Colby is going to swear you in and then we'll hear from the attorneys in their opening statement and then leap immediately into the trial itself. Alrighty.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK: Members of the jury, please stand and raise your right hand.

(Whereupon, the jury was duly sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. In the order in which the attorneys give their opening statements and at the end their closing arguments is based on who has the burden of proof. In this case, the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence is on the Plaintiffs.

They're the ones suing the Defendants. So they get an opportunity to talk to you first and at the end of the trial they'll have an opportunity to talk to you last but more about that later.

With that being said, are the Plaintiffs ready with an opening statement?

MR. HANSEL: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

## OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS

MR. HANSEL: Good afternoon. Ladies of the jury, I want to thank you for your time here today. What we're about today is something that's very important not just to my client, Daquan Wallace, not just to his

mother, Nicole Wallace, not just to myself. My name is Cary Hansel or to Mr. Greenberg, my co-counsel, Larry Greenberg. But we're here today about something that's important to all of us about ultimately our fundamental constitutional rights, those rights that protect each and every person in this room in this state and ultimately in this country from misconduct overreached by the government. Thomas Jefferson said many hundreds of years ago quite well when he said that "the jury, you, are the strongest anchor yet imagined to tie the government to the principles of its constitution". And whenever I have the privilege of standing in front of a jury and talking to people like yourselves I think about that quote and I imagine the weight of that burden that you and I together carry that it is our job to tie the Government to the principles of its constitution. And it's an amazing thing. It's an incredible part of this democracy. And I know when you were sitting out there earlier you were probably praying not to end up where you are now and I understand that, I do, but I want to ask you to look at with fresh eyes today as you sit here, look at with fresh eyes when you think about this case. And when you think about this really historic role that you're here to play to sit in judgment of your Government. There couldn't be a higher democratic duty. There couldn't be a higher

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

calling for those of us who are privileged to live in a free society. And so when Jefferson said "you're here to tie the Government to its constitution" you are the last straw, the last links in a chain that might make sure all of our rights are protected, not just Daquan's, not just his mother's, but the rights of all of us. And so I want to thank you for your time here today and I want to stress to you the importance of that goal. I want to let you know that I'm here and everyone's here to help you reach that goal together. I want to thank you for your time and attention. It's not going to be a brief case. It's not going to be an easy case. But I think at the end your decision will be easy.

I want to tell you a little bit about what the evidence in this case will show. I've said it's my great privilege to represent Daquan Wallace. He's seated here to my right and his mother, Nicole Wallace who is seated behind him.

In 2014 -- and I'll tell you the wheels of justice and the art of justice turned slowly but hopefully, in the right direction.

In 2014, Mr. Wallace was obviously a young Black man. He was living in Baltimore. He was at that time healthy and able bodied. He was 20 years old about, liked to play basketball and sports and do other things

that healthy young men like to do, maybe take a girl out every once in awhile and he had really his whole life in front of him and all of the privileges and honors that those of us who have our health have and those things were stripped away from him in many ways by the events I'm about to describe to you.

He was arrested by Baltimore City police officers. He was taken to Baltimore City Detention Center which is now closed. He was housed there in Pretrial Detention.

So Mr. Wallace was then and is now innocent of any charges that put him in the hands of the State. We all again, I've said this case is about all of our constitutional rights. We all move through society with the protection of being innocent until proven guilty.

Mr. Wallace was arrested. He was there on Pretrial Detention meaning, he hadn't had a trial. No one had found him guilty. And to this day all of those charges were dropped, so he's never been found guilty of anything that brought him in connection with the State during these events.

He was housed at the Baltimore City Detention Center in a building called the J.I. or Jail Industries building. As you might imagine, a facility like this that houses some very dangerous people and some not so

dangerous people has a variety of places where they can be housed. The J.I. Building was one of the safer places to be. It's a dormitory style. It was preferable to prisoners because they have a little bit more freedom of movement instead of being stuck in a cell, you were more like in a little bit of a group dormitory setting and Mr. Wallace was originally assigned to that seg.

And when he was there there were some corrections officer he came into contact with who are going to be witnesses in this case. One is a Lieutenant Tamara Patterson. She was the lieutenant who oversaw that building, the J.I. Building.

