IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT - LAW DIVISION

SUZANNE E. MALEC McKENNA, as Executor and Personal Representative of the Estate of MICHAEL R. MALEC McKENNA, deceased, et al.,

No. 2015 L 012124 Consolidated with 2016 L 000159

Plaintiffs,

2016 L 000159 2016 L 000160 2016 L 000161

vs.

ALLIED BARTON SECURITY SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

P.M. TRIAL SESSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS at the trial of the above-entitled cause before THE HONORABLE JOAN E. POWELL, Judge of said Court, in Room 2506 of the Richard J. Daley Center, Chicago, Illinois, on December 11th, 2017, at the hour of 1:41 p.m.

REPORTED BY: DERALYN GORDON

CSR, CRR LICENSE NO.: 084-003957

1		1	INDEX	
2	APPEARANCES:	2		
4	POWER, ROGERS & SMITH, P.C., by	3	CLOSING ARGUI	MENT
5	MR. LARRY R. ROGERS, JR. MR. JOSEPH A. POWER, JR.	4		AGE
3	MR. JAMES POWER			
6	70 West Madison Street, Suite 5500 Chicago, Illinois 60602-4212	5	By Mr. Patton:	21
7	(312) 236-9381	6		
8	joepower@prslaw.com jamespower@prslaw.com	7	REBUTTAL CLOSIN	G ARGUMENT
	Irogersjr@prslaw.com	8		
9	Representing the Plaintiffs	9	By Mr. Joseph Power:	91
10	McKenna, Hoover, Leib;	10	By Mr. Rogers:	111
11 12	TOMASIK KOTIN KASSERMAN, LLC, by	11	By Mr. Kotin:	115
1.2	MR. DANIEL M. KOTIN	12	•	
13	10 South LaSalle Street, Suite 2920 Chicago, Illinois 60603	13	READING OF JURY	INSTRUCTIONS 116
14	(312) 605-8800	14	READING OF JUNE	INSTRUCTIONS 110
15	dan@tkklawfirm.com			
16	Representing the Plaintiff Goodson;	15		
16 17	PATTON & RYAN, LLC	16		
18	MR. JOHN W. PATTON, JR.	17		
	MR. PAUL D. MOTZ MR. DAVID F. RYAN	18		
19	MS. KATHRYN R. VAUGHN	19		
20	330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 3800 Chicago, Illinois 60611	20		
21	jryan@pattonryan.com pmotz@pattonryan.com	21		
	dryan@pattonryan.com	22		
22 23	kvaughn@pattonryan.com Representing the Defendant	23		
	AlliedBarton Security Services.	24		
24		23		
	Page 2			Page 4
1	ALSO PRESENT:	1	(Whereupon th	e following
	Nicole DeBartolo, Court Reporter	2	proceedings we	ere had outside
2	Ben Stanson, Videotechnician	3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d presence of the
	Steven Grant, Videotechnician	4	jury.)	•
3	,	5	THE COURT: We'l	l ask the
4		6		
5		7	court reporter what time	
6			going by this clock, that's	•
7		8	MR. MOTZ: With r	,
8		9	thing is the issues there	
9		10	issues instructions that, a	ccording to my notes
10		11	and Mr. Esposito's notes,	I heard O
11		12	THE COURT: Juro	r. Juror, sorry.
12		13	Two jurors.	
13		14	(Brief pause.)	
14		15	MR. MOTZ: It's O	and S were not
15		16	given. This is the easy iss	
16		17	-	
17			THE COURT: Okay	
18		18	MR. ROGERS: The	-
19		19	MR. MOTZ: Our re	-
20		20	were both duplicative of o	other functions.
21		21	(Discussion hel	d off the
22		22	record.)	
23		23	THE COURT: It's	O and S. Defense
24		24	is objecting to them saying	
				g :g
	Page 3			Page 5

