell at this point until we get a feel for the case. If it goes faster and we can get done on Saturday, we may work on Saturday. So that's the parameters of the case.

Please follow the directions of the bailiff as you're seated.

The cases is entitled, as I indicated, State of Wisconsin versus Kenneth Hudson. I'll tell you the charges as we start the voir dire.

1 Please proceed. Swear the potential jurors. 2 THE CLERK: All jurors please stand and raise 3 your right hand. You and each of you do solemnly swear 4 5 6 as jurors in this cause, so help you God? 7 (The jury panel is sworn) 8 9 chairs in the room. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 along --18 19 20 chairs here. 21 22 MR. BISKUPIC: Okay. That's 14. Right. 23 THE BAILIFF: Yeah. 24 THE COURT: I need 28.

THE BAILIFF:

25

that you shall true answers make to such questions as shall be put to you, touching upon your qualifications THE COURT: I don't believe we've got enough We're going to seat 28 individuals in the panel. And it looks like we're going to have to get some chairs from someplace for a few more jurors. MR. BISKUPIC: Well, if you had 14 in the box and then 14 out, I believe there's eight on the bench and the potential for six on these benches right behind us, so that would be 28. That would be easier to address potential jurors, 14 inside the box and 14 THE COURT: Yeah, I know, but we got eight or ten in front. I think we still need about four more THE BAILIFF: We can get ten on the benches.

64

We'll have to get four chairs.

1	THE COURT: I want them up here. So Mr.
2	Bailiff
3	MR. BISKUPIC: Get four chairs from Branch VI
4	or Branch V.
5	THE COURT: Okay. We can start while they're
6	getting the chairs.
7	THE CLERK: Terry Turner.
8	THE COURT: Please follow the directions of
9	the bailiff.
10	THE CLERK: Terry Turner, Larry Blohm, Ronald
11	Werner, Joan Martin, Robert Timm, Ronald Roehrborn,
12	James Lecker, Carrie Killian, Carol Micke, Theresa
13	Carpenter, Brian Ziewacz, Sandra Volkman, Joyce
14	Hermann, Jan Obermeier, Lori Bresnahan, Crystal
15	England, Robert Daugherty, Candice Maki, Bethann
16	Welson, Todd Lettau, Sarah Mueller, Patricia Sanders,
17	Joshua Halla, Randall Grunwald, Christine Davis-Lopas,
18	Travis Thede, Shelly Plymesser.
19	Terry Turner.
20	MR. TURNER: Here.
21	THE CLERK: Larry Blohm.
22	MR. BLOHM: Here.
23	THE CLERK: Donald Werner.
24	MR. WERNER: Here.
25	THE CLERK: Joan Martin.
	65

1	MS. MARTIN: Here.
2	THE CLERK; Robert Timm.
3	MR. TIMM: Here.
4	THE CLERK: Donald Roehrborn.
5	MR. BOEHRBORN: Here.
6	THE CLERK: James Lecker.
7	MR. LECKER: Here.
8	THE CLERK: Carrie Killian.
9	MS. KILLIAN: Here.
10	THE CLERK: Carol Micke.
11	MS. MICKE: Here.
12	THE CLERK: Theresa Carpenter.
13	MS. CARPENTER: Here.
14	THE CLERK: Brian Ziewacz.
15	MR. ZIEWACZ: Here.
16	THE CLERK: Sandra Volkman.
17	MS. VOLKMAN: Here.
18	THE CLERK: Joyce Hermann.
19	MS. HERMANN: Here.
20	THE CLERK: Jan Obermeier.
21	MS. OBERMEIER: Here.
22	THE CLERK: Lori Bresnahan.
23	MS. BRESNAHAN: Here.
24	THE CLERK: Crystal England.
25	MS. ENGLAND: Here.
	66

1	THE CLERK: Robert Daugherty.
2	MR. DAUGHERTY: Here.
3	THE CLERK: Candice Maki.
4	MS. MAKI: Here.
5	THE CLERK: Bethann Welson.
6	MS. WELSON: Here.
7	THE CLERK: Todd Lettau.
8	MR. LETTAU: Here.
9	THE CLERK: Jonathan Wood.
10	MR. WOOD: Here.
11	THE COURT: None of us he wasn't called.
12	THE CLERK: Oh, he wasn't?
13	THE COURT: No. Well, we're going to put him
14	in last. He's going to go on our list last so we know
15	where he is.
16	THE CLERK: Okay.
17	THE COURT: That's Jonathan Wood.
18	THE CLERK: Jonathan Wood. Shelly Plymesser.
19	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: It's Schuh. It's my
20	married name, Schuh.
21	THE CLERK: Okay. You're not on our list
22	that way.
23	THE COURT: I still didn't get her name.
24	THE CLERK: Shelly Plymesser-Schuh.
25	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as I
	67

indicated, this case is entitled the State of Wisconsin versus Kenneth A. Hudson. The charges are that on or about June 25, 2000, in the City of Kaukauna, Outagamie County, Wisconsin, the defendant did cause the death of another human being, Shanna Marie Van Dyn Hoven, with intent to kill that person, contrary to Wisconsin Statutes 940.01(1)(a) of the statutes.

As to each element of this offense, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty, denying each and every element.

Count 2 is that on June 25, 2000, in the City of Kaukauna, Outagamie County, Wisconsin, the defendant did, by force, attempt to seize another, Shanna Marie Van Dyn Hoven, without her consent and with intent to cause her to be secretly confined or to be held to service against her will, contrary to section 940.31(1)(b) and 939.32(1) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

To this charge, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty, a denial of all elements of the offense.

Count 3: That on or about June 25, 2000, in the City of Kaukauna, Outagamie County, Wisconsin, the defendant did attempt to cause the death of another human being, David Carnot, with intent to kill that person, contrary to 940.01(1)(a) and 939.32(1) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

To that charge, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty, denying each and every element of the offense.

Count 4: That on or about June 25, 2000,
Outagamie County, Wisconsin, the defendant did
recklessly endanger another's safety under
circumstances in which utter disregard for human life,
to wit: namely, engaged in a high-speed chase over 16
miles through various areas of Outagamie County,
endangering the safety of Sergeant Patschke and
numerous citizens, contrary to section 941.30(1) of the
statutes.

To this charge, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty, denying each and every element of the offense.

And additionally, the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty by reason of mental defect or illness.

Jurors, I will now ask you certain questions pertaining to your qualifications to serve as jurors in this case. After I've completed my questioning, counsel or Mr. Wilson -- Mr. Hudson have the right to ask you additional proper questions pertaining to your qualifications to serve as jurors. These questions are to obtain the most fair and impartial jury possible. Some of the questions might appear to be prying or

embarrassing, again though the purpose of the questions are to determine the most fair and impartial jurors.

If your answer to any of my questions is yes, will you please raise your hand?

Those of you who have been called for jury duty and are not in the preliminary jury panel, please listen carefully to the questions asked and make note of any that you would have answered yes, for if you are called to replace someone in the preliminary panel, I will ask you to tell me what prior questions you would have answered yes to. That may be difficult. Do your best, please.

Are there any among you in the preliminary panel who are no longer residents of Outagamie County?

(No response)

THE COURT: Any of you not residents -- not citizens of the United States.

(No response)

THE COURT: As I indicated, we don't know the exact length of this trial, but it may last eight days, give or take. Are there any among you that, for any reason, feel you cannot serve for that anticipated time?

We'll start in the back row, please, first. Anybody in the back row? Mr. Roehrborn.

1	MS. HERMANN: Thank you.
2	THE COURT: Call another juror, please.
3	THE CLERK: Barbara Griesbach.
4	THE COURT: Ms. Griesbach, would you have
5	answered yes to any questions I've asked so far?
6	MS. GRIESBACH: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Which one? You're a resident of
8	Outagamie County?
9	MS. GRIESBACH: Yes. Yes.
10	THE COURT: And you're a resident you're a
11	citizen of the US.
12	MS. GRIESBACH: Yes.
13	THE COURT: And can you serve here for eight
14	days?
15	MS. GRIESBACH: Yes, I can.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else in the second
17	row that eight days presents a problem?
18	(No response)
19	THE COURT: The first row then, in front.
20	Oh, wait a minute. I got another hand back here.
21	Carol Micke.
22	MS. MICKE: I have a mother that she's in
23	rehab. She's an Alzheimer's patient, and we do meds
24	and we take care of her. She's got to be on
25	supervision 24 hours a day.

1	THE COURT: And you are part of that
2	24-hour-a-day care.
3	MS. MICKE: Yes. Yes.
4	THE COURT: There's no one else that can do
5	that for you?
6	MS. MICKE: For eight days it wouldn't, but
7	if it would go into two weeks. I do all the
8	medication, setting up the pill boxes and things.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MR. BISKUPIC: Judge, just so it's clear, we
11	weren't going to sequester the jury. They could go
12	home after five or six o'clock.
13	THE COURT: That's correct.
14	MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I was going to ask
15	that the jury be sequestered.
16	THE COURT: This is not the proper time
17	though.
18	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
19	THE COURT: You've already made that decision
20	anyway, but you can make your record at a later time.
21	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
22	THE COURT: You'll be going home each day.
23	MS. MICKE: Okay.
24	THE COURT: Does that have an effect on your
25	problem?

1	THE COURT: Your uncle's in the hospital?
2	MR. HALLA: Yep.
3	THE COURT: Having heart surgery.
4	MR. HALLA: Yeah.
5	THE COURT: And that will prevent you from
6	concentrating.
7	MR. HALLA: Yeah, pretty close.
8	THE COURT: You're excused.
9	THE CLERK: Leslie Mc Kee.
10	THE COURT: Ms. Mc Kee, anything you would
11	have raised your hand to so far?
12	MS. MC KEE: Yes, there is.
13	THE COURT: Tell me.
14	MS. MC KEE: The question about my ability to
15	serve for eight days. I wrote a letter to the Court
16	and was already excused for later days because I have a
17	plane ticket in hand leaving on the 15th.
18	THE COURT: That's a Thursday?
19	MS. MC KEE: Yes.
20	THE COURT: What's your best guess, Mr.
21	Biskupic?
22	MR. BISKUPIC: I was thinking Tuesday would
23	be the last day, but
24	THE COURT: Well, I don't want to compromise
25	the jury, and if you have a ticket, you may you're
	75

1	hand to any questions asked to this point?
2	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: I do know some of the
3	family that an aunt and uncle of Shanna.
4	THE COURT: Do you know them personally? Do
5	you socialize with them or just know who they are?
6	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: I worked with the aunt for
7	about ten or eight years for the city.
8	THE COURT: Are you working with her now?
9	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: Not now.
10	THE COURT: Do you have any social contact
11	with her?
12	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: Lately?
13	THE COURT: Now. Now.
14	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: Not right now, no.
15	THE COURT: Would that relationship affect
16	your ability to be fair and just in this deliberation
17	process?
18	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: I think I could be a
19	juror.
20	THE COURT: Pardon me?
21	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: I think I could be a
22	juror.
23	THE COURT: There will be some more questions
24	asked in this regard later on, too.
25	MR. ROZMARYNOSKI: Okay.
	70

1	THE COURT: Who else in the back row? Mr.
2	Timm?
3	MR. TIMM: I don't believe I could. I have a
4	strong opinion.
5	THE COURT: You're excused.
6	THE CLERK: Ray Meyer.
7	THE COURT: Mr. Meyer, would you have raised
8	your hand to any questions asked up to this point?
9	MR. MEYER: No, sir.
10	THE COURT: Mr. Roehrborn?
11	MR. ROEHRBORN: I'm a personal friend of the
12	Van Dyn Hovens sitting here.
13	THE COURT: You are excused.
14	THE CLERK: John Pollack.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Pollack, would you have
16	raised your hand to any questions asked up to this
17	point?
18	MR. POLLACK: No, sir.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Lecker, did you have your
20	hand up?
21	MR. LECKER: No.
22	THE COURT: In the next row down, Ms.
23	Killian.
24	MS. KILLIAN: I've been following the case in
25	the paper and the case through the media, and I don't
	79

1	feel that I could believe he's innocent at any point.
2	THE COURT: Okay. You are excused.
3	THE CLERK: JoAnne Eiting.
4	THE COURT: Ms. Eiting, would you have raised
5	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
6	MS. EITING: No, sir.
7	THE COURT: Anybody else in that row?
8	Theresa Carpenter.
9	MS. CARPENTER: I've been following the
10	newspapers, and I think I have a pre-informed (sic)
11	opinion.
12	THE COURT: You are excused.
13	THE CLERK: Bruce Schmidt.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Schmidt, would you have
15	raised your hand to any questions asked to this point?
16	MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. I have flight plans for
17	the 14th.
18	THE COURT: Flight plans to where?
19	MR. SCHMIDT: Las Vegas to get married on the
20	18th.
21	THE COURT: You are excused.
22	MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: Good luck.
24	THE CLERK: JoAnne Hoffmann.
25	THE COURT: Ms. Hoffmann, would you have
	80

1	raised your hand to any questions asked to this point?
2	MS. HOFFMANN: No, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: And next, I believe, Brian, you
4	had your hand up.
5	MR. ZIEWACZ: Yes. I have a strong opinion
6	also about reading the papers.
7	THE COURT: You are excused.
8	THE CLERK: Michael Balthazor.
9	THE COURT: Michael, would you have raised
10	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
11	MR. BALTHAZOR: No.
12	THE COURT: Anyone else in that row? Sandra
13	Volkman.
14	MS. VOLKMAN: I've already made up my mind.
15	THE COURT: You are excused.
16	THE CLERK: Larry Schroeder.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Schroeder, would you have
18	raised your hand to any questions asked to this point?
19	MR. SCHROEDER: No, sir.
20	THE COURT: Anyone else in that row?
21	(No response)
22	THE COURT: The front row. The front row,
23	the ten-person row, starting on that end, first one.
24	MR. DAUGHERTY: I formed an opinion in this
25	case, Your Honor.
	0.1

1	THE COURT: You are excused.
2	THE CLERK: Darvin Gagnow.
3	THE COURT: Would you have raised your hand
4	to any question asked?
5	MR. GAGNOW: Yes. I work at the quarry right
6	there for MCC, and I also have very weak kidneys.
7	THE COURT: You are excused.
8	THE CLERK: La Vone Schmitz.
9	THE COURT: Ms. Schmitz, would you have
10	raised your hand to any questions asked to this point?
11	MS. SCHMITZ: The last question I have a very
12	strong opinion about.
13	THE COURT: You are excused.
14	THE CLERK: Richard Redman.
15	THE COURT: Mr. Redman, would you have raised
16	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
17	MR. REDMAN: Yes, I do. I have a plane
18	ticket tomorrow for a conference that starts on
19	Wednesday. I intend to go to that.
20	THE COURT: A conference that starts on
21	Wednesday?
22	MR. REDMAN: A conference that starts on
23	Wednesday in New Orleans, a pre-booked conference.
24	THE COURT: This is pertaining with your
25	employment?
	82

1	MR. REDMAN: With my employment, yeah.
2	THE COURT: You are excused.
3	THE CLERK: Karla Repta.
4	THE COURT: Ms. Repta, would you have raised
5	your hand to any question asked to this point?
6	MS. REPTA: No.
7	THE COURT: Anyone else in that row now?
8	Candice Maki.
9	MS. MAKI: I have formed a very strong
10	opinion.
11	THE COURT: You are excused.
12	THE CLERK: Margaret Rueden.
13	THE COURT: Ms. Rueden, would you have raised
14	your hand to any questions asked up to this point?
15	MS. RUEDEN: Yes. I have formed a very
16	strong opinion.
17	THE COURT: You are excused.
18	THE CLERK: Shari Adams.
19	THE COURT: Ms. Adams.
20	MS. ADAMS: Yes. My mother's in the final
21	stages of kidney failure, and she's developed an
22	allergy to her dialysis machine, and we almost lost her
23	last week, and I don't know how long
24	THE COURT: How can you concentrate on this
25	case when that's happening. You are excused.
	0.0

1	MS. ADAMS: Yes. Thanks.
2	THE CLERK: Angela Perrine.
3	THE COURT: Who was the last one?
4	THE CLERK: Angela Perrine. Ms. Perrine,
5	would you have raised your hand to any questions asked
6	to this point?
7	MS. PERRINE: Yes. I've got back problems
8	and getting ready for surgery, plus I think he's
9	guilty.
10	THE COURT: You are excused.
11	MS. PERRINE: Thank you.
12	THE CLERK: Jo Ann Schmidt.
13	THE COURT: Ms. Schmidt, would you have
14	raised your hand to any questions asked?
15	MR. SCHMIDT: No.
16	THE COURT: Next, anyone else in that row?
17	Next hand is
18	MR. BISKUPIC: Ms. Mueller?
19	THE COURT: This is Patricia Sanders.
20	MS. SANDERS: Yes. I've already formed an
21	opinion.
22	THE COURT: You are excused.
23	MR. BISKUPIC: Pardon me, Judge. I think Ms.
24	Mueller raised her hand prior.
25	THE COURT: Oh, she did.
	84

1	MC MITELLED. Voc
	MS. MUELLER: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Oh, I didn't see that.
3	MS. MUELLER: I've also formed a very strong
4	opinion.
5	THE COURT: I'm going to ask you one
6	additional question here. Is there any possibility
7	that you can set aside that opinion and listen to the
8	evidence that's brought forth in court and render a
9	fair and just verdict?
10	MS. MUELLER: I have a problem with that.
11	THE COURT: You are excused. That's Sarah
12	Mueller.
13	THE CLERK: Jean Robinson.
14	THE COURT: Ms. Robinson, would you have
15	raised your hand to any questions asked up to this
16	point?
17	MS. ROBINSON: Well, I'm sympathetic with the
18	family. We did the flowers for the funeral.
19	THE COURT: You are excused.
20	THE CLERK: Edward Krueger.
21	THE COURT: Mr. Krueger, would you have
22	raised your hand to any questions asked to this point?
23	MR. KRUEGER: I don't think I'd be able to
24	sit that long, sir.
25	THE COURT: Okay. You are excused.
	85

1	THE CLERK: Angela Agen.
2	THE COURT: Ms. Agen, would you have raised
3	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
4	MS. AGEN: Yes, Your Honor. My son just got
5	out of the hospital, and we have to see a neurosurgeon
6	this week.
7	THE COURT: You won't be able to concentrate.
8	(Ms. Agen nods negatively)
9	THE COURT: Okay. You are excused.
10	MS. AGEN: Thank you.
11	THE CLERK: Gary Kempen.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Kempen, would you have raised
13	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
14	MR. KEMPEN: No, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Patricia Sanders.
16	MS. SANDERS: Yes, I have a very strong
17	opinion, already formed.
18	THE COURT: You are excused.
19	THE CLERK: Wanda Zimmer.
20	THE COURT: Ms. Zimmer, would you have raised
21	your hand to any questions asked?
22	MS. ZIMMER: No, no question.
23	THE COURT: Pamela Rosin.
24	MS. ROSIN: I know the Van Dyn Hoven family
25	and Dave Carnot and
	86

1	the presumption of innocence.
2	MR. GRUNWALD: No.
3	THE COURT: You are excused.
4	THE CLERK: Duane Hallam.
5	THE COURT: Mr. Hallam, would you have raised
6	your hand to any questions asked to this point?
7	MR. HALLA: No, I would not.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Any the two in the back
9	of the two in the front?
10	(No response)
11	THE COURT: And the other two.
12	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: And you are, so I can get this
14	right, Ms
15	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Shelly Schuh.
16	THE COURT: Shelly Schuh.
17	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Yeah.
18	THE COURT: And you can't give him the
19	presumption of innocence at this point.
20	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Well, I could, but I
21	just thought it was fair that my husband's aunt is
22	married into the Van Dyn Hoven family.
23	THE COURT: Okay. And based upon that
24	relationship, you don't think you can be
25	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: I could. I could.
	88

THE COURT: Then let's go on at this point. 1 2 MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Okay. 3 THE COURT: You've all had a little time on the question of presumption of innocence. I want to 4 5 read it one more time. I want to make sure that you understand it and hear it again. 6 7 The law presumes every person charged with a crime 8 to be innocent, and this presumption of innocence 9 remains with the defendant throughout the trial until 10 such time that the jury is convinced and finds, by all 11 the evidence admitted, that the defendant is guilty 12 beyond a reasonable doubt. 13 Are there any members of the panel who cannot, as 14 we start this trial, give the defendant that 15 presumption of innocence? We have two more that have 16 raised their hand. Mr. Hoelzel. 17 MR. HOELZEL: Brad Gehring is my son-in-law, 18 and I heard a lot about the case already. 19 THE COURT: You are excused. 20 THE CLERK: Todd Bolwerk. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Bolwerk, would you have 22 raised your hand to any questions asked to this point? 23 MR. BOLWERK: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: We had a hand by JoAnne Eiting. 25 MS. EITING: Yes. I don't think I could be 89

in this case, you'll be given instructions by the Court as to the applicable law in this case. Are there any among you who would not follow the law as given to you by this Court and disregard any ideas, notions or belief you might have to the contrary as to what the law ought to be?

(No response)

THE COURT: For those of you that are still here, have any of you heard any media coverage -- that's radio, TV or newspaper -- coverage of this case?

Just raise your hand for the information of the parties. We've got the back row. Do you want to mark this down, either of you? In the back row, we've got one, two three, four with hands up.

Second row, please. Raise your hands high. Four. Front row, the four in front, two, three.

Now, those that raised your hands, do you have any recollection of the factual content of the news items you heard or read? One hand up. Okay. Have any of you become familiar with this case by word of mouth, from talking to others? Okay.

You will be instructed that you are only to consider the evidence and testimony presented in the courtroom at the trial, and that any information about this case that you have received outside of the

courtroom cannot be considered as part of your consideration or deliberations in this case.

Are there any among you that cannot or will not follow this instruction? You must hear the testimony in this case and decide from that testimony, not from what you've heard or read, and can you follow that rule? Anyone that can't follow that rule?

(No response)

THE COURT: And we've had expressions of some who have formed an opinion. I'm going to ask that question again. Did you at any time, when you've heard or read the news stories of this case, form any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant?

(No response)

THE COURT: If you have formed any opinion on any aspect of this case from the news articles or media comment, are you able and willing to set aside such opinion and decide this case solely upon the evidence received during the course of this trial? Anyone not willing to do that?

(No response)

THE COURT: Having seen media accounts, TV, radio or newspaper, regarding the case, is there any potential juror that feels that he or she cannot put that information aside and impartially decide the

issues in this case based solely on the evidence and
the testimony presented during the course of the trial?
(No response)
THE COURT: Are there any among you that have
had jury duty before? Just one, two? Okay. That's
Crystal England.
MS. ENGLAND: Yes.
THE COURT: Did you serve on a civil or
criminal case?
MS. ENGLAND: I was in the jury selection
process for a civil case.
THE COURT: But you never stayed on for the
jury.
MS. ENGLAND: No.
THE COURT: That's the only experience you
had with jury duty.
MS. ENGLAND: Yes.
THE COURT: And there was another hand.
Jo Ann Schmidt?
MS. WELSON: Bethann Welson.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. WELSON: I served on a federal jury for a
criminal case in Milwaukee.
THE COURT: Were you the foreperson of that
jury?
93

ı	
1	MS. WELSON: No, I was not.
2	THE COURT: Was there a conviction or not?
3	MS. WELSON: Conviction, yes.
4	THE COURT: Have any among you ever
5	participated in a court or jury trial as a witness?
6	Let's start well, let's start from the first
7	one down the row in the back row. First hand was John
8	Pollack.
9	MR. POLLACK: I was subpoenaed but never had
10	to serve.
11	THE COURT: As a witness.
12	MR. POLLACK: Right.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lecker.
14	MR. LECKER: I was a character witness in
15	a one of my friends was on trial.
16	THE COURT: What kind of case was it,
17	criminal or civil?
18	MR. LECKER: Criminal.
19	THE COURT: Okay. Would that experience
20	affect your judgment in any way in this case?
21	MR. LECKER: No.
22	THE COURT: Rose Giesbers.
23	MS. GIESBERS: I was a witness.
24	THE COURT: Would that experience affect your
25	judgment in this case in any way?