Another one is a Sergeant Lisa Portee. She was one of the sergeants at that J.I. Building. Another one was a Sergeant Jackens Renee. The name is a little unusual. He happens to be a male. Jackens is a male who again, was one of the sergeants initially at the J.I. Building in connection with Mr. Wallace's stay.

Mr. Wallace is a slight built man. He was weighing about 130 pounds, 20 years of age when he was incarcerated. Because he was incarcerated and his family couldn't afford bail for Pretrial he was lumped in with some characters who were larger than him and did not have as sunny a disposition.

Mr. Wallace was subject to some pretty

difficult interactions with these people. They included beatings and fights and he did the best as a smaller framed man that he could to protect himself.

When these things happen Mr. Wallace would bring them up. He would call his mother on the phone and you'll hear tape recordings of those conversations where he calls and says "Mom, they beat me up. I'm bleeding.

I'm cut." That kind of thing.

He appeared in a courtroom like this as part of his proceeding and the State concedes and we'll have a concession read into evidence at the appropriate time that when he stood in the courtroom he had visible marks on him from being beaten. So he was being subjected to a course of abuse by over larger, stronger, more seasoned criminals.

And during that period of time his mom did everything she could like a mother might called, begged, pleaded, but didn't have the money to get him out but did what she could to try to swage the situation.

One of the people she talked to is going to take the stand in a few minutes, Lieutenant Tamara

Patterson. Mom called and Nicole said to Lieutenant

Patterson "You know, my son's worried about his health and safety. He's being beaten."

Patterson has him in and takes a look at him

and his face she'll tell you was black and blue even at that moment when she had him in to take a look at him and mom kept calling and did, as I said, what any mother would do, followed up, and called.

And I think eventually probably what happened is the people at the jail got tired of it, got angry, got mad. I think they also got mad because they'll tell you that Mr. Wallace didn't want to do what they asked him to do. They'll say maybe I don't know he stood up for himself.

But for whatever reason certain officers in this facility and they're not all bad, but certain officers in this facility decided to exact revenge on Mr. Wallace to put him in the condition that you see him in today. And so they designed a plan. And the way this worked was the three officers I mentioned, Patterson, Portee and Renee, were here at the J.I. Building and they wanted to do something to Mr. Wallace.

So the first thing they did was they falsely charged him and they falsely charged Mr. Wallace with "Extorting other individuals for commissary and phone privileges." I'm sorry. "Detainees." So they charged Mr. Wallace with extorting other people.

Now, the person who wrote this charge is Sergeant Portee. The person who signed off at least in

one spot is Lieutenant Tamara Patterson.

Sergeant Portee and Lieutenant Tamara Patterson themselves are going to take the witness stand behind me and tell you that Mr. Wallace did not do these things. They will admit to you in this courtroom that these things did not happen, that he did not extort other inmates. These, ladies of the jury, are lies. There's a reason they told these lies.

They told these lies so that Mr. Wallace could be transported from the dormitory setting which is safer where he was already having problems to what they call the Mens Detention Center in D.C. It's another building and facility and it is far more dangerous. It houses a higher level of security risk prisoner. Because of that the cells are instead of dormitory styles they're individual cells. That creates a significant risk to the inmate. It's the classic cell door with the jail cell in front of it.

So the plan was to transfer Mr. Wallace to a more dangerous setting even though he was already being beaten in the safer area. It was effected by simply coming up with lies. Again, they will take the stand and tell you those things didn't happen.

In addition to the fact that the transfer was designed based on a lie these would not be appropriate

grounds for a transfer to begin with. And again, I'm not here to tell you that. You will hear people from the jail tell you that.

You will hear some of the people involved in this transfer tell you these are not appropriate grounds for a transfer. As you might imagine and common sense would tell you if a prisoner was, in fact, extorting commissary and phone privileges from another prisoner there would be an investigation. That prisoner who was accused of doing it would be placed in segregation during the investigation.

So the appropriate response even if this lie was true, it isn't, and they will admit it isn't, the appropriate response would have been to put this man someplace he would have been safe, would have been to put him in segregation. In segregation it's just what it sounds like. Nobody can get to him. He wouldn't be in the condition he is today.