duplicative. MR. MOT2: And that's our recollection from the conference. THE COURT: And I've ruled on it prior. Okay. MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the transcript. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: I say "Till accept his firled yamendment to remove the reference." but it should say "failing to implement office policles and procedures and/or post orders"				
THE COURT: And I've ruled on it prior. Okay. MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the transcript. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: 1 say 1'l'II accept his I should say "failing to implement office populcies and procedures and/or post orders." THE COURT: I know. Let's step Over here. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 19 Sin the transcript, right? MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, a syou may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: Why and you have to faint. You asked talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: Why asked or talking about was it amended by MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, which is not low the court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, which is not how that we talked about. I do remember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, advanced that he was a will be decayed we deleted a some carlier, so the letters are different. They argued that it was duplicative, but it was - but you indicated that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises do from the counts of the coun	1	duplicative.	1	MR. MOTZ: That's why M and N here,
THE COURT: And I've ruled on it prior. Okay. MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the transcript. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: 1 say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it should say "failing to implement office policles and procedures and/or post orders" THE COURT: I know. I in procedures and/or post orders " THE COURT: I know. Let's step policles and procedures and/or post orders" THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about Simple MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. MR. MOTZ: The out of beautiful about that at all. THE COURT: I wish I could remember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other sublellations about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is whether MR. MOTZ: The other issue is whether MR. MOTZ: The other issue is whether MR. MOTZ: The other issue is microcomple recollection is that it was subleagation is talk about that. THE COURT: Undir termember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: The si the deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Deal with stall, distract or delay." They argued that it was THE COURT: I wish I could remember that ow that he has established, includes with they. Jackson an the criminal cause, which is not how that he has established, includes with they. Jackson an the criminal cause, which is not how that he has catablished, includes with they. They argued that it was THE COURT: Deal with stall,	2	MR. MOTZ: And that's our	2	it's the exact same stuff.
5 prior. Okay. 6 MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the 7 transcript. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. ROGERS: I say "I'll accept his 10 friendly amendment to remove the reference," but 11 it should say "failing to implement office 12 policies and procedures and/or post orders" 13 I'm sorry, "post orders and" (inaudible). 14 THE REPORTER: I can't hear Your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: I know. Let's step 17 over here. 18 MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 19 Sin the transcript, right? 20 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 21 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, 22 as you may recall, cut out our reference to the 23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. 25 And it is included, as indicated by 26 the Court, you might also remind 27 MR. MOTZ: What about O? 28 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 39 MR. MOTZ: Wall, you just talked 39 about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. 30 MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the 31 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 3a bout S. I'll withdraw my question on S. 31 MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the 32 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 34 some ariler, so the letters are different. 36 MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the 37 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 38 some earlier, so the letters are different. 39 MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the 30 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 31 some earlier, so the letters are different. 31 THE COURT: Which is letters are different. 32 but that at all. 31 THE COURT: Which is letters are different. 32 but the at law do something remember that all. 31 the my or a delay is a distract or delay is a distract or delay. 31 the my or a distract or delay. 32 correlation is that it was stablished, includes with they, 33 distract or delay. 34 or the discussion on this. 35 MR. ROGERS: No you member this, 36 the court with a distract or delay. 36 manuel manu	3	recollection from the conference.	3	MR. ROGERS: Yeah, but we're not
6 MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the transcript. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. ROGERS: 1 say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it should say "failing to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" 12 policies and procedures and/or post orders" 12 policies and procedures and/or post orders 12 ms. MR. ROGERS: Well, at this juricure, I mean 13 jurnscry, "post orders and" (inauditie). 14 THE COURT: I know. Let's step policies and procedures and/or post orders 12 ms. MR. ROGERS: Well, at this juricure, I mean 13 jurnscry, prost orders and "Ginauditie). 15 THE COURT: I know. Let's step 16 ms. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 17 ms. MR. MGERS: This is the S, yes. 18 ms. Sepecifically discussed it, and Your Honor, 22 as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so 18 ms. MR. MGERS: This is the system of the language. 19 ms. MR. MGERS: It used to say 14 ms. MR. MGERS: It used to say 15 ms. MR. MGGERS: It used to say 16 ms. MR. MGGERS: It used to say 16 ms. MR. MGGERS: Newly. MR. MGERS: Or yo by the way, the 16 tetring is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. 19 ms. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 19 ms. Mr. Rocer, 19	4	THE COURT: And I've ruled on it	4	rearguing. The issue is whether
transcript. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: I say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it should say "failing to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" TI'm sorry, "post orders and" (inaudible). THE COURT: I know. Let's step of over here. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about S in the transcript, right? MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order - it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: What about 0. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: colay. THE COURT: Which is letters M and N. Counsel, I don't remember the discussion on his. MR. ROGERS: What this juncture, I mean THE COURT: It know. Failing to restrain. It sounds like It's duplicative, but I'm looking at M especially, providing access to third floor." MR. ROGERS: It's not duplicative, but I'm looking at M especially, providing access to the third floor." MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post orders and so of the large and so one shing, you have to do something, you have to do something or remember what we talked about. I do remember what we talked ab	5	prior. Okay.	5	MR. MOTZ: I believe my
transcript. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: I say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it should say "falling to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" 12	6	MR. ROGERS: Page 264 of the	6	recollection is that it was stricken because of
### THE COURT: Okay MR. ROGERS: I say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it fishould say "falling to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" The REPORTER: I can't hear Your He THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. ### THE COURT: I know. Failing to testain. It sounds like it's duplicative, but I'm looking at M especially, "providing access to the" accessing the premises above the fird floor." ### THE COURT: I know. Failing to the Course, I don't remember the discussion on this. ### THE COURT: I know. Failing to Coursel, I don't remember the discussion on this. ### COURT: I know. Failing to the Sound of the Court of the Court. you might also remind ### ART HE COURT: I know. Failing to the Court of the Other one stalk about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. ### ART HE COURT: I know. Failing to the Court of the Other one stalk about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. ### ART HE COURT: Wink is elters M and ### ART HE COURT: I know. Failing to coursel, I don't remember the discussion on this. ### THE COURT: I know. Failing to the Court of Intimoting access to the "The Court": A court of Intimoting access to the "The Court": A court of Intimoting access to the "The Court": Wink I to out or remember ### ART HE COURT: Wink I this ### ART HE COURT: I know. Failing to the Court of Intimoting access on the to the "The Court": A court of Intimoting access to the "The Court": Wink I the S	7		7	the two immediately before it.
MR. ROGERS: I say "I'll accept his friendly amendment to remove the reference," but it should say "failing to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" 12 post orders and "(inaudible). 13 I'm sorry, "post orders and" (inaudible). 14 THE REPORTER: I can't hear Your 14 THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. 15 MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 18 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 17 In booking at Me specially, "providing access to the" "accessing the premises above the third floor." 18 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 19 MR. ROGERS: It's not duplicative, but the forth. 19 MR. ROGERS: It's not duplicative, but the forth. 19 MR. ROGERS: It's not duplicative, but the case, as you might recall, our argument is you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something to distract 19 you have to do something or a say our may recall, cut out our reference to the 22 you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something to distract 19 you have to do something to distract 19 you have to do something or saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something to distract 19 you have to do something or many to premise about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something to distract 19 you have to do something to distract 19 you have to do something to distract 19 you have to do something or many to distract 19 you have to do something to distract 19 you have to do something or many to distract 19 you have to do something	8	•	8	-
ti should say "failing to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" - 12 policies and procedures and/or post orders" - 13 I'm sorry, "post orders and" (inaudible). 14 THE REPORTER: I can't hear Your 14 THE COURT: I know. Let's step 15 Honor. 15 THE COURT: I know. Let's step 16 WR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 18 Sin the transcript, right? 19 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 20 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the 23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. 24 The Court; you might also remind MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about 5. I'll withdraw my question on S. 10 MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about 5. I'll withdraw my question on S. 10 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to the court, you might also remind MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about 5. I'll withdraw my question on S. 11 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way, the 14 lettering is It's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to train and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument fund. 17 may made and sustained, but based on counsel's control or delay Jackson of the crimal cause, which is not how that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exitting the premises 17 me of the other counsel's argument fund to say on might recall, un argument by the court, you and the post orders and so something to something you have to do something to stall them, you have to do something to a faint, you can do something you have to do something you have to do something to a faint, you can do something you have to do something to a faint, you can do something you have to do something to a faint, you can do something to a faint, you can do something to a faint, you can do something to a faint, y	9		9	N.
it should say "failing to implement office policies and procedures and/or post orders" 12	10		10	Counsel, I don't remember the
12	11	-	11	
13	12		12	MR. ROGERS: Well, at this
THE COURT: I know. Failing to Honor: THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, a you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order It violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about talked ashed talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: I'l was to say MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: I'l was to say MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: I know. Failing to take any steps to stall, distract, or delay Jackson as the criminal, it doesn't have any important in this low displaced by ''revoiding access to to the" "accessing the premises above the third floor." MR. ROGERS: It's not duplicative, because, as you might recall, our argument is you have to do something remember, we talked about the cause, as you might recall, our argument is you have to do something remember, we talked about that at all. THE COURT: I know. Failing to the premises above the third floor." THE COURT: I wish I could remember what we talked about. I do remember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. THE COURT: I wish I could remember what we talked about. I do remember that coming out in during the crial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. THE COURT: Deal with stall, distract or delay. Providing access to the there was evidence that they did not that	13		13	-
THE COURT: I know. Let's step over here. MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about S in the transcript, right? MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. ROGERS: Os by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, 'failing to take any steps to stall, and the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises	14		14	_
16 THE COURT: I know. Let's step 27 over here. 18 MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 19 S in the transcript, right? 20 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 21 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, 22 as you may recall, cut out our reference to the 23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. Page 6 1 So this one was specifically 2 asked talking about was it amended by 3 friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of 4 the language. 4 And it is included, as indicated by 5 the Court, you might also remind 7 MR. MOTZ: What about 0? 8 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 9 MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked 10 about S. I'lli withdraw my question on S. 11 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 12 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 13 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way, the 14 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay." 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was 22 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 23 or delay them. None of the other ones talk 24 about that at all. 25 and it is included, as indicated by 26 the Court, you might also remind 27 MR. MOTZ: What about 0? 28 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 29 MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked 29 distract or delay. "Providing access 29 the transcript, right? 20 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way. The 21 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way, the 22 distract or delay." 23 distract or delay." 24 distract or delay." 25 They argued that it was 26 duplicative, because we deleted 27 that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, 28 or delay them. None of the other ones talk 29 about that at all. 20 distract or delay them. None of the other ones talk 21 about that at all. 22 distract or delay. 23 distract or delay. 24 distract or delay. 25 duplicative, accessing the premises above the 26 that he about to the post or delay. 27 They argued that it was 28 duplicative, but the done or the other ones talk 29 distract or del				
17 over here. 18 MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 18 third floor."	16		16	
18 MR. MOTZ: So you're talking about 19 Sin the transcript, right? 20 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 21 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, 22 as you may recall, cut out our reference to the 23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. 25 Page 6 1 So this one was specifically 26 asked talking about was it amended by 27 friendly amendment by Mr. Espositio in terms of 28 the language. 29 And it is included, as indicated by 29 the Court, you might also remind 29 MR. MOTZ: What about 0? 30 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 31 MR. MOTZ: What about 0? 32 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 33 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 34 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 35 It lettering is it's changed because we deleted 36 some earlier, so the letters are different. 37 MR. ROGERS: O you remember this, 38 Your Honor, "failling to take any steps to stall, 39 distract or delay." 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was 22 but it was 23 but have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something, you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to do something remember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to do something remember to saturate about Mr. Power saying you have to do something remember to saturate about Mr. Power saying you have to do something to distract 20 ar faint, you can do something, you have to do something to distract of alayuth ta tall. 21 distract or lally use in the fail. You and lally in the fail tour. 22 a	17	•	17	
So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MR. Will withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MR. OGERS: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: Ox by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: Ox by our emember this, distract or delay, ven clause, which is not how the law is a duplicative, because, as you might recall, our argument is you have to do something rerember, we talked about Mr. Power saying you have to faint. You can faint, you can do something, you have to do something to distract Page 6 Page 8 1	18		18	
20 MR. ROGERS: This is the S, yes. 21 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, 22 as you may recall, cut out our reference to the 23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. Page 6 25 So this one was specifically 26 asked talking about was it amended by 27 friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of 28 the language. 29 And it is included, as indicated by 29 the Court, you might also remind 29 MR. MOTZ: What about O? 20 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 20 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way, the 21 lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. 29 MR. ROGERS: O- by the way, the 20 They argued that it was 20 because, as you might recall, our argument is you have to do something we about Mr. Power saying you have to do something to distract can be the faint, you can do something, you have to do something to distract can be should be stall them, you have to do something to distract can be should be should that them, you have to do something to distract can be should be should be should the stall them, you have to do something to distract can be should be should the stall them, you have to do something to distract can be should		-		
21 So we specifically discussed it, and Your Honor, as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 Page 8 1 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. ROGERS: Oc by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises			20	·
as you may recall, cut out our reference to the post order it violated the post orders and so forth. Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises	21		21	
23 post order it violated the post orders and so 24 forth. Page 6 Page 8 1 So this one was specifically 2 asked talking about was it amended by 4 friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of 4 the language. 5 And it is included, as indicated by 6 the Court, you might also remind 7 MR. MOTZ: What about 0? 8 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 9 MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked 10 about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. 11 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 12 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 13 Itertering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "falling to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay. 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Ihem. None of the other ones talk 25 about that at all. 26 THE COURT: I wish I could remember 27 what we talked about. I do remember that coming out in during the trial. 28 MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. 29 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 20 MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked 21 distract or delay, even though the others deal 23 with failing to restrain and allowing l'm 24 going to keep that in over your objection. 29 MR. ROGERS: Oc by the way, the 30 during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' 31 argument during his close, we believe that now 32 that he has established, includes with they, 33 Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how 34 that he has established, includes with they, 35 Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how 36 the law is. And eventually an objection was 37 made and sustained, but based on counsel's 38 argument trying to say, you know, the 39 criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any 39 import in here. 30 the doubt. 30 refeat yell. 31 manufaction. 32 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 32 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 39 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 30 counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the				
24 forth. Page 6 Page 8 1 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises				
Page 6 So this one was specifically asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Deal with stall, distract or delay, even though the other sisue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The GO-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	24			
1 So this one was specifically 2 asked talking about was it amended by 3 friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of 4 the language. 5 And it is included, as indicated by 6 the Court, you might also remind 7 MR. MOTZ: What about O? 8 MR. ROGERS: It used to say 9 MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked 10 about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. 11 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 12 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 13 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 14 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: I wish I could remember 17 what we talked about. I do remember that coming 18 out in during the trial. 19 MR. ROGERS: And none of the other 19 suballegations talk about that. 10 THE COURT: Deal with stall, 11 distract or delay, even though the others deal 12 with failing to restrain and allowing I'm 13 going to keep that in over your objection. 14 MR. MOTZ: The other issue is 15 during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' 16 argument during his close, we believe that now 17 that he has established, includes with they, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay"? 19 They argued that it was 20 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 21 that they did not that there was evidence 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 10 or delay them. None of the other 24 about that at all. 25 THE COURT: I wish I could remember 26 what we talked about. I do remember that coming 27 out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other 28 suballegations talk about that. THE COURT: Own. 18 MR. ROGERS: Own. 19 distract or delay is this failing to restrain and allowing I'm 29 during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' 20 argument during his close, we believe that now 21 that he as established, includes with they, 22 argument trying to say, you know, the 23 criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any 24 import in here. 25 The 60-01 inst				3 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
asked talking about was it amended by friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: I wish I could remember what we talked about. I do remember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. THE COURT: Deal with stall, distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the		Page 6		Page 8
friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. I'll withdraw my quest	1	So this one was specifically	1	or delay them. None of the other ones talk
the language. And it is included, as indicated by the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about 0. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, MR. ROGERS: Do you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that they did not that there was evidence that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about. I do remember that coming out in during the trial. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. MR. ROGERS: And none of the other suballegations talk about that. The COURT: Deal with falling to restrain and allowing I'm distract or delay, even though the others suballegations talk about that. The COURT: Deal with falling to restrain and allowing I'm distract or delay, even though the others suballegations	2	asked talking about was it amended by	2	about that at all.
the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's made and sustained. made and sustained	3	friendly amendment by Mr. Esposito in terms of	3	THE COURT: I wish I could remember
the Court, you might also remind MR. MOTZ: What about 0? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	4	the language.	4	what we talked about. I do remember that coming
MR. MOTZ: What about O? MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, WR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	5	And it is included, as indicated by	5	out in during the trial.
MR. ROGERS: It used to say MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Deal with stall, distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that they did not that there was evidence that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	6	the Court, you might also remind	6	MR. ROGERS: And none of the other
MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm with failing to restrain and allowing I'm distract or delay, even though the others deal with failing to restrain and allowing I'm during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' argument during his close, we believe that now that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	7	MR. MOTZ: What about O?	7	suballegations talk about that.
about S. I'll withdraw my question on S. MR. ROGERS: Okay. MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, WR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, WR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, distract or delay"? They argued that it was that they did not that there was evidence that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises with failing to restrain and allowing I'm going to keep that in over your objection. MR. MOTZ: The other issue is during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	8	MR. ROGERS: It used to say	8	THE COURT: Deal with stall,
11 MR. ROGERS: Okay. 12 MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. 13 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 14 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay"? 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises	9	MR. MOTZ: Well, you just talked	9	distract or delay, even though the others deal
12 MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O. 13 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 14 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay"? 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises	10	about S. I'll withdraw my question on S.	10	with failing to restrain and allowing I'm
13 MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the 14 lettering is it's changed because we deleted 15 some earlier, so the letters are different. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay"? 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 13 during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers' 14 argument during his close, we believe that now 15 that he has established, includes with they, 16 Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how 17 the law is. And eventually an objection was 18 made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the 20 criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. 21 import in here. 22 The 60-01 instructions, as 23 tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	11	MR. ROGERS: Okay.	11	going to keep that in over your objection.
lettering is it's changed because we deleted some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that they didnot that there was evidence or delay Jackson from exiting the premises late argument during his close, we believe that now that has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	12	MR. MOTZ: Tell me about O.	12	MR. MOTZ: The other issue is
some earlier, so the letters are different. THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that the didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises that he has established, includes with they, Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	13	MR. ROGERS: O by the way, the	13	during counsel's, specifically Mr. Rogers'
THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises THE COURT: Okay. Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how the law is. And eventually an objection was made and sustained, but based on counsel's argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	14	lettering is it's changed because we deleted	14	argument during his close, we believe that now
17 MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this, 18 Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, 19 distract or delay"? 19 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 17 the law is. And eventually an objection was 18 made and sustained, but based on counsel's 29 argument trying to say, you know, the 20 criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any 21 import in here. 22 The 60-01 instructions, as 23 tendered, now must be offered, because of 24 counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	15	some earlier, so the letters are different.	15	that he has established, includes with they,
Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay"? They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall, argument trying to say, you know, the criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	16	THE COURT: Okay.	16	Jackson as the criminal cause, which is not how
19 distract or delay"? 20 They argued that it was 21 duplicative, but it was but you indicated 22 that they did not that there was evidence 23 that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, 24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 19 argument trying to say, you know, the 20 criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. 22 The 60-01 instructions, as 23 tendered, now must be offered, because of 24 counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	17	MR. ROGERS: Do you remember this,	17	the law is. And eventually an objection was
They argued that it was duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises curriminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any import in here. The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	18	Your Honor, "failing to take any steps to stall,	18	made and sustained, but based on counsel's
duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises duplicative, but it was but you indicated that they did not that there was evidence that they did not that the did not the they did	19	distract or delay"?	19	argument trying to say, you know, the
that they did not that there was evidence that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 22 The 60-01 instructions, as tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	20	They argued that it was	20	criminal is the criminal, it doesn't have any
that he didn't do anything to stall, distract, or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 23 tendered, now must be offered, because of counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	21	duplicative, but it was but you indicated	21	import in here.
24 or delay Jackson from exiting the premises 24 counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the	22	that they did not that there was evidence	22	The 60-01 instructions, as
	23	that he didn't do anything to stall, distract,	23	tendered, now must be offered, because of
Page 7 Page 9	24	or delay Jackson from exiting the premises	24	counsel's argument. Counsel has opened the
		Page 7		Page 9