1	MS. GIESBERS: No.
2	THE COURT: Another hand in the second row,
3	Mr. Schroeder.
4	MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I was subpoenaed for a
5	witness on a land dispute.
6	THE COURT: And did you serve?
7	MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah.
8	THE COURT: Would that experience affect your
9	judgment in this case in any way?
10	MR. SCHROEDER: No.
11	THE COURT: Anyone else in the front row?
12	Karla Repta.
13	MS. REPTA: I had been subpoenaed a couple of
14	times for things related to insurance, both for
15	criminal or for civil. One related to a bone marrow
16	transplant and one related to a contract dispute with
17	physicians.
18	THE COURT: And you actually testified in
19	those cases?
20	MS. REPTA: No, I didn't testify either time.
21	THE COURT: You didn't testify. Would that
22	experience affect your judgment in this case in any
23	way?
24	MS. REPTA: I don't believe so.
25	THE COURT: Anyone else? Have anyone in a
	95

1	Todd Lettau.
2	MR. LETTAU: I sued an uninsured motorist
3	about ten years ago.
4	THE COURT: And would that affect your
5	MR. LETTAU: No.
6	THE COURT: at all in this case?
7	MR. LETTAU: No.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else?
9	(No response)
10	THE COURT: Have you or a close relative or
11	friend been the victim of a crime? Ms. Giesbers.
12	MS. GIESBERS: You can call me Rose. I was
13	held up once at gunpoint at a gas station.
14	THE COURT: How long ago?
15	MS. GIESBERS: Seventeen years ago.
16	THE COURT: Did the person that held you up,
17	was he caught?
18	MS. GIESBERS: Yes, he was.
19	THE COURT: Did you participate in that trial
20	at all?
21	MS. GIESBERS: Yes, I did.
22	THE COURT: Would that whole experience
23	affect your judgment in this case in any way?
24	MS. GIESBERS: No, not at all.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? Christine
	97

1	Davis-Lopas?
2	MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: Yes. My daughter was a
3	victim in a sexual assault case.
4	THE COURT: How long ago was that?
5	MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: Six months.
6	THE COURT: Is there was the perpetrator
7	caught?
8	MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Is that process going on through
10	the court system?
11	MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: Yes.
12	THE COURT: Would that experience affect your
13	judgment in this case in any way?
14	MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: No.
15	THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?
16	MS. HOFFMANN: Would you rephrase the
17	question?
18	THE COURT: Have you or a close relative or
19	friend been the victim of a crime?
20	MS. HOFFMANN: My daughter was worked at a
21	bank and there was a robbery, and she had to testify.
22	That was about three years ago, and that took place in
23	Madison.
24	THE COURT: And would that affect your
25	judgment in this case in any way?
	98

MS. DAVIS-LOPAS: Um-hummm.
THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else?
(No response)
THE COURT: Do any of you or close friend or
relative work in police work? Do you work in police
work or does a friend or relative work in police work?
That's the sheriff's department, FBI, federal agency,
Appleton police, Kaukauna police, any police
department? Let's see. Here we have Larry Schroeder?
MR. SCHROEDER: My niece's husband works for
the police department.
THE COURT: Where at?
MR. SCHROEDER: Outagamie here.
THE COURT: Outagamie County
MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah.
THE COURT: Sheriff's Department.
MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah.
THE COURT: Have you talked to her about her
work?
MR. SCHROEDER: I seldom see her.
THE COURT: So that relationship and any
information you gain from it wouldn't affect your
judgment in this case.
MR. SCHROEDER: No.
THE COURT: And then we have Crystal England,
100

1 I believe. 2 MS. ENGLAND: Our school police liaison 3 officer is a good friend of mine. She's with Fox 4 Valley Metro Police. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Would that relationship 6 and the information you gain affect your judgment in 7 any way in this case? 8 MS. ENGLAND: No. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Thede. 10 MR. THEDE: A friend of mine is a Grand Chute 11 police officer part time. 12 THE COURT: Would that affect your judgment 13 in any way in this case? 14 MR. THEDE: No. 15 THE COURT: That's a no? 16 MR. THEDE: No. Right. No. 17 THE COURT: Do any of you hold any religious, 18 moral, philosophical beliefs that forbid you from 19 rendering a judgment upon the innocence or guilt of 20 another person? 21 (No response) 22 THE COURT: Have any of you or your immediate 23 family members studied law or practiced law or been 24 employed as lawyers in a law firm or for a law firm? 25 (No response)

1 hand. 2 MR. BISKUPIC: Donald Krueger from the 3 Kaukauna Police Department, Brad Sanderfoot from the Kaukauna Police Department, Robert Patschke from the 4 5 Kaukauna Police Department. 6 The next several names are either scientists or 7 analysts at the State Crime Lab near Madison. Gerald 8 Kotajarvi, Nick Stahlke, John Ertl, Guang Zhang, Robert 9 Block. Those are all employees of the State Crime Lab. 10 Other potential witnesses is a Dr. Frederick 11 Knoch, K-N-O-C-H, who sometimes works at St. 12 Elizabeth's. The county coroner is Ruth Wulgaert. 13 of the deputies with the sheriff's department is Dan 14 Pamenter. Some citizen witnesses, potentially, Jeremy 15 Vetter, V-E-T-T-E-R; John Panetti, P-A-N-E-T-T-I; 16 Robert Huss, H-U-S-S; an officer from the Grand Chute 17 police department, Todd Zolkowski; a deputy from the 18 Outagamie County Sheriff's Department, Ron Viane, 19 V-I-A-N-E; an officer, potentially, from Fox Valley 20 Metro, Matt Andres, A-N-D-R-E-S. He's --21 THE COURT: Do we have a hand? 22 MR. BISKUPIC: He took some photographs in 23 this case. 24 THE COURT: What kind of -- how do you know 25 this individual?

1	MS. WELSON: I know the name because he grew
2	up with him.
3	THE COURT: Did your husband bring any
4	information home to you from him?
5	MS. WELSON: No. No, because he doesn't have
6	contact with him anymore.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. BISKUPIC: His wife, Lisa Carnot. We
9	have a hand. Barbara Griesbach.
10	MS. GRIESBACH: One of the names that you
11	mentioned, a Mr. Thies.
12	THE COURT: Bud Thies.
13	MR. BISKUPIC: Right. He works at K-Mart.
14	MS. GRIESBACH: That's a gentleman perhaps I
15	knew 20, 25 years ago. My husband and I knew him, but
16	I I haven't seen or heard from him for a long time.
17	THE COURT: Now, we have potential here for
18	about 80 or 90 witnesses, and if he's one of them,
19	would you weigh his testimony any greater than any
20	other witness?
21	MS. GRIESBACH: Probably not.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. BISKUPIC: Miss Micke had her hand up.
24	THE COURT: Oh, there's another one?
25	MS. MICKE: Yeah, I know Lisa.
	105

1	MR. BISKUPIC: Lisa Carnot is the spouse.
2	THE COURT: That's Crystal England?
3	MS. MICKE: Carol Micke.
4	THE COURT: And your relationship to who?
5	MS. MICKE: I know Lisa. She used to go with
6	my son at one time, but it wouldn't create a problem.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. BISKUPIC: James Vander Loop; James
9	Sprangers; Bruce Benotch, B-E-N-O-T-C-H; Melvin
10	Vandenbloomer; Mike Borchert; Matt and Amy Brittnacher,
11	from Kaukauna; Diane Vandenberg from Kaukauna.
12	Some other Kaukauna officers, Officer Nejedlo;
13	Officer Megna; Officer Graff, G-R-A-F-F, Kaukauna
14	police officer, Jamie Graff.
15	MS. WELSON: He cut our lawn. That's all I
16	know him by.
17	THE COURT: Pardon me?
18	MS. WELSON: Jamie Graff cut our lawn last
19	summer, but I never talked to him. This was while we
20	were at work.
21	THE COURT: And his testimony wouldn't be
22	weighed more than any other testimony by you.
23	MR. WELSON: No. No.
24	THE COURT: Go ahead.
25	MR. BISKUPIC: Would you hold that against
	106

There's

testimony any greater than any other person.

1 (No response) 2 THE COURT: Have any of you had contact with 3 a police agency that you would label a good experience 4 so that it would -- you would provide sympathy toward a 5 police officer or weigh his testimony more than any 6 other person that testifies? 7 (No response) 8 THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, do you want to stand 9 up so everybody can see you? 10 (Defendant complies with request) 11 THE COURT: This is Kenneth A. Hudson, the 12 defendant in this case. Your family is from New York; 13 is that right? 14 MR. HUDSON: Correct. 15 THE COURT: Do you have any cousins or 16 related family here in the area? 17 MR. HUDSON: I do. 18 THE COURT: Who would they be? 19 MR. HUDSON: It would be Valerie Sisson, 20 would be an ex-sister-in-law. She was married to my 21 brother, but he's deceased; and her son, Kevin Chia 22 (phonetic). 23 THE COURT: I believe those are on the 24 witness list. 25 MR. HUDSON: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And that's it?
2	MR. HUDSON: That's it.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Do any of you know
4	Mr. Hudson or any of his relatives?
5	(No response)
6	THE COURT: Mr. Carns, would you introduce
7	yourself, please?
8	MR. CARNS: Thank you, Your Honor. Good
9	morning. My name is Edmund Carns. I'm acting as
10	stand-by counsel for Mr. Hudson. I've practiced for
11	about 22 years in Oshkosh with Tom Hughes, Henry
12	Matthewson and Frank Slattery, and as of July 1, last
13	year, I opened up my own practice up in the north woods
14	around Mountain, Wisconsin.
15	THE COURT: Any of you know Mr. Carns? Have
16	you had any business with his law firm or his partners?
17	(No response)
18	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Carns. And why
19	doesn't the investigator for the defense introduce
20	himself, too.
21	MR. PETER ROTH: My name is Peter Roth. I
22	own and am sole employee of Tracers Investigations in
23	Oshkosh. I've been licensed by the state since 1993.
24	THE COURT: Any of you know Mr. Roth?
25	(No response)
	113

1	cousins, uncles, so forth and so on? Mr. Pollack?
2	MR. POLLACK: I'm employed at the same
3	company as her uncle.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And do you ever associate
5	with the uncle at all?
6	MR. POLLACK: I maybe see him once a year.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Would that distant
8	relationship affect your judgment in this case in any
9	way?
10	MR. POLLACK: No.
11	THE COURT: Okay. And Shelly Plymesser?
12	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Schuh.
13	THE COURT: Schuh.
14	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Like I said before, my
15	husband's aunt is related to the brother of Shanna.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Would that relationship
17	or
18	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: I don't know the
19	family. I've never met any of them.
20	THE COURT: So you could listen to that
21	testimony and be fair and just in your verdict.
22	MS. PLYMESSER-SCHUH: Yes, I could.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything or any
24	reason at all, however personal or private, that makes
25	you feel you should not serve as a juror in this case
	115

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25 that you could not be a fair and impartial juror? (No response)

THE COURT: The jurors will be instructed not to read, watch or listen to any news accounts of this trial whatsoever until it is over and not to talk to anyone about the case, not even to one another, until you retire to the jury room to decide your verdict. Are there any of you that would not follow my instruction in that case -- in that area?

(No response)

THE COURT: Is there any among you who cannot or will not try this case fairly and impartially on the evidence that is given here in court and, under the instruction of the Court, render a true and just verdict?

(No response)

THE COURT: Mr. Biskupic?

MR. BISKUPIC: As mentioned before, my name is Vince Biskupic. I'm the district attorney for Outagamie County. And during the course of the case, I'll be handling some of the witnesses, and so will our Deputy District Attorney, Carrie Schneider. And the State's purpose in being here on behalf of law enforcement and the Van Dyn Hoven family is to just have a fair and impartial jury, and I guess, is there

any of you that, knowing our Constitution and the extended laws, just disagree with the concept that cases are to be heard in the courtroom? You're to set aside any media accounts, whether they were fair and accurate or maybe mistaken, and just try the case in the courtroom? Does anybody disagree with that concept?

(No response)

MR. BISKUPIC: And as the judge has mentioned, based on our Constitution and our extended laws, you know, the State has the burden of proof, and we accept it. That's why we're here. And a defendant doesn't have to prove anything. And they could represent themselves. The can have counsel. They can have stand-by counsel. Does anybody disagree with those concepts; that the State has the burden of proof and the defendant really doesn't have to prove anything?

(No response)

MR. BISKUPIC: Okay. Now, some of you had mentioned either having somebody close to you or yourself being a victim of a crime. I just want a show of hands, those people that have raised their hand.

Were there any of you that felt even discouraged a little bit to agree with the police effort in that

case? Maybe they could have done more, whether it's other investigative-type tactics? Do any of you, after those life experiences, whether they lasted 15, 20 years, feel that the police didn't do enough for your particular case or your loved one's case?

(No response)

MR. BISKUPIC: Do any of you disagree with certain police tactics that you maybe heard about on the news, like DNA, fingerprinting, getting search warrants, maybe even taping phone calls, things of that sort? Do any of you have some strong personal feelings against police doing those certain kind of investigative tactics to try and solve a case?

(No response)

MR. BISKUPIC: Are there any of you that have ever worked in a field where you have provided services to victims of crime, maybe a counselor or somebody in the medical profession, things of that sort, therapist?

(No response)

MR. BISKUPIC: Do any of you have close friends or family members that work in those types of fields where they provide services to victims of crime? Mr. Schroeder.

THE COURT: Mr. Schroeder.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yeah. My wife works at

1	social human services over here.
2	MR. BISKUPIC: Is she actually a social
3	worker or a clerk?
4	MR. SCHROEDER: No, she's a secretary over
5	there for the social workers, but that's as much as I
6	know.
7	MR. BISKUPIC: So that's not necessarily
8	directly providing the services.
9	MR. SCHROEDER: No.
10	MR. BISKUPIC: Ms. Cannon.
11	MS. CANNON: Yes. My father was a minister.
12	He did do some counseling of people, but I was very
13	young and very little contact personally.
14	MR. BISKUPIC: So it's something that
15	wouldn't affect you as a juror in this case.
16	MS. CANNON: No, not at all.
17	MR. BISKUPIC: Let's see. Mr. Balthazor.
18	MR. BALTHAZOR: Yeah. My wife's an RN at the
19	Outagamie County Health Center.
20	MR. BISKUPIC: What's the title of her job?
21	MR. BALTHAZOR: She's an RN.
22	MR. BISKUPIC: Anything about her work that
23	you feel would affect you in serving as a juror?
24	MR. BALTHAZOR: No, I don't believe so.
25	MR. BISKUPIC: Now, do any of you have
	119

1 experience, either yourself or somebody close to you, 2 working in a field where they provided or you provided 3 services to those either charged or convicted of a 4 crime, either as maybe a probation and parole agent or 5 some sort of counselor after the fact when somebody's 6 been either charged or convicted of a crime? 7 (No response) 8 MR. BISKUPIC: Do any of you that have had 9 experiences with crime, either for you directly or with 10 your family members close to you, can you think if any 11 of that crime was motivated maybe by drug or alcohol 12 use by the perpetrator? We talked about somebody maybe 13 sticking up somebody or robbing somebody, some of the 14 jurors. Do any of you know if the crime against you or 15 your loved one was motivated by alcohol or maybe drugs 16 to at least some degree? 17 MS. GIESBERS: I'm not sure. 18 MR. BISKUPIC: That was over there, Ms. 19 Giesbers? 20 MS. GIESBERS: Yes. 21 Am I saying that correctly? MR. BISKUPIC: 22 MS. GIESBERS: Yeah. 23 MR. BISKUPIC: You were robbed years ago, you 24 said?

120

Yeah.

MS. GIESBERS:

1	contact with the person?
2	MS. DAVIS-LOPAZ: No.
3	MR. BISKUPIC: Anybody else have that
4	situation where you were sent a notice regarding that?
5	(No response)
6	MR. BISKUPIC: I think that's all the State
7	has. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, any questions
9	generally to ask the jury?
10	MR. HUDSON: Yes, Your Honor.
11	(Pause)
12	MR. HUDSON: Anybody from the jury panel, is
13	there anyone who would disregard the testimony of the
14	defendant solely because he is charged with a crime?
15	(No response)
16	MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone who does not
17	agree with the fact that our criminal justice system
18	requires you to find the defendant not guilty if you
19	have any reasonable doubt whatsoever considering his
20	guilt?
21	(No response)
22	MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone that feels that
23	the defendant must prove to you that he is innocent?
24	(No response)
25	MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone who does not
	127

1 understand or agree with the fact that the burden of 2 proof in a criminal case is solely on the State and the 3 defendant has no obligation to take the witness stand 4 or offer any evidence on his behalf? 5 (No response) 6 MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone who does not 7 understand what the term, beyond a reasonable doubt, 8 means? 9 (No response) 10 MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone who will not 11 listen to the judge's instructions concerning the 12 State's burden to convince you that the defendant is 13 guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and apply that 14 standard exactly as the judge instructs you? 15 (No response) 16 MR. HUDSON: Is there anyone who cannot 17 honestly promise the defendant that they will find him 18 not guilty if the State fails to meet its burden of 19 proving? 20 (No response) 21 MR. HUDSON: That's it. 22 THE COURT: Is that it? 23 MR. HUDSON: That's it, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: You may be seated. The bailiff 25 will now circulate the strikes, the strike list.

1 Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who were not 2 seated in the preliminary panel are now excused. 3 you very much for coming. 4 (Pause). 5 THE CLERK: When I call your name, please 6 stand. Joan Martin, John Pollack, Carol Micke --7 THE COURT: Go a little slower, please. 8 THE CLERK: Sorry. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 THE CLERK: JoAnne Hoffmann, Rose Giesbers, 11 Barbara Griesbach, Lori Bresnahan, Karla Repta, Jo Ann 12 Schmidt, Bethann Welson, Todd Lettau, Jonathan Wood, 13 Gary Kempen, Travis Thede. Is that 14? 14 THE COURT: Fourteen. Would you please swear 15 the jury? 16 THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. 17 You and each you do solemnly swear, well and truly to 18 try the issues in the case you are about to decide, 19 unless discharged by the Court and a true verdict give, 20 according to law and to evidence given in court, so 21 help you God? 22 (The jury is sworn) 23 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Those of you 24 who were not just sworn, you are excused. Thank you 25 very much for your participation.

(Pause)

THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

twelve o'clock. We are going to recess for lunch, but perhaps you should go into the jury room, make any telephone calls you need to make. The process is going to be, we're going to start every morning at 8:30.

We're going to close sometime around five o'clock, depending on where -- if we're in the middle of a witness or maybe a little earlier if it's going to be a long witness that's coming on. So it's basically 8:30 to 5:00. At noon every noon, the bailiffs will be taking you someplace for lunch. So you're -- once you're here at 8:30, you're here until five o'clock. And so you might want to go make some phone calls, and then they'll take you to lunch.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's now

So take them in the jury room and let them make their phone calls and then take them to lunch.

THE BAILIFF: Okay.

MR. BISKUPIC: What time will we reconvene?

THE COURT: We'll be back here at 1:15 -- not

back here -- Branch III. We're in Branch III at 1:15.

The bailiffs know that. Go get your coats.

* * * * * * *

(Outside the presence of the jury)

MR. BISKUPIC: While we're still on the

1	record, is there anything you need from either side
2	before 1:15?
3	THE COURT: No. See you all with 1:15.
4	MR. BISKUPIC: And we'll start with an
5	opening?
6	THE COURT: Start with an opening. Well,
7	I'll give some preliminary instructions.
8	MR. BISKUPIC: Right, regarding the two
9	phases.
10	THE COURT: I don't have an instruction for
11	that. Is there an instruction on it?
12	MS. SCHNEIDER: I filed it. It's 601. Donna
13	should have it or it should be in the file.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And I want to do 50, which
15	is that preliminary instruction. 601, you say?
16	MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	(Recess had from 12:05 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.)
19	THE COURT: The record should show the
20	defense is here, stand-by attorney is here, district
21	attorney, and his assistant deputy is here. And we'll
22	bring in the jury.
23	MR. PETER ROTH: Your Honor?
24	THE COURT: Yes. Just a minute.
25	MR. PETER ROTH: He had a couple of things he
	131

1	wanted to make.
2	MR. HUDSON: I would like to address the
3	Court to? One is, will we be allowed to add to the
4	record on the venue question?
5	THE COURT: That issue is closed.
6	MR. HUDSON: I didn't know that you all
7	right.
8	THE COURT: We've addressed it at least
9	twice.
10	MR. HUDSON: Okay. Another one is motion to
11	strike entire panel on basis of number of people saying
12	I was guilty.
13	THE COURT: Denied.
14	MR. HUDSON: Okay. I'd like the jury
15	sequestered.
16	THE COURT: Denied.
17	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
18	THE COURT: Bring in the jury.
19	* * * * * *
20	(In the presence of the jury)
21	THE COURT: You may be seated. Just as a
22	matter of housekeeping, when you come in from the jury
23	room, you don't have to sit in the same seat each time.
24	Just come in and fill up the seats, whatever order you
25	are in. It's much more convenient.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, before the trial begins, there are certain instructions you should have to better understand your functions as jurors and how you should conduct yourself during the trial. Your duty is to decide the case based upon the evidence presented and the law given to you by the Court.

Do not let any personal feelings or bias or prejudice about such things as race, religion, national origin, sex or age affect your deliberations. Do not begin your deliberations or discussions in the case until all the evidence is presented and I have instructed you on the law. Do not discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else until your final deliberations in the jury room. We will stop or recess from time to time during the trial. You may be excused from the courtroom when it is necessary for me to hear legal arguments from the lawyers or the parties. If you come in contact with the parties, the lawyers or witnesses, do not speak with them. For their part, the parties, lawyers and witnesses will not contact or speak with you, the jurors.

Do not listen to any conversation about the case.

Do not read any newspaper reports or listen to any news reports on the radio or television about this trial.

Do not investigate this case on your own or visit the

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

Do not engage in any experimentation or research relating to any issue of facts in this case. Anything you see or hear outside the courtroom is not evidence. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence offered and received at trial.

Evidence is, first, the sworn testimony of witnesses, both on direct and cross-examination, regardless of who called the witness; second, the exhibits the Court has received, whether or not an exhibit goes to the jury room; third, any facts to which the lawyers have agreed or stipulated or which the Court has directed you to find.

You will not have a copy of the written transcript of the trial testimony available to you for use during deliberations. Therefore, you should pay careful attention to all the testimony because you must rely on your memory of the evidence -- of the evidence and testimony introduced during the trial.

It is the duty of the jury to scrutinize and to weigh the testimony of witnesses and determine the effect of the evidence as a whole. You are the sole judges of the credibility, that is, the believability of the witnesses, and of the weight to be given to their testimony.

In determining the credibility of each witness and

the weight you give to the testimony of each witness, consider these factors: whether the witness has an interest or lack of interest in the result of this trial; the witness's conduct, appearance and demeanor on the witness stand; the clearness or lack of clearness of the witness's recollection; the opportunity the witness had to be observing and for knowing the matters the witness testified about; the reasonableness of the witness's testimony; the apparent intelligence of the witness; bias or prejudice, if any has been shown; possible motives for falsifying testimony; and all other facts and circumstances during the trial which tend either to support or discredit the testimony. Then give to the testimony of each witness the weight you believe it should receive.

There is no magic way for you to evaluate the testimony. Instead, you should use your common sense and experience in everyday life. You determine for yourselves the reliability of things people say to you. You should do the same thing here.

Mr. Biskupic and Mr. --

One more instruction. The defendant, Kenneth Hudson, has entered two pleas to the charges against him, first degree intentional homicide, attempted first degree intentional homicide, attempted kidnapping, and

recklessly endangering the safety of another. He has joined the plea of not guilty with a plea of not guilty by reason of mental disease or defect.

The law requires that the issues raised by the two pleas be decided in a continuous trial that is separated into two phases. Your verdict will be taken at the end of each phase. You are to consider only the issues presented to you during each phase. You are not to consider any issues other than those presented to you for each verdict.

In the first phase of this trial, you will be asked to determine if the defendant is guilty of the charges of first degree intentional homicide, attempted first degree intentional homicide, attempted kidnapping, and reckless endangering safety. You will make this determination solely upon the facts which deal with the actual incident alleged in the information.