So first, this group of officers lied on the form. Second, they ignored procedure because they wanted him transferred to the more dangerous area to punish him and to punish his mother for speaking out because he was being beaten, because he wasn't being protected.

Third, they knew that these grounds wouldn't fly. So when they went to make the transfer they did not

get "shift commander approval." There's a blank line on the form.

They couldn't get shift commander approval because these are not appropriate grounds for a transfer. The form says right on it "Form void" in all capital letters "unless signed by a shift commander or operations captain where applicable." Those words are written below a blank signature line.

Every single officer who will testify in this case will tell you the transfer should not have taken place because it was not signed. Officers will tell you these would not be appropriate grounds for a transfer. Officers will tell you that the accepting officer down here should not have accepted Mr. Wallace into the more dangerous scenario.

Remember earlier I said that it was Officers

Tamara Patterson. His name appears here. Lisa Portee,

whose name appears here. And Jackens Renee, his name

appears here who were with Mr. Wallace the morning before

he was attacked.

When he was transferred on a form that never should have been accepted on false grounds, on false grounds that wouldn't have been appropriate to begin with, he was transferred and accepted by Officer Renee at the other building.

The way that was accomplished was Renee worked with Portee and Patterson at the J.I. Building in the morning and then moved to the other building in the afternoon to accept the prisoner, Mr. Wallace, who never should have been transferred on false grounds.

So the way these three were able to accomplish it is they were both the ones sending him out and then Renee was the one receiving him in. And so all of these checks and balances that are supposed to take place did not take place and they were defeated. That served an important role for the officers.

At the J.I. Building in the dormitory style arrangement there is a mechanism by which people are protected and that mechanism involves having multiple tier officers, multiple officers on the tier at the same time to protect individuals.

So if you're at the J.I. Building there are at least two officers at all times there so if someone were going to permit you to be attacked they both have to cooperate. Not so at MDC.

When these officers had Mr. Wallace on false grounds transferred in D.C. he was in the hands solely of Officer Renee, the man who also accepted the form that says right on that it's void without the appropriate approval.

Now, I'm not here to tell you about paperwork violation. That's the first part of the story. Mr. Wallace's roommate will tell you, in part, about the second part of the story.

Once Mr. Wallace was transferred over, he was processed for a time and then brought up to the tier that was overseen by Officer Renee. Once he got to that tier, his bunkmate is going to be man by the name of Beatty. He will testify in this case.

Mr. Wallace because of his traumatic brain injury does not have memory of some of these events, doesn't remember his attack. But Mr. Beatty, his cellmate, will tell you that what happened when Mr. Wallace came onto that tier was overseen only by Jackens Renee was that Mr. Beatty was excused out of the cell, was told to go to dinner early. This is somewhere around 7:00, 7:30 in the evening in 2014. He's sent out early to go to dinner that is, after this transfer occurs. We're talking about December 18th of 2014.

With the cellmate out Mr. Wallace is placed in it. Now, there are some important things to understand before I tell you about the rest of the story about the procedures and policies for what happens during dinner. Okay. And you don't have to take my word for it because officers will explain that to you.

There will be an officer who comes in who is a very high ranking officer who will explain to you everybody on the tier goes to dinner, everybody. Nobody stands behind. To this very day, even though the institution has been closed, there is a sign still bolted to the wall that says "As of August 4th, 2014, MDC will no longer conduct feed up in specific housing units. All housing units except specialized housing will utilize the dining room for their daily meals. Detainees will no longer eat in their cells." That's as of August 18th, 2014. These events happened some months later in December of 2014.

So written on the wall in case there's any question is a sign that says everybody goes to the dining hall except specialized units and this wasn't one of them.

You will hear officers explain to you that the policy at the time was everyone goes to the dining hall.

Mr. Beatty will explain that Mr. Wallace was held back while his roommate was excused early.

Not only was Mr. Wallace held back but when we engage in litigation like this we ask for admissions, people to admit this or that, okay. The State answered some of our requests for admissions. These are the signatures of the two lawyers representing the State of

Maryland here.