1	door	1	the same argument.
2	THE COURT: Juror. Juror.	2	MR. ROGERS: No, I didn't.
3	I heard that, and it caught my	3	MR. MOTZ: So now
4	attention. My problem with putting in those	4	THE COURT: Wait a minute.
5	instructions is I don't want the jury to spend	5	MR. MOTZ: the 60-01
6	one minute more than just reading through them	6	instruction, it's not about bringing the
7	trying to figure out if Jackson is guilty of	7	criminal standard in. It's about evidence of
8	this do you see what I mean?	8	Mr. Jackson's negligence.
9	MR. MOTZ: And they won't do that.	9	Since we have a contribution claim,
10	THE COURT: I'm afraid of that,	10	counsel has tried to neuter that argument by
11	yes.	11	saying that doesn't apply here.
12	MR. MOTZ: The way that they're	12	But that is exactly why you give
13	read, you know, it's to add evidence of	13	the 60-01 instruction on our counterclaim. Our
14	potential negligence. They've all taken great	14	counterclaim has been prejudiced by counsel's
15	notes in this case. We've seen them write them	15	argument. The only cure is giving a 60-01.
16		16	THE COURT: Now, this is the
17	down every day, especially when the experts and police officers have been testifying. Every	17	situation:
18	. , , , ,	18	You mentioned criminal. I
19	single one of them said here are the felonies	19	
20	that they committed the kidnapping, the hostage	20	understand why you did it. Mr. Power mentioned
	taking; you know, now counsel has opened the		beyond a reasonable doubt. And it just I
21	door inappropriately by his argument trying to	21 22	just feel like I'm opening up a can of worms.
22	separate liability		I understand defense's point that
23	THE COURT: Yes, I know that. I	23	now it sounds like that was eons ago, and he
24	know	24	stated that he got shot and it's not a criminal
	Page 10		Page 12
		_	
1	(Simultaneous speaking.)	1	and you only had to deal with civil, and they've
1 2	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it.	1 2	and you only had to deal with civil, and they've got a contribution claim so
	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor.		
2	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that	2	got a contribution claim so
2	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor.	2 3	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the
2 3 4	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that	2 3 4	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim
2 3 4 5	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to	2 3 4 5	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different	2 3 4 5 6	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal.	2 3 4 5 6 7	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an inappropriate argument, this is what happens.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence THE COURT: Counsel, I'm still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an inappropriate argument, this is what happens. THE COURT: Did I sustain it? Did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence THE COURT: Counsel, I'm still realy concerned that the jury is going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an inappropriate argument, this is what happens. THE COURT: Did I sustain it? Did I strike it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence THE COURT: Counsel, I'm still realy concerned that the jury is going to be bogged down on this. They already know that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an inappropriate argument, this is what happens. THE COURT: Did I sustain it? Did I strike it? MR. MOTZ: You struck a portion of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence THE COURT: Counsel, I'm still realy concerned that the jury is going to be bogged down on this. They already know that MR. MOTZ: We have the burden of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. MOTZ: He didn't have to do it. The way he did it is inappropriate, Your Honor. Now the jury needs to be instructed that THE COURT: What am I going to instruct them on? It's a whole different standard on criminal. MR. MOTZ: No. The way that 60-01 is worded in the second part is, "if you violate a statute" and there is it's not beyond a reasonable doubt. It's admitted by all of the parties that he committed crimes. MR. ROGERS: No. MR. MOTZ: There is no the testimony is unequivocal. No one is quibbling with the criminal allegations MR. ROGERS: It can't be argued. MR. MOTZ: Well, when you make an inappropriate argument, this is what happens. THE COURT: Did I sustain it? Did I strike it? MR. MOTZ: You struck a portion of it, but the argument he still made the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	got a contribution claim so MR. ROGERS: I argued the contribution claim THE COURT: Yes, I know. MR. ROGERS: and I did not reference any particular statutes whatsoever. THE COURT: I know. MR. ROGERS: He's trying to get specific statutes in, and he's calling criminal statutes the equivalent of negligence. So what to follow his argument, I can't address it at all. MR. MOTZ: That's not how 60-01 is worded, Your Honor. MR. ROGERS: It absolutely is. If you look at the other 60-01, it says they can consider that as negligence THE COURT: Counsel, I'm still realy concerned that the jury is going to be bogged down on this. They already know that MR. MOTZ: We have the burden of proof

1	MR. MOTZ: on our counterclaim.	1	MR. MOTZ: I think loss of society
2	Our counterclaim is about Joe Jackson.	2	covers it, so we'd object.
3	Counsel is attempting to argue the	3	THE COURT: Is this the correct
4	counterclaim. It doesn't, you know, impact	4	one?
5	whether or not his case whatsoever. At least	5	MR. ROGERS: This is corrected.
6	that's what he keeps telling everyone.	6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	So here counsel's argument has	7	MR. ROGERS: And we also didn't
8	negatively prejudiced us	8	have a line for the lost earnings that was in
9	THE COURT: I know. You told me.	9	evidence
10	MR. MOTZ: on our counterclaim,	10	MR. MOTZ: That I don't have an
11	because he has inaccurately stated the law.	11	objection to.
12	MR. ROGERS: First of all, I	12	But I do have an objection
13	disagree. He objected, I guess. You sustained	13	THE COURT: We still have this
14	the objection. I don't even know what you're	14	other thing.
15	talking about.	15	MR. MOTZ: to loss of sexual
16	THE COURT: I said you may re-ask	16	relations, because, in our opinion, in terms of
17	it, and I don't remember.	17	loss of society is encompassed encompasses
18	Counsel is claiming when you	18	the loss of sexual relations. It does not need
19	re-asked it, you did a very similar statement.	19	to be in there. All the ones they've tendered
20	MR. ROGERS: No, I disagree.	20	have never had it, so we would object.
21	Otherwise, they would have objected. They have	21	MR. ROGERS: The reason that it's
22	never been hesitant to object, Your Honor.	22	in there
23	MR. MOTZ: Counsel knows he messed	23	THE COURT: I'll keep it in there.
24	up, and he knows it's	24	MR. ROGERS: No. I want to say
	Page 14		Page 16
1	MR. ROGERS: No, I haven't.	1	this.
2	THE COURT: It's kind of no harm to	2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	put them in there, except that I didn't want the	3	MR. ROGERS: We specified for the
4	jury to labor over whether	4	widow because loss of society is for all of
5	MR. MOTZ: There is no harm.	5	THE COURT: I get it, counsel.
6	There's no harm whatsoever.	6	The jury is going to get bogged
7	MR. ROGERS: Because he's talking	7	down on this.
8	about criminal statutes. There was no evidence	8	MR. ROGERS: They won't get bogged
9	of it, Your Honor, and he's trying to equate the	9	down unless incomplete statute
10	violent statutes, as best as you can consider	10	THE COURT: Well, but they
11	that. The jury instruction book says you only	11	MR. ROGERS: I looked at the
12	use those that are relevant to a standard of	12	complete one to know it's
13	care. He has no evidence of that, none	13	THE COURT: Counsel quoted me
14	whatsoever. In terms of the issues	14	something this morning that case law supports
15	THE COURT: What is this?	15	MR. MOTZ: You can paraphrase.
16	MR. ROGERS: This is the verdict	16	MR. ROGERS: No, no. That's not
17	form. We identified a couple of missed errors.	17	what we did.
18	One was loss of society	18	MR. MOTZ: We put in the relevant
19	MR. MOTZ: We are not done with it.	19	language. We did not paraphrase, or have any
20	THE COURT: I understand.	20	battle on that whatsoever.
21	MR. ROGERS: One is loss of	21	MR. ROGERS: Why are we arguing?
22	society, it didn't include sexual relations, so	22	We're supposed to reordering the
23	I told counsel we added loss of society and	23	instructions.
24	sexual relations for McKenna and	24	THE COURT: I know.
	Page 15		Page 17

1	MR. MOTZ: That would be the last	1	the case. I said those are criminal actions. I
2	instructions to give, so this is	2	argued it's not the last or nearest. That was
3	MR. ROGERS: We've had no jury	3	the only proper argument. Nothing improper
4	instruction conference	4	about it. And it does not open any door to a
5	THE COURT: I did those two things.	5	60-01 instruction about murder, kidnapping, use
6	MR. ROGERS: That was something you	6	of a weapon, all of those things. How does that
7	ruled on	7	possibly open the door to that?
8	MR. MOTZ: I think that's easy to	8	THE COURT: Counsel, I'm sorry.
9	print off, and we can include it.	9	I'm sticking with my ruling.
10	MR. ROGERS: No. No, we have	10	MR. ROGERS: You're sticking with
11	absolutely	11	which ruling?
12	THE COURT: Do you know what? I'm	12	THE COURT: Don't do that. I just
13	going to include it.	13	made a ruling.
14	MR. MOTZ: Okay.	14	Listen, when I get the jury
15	MR. ROGERS: Your Honor.	15	instructions, I want you all to read them
16	THE COURT: Counsel, I'm sorry.	16	silently while I'm reading them just to make
17	(Discussion held off the	17	sure I don't misspeak or there's not a typo.
18	record.)	18	MR. ROGERS: We've barely had a
19	MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I mean,	19	chance to reorder them, because he's rearguing
20	this is not a criminal case.	20	motions.
21	THE COURT: I understand that.	21	MR. JOSEPH POWER: There was a
22	MR. ROGERS: What led you to	22	mistake in the sexual relations.
23	reverse your position?	23	THE COURT: I got that. Yes, we
24	THE COURT: Because of the way that	24	edited that.
	Page 18		Page 20
1	it because of the argument.	1	(Whereupon the following
2	MR. ROGERS: The argument did not	2	proceedings were had in the
3	mention one 60-01 instruction, not one. Not	3	hearing and presence of the
4	one.	4	jury.)
5	I have the duty to argue the	5	THE DEPUTY: Please rise for the
6	counterclaim issue, an absolute duty. So	6	jury.
7	because I argued the counterclaim, now you're	7	Court is back in session. Please
8	allowing him to introduce 60-01s that are	8	be seated and quiet.
9	abbreviated, not complete, have no bearing or	9	THE COURT: Okay. You heard from
10	relevance on negligence.	10	the plaintiffs this morning, and now you're
11	THE COURT: This jury is deciding	11	going to hear from the defense.
12	on a negligence case, not a criminal case, I	12	Mr. Patton?
13	know, but regarding the liability, you can't	13	MR. PATTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	you can distance the criminality so far that it	14	If it please the Court, counsel, Robert.
15	looks like it took it off the plate.	15	DEFENDANTS' CLOSING ARGUMENT
16	MR. ROGERS: I didn't argue so	16	MR. PATTON: Ladies and gentlemen
17	how do 60-01s change that? I didn't argue	17	of the jury, good afternoon.
18	anything about 60-01s.	18	This is my one chance to give a
19	I am supposed to argue the	19	closing statement. You will hear again from the
20	counterclaim, and I did argue the counterclaim.	20	plaintiffs' attorneys. They have the burden of
21	I didn't do that improperly. I absolutely did	21	proof, and they're going to be given time to
22	not do it improperly.	22	come back up there and argue some more.
23	Everyone in the case said Jackson	23	But, on behalf of AlliedBarton and
24	had committed criminal actions. Everybody in	24	Robert and all of our folks, we thank you for
1	Page 19		Page 21

1 your kind attention. This trial has been quite 1 MR. ROGERS: Objection, Your Honor, 2 involved. There's been a lot of evidence. And 2 we have a motion in limine. 3 3 THE COURT: "Hired guns," okay. it looked to us that you were all paying 4 attention pretty well, taking a lot of notes. 4 Sustained, counsel. 5 5 We look forward to your fair deliberations in MR. PATTON: Why isn't it important 6 this case. 6 that the person who should be the most 7 7 We don't agree on much in this trustworthy witness in this case, because he 8 8 case; I think that was probably obvious to you certainly was the most heroic person in this 9 9 throughout the testimony. case, Greg Jenkins, the Director of Security for 10 10 I think probably our most the building, why isn't he important in this 11 significant disagreement is how Joe Jackson has 11 dialogue about where the fault belongs? 12 12 been redefined in this case by the plaintiffs, This is the man, if you remember, 13 redefined in terms of it's as if he didn't do a 13 one of the last witnesses in this case. You 14 14 thing. It's as if he didn't plot this as he didn't hear them criticizing him; how could 15 15 did, he didn't plan this as he did. He knew 16 where he was going, brought all kind of weapons 16 He went up there on the 38th floor, 17 17 with him. he saw Mr. McKenna on the ground, a bullet hole 18 He was suicidal. He went there to 18 to his head, and he tried to break those doors 19 die and take as many people as possible, and for 19 down. 20 20 some reason the plaintiffs feel like he And, ultimately, Sidney Chambers 21 shouldn't get a percentage of fault at all. 21 came up, another hero, broke those doors open. 22 They talked about our founding 22 They went in, they got Robert, they got other 23 23 attorneys, and in exchange for their efforts, fathers, and how we have a right to a jury. 24 24 Jackson fires shots at them. Well, I can assure you, they would bristle to Page 22 Page 24 1 sit in this courtroom and hear this well-crafted 1 Isn't Jenkins somebody that has 2 2 misdirection of this case to minimize, if not credibility in this case? Because he came in 3 rule out of -- the events of Joe Jackson. 3 here and told you he did his investigation, 4 4 If this is truly a search for which included looking at the surveillance 5 5 justice, then justice requires that you assess 6 6 Joe Jackson his fair share of the fault, which I Let's remember who Jenkins is. He 7 7 believe the evidence shows is 100 percent for is the owner's rep. He is the managing 8 8 what happened. company's representative to keep an eye on 9 9 I think that Robert is still AlliedBarton, to interact with us weekly, daily, 10 10 when he sees us. wondering how this could have happened. And 11 10 years later, 11 years later, we have a 11 He wanted to know how did this 12 misapplying, misleading, and misrepresenting the 12 happen. He interviewed Chambers. Chambers 13 13 evidence. never told him that he saw Jackson earlier that 14 14 Robert wants to understand why all day. Chambers told him on the day of the 15 15 of the investigation that took place at the time shooting the first time he saw Jackson was on 16 of these murders, all of it, the only people 16 the third floor. 17 17 blaming him are the plaintiffs' attorneys and Jackson prepares -- Chambers 18 18 two hired experts they brought in. prepares a report that day, never mentions 19 MR. ROGERS: Objection, Your Honor. 19 seeing Jackson earlier that day. In that 20 20 THE COURT: Overruled. report, the first time he says he saw Jackson on 21 21 MR. PATTON: How is that possible? the third floor. 22 22 How is that possible after all of this time, So what should be the evidence 23 after all of this time? The lawyers and the 23 that's important in this case? What the lawyers 24 24 hired guns they brought in. are telling you? What the experts they brought