During the first phase, you will not be asked to determine whether, at the time of the incident, the defendant was suffering from mental disease or defect. If, after the first phase of the trial, you find the defendant not guilty, the trial will be over. If you find the defendant guilty, the trial will then move to the second phase.

During the second phase, you'll be asked to determine whether the defendant is responsible for the criminal act. Wisconsin law provides that a person is not responsible for a criminal act if, at the time it was committed, he had a mental disease or defect, as a result of which he lacked substantial capacity, either to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to confirm his conduct to the requirements of law. If the trial proceeds into the second phase, you will be instructed more fully as to your duties at that time.

Evidence will now be received on the first phase of the trial as soon as the opening statements are over. I caution you that this first phase is concerned solely with the question of whether the defendant committed the crimes as set forth in the information.

We will now proceed to the opening statements.

However, the statements are a guide as to what they
believe the evidence will prove. It's not evidence,
and it shouldn't be considered by you as evidence.

They're just the comments of the parties and the
attorneys.

You may proceed, Mr. Biskupic.

MR. BISKUPIC: Good afternoon. As mentioned this morning, my name is Vince Biskupic. I'm the district attorney for Outagamie County. And during the

4 5

course of this trial, I'll be assisted by Deputy D. A. Carrie Schneider. You've also been introduced to the defendant, who has stand-by counsel, Attorney Carns, and his investigator, Peter Roth, available to him.

Now, as Judge Froehlich has mentioned, the State of Wisconsin, who we represent, has brought four separate charges against the defendant, Kenneth Hudson. However, the evidence will show in this case that all four charges relate to a specific time period, in particular, the early evening hours of Sunday, June 25, 2000, starting out on the north side of Kaukauna, Wisconsin, and then continuous offenses going into the western part of our county, Outagamie County.

Now, the evidence will show in this case that the defendant's actions relate to his anger, to rage, and ultimately evil, motivated by a specific purpose in mind on that Sunday, June 25. You will learn from all his actions, his words, his demeanor, his behavior on that Sunday, that this is a case that involves anger, rage and evil, anger, rage and evil all for one specific purpose. And the evidence will show that despite the defendant's anger, rage and evil on that day, this is a case that involves specifically intentional acts, acts that are cold and calculated, acts that were thought out and intentional, planned in

a particular -- in a particular way with a particular purpose in mind. And you'll learn that this defendant's specific purpose in mind on that Sunday early evening was to vent his frustration, to let out steam, to let out, in fact, anger and rage towards a woman, and not necessarily any particular woman, but the evidence will show he was looking to vent his anger and rage towards any woman he could get his hands on. And you will learn from the evidence and testimony that he wanted to vent his anger and rage as a response, as a response to things that had happened to him in the previous 24 hours; and, in particular, as a response to things that two particular women had caused for him within the previous 24 hours.

You will learn from the evidence and testimony that within the previous 24 hours to these crimes, the defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson, had been dealt an emotional blow, an emotional blow from two particular people in his life that were probably two of the closest people to him, two women, in fact, one, his mother, and one, his girlfriend, a lady named Danita Scharenbroch; that both of these ladies, within the previous hours of these crimes and, in fact, overall in the previous 24 hours, had dealt this defendant an emotional blow, and he was going to respond to it.

And you will learn that emotional blow was in the form of flat-out rejection. These two women that were important in the defendant's life flat-out rejected him within the previous 24 hours of the crime, his mother first and then later on his girlfriend. And although the evidence will show that at least as of Sunday morning, June 25, 2000, the defendant was able to vent his anger to some degree, you'll learn that that was only verbal venting; that, in fact, as the day went on and his anger boiled up and he was looking to physically vent, his mother was no longer around and his girlfriend was not around either.

The evidence will show that later in the day on June 25, 2000, when the defendant's anger and rage peaked and, in fact, it turned to what you'll learn was evil in this case, that the only person around was an innocent bystander.

You'll learn from the evidence and testimony that, unfortunately, at the time that the defendant's anger and rage peaked to the point that he wanted to vent physically, the only person that was around was a young woman named Shanna Marie Van Dyn Hoven. You'll learn that this young woman was in an isolated situation, a vulnerable situation, and you'll in fact learn that at the time, she was barely even a woman, age 19 at the

time, having just turned 19 about a month earlier.

You'll learn some background on Shanna during the testimony, and you'll learn that she was a graduate of Kaukauna High School at the time; that she had just been home from her first year of college at U. W. Madison after her freshman year. And you will learn that at the time of the offenses towards her, that she had no clue whatsoever who this defendant was; that in fact, at this time, at the time of these offenses towards her, she was totally unsuspecting of the defendant, and she was totally unsuspecting of the anger and violence that would await her.

THE COURT: Excuse me.

(Pause)

MR. BISKUPIC: Okay. The evidence will show that on the early evening of June 25, 2000, Shanna Van Dyn Hoven was totally unsuspecting of the anger and the violence that the defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson, had in store for her. The evidence will show that that anger and violence ultimately resulted in acts that ended her life.

The evidence will show from the physical evidence, from witness testimony, from statements, that her death was solely at the hands of this defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson. And in fact, that his actions and his actions

alone start us on the course, on a path that brings us here today with the four charges that you will sit as jurors on and decide guilt or innocence.

The evidence -- and the judge has mentioned this, that there are four specific charges. The first count related to a charge of first degree intentional homicide for the stabbing death of Shanna Van Dyn Hoven on June 25, 2000.

There's a second count that also relates to Shanna Van Dyn Hoven and, specifically, the judge will give you all the elements at the end of the case, but it relates to a charge of attempted kidnapping, for the defendant forcing Shanna into his truck to secretly confine her on that same day.

You'll learn that the third count relates to another party, and specifically a charge of attempted first degree intentional homicide for acts by the defendant to try to kill a citizen witness named David Carnot, a neighbor near the scene of the original stabbing who was trying to come to Shanna's aid and ended up having to deal with the defendant, the evidence will show.

And finally, the fourth count, recklessly endangering the safety of Kaukauna Police Officer Robert Patschke. The evidence will show that that

8

9

7

10

11 12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

relates to an approximate 16-mile case from the original stabbing scene, through areas north of Kaukauna, then over towards Appleton, and all the way out to the area of Greenville and Hortonville.

Now, Judge Froehlich has told you and you heard in jury selection that the State has the burden of proof in this case; that it's our duty to come forward with evidence to prove all four counts and all elements within those counts beyond a reasonable doubt. And based on the evidence and testimony that we will present to you with exhibits, with tests, with witness testimony, we wholeheartedly accept that burden of proof in this case. It's a burden that we won't try and avoid or dodge in any way. It's a burden we won't try and hide from, and it's a burden we won't try and Throughout this case, we accept that hide behind. burden continuously to prove from all the evidence, head on, that this defendant committed all four offenses beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, you have been introduced to the defendant, Kenneth Hudson, and through the testimony and evidence that the State will present to you over the next few days, we'll introduce you to several other people that are important to this case that will describe to you what they observed or what they tested or maybe even

photographs or things that they picked up regarding physical evidence; and you'll learn that the State's witnesses come from a variety of backgrounds, a variety of life experiences and specialties regarding their work, and you'll also learn they come to this case by many different paths, many different paths to this courtroom. And you will learn that this case is about these people taking different paths not only to this courtroom but also encountering each other, encountering the defendant, encountering the victim, encountering pieces of physical evidence by many different paths and, obviously, from many different backgrounds.

You will learn, regarding the background of these witnesses, that some of them are medical professionals, some of the witnesses are from the law enforcement community, and some of the witnesses come from the scientific community, particularly the State Crime Lab. And then the remainder of the witnesses, you will learn, will be everyday citizens, generally from the Kaukauna community on the north side of the town, but a few citizen witnesses from other areas of our county.

Now, it is likely during this first week or first few days of the trial that the State will present to you, probably at a minimum, three to four dozen

witnesses. They will be here basically to shepherd in or escort in information to you as the givers of information that you will take in and decide what you want to give great weight or little weight to. But all of that evidence, in aggregate, will prove to you, beyond any reasonable doubt, that this defendant committed all four offenses as charged.

Now, I have mentioned to you that the evidence will show that these witnesses came to this case or came to the evidence by many different paths in their life. And you will learn that all of the witnesses in this case, including the defendant, were involved in this case because of the paths they chose, and you will learn from the evidence that the variety of paths involved in this case are some paths that are literal and some that are figurative.

You will learn that some of the literal paths of this case involved things such as roads, highways, different streets of Outagamie County that are a part of this case that some of our witnesses traveled on as it relates to the time period, on or about June 5 of 2000; but regarding figurative paths, you'll learn that those are probably more important in this case; that the defendant and some of the witnesses in this case went down some figurative paths regarding to their

decisions and some of their thought process and choices as it relates to June 25 of 2000.

The evidence will show that the key paths in this case for the defendant are the figurative paths that he took leading up to and on June 25 of 2000. Although the evidence will show that on that particular day, June 25, 2000, he traveled many miles in his vehicle, in his pickup truck, and that those are relevant — those travels are relevant to this case, figuratively, it was his decision and choices on that same day that led to his travels down a more important path, his choices and decisions to travel down a path of violence, a path of destruction, a path of evil that ultimately ended the life of an innocent young lady named Shanna Van Dyn Hoven.

Although you will hear about Shanna many times throughout this case, one of the earlier important witnesses that you'll hear from that is relevant to this case is a Kaukauna resident up on Grandview Lane named David Carnot. You will learn a lot about David Carnot in this case. He's an important key witness. And you will also learn about David Carnot's neighborhood. The State will present to you a number of maps and photographs, including some aerial photographs to lay out the scene of where many of these

5

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

2425

activities took place. And you'll be in a position to observe those on either easels or up on the board, and if need be, during the course of the case, you may want to shift seats because it may be harder to see from the back for certain people, but those maps and those diagrams, those pictures, will describe to you the neighborhood of David Carnot.

And you'll learn that it's a neighborhood on the north side of Kaukauna, just north of Murphy's Quarry. And by way of example, I'll set up there one of the photo exhibits that we will be presenting into evidence that it's actually a view from north to south, with south on the bottom of Murphy's Quarry; and that the relevant neighborhood in this case, you'll learn from the evidence, is to the bottom of the photo, actually north of the quarry, and it's the neighborhood of David Carnot. And you'll learn that David Carnot and his wife Lisa and their children have lived in that neighborhood for a number of years and also during the time period of June 25, 2000. And you'll really learn quite a bit about that neighborhood in this case; that it's really your typical type of ideal apple pie, all-American type of neighborhood that many families, young families, older families, would dream about living in. It's a nice residential neighborhood, nice

homes. There's aspects -- even though it is within the city limits, there's aspects of nature involved in that neighborhood with trees and hills, and also aspects to the south of nature with the river.

You'll learn that there's a number of parks nearby. One big one you can see is Grignon Park.

There's also Strausberg Park, and there's also a nearby park, City Park, and a number of schools within a reasonable walking distance.

And for purposes of parents and people working in the neighborhood, you'll learn that it's a neighborhood that also has easy access to the highways, to go to an industrial park on the north side of the town, and also any other work location via Highway 41. You'll learn a lot about this neighborhood in the State's case through the evidence and testimony.

You'll also learn that not only was this all-American, apple pie type of neighborhood the home of David Carnot for a number of years, but it was also the home of Shanna Van Dyn Hoven for all of her 19 years, living on Garfield Street, a block or two from Carnot, Garfield Street being down at the very bottom edge of the picture, you'll learn, and you'll learn that Shanna lived there her entire life with her brother David and with her parents, Steve and Nancy Van

Dyn Hoven.

And you'll learn that up through June 25 of 2000, Shanna and her neighbor, Dave Carnot, who plays such a key role in this case, never really crossed paths in any significant way. They may have seen each other, at best, maybe even waved, but didn't really know each other in any significant way. But you'll learn through the evidence and testimony that that changed quite a bit on the early evening hours of June 25 of 2000, when David Carnot was compelled by concern, by emotion, or just by goodwill to try and come to the aid of a neighbor, and you'll learn that that neighbor was Shanna Van Dyn Hoven. And you will learn that by goodwill, he was compelled to come to her aid when she was in a dire situation and definitely in the need of help.

What led to Shanna's need for help on a clear and pleasant day in the early evening of June 25, 2000, in this all-American neighborhood in Kaukauna? The evidence will show that this pleasant neighborhood was something that she took advantage of for her activities, innocent things such as just getting some exercise, going out for a jog. And you will learn that on that pleasant Sunday evening, she decided to go out, after working earlier in that day and taking a nap, she

decided to go out for a jog. And the evidence will show that that was something that she had done on somewhat of a regular basis.

You'll learn that she had a particular route coming out of Garfield and going more to the west down Lawe Street and around where she could access Augustine Street, which is the street to the top of the quarry, and that was part of her jogging route where she would go down Augustine Street and jog up Plank Road, which is the street down towards the bottom of the quarry where you can see three quarry entrances.

The evidence will show that on that particular day, while out for a jog, and with her neighbor, David Carnot, out doing some yard work, Shanna basically had in store for her a pleasant, relaxing thing, to get some exercise. But you'll find out, unfortunately, from the testimony, that she encountered something that was completely unpleasant. And certainly when she encountered a particular person, you'll find out it was someone who didn't have goodwill in mind, didn't have pleasant intentions, and didn't have concern for others on his mind when she encountered this particular individual. That, you'll learn, was the defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson.

The evidence will show that shortly after 6:00

p.m. on that day when Shanna was on the home stretch of about a two- to three-mile jog on Plank Road near Murphy's Quarry -- and you can see the entrances there -- when she was about a third of a mile from her home and the safety of her family, she was encountered by the defendant and a particular defendant whose rage and whose emotions were ready to boil over.

The evidence will show that up to that point on that Sunday, Kenneth A. Hudson was having anything but a pleasant day, you'll learn through some of the testimony and police information regarding Mr. Hudson and his background.

The evidence will show that the defendant is originally from Buffalo, New York. He'd been living in our area for about a year to a year-and-a-half and had been employed as a roofer.

The evidence will show that during his time here in the Fox Cities, he had basically been living the life of somewhat of a loner, somewhat isolated, as most of his family was back in the New York area.

The evidence will show that by the fall of 1999, Hudson, this defendant, ended somewhat of his isolated existence when he hooked up with a girlfriend, and you'll hear about this woman, a woman named Danita Scharenbroch, from Little Chute, Wisconsin.

7 8

The evidence will show from late 1999 through June of 2000, other than his roofing work, Danita

Scharenbroch was the main focus in this defendant's life; and, in fact, by his own words, you'll hear from police officers, that was probably the only thing that he felt positive about in his life, was his girlfriend, Danita.

The evidence will show that he carried on this relationship with Danita up through June of 2000 and that a time period towards the end of the month, in particular, the weekend of June 23, June 24, June 25, the key date in question in this case, he decided to at least make another effort to re-establish a tie with a former key woman in his life, and that being his mother, Lorraine.

The evidence will show that he, in particular, invited his mother Lorraine to come out from New York for a weekend of camping so he could show her that he had been doing some successful things as a roofer. He had saved some money and wanted to introduce her to his girlfriend, Danita. The evidence will show that, in fact, a weekend was planned in an area near Lakewood, up north on some camping ground that his girlfriend Danita had.

The evidence will show that his mother did come up

4

6

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

23 25

with his stepfather from New York and that a few other people joined this group up at the campground near Lakewood. But the evidence will show, because of friction in the relationship, tumultuous relationship between the defendant and his mother, the weekend was anything but pleasant. And in fact, the tumultuous relationship continued with bickering and arguing on that weekend.

In fact, the evidence will show that things got so unpleasant or awkward that weekend that it resulted in some arguments and some blow-ups and, ultimately, his mother Lorraine just decided to pick up and leave and go back to the Fox Cities and, ultimately, make arrangements to go back to New York. And you'll learn that this, in particular, caused an emotional blow to the defendant. In fact, it angered him and it enraged him.

The evidence will show that not only did his mother enrage him on that particular weekend, by Sunday morning, the only other important woman in his life, Danita Scharenbroch, also ticked him off, also set him off in regard to his anger.

The evidence will show that because of the defendant's hostile behavior up at the campground, Danita also expressed that she had enough with him and

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

that she was going to pack up and leave the campground with her children. You'll learn that she, in particular, told the defendant not only that she was leaving that weekend, but their relationship was over; that that was the end of it; that she was rejecting him. Despite their eight or nine months together, their relationship was over. She packs up and leaves the campground by Sunday morning, leaving this defendant, once again, alone and isolated.

Now, because of this rejection by both his mother and his girlfriend, this defendant's anger and rage boiled up, and, in fact, you'll hear testimony from somebody up at that campground, a citizen witness, a lady named Shirley Schultz, a friend of Danita's who was invited to go camping up with them near Lakewood, and you'll hear testimony directly from Shirley Schultz about how she had known Danita for a period of time and also got to know the defendant and got to observe his demeanor and behavior over the eight or nine months that Danita was dating him and that when she was specifically up with him at this campground, she saw a level of anger, a level of rage that she had never seen before, and, in particular, regarding a big argument, a blow-out between the defendant and his girlfriend on that Sunday morning, June 25, and you'll learn from

that citizen witness, Shirley Schultz, that the defendant's anger and rage got to such a point that while Shirley was washing up in the shack there, the defendant came in, was in a fit of rage, had just gotten over an argument with Danita and made the comment to Shirley, I could kill her, in reference to his argument that he just had and, in fact, he stormed out, but he particularly made that comment, quote, I could kill her.

You'll learn from Shirley that that was a level of anger and range that she had never seen in the defendant before. The evidence will show that people cleared out of the campground, leaving the defendant alone, and before the defendant could do anything physical in the sense of violence, he was left alone at that campground.

The evidence will show that by that early Sunday afternoon, he, too, packed up in a frustrated and angry mood. He started back to the Fox Cities, traveling in a very distinct-looking, rusty, beat-up, dark-colored 1985 pickup truck with a white cap on the back and pulling a 14-foot boat. You'll hear a lot about that truck and that trailer and that boat throughout this case, but that's what the defendant came back to the Fox Cities in.

The evidence will show that during the drive back to the area, the defendant was basically stewing. He was frustrated. He was angry. He had been rejected by the two main people in his life, and he was going to go back to the Fox Valley and vent, in some way, to let out his frustrations.

The evidence will show that during that afternoon, he had a few beers to deal with his frustrations to some degree, and you'll learn that once he was back in the Fox Cities, there were a few citizen witnesses that were able to account for his whereabouts on that late Sunday afternoon. In particular, you'll be introduced to some of them.

Some of the first ones in regard to time sequence that you'll hear about were two employees of the K-Mart on West College Avenue, and you'll learn that since this case in June of 2000, the K-Mart has moved even farther out west, but when it was at its older location on the south side of College Avenue, west of downtown Appleton, there were two particular employees working there, one, a young cashier, about a 17- or 18-year-old kid name Jeremy Vetter; and then an older guy -- well, older, in his mid forties, named Alvin Thies, who goes by the name Bud; and that Mr. Thies at the time of Sunday, June 25, 2000, was working at that store as the

manager of the sporting goods section.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, you'll learn that at about 4:30 or a little bit later, these two citizens had a chance to observe the defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson, his mood, his demeanor, his actions. And you'll learn first, in particular, Bud Thies saw the defendant basically come into the K-Mart, walk into the sporting goods section, and you'll hear Mr. Thies describe the defendant's demeanor as basically somebody who just exuded hostility or anger; that he basically walked over to the big display case of knives that has all sorts of sporting goods knives, knives you can use for any purposes, including narrow little ones that you fillet a fish with, different types of grips, different types of bigger knives; and, in particular, Mr. Thies saw the defendant look at this big display of knives and pick out one in particular.

You will learn that the knife he chose to pick out at about -- between 4:30 and 4:40 p.m., was a hunting knife. And you'll see the wrapper of the particular knife in question, and you will learn that this defendant, in his angry state that Mr. Thies saw, picked out a five-inch blade hunting knife.

You'll learn that the defendant ultimately went to a cashier's station where this young Jeremy was

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

25

working, and Jeremy, in particular, made note of the fact that the defendant seemed a little out of sorts. I think Jeremy describes it as somewhat nervous because Jeremy asked him a question, some identification information, I think, regarding his date of birth or some other background, and the defendant was a little bit rattled by that and seemed nervous.

The evidence will show then that probably no later than 4:45, the defendant departed K-Mart with this five-inch bladed hunting knife, and he's next seen by some citizen witnesses on the west side of Appleton, in particular, in another residential neighborhood, the area of Oak Street, kind of by West High School. And you'll learn from a couple of citizen witnesses over there, two ladies, one named Kathryn Moy-Bye, and her neighbor across the street, a lady named Kate Vance, that they were around their neighborhood, either by windows or out in their yards about 5:05, 5:10, in that range; and that, in particular, Miss Moy-Bye was back from a weekend up north and that she had returned home about five o'clock. And that at that time, she had her daughter, 20-year-old daughter, Erin, who is also a UW-Madison student who had been at the house since about four o'clock that day. And you'll learn that Erin had been there after in fact being up north

herself with some younger people in a place called Bass Lake, which is actually not too far from where the defendant was camping.

You'll learn that Erin was home from about four to five alone; that her mom comes home and is unpacking things and notices this distinctive pickup truck with a trailer on it on their street. And she notices a particular, odd maneuver of the defendant trying to turn the truck around or maneuver it in some fashion right by her neighbor's house. And you'll also learn from Kate Vance that she saw that in particular, saw the distinctive truck, distinctive boat, and the defendant basically maneuvering around a very residential neighborhood in an odd fashion with his truck. The evidence will show that Mrs. Moy-Bye saw him and that he turned around and left the neighborhood at a high rate of speed around 5:11 p.m.

Now, in time sequence, the next citizen that sees him is over in Kaukauna, and you'll learn that it's maybe about 15 or 20 minutes from that neighborhood over to the quarry. And you'll learn that sometime after 5:30, probably closer to about 5:50, a citizen from the north side of Kaukauna, a guy named John Panetti, once again spots this distinctive truck, and you'll learn that Panetti, sometime around 5:30 to

6

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

5:50, is driving around this area of Murphy's Quarry, actually to the south, because he hears that the city may be selling off some land or there's other property, private property for sale; and that he's a businessman and is interested in purchasing some property.

So he's out for a drive with one of his company trucks -- I think it's a business called Team Services or Team Industries -- and he's traveling on Augustine Street, so that's from the right to the left of the photo at the top before the quarry, and he makes the turn of Plank Road, which is the intersection at the top left of the photo, three-way intersection; and that when he makes the turn and starts heading to the right of the photo, which is back to the east on Plank Road, he comes upon that first quarry entrance between the trees as you see it go into the quarry; and that knowing that neighborhood and what kind of activity goes on, he thought it was kind of odd when he spotted what you'll learn was the defendant's pickup truck backed in to that first quarry entrance about ten to 6:00 p.m., with the boat on it and the truck facing out so it's backed up against the gate in between the woods there on that first entrance. You'll learn that Panetti drove by. He made note of the vehicle; couldn't, in particular, notice if there was a driver

in there or not but did notice this distinctive-looking vehicle and thought it was somewhat odd because it was Sunday and the quarry was closed. But he didn't really understand the greater significance of that vehicle being parked there until later on after he found out what happened with Shanna.

The evidence will show that up to that point of seeing the defendant's truck shortly before 6:00 p.m., no other citizen can confirm the whereabouts of this defendant or his truck. You'll learn that, however, despite this lapse of time leading up to six o'clock or shortly before there, the defendant's mood, you'll learn from the evidence and testimony, was still one of anger and one of rage.

In time sequence, you'll learn information from other citizen witnesses and one in particular is a guy named Mike Borchert who has basically got the only house at the corner of that intersection of Augustine and Plank Road on the northwest corner.