One of the requests for admissions are "That inmates or detainees of Cells 3, 47 and 48 did not go to feed up on December 18, 2014." The State of Maryland admits that fact. "Officer Renee allowed the detainees of Cells 3, 47 and 48 not to go to feed up for dinner on December 18, 2014." The State of Maryland admits that fact. "There are no records confirming that Daquan Wallace was at feed up for dinner on December 18, 2014." The State of Maryland admits that fact.

During feed up and again, some of this is common sense, but during feed up even though those cells are empty they're supposed to remain closed and locked.

Again, you don't have to take my word for it because the State of Maryland says "All cells are to remain closed and locked unless necessarily moving of detainee or inmate from the cell or to the cell." Response. "Admit."

So the misconduct in this case is virtually admitted. Mr. Wallace was held back. The other three cells were held back. And what happened then is that Officer Renee was the sole officer in that tier and in that area of the jail. Officer Renee was the sole person with the keys to those cells. He says at the beginning of dinner they were all locked. Mr. Wallace's cell was locked, the other cells were locked tight. Renee is

there during dinner. He's the only one with the key. When Mr. Beatty comes back he discovers Mr. Wallace severely traumatized suffering from unbelievable wounds in the cell. The attack obviously happens at dinner.

The cells immediately after Mr. Beatty comes back immediately after Mr. Wallace is discovered again, this is common sense, the whole thing is shut down, right. Everybody's in their cells. Everything's locked down. Nobody can move or do anything.

But what was later discovered was "that bloody clothes were found in Cells 47 and 48 after the December 18, 2014 attack on Daquan Wallace." The State through its lawyers who are here today admits that fact. "47 and 48 were two of the cells that Renee -- that Jackens Renee allowed to remain back.

So we have a situation in which the rules were violated to hold Mr. Wallace back. The rules were violated to hold Cells 47 and 48 back. Dinner began with all of those cells locked. Officer Renee was the only officer there and Officer Renee was the person with the key during the time that all those cells were supposed to be locked, during the time when everyone was supposed to have gone to dinner, after the fraudulent transfer that Officer Renee had participated in and signed off on, we know that the men from two, at least of the cells that

were held back attacked Daquan Wallace during a period of time when those cells were supposed to be locked. They weren't supposed to be there. Officer Renee was the only person there supervising and he was the only person who had the key.

How do we know they were the ones who did it?

Because that's where the bloody clothes were recovered after the lockdown. Imagine the coincidence the State might have to explain to you how is it that the bloody clothes just happen to be found in the cells that were the only -- that were two of the only three that Renee held back against policy?

I gave Officer Renee a chance to explain himself. I took his deposition. It's a statement he gives under oath of me asking him questions. I'm going to bring him in here and have him explain himself to you.

When I asked him to explain himself Officer
Renee had this to say. I asked him how the inmates from
Cells 3, 47 and 48 or any combination -- 47 and 48 is
where the bloody clothes were found could have possibly
gotten to Daquan Wallace.

And his testimony was and will be "The only way they would come out if I let them out." The only way they came out is if he let them out. I said well, wait a minute. Wasn't Daquan's cell supposed to be locked? How

did they get in there? "I would have had to have unlocked Daquan's cell."

So when given a chance to explain how this possibly could have happened the explanation is "the only way they would have come out if I let them out. I would have had to have unlocked Daquan's cell."

If you think about these things, there's something that's dark that will come out. Daquan was only on that tier for a matter of minutes. He's downstairs being processed. They bring him up, open the door, send Beatty out, send him in and dinner begins and he's attacked during dinner when those cells were open.

What that tells us is this had to have been a set-up. This was not a situation where there's any allegation or evidence whatsoever that Daquan had any interaction with these inmates previously. There certainly wasn't time enough in the minutes between when he arrived on the tier and when he was attacked for him to have developed any kind of beef or argument or fight or anything else.

And if you consider that these officers went to extraordinary lengths, extraordinary lengths to make sure that he would be there, to take him from the facility where multiple guards would see what was happening, could protect him, could followup on what the State will tell

you is its duty to make sure he's safe.