Page 25

1 in are telling you? Or maybe somebody like 1 Do you want to turn down the lights? 2 MR. PATTON: Do you want to turn Jenkins, a guy that went up there to rescue 2 3 3 them down? people, shots being fired, unarmed, and he tells 4 you I did my investigation, I watched all of 4 So this is Chambers you see up in 5 5 that surveillance, and we're going to see some the upper corner here coming over and being with 6 more today. He watched the surveillance, not 6 Jackson and Robert Brown. 7 7 10 years, 11 years later being interpreted from Here's another view right down 8 8 attorneys that have had 10 or 11 years to here, and this is probably the segment you 9 confuse you. He saw it back then. 9 should watch. 10 10 He had to make decisions; right? Now, they're all walking away --11 He had to figure out what went wrong. And he 11 this is still pretty dark -- and we pick them up 12 12 came in here, and he told you Robert Brown did here. And he's already gone down the escalator, 13 everything he was supposed to do under their 13 and Robert Brown and Jackson haven't even got to 14 expectations of AlliedBarton. Same comments for 14 the turnstiles yet. 15 15 Sidney Chambers. Let's talk about another 16 16 Now, which one of these four misinterpretation of the surveillance tape. And 17 these are important when you're evaluating the 17 lawyers changed what Jenkins had to say? Now, 18 18 representations being made by the attorneys, the you saw some of them try to mess with his 19 testimony, and you saw how he responded back. 19 credibility of what you're being told. 20 20 What's another whopper you just One of the few witnesses in this case that said heard earlier today? Jackson -- they showed you 21 don't be showing me things or telling me things 21 22 that aren't true. That aren't true. 22 a clip of Jackson that they represented to all 23 23 And you would think Jenkins would of you was him earlier in the day. 24 24 Now, we kind of covered that a be the person that, if he felt we did something Page 26 Page 28 1 wrong, because he cares for his tenants, you 1 little bit with the witnesses, but let me 2 2 don't think he would have done something back refresh your memory about that. 3 then? 3 The only video, the only 4 You don't think he would have 4 surveillance tape you're ever going to see of 5 5 written a report back then criticizing Robert, Joe Jackson coming into 500 West Madison is at 6 6 criticizing Sidney after seeing the tape? about 10 to 3:00. See, our cameras capture all 7 I told you in my opening statements 7 of the entrances. Our cameras capture all of 8 8 the most important evidence in this case is that the floors. You can't say somebody was here and 9 9 surveillance tape. It can't be changed. It did this at this time, and it won't be captured 10 10 can't be spun. It can't be misinterpreted. It on the surveillance tape. 11 is what it is. Yet, you've heard it 11 So we've had 11 years to study that 12 misinterpreted. In fact, you just heard it 12 tape, 11 years to find Joe Jackson. To find 13 13 misinterpreted a moment ago. Joe Jackson. 14 14 Mr. Rogers got up here and told you We found him. And I showed you the 15 that surveillance tape shows Sidney Chambers 15 video of him. We've got some snapshots. Let's 16 16 following Robert Brown and Jackson watching them play those snapshots. 17 17 go through the turnstiles and over to an (Whereupon a video was 18 elevator. 18 played with no sound.) 19 Would you play that tape, please? 19 MR. PATTON: Here is Joe coming 20 20 Take a look and see if you see into our doors for the first time. 21 Chambers seeing all of this happening. 21 Does this look like the fake 22 22 (Whereupon a video was played Jackson they were showing you earlier? 23 with no sound.) 23 Let's go the clip with the clock, 2.4 24 THE COURT: This is pretty dark. please. Page 29 Page 27

1 1 cross-examined him. You don't see Mr. Jackson? And he's on a mission. He goes 2 right to the escalators, comes right up. What 2 You've had all this time? You're relying upon 3 time is that? What time is that? It's 5 to 3 Chambers' deposition saying he saw him earlier 4 3:00. 4 in the day, and you're relying upon that to 5 5 criticize my client. That's what you're doing, If he was in the building, as they 6 maintain, you're going to see him coming through 6 sir, aren't you? 7 7 our doors. He wasn't stealth. You're never Yes. I am. 8 8 Well, where's the video? Where do going to see it. You're never going to see it, 9 9 where he came in earlier, because he didn't. you see him coming into our building? Where do 10 10 He came in right around the time we you see him anywhere in our building? 11 11 I don't. I don't. said he did, which means, by the way, that 12 12 Mr. Chambers never saw him earlier that day on The next day he comes in, and for 13 the first floor, the video would have shown 13 the first time the plaintiffs show him a clip of 14 14 that, on the second floor, the video would have the alleged Joe Jackson. And, by the way, 15 15 shown that, with Chambers somewhere eyeballing that's the individual that you saw -- they only 16 him, as they maintain. You aren't going to see 16 played a part of it -- where he continues to 17 Chambers in any of those, because it didn't 17 walk and gets in line to a cell phone company. 18 18 I'll bet the last thing on Joe's happen. 19 19 You think when they're talking mind that day was to spend some time shopping on 20 20 the shopping floor. That wasn't Joe Jackson. about the evidence in the case, why are they 21 doing that? Why are they doing that? 21 But, magically, Hauri said -- the 22 22 When is the first time, by the way, first time he's seeing it, and he says well, it 23 23 they showed you the fake Jackson? When is the might be him. Then I cross-examined him. He said 24 24 first time? We were cross-examining their Page 30 Page 32 1 experts; right? We were halfway into the gates, 1 I never said that was him, I'm seeing this for 2 2 Hauri and Dr. Kennedy. Do you remember that? the first time. 3 3 None of them, none of them, came in here with And I ask is that fair? Is that 4 4 opinions that they found Joe Jackson earlier pursuing justice when you do something like 5 5 that day, none of them after 11 years. 6 6 Surely, as they made this such an He wasn't there, and they're never 7 7 important issue, surely you think they would going to show you any video, any surveillance, 8 8 have given that tape to Hauri, Dr. Kennedy, to show you he was there. But that's what I 9 9 along with the tape where he's coming into our mean in this case. 10 10 building that morning. They didn't, because it They've had 11 years to come up and 11 doesn't exist. 11 misinterpret and misrepresent the facts. Well, 12 12 And they didn't give their experts maybe Jenkins ought to be the guy. He doesn't 13 13 any tape of Jackson, any tape of Jackson, have a stake in the outcome of the case. You 14 14 showing him on the first floor, on the second don't see NACA or MB Realty at a chair at the 15 15 floor, as they maintain. table with us. We don't work for 500 West 16 When is the first time they did it? 16 Madison anymore. They renewed the 17 17 contract years later with somebody else. And also a little while ago. What's his motive? What's his 18 18 But you remember we had Hauri on, 19 19 Mr. Hauri, the former Captain in the Waukegan stake? The guy that's a hero. The guy that did 20 20 police force, one of their experts. And he was an investigation at that time before the 21 21 kept overnight. We didn't -- we didn't finish lawsuit, before all of this stuff, coming up 22 22 him. I think it was a Tuesday or a Wednesday. with Jackson somewhere else in the building. 23 We didn't finish him. 23 Before all of that he did his own investigation 24 24 So then he comes on. And I as Director of Security. Page 33

1 What about Tenton? What about 1 at everybody in his way. He shot at the Chicago 2 Detective Tenton? We heard from him earlier in 2 PD. He shot at Tenton. And they want to tell 3 3 the case to talk about him hearing the screaming you he was just there to kill a lawyer. 4 of Mr. McKenna. That's the limited purpose they 4 Well, he shot at Jenkins. He shot 5 5 put him on the stand, to talk about the at Chambers. He shot at Robert. And do you 6 screaming of Mr. McKenna, which we know 6 remember they spent all that time during the 7 7 absolutely did not happen. trial trying to deny that Robert was shot at? I 8 8 They brought him on. He heard don't remember them questioning Jenkins when he 9 9 said we were all shot at. screaming. Of course, that was either 10 10 Mr. Danzig or Murphy, but what was the point of A constant effort, ladies and 11 bringing him on, on an issue that, you know, we 11 gentlemen, in this case to put Robert in a bad 12 12 light, a constant, never-ending effort to malign put Dr. Raphael on, and she gives you the 13 graphic, the graphic explanation of what the 13 Robert. Is that justice? 14 14 bullet did to Mr. McKenna, and he could not be So Joe Jackson, I mean, I could 15 15 screaming. He could not have conscious pain and probably go on for an hour on the savagery he 16 suffering. It went right through the cranium, 16 demonstrated up on that floor, premeditated, 17 the central nervous system. But they put that 17 planned, up and down the hallways. Are you a 18 18 lawyer? Boom. Taking hostages. evidence on that has absolutely no truth in this 19 19 Mr. McKenna, he's not screaming, 20 20 but he's having, what do you call it, that death Then they try to cross-examine her. 21 Wikipedia? She's relying upon learned 21 sound, the death gurgle. 22 22 treatises? She fought back. She fought back Jackson is so vicious he takes out 23 23 a hunting knife and goes to stab him, but when they tried to misrepresent her record of 24 24 who she testifies for. You saw how tough she managed to be persuaded out of it by Danzig. Page 34 Page 36 1 was; a lot like Jenkins. 1 That person doesn't deserve percentages in this 2 2 If you're going to ask me case? 3 3 questions, ask me something that's actually What's another myth that they've 4 4 relevant in this case, and I'll answer them. been floating in this case about Joe Jackson? 5 5 So what about Joe Jackson? You're He could be talked out of it. All we had to do 6 6 probably not going to hear much about him again was walk up to him on the third floor, May I 7 7 when they get their chance for rebuttal. help you, sir? Are you lost? Oh, well, here's 8 8 But you're getting jury the exit. This is how you leave. They just got 9 9 instructions from Her Honor that are having you up here and told you that he could be talked out 10 10 assess the percentage to him. Evaluate that. of this suicidal, homicidal mission that he was 11 And how can they look you in the 11 on. Is that really believable? 12 eye, this individual that spent years raging 12 That's why we brought in Sergeant 13 13 over feeling that McKenna screwed him, years, to Rhein, the last witness in the case, Sergeant 14 14 the point where he plans this. Rhein to tell you he didn't take just one shot 15 15 He's got the sledgehammer; you've from SWAT. He took two. I had to shoot him 16 heard evidence about that. It probably would 16 again, because, even though he had a bullet 17 17 have broken through the glass and the doors if right through his face, he was still raising his 18 18 the doors weren't locked. He didn't know the gun up, pointing it at Danzig, pointing it at 19 19 doors were broken, and they couldn't have been me, pointing it at my partner. 20 20 locked. Duct tape? He chained the door. Do Is this a person that you could 21 21 you think this was going to be about one person? have talked out of killing people on the third 22 22 A hunting knife? A .38 with a lot of bullets, floor? Does that sound like a person you could 23 and he doesn't get a percentage in this case? 23 reason with, you could say nice things to him?