You'll be introduced to Mike Borchert, a long-time Kaukauna resident; had been living on that corner for a number of months, although he had lived in Kaukauna for most of his life. And you will learn that on that evening hours, roughly between 5:30 and 6:00 forward, he had been working out in his yard, working on a

go-cart, also doing some other yard work; and that he remembers seeing John Panetti go by, because they work at the same place, and you'll learn that about a good ten minutes or so pass by after Panetti goes by, he sees Shanna Van Dyn Hoven out for a jog, that being a little bit after 6:00, at best. And you'll learn that, although Mike Borchert didn't necessarily know Shanna Van Dyn Hoven personally, he had been aware of her from prior occasions, because that was her jogging route. He would see her go by the same route on a regular basis in the neighborhood and, in particular, in the month or so leading up to these crimes.

You'll learn that when Borchert saw Shanna drive by -- or jog by -- pardon me -- she appeared to be in a pleasant mood. She waved in a friendly fashion and smiled at him, and he waved back, as you would expect a friendly neighbor to do.

The testimony from Borchert will be that he then saw Shanna with her running clothes on, shorts, a T-shirt, headphones and a walkman, continue her jog up the hill. You'll learn that that's a hill that -- region from Augustine, up Plank Road, up to that first quarry residence (sic); that he saw her continue on the right-hand side of the road up Plank Road to the west.

You will learn from the evidence and some

measurements and approximations that there's really no other houses on Plank Road until you get past those three quarry residence -- or quarry entrances until you get up to the next intersection, which is Florence Street, and different officers and different citizens will point out the particular names of the street. And we will show you a blown-up city map so you can get all your streets straight regarding the evidence in this case.

Borchert sees her run up to the right of the road, and you'll learn that it's about, oh, maybe 200 yards or less to the first quarry entrance, over the hill on Plank Road to where Panetti had seen the defendant's truck a good ten minutes earlier on that evening. And you'll learn from the evidence and testimony in this case that, as Shanna continued to jog up the hill, she reached a point just past that first quarry entrance, shortly before that second one, still with trees in front of it where she encountered something that the evidence and testimony will clearly show was nothing short of a surprise attack or, actually, nothing short of an ambush, a point prior to that second gate, no more than about 40 or 50 feet from that second gate at Murphy's Quarry.

You will learn from the evidence and testimony

23

24

25

that shortly after 6:00 p.m., after Shanna ran by, the defendant pulled his truck onto Plank Road, from the place where he was laying in wait, drove that truck a short distance, that distinctive truck, dark in color with the rust points -- rust spots on the trailer and the boat, and he drove that distinctive truck out of that first entrance, to a key point where his path would cross the path of Shanna Van Dyn Hoven. And you'll learn regarding that key point in the road about 40 feet short of that second entrance, and you'll learn from the evidence that at that key point on the road and at that key point in time, as their paths crossed, happiness met anger. A smile met a scowl. At that key point and that key time on the road, you'll learn from the evidence and testimony that peace met anger; that innocence met evil; that flesh was met with a blade; and, ultimately, life met death.

The evidence will show that this was an ambush; that the defendant was able to sneak up on Shanna; that the evidence will show that he had subdued his target, the 19-year-old girl, with physical blows, and at least one plunge with a knife, blade to her flesh, in particular, her back at first.

The evidence will show that at least one plunge of the knife early on was outside his truck, and then he

2

tried to isolate her even more to do what he -whatever he wanted with her, pushing and pulling her into the passenger's side of a truck. The evidence will show that his efforts, pulling and pushing this struggling, young 19-year-old girl into the truck were done with the specific purpose to confine her and to control her, with the goal in mind of controlling a woman, something that the defendant had failed to do earlier in the day and over the weekend in regard to the frustrations with his mother and with his girlfriend. He couldn't control the women in his life, so he decided to go on a hunt that Sunday afternoon to find a woman that could be easy prey, easier to control and easier to use as he saw fit, the evidence will show, to let out his frustration, to let out his anger, to let out his rage, the evidence will show.

The evidence will show that because of the isolated location of the jog at that point, the fact that she had headphones on, operating a walkman that diverted her attention, and the fact that her attacker had a knife on him, Shanna Van Dyn Hoven was an easy target for this defendant.

Now, the evidence will show that although she was an easy target for this defendant, because of her physical condition, because of her spirit, because of

her will, even though she was surprised, you'll learn that she wasn't going to go down without a fight. She wasn't going to make this attack for this perpetrator an easy and quick ordeal.

You'll learn that after the defendant first wounded her, Shanna fought with the defendant. And there was a period of time where she was able to fight free from him and his attack, including, you'll learn from the physical evidence, she was able to fight her way out of the defendant's truck after he had forced her in. You'll learn how this 19-year-old young girl from the north side of Kaukauna waged the fight of her life when dealing with this defendant, to break free from her attacker, to get out of his truck, to prevent his kidnapping attempt, and to try and prevent being stabbed some more.

You'll learn that with a knife wound or two to her back and a defensive wound to her left hand she had sustained from trying to block some of the stabs, she valiantly struggled up the road, back towards the last friendly face she had seen, Mike Borchert, the guy she had just waved to and smiled at and he waved back. You'll learn that she physically struggled back down the road on that same right-hand side, and you'll learn about a blood trail and some other more significant

blood marks back towards a few 10, 20, 30 feet back towards the first entrance in the direction of Borchert's house.

And you will learn that beyond her physical efforts and her fighting to try and break free from this attacker, she tried to summon help, and you'll learn that she screamed and yelled; and even though there's not some houses immediately nearby that there's a buffer with the woods, she tried to cry out to her neighbors to get the attention of them to try and get them to intervene on her behalf, the evidence will show.

The evidence will show that, despite her efforts in fighting free of the defendant -- from the defendant, that, from his perspective, the hunt wasn't over. The evidence will show that the defendant had gotten in his car once he had gotten Shanna in there. Once she fought out and started heading back towards Borchert, he put the truck in reverse, backed it up a few feet on the road, to cut off Shanna's path to safety, to cut off her path to help. Then he got out of the car with knife wielded. He continues to pursue his target, to pursue his prey. He goes along that edge of the road after her. There's more stab wounds, and then ultimately she makes her way across the road

to the south side of the road towards the quarry in an effort to get away from him, around his truck.

You'll learn that he pursues her around the truck. There is some blood spray on the truck. There is some blood spray on the road that confirms that, but he pursues her across the road, ultimately to the south side just outside his driver's side door as his vehicle is still facing to the west, and he comes upon her basically on the ground with the life going out of her, and he comes upon her, basically to finish the hunt, to finish the kill of this 19-year-old girl. And he does it all with the frustration of his mother and his girlfriend on his mind.

In the end, the evidence will show that Shanna's physical fight and yells for help weren't able to save her, but you will learn that those efforts clearly put in motion a series of events that would help slow down Kenneth Hudson and, ultimately, help others apprehend him.

The evidence will show that Shanna's calls for help did get through to some neighbors and, in particular, a neighbor just through the woods by that second quarry entrance, and you can see two blue swimming pools in the back yards there with the water in them, and you'll learn that one of those particular

1

houses is the house of David Carnot up a hill, through the woods off of Plank Road, and his house is on Grandview. And you will learn that Shanna's calls for help did get through to David Carnot; and that you will hear that Carnot was in his back yard doing some landscaping or yard work, had a rake in his hand moving some dirt, and that his work was interrupted; that he was expecting it to just be a typical, relaxing Sunday late afternoon, early evening, in his backyard doing some work. His wife was off with the kids in the house around other parts of the house. And you will hear from Carnot that his work, his peaceful, quiet Sunday was interrupted by what are generally described as blood-curdling screams that you will learn came from Shanna; and that he's startled by them. He hears some more, and he reacts. He reacts by deciding to go down a path -- physical path in his life in his neighborhood, through those woods, from those blue swimming pools to that second quarry entrance. And you'll learn that there's not an exactly carved-out path, but there is an ability for people to go through those woods. And there is an apple orchard in that open area and that Carnot makes his way down there after hearing those screams. He's not sure exactly what he's going to encounter, but as the screams

continue, he knows it's something that's bad and something that involves somebody being in trouble.

You'll learn that he goes through the woods basically just in time to come out on Plank Road to see this defendant, Kenneth Hudson, standing over Shanna's body at the point of her resting, in this case, on Plank Road, and the defendant is standing over her just outside his driver's side door on his pickup truck.

You'll learn that Carnot jumps out on the road and basically yells over to the defendant something to the effect of, you know, what the hell's going on? He was in a tense situation. He doesn't know what he's encountering. He wants to find out exactly what is going on. He sees the victim on the road. He sees the defendant standing over her, and he makes this verbal inquiry, what the hell's going on? But the evidence will show that this defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson, was in no mood to get in a discussion, let alone a discussion with somebody that could potentially be a key witness against him, David Carnot, who came upon the crime scene.

You will learn that this defendant, knowing that this neighbor, this good Samaritan, Dave Carnot, had seen him at a critical point in his crimes, was somebody that could be a key witness against him and

that he was not interested at all in talking to him or trying to get some odd explanation, that he knew -this defendant knew at this point that he had to take some drastic action, more physical action towards this potential eyewitness.

The evidence will show that, in fact, he needed to engage in more violence to eliminate the key witness against him. So the evidence will show that once Carnot yelled at the defendant, the defendant jumped in his truck, fired up the engine, basically floored the truck directly towards David Carnot right by that second quarry gate, with this particular target in mind to run him over, to eliminate this witness, and you'll learn that in direct, straight pursuit with his truck, he came straight at Carnot. And the evidence will show that the defendant in fact did strike David Carnot with his truck. Carnot, somewhat being able to react saying, basically, oh, my God. This guy's coming at me.

He makes an attempt to climb over the gate at the quarry entrance to the middle entrance. He's hit in the leg by the defendant's truck, knocked to the ground, but is able to get up and climb over the fence to some degree of safety, the evidence will show.

The evidence will show that the defendant's truck

hit the gate, hit the fencing area there, and then he made efforts to back up the truck off the fence to try and ram Carnot a second time. But unexpectedly for the defendant, you'll learn, that his truck got somewhat hung up on the gate, on the fence; that the left front bumper and the left front tire area got caught up on that fence. And the evidence will show, in fact, that because the truck got caught up on there and was temporarily struck, key parts of that truck fell off and evidence was left at the scene, some damage to the tire, some damage to the lighting area, and a metal

strip that was on the truck.

You will learn from Carnot and the physical evidence in this case that the defendant eventually was able to unhook his truck. He got it unhooked, backed it up with the trailer kind of jackknifing in the street, and then he fled off from the crime scene to the west of Plank Road at a high rate of speed, leaving some tire marks from the scene.

The evidence will show that Carnot and other area residents who had heard some of the yells came upon the scene after Carnot then climbs over the fence to try and come to Shanna's aid. They can see that she's laying on the road just to the east of that middle quarry entrance on the south side of the road with her

feet out towards the road. The evidence will show that these people, these neighbors, tried to come to the aid of Shanna, but sadly, you will learn from this evidence, that it was basically too late; that they weren't able to do anything for her because of the significance of her injuries. You'll learn three stab wounds, some very deep to her back with this five-inch knife, a stab wound to her stomach right near her belly button, and a deep five-inch defensive cut to her hand between her pointer finger and her thumb and a variety of other bruises and injuries, that it was really too late for them to help, but although they were there to help a neighbor in need, that the activities of the defendant had been to a point where Shanna, unfortunately, was beyond help, the evidence will show.

Now, beyond those efforts of the citizens and the neighbors that came upon the scene -- and you'll learn that some people were actually a little farther out of that neighborhood, came down Plank Road and encountered Shanna on their way to take their kids to soccer practice over at Grignon Park -- that these citizens also play a key role in this case because it relates to evidence collection or spotting evidence and even regarding the apprehension of the defendant.

The evidence will show that as this defendant fled

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

the scene in that distinctive pickup truck with the damaged tire, he unintentionally started to leave evidence, physical things, along his flight path. in particular, just to the west, even up to the last quarry entrance where there's an office, he left -started leaving pieces of evidence, a ring from his left front tire.

As he got farther up the road during his escape route, you'll learn that he started to lose something more significant that actually slowed him up for a period of time. You'll learn that the next street up is Florence Street; and that just past Florence Street is Green Bay Road; and that between those two roads, on Plank Road, the defendant's boat started to fall off. And, in fact, you'll hear from some citizen witnesses that observed that taking place, a couple that lives on Florence Street, a younger couple named Matt and Amy Brittnacher, and you'll learn that they were coming back from some family activity eastbound on Plank Road ready to turn onto Florence Street on a left-hand turn, and Matt starts honking because he sees the defendant's distinctive-looking truck losing the boat, and he doesn't know what else has been happening, but he sees somebody on his road losing a boat. So he's honking at him.

In fact, a neighbor or two also spots it, but regarding the Brittnachers in particular, the boat's falling off. They — the defendant realizes it, too. What does he do to solve this problem? Well, in his thought process, he knows he's got to get rid of this problem, so he gets out of his car after pulling it over — his truck — and basically makes some minimal efforts to try and get the boat back on the trailer, but realizing it's going to take a little more effort and time than he has, because he's got to get away from this crime scene, he decides just to let the boat loose, to cut it loose or to just unhook it and leave it in the middle of Plank Road.

The evidence will show that Matt and Amy
Brittnacher observed that. Matt even yelled from a
distance, you know, do you need some help? The
defendant refused; hops in his truck and tears off at a
high rate of speed, continuing west on Plank Road.

You will learn, although it's not on this particular photo, there is some other aerial photos that he continues westbound to get away from this crime scene, and as he's doing that, he's also making a conscious effort, some calculated decisions in his mind to start disposing of some of the evidence. And, in fact, he's got the victim's blood on him and makes some

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

efforts with a rag to wipe off the torso of his body, the trunk of his body, his arms, his hands, with a white rag that was in his truck.

You'll learn that just short of Lawe Street, which is one or two more up from the intersection of Plank and Green Bay Road, he takes this bloody rag and throws it out the window, and there's a citizen witness, a man name Melvin Vandenbloomer, that saw that and pointed that out to the police. You'll learn that Vandenbloomer was over by the top part of that park, Grignon Park. There is a frisbee golf area. And he sees that rag being thrown out of the truck and then the truck speeding off at a high rate of speed, continuing west on Plank and actually coming onto a little more peculiar intersection in Kaukauna, the area of Plank Road, Lawe Street and a street called Delanglade, which is actually Highway 55 that goes north out of Kaukauna.

The evidence will show that the defendant then sped off through that intersection, through a stop sign, in his desire to get away from that crime scene. You'll learn that the defendant makes a variety of calculated, intentional decisions in maneuvering away from that crime scene to try and get away from what he had done, to try and get away from, in fact, the

authorities, you will learn.

And you will learn that as he proceeds north on 55 in the area of Highway 55 going north towards 41 where that old dog park, the greyhound park, is at, he unexpectedly crosses paths with law enforcement.

Now, you will learn through one of the first law enforcement witnesses about who crossed paths with the defendant in regard to the police. And the first person you'll be introduced from law enforcement to is a veteran police officer named Robert Patschke, and you'll learn that, in fact, he's to the level of sergeant with the police department, and that he's got 25 plus years in law enforcement. He's a former Marine. You'll be introduced to him. You'll see his demeanor. He's somewhat rough at the edges, but working on a Sunday shift, doing patrol on the north side of town. He's heading south on 55 and sees something that catches his attention, not knowing the rest of the story at the time.

The evidence will show that Patschke was in an unmarked squad from Kaukauna, plain vehicle, although it does have a siren and a mobile flashing thing on there that he can use if he needs it. He's heading south on 55. The defendant's heading north, basically down to about three wheels because he's popped his

front left tire on that fence. He's shooting off some tire pieces, and Patschke makes note of it. He radios and says, I'm going to pull over a pickup truck to the dispatcher. And you'll hear about some of the dispatch tape and radio activity. He makes a U-turn around and tells the dispatcher, I'm going to stop a truck that's going on three wheels.

You'll learn that he turns around. The cross street at 55 is either Badger or 00, heading north out of town. And that eventually Patschke realizes that this truck is really a truck that doesn't want somebody to point out, hey, you've got a flat tire or you're losing your tire. I'm here to help you. This is a truck that the man wants no business whatsoever with law enforcement on that Sunday afternoon.

You'll learn that Patschke pursues the vehicle north towards the 41 intersection, right by the old dog park there, and that the truck has no intentions of pulling over. You'll learn that eventually, he sees the truck that the defendant, you'll learn, was operating get on the ramp to go on 41 to the south towards Little Chute, down to Appleton, basically in a west direction from that point, but eventually it's called 41 south.

You'll learn that during the course of that

24

25

1

pursuit, the defendant realizes he was being chased by a police officer. Patschke turns on his siren and is pursuing the defendant on basically late afternoon, early evening traffic on Highway 41 south. And you'll learn from Patschke that it's pretty active. You've got a summer day, nice temperature, people coming back from up north. And you've got a lot of activity on 41 south on those two lanes; and that the defendant, in a calculated fashion -- he's just not, like, driving around like a zombie down the middle of the road. He's making calculated maneuvers, in and out of traffic, sparks flying from the wheel of his tire. Some pieces of rubber still remaining, shooting off back at Patschke. Patschke, realizing it's a dangerous situation to the citizens on the road, continues to pursue, and the defendant continues to put that officer in a dangerous situation, endangering his safety by sparks shooting back at the officer, pieces of tire, the metal hitting the concrete, and they go on a pursuit down 41.

They cross through the exit in Little Chute -- I believe that's N -- and ultimately, the defendant realizes that this officer is still on his tail. He can't just stay on 41. He's got to do some more drastic maneuvers. And you'll learn that on 41, as

Patschke's in high pursuit, the speeds are hitting 70, 80, 90 miles an hour. Cars are moving to the side. Some realize it, some don't. The defendant's weaving in and out. The trailer's flopping around, and Patschke's got, you know, like something you'd see out of a movie, a good-old chase scene down 41 on a busy day.

He comes upon 441, and you'll hear from the radio dispatch the defendant tries something drastic there. He maneuvers across lanes and tries to get on the off ramp of 441. You'll learn that there was a slower car out there, and the defendant had to slow down quite a bit, a calculated move to avoid hitting a car on the ramp, but you'll learn from a map and other aerial maps -- pardon me -- that 441 only goes basically south heading into the middle of Appleton or the east side of Appleton; and that the defendant gets off onto 441 -- Patschke's still in pursuit -- maneuvers around this slow vehicle and then continues his flight from the crime scene at a high rate of speed.

He only goes a short distance on 441 and figures, I got to try something else. So he gets off at 00, basically borders the north side of Appleton, you'll learn; gets off at 441. Patschke radioed for some help. It's on the west side of Little Chute,

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

2425

basically, and you've got an Officer Freeman from Fox Valley Metro. There's police assistance, friendly neighborhood police. He comes upon the chasing, too. He and Patschke then continue pursuing this defendant, who has no intentions to stop, no intentions to being apprehended, no intentions to face what he did back in Kaukauna.

He continues westbound on OO, and not just for a short period of time. You'll learn that they basically went the full length of OO, through the remainder of Little Chute, into Appleton, crossing a number of intersections, and Patschke will describe that. There's a number of controlled intersections on the north side of Appleton on OO, Northland Avenue. defendant is still continuing his calculated desire to get away from the crime scene and away from the authorities; high rate of speed down 00, 70, 80 miles an hour, police in pursuit, sirens, lights, blows off seven, eight, nine intersections that have red lights, Ballard Road, Meade Street, Oneida Street, Richmond Street, a couple of lights at the Northland Mall, all red, and this guy blows through them in calculated fashion to try and get away from the police.

Grand Chute comes in on the chase as you get to the Northland Mall area. Sergeant Todd Zolkowski plays

radio talk aborspikes to stopping. He'
calculated fast and riding on continue west. at Mason Street Lynndale, and west at Bluemo spikes to try and subdue the You'll le Bluemound, he'
Patschke, by Zaware that he'
police want to from his alert

a key role in this case, starts pursuing. There's some radio talk about maybe let's throw down a strip of spikes to stop this guy who has no intentions of stopping. He's maneuvering away from the police in a calculated fashion, high rate of speed, three tires, and riding on a wheel rim on his left front tire. They continue west. He does catch a green light, I believe, at Mason Street; goes over a hill heading towards Lynndale, and Grand Chute has set up further to the west at Bluemound an officer to throw out a strip of spikes to try and deflate the rest of his tires, to try and subdue the defendant by stopping his truck.

You'll learn, as the defendant approached Bluemound, he's still being chased from behind by Patschke, by Zolkowski from Grand Chute, and that he is aware that he's being chased. He is aware that the police want to apprehend him, and now he's also aware from his alert behavior, despite a few beers in his system, that they are going to try something else to stop me, and he does see that they throw this spike out there. And you'll learn that, in calculated fashion, this defendant maneuvers his truck around the spikes. In fact, he goes around a median into the opposite lane of traffic on OO over by Bluemound and Fox Valley Tech out there and is able, in calculated fashion, to avoid

23

24

25

those spikes; goes back into his lane on OO, and the pursuit continues. And that's the point where 41 curves. It kind of has an overpass, and as you go OO west, it changes to Highway 15 and 45. You start getting out of Grand Chute and get out of the county towards Greenville. And you'll learn that the pursuit continued because the defendant had no intention to stop.

The Sheriff's Department gets involved a little bit, more Grand Chute officers. The defendant's heading at a high rate of speed, 70, 80, 90 miles an hour out. At that point it's called Highway 15 and 45 to the west. OO basically ends once you get to the overpass at 41. There's trucks and cars coming in the other direction. The defendant's trying to pass people. He's maneuvering in and out. He's continuing to endanger the safety of Patschke and the other officers, trying to avoid apprehension in a calculated way. He avoids the sticks in the road, the spikes in the road. Patschke radios, and Zolkowski radios that, hey, they're heading up to Greenville. They're heading up to Hortonville. You better warn the people down Main Street, Highway 45 in Hortonville, that this truck's not going to stop.

You'll learn that the police realize that this

try something more drastic. And you'll learn that there's a particular, calculated move by Sergeant Todd Zolkowski of the Grand Chute Police Department where he maneuvers his squad eventually around to get in front of the defendant, in front of his truck. He slows down to try and box him in with the other officers, and actually, because of their good police tactics, they are able to force him off the road. But by that time they're already up basically through Greenville, north on 45, heading almost into Hortonville. They eventually get him off the road at an area 45 and Julius Road. There's a church nearby.

one's going to be difficult to stop, and they have to

The evidence will show that Patschke at the time has gotten a few radio signals back from Kaukauna that, hey, we have a young woman down on Plank Road. We are not sure exactly what we got. Some of the neighbors had called 911. A guy name Bruce Benotch, who lives up in the neighborhood, had cell-phoned down on Plank Road because he was driving by, taking his kid to soccer practice. Kaukauna — some of the other officers are at the scene. They know they have basically a barely breathing or deceased young lady.

Patschke gets a radio call that, hey, this may be connected since the chase started generally pretty

close to the scene where Shanna was. You'll learn that the defendant's pulled over, knowing that he's basically caught, conscious of what's going on. The police come by him. And he responds by basically sticking his arms out the window to let them apprehend him. He's alert. He knows he's caught, so he sticks his hands out the window, basically, to give up.

The evidence will show that when Patschke came upon him, he and other officers took custody of the defendant. You'll learn that he made some physical observations of the vehicle, and one key thing that was in plain view as he approached the driver's side of the vehicle and the defendant's taken out is something on the floor of the driver's side of the vehicle near the pedals, right below the driver's seat, but in plain view, he sees a knife, a distinctive knife, in that it's got something on it. And Patschke can clearly tell it's a bloody knife.

And you'll learn that that knife was collected, taken into evidence, transported down to the Crime Lab along with a number of other things taken from that truck, including a receipt from K-Mart, some other physical things from the truck, some physical things from back on Plank Road.

And things were done in the form of DNA testing,

comparisons of broken headlights found at the scene and broken headlights on the defendant's truck, metal pieces, DNA analysis and scientific analysis that will play a role in this case, you'll learn.

And part of this case will be some science, and you'll learn from that science and that analysis that the physical evidence clearly linked this defendant to the crime scene and clearly support his guilt on all four charges. Deputy D.A. Schneider will have a number of witnesses that she will handle from the State Crime Lab that will talk about analysis of blood and other items, and they'll also talk about the blood of the defendant. In fact, that there was some alcohol in his system. There was some therapeutic levels of some drugs in his system, but you'll learn that the levels were such that it didn't really play a huge role in his decision process.