When you think about the great lengths they went to, how Renee had to work at J.I. in the morning and then work a double shift and work at MDC to sign off on this form that never should have been accepted, how Portee and Patterson had to write something that they will tell you was false, that is a lie on this official document to make sure that Mr. Wallace was put into the hands of Renee in a situation where there will only be one officer supervising him, that one officer who had the keys at a period of time when these inmates are held back.

So what we see is a cascade of evidence that shows that ultimately when Mr. Wallace complained, when his mom complained, when they asked the State to follow through with its duty to protect him this is what happened and this was the way in which these officers effected their revenge.

The State in this scenario bears a sacred duty to the people in its charge and it is a higher duty in the case of someone like Mr. Wallace who like all of us sitting here today has the presumption of innocence. Ultimately, he was never convicted. That duty is to protect people and it's simple logic that you're not able to protect yourself. It isn't up to Mr. Wallace where he

moved in the jail. He couldn't say I want to stay at J.I. It's safer. I don't want to go to MDC. When they sent his roommate out he couldn't say well, wait. I want to go -- I want to go dinner too. I don't want to be in here alone. When the other inmates were let out by Renee and he's behind a jail cell watching them cross over to his side with the officer coming with the keys he has nowhere to go and there's nothing he can do to protect himself.

When that jail cell was opened and you will hear one of the facilities managers say "The only way it could be opened is if a physical key is inserted right there at the jail cell." When that jail cell is opened Mr. Wallace isn't able to do anything about it. It is the State that bears that burden to protect everyone that is in its care and in this case, Mr. Wallace.

You will hear evidence that as I've said before when Mr. Wallace when he went to the State, when he found himself under what was supposed to be the State's protection was a healthy young man. This was in 2014. For five years Mr. Wallace has been as you've seen him here today.

He spent the first month or two after the beating in a coma in a hospital with 24-hour care. He spent weeks and months after that not being able to move,

slowly regaining some mobility in one of his arms. He today is contracted in terms of his limbs cannot stand up, cannot walk. Mr. Wallace cannot speak. And for the longest time his family thought that he couldn't communicate in any way that maybe he didn't have the capacity.

And I think they'll tell you a pretty miraculous story of how his little sister worked with him and finally when he got a little bit of dexterity back in his hands they discovered he can text and he can communicate. But that didn't happen for about a year.

So about a year went by when he was awake and conscious living with his family and just locked inside and not able to reach out, not able to communicate, not able to tell someone when he wants something, not able to tell somebody he loves them or that he needs something else. Mr. Wallace has spent the entire time confined to this chair.

And I want you to think, ladies and gentlemen, about what that does to someone as they move through society and the difference it makes in their presentation and how they interact with people and the gift it is that all of us have, you know, to be able to rise when called to do so, to be able to dress ourselves, to be able to use the bathroom by ourselves, to be able to clean

ourselves, to go through daily life with a natural and mobile body.

And I want to suggest to you that the evidence in this case is going to show that since 2014 Mr. Wallace was robbed of all of that and there's nothing that I can do, nothing that you can do to lift him up, to help him rise out of that chair.

But at the end of the case, I think I am going to ask you to try to make a difference. Mr. Wallace can't speak for himself. He has no voice. He can't stand for himself. His legs won't allow it.

But I'm going to at the end of the case ask you to rise up with me with him and for him. You can't pull him up out of the chair, but you can lift his spirits.

You can't put a voice back in his throat, but you can speak with your voice for him.

And at the end of this case I will ask you for a very significant verdict because that is the only voice that you have on his behalf and it's the only voice that might be heard, not just here, not just by Mr. Wallace and his family, but beyond these walls.

In fact, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you dearly for your time and for your efforts in this case and I'll have a chance to speak to you again at the close of the case and I'll ask you to keep an open mind,

listen to all the evidence and be ready with that voice and be ready to lift up Mr. Wallace in the principle of justice itself. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything from the State?

MS. MULLALLY: Yes, Your Honor.

May it please the Court.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

## OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS

MS. MULLALLY: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Laura Mullally as you know and Michelle Wilson and I represent the State of Maryland in this case.

Now, if everything that Mr. Hansel has told you about, if it were true, if it were all correct, if it were consistent, we wouldn't be here. There would be no trial. You would be going about your life and we would be doing the same. And as you've always known that to every side of a story there's another side. And the State is indeed here to give you its side of the story.