Page 37

Because that's our post orders. We

Page 35

24

24

A person that was willing to shoot

1 1 have to smile when we talk to people, talk to for you. 2 tenants, talk to guests. We have to smile. We 2 Well, what's the good news? The 3 3 have to stand up straight, and we can never good news is a guy like Robert, and a guy like 4 argue. It always has to be nice language. 4 Sidney are going to attack Mr. Jackson and try 5 5 Would that have worked on Joe Jackson? to take his gun away, which, by the way, was in 6 And so when they'd gone through all 6 a manila envelope, and, by the way, they never 7 7 of these ideas, I should say, of how Joe Jackson did say how they would do it, do you go with the 8 8 should have been dealt with when he first came right hand first, left hand first, do you kick 9 9 him? They lacked all of those details. into our building, they've gone over them again. 10 10 You'll probably hear them again in rebuttal, the They said you should get after him 11 6-foot rule, search the package, inquire if 11 right there on the third floor. Then you say 12 12 well, that's the good news. What's the bad you're lost, all of these things, do you think 13 that would have worked with Joe Jackson after he 13 news? 14 told Robert kill him? Do you want to go home to 14 Well, the bad news is there's this 15 15 your family tonight? Don't be a hero. Are expert named Hauri, and he wants the post orders 16 those the words of somebody that you could be 16 to say but when you do, you're going to have a 17 17 reasoning -- that you could reason with? 50 percent chance of getting shot. What do you 18 18 And so what they keep telling you think the reaction of all of those people would 19 is, you know, that was Robert's opportunity to 19 have been? They have families. They have kids. 20 20 restrain him, maybe Sidney's too. Of course, What do you think their answer would be? 21 his hand was on the .38. It's on the trigger. 21 Or we'll give them the alternative. 22 You don't think Joe would have 22 Robert is going to stay calm. He's not going to 23 23 taken exception to that? And what's interesting panic. He's not going to run. He's not going 24 about that is that was Mr. Hauri's view. Attack 24 to start crying. He's not going to start Page 40 Page 38 1 him down on the third floor, attack him on the 1 begging for his life. He's going to take him 2 2 third floor, get after him. away from all of you, the immediate threat. 3 3 And I asked him well, what do you What do you think the vote would be 4 4 think would happen, Mr. Hauri? What do you of all of those people down there on the third 5 5 think would happen? floor? Which way do you think they'd vote, the 6 6 He says well, you get a 50/50 50/50 one or get this suicidal, homicidal maniac 7 chance Robert gets killed, Chambers gets killed, 7 away from us and see if the situation can 8 8 he starts shooting all those people in the change. What do you think they'd do? Because 9 9 lobby. That's their expert's testimony to you. their lives count, by the way. Their lives 10 10 100 percent chance a wrestling match would count too. Robert's life counts. Chambers' 11 break out. That's their expert's sworn 11 life counts. 12 12 Now let's do it the other way. testimony to you. 13 13 So picture that on the third floor, Let's say that the Joe Jackson we know is now up 14 14 wrestling with the gun with Joe Jackson, we on the 38th floor, because I showed you a 15 15 know, and Robert, and Sidney, and all of those post order. This building is so safe the 16 unsuspecting folks have got a 50/50 chance of 16 post order says if somebody doesn't look 17 17 being killed. dangerous, they can walk right through the 18 18 Remember, I didn't ask them now, do turnstiles, which would be violating the rules, 19 19 you write that in the post orders at AON? No, I the access code, but they could walk right 20 20 don't put that in there. through. 21 So let's go with that for a minute. 21 And the post orders say do not 22 22 Let's say that we had all of those people down chase, do not chase, let him go, report. Report 23 there in the lobby when this happened. And we 23 that that just happened. Of course, apparently, 24 24 Jackson didn't know that, but he could have gone say we've got good news, and we've got bad news

Page 41

1 right through. 1 I think one of the more interesting 2 Now, let's say he did, and he gets 2 points of this trial is when counsel was 3 3 up to the 38th floor. Now let's say Robert is berating Robert. Robert was trying to answer 4 up there. Robert knows he's got a gun. He's 4 but I had a gun on me, I had a gun on me. 5 5 threatening to kill him. And Robert turns to And Robert turned to counsel and 6 the folks up there on the 38th floor and says 6 says what would you have done with that gun on 7 7 give me your choice: you? You didn't get an answer. You didn't get 8 8 I'll wrestle the gun away in front an answer, because we all know that if a gun is 9 of all of you -- of course I've got a 50/50 9 put on you, you comply. You comply. 10 10 chance I'm going to be shot and killed and And in this particular case Robert 11 you're going to be shot and killed -- or I can 11 kept his calm. I don't know how many people 12 12 get this threat away from all of you. What do confronted by Joe Jackson would have kept their 13 you think their vote would be up there? 13 calm, wouldn't have panicked under the 14 14 That's why this choice they're situation. And he took Joe away from the 15 15 saying Robert and Sidney should have made down immediate threat which was on the third floor. 16 16 there is absolutely disrespectful of the folks And then what happened? He gets in 17 17 on the third floor, disrespectful of anybody the elevator. It's called deescalation; right? 18 that could have been shot that day. That's why 18 It's not escalation. Deescalation. 19 the post orders all say do not try to take a gun 19 Robert asked the man with the gun 20 20 away, because they're not trained to do that. pointed at him what's this all about? What's 21 And let's say Robert and Sidney 21 this all about? And Jackson tells him the guy 22 made the choice to do that that day, and, 22 upstairs owes me \$1,000. That's not in dispute. 23 23 according to Hauri, it went with the bad So now let's evaluate. A security 24 50 percent. They're killed and other people are 24 guard exercising ordinary care -- that's the Page 44 Page 42 1 killed in the lobby, because Jackson wanted to 1 standard you're going to be judging Robert and 2 2 make sure nobody stood in his way to make it up Sidney by, by the way. The jury instruction 3 3 says "ordinary care." You didn't hear that very to the 38th floor. Let's say they're killed. 4 4 Wouldn't we still be in this room, often in those speeches earlier. Ordinary care. 5 5 except we'd have the loved ones of those down What would a security guard with a 6 there on the third floor, and they'd be arguing 6 gun pointed at him -- excuse me, a gun pointed 7 7 you're violating our post orders by trying to at him do when he's told I want to go upstairs 8 8 and get \$1,000 from lawyers? What would take the gun away. These are the choices that 9 9 ordinary care -- what should he have done and they're giving you, and those choices make 10 10 absolutely no sense. exercised with ordinary care? 11 Where is the talk from these 11 Well, he's got choices; right? 12 12 individuals that Robert was taken as a hostage? It's \$1,000. This guy is calm. Do you 13 13 No one disagrees with that. Jake has looked at remember? In all of the descriptions, you see 14 14 him on the surveillance film. Jackson is calm the surveillance tape, taken a hostage, all of 15 15 the whole time. Tenton described him as calm the experts, Mr. MacGeoy, our expert, Mr. Hauri, 16 Dr. Kennedy all agree Robert was taken a hostage 16 and methodical, which really made it freaky. 17 17 that day. But he's confronted by a guy that's 18 18 real calm, not screaming, hollering, going Where do you hear discussion about 19 19 crazy. I want \$1,000 from a lawyer. A lawyer what it means to be taken as a hostage and be 20 20 threatened and you're going to be killed? Where owes me \$1,000. What should he have done there? 21 is that discussion in this case? 21 Escalate the situation? Try to take him on in 22 22 They act as if it's the movies. the elevator and get killed? 23 Somebody comes up, threatens to kill you, has a 23 And, of course, now you've got 24 24 Jackson free to roam the building. No longer gun on you, and it's no big deal.

Page 45

1 1 can't hear a thing. It's eerily quiet. And he can a security guard observe and wait for an 2 opportunity to report. 2 told you he was so afraid for himself with a 3 3 He gets him up there. He's being bulletproof vest on and a big gun. 4 calm. They go inside. He's being calm. Robert 4 What did he tell you he did? He 5 5 reasonably, reasonably, believed that this turned around and left. He turned around and 6 situation was going to go away for \$1,000. Of 6 left, went back out the door, because he was 7 7 course, no one knew Joe Jackson. afraid for his life. 8 8 Was he supposed to take him out in Tenton's life counts. Robert's 9 9 the hallway for \$1,000? According to life counts. Everybody that day in that suite, 10 10 Mr. Hauri -- do you remember his testimony -down there in the third floor, up in the 11 now they're up on the 31st floor before they 11 elevator, everybody's life counted that day. 12 12 So he comes back around -- this is make the exchange to go up the remaining seven 13 flights? Hauri says you should have run. 13 Tenton -- and he sees his partner, Nelson. And 14 14 That's his opinion to you. At that point Robert they go and peek down that hallway, the hallway 15 15 should have run. that goes right through the glass doors of the 16 16 As we sit in this courtroom and you 38th floor. 17 17 He told you what he saw. He sees hear all of these disparaging things said about 18 Robert, I'll bet he thinks maybe he should have 18 McKenna down, he sees Danzig, and he sees 19 19 just run. Jackson standing there with a gun. 20 20 But, of course, if he did, we'd And what did Tenton try and do? He 21 still be back in this courtroom, and all of 21 tried to talk to Joe Jackson. He tried to talk 22 these post orders, and you should have done 22 to him. Put your gun down. 23 23 this, and you should have done that. Do you remember what Joe Jackson 24 But Robert didn't run. He didn't 24 did at that moment? This is the guy that they Page 46 Page 48 1 cry. He didn't beg for his life, because he had 1 say could have been persuaded to leave our 2 2 a reasonable belief, even though he had a gun, building on the third floor. 3 3 the guy wasn't -- Jackson wasn't acting crazy. As soon as he sees Tenton, he grabs 4 4 Real calm. It's 1,000 bucks. We'll get the Goodson, takes him around the corner and kills 5 5 money, I'll escort him back out of the building, him right on the spot right in front of Tenton. 6 6 get him on the street, call CPD. That was his Is that a person that Robert could have 7 7 plan. And that was a guard in similar persuaded or Sidney could have persuaded 8 8 downstairs? circumstances showing ordinary care. 9 9 Then, of course, we all know all Then he comes back. Jackson is 10 10 hell broke loose, and Jackson could not be sitting there right in the lobby. And a hero, a 11 stopped. 11 hero, now Detective Tenton, turns to his partner 12 12 You heard Tenton come in here and says as soon as he reloads, as soon as he 13 13 earlier. I got him down off the stand to show takes his gun down, pulls that chamber out and 14 14 you everything he did. Tenton is a hero. starts to reload, let's rush him. Let's rush 15 15 There's a few heroes in this case him. And that's exactly what he did. Except 16 that you haven't been hearing about. He comes 16 Joe was too fast on the draw. He got that gun 17 17 back up and fired right at Detective Tenton as up there. He knows shots have been fired; 18 18 Detective Tenton fired about five rounds at him. that's the call. He doesn't know anything about 19 19 it, but he sneaks in the back way. They all missed. Each one tried to kill each 20 20 Do you remember what his testimony other. That's Joe Jackson. Unstoppable, 21 21 was? This is the Joe Jackson that plaintiffs fearless. You're not going to dissuade me. I'm 22 22 say Robert could have taken down, could have going to kill you. 23 23 And then Tenton is now stuck on the persuaded. 24 24 side of the door that's chained. He's stuck Tenton goes in that back way, he Page 49

1 1 for example, that the Woods firm, Mr. McKenna, there now. He's got nowhere to go. And what 2 did he tell you? He spent 40 minutes there 2 Ms. Leib, ever felt that Jackson was a danger, 3 3 right around the corner trying to talk to was a candidate for workplace violence. No one 4 Danzig, trying to talk to Joe Jackson, trying to 4 told the building about Jackson. This was a 5 5 very safe building. work things out. Is that -- Joe Jackson, was he 6 6 And who was in the best position, able to be persuaded now? 7 7 He kept telling him I'm going to the best position to determine the level of 8 8 kill Danzig. He pulls the hunting knife out. security services they wanted? Well, wouldn't 9 9 it be the building? The owners? NACA? Jackson tells Tenton okay. I'll make a deal. 10 10 You're right, they're right. We can negotiate. Wouldn't it be MB Realty? Wouldn't it be 11 11 Jenkins? We can negotiate. Here's how I'll let you out 12 12 of the situation. I'll let Danzig go, you come Because you heard they've had many 13 in and shoot me right between my eyes. That's 13 security companies provide services at their 14 14 Joe Jackson. Is that the person on the third building before us, before us, and I don't think 15 15 floor that could be persuaded to leave? anyone is here disputing that they were the ones 16 16 that dictated the level of services. We were And all of the experts agreed, by 17 17 the way, he came there to die. That's not in just a vendor that provides security services. 18 18 dispute. Tenton told you that, "murder by You want armed guards? We'll give 19 suicide." 19 you armed guards. You want a quasi militia? We 20 20 can probably arrange that for you. What do you And they want you to believe a few 21 21 want? Oh, you want the same service of every kind words to Joe on the third floor, and he 22 would have said oh, you're right, I'll leave and 22 other security service company that had been 23 23 there before us? We can do that. come back another day. Those people on the 24 24 You don't want us armed? We're not third floor, their lives count too. Page 50 Page 52 1 So that's Joe Jackson, unstoppable, 1 armed. You want us wearing nice suits? We'll 2 2 murderous, suicidal, vicious. I could keep wear nice suits. You want to go over these post 3 3 going. And he doesn't get a percentage in this orders and have a hands-off policy? We'll keep 4 4 case? I wonder why that is. I wonder why that our hands off people. 5 5 You want what everybody else did? 6 6 We'll give you that. You want a duress code? Let me cover a couple of other 7 7 topics here so that the representations being That seems to be a big one in this case, duress 8 8 made have a little balance. code. It sounds good, doesn't it? 9 9 500 West Madison, it sounds like Which one do we use, though? Which 10 10 they're suggesting this is some dangerous, one do we use? I just heard from counsel 11 high-risk place, and AlliedBarton should have 11 Dr. Kennedy -- you guys remember Dr. Kennedy --12 12 seen that coming and done something about it. the representation I heard is he spent his whole 13 13 Yeah, well, that wasn't the evidence in this life going over the duress codes. Okay. Sure. 14 14 case. And you should be looking at this case I'll go with that. 15 15 from the evidence. Do you remember when I asked him? 16 16 The evidence in this case is All right, do you think a duress code would have 17 17 worked? Which one? Give me a name. Tell me 20 years, 20 years before this, all those 18 18 20 years, never violence on that third floor or something. 19 19 Well, I don't know. I don't know above. Never. 20 20 what duress code AlliedBarton should have used. Even Dr. Kennedy agreed this 21 21 I'm just saying they should have used one. incident was not foreseeable to AlliedBarton, 22 22 but they keep throwing these workplace post NORA, I asked him about that. Does 23 orders at you and everything else. 23 Sidney look like a NORA? Dr. Strong? Code 10? 24 24 What do you think Joe Jackson would have been I don't remember hearing,