The evidence will show that the main motivation for this defendant was anger and rage and frustration that he wanted to vent on that day.

The evidence will show from the scientific and medical evidence that was done on this case, the physical exam of the victim, the autopsy by Dr. Chambliss, that it will confirm that this defendant was well aware of his actions, and he committed intentional

acts towards Shanna, towards Dave Carnot, and then was extremely reckless with Patschke on his chase.

Now, Patschke makes the observations of the knife. He also makes some observations of the defendant. The defendant's hyped up, to some degree, and he's got some blood on him, but physically you look at him and you can't see any significant injuries that would cause the quantity of blood to be on him. It's dripping down his ankles onto his feet with his sandals. There's some on his hands. There is some on his torso. He was able to wipe some of it off on that rag, but Patschke still physically sees blood that was from some source other than the defendant, Mr. Hudson, and makes note of that.

He decides that before they do anything further with him, that they'll at least run him quickly to St.

E's to check him out to see if there's any source of blood on him, and you'll learn that, other than any minor scratch or a little abrasion on his person, there's no significant injury on him that would cause that quantity of blood, and you'll learn that some of the blood was wiped off then by officers at the hospital and ultimately tested and, in fact, turned out to be the blood of Shanna Van Dyn Hoven.

You'll learn that at the hospital, at St. E's, when the defendant was there for a period of time, that

they took blood to just confirm his alcohol level and any other drugs in his system. He was observed at the hospital to be alert by the police personnel. He does have some limited conversation with them and agrees, in particular, with one or two officers at the scene that are designated the investigators for the long haul in this case from Kaukauna, to talk to them; that they ask if they can talk to him, Officers Manion and Shepardson, you'll be introduced, and the defendant agrees to do so to give his side of the story, to give his side of his activities on that day and leading up to that day.

Now, during the course of the trial, you'll be introduced -- and you did during jury selection -- to Assistant Chief Manion and Lieutenant Shepardson of the Kaukauna Police Department, and you'll learn that after the defendant was at St. E's and checked out for a period of time, that they had an opportunity to interview the defendant at the Kaukauna Police Department for about an hour, hour-and-a-half, shortly after midnight, on the next day, which would be June 26; and basically the officers were of the mind-set to give the defendant an opportunity to tell, hey, tell your side of the story, what do you know, what do you remember, things of that sort. And you'll learn that

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

at least the first part of that interview is focusing mainly on background information, where are you from, what have you been doing, who have you been hanging out with, those types of things.

And you'll learn that during that part of the interview, the defendant's quite verbal and articulate with the officers. He's coherent and conversational. And he lays out some history. Yes, you know, I'm from New York. My mother was in town. I've got this girlfriend. And he does point out some of the tensions in his life, at least to some degree, at least at that time with the officers. And you will learn that he talks about his awareness of certain things regarding his job; that he's done roofing jobs in the Fox Cities, including, he acknowledged in particular, a roofing job that he did over on Florence Street the first half or so of June of 2000, basically a house at the intersection of Florence and Plank Road; that he was there for a good chunk of the first half of June of 2000; indicating to the officers that, yes, he did have some knowledge of that neighborhood in question.

But the evidence will show that as that interview went on and the officers tried to pin him down on information as to the particulars of Plank Road, you know, that it had just happened a few hours earlier,

the defendant is somewhat selective in his memory. And in fact, on key things early on, he claims a lack of memory.

The officers then realize that, because of the defendant's selective memory, that they've got to take a little more tact -- different tactic than just being, hey, tell us what you know. They start to ask questions that are a little more pointed, not like interrogation in his face, but more pointed in saying, hey, we know certain things. We collected things. Other officers have encountered the crime scene, and we've got some physical things that show you were on Plank Road. And in fact, the guy's got blood on him right during the interview.

So as they try to pin him down, the defendant is still somewhat selective in his memory as to Plank Road. But eventually, over time, as they pin him down and point out things they know, he makes some acknowledgments. He talks about doing things and having a confrontation with somebody on Plank Road as his first step of acknowledgment. Yes, that he remembers having a confrontation on Plank Road. But throughout these steps he takes -- and you'll learn that he does progress in those steps of information -- he always qualifies it and basically says these things

are happening not because he's willing to take responsibility, but he wants to point the finger at somebody else, the evidence will show. And the evidence will show that throughout the interview, he continually goes back and says this happened because of my mother, because I had a rough childhood and she wasn't nice to me and I hate her, so that's why this happened, you'll learn.

The evidence will show as these steps of progress continue for Manion and Shepardson, the defendant then does admit -- because the officers know there's blood in his truck -- he admits that, yes, he did try to force a young lady in his truck on Plank Road. Then he takes the next step and says -- he does admit at least stabbing her once and says he remembers that at least once in the truck. And the physical evidence will show that there were probably stabs outside the truck and inside the truck.

The evidence will show that, although he makes some of those steps in general acknowledgments, he's selective on his memory regarding specifics. The evidence will show that even beyond his general acknowledgments regarding confrontation with Shanna, pulling her into the vehicle or pushing her in the vehicle, stabbing her, he also makes some statements

regarding the citizen neighbor, David Carnot, that came upon the scene, and once again you'll learn that the tone of the interview is such that he points the finger at somebody else and says that it's not his fault regarding Carnot. Basically he claims that Carnot — he drove at Carnot just because Carnot had a rake and was coming at him, will be the perspective the defendant tries to portray to the police.

The evidence will show that during the course of the interview, there are some emotional points where the defendant's talking about his mother, but throughout the course of the interview, it's a coherent dialogue. The defendant's alert. He has memory, at times although selective, and he's conversational with the officers. There's other times there's contradictions. At one point even after acknowledging the neighborhood from his roofing job, he goes on later and claims that the only reason the confrontation happened was because he didn't know the neighborhood and he was asking Shanna, the young lady, for directions. So you'll get a chance to sort out that interview when those officers testify about it.

The evidence will show that towards the end of the interview, as the police are trying to push for more specifics, the defendant's becoming agitated, and they

decide to end the interview.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The evidence will show that, as a whole, the defendant was alert and coherent with the officers during the interview. The evidence will show that after they concluded the formal interview, they transported the defendant over to the sheriff's department, but he provided them a few bits of additional information. Unsolicited, he makes some comments to them while they're in the car with them going for a ride from Kaukauna basically to Appleton.

And you will learn that at times during the drive early on, there's some emotional comments. defendant realizes the police have him. He makes emotional comments about acknowledging stabbing the young lady. He makes a specific comment, quote, this is all because of my mother, unquote. But then beyond a few emotional comments, he does make one calm, inquisitive type of comment that the evidence will show his acknowledgment of consciousness of guilt.

In particular, you'll learn that during the course of this ride, while the defendant's realizing he's caught, he's in trouble, there's going to be some penalty to pay, he calms down, directs his attention to the two officers, and in a calm, inquisitive, alert fashion, starts to try and find out what the penalties

23

24

25

1

are potentially against him. And with this consciousness of guilt in mind, he flat-out says to the officers in calm fashion, after a little bit of emotion, settles down, turns towards them and says, does Wisconsin have the death penalty? And the evidence will show that that particular comment shows his consciousness of guilt, and you'll learn that the officers, knowing that our state doesn't have that penalty, didn't respond to him because they -responded to the defendant because they wanted him to continue with his thoughts regarding the situation, but you'll learn that those comments, as a whole, in the car, the comments at the police department, and a wealth of physical evidence, show his guilt beyond his own consciousness of guilt. The investigation, the physical evidence, the interviews, the whole picture, shows this defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt on all four counts.

Now, as I said, towards the beginning of this opening statement, this is a case about a variety of lives, various lives crossing paths, and it's also about the decisions of those traveling those paths. And as we start with the evidence in this case and the testimony from the witnesses, you, too, all 14 of you, will be traveling a path in some particular way, as

1 1

people listening to witnesses, listening to evidence, and taking a path, as jurors, as part of a community process, the criminal justice process, a government process. And you'll learn that, as you travel down that path, you'll hear evidence, the story of this case, the physical evidence, that will guide you down your path as jurors, and it will guide you to a path that will take you to the truth of the evidence in this case.

And when your path as jurors ends, you'll have jury deliberations. And I trust you will realize, from the evidence and the testimony in this case, that although Shanna Van Dyn Hoven's path in life ended with violence and death with that early evening jog on June 25 on Plank Road in Kaukauna, Wisconsin, her path in life does not have to end without justice.

I trust you, as jurors, and keeping an open mind and considering all the evidence and testimony in this case and all the statements you will hear, you will give Shanna her justice, based on the evidence and testimony, and give her justice with four guilty verdicts, guilty, guilty, guilty, guilty, on all four counts against this defendant, Kenneth A. Hudson.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, do you have an opening statement, or do you waive it?

1	MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I'd like to reserve
2	right to opening statement until prior to presenting my
3	defense.
4	THE COURT: You may do so. We'll take a
5	break. Mr. Biskupic, get your first witness ready.
6	Take ten minutes.
7	(Recess had from 2:58 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)
8	THE COURT: Are you ready with the first
9	witness?
10	MR. BISKUPIC: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please.
12	(In the presence of the jury)
13	THE COURT: Be seated, please. You may
14	proceed.
15	MR. BISKUPIC: The State's first witness is
16	Nancy Van Dyn Hoven.
17	THE COURT: Come up to the chair, remain
18	standing and raise your right hand, please.
19	NANCY VAN DYN HOVEN,
20	having been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,
21	testified as follows:
22	THE CLERK: State your full name and spell
23	your last name, please.
24	THE WITNESS: Nancy Van Dyn Hoven,
25	V-A-N-D-Y-N-H-O-V-E-N.
	196

1		THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
2		DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
4	Q	Ma'am, where is your residence?
5	A	121 Garfield Street in Kaukauna.
6	Q	Okay. And that's Outagamie County, Wisconsin; is that
7		correct?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And how long have you lived on Garfield Street?
10	A	About 20 years. We rented a duplex down the street
11		from our house, and then a couple years later we moved
12		up the street when a house came up for sale, so about
13		20 years.
14	Q	And you're married; is that correct?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And what's your husband's name?
17	A	Steven Van Dyn Hoven.
18	Q	And how many years have you been married?
19	A	Twenty years, just over 20 years.
20	Q	And it's correct you have two children; is that
21		correct?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And what are their names?
24	A	Shanna Marie Van Dyn Hoven and David Barry Van Dyn
25		Hoven.
		197

1	Q	What are their dates of birth?
2	A	Shanna's is 5/26/81, and David's 6/11/82.
3	Q	Were they a year apart in school?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And did they always reside with you at 121 Garfield
6		Street?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	What do you do for work?
9	A	I work at Miron Construction. I'm a project
10		coordinator.
11	Q	And what type of work does your husband do?
12	A	He does electrical work.
13	Q	Now, you said you lived at two different locations on
14		Garfield Street; is that correct?
15	A	Um-hummm.
16	Q	And how many houses apart roughly?
17	A	Six or seven, opposite sides of the street.
18	Q	And what part of Kaukauna is that in?
19	A	It's on the north side.
20	Q	I'm going to direct your attention to some diagrams and
21		exhibits, and I'll walk up and show you which ones in
22		particular, with the Court's permission.
23		THE COURT: You may proceed.
24	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
25	Q	This is Exhibit 3. Are you familiar with what's

1	E	depicted in three?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And what is depicted in three?
4	A	City of Kaukauna.
5	Q	Okay. When I direct your attention to an exhibit, can
6		you tilt your microphone a little bit just so people
7		can hear you? And does this City of Kaukauna map, at
8		least from your observations, appear to fairly and
9		accurately depict the city as you've known it for the
10		last 20 years?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Now, in particular, on this map, can you mark with your
13		initials NV as to where Garfield Street and
14		approximately where your home is with this green
15		marker?
16		(Witness complies with request)
17	A	Right there.
18	Q	Okay. You can go back to your seat. And is that
19		correct that Garfield ends to the west on Lawe Street
20		and to the east on Green Bay Road?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Now, you were living in that home back at 121 Garfield
23		Street back in June of 2000; is that correct?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And at least as of June of 2000, were both your kids
		199

1		living in the house?
2	A	Yes. My daughter was home for from college for
3		summer vacation, so yes, they were both living there.
4	Q	Now, above Exhibit 3, the city map, is an aerial photo,
5		Exhibit 4. Are you familiar about what's depicted in
6		four?
7	A	Yes. It's the quarry, and it's upside down from the
8		map, I believe.
9	Q	Okay. So it's the top of the photo is to the south;
10		is that correct?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And to the bottom of the photo is north in your
13		neighborhood; is that correct?
14	A	Yes.
15		THE COURT: Is there a possibility of
16		changing that around so it squares with the other map?
17		MR. BISKUPIC: Get a headache doing that, but
18		we'll manage.
19		THE COURT: Okay.
20	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
21	Q	Regarding this photo four, from your knowledge of the
22		neighborhood and the area of the quarry on there, does
23		that fairly and accurately depict your neighborhood as
24		you knew it in June of 2000?
25	A	Yes.

1 And at least -- are you familiar with this main road to Q 2 the south of the quarry? 3 A Yes. 4 And what is that? 5 A That is Plank Road and Highway 96. 6 Okay. From Plank Road, is it correct that you 7 intersect on Florence Street and then Highway 96? 8 A Yes. 9 And do you know which road in from 96 Garfield Street 10 is? 11 A The first one is Washington. No, the -- the other --12 that's Garfield right there. 13 Okay. And would that be consistent with what's on the 14 map, actually Washington, Grant and then Garfield? 15 A Yes. 16 And does four fairly and accurately depict at least the 17 entrance to your street from Highway 96, as you knew it 18 back in June of 2000? 19 A Yes. 20 Now, back in June of 2000, when your daughter was 21 living with you, did she also work? 22 A Yes, she did. 23 And what type of work did she do? 24 She worked at Blimpie's Subs, a fast-food 25 establishment.

	1	
1	Q	Okay. And what were her general hours, if you recall?
2	A	She worked varied hours. She worked quite a few days,
3		weekends.
4	Q	Now, on Sunday, June 25, 2000, do you remember if she
5		worked on that day?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And what shift did she work on that Sunday?
8	A	She worked from 8:00 until 2:00.
9	Q	And was Blimpie's open that early on that Sunday
10		morning?
11	A	No, they don't open until ten, but she was opening
12		herself that day, so she went in and to set things up
13		for when they actually opened for business.
14	Q	Now, do you recall after her shift whether what time
15		roughly she would have returned home?
16	A	It would have been probably around quarter after two,
17		right around there.
18	Q	Is Blimpie's on the north side of Kaukauna or the other
19		side?
20	A	It's on the south side.
21	Q	Okay. And would she normally have use of one of the
22		family cars to go there?
23	A	Her own car, yes.
24	Q	And on that particular afternoon, do you recall what
25		you were doing at the house on Garfield, if anything?
		202

1	A	I was just kind of laying around on the couch. We had
2		the NASCAR race on, and I had kind of gotten into the
3		habit of taking a nap during the races on Sunday
4		afternoons so
5	Q	Did you observe your husband Steve to be around that
6		afternoon?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And what was he doing?
9	A	He was watching the race.
10	Q	Do you remember any other activities he would have been
11		involved in that afternoon?
12	A	Well, he was doing some plumbing repair in our
13		bathroom, our bathtub drain.
14	Q	Now, regarding some background on your daughter, do you
15		know approximately how tall and what her weight was
16		back in June 25 of 2000?
17	A	Five seven, about 130 to 135, I'd say.
18	Q	And at least over the year or so leading up to that
19		time period, was she involved in, over that last year
20		or two, in sports or athletic type of activities?
21	A	Yes. She played volleyball through her junior year in
22		high school, and she was involved in a Tae-Bo course at
23		high school. And at college she played intramural
24		volleyball, and she liked to go running. And she was
25		playing volleyball with me. I'm on a volleyball team,

1		and she was going to be doing that that summer, this
2		summer.
3	Q	When you mentioned running, did she have a routine for
4		jogging that you were aware of?
5	A	Not any specific routine, no.
6	Q	How often per week would you be aware that she would go
7		for a jog?
8	A	I would say several times a week.
9	Q	And were you familiar with the general route she would
10		take on her jogs?
L1	A	Yes.
12	Q	And can you describe to the jury what routes she would
13		take?
14	A	Using the map or
15	Q	No, just in general, a description of what areas she
16		would go around.
7	A	Running up Lawe Street well, actually south on Lawe
18		Street, and turning somewhere in the neighborhood of, I
.9		believe, it's Augustine Street.
20	Q	That's the road to the south board of the quarry; is
21		that correct, at the top of the photo.
22	A	Yes. Actually, turning on I'm not sure of the name.
23		Catherine, Catherine Street to John Street, and then
24		that hooks up to Augustine Street, and then coming down
25		that way, and then coming up the hill at Plank Road.

1	Q	Plank Road, once you hit Augustine Street, it heads to
2		the west; is that correct?
3	A	I'm not sure of directions, but
4	Q	Well, I'll direct your attention to photo Exhibit 4
5		that you've identified. Is it correct that this
6		intersection up to the left of the photo is Augustine
7		and then Plank Road up the hill?
8	A	Yes. Yes.
9	Q	And once you hit Plank, you're heading back to the
10		west; is that correct?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And does that got somewhat of a hill or is it flat?
13	A	It goes up a big hill there.
14	Q	And then you have quarry entrances; is that correct?
15	A	Um-hummm.
16	Q	And are you familiar that there's three different
17		quarry entrances on the south side of Plank Road into
18		Murphy's Quarry?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	And is that how it's been for a number of years there?
21	A	As far as I know, yes.
22	Q	Now physically, did you provide us with some pictures
23		that depict your daughter's approximate size and weight
24		back from June of 2000?
25	A	Yes, I did.

Q	Direct your attention to photo No. 1. Do you know
	who's depicted in the T-shirt and shorts in photo
	Exhibit 1?
A	That's my daughter Shanna.
Q	And do you know approximately when that photo was
	taken?
A	That was at her high school graduation party, so it
	would have been in about July of '99.
Q	Okay. About 11 months before this case?
A	Yes.
Q	And then you've also provided us with photo Exhibit 2;
	is that correct?
A	Yes.
Q	And is that was that a more recent photo?
A	Yes, much more recent.
Q	And when approximately was that from?
A	It would have had to have been in in April or May.
Q	Of 2000?
A	Yes.
Q	After she had already been off to school?
A	Yes.
Q	And at least physically, heightwise and buildwise, does
	photo Exhibit 2 depict more of her weight and height?
A	Yes.
Q	But then on one, you depict how she would look in a
	206
	A Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A

1		T-shirt and shorts; is that correct?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And do one and two physically and accurately depict the
4		approximate size and height and weight of your daughter
5		as you knew her back in June of 2000?
6	A	Yes.
7		MR. BISKUPIC: Ask permission to publish one
8		and two to the jury.
9		THE COURT: You may publish.
10	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
11	Q	Did you call your daughter Shanna Marie, or did you
12		have a particular nickname of how you addressed her?
13	A	I occasionally called her Shanna Banana, which was her
14		nickname by all her friends. Most of the time I just
15		called her Shanna.
16	Q	Now, directing your attention back to Sunday, June 25,
17		2000, do you remember observing the activities of
18		Shanna once she returned from work at Blimpie's?
19	A	Yes. She took a nap, and David went up and asked her
20		if she wanted to go to the beach, and she said no. She
21		went back to sleep then for a little while. And then
22		she got up and got ready to go for a run.
23	Q	And did you see what kind of clothing she put on?
24	A	She always wore shorts and a T-shirt when she went
25		jogging.
		207

1	Q	Did she have any other running gear or devices that you
2		were aware of that she would take on a jog?
3	A	She always took her walkman.
4	Q	With headphones?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And did she have a particular kind of running shoes?
7	A	White with blue trim. I'm not sure of the brand name,
8		if they were Nike's or I'm not sure.
9	Q	Now, directing your attention to the area of 5:30 to
10		5:40 p.m., do you recall observing Shanna with her
11		running gear on within the residence?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	What room did you observe her in?
14	A	She was in the kitchen. I was in the living room.
15	Q	Did you say anything to her as she took off or vice
16		versa?
17	A	Yes, I did. I asked her if she wanted to go take a
18		ride with Steve and I out to the lake, take the dog out
19		by the boat landing for a run.
20	Q	What lake were you talking about?
21	A	Lake Winnebago.
22	Q	At a particular park or something?
23	A	It's a public boat landing down a ways from High Cliff.
24	Q	Okay. Did she agree to go with you, or no?
25	A	No. She said she was going to go for a run, and then
		208

	she wanted to go to Shopko.
Q	Had you had some activities planned with your daughter
	to go to Shopko or shopping later that day?
A	No. It wasn't anything planned. But after she left
	then, I said I told Steve that I would rather wait
	for her to come back and go to Shopko with her.
Q	So you didn't go to the lake?
A	No.
Q	Did your husband stay around at that point?
A	He finished fixing the drain in the bathtub, and then
	he went over to his parents', and then he took a drive
	over to his friends had had a we had been at a
	graduation party earlier, and he went to see if they
	needed help cleaning up at the park.
Q	Now, at least from your recollection and by
	observations, what was the average time that your
	daughter was usually gone for a jog?
A	I would guess about a half an hour.
Q	And after she left in that area of 5:30 to 5:40, about
	a half hour later, did you observe her come back?
A	No.
Q	Where did you see her depart from? What room or what
	exit from your home?
A	She left the back through the back door, through the
	kitchen.
	A Q A Q A Q

1	Q	Okay. Does that go out to a driveway or a back yard?
2	A	Yes. It goes out to the driveway by our garage.
3	Q	And then what did you do at least over the next 20 to
4		30 minutes as she was out for her run?
5	A	I just nothing really. I got a phone call. I
6		didn't really do much of anything; kind of just
7		half-napped.
8	Q	And by routine, she would go for this jog usually
9		several times a week; is that correct?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Now, as it got past six o'clock, into the area of 6:30,
12		did either your daughter or your husband return first?
13	A	Yes. Steve came back, and I said, Shanna's not back
14		yet. And so he went to took a drive around the
15		block, and then he came back, and he said, there's a
16		there are a whole bunch of police cars, so
17	Q	In what area?
18	A	He said they were down on the on Green Bay Road, on
19		the curve. And I jumped in my car and I drove down
20		there.
21	Q	And what why did you go down there?
22	A	I I wanted to see what was going on. I knew Shanna
23		should have been back, and I I just had to go down
24		there and see what was going on.
25	Q	And so where did you go?
		210

1 A I went down Garfield Street and took a right onto Green 2 Bay Road, and I pulled over on the -- on the right-hand 3 side of the road where the Plank Road was blocked off 4 with blockades, and there were some motorcycle police 5 there. 6 Q Which direction were you looking down Plank Road? 7 A To the east. 8 Towards the quarry? 0 9 A Yes. 10 And were you able to get down Plank Road? 11 A No. 12 Q Did you make some efforts to go down Plank Road? 13 A With my car, you mean? 14 0 Either on foot or in car. 15 Yes, I did. I -- I got out of my car and there were a 16 couple of kids standing there that I know, and I said, 17 Kurt, what's going on? And he said, somebody said two 18 joggers got hit by a car. So I crossed the street, and 19 there were some women standing by the blockades. 20 of them had a camera, I think, and I asked them, what 21 was going on? And they said they didn't know. And I 22 saw a state trooper down blocking off Florence Street, 23 so I started heading that way. I started just running

down the street to go get closer and to talk to her and

to see if I could find anything out. And I got most of

24

the way there, and --

- Q Could you see any vehicles or police activity down there?
- A No, nothing other than her car parked at the end of Florence Street, and -- and one of the policemen on the motorcycles then came up behind me and asked me what I was doing. And I told them, I said, I had to find my daughter. And he said, you can't go down there. He said, you'll have to call the Kaukauna Police Department.
- Q So what did you do?
- A I ran back to my car, and my mother lives on Florence Street. So I drove to her house, and I called the police department and explained to them that I was looking for my daughter who was out jogging, and that I knew she jogged there; and that everything was blocked off and that someone had said that two joggers got hit by a car.