You will consider that. You'll use your sharp eyes and your ears to weigh and balance the evidence in the case.

Now, a few things. A few cautionary things. First of all, it is human nature to look at Mr. Wallace and to work backwards to say this should never happen to

a human being. We need to find the accountable person. But that's not how a trial works. The Plaintiffs, Mr. Wallace and his mother through their attorney they have the burden of proof. They must prove each and every element of their case and they must prove it to your satisfaction each one of those satisfactions.

In fact, the State because it doesn't have the burden of proof Ms. Wilson and I could simply sit there take not a note, a question, not a single witness, call no witnesses for the State's case and make no argument because after all the State doesn't have the burden of proof.

But I ask you to consider the burden of proof because certainly Mr. Wallace's situation is -- it hurts everyone. And what I ask you to do is to be objective, to use your good minds, to weigh and balance the evidence.

Now, one big overarching question that you will have throughout this case once you meet the witnesses that Mr. Hansel is about to call who are, in fact, State employees the question is why on earth would they do such a thing? They are good people working in a tough environment to get a difficult job done.

If you think this is the first time someone's mother has called to complain about jail conditions, no,

no. They are very accustomed to that.

So what would they gain? Get tired of some calls or tired of some complaints. So it is the power that you want someone in harms way? Is it money? Is it glory? Or are they just mean, miserable, nasty awful people? Well, it's none of that. Again, they're good people doing a hard job in difficult circumstances.

So you have to look at this. You have to look at their actions through the prism of reasonableness because that's the standard. If you put yourself in their shoes at the time that they knew of things, in other words, what did they know? When did they know it? Then you put yourself in their shoes and you decide if what they then did was reasonable.

So here's some questions because Mr. Wallace whether he's tall or not or short or not or thin or not or young or not he came to the jail as an adult. He was an adult. What did they do with this young man to get to the bottom of his problem? First question. Did they know that he had a problem? Were they able to confirm it?

Now, you would think that if someone, if I'm in danger, if you're in danger, the first person you're going to tell is someone that can help you. So is that what Mr. Wallace did? Were they able to confirm that he

had trouble or did he resist and fight them the entire way so that they knew nothing about who he had a problem with, what the problem was and how to best protect him.

And what we have, ladies and gentlemen, is we have a young man, a detainee, who became increasingly more and more difficult in a dormitory situation. And you'll hear about that. He was a medium security inmate and they moved him to the Mens Detention Center which housed medium and maximum security inmates just like the J.I. Building did.

So there was no change in his security level and there was no change of him from one place to the other. In other words, he wasn't taken to a place where he didn't belong and in fact, because of the (indiscernible - 2:57:09) in the dormitory they moved him to a more restrictive environment.

Mr. Wallace had his issues in jail. You'll hear about them. You'll hear about some of the reasons that he was (indiscernible - 2:57:21) and I ask you to keep your eyes open, to keep your ears open, weigh and balance all of the evidence and look at it in terms of reasonableness.

You will hear from very good people and the accusations against them, this grand conspiracy, they're false. And it makes it worst this young man who's

injured and we have a lot of false nonsense floating 1 2 around the witnesses and I ask you to listen to what they 3 have to say. They would like to clear their names. thank you. 4 5 THE COURT: Plaintiffs ready with a witness? MR. HANSEL: Yes, Your Honor. The Plaintiffs 6 7 call Lieutenant Tamara Patterson. My paralegal is going to bring him in now. 8 9 THE COURT: Super. 10 (Brief pause.) 11 MS. WILSON: Your Honor, how do you -- do you 12 leave the audio visual equipment here? 13 THE COURT: Well --14 MR. HANSEL: It won't be in my way, Your Honor. 15 We're ready to get started. 16 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 17 MR. HANSEL: I said it won't be in my way, Your 18 Honor. We're ready to get started. 19 THE COURT: Super. I mean, I see it in two 20 places either there or over here in the corner so the 21 jurors are going to have to like --22 MS. WILSON: If i push it down when we need it 23 24 THE COURT: That's fine. 25 MS. WILSON: -- so that --