Page 53

1 thinking about that, by the way? What do you 1 was taken hostage. What should his response be? 2 think you would have been thinking about that? 2 I'm sorry, sir. I know you've 3 3 He tells Robert get rid of him. Okay. Sidney threatened to kill me. I know you want to take 4 comes over. Is there a problem? No. NORA. 4 me up to the 38th floor, but that would be 5 5 No. Code 10. I could go on and on and on. violating the rules. Can I just stay here? Can 6 Nonsense. There isn't any code that would have 6 I just hang out here? 7 7 worked with Joe's gun pointed at Robert. Or Robert, you violated the pass. 8 8 And, by the way, all of the experts He needed a pass. Okay. He threatened to kill 9 9 me. Why don't you take me up to the 38th floor. agree no one was using codes back then. No one. 10 10 That was the standard. No one used those kind I can't do it before you get your pass. What do 11 of duress codes, but they think we should have. 11 you think Jackson's response to that would have 12 12 Is it because it sounds -- it been? 13 sounds interesting to put blame on us? Or would 13 All of these things, I went through 14 14 it have worked because surely NACA and MB all of these things with their experts, and they 15 15 Realty, if they felt they wanted guards with a agreed well, it certainly could have happened 16 16 gun on them, coming up with some sort of code that Joe might have just killed Robert right 17 17 language, they would have asked us to. then and there, and Chambers, assuming he was in 18 I don't know which one would have 18 the vicinity. 19 worked, though. I'm still waiting to hear which 19 These are all -- they like to use 20 20 one would work instead of just a blanket claim the word "red herrings." I call them 21 we should have had one. 21 distractors, distracting you from what the 22 What else have they said about 22 reality of the situation would have been. 23 23 Robert? You're going to get this issues He shouldn't have double swiped him 24 instruction here, and it's got, I don't know, 24 through the turnstiles, shouldn't have done Page 54 Page 56 1 maybe 20 of them. He should have had 6 feet as 1 that. You should have told -- this is what 2 2 the gun is on him. Oh, excuse me. You told me they're claiming. 3 3 you'd kill me, but, before you do, can I get You should have stopped Jackson and 4 4 6 feet between us? said I can't let you through. You're violating 5 5 He should have searched his the rules. I know you say you're going to kill 6 6 package. Now, they're not saying before, before me, but my rules count more than my life. 7 his hand was in the package. They're not saying 7 Do you think that was a reasonable 8 8 that, because the video shows that it was just a reaction? Do you think that's ordinary care on 9 9 flat envelope, flat manila envelope. It wasn't a person that's a hostage, to start going over 10 10 until he put his hand in there -- and I -- I've post orders with a guy that turns out to be a 11 got to talk about that too. 11 suicidal, homicidal maniac? Do you think he 12 So search the package they're 12 would have taken kindly to that? Do you think 13 13 claiming is when Jackson has his hand on the .38 that might have escalated the situation down 14 14 in the manila envelope. Okay. I wonder how there with all of those people around? You bet. 15 15 that would have worked out. Don't be a hero, Another one I heard is, you know, 16 16 you'll go home to your family tonight. Everyone even though he's forcing you to go through the 17 17 agrees, everyone agrees in this case, a clear turnstile to the mid-rise, you should have taken 18 18 him to a different set of elevators. threat to kill. 19 19 And then Robert says to him can I Of course, that kind of contradicts 20 20 search your package, please? It looks their position that you should have delayed him 21 21 suspicious. Robert's life matters. longer, had he taken him to the express elevator 22 22 Don't leave your post. That's to the 38th floor. That took time off the 23 another one. Don't leave your post. They're 23 clock. 24 24 saying he shouldn't have left his post after he And you heard Robert tell you in Page 57

1 1 the elevator, in the elevator, he's being words. 2 contacted by the fellow security guards. They 2 I believe the claim is -- and it's 3 knew he was missing right off the bat. They 3 a little confusing -- that it's Chambers that 4 were paying attention that day; they just didn't 4 should have gone to the Control Room and alerted 5 5 know what was going on. They didn't know he was the police. All right. Let's go with that. 6 a hostage. 6 What was he going to tell them? 7 7 So let's stay on that for a minute, You know, I'm concerned about one of my security 8 8 the third-floor conduct on the part of Robert. guards. A guy's acting suspicious? Chambers 9 9 In addition to all of these that clearly would certainly didn't know he had a gun. 10 10 have escalated the situation and put everybody's And so you call that out to the 11 lives at risk, another one is somehow he should 11 Chicago police department. You know, we've got 12 12 have been caught. a concerned, suspicious person, how quickly do 13 Well, of course, that's the role. 13 you think they would have come over on that 14 We don't fight. We don't disarm. The services 14 information versus how quickly Tenton came when 15 15 contracted for, we observe and we report to the the report to him was shots fired? Or might 16 police. That's a valid -- that's a valid one to 16 they have responded hey, you know, look -- check 17 17 talk about. into it, keep us posted. 18 18 Well, first of all, where was the But even if somehow they 19 opportunity to call the police? You know, it's 19 interpreted suspicious person and the calvary 20 20 comes in, the time line doesn't work. It's as if, when I hear these arguments, we're in 21 slow motion. We're like in a Scorsese movie. 21 never going to work. It's never going to work. 22 Everything is slow. 22 It didn't work for Tenton; he told you that. 23 23 That's not what it was on the And he told you, in probably one of 24 24 the most candid things I've ever heard, he told videotape. Well, let's slow it down. Let's go Page 58 Page 60 1 in slow motion. How long did it take for 1 you, you know, I wasn't trained to take on 2 2 Detective Tenton to get to the building? Do you Joe Jackson. I wasn't trained to disarm him. 3 3 remember that? I thought that was an important The last couple of questions in 4 4 question to ask. your notes, I thought that might be important 5 5 You might want to -- you might be for you to hear. 6 6 interested in a time line, since they're Detective, tell them what you were 7 7 claiming somehow the calvary could have come and thinking of Joe Jackson after exchanging gunfire 8 8 stopped this from happening. when you felt you had the drop on him and you 9 9 Remember, it's hostage, turnstile, quickly reloaded and fired right back at him. 10 10 elevator straight to the 31st floor, elevator And, by the way, you may have 11 straight to the 38th floor. We're talking about 11 caught it, but Tenton's too solid of a guy to 12 seconds. Seconds. 12 have told you, but remember he said to Nelson, 13 13 And you heard McKenna, right? as soon as he's reloading, we both go. What did 14 14 Quickly, as soon as he got in there? You heard Nelson do? He didn't move. He stayed back. 15 15 about Jackson and Robert, how quickly they got And that's not criticism. That shows you how 16 16 Mr. McKenna? dangerous Joe Jackson was, the guy they wanted 17 17 Do you really believe the Chicago us to talk into leaving our building. 18 police could have got there in time to do 18 So Tenton told you when I asked him 19 anything? 19 why SWAT? You're there. He looked you in the 20 20 And, by the way, what would be the eye and said we are not trained to take a gun 21 21 report to them? I think the claim is Chambers away; that's SWAT, and that's 40 more minutes. 22 22 saw him being suspicious on the third floor. So when you hear about how all of 23 Instead of going down, his actions -- I'm 23 these possibilities could have happened if 24 24 telling you his actions speak louder than his Chambers had called the police, the math is

Page 61

1 1 never going to work. Jackson was up there, and And that's the guy, Sidney, they're 2 2 trying to convince you should have been playing he was not going to be stopped. 3 3 So the experts agree this wasn't Rambo down there on the third floor. That's not 4 foreseeable. The experts agree under the 4 the law. That's not the custom and practice. 5 5 I mean, think about it. Think contract, under Illinois law, unarmed security 6 6 about who the plaintiffs are in this case for guards get zero training for hand-to-hand 7 7 combat, taking guns away, wrestling somebody liability. They want damages. They have the 8 8 with a gun, because they don't want them doing burden of proof. I'll bet you they'll be 9 9 telling you that shortly. They have the burden that without that training. That's a good way 10 10 to get a lot of people shot, including yourself. of proof. They have to produce the evidence. 11 Illinois law doesn't provide for 11 Well, surely there's got to be 12 12 that training. NACA/MB didn't want that somebody that owns that building, somebody that 13 training. That's Jenkins telling you that. And 13 works for MB Realty, if we did something wrong, 14 14 we don't have that training. We're there to would come in and say you know, this is an utter 15 15 detect, deter, observe, and report. disaster, a true tragedy. Robert and Sid should 16 16 have done more. Well, I'm still waiting for It's the Chicago police department 17 these people to come in here, but they're not, 17 that, when we talk about saving lives, that's 18 18 because we did nothing wrong. how we do it. We report these things are 19 happening. We don't try to take the gun away 19 Now, I know they've got 20 20 Sidney Chambers. We've heard. They just played from you. 21 They have tried to create this 21 a clip of him earlier. And this is one of those 22 image that your title is security guard, and 22 kind of catch-22 situations. There is no doubt 23 23 Sidney Chambers was a hero that day, just like you're there to take on people with guns. 24 24 That's not the evidence. That's never going to Jenkins. He saved people. Page 62 Page 64 1 be the evidence. And you saw all of our post 1 But I want you to think about that 2 2 person, that Sidney Chambers. And I want you to orders that say no, you're not supposed to do 3 3 that. That's how you get killed, and that's how think about what Jenkins said about him, that he 4 4 you jeopardize others. was a great guy, great at training, ready to go, 5 5 And I'll say it again. Robert's great security guard. Of course, Jenkins said 6 6 life matters. And you heard him tell you about that about Robert as well. 7 what he experienced. And he's not here for your 7 But let's say that's the true 8 8 sympathy. He's not asking for anything but you Sidney Chambers, the hero willing to be shot to 9 9 being fair to him. get up there and break through that door. 10 10 But you've heard what he went Is it believable that he would have 11 through, witness after witness, how inconsolable 11 walked away from Robert and Jackson on the third 12 he was, Jenkins telling you they cried together. 12 floor? Is that really believable? 13 13 They act as if having a gun pointed That Sidney Chambers, that he would 14 14 at you, seeing somebody killed right in front of have felt, he saw him earlier, looked like one 15 15 you, hearing a guy going down the hallway of his childhood puppets, he was suspicious. 16 16 killing people, the screams, that somehow a That they even played a tape -- or 17 17 security guard that under Illinois law is not a he said he felt threatened, he felt threatened 18 18 police officer, has no powers of arrest, and has by Jackson on the third floor. Is it that 19 19 Sidney Chambers? The one I told you you judge to be told under Illinois law, under Illinois 20 20 law told you are a private citizen. Just in on his actions? Is it just a coincidence he got 21 21 case you think you have some additional powers, demoted, then he got fired? 22 22 you don't. You call the Chicago Police And all of this information they're 23 Department. You don't fight. You don't bring 23 playing you from his deposition is when he had 24 24 been fired. Wasn't working for us. your own weapons. You're unarmed.