And they asked me what she was wearing. And I kept saying, I don't know, because I didn't realize I could have just said shorts and a T-shirt. I just kept thinking I was supposed to tell them exactly what she was wearing. And I was getting very upset. And then they asked me if she carried a walkman. And I said yes. And they asked me what her shoes were like. And

1 I said they were white with blue trim. And then they 2 asked me if she had a boyfriend or an ex-boyfriend, and 3 I said no. And then they said -- they asked me for the 4 number -- the telephone number of where I was, and I 5 gave them my mother's telephone number, and they said 6 they would call me back. But then I got off the phone 7 and I -- I went back home, and I told my mother or her 8 fiance, I said, if the police call, tell them I went 9 home. 10 So where did you go then? 11 A I went home, and we were just waiting to find anything 12 out. And Police Chief Morse came and got a picture of 13 Shanna, took it with him, and then a while later, 14 someone called and said we should come up to St. 15 Elizabeth Hospital. 16 0 Did you go there? 17 A Yes. 18 By yourself or with others? 19 It was Steve and I and his parents, and his brother and 20 his wife. 21 Was that getting later into the evening? 22 Yes. I'm not sure what time it was. And my mother and A 23 her fiance also came. 24 When you -- up to the point you were at St. Elizabeth's 25 prior, had you seen Shanna since she had left for the

1		run?
2	A	No.
3	Q	And once at St. Elizabeth's, did you end up meeting
4		with law enforcement and people from the hospital?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And were you asked to identify your daughter at that
7		scene?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And in fact, was she there?
10	A	Yes, she was.
11	Q	And did you go in and identify her?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And at least up to that point, she was deceased; is
14		that correct?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Was that the first at the hospital the first time
17		you saw her subsequent to her leaving for her run on
18		that night?
19	A	Yes.
20		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have on direct.
21		THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, any questions?
22		MR. HUDSON: No, Your Honor.
23		THE COURT: You may step down.
24		MR. BISKUPIC: We'd ask that Exhibits 1, 2
25		and 3 be received into evidence; and four, which is the
		214

-		
1	map she's identified.	
2	THE COURT: They'll be received.	
3	MR. BISKUPIC: Okay. We'd call David Carnot	
4	to the stand.	
5	THE COURT: Come right up, Mr. Carnot, to the	
6	witness stand, remain standing and raise your right	
7	hand, please.	
8	DAVID J. CARNOT,	
9	having been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,	
10	testified as follows:	
11	THE CLERK: State your name and spell your	
12	last name, please.	
13	THE WITNESS: David J. Carnot, C-A-R-N-O-T.	
14	THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.	
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
16	BY MR. BISKUPIC:	
17	Q What's your occupation, sir?	
18	A I'm a welder/fabricator for Voith Sulzer.	
19	Q And how many years have you worked for them?	
20	A Three years.	
21	Q And how old are you right now?	
22	A Thirty-three.	
23	Q And are you married?	
24	A Yes, I am.	
25	Q What's your wife's name?	
	215	

1 A Lisa. 2 Do you have any kids? 3 A One, and a stepdaughter. 4 And what's your residence address? 0 5 A 1806 Grandview Lane. 6 Is that in the City of Kaukauna, Outagamie County, 0 7 Wisconsin? 8 A Yes, it is. 9 And how long have you lived at 1806 Grandview Lane? 10 A Six years. 11 Other than living in Kaukauna for the last six years, 12 have you lived in Kaukauna your whole life? 13 A I've lived in Kaukauna my whole life. 14 Graduate of Kaukauna High School? 15 A Kaukauna High School. 16 Now, I direct your attention to some exhibits. 17 a map identified as Exhibit 3 that's been received into 18 evidence. Are you familiar with the City of Kaukauna 19 map? 20 Yes, I am. A 21 And at least from your observations, does it fairly and 22 accurately depict Kaukauna as you know it? 23 A Very close, yep. Yes, it does. 24 And what side of town do you live on? 25 A I live on the north side.

1	Q	And it's 1806 Grandview Lane; is that correct?
2	A	Yes, it is.
3	Q	Can you use this green marker and just put initials
4		where your home would be on Grandview Lane with DC?
5	A	DC?
6	Q	Correct.
7		(Witness complies with request)
8	Q	And where you put that on Grandview Lane, it's on the
9		south side of the street; is that correct?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	And does your backyard go up to other houses, or is
12		there something else behind your backyard?
13	A	There's houses off of Claribel Street but nothing
14		behind my house.
15	Q	What do you encounter when you walk out to your
16		backyard?
17	A	A woods.
18	Q	Heading towards what direction?
19	A	Towards Plank Road.
20	Q	Now, direct your attention to photo exhibit, aerial
21		photo four. Are you familiar with what's depicted in
22		four?
23	A	Yes, I am.
24	Q	And what do you know the aerial view of four to be?
25	A	A big percentage is the quarry. Straight up from the
		217

1		quarry, you can see my house and the neighbors'
2		surrounding houses.
3	Q	Are you familiar with Murphy's Quarry?
4	A	Yes, that's correct.
5	Q	And are you familiar with that there's three entrances
6		going to the south into Murphy's Quarry?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	At least in relation to your house, which entrance is
9		the closest direction off of Plank Road?
10	A	Would be the the middle entrance, the second one.
11	Q	Now, directing your attention to that middle entrance,
12		is it correct that if you go north, you go into the
13		woods; is that correct?
14	A	Correct.
15	Q	And then there's a blue swimming pool, at least the
16		first one coming through the woods to the north of the
17		woods. Are you familiar with whose swimming pool that
18		is?
19	A	That is my swimming pool.
20	Q	And that's in the backyard of your house?
21	A	In the back of my house.
22	Q	And this kind of darker roof next to it, is that your
23		home?
24	A	That is my house.
25	Q	At 1806 Grandview?

1	A	Yes, it is.
2	Q	And at least as it was laid out back in June of 2000,
3		does this fairly and accurately depict your
4		neighborhood on the north side of Kaukauna back in June
5		of 2000?
6	A	Perfectly.
7	Q	Now, on Sunday, June 25, do you remember what you were
8		doing in the afternoon hours?
9	A	Working in my yard doing some yard work.
10	Q	And what, in general, were you doing?
11	A	I had built a retainer wall, and I was backfilling on
12		the retainer wall.
13	Q	Do you remember where your wife or children would have
14		been at that time?
15	A	Children were swimming in the pool along with some
16		neighbor kids, and my wife was in the house making
17		supper.
18	Q	Now, directing your attention to the area of six
19		o'clock or within the next five or ten minutes after
20		six o'clock, do you recall doing that type of activity
21		at that time?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	And show you another photo board. This is photos 7, 8,
24		9, 10, 11 and 12. First starting with seven, can you
25		identify what photo seven is?

1	A	Photo seven would be the back of my house, would be
2		right here.
3	Q	Is that a view of Plank Road and also up to Grandview?
4	A	Yeah, Plank Road. Then it turns into Highway 96. This
5		is Plank and then 96.
6	Q	So is it correct that that's a view going up Plank
7		Road?
8	A	Yes, it is.
9	Q	From Augustine Street?
10	A	Yes, it is.
11	Q	And to the right of the photo is the pools in your
12		backyard?
13	A	Yes, it is.
14	Q	Okay. Is seven a fair and accurate depiction of the
15		view of Plank Road heading up the road to the west as
16		you knew it back in June of 2000?
17	A	Perfect.
18	Q	Photo eight is what?
19	A	Photo eight is a lot of the quarry, and then upper half
20		of the picture is the woods behind my house, a little
21		apple orchard and then the back of my house.
22	Q	To the top of the photo is the north; correct?
23	A	Top of the photo would be northeast, yeah, north,
24		northeast.
25	Q	Does this photo fairly and accurately depict Murphy's
		220

1		Quarry and then to the north from the three quarry
2		entrances as you knew it back in June of 2000?
3	A	Yes, it does.
4	Q	Photo nine is what?
5	A	Photo nine, we have the it would be everything
6		upside down, but my house would be on the bottom, and
7		then would be the woods behind my house, a little apple
8		orchard, and Plank Road, and then the quarry on the
9		top.
10	Q	It shows more of your neighborhood; is that correct?
11	A	That is correct.
12	Q	Does nine fairly and accurately depict your
13		neighborhood at the bottom and then heading south to
14		the top of the photo as you knew it back in June of
15		2000?
16	A	Yes, it does.
17	Q	And what's ten?
18	Α	Ten is way up in the sky. We've got the whole City of
19		Kaukauna.
20	Q	Okay. In particular, to the north; is that correct?
21	A	No, that wouldn't north would be
22	Q	Okay.
23	A	It would be like south southwest, west.
24	Q	Okay. And is it your neighborhood depicted on there
25		with Plank Road also?
		221

1 A Yes, it is. 2 And does that fairly and accurately depict a higher 3 view of your neighborhood as you knew it back in June 4 of 2000? 5 A Yes, it does. 6 Now, going down to the last two, 11, what's 11? 7 A Eleven is half of my backyard and a lot of my 8 neighbor's backyard, and then the woods and then the 9 road. 10 Is that more of a close-up of your backyard where you Q 11 could see where you were working? 12 A Yeah, it is. You can -- we were standing on the wall 13 there, yeah. Right there we are. 14 0 And to the right of the photo, does it go down to that 15 second gate at the quarry? 16 Yes, it does. 17 Does 11 fairly and accurately depict a close-up of your 18 backyard down to the second gate? Yes, it does. 19 A 20 And what's 12? 0 21 A Twelve is the one corner of my property, and then that 22 corner leading through the woods to Plank Road. 23 And it's more of a close-up towards the woods and the 0 24 gate; is that correct? 25 Yes, it is. A

1	Q	And once again, is that photo a fair and accurate
2		depiction
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	of the edge of your yard down to the gate?
5	A	Yes, it is.
6		MR. BISKUPIC: We'd ask that seven through 12
7		be received.
8		THE COURT: Received.
9		MR. BISKUPIC: We'd ask permission to publish
10		to the jury.
11		THE COURT: I don't want to divert their
12		attention from his testimony.
13		MR. BISKUPIC: I'll just turn it up here for
14		now, if that's okay with the Court.
15		THE COURT: Sure.
16	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
17	Q	Now, while you were working in the yard on that Sunday
18		early evening, did anything interrupt your work?
19	A	I could hear I could hear somebody screaming. I
20		could hear a series of screams, a woman screaming.
21	Q	And how did you react?
22	A	The first one, and it was more or less like it sounded
23		bad, and then the second one was like kind of like
24		where it was coming from, and the third one was I
25		was on my way down the hill.

1		was standing right here working backfilling, and I
2		went off this corner of the wall, jumped off the wall,
3		and then I ran across the backside of my my yard,
4		and then it would have been straight this way, I
5		believe is the apple orchard, is right here and then
6		out onto the road.
7	Q	You can go back to your seat now.
8		(Witness complies with request)
9	Q	As you're going through the woods, are you hearing
10		anything more?
11	A	I'm hearing a lot of screams, a lot of like muffled,
12		like it was coming from her, like around coming
13		from it wasn't coming from the same direction every
14		time, you know, like it was being the voice was
15		coming was something something was going on.
16	Q	When you were traveling through the woods, were you
17		responding back or yelling back?
18	A	I was hollering, does anybody need any help? What's
19		going on? Should I dial 911? What seems to be the
20		problem?
21	Q	What's your mood or demeanor at that time as you're
22		going down the hill?
23	A	Pretty scared.
24	Q	Did you have anything with you?
25	A	I got a garden rake that I was raking the fill out
		225

1		that I I was I was digging the fill out of one
2		side of my yard, and I was putting it hauling it in
3		a wheelbarrow, and I was spreading it out on top of the
4	4.	wall, backfilling the wall to make the ground level
5		with the top of the wall. So I had the rake in my
6		hand.
7	Q	Now, as you're yelling things out as you're traveling
8		through the woods, are you getting any response?
9	A	I'm not getting any response.
10	Q	Now, when you got down to Plank Road, what did you do?
11	A	I got out onto the road, eight or nine steps, and I
12		looked down down the road.
13	Q	And what which direction did you look?
14	A	I would have been looking towards would have been
15		the third entrance to the quarry in that direction,
16		down the road.
17	Q	And did you notice anything?
18	A	I saw a guy standing next to his truck, and there was
19		a somebody laying down on the ground, and the guy
20		was just standing there hanging onto the door of his
21		truck looking at her.
22	Q	Now, in relation to photo Exhibit 4, in the apple
23		orchard that you pointed out, you came out to what
24		area? Can you point on the road?
25	A	Would have been right would have been right here in
		226

	this corner of the apple orchard, right to here.
Q	Okay. Can you put an X with that green pen, just a
	small X where you first came out on the road?
	(Witness complies with request)
Q	Now, from that green mark, is it correct the closest
	gate to you at that point is the middle gate? Is that
	correct?
A	That is the middle gate.
Q	And did you look to your right or to your left as you
	were
A	I would have been looking left, which would be going
	down the hill.
Q	Towards Augustine Street?
A	Yep.
Q	Do you know the person who lives on the corner there?
A	Yes, I do.
Q	And who's that?
Α	Mike Borchert.
Q	If you can kind of turn when you talk so the jury can
	hear you. And have you known Mr. Borchert for a number
	of years?
A	Since kids.
Q	And is it correct that there is one gate farther down?
A	That closes that road off, yeah.
Q	So the first gate from Augustine Street is this one; is
	227
	Q A Q A Q A Q A Q A

1		that correct?
2	A	Yes, it is.
3	Q	And then the second one is the one nearby; correct?
4	A	Yep.
5	Q	And the third one is down by the office; is that
6		correct?
7	A	Is the office.
8	Q	So when you were looking to the left, you were actually
9		looking back towards the first gate; is that correct?
10	A	That is correct.
11	Q	And can you put an X with this blue pen where you would
12		have seen the man standing by his truck?
13	A	Would have been like in here somewhere.
14	Q	So that's a blue X.
15	A	Yeah.
16	Q	Kind of by where the trees overhang; is that correct?
17	A	That is correct, or the trees are over the road.
18	Q	During the time you were down on the road, did you get
19		a chance to look at the type of truck or get some
20		viewing of the truck?
21	A	Yeah. I'm pretty familiar with trucks and I'm
22		pretty familiar with vehicles with all the old beaters
23		I've drove, I guess, yeah. It was an old Chevy.
24	Q	Okay. Now, here's photos Exhibit 98 and 99. Are you
25		familiar with what's depicted on 98 and 99?
		228

1	A	This one here is the pickup truck that I saw on Plank
2		Road.
3	Q	Okay. And it has a trailer attached; is that correct?
4	A	It has the trailer attached. It's the passenger's side
5		of the truck.
6	Q	When you saw the truck on the road on Plank Road, did
7		it have the trailer on it?
8	A	Yes, it did.
9	Q	And did it have a boat on it at that time?
10	A	It also was carrying a boat.
11	Q	And that's photo Exhibit 98; is that correct?
12	A	That is correct.
13	Q	And 99 is a close-up of which side of the truck?
14	А	That is a close-up of the driver's side of the truck.
15	Q	The same vehicle that you remember seeing?
16	A	The same vehicle that I remember seeing.
17	Q	Okay.
18		THE COURT: Mr. Biskupic, have you shown that
19		to the defendant?
20		MR. BISKUPIC: They got copies of everything.
21		THE COURT: Okay.
22	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
23	Q	Now, how many people did you see by the truck, at least
24		in your first view?
25	A	One. There was a man standing there, and there was a

1		girl on the ground.
2	Q	To which side of the truck?
3	A	On the driver's side of the truck.
4	Q	So that would be the on the side towards the quarry;
5		is that correct?
6	A	That is correct.
7	Q	And the man is standing. Is the door open or closed?
8	A	He's hanging onto the door, and the door is open.
9	Q	And did you notice anything going on between the two of
10		them when you first looked over there?
11	A	Nothing. There was nothing going on.
12	Q	She was on the ground; is that correct?
13	A	Yeah.
14	Q	And how did you react to seeing that?
15	A	I hollered down to them, hey, what what the fuck's
16		going on down there, and as I was coming down
17		coming down the road.
18	Q	You started heading down the road?
19	A	Yep.
20	Q	Towards them?
21	A	Towards them.
22	Q	As you're getting close towards them, are you going
23		closer to that middle gate?
24	A	Yes, I am.
25	Q	And did this man react to you at all?
		230

1	A	He immediately jumped into the truck, put it into gear
2		and came after me.
3	Q	Straight at you or at an angle?
4	A	Straight at me.
5	Q	Where are you physically at when that vehicle starts
6		coming straight at you?
7	A	The middle of the road.
8	Q	Now, can you see if up to that point, whether the
9		girl on the ground was moving at all?
10	A	I could still hear her.
11	Q	Did it sound the same as what you heard up the hill?
12	A	She was she was screaming. I guess up to the point
13		to where well, when I was even in the quarry, she
14		was still screaming.
15	Q	What happened after this truck came directly towards
16		you?
17	A	I the truck started coming at me. I ran to the far
18		side of the road on the quarry side, up there was a
19		big metal pole there. I tried to climb up the pole,
20		climbing the fence, and he he rams the fence.
21	Q	Show you another photo board with Exhibits 13 through
22		18. Starting with 13, are you familiar with what's
23		depicted on 13?
24	A	Yes, I am familiar with what's depicted.
25	Q	And what is depicted on 13?
		231

1 A It's a picture of the gate from the downhill side, 2 probably more so from where the victim was laying in 3 the road, but the victim would have been --4 0 To the left? 5 A -- more to the left. 6 And that's -- 13 is a picture of the gate that you ran 7 up to as his vehicle was coming at you. 8 A Yes, it is. 9 Does it fairly and accurately depict the gate as you 0 10 knew it back on June 25? 11 A Yes, it is. 12 What's 14? 13 Fourteen is a picture of the same -- of the same gate, 14 and it -- but it's more taken from a little bit more of 15 a -- a view from down the road. 16 Okay. So you can see at least a portion of Plank Road 17 curving up to the woods? 18 A Yes. 19 And does it once again show the entire gate that you 20 ran to as you were being pursued by this truck? 21 A Yes, it does. 22 Is that a fair and accurate depiction as you knew it 23 back on June 25 of 2000? 24 A Yes, it is. 25 What's 15?

1 Fifteen is a head-on view of the fence, showing the A 2 damage that was done. 3 And you said the vehicle did hit you by the gate? 4 It did hit me by the gate. 5 And what's 16? 6 A A different view of the same gate, taken from up the 7 hill looking down the hill at the gate. 8 Okay. From --9 A Plank Road. 10 -- west back to the east? 11 A Yeah. 12 And 15, what is that a general view of? 13 That is the picture from the west looking east down the 14 hill. 15 0 Okay. 16 With the gate to the right. 17 And you can also see back down to the east down to 18 Plank Road; is that correct? 19 A Yes, it is. 20 And also the location where the girl was; is that 21 correct? 22 A That is correct. 23 And do 13 through 17 fairly and accurately depict views 24 you saw on that day?

233

25

A

Yes, they do, perfectly.

	l	
1		off of the fence.
2	Q	What did you observe it to do next?
3	A	As a couple seconds went by, he got the truck free from
4		the fence, and he took off up the hill.
5	Q	Which direction?
6	A	It would be west.
7	Q	Up Plank Road toward
8	A	Up Plank Road towards 96.
9	Q	How did the truck become unhooked, from your
10		observations?
11	A	Just by ramming, ram-rodding it back and forth. He
12		was he was just forcing it.
13	Q	And could you hear any revving noises?
14	A	Revving noises and tires squealing and gravel flying
15		and crunching and
16	Q	As that evening went on, did you notice any rev marks
17		on the road from the tires?
18	A	I didn't really look. I come out of the quarry, and I
19		could see some stuff laying on the on the road, like
20		a headset, and I think it was like a truck a handle
21		out of the truck, and her laying on the road.
22	Q	And that's back to your the east?
23	A	Which would have been back to the east.
24	Q	On Plank Road?
25	A	On Plank Road.
		235

1	Q	Did you wait in the quarry for a while before you came
2		out?
3	A	He kind of went as he was pulling off up the hill, I
4		watched him leave.
5	Q	And then what did you do?
6	A	I came out between the crack in the fence where the two
7		gates come together, and then I went over by the victim
8		laying in the road.
9	Q	And how was she positioned?
10	A	Facing up the hill, laying on the ground, kind of like
11		in a fetal position.
12	Q	And did you notice anything about her condition?
13	A	She was laying in a lot of blood.
14	Q	And did you could you hear anything or did you
15		observe her moving in any way?
16	A	As I was coming up to her, it was as I was coming up
17		to her, but then as I took a closer look, it just
18		like everything went.
19	Q	And what do you mean by everything went?
20	A	The movement kind of went out of her. She had stopped
21		screaming, and she went into I don't know if it was
22		an unconscious state.
23	Q	Did you try and say anything to her to get her
24		attention?
25	A	Yeah. I said, can I move you or or I said some
		236

	1	
1		stuff to her, like where is the bleeding coming from,
2		stuff like that, but I couldn't get any response out of
3		her. And I didn't feel it was safe to move her or try
4		to do anything.
5	Q	Were her hands moving or positioned in a certain way?
6	A	One arm was out in front of her and that that was
7		it.
8	Q	And could you hear any noises or breathing at that
9	5	point?
10	A	No.
11	Q	And where did you first see the blood coming from on
12		this person?
13	A	The majority of the blood was coming from her back.
14	Q	And what's your mood or demeanor at that point?
15	A	I I then I figured I better go get help. I stood
16		on the road and I screamed quite a bit and hollered,
17		but nobody came. And then I just I ran up the hill,
18		ran up the hill to get help.
19	Q	Which way?
20	A	I would have went a little bit more down the hill and
21		then up the hill to the neighbor's backyard.
22	Q	Okay. Which neighbor?
23	A	Would have been Bruce Vandenberg.
24	Q	And does he live on Grandview by you or on one of the
25		streets around the corner?

1 He lives on Claribel Street. 2 Okay. Is that that street that is at the end of yours? 3 Yeah, it's the street at the end of mine, and then the A 4 house on the very end of that road is -- that's 5 Claribel, and the house on the right, that's where 6 Bruce and Diane Vandenberg live. 7 0 And is that house also with a pool or does their 8 neighbor have that other pool? 9 A No. He's the house without the pool. 10 0 And does his house go to the dead-end of Claribel up 11 against the woods? 12 Yes, it does. 13 And you came out in their yard; is that correct? 14 That is correct. 15 And did you run into this Mr. Vandenberg or --16 I ran into his wife. She was reading the paper in the A 17 backyard. 18 And that's Diane? 19 That's Diane. A 20 And what did you do or say to her? 21 A I hollered to her, dial 911. Get Bruce. I need help 22 now. 23 Okay. 24 And then at that point my wife came out of the back of 25 our house, because she could see me out our back door,

1		and I was hollering to her, bring me some towels. She
2		came running over by me with some beach towels, and I
3		says, go go dial 911. Something happened. And then
4		I took the towels. I thought, you know, do something,
5		and took the towels and went back down there.
6	Q	Okay. Back down through the woods?
7	A	Back down through the woods.
8	Q	What's your emotional state at that time?
9	A	Shock.
10	Q	Do you have injuries that you're aware of at that time?
11	A	Not that I'm aware of yet at that time.
12	Q	As the evening progressed, did you notice some injuries
13		on you?
14	A	When I got back down to the victim and my neighbor,
15		Ham Bruce Vandenberg, he come down and said, you
16		better go take care of your knee.
17	Q	And what did you examine yourself?
18	A	And then at that point I did. I had a pretty I had
19		a big cut in my knee, and I was bleeding pretty good.
20	Q	Did you have that before the vehicle hit you?
21	A	No, I did not.
22	Q	You made reference to Ham. Is that the guy's nickname?
23	A	Ham is Bruce Vandenberg.
24	Q	And he was back down on the road eventually with you?
25	A	He came down then after I came I left the yard
		239

1		after I got the towels, and then he came down behind
2		me.
3	Q	What instructions had you given your wife Lisa?
4	A	To dial 911. There's somebody laying on the road.
5	Q	When you got back down the hill, did you go back to
6		this young lady's body?
7	A	Yes, I did.
8	Q	And were there other people there at that time?
9	A	Yes, there was.
10	Q	And did you know any of them?
11	A	The one guy looked familiar, and I found out who he was
12		later on. And that would have been, I believe, Bruce
13		Benotch.
14	Q	Okay.
15	A	He had a cell phone, and he had a direct line with 911.
16	Q	Did you see eventually any other neighbors that you
17		were away of come up the road?
18	A	I see Mike Borchert come up from the corner. When I
19		first got on the road, there was there was a guy in
20		a pickup truck with a boat on the back of his truck,
21		Jim Vander Loop, and then we exchanged some words. I
22		asked I I don't remember exactly what I said,
23		but, you know, then I went down. I seen him, and then
24		I looked up towards Shanna, and then I went towards
25		Shanna.