Page 65

1 Which Sidney Chambers do you want 1 argue over, and Mr. Scarborough's numbers were 2 to believe in? All I can tell you is that's why 2 about 65 percent of what Mr. Linke's were. 3 3 I told you the surveillance tape is the best In terms of all of the non --4 evidence in this case. You're never going to 4 that's what we call these -- noneconomic 5 5 see Sidney and Jackson at any other time other damages, absolutely experienced by all. Their 6 than on the third floor. Never. 6 testimony coming from that stand was compelling; 7 7 And when you see interaction with that's why we didn't ask any questions. 8 8 Chambers and Robert and Jackson, there wasn't Obviously, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Hoover, 9 9 anything suspicious looking. And let's say Ms. Leib, all of the things that they testified 10 10 there was. Robert told him, as he was forced to to, you know, that their families testified to, 11 do by Jackson, there's no problem here. And you 11 you know, were heartfelt. 12 12 see Chambers walk behind him and then go on the But I'm just wondering here 13 rest of his rounds. 13 whatever happened to the value of a dollar? 14 14 Those are the actions of a person Throwing out millions and millions and millions 15 15 that wasn't thinking Jackson was threatening at of dollars. Whatever happened to the value of a 16 16 that time, suspicious at that time. That's not dollar? 17 17 Sidney Chambers. Sidney Chambers, if he felt When I think of how hard people 18 18 that, they would have never walked another foot. work every day to make their income, the 19 Of course, what was he supposed to 19 sacrifices all of us make to pay our expenses, 20 20 do then? Do you know what? I think this is fix the car, to try to set -- we spend a 21 suspicious, sir. Tell me a little bit more 21 lifetime to try to set some money aside to 22 about -- boom, shot. 22 retire on, the worries we have. That's the 23 23 Well, now we have two hostages. value of money, not millions and millions of 24 24 dollars. That has -- those claims have about as There might have been that. But Sidney wasn't Page 66 Page 68 1 going to talk Jackson out of anything that he 1 much credibility as the fake Joe Jackson or as 2 2 much credibility as Joe doesn't have any had planned for a long, long time. 3 3 We have damages being sought in responsibility in this case, it's all Robert. 4 4 this case. I can tell you that defense lawyers I want you to think about that. If 5 5 tend to be reluctant to talk about damages, you get to damages, you'll get an instruction. 6 6 There's no liability. There's no cause to think because you know when they get their last bite 7 7 at the apple, they're going to say something about damages considered at all. And we believe 8 8 we've done nothing wrong. We've kept the like well, a defense attorney wouldn't be 9 9 standard of care, the ordinary care that guards talking about damages if he felt that he had no 10 10 liability. exercised that day. 11 Well, I have a duty to my clients 11 But I do think we need to be fair 12 12 to address all of the issues in this case. And and just. And, of course, I do this at great 13 13 I don't have much to say about the damages, risk whenever I suggest the next half hour or so 14 14 other than this: they get to speak, they're going to be jumping 15 15 You heard Scarborough and Linke, up and down, screaming, hollering, probably 16 16 the two economists that squared off. Linke calling me names, everything. 17 90 percent of his time is for plaintiffs. 17 But we respect the value of a 18 18 dollar. I think every one of those Scarborough pointed out he doesn't follow proper 19 19 beneficiaries, give them a range of \$750,000, methodology in doing his present cash value 20 20 calculations. a million and a quarter, adjust them up and 21 21 In the one case with Mr. McKenna. down, depending on how much time they spent with 22 22 there's not that much difference because there their loved ones. That's probably what's fair 23 wasn't that much income to argue over. And in 23 and just. 24 24 Mr. Hoover's case there's a lot of income to The jury instructions themselves, Page 69

1 you've heard a little bit about it. We have a 1 Now, they've said a lot of 2 case against Joe Jackson that Her Honor is going 2 derogatory things about Robert, particularly up 3 3 on the third -- on the 38th floor. to ask you to assess percentages. And we have a 4 whole bunch of them here to talk about what you 4 And I would suggest to you you 5 5 ought to be considering when it comes to ought to consider that in terms of what's the 6 Joe Jackson. 6 point? Why are you maligning Robert on the 38th 7 7 For example, does he have fault for floor? 8 8 resisting and obstructing and shooting at a Why don't you talk about the fact 9 police officer, shooting and killing 9 that, when he got up there, he tried to talk 10 10 Mr. McKenna, Mr. Hoover, shooting Ms. Leib? Jackson into leaving a message when Ms. Leib 11 Does he have responsibility for 11 kept telling Jackson you're not going to see 12 12 taking -- kidnapping Robert, taking him hostage, Mr. McKenna, he's in a meeting. 13 terrorizing -- terrorizing everybody up on that 13 Why are they maligning Robert when 14 14 floor. Doesn't that eschew fault? All of this all this goes down? Jackson takes off down the 15 15 with a plan, that he wasn't giving up, that he hallway going left, and Robert goes right and 16 16 wasn't going to be talked out of it. warns people. They're challenging that, 17 17 Proximate cause will tell you what I guess. 18 it means, that the natural and ordinary course 18 Except we produced a witness, one 19 of events produced the decedents' and the 19 of the gentlemen up in that suite, and he told 20 20 plaintiffs' injuries. That's Joe Jackson. you Robert was knocking on my door. Does that 21 Doesn't his criminal behavior exceed Robert if 21 sound like a person that wasn't trying to help 22 he didn't show ordinary care? 22 23 23 You didn't hear Robert go hide in How can you possibly assess a 24 percentage to Robert or AlliedBarton or Sidney 24 an office, lock the door. You didn't hear Page 72 Page 70 1 when you see what this monster did from the 1 Robert go running to hide under a desk, cry for 2 2 third floor on? help, beg for his life. 3 3 And they haven't sued him. How can What you heard was Robert trying to 4 4 they ask you for justice if they don't say he warn people, and then he's back in the lobby. 5 5 deserves something? And he told you because McKenna was there, 6 6 And I mentioned ordinary care. Danzig was there. I don't know what he was 7 Ordinary care, this is the instruction you're 7 planning on doing. He didn't run. He didn't 8 8 going to get. It means the care a reasonably run. But they want to malign him, because that 9 9 careful person would use under the circumstances takes your attention away from Jackson. 10 10 similar to those shown by the evidence. He stayed there -- Jackson is 11 The law does not say how a 11 running around killing. He comes back, and he 12 reasonably careful person would act under those 12 fires at Robert and Jenkins and Chambers. This 13 13 circumstances; that is for you to decide. is real life. This isn't a movie. 14 14 Robert made a decision to take that And for that Robert couldn't go 15 15 threat off the third floor. He didn't know back to work for months and never has been back 16 16 where it was going, but he knew he was in a to 500 West Madison. He's gotten help for his 17 17 crowded area. mental issues. He told you on the stand I spent 18 18 And he wasn't going to check the 11 years trying to forget this. So did Jenkins, 19 19 passage and say, you know, you've got to get a not by coincidence, I've been trying to forget 20 20 pass first. He was protecting everybody around this, as they're trying to ask him all of these 21 him. As I've said, their lives matter too. 21 questions, and he wants to see the paper. It's 22 22 This was not foreseeable. Robert called trauma. It's not the movies. 23 addressed the immediate threat; get him away 23 No one really understands what it 24 24 from people, talk to him. means to be taken a hostage and threatened to be

Page 73

1 1 want them to tell you he had flunked a voluntary killed. I don't care how macho you are, 6'2," 2 they keep saying, Sidney Chambers 6'4'." 2 examination that he never had to take in the 3 3 There's a lot of tough guys in this first place and judge him on that? Is that 4 town, the toughest guys in this town, that are 4 seeking justice? 5 5 lying dead on the street because a gun won. Couple more just came to mind here. 6 Have no mistake. Jackson was there 6 Do you remember that whole display? 7 7 to kill, and he wasn't just thinking lawyers. When you think about credibility, 8 8 Tenton would tell you otherwise. Goodson would what they're saying against us. Do you remember 9 9 tell you otherwise. Leib would tell you the bloody envelope? I'm not going to put the 10 10 otherwise. Robert, Greg Jenkins, gloves on and bring it back in front of you, but 11 Sidney Chambers would tell you otherwise. He 11 do you remember that whole big deal? 12 12 was on a mission to kill anybody and everybody You know, Mr. Brown, Mr. Brown, where's the writing on this? Where's the 13 that was in his way. 13 14 And, as I said before, that's why 14 writing? He's like I don't know. I'm trying to 15 15 it took two bullets to take him out by SWAT. He forget this. I'm trying to forget this, sir. 16 just wanted to kill and kill and kill until the 16 Well, where is it? It's not on there. 17 17 people that could only stop him, Chicago SWAT, And do you remember they went in 18 18 took him out. front of you? Look. Look. One of you said 19 So I'm sure I missed something 19 turn it around. Look, look, it's not there. 20 20 here, but I tried to cover all of the areas It's not there because it wasn't written on this 21 important for your consideration. I guess 21 envelope. They had the tape. They had the 22 training would be the last thing. 22 surveillance tape. Let's put that clip up. 23 23 Maligning Robert. I guess I wasn't That's it right there. 24 24 done talking about that. I mean, how dare they They spent all of this time trying Page 74 Page 76 1 question the fact that he didn't have a GED. 1 to make Robert look bad by saying where is it, 2 2 sir? It's not here. You're making it up is How dare they? 3 3 He had 10 years as a security guard what they're trying to tell you. 4 4 when this incident happened, 10 years. And I But they have the same surveillance 5 5 went through all of the companies, National tape we had. That wasn't the manila envelope; 6 6 Canine, he's out there on the Red Line at night it was a white note. 7 7 as a security guard, and others that Mr. Power Do we have it when he's presenting 8 8 and his experts said those are all companies -it? He's showing him the white note, not the 9 9 they're companies that he came to work for manila envelope. 10 10 before he came to AlliedBarton. Do you think he But they did that to make Robert 11 should have had a high school degree? 11 look bad when they knew it wasn't the yellow 12 12 He flunked an exam. We heard that folder, manila envelope, that was shown to 13 13 one again. He flunked an exam. Really? That Robert by Jackson. It was a white note that's 14 14 was an MSO, which Jenkins told you Peter Moreau, gone. Is that searching for justice when they 15 15 our ex-Account Manager, all our witnesses don't know that whole demonstration was phony boloney? 16 16 work for us. Those are the kind of credible Or how about grilling Robert about 17 17 witnesses you out to listen to. They don't have the suspicious package; right? Do you remember 18 18 this thing? a stake in this case like a paid expert. 19 19 We told you the MSOs is what I said counsel, take your hand out 20 20 distinguishes AlliedBarton among all other of there for a minute. Is that how a gun is 21 21 security companies. We double the requirement held? 22 by Illinois law, not 8 hours a year, 16. And 2.2 Questioning Robert about a 23 the MSOs are our creation to make our security 23 suspicious package hoping to get him to say 24 2.4 things. And he kept saying I don't remember, guards better. But it's voluntary. And you Page 77

1 show me the videotape. 1 told you those are at the minimum 4 hours each, 2 Then you see the videotape, and 2 maybe 5. Robert exceeded his training that 3 3 this envelope was never with fingers stretched year. 4 out like this. Trickery. Trickery to malign 4 And do you remember the best that 5 Robert. 5 they could do about that after that discovery 6 Do you remember the group hug when 6 which they probably should have known about? 7 7 the three lawyers got down here in the well? Then the rest of the question is what did you 8 8 Robert says I don't remember how much space was do? You didn't do a quarterly. You didn't do a 9 9 between us. They had the tape. They had the quarterly. He exceeded AlliedBarton's 10 10 surveillance tape. They knew exactly the requirements, Robert, but you should have done a 11 positions that Jackson, Robert, and Sidney were 11 quarterly. Does snow on the ground make a 12 12 in. They knew exactly. difference in a properly trained security 13 And Robert kept saying I don't 13 officer? 14 14 remember, show me the video. And they show him So just think about all of these 15 15 a camera angle that's blurry, and it looks like things. There's a lot of them. I'm not going 16 16 everybody's together. to go through all of them. There's a lot of 17 And then I got up there and showed 17 them. And compare that then to the truth from 18 him the correct one. And there's not a group 18 Greg Jenkins, his story, because you're not 19 hug. There's no sticking the package up in his 19 going to hear anybody else, other than the hired 20 20 ribs. Is that searching for justice? Are they experts come in here and criticize AlliedBarton. 21 really wanting to get at the truth? 21 You're not. 22 Why didn't they ever say to Robert 22 So they get their second bite at 23 23 you did this, tell us why. Tell us why you did the apple. And I wish I could get up and 24 it. They weren't interested in the whys. 24 address everything they're about to say. That's Page 78 Page 80 1 They're just talking about no 1 not the rules. They've got the burden of proof. 2 2 high school degree, flunking an exam, shots But you've got an awful lot of 3 3 weren't fired at you, trying to play the 911 notes, and you've got an awful lot of memories 4 4 tape. All of these things, is that really the about what you saw happen in this courtroom. 5 5 path to determine whether Robert exercised And you'll be able to decide whether or not 6 6 ordinary care or is that to make him look so bad they're here to seek justice or they're here to 7 7 to all of you you'll forget Joe Jackson? You're seek something else. 8 8 smarter than that. Thank you, and we look forward to 9 9 And I could go on and on. Another you bringing justice to this case. 10 10 one just came to my head when they had THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 11 Mr. Moreau on the stand talking about Robert's 11 Counsel is right. Plaintiffs start 12 training. Do you remember? 12 and they get the last word. Do you all need a 13 13 Robert, even though Jenkins said he quick break? You do? Okay. Let's take 14 14 was trained, they're going after Moreau. They several minutes. 15 15 pulled out one of his employment records, and it (Whereupon the following 16 shows in November he didn't attend one of the 16 proceedings were had outside 17 17 training sessions in December, but he had up the hearing and presence of the 18 18 until July of 2006. Do you remember that? jury.) 19 19 They're telling you that he didn't do his THE COURT: Okay. What do we have? 20 20 training. MR. JOSEPH POWER: Your Honor, I 21 21 Then I come back with the other know you did not allow us in our initial 22 22 document in his employment file that showed he argument to use the 911 tapes. 23 had already 11 hours that they didn't show you, 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 24 and then the other courses that he took, Moreau MR. JOSEPH POWER: I think counsel