1	Q	This Vander Loop was with Borchert; is that correct?
2	A	Yes, that is correct.
3	Q	And did you go back to this girl to try and aid with
4		these other people?
5	A	Yes, I did.
6	Q	Did the condition get any better?
7	A	The condition was, it didn't from my own opinion, I
8		don't believe she was alive.
9	Q	Now, how much time did you and any citizens spend by
10		her until any police or rescue people arrived?
11	A	I went over to the side then Ham come down, and he
12		said, go look at your knee. There's nothing that you
13		can do. And then I went on over up on the north
14		north side of the gate there. I sat down, and Ham
15		stayed by her for a little bit, and there was some
16		other people that stayed by her. And maybe a minute
17		had passed, and then an Officer Rosche showed up and
18	Q	Okay. And then they took over?
19	A	And then they took over.
20	Q	And were you did you step back from the scene then?
21	A	Yes. Then I he said that he took my name and
22		number, and he said to go get my leg looked at. So
23		then at that time I went home and showered up and went
24		to the hospital.
25	Q	Had some stitches in your leg; is that correct?
		241

	1	
1	A	Yeah, six or seven stitches or something.
2	Q	Now, when you saw the person standing by the girl and
3		then also by the in the truck, were you able to
4		identify them?
5	A	No, I wasn't able to identify her. She looked
6		familiar, but the guy didn't look like anybody that I
7		had noticed.
8	Q	Do you know if that person that was in the truck, the
9		guy, is in court here this afternoon?
10	A	Yes, I know him.
11	Q	And can you point him out for the record if he is?
12	A	Sitting right there.
13		THE COURT: Wearing what?
14		THE WITNESS: Wearing what's that?
15		THE COURT: What's he wearing?
16		THE WITNESS: He's wearing a black shirt.
17		THE COURT: The record will show
18		identification.
19	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
20	Q	Now, at least later in that evening after you had some
21		medical treatment later in the night, were you shown
22		some series of photos?
23	A	Yes, I was.
24	Q	By the Kaukauna Police Department?
25	A	Yes, I was.
		242

1	Q	And at least in the series of photos that you were
2		shown by two different officers, were you able to 100
3		percent pick out the
4	A	No, I was not. I was not able to
5	Q	Let me finish the question and then you can answer it.
6		Were you able to, at least in the photo arrays that you
7		were shown that night, able to do a 100 percent
8		identification that night?
9	A	No, I was not.
10	Q	Were there any features in particular when seeing this
11		person in person that were significant at least
12		regarding your identification?
13	A	The way his hair was pulled back and he had a different
L 4		color. He had more tan versus a black-and-white
15		picture. I guess if you see somebody in person, it's a
L6		lot harder to pick him off of a picture and be 100
L7		percent sure versus seeing someone in person. Then you
18		know who it is.
L9	Q	Now, you said you an Officer Rosche came by the
20		scene; is that correct?
21	A	That is correct.
22	Q	And had you generally known him before or just knew who
23		he was?
24	A	Just know who he was.
25	Q	And did he tend to you at all at the scene?
		243

1	A	No.
2	Q	Did anybody give you aid at the scene for your leg
3		injury?
4	A	No.
5	Q	When the vehicle first came at you, the truck, was it
6		moving slowly or quickly, or how would you describe it?
7	A	It was moving fast. The engine was squealing tires and
8		he was coming.
9	Q	Did you hear any braking?
10	A	No, none. He was just flooring it.
11	Q	And then it was stopped by the fence or the fence pole?
12	A	It was stopped by the fence. It kind of almost like he
13		got he tried to swipe me off of the cyclone fence,
14	,	and it was almost like it pulled him into it and
15		stopped his truck.
16	Q	Do you know how much time passed as he's going back and
17		forth trying to get the truck off the fence?
18	A	It couldn't have been more than five, ten seconds
19		maybe.
20	Q	And how much time did you remain behind the fence until
21		you went out and checked on the victim?
22	A	Fifteen seconds.
23	Q	I'm going to show you a few more photos, photo board 19
24		through 24. Are you familiar with what 19 depicts?
25	A	That's yeah.
		244

	1	
1	Q	And what does 19, in general, depict?
2	A	It depicts Shanna Van Dyn Hoven laying on the road.
3	Q	But also in reference to where?
4	A	In reference to the gate, which would be she's
5		laying east of the gate.
6	Q	Okay. At the back of the picture; is that correct?
7	A	That is correct.
8	Q	And this was a view when you were to the west of the
9		gate on Plank Road looking back to the east; is that
10		correct?
11	A	That is correct.
12	Q	And you said you did see some headphones and a handle;
13		is that correct?
14	A	Yeah.
15	Q	Directing your attention to Exhibit 20. Are you
16		familiar with what's located on the road on 20?
17	A	Yeah. There's some pieces laying in the road next to
18		where Shanna was.
19	Q	Okay. Out from the road from her feet; is that
20		correct?
21	A	That is correct.
22	Q	And does 20 fairly and accurately depict where you
23		observed those items in the road?
24	A	Yeah. They were in a very close proximity I was
25		unable to really remember exact, but that's about the

1		way it laid.
2	Q	Okay. And 21 is a close-up of what?
3	A	Looks like the window crank and a headphone set.
4	Q	Is there also a walkman in that picture?
5	A	There's also a walkman.
6	Q	Did you also see any cassette tapes on the road, too?
7	A	Not that I remember.
8	Q	But regarding 21, the close-up of the walkman, the
9		headphones and the window handle, is 21 also a fair and
10		accurate depiction of where you found those items?
11	Α	Yes, it is.
12		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have on direct
13		for this witness.
14		THE COURT: Mr. Hudson?
15		MR. HUDSON: Yes, Your Honor.
16		CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	BY	MR. HUDSON:
18	Q	You said when you came out of the woods, you were
19		running down through the orchard from your house; and
20		when you came out onto the road, you looked to the
21		left, and at that time did you see any person attacking
22		the female?
23	A	No, I did not.
24		MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, I'd like to approach
25		with this exhibit.
		TO CHILD CANEDIC.

1		THE COURT: Sure.
2		MR. HUDSON: I'd like to make this as an
3		exhibit.
4		THE COURT: Have the officer bring it up.
5		MR. HUDSON: I'd like to point out some
6		specific things to Carnot, please. It won't be no
7		problem, Your Honor.
8		THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.
9		MR. BISKUPIC: Is it marked?
10		MR. HUDSON: No, it's not marked.
11		THE COURT: Have it marked first. Counsel,
12		do you want to come over, too?
13	ВУ	MR. HUDSON:
14	Q	This is Exhibit 121. Is this where you came out of the
15		woods?
16	A	That is correct.
17	Q	And about where were you?
18	A	Right there by that X.
19	Q	Right there. And where was the the black truck that
20		you seen?
21	A	Right there where you got the mark a little bit more
22		down.
23	Q	And was that truck headed in the direction of the
24		fence?
25	A	Yes, it was.
		247

	1	
1	Q	So it was already facing the fence?
2	A	Yes, it was.
3	Q	Okay. Did the person of that truck ever threaten to
4		kill you?
5	A	No, he didn't.
6	Q	Never said anything to you.
7	A	No, he did not.
8	Q	As in he was going to harm you in any way?
9	A	No, he did not.
10	Q	What made you feel that the person that got in that
11		truck was going to harm you?
12		THE COURT: Are you done with the picture?
13		MR. HUDSON: Yes.
14		THE COURT: Then please go back to your seat
15		and ask the questions from there.
16		MR. HUDSON: Okay.
17	Q	Now, you just said that when you came out of the woods
18		and you looked down to the left, that you didn't see
19		anybody attacking the female; correct?
20	A	That is correct.
21	Q	This is a police officer's report that he took that
22		a police officer took a statement from David Carnot?
23		MR. BISKUPIC: Object to the form of reading
24		a statement. He can ask him if he said certain things
25		to the police, but he shouldn't be able to read from
		248

1	the report.
2	THE COURT: You can ask questions; not read
3	from the report but ask him questions.
4	BY MR. HUDSON:
5	Q Did you ever tell a police officer that you seen a
6	person attacking the female?
. 7	A No.
8	Q You never said that? You never said, he heard loud
9	screaming coming from the area below his residence. He
10	told me he ran down to this area and saw a male person
11	engaged in a fight of some kind with a female, and
12	another police officer states in his
13	THE COURT: Just Mr. Hudson.
14	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
15	THE COURT: Is that a question?
16	BY MR. HUDSON:
17	Q So you never ever made that statement to a police
18	officer.
19	A I don't recall it, no.
20	Q Didn't recall it.
21	THE COURT: No comments, please. Just
22	questions.
23	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
24	Q So the person that got into that truck and that
25	truck was already facing the gate; correct?
	2/19

1	A	From a distance away, yes, it was.
2	Q	So you said when the person got into the truck and
3		gunned it, it was already going towards that fence.
4	A	Yeah. You were already coming right at me.
5		MR. HUDSON: That exhibit, Your Honor, he
6		said can I approach again, please?
7		THE COURT: Sure.
8	BY	MR. HUDSON:
9	Q	Again you said you were here; correct? You came out
10		of
11	A	That's where I entered the road.
12	Q	Okay. Where were you in that road?
13	A	As I took eight or nine steps out to the road, you
14		started coming at me this way. And as I kept running
15		towards the fence, you kept coming right at me.
16	Q	Now, if that truck's heading towards the fence, why
17		would you run in the same direction as the fence? Did
18		you run in the same direction the truck was facing?
19	A	Did you expect me to run up the road?
20	Q	I didn't ask you that, sir. I said, did you
21		MR. BISKUPIC: Ask that the defendant resume
22		the table if it's just questions at this point.
23		MR. HUDSON: All right.
24		THE COURT: Go ahead.
25		MR. HUDSON: Could I show this to the jury?
		250

1	Could the jury look at this photo?
2	THE COURT: Well, they aren't going to
3	know what you're talking about.
4	MR. HUDSON: To where David Carnot was and
5	the truck.
6	THE COURT: Just show him just point out
7	where he was and the truck. Don't circulate it.
8	MR. BISKUPIC: We'd ask that it be offered
9	first.
10	THE COURT: Is it offered into evidence?
11	MR. HUDSON: Yes, it is.
12	THE COURT: It's received. What number is
13	it?
14	THE CLERK: 121.
15	THE COURT: One twenty-one is received. And
16	just point it out. Hold it up and point it out.
17	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
18	Q David Carnot
19	MR. BISKUPIC: I'd object to him talking to
20	the jury, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Point it out. I'm allowing him
22	to do this. Okay?
23	BY MR. HUDSON:
24	Q If Carnot's saying he's here and the truck's here
25	already facing the gate, why would you run in the
	251

1	same
2	MR. BISKUPIC: Object to him
3	THE COURT: No. No. Questions.
4	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
5	THE COURT: Just tell them what he just told
6	you so they can see the picture.
7	MR. HUDSON: The truck was already facing the
8	gate. Carnot is here, and he ran towards the gate, the
9	same direction the truck was headed in. That's all I
10	have to say
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. HUDSON: on that question. Your
13	Honor, could I state something out of a preliminary
14	hearing that he testified on the stand?
15	THE COURT: You may ask the question, and if
16	it doesn't compare, then you can ask him if he was
17	asked this question and answered this way
18	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
19	THE COURT: if you get a different answer.
20	MR. HUDSON: On page 49.
21	THE COURT: No. No. You have to ask
22	him the question that you want to ask.
23	MR. HUDSON: Okay.
24	THE COURT: If the answer is different than
25	what you get in the in that preliminary hearing,
	252

1	then you may ask the question and say, did you give
2	this answer?
3	MR. HUDSON: If it's different?
4	THE COURT: Yes.
5	MR. HUDSON: Okay. It's the same thing.
6	THE COURT: Ask the question.
7	BY MR. HUDSON:
8	Q He said the truck was headed in the same direction and
9	you ran to the gate. The truck was headed in the same
10	direction. So when that person got into the truck and,
11	you say, gunned it, could that person have lost control
12	of that vehicle?
13	MR. BISKUPIC: Object, no foundation to get
14	in the mind of the person flooring the vehicle at him.
15	THE COURT: Objection is sustained. That
16	means he will not answer.
17	BY MR. HUDSON:
18	Q Were you under the influence of any alcohol or drugs
19	that day?
20	A No, I was not.
21	MR. HUDSON: That's all I have, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Anything else?
23	MR. BISKUPIC: Yes.
24	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. BISKUPIC:
	050

1	Q	Mr. Carnot, at any point when you saw this vehicle at a
2		high speed coming at you, did it appear to veer off to
3		the side to avoid striking you or the fence?
4	A	No, it just kept coming directly at me.
5	Q	At any point did it take any evasive action up to the
6		point of striking you up against the fence?
7	A	No, it did not.
8	Q	And is it correct that from the point it took off at
9		you, that it was a good 20 or 30 feet down the road
10		from that gate?
11	A	That is correct.
12		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have.
13		THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, anything further?
14		MR. HUDSON: I'm just trying to find
15		something here.
16		THE COURT: Go ahead. Take your time.
17		MR. HUDSON: Please.
18		(Pause)
19		MR. HUDSON: That's all I have, Your Honor.
20		THE COURT: You may step down.
21		MR. BISKUPIC: We'd ask that the ones he
22		identified, 13 through 17, and 19, 20 and 21 be
23		received.
24		THE COURT: They're received.
25		MR. BISKUPIC: Call Lisa Carnot.
		254

1	THE COURT: Come right up to the chair,
2	remain standing and raise your right hand, please.
3	LISA CARNOT,
4	having been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,
5	testified as follows:
6	THE CLERK: State your name and spell your
7	last name, please.
8	THE WITNESS: Lisa Carnot, C-A-R-N-O-T.
9	THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. BISKUPIC:
12	Q Where do you reside, ma'am?
13	A 1806 Grandview Lane in Kaukauna.
14	Q And who do you live there with?
15	A My husband and my two children, Dave Carnot.
16	Q And how long have you lived there?
17	A Seven years.
18	Q Now, directing your attention to the time period of
19	approximately 6:15 to 6:30 on the night of Sunday, June
20	25, 2000, do you remember what you were doing?
21	A Yes.
22	Q And what were you doing, in general?
23	A The dishes.
24	Q And do you know where your husband and children were
25	at?
	255

1 My husband was outside working in the yard, and my kids A 2 were in the swimming pool. 3 0 Now, at some point in that range of 6:15 to 6:30 p.m. 4 on that Sunday night, did your husband interrupt you or 5 try and get your attention? 6 A Yes. 7 Okay. And how did he approach you? 0 8 I seen him running up the hill in our backyard. A 9 From what direction? 0 10 A From the woods. 11 And where do the woods lead to? 12 Down to Plank Road. 13 And at least when you observed your husband coming up 14 out of the woods, did you observe his demeanor or 15 emotional state? 16 He fell to the ground, out of breath, bleeding. A 17 And what's his mood or demeanor? 18 Oh, he was in -- he was frantic. 19 And did he say anything to you in this frantic state? 20 A He just screamed, give me some towels. She's dying. 21 need help. Call 911. 22 Did you get him some towels. 23 A I ran, I got him some towels, and then I called 911. 24 And where did you see your husband go from there? 25 He went back down the hill.

1	Q	Into the same woods towards Plank Road?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And where did you go?
4	A	I went back in the house and I called 911.
5	Q	And did you talk to a dispatcher from 911?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And explained where there was a need for some help?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	And up to that point on that day, had you or your
10		husband had any alcohol?
11	A	No.
12		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have on direct.
13		MR. HUDSON: No, Your Honor.
14		THE COURT: You may step down.
15		MR. BISKUPIC: Mike Borchert.
16		(Pause)
17		THE COURT: What's the problem, Mr. Biskupic?
18		MR. BISKUPIC: Apparently he was downstairs
19		in the waiting room.
20		THE COURT: Want to stretch, just stand up
21		and stretch? You may.
22		(Pause)
23		MR. BISKUPIC: Mike Borchert.
24		THE COURT: Come right up to the chair,
25		remain standing and raise your right hand, please.
		257

1		MIKE BORCHERT,
2	hav	ring been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,
3	tes	stified as follows:
4		THE CLERK: State your name and spell your
5		last name, please.
6		THE WITNESS: Mike Borchert, B-O-R-C-H-E-R-T.
7		THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated
8		DIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
10	Q	What's your occupation, sir?
11	A	Welder.
12	Q	And what is your employer?
13	A	Team Industries.
14	Q	And how long have you worked for Team Industries?
15	A	Around 11, 12 years.
16	Q	And what's your home address?
17	A	1901 Augustine Street.
18	Q	And is that in the City of Kaukauna, Outagamie County,
19		Wisconsin?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	How long have you lived in Kaukauna?
22	A	Basically my whole life. In fact, my whole life, I
23		should say.
24	Q	And how old are you right now?
25	A	Thirty-two.
		258

1	Q	And are you married?
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	And do you have any kids?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	How many kids?
6	A	One.
7	Q	And did you graduate Kaukauna High School?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And it is correct you have one criminal conviction; is
10		that correct?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	That was for a disorderly conduct about seven years
13		ago?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Prior to working at Team Industries, what other type of
16		work did you do?
17	A	Been welding my whole life.
18	Q	Now, 1901 Augustine Street, is that on the north side
19		of town or south side of town?
20	A	It's on the north side.
21	Q	Direct your attention up above you to the left, there's
22		a photo Exhibit 4, an aerial photo. Are you familiar
23		with what's depicted in that photo exhibit?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And what do you know that to be a depiction of?
		259

1	A	The Grignon right there's my house, the Grignon
2		Home. My neighborhood's right there.
3	Q	Around Murphy's Quarry; is that correct?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And the neighborhood at the bottom of the photo is to
6		the north of Murphy's Quarry; is that correct?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	And is it correct that you live at the intersection of
9		Augustine Street and Plank Road to the left middle of
10		that photo; is that correct?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	How long had you lived there prior to today's date?
13	A	Somewhere approximately eight months.
14	Q	Was that prior to June of 2000 or prior to this date?
15	A	Prior to June.
16	Q	Okay. And back in June of 2000, directing your
17		attention to that S <mark>unday, June 25, 2000,</mark> do you
18		remember being in your yard later in the evening hours
19		after five o'clock?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And do you remember what you were doing out that Sunday
22		early evening?
23	A	Yes, washing my go-cart.
24	Q	Was anybody else out in the yard with you, at least
25		initially?

1	A	No.
2	Q	Now, direct your attention to a photo exhibit or
3		pardon me a map, Exhibit 3. Are you familiar with
4		this City of Kaukauna map?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	And at least from your observations, does it fairly and
7		accurately depict Kaukauna, including your north-side
8		neighborhood?
9	A	Um-hummm.
10	Q	Is that a yes?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. Mr. Borchert, in regard to the intersection of
13		Augustine and Plank Road, is it correct that where I'm
14		pointing is the intersection near your home?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	Could you put your initials MB where your home would be
17		on Exhibit 3? And I'll hold it still.
18		(Witness complies with request)
19	Q	That would be on the roughly the northwest corner as
20		you come up Augustine Street; is that correct?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	Is your house can you view it on Exhibit 4, the
23		aerial photo?
24	A	Right there.
25	Q	Okay. So as you make the turn, it's the first house?
		261

1 A Yes. 2 Is it a light-colored roof and also garage? 3 A Yes. 4 And are you the only house at that corner? 5 A Yes. 6 As you come down Augustine Street and make a left onto 7 Plank, is it flat or is it raised at that area? 8 A It's raised. 9 And so is your house up on a hill somewhat? 10 Yes. It's all moated. A 11 0 And as you go up Plank Road to the east, is it flat or 12 does it go up a hill? 13 A It goes uphill. 14 0 Are you familiar with the entrances to Murphy's Quarry? 15 A Yes. 16 And are you aware of three separate entrances as you 17 travel up Plank Road? 18 A Yes. 19 Is it correct this first one is the one closest to your 20 house? 21 A Yes. 22 When you're standing out either at the end of your 23 driveway or in your yard, do you see that first 24 entrance? 25 A No.

1 0 And what separates or what prevents you on the road 2 from seeing that entrance? 3 A Actually, it's a hill. It's elevated. It's raised 4 so --5 0 And is that entrance also surrounded by woods? 6 A Yes. 7 0 Go back to your seat. Direct your attention to the 8 time period shortly before six o'clock that night, 9 roughly quarter to or ten to, in that range, do you 10 recall any of your co-workers or fellow employees at 11 Team going by your home? 12 A Yes. 13 And who did you notice? 14 A John Panetti. 15 And how do you know John Panetti? 16 A He is, actually, my boss. 17 0 At Team? 18 Um-hummm. 19 And where did you see him? 20 A He was actually driving down the street towards what 21 would be the Marina Bar. 22 On Augustine Street? 0 23 A Yeah. 24 And did he -- did you see him turn in your direction? 25 A No.

1	Q	Where did you see him?
2	A	Actually, he was going down to the Marina Bar at that
3		time.
4	Q	Okay. And then where did you see him after that?
5	A	That was it. That's that's the only time I seen
6		him.
7	Q	Did you see him go by your
8	A	Right, down past my house. I seen him go by that, and
9		that's it.
10	Q	Right by Plank Road there?
11	A	Yep, go down.
12	Q	Did you see, after his car went by, any other cars go
13		by for the period of the next 10 to 15 minutes?
14	A	No, not at that time.
15	Q	Did you see anybody on foot go by after Panetti went
16		by?
17	A	When I was washing my go-cart I did. That's when I
18		seen the young lady run by, Shanna. I
19	Q	Was that somebody you had seen prior to that date?
20	A	Yes. I seen her before run down there.
21	Q	What direction was she running?
22	A	She was running up Plank Road.
23	Q	Okay. Where was she coming from, what direction?
24	A	From Augustine, coming from actually, it would be
25		the south. You know, she's running up, actually,
		264

1 north. She came from the south. 2 0 On Augustine? 3 A Right. 4 And then made a left onto Plank? 0 5 A Yep. 6 And --7 Yes. A 8 And at least when you saw her, what was her mood or 9 demeanor? 10 A She ran around the corner, and then I -- I waved to her 11 and then she waved to me, and she just kept running up 12 the road. 13 You were friendly to each other? 14 A Yep. 15 Were there any words exchanged? 16 A No. 17 And could you see what, in general, she was wearing? She had shorts on and a T-shirt and headsets. 18 A 19 Like a walkman-type thing? 20 A Um-hummm. 21 And did you -- as she's coming around the corner by 22 your house in that driveway area, is she on the south 23 edge of the road or in the middle of the road or on the 24 north edge of Plank Road as she's heading up the hill? 25 As she's running, she was on the right side of the A

1		road.
2	Q	Closest to your property?
3	A	Right.
4	Q	And did you see her continue up the hill then?
5	A	Yes.
6	Q	Now, after she went by, did anybody else come by your
7		house in the immediate time right after that?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	Who was that?
10	A	Jim Vander Loop.
11	Q	And how do you know Jim Vander Loop?
12	A	He's my wife's uncle.
13	Q	And how much time elapsed after this young lady ran by
14		did your wife's uncle, Jim Vander Loop, come by?
15	A	About a minute.
16	Q	And was he walking or was he driving or what did
17	A	He was driving a pickup truck and his boat on the back,
18		and he stopped to talk to me.
19	Q	You guys talked for a period of time?
20	A	Yeah, about four to six minutes.
21	Q	And where were you physically at when you were talking
22		with Vander Loop?
23	A	I was standing right on the edge of my my property
24		there on the south side of the house.
25	Q	Towards on the edge of Plank Road?
		266

1	A	Yeah.
2	Q	Did he get out of his truck at all?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Did he go a distance from his truck off the road?
5	A	Yeah. His truck was kind of parked, like, not right on
6		the side but right right in the traffic, actually,
. 7		right in the you know, right in the middle of the
8		road, actually.
9	Q	Did he then come out on the road and talk to you for a
10		period of time?
11	A	Yeah.
12	Q	Did any other cars pass by him while the two of you
13		talked?
14	A	No one passed by.
15	Q	So nobody else went up Plank Road the same direction as
16		the lady jogger?
17	A	No.
18	Q	And you said you talked to him for about, what, five or
19		six minutes?
20	A	Yeah, four four to six minutes, I'd say, yeah, five.
21	Q	As the two of you were talking, did anybody else come
22		by from the other direction?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And what do you remember happening?
25	A	A man and his a guy and his truck came down with
		267

1		he had a little boy with him, and he said to call 911.
2		He said it looked like a young lady got hit by a car up
3		the road, so then I ran into the house.
4	Q	What did you do in the house?
5	A	Then I grabbed the phone, called 911, and I quick ran
6		out, put the dogs in the garage, and I started running
. 7		down the street because the dispatcher told me, can you
8		see her? Can you get to her from where you're at right
9		there? And I ran up the road then.
10	Q	So you actually had a conversation with the 911
11		dispatcher?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And did they ask you questions about the condition of
14		the person on the road?
15	A	I can't really
16	Q	Well, were you instructed to go do something then?
17	A	Yeah, I was instructed to go run up there and see
18		see how you know, see how bad it was.
19	Q	Did you have a cell phone or like a
20	A	I had a home phone, just a regular home phone.
21	Q	Did you in fact head up Plank Road?
22	A	Yes; started running up there.
23	Q	Were you able to keep your phone signal, or did it go
24		fuzzy?
25	A	It went fuzzy.
		268

1	Q	Did you eventually go up to where a person was in the
2		road?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And in relation to the first and second gates for the
5		quarry as you head up Plank Road to the west, where did
6		you observe the person?
7	A	Actually, close to the second gate but back a little
8		bit further, maybe 50 yards, maybe not even that; you
9		know, maybe even a little bit closer in, maybe 30
10		yards.
11	Q	From the gate, the second gate?
12	A	Yeah, um-hummm.
13	Q	Was the person on your side of the road or on the side
14		of the road toward the quarry?
15	A	On the side of the road towards the quarry.
16	Q	And when you got up there, were there any other people
17		there?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Who?
20	A	Jim Vander Loop and Dave Carnot.
21	Q	Okay. So your wife's uncle headed up there first?
22	A	Yes.
23	Q	Do you know if he was on foot or brought his car?
24	A	He brought his truck up.
25	Q	And when you got up there and Vander Loop was there,
		269

1 who else was there? 2 A Dave Carnot. 3 Did some other citizens eventually come by, too? 4 A Yes. 5 What did you do up at that scene? 6 A When I ran up to the scene, I seen her laying kind of 7 crouched or whatever, and I -- I seen Dave with the 8 rake walking around in a circle. And I looked at her, 9 and I said, what's going on, Dave? And Dave was really 10 upset walking around and angry that somebody tried 11 running him over. And then I walked back over to that 12 girl, and I -- you know, are you all right? But when I 13 seen her, she was --14 What was her condition? 15 To be honest, I -- I think she was dead. I mean, she A 16 was in bad shape. 17 And had you seen a dead person before? 18 Only in a river once when I was young. 19 And did you -- was there any signs of life, at least 20 that you noticed in this young lady? 21 A No. 22 Now, direct your attention to some photo boards that 23 have already been identified, in particular, Exhibit 24 19. Are you familiar with what's depicted in 19? 25 A Yes.

1 And what is that a view of in 19? 0 2 That's her laying there. 3 What is the overall picture of from where on 4 Plank Road? 5 A It's actually coming from the top looking down. 6 From the west looking back towards your house? 7 A Right. Right. 8 0 And are you familiar with what's in the right of the 9 photo as you look back down towards your house? 10 A Yes, that's the gate for the quarry. 11 The middle gate? 12 A No, that's the -- actually, the second gate. 13 Second gate from your home. 0 14 A Right. 15 And --16 Middle gate. 17 The position in the back of the photo where the person 18 is covered in the road, is that where you encountered 19 that same lady? 20 A Um-hummm. 21 Is that correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Did you make any observations other than her position 24 and -- to the gate as to things laying around the area?

25

A

No.

1	Q	And from the time that you saw Panetti go by, no other
2		vehicle came by from your direction onto Plank Road; is
3		that correct?
4	A	No.
5	Q	Until your wife's uncle came by?
6	A	Right.
7	Q	And
8		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have on direct.
9		THE COURT: Mr. Hudson.
10		CROSS-EXAMINATION
11	ВУ	MR. HUDSON:
12	Q	Did you walk up there to that area or did you drive?
13	A	I ran.
14	Q	You ran?
15	A	Um-hummm.
16	Q	And you said Jim Vander Loop, he drove up to that area?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And whereabouts did he park his vehicle? Near the
19		gate, down from the gate?
20	A	The right-hand side of the road, actually, kind of back
21		a little bit further than where she was laying.
22	Q	So it was below the gate on the right-hand side of the
23		road?
24	A	It was yeah. I would think that was where it was,
25		but I on the side of the road. That's all I can
		272

1		really remember is he had it parked on the side of the
2		road. I don't know if it was before or I can't
3		really be right exact where the positioning was.
4	Q	When you were on the scene, did any police vehicles or
5		ambulances come down into that area?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And could you tell me in relation to where they were?
8		Near the gate, by by Jim Vander Loop's truck?
9	A	Well, the police officers arrived first.
10	Q	And where did they park their vehicles?
11	A	Actually, they parked the vehicles before the body.
12		Okay?
13		MR. HUDSON: Your Honor, could I get that
14		exhibit?
15		THE COURT: Your exhibit?
16		MR. HUDSON: Could I go up there, approach?
17		THE COURT: Sure.
18	BY	MR. HUDSON:
19	Q	That's the gate; correct?
20	A	Yep.
21	Q	And where about would you say Jim Vander Loop parked
22		his truck?
23	A	Like I say, he parked it on the side of the road,
24		somewhere in here. I'm not really sure exactly, but
25		somewhere along in there. I
		273

1 Right in here somewhere? A Yeah, somewhere in there. 3 And when --4 Police officers stopped right about, you know, in here. A 5 Right by the gate? 6 In this direction. Well, maybe even back a little 7 further. I'm not really sure on positioning, but --8 0 But pretty close though to the gate. 9 A Somewhere in there, yeah. 10 Somewhere right in this area. 11 A Yes. 12 And did an ambulance come down there? 13 A They came later, a couple, you know --14 And where did they park their vehicle? Or did they 15 drive down here? Did they drive down towards the body? 16 By then the police officers had us backed up. 17 us backed up, so there was a lot of commotion by then. 18 So they had the -- had the bystanders backed up. 19 A Yeah. 20 They let the ambulance in; right? 21 Right. Right. A 22 0 And where did that ambulance drive to? 23 Well, down into here somewhere. A 24 So it drove past the gate then. 25 A I would think so, yeah. I'm not totally sure, but it

1		drove right next to the body.
2	Q	So
3	A	Pretty close.
4	Q	Past the gate?
5	A	Yep.
6	Q	So it drove
7	A	Yep.
8	Q	from down this way. That would be north east.
9	A	East would be going, yeah, down towards my house,
10		right.
11	Q	So it went down that way and past the gate.
12	A	Yep.
13		MR. HUDSON: Okay. That's all I have, Your
14		Honor.
15		THE COURT: Okay.
16		MR. BISKUPIC: Nothing else for this witness.
17		THE COURT: You may step down.
18		(Pause)
19		THE COURT: Just come right up to the chair,
20		remain standing and raise your right hand, please.
21		JAMES SPRANGERS,
22	hav	ing been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,
23	tes	tified as follows:
24		THE CLERK: State your name and spell your
25		last name, please.
		275

1		THE WITNESS: James Sprangers,
2		S-P-R-A-N-G-E-R-S.
3		THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
4		DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
6	Q	What's your occupation, sir?
. 7	A	I'm an operating engineer for Oudenhoven Construction.
8	Q	And what's your where do you live?
9	A	On Highway 96, about two miles out of the City of
10		Kaukauna.
11	Q	Is that also known as Green Bay Road?
12	A	Right.
13	Q	And are you married?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And how many kids do you have?
16	A	Two.
17	Q	Now, directing your attention to Sunday, early evening,
18		approximately 6:20 p.m., did you have occasion to go
19		into the city limits on the north side of Kaukauna on
20		June 25, 2000?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And what did you head into town for?
23	A	My son had soccer practice down by the Grignon Home.
24	Q	Now, directing your attention to there's a photo up
25		to your left, Exhibit 4. The soccer fields where your
		07.6

1	son has, can you tell where those are in relation to
2	the quarry in the picture?
3	A Yes. They're on the left-hand side of the quarry.
4	Q Okay. Well, as you're facing the photo
5	A They would be on the right.
6	Q Okay. And
. 7	THE COURT: Could you point it out, go up to
8	the map and point it out?
9	THE WITNESS: Sure. Right here.
10	BY MR. BISKUPIC:
11	Q Those soccer fields?
12	A Yes.
13	Q You can go back to your chair.
14	THE COURT: Where is the Grignon Home?
15	THE WITNESS: The Grignon Home is right here,
16	the Grignon Mansion.
17	BY MR. BISKUPIC:
18	Q Just to the right of the quarry also?
19	A Yes.
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	BY MR. BISKUPIC:
22	Q What route were you heading to on to go to those
23	soccer fields, what streets?
24	A Come in on 96, and then I turn on Plank Road.
25	Q And then head east?
	277

1	A	Then you're heading pretty well east, yep, past the
2		quarry.
3	Q	And then from there where would you normally go to take
4		your son?
5	A	Go down to the down Plank Road to the river, down by
6		the river, and then you take a right, and that's
7		Augustine Street or Augustine or whatever.
8	Q	Okay.
9	A	Then you got about a mile to the soccer field there,
10		not even a mile.
11	Q	Okay.
12	A	Then I drop him off and take the same way back home
13		while he's
14	Q	And that's the route that you had taken prior to June
15		25?
16	A	Right.
17	Q	And when you came off of 96 onto Plank Road on the
18		evening of June 25, 2000, as you turned onto Plank
19		Road, did you notice anything unusual?
20	A	Yeah. There was a boat laying in the opposite lane.
21	Q	On what street?
22	A	On Plank Road.
23	Q	Now
24	A	About a hundred yards up from the corner, I would say.
25	Q	From the intersection of Green Bay Road?
	7	278

1	A	Right.
2	Q	Direct your attention to the city map, Exhibit 3. Are
3		you familiar with what's depicted on this map, what
4		area that is?
5	A	Yep.
6	Q	Do you know that to be a city map for Kaukauna?
. 7	A	Um-hummm.
8	Q	Is that a yes?
9	A	Yep. Yes.
10	Q	And is it correct that 96 is this road, Green Bay Road?
11		Is that correct, where I'm pointing to?
12	A	Yes, it is.
13	Q	And can you mark with a letter B with this green pen
14		where you saw the boat approximately as you turned off
15		of 96? Just mark it on the line on Plank Road where
16		you saw it.
17		(Witness complies with request)
18	A	Okay.
19	Q	Okay. And can you put a B below the dot?
20		(Witness complies with request)
21	Q	You can go back on the stand now. Is it correct that
22		where I'm pointing to, kind of between the intersection
23		of Green Bay Road and Florence, is where you saw the
24		boat?
25	A	Yes.
		070

1	Q	And directing your attention now back to the photo
2		exhibit, No. 4, are you familiar with the intersection
3		of Green Bay Road on that also?
4	A	Yes, I am.
5	Q	And as you turn you turn left; is that correct?
6	A	Correct.
7	Q	And Florence would be the next one up; correct?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And you said the boat would have been somewhere right
10		in the middle of the street where I'm pointing?
11	A	Yes. It was past that house's driveway that is right
12		there.
13	Q	Closer to Florence?
14	A	Yeah, about halfway in between, I would say, the
15		driveway and Florence.
16	Q	Okay. When you saw the boat, did you stop or did you
17		continue?
18	A	We continued. We slowed up a little bit, and we went a
19		little further. We looked at the boat. We thought
20		somebody just lost it. And a little further up the
21		road, about not quite Murphy's office was the
22		cowling of the motor laying on the road also.
23	Q	Like a cover?
24	A	The cover of the motor.
25	Q	Now, did you continue to the east on Plank Road?
		280

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	And are you familiar with the number of quarry
3		entrances on the right-hand side of the road?
4	A	Yes, I am.
5	Q	And as you approach the middle gate entrance, did you
6		notice anything in the area of the middle gate
. 7		middle gate of the quarry that caught your attention?
8	A	Well, yes. Actually, before that, as soon as I got up
9		on top of the hill by the Murphy's office, start to
10		come down the hill, and that's when I seen a body
11		laying on the road.
12	Q	Did you drive up by it?
13	A	Yes. We I kind of speeded up even to get down
14		there, you know, and we pulled up to it.
15	Q	Who was with you?
16	A	My son.
17	Q	And how old is he?
18	A	He's 12.
19	Q	And did you make some observations at least from your
20		truck?
21	A	Yes, we did. We stopped and I looked, and from what we
22		could see, she wasn't breathing so first thing I
23		thought of was to get help. And I didn't have no
24		phone, cell phone.
25	Q	So where did you head to?
		281

1	A	I headed down to the down Plank Road to the corner,
2		to Mike's house.
3	Q	Right on the corner, Mike Borchert?
4	A	Right.
5	Q	And did you see anybody else outside that house?
6	A	Yes. I forget if he was standing or sitting on the
7		lawn talking to, I think it was his dad. He was
8		talking to his dad. His dad was in his car so
9	Q	Either of those two people that you encountered, did
10		you say something to them?
11	А	Yes. I stop and I hollered to Mike to call 911; that
12		there's a woman laying in the road up there, and it
13		appears like she's dead. And then Mike took off
14		running for the house.
15	Q	And did you see where the other man went?
16	A	He stood there a minute, and then he went up the road
17		as far as I could see. I continued on and I dropped my
18		boy off at the soccer fields because I didn't want him
19		to see anymore.
20	Q	And then where did you go?
21	A	So then I turned right around and I come back up, and
22		at that time when I made the corner and went back up
23		Plank Road, Mike was about halfway there running, and
24		the man that had the car was there already. So then I
25		stopped, and all three of us were there then.

1	A	It was about in the middle of the road, right dead
2		center.
3	Q	So when you drove down through that area, did you run
4		anything over?
5	A	No, I didn't.
6	Q	Not that you know of.
7	A	I I saw the headset when I drove down. I swerved
8		around it when I stopped.
9	Q	So you would have been almost on the grass on the
10		left-hand side; correct?
11	A	Correct.
12		MR. HUDSON: That's all I have, Your Honor.
13		MR. BISKUPIC: No follow-up.
14		THE COURT: You may step down.
15		Is this a good time to recess, Mr. Biskupic, or
16		you got another short witness?
17		MR. BISKUPIC: We can do Mr. Vander Loop. He
18		wasn't there that long.
19		THE COURT: Okay.
20		MR. BISKUPIC: James Vander Loop.
21		THE COURT: Come right up to the chair,
22		remain standing and raise your right hand, please.
23		JAMES VANDER LOOP,
24	hav.	ing been first duly sworn on oath to testify the truth,
25	tes	tified as follows:
		284

1		THE CLERK: State your name and spell your
2		last name, please.
3		THE WITNESS: James Robert Vander Loop,
4		V-A-N-D-E-R-L-0-0-P.
5		THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION
. 7	BY	MR. BISKUPIC:
8	Q	What's your occupation, sir?
9	A	Mill worker, shift worker.
10	Q	And are you married?
11	A	Yes, I am.
12	Q	And do you have any kids?
13	A	Two.
14	Q	And are you related, in some fashion, to a Mike
15		Borchert?
16	A	Yes, I am.
17	Q	And how are you related to Mike Borchert?
18	A	He married my niece.
19	Q	Now, directing your attention to June 25 of 2000, last
20		year, do you recall where Mike Borchert and your niece
21		were living?
22	A	Down at the bottom of the quarry there on I forget
23		the name of the road there.
24	Q	Is that Augustine area?
25	A	Right.
		285

1	Q	And do you know what the cross street is there or the
2		intersection?
3	A	Grignon, Grignon Street or
4	Q	I'll show you direct your attention to a photo
5		exhibit, four, in relation to the quarry. In
6		particular, Augustine Street. Are you familiar with
7		what's depicted on there?
8	A	The quarry is where?
9		(Mr. Biskupic indicates)
10	Q	And then you have Plank Road here.
11	A	Okay. It's Plank Road on the northwest corner.
12	Q	The northwest corner there is Plank and Augustine?
13	A	Right. Right.
14	Q	And is that where you knew Mike to be living with your
15		niece back then?
16	A	Right.
17	Q	Now, directing your attention to that day, on Sunday,
18		June 25, did you have occasion to visit with Mike
19		Borchert sometime in the area of six o'clock or later?
20	A	Yes, I did.
21	Q	And do you remember where you had been coming from?
22	A	I had my boat in down to the river doing a little
23		fishing down there.
24	Q	And did you then drive over to Mike's house?
25	A	Yes, I did.
		286

1	Q	And do you remember where you parked?
2	A	Right at the bottom of the hill.
3	Q	At Plank Road there?
4	A	Right.
5	Q	And how long do you remember spending time at Mike's
6		house?
7	A	An approximately four-and-a-half, five minutes.
8	Q	Did you go in the house or just stay outside the house?
9	A	Stayed outside the house.
10	Q	And who did you deal with or talk with at that
11		location?
12	A	Just Mike.
13	Q	Do you know what he was doing at the time?
14	A	Pushing his dune buggy or go-cart or whatever the heck
15		it was out when I come around the corner.
16	Q	Now, at some point as you and your relative, Mike
17		Borchert, were talking, did somebody drive up and ask
18		you to call 911?
19	A	An elderly gentleman come down in his pickup truck and
20		mentioned that it looked like there was a girl laying
21		dead in the road.
22	Q	And which direction did he come from?
23	A	He come down the hill heading towards the river.
24	Q	So from the direction of Plank Road from the west to
25		the east towards you guys?
		287

1	A	Right.
2	Q	And when this man came by, told you to call 911, what
3		did you do?
4	A	I immediately told Mike to dial 911, and run to my
5		truck and drove up the hill towards where she was
6		laying.
7	Q	And was that up towards the gates to Murphy's Quarry?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	And when you got up there, was there anybody else
10		there?
11	A	No.
12	Q	What did you do?
13	A	I pulled my vehicle I had my boat on the back
14		completely across the road, and then I got out and ran
15		over to her, and I could see she was she was hurting
16		pretty good so
17	Q	Did anybody show up soon after you approached her?
18	A	No. I could hear somebody in the woods, and then I
19		just assumed, because they got go-carts and stuff,
20		that, you know, there was possibly an accident up there
21		and that she had crawled down onto the road. So then I
22		went in the woods to find out; maybe I could hear
23		somebody in there making noise, you know.
24	Q	Did you see a David Carnot there?
25	A	Yeah, I sure did. I got in the woods just a little
		288

1 ways, rather steep hill, and he made a remark, 2 something like, you son of a bitch. You tried to kill 3 me. And he swung a garden rake at me. And at that 4 time I recognized who he was. I told him that, you 5 know, that it wasn't me, and I didn't know what he was 6 talking about at that time. And then he recognized who 7 I was because I knew his older brother so --8 Did he calm down at that point? 0 9 A Yes, he did. 10 And what did the two of you do then? 11 A We went out by the girl. I went out by the girl, and 12 I'm not sure what he did exactly. 13 At that point are there any other people arriving on 14 the scene? 15 A No. 16 Okay. Shortly after that? 17 A Pretty much, yeah. 18 Who came upon the scene that you knew? 19 There was just several officers showed up and --20 Prior to the officers arriving, did Mike or anybody 21 else you know come back to the scene? 22 A Mike got there, but I'm not exactly sure when he had 23 gotten there. 24 And at least when you tended to this young lady, was 25 there any signs of life that you noticed? 289

1	A	Her eyes were moving a little bit and her jaw, but no,
2		not really, no. I think she was just dying.
3		MR. BISKUPIC: That's all I have for this
4		witness.
5		THE COURT: Any questions, Mr. Hudson?
6		MR. HUDSON: Can I approach him with that
7		exhibit, Your Honor?
8		THE COURT: Sure.
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY	MR. HUDSON:
11	Q	You came up this way, would be from Augustine, would be
12		here, up that way to the east.
13	A	Um-hummm.
14	Q	And you came up the road towards the gate going west.
15	A	Where is the river from here?
16	Q	The river is down this way to the east.
17	A	Okay. Then I come this is the bar down this way, I
18		take it?
19	Q	The bar would be down here. I don't know, you know,
20		where
21	A	I was going up the hill.
22	Q	This road here There is a gate here. You couldn't
23		go through there.
24	A	This is Mike's house here on the corner? I come around
25		this way then.

	1	
1	Q	No. This is the quarry here. This road leads into the
2		quarry right here.
3	A	Oh, okay. Now, what was the question?
4	Q	Just like this right here, this is the same exact
5		photo.
6	A	Um-hummm.
7	Q	So you came up from this way.
8	A	Right.
9	Q	Okay. So you're coming from here.
10	A	Yep.
11	Q	Where in regards did you park your vehicle?
12	A	I just swung it completely across the road, just a
13		little ways down from that gate that goes down.
14	Q	But right right can you point out to me exactly
15		where you parked your vehicle? Here's the gate.
16	A	Okay.
17	Q	Where in regards did you park your vehicle?
18	A	Possibly right in here, where the shade comes across
19		the road.
20	Q	On the right-hand side of the road?
21	A	Completely across it, just about, till the other
22		officers come.
23	Q	So you were on the left-hand side of the road you
24		parked your vehicle?
25	A	On both sides. I had my boat on the back, so I
		291

1 basically just stopped complete traffic so they 2 wouldn't be able to come up the hill and run her over. 3 Was it any close to here where these three patches are, 0 4 would you say? 5 A Sure. Sure. 6 So it was maybe right over them three patches? 7 A I doubt that. I think it was back a little bit. 8 But just right in that same area? 9 A Sure. 10 MR. HUDSON: Okay. That's all, Your Honor. 11 MR. BISKUPIC: No follow-up questions. 12 THE COURT: You may step down. That will 13 take care of it for the day? 14 MR. BISKUPIC: Yeah, I think so. 15 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, 16 we'll now recess till 8:30 tomorrow morning. 17 recess, I want to remind you about some instructions. 18 Do not discuss this case among yourselves or with 19 anyone else until your final deliberations in the jury 20 room. Do not listen to any conversation about this 21 case. Do not read any newspaper reports or listen to 22 any news reports on the radio or television about this 23 trial. Do not investigate this case on your own or 24 visit the scene. Do not engage in any experimentation 25 or research relating to issues of fact in this case.

If you come in contact with the parties, the lawyers or witnesses, do not speak with them. On their part, they are not to speak with you. Have a good evening and we'll see you tomorrow at 8:30. The bailiff will take you to the jury room. (The jury is excused) THE COURT: You may be seated. We're adjourned. (Proceedings concluded at 5:05 p.m.)

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN)) ss.
2	OUTAGAMIE COUNTY)
3	
4	I, Jeanne L. Spoehr, certify that I am the
5	official court reporter for Branch IV of the Circuit Court
6	of Outagamie County; and as such court reporter, I made
7	full and accurate stenographic notes of the foregoing
8	proceedings; that the same was later reduced to typewritten
9	form; and that the foregoing is a full and accurate
10	transcript of my stenographic notes so taken.
11	Dated and signed in the City of Appleton on
12	the 13th day of July, 2001.
13	0 1
14	
15	
16	
17	Jeanne J. Buch
18	Jeanne L. Spoehr Registered Merit Reporter
19	Certified Realtime Reporter Outagamie County Justice Center
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	294