Page 81

1 argued it repeatedly about the shots being fired 1 for the jury to hear it again, and you abided by 2 at Chambers and at Brown and at Jenkins, and 2 that, and you played the segment that didn't 3 3 they're heroes. have the shots. 4 There are no shots that are on that 4 Mr. Jenkins did testify -- I wish I 5 5 911 tape. That's why we played it before. And could put my finger to it -- but he did testify 6 I think it's proper rebuttal, and I should be 6 that they guided -- whether he was pulled, 7 7 allowed to play that tape. followed, whatever, Brown out through that door 8 8 That segment, not only the first opening, that we guided Brown out, we guided him 9 9 out, we made sure he did not leave our general part that shows you can hear the sound of 10 10 shooting from the lobby, but then after they area --11 pulled the door down, where Ms. Murphy mentions 11 (Discussion held off the 12 12 they're pulling the door apart, there's no shots record.) 13 fired for a minute and a half after that. I 13 THE COURT: Counsel, I'm sorry. 14 14 request the Court that I be able to play that. I'm not going to play it again. 15 15 MR. PATTON: And we, obviously, MR. JOSEPH POWER: You're not 16 16 object to that. allowing me to play the fact that they weren't 17 My argument was -- and you heard 17 shot at? 18 him argue when they had Robert Brown on the 18 THE COURT: You can make that --19 stand -- that he didn't have shots fired at him. 19 you played it -- you chose the one you played. 20 20 That was their position when they were trying to And I remember turning to you at 21 malign my client. 21 the time and said are you sure you want to put 22 Of course, Mr. Jenkins came in and 22 it on now? Just because I -- remember I said 23 23 said we were all there when the shot or shots that to you? 24 were fired at us --24 MR. JOSEPH POWER: I understand Page 84 Page 82 1 MR. ROGERS: That's not what he 1 that, but that's in evidence. 2 2 said. But in arguing you can use evidence 3 3 MR. PATTON: And what they tried to to argue to the jury. 4 4 insinuate with the 911 tape, which they never THE COURT: Yes, but not this 5 5 tied up with Robert, by the way. They played evidence. This was --6 6 it. And then when he came back the next day, MR. JOSEPH POWER: This directly 7 7 they never asked him about the 911 tape. I contradicts his argument. 8 8 probably should have moved to strike the 911 THE COURT: Counsel, then you have 9 9 to say that, but you can't play the tape. I'm tape as it applies to Robert, because they never 10 10 tied it up. But certainly they made that sorry. 11 argument. And that's fair game for me to say 11 MR. JOSEPH POWER: Well, I'm going 12 they made that argument. 12 to -- in open court, since they objected, I've 13 13 It doesn't mean they get to play got to offer to play it, and then you're going 14 14 the 911 tape. It doesn't mean I get to play the to deal with --15 15 tape by Sidney Chambers where he says he was MR. PATTON: No, no, Judge. He 16 shot at in his deposition, nor do I get to play 16 doesn't have to make the offer in front of the 17 17 the deposition testimony of Brown where he says jury. He did that earlier, by the way. 18 18 he was shot at, nor do I get to play the THE COURT: We're also doing it 19 19 deposition testimony of Mr. Jenkins where he right now too. 20 20 said he was shot at. We absolutely object to MR. PATTON: And we agree this 21 21 this. preserves the issue. 22 22 THE COURT: Counsel, I made the THE COURT: Guys, I'm not going to 23 ruling that you could play 5 minutes. And I let 23 run over it one more time. This is what I feel 24 24 part of it play so it wouldn't be so traumatic like is happening.

Page 85

1	MR. ROGERS: With regard to the	1	THE COURT: Okay. Okay.
2	60-01s, we were not able to argue during our	2	MR. PATTON: It wasn't the Court's
3	closing arguments about any 60-01 instructions	3	fault. It's the way it came about.
4	at all, because you had ruled that they would	4	If he wants to argue it in his
5	not be admissible.	5	rebuttal have we agreed on a time?
6	And then on the break after our	6	MR. MOTZ: Twenty-seven minutes.
7	closing arguments, counsel reraised the issue,	7	THE COURT: Twenty-seven minutes?
8	and you indicated you would reentertain it and	8	MR. PATTON: I thought it was 18.
9	possibly allow them.	9	THE COURT: Well, every group had
10	We are clearly prejudiced in not	10	different
11	being able to argue jury instructions based upon	11	MR. MOTZ: It was 18 with the
12	the Court telling us that they would not be	12	sidebar, 22 without yeah, without the sidebar
13	given. We have not gone into those. That is	13	is how much time they had left.
14	prejudicial to us, and they should not be	14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	allowed.	15	MR. MOTZ: I had all of the
16	THE COURT: It was kind of a	16	calculations per the clock so
17	toss-up it was I was on the fence either	17	THE COURT: I didn't time the
18	way last night when we were considering it.	18	sidebar. I took an estimate. I also was using
19	And then I my feeling was it	19	the clock in the courtroom, which seems a little
20	would confuse the jury and make them think that	20	different than some of the other clocks.
21	they had to make a determination with a	21	Is that what you all were using?
22	different standard of proof. That was my reason	22	MR. KOTIN: Your Honor, I used the
23	for not not allowing it.	23	clock in the courtroom, and I had 29 minutes.
24	And then when I heard, and	24	THE COURT: I had 29 minutes.
	·		
	Page 86		Page 88
1	rightfully so. I'm not criticizing you at all	1	MP KOTIN: But I didn't take out
1 2	rightfully so, I'm not criticizing you at all,	1	MR. KOTIN: But I didn't take out
2	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the	2	the sidebars.
2	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party,	2	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had
2 3 4	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his	2 3 4	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes.
2 3 4 5	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it.	2 3 4 5	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the
2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I	2 3 4 5 6	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys	2 3 4 5 6 7	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry MR. ROGERS: I'm not done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we going to go back, Your Honor? It's quarter to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry MR. ROGERS: I'm not done. MR. PATTON: I'm helping you here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we going to go back, Your Honor? It's quarter to. THE COURT: I was going to go right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry MR. ROGERS: I'm not done. MR. PATTON: I'm helping you here. I have no objection. I agree with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we going to go back, Your Honor? It's quarter to. THE COURT: I was going to go right back in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry MR. ROGERS: I'm not done. MR. PATTON: I'm helping you here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we going to go back, Your Honor? It's quarter to. THE COURT: I was going to go right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Rogers, you were talking about the contribution, that counterclaim, third party, and talk about Jackson, and talk about his criminal behavior, even though you rephrased it. When I sustained the objection, I don't know the exact word at this point, guys it's not just because of this. I almost let it in in the beginning. And it was my decision that it might be a little too much to put on the jury to have to think and consider that. I didn't want them to get sidetracked. MR. ROGERS: In reliance upon that, though, you're ruling not to put that in. I take care to pay attention to the instructions the Court tells me they're going to issue, and I argue those. I did not argue any 60-01 instructions on reliance on the Court's ruling MR. PATTON: Larry MR. ROGERS: I'm not done. MR. PATTON: I'm helping you here. I have no objection. I agree with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the sidebars. MR. JOSEPH POWER: And we had 27 minutes. THE COURT: I had 29 minutes by the clock in the courtroom. I thought it was 27 minutes by the sidebar. And we agreed, when I was announcing it, and everybody had a different amount, that I was going to go to the 37 minutes. MR. MOTZ: Let's instruct tonight. Let's get it done. THE COURT: Do you have it all for me in the order that I need? MR. MOTZ: I'm waiting for Larry to MR. ROGERS: You're not waiting on me. MR. JOSEPH POWER: What time are we going to go back, Your Honor? It's quarter to. THE COURT: I was going to go right back in.

			_
1	to go to the washroom.	1	contract, additional personnel.
2	THE COURT: Okay.	2	If we go to the second contract,
3	MR. PATTON: Just hold on, Joe. Do	3	2018, under "Additional Personnel," then you go
4	we have a problem with them leaving at 5:00 and	4	to the second page. It was increased to eight.
5	you being you may be 75 percent	5	And you might remember when we had
6	MR. JOSEPH POWER: No. She should	6	that little segment in Contract 1, if we go back
7	finish the instructions.	7	to it, where they talked about they were
8	MR. PATTON: I agree. What I'm	8	supposed to have two people on the third floor.
9	saying is I think you need to let this jury know	9	Then we have enhanced security, enhanced duty,
10	you may run over a little bit, you know, so	10	because they had a duty now to provide for the
11	they're not looking at the clock.	11	safety. They took on an added duty. And in
12	THE COURT: Do you know what? I	12	this particular contract, they were supposed to
13	think we can still do this.	13	have two full-time people on the third floor.
14	MR. KOTIN: Let's go.	14	Now, they took that out of the
15	THE COURT: I think we can do it.	15	second contract in terms of that issue. They
16	Take a few minutes to go to the washroom. I	16	took that out, but that didn't mean that they
17	won't start without anybody.	17	were able to cut things back.
18	(Recess taken from 3:34 PM to	18	And you might recall Mr. Jenkins,
19	3:55 PM.)	19	when I asked him about that, he said I was not
20	THE COURT: Folks, one of our	20	part of any dealings in respect to not having
21	jurors has to leave right at 5:00. Once	21	two guards on the third floor during
22	Mr. Rogers comes in, we'll get started.	22	working hours, Monday through Friday. He was
23	(Discussion held off the	23	not part of it. And he said that in his
24	record.)	24	deposition. And I reminded him of that, and he
	Page 90		Page 92
1	(Whereupon the following	1	agreed.
2	proceedings were had in the	2	Now, if we go back to timing on
3	hearing and presence of the	3	this, if we go to Exhibit 140, if we look at the
4	jury.)	4	time clock, Steve and counsel pointed this
5	THE DEPUTY: Court's back in	5	out earlier in the trial we've got it's
6	session. Please be seated and quiet.	6	approximately 5 to 3:00.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So we just told	7	And then if we go up to the time on
8	you the plaintiffs get the last word. It's	8	the turnstile, so that's 5 to 3:00. Going
9	called a rebuttal.	9	through the turnstile we have 3:01. Where is
10	Mr. Power?	10	that shown? Oh, 3:02:36.
11	PLAINTIFFS' McKENNA, HOOVER AND LIEB	11	When they go through, what time is
12	REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT	12	it when they go through?
13	MR. JOSEPH POWER: Thank you,	13	MR. GRANT: It says 6 minutes,
14	Your Honor.	14	6 minutes later.
15	All of the time is even. We don't	15	MR. JOSEPH POWER: Okay. So
16	have any more time. They're allotted the same	16	6 minutes later from the time. So go back to
17	amount of time as us. We'll just offer a	17	the clock again. Thirty-five seconds. You see
18	rebuttal.	18	46 seconds, this is their timer, showing them
19	When they talk about who was in a	19	going up the escalator. We see 5 to 3:00.
20	good position to decide Security, they said it's	20	So then we have on their time
21	the building. Well, AlliedBarton is the	21	clock, we have 6:48 now. So 6:48 they're going
22	security specialist.	22	through the turnstile and put the time on it
23	And, if we go to the first contract	23	the first call to the 911, put the time on. And
24	on 1019, we have six standby people in the first	24	you should look at your notes on this. 3:12:51
	on 1017, we have an standay people in the illst		you should look at your notes on this. 5.12.51
	Page 91		Page 93

1 is the time the call went in to 911. 1 wasn't me, that was Mr. Brown. 2 So they have 11 minutes and 40 2 Now, counsel says no one was using 3 3 seconds from the time that they go through the duress codes around this time. That's absurd. 4 turnstiles until the time of the 911 call, 4 That was one of his comments in closing. That's 5 5 plenty of time for Mr. Chambers to call for a absurd. 6 lockdown to stop the elevators. 6 Now, if we go to 5-325, that's why 7 7 As Mr. Jenkins said, we could during the trial I asked -- it's interesting. 8 8 recall the elevators and stop them, not only Did Mr. Jackson ever read the AlliedBarton 9 9 from 3, but also from 31. So they had almost materials. I asked Mr. Brown, why is that? 10 10 12 minutes to do something from the time Right on their materials "Don't be a hero." 11 Mr. Jackson and Mr. Brown entered through the 11 Now, why is Mr. Jackson repeating 12 12 turnstiles. something that's in their materials all the 13 Now, you remember when -- you want 13 time? Think about it. How did Mr. Jackson come 14 14 to talk about representations, remember when up with stuff right out of their materials? 15 15 counsel with our expert, Hauri, Mr. Hauri said That was all the defense. They were already 16 16 Mr. Brown, who knew none of the post orders, he preparing for their defense in this case, "Don't 17 knew none of the lessons, he knew really 17 be a hero." 18 nothing, he was so poorly trained. That's why 18 Well, what we wanted them to do was 19 he talked about 50/50, because of how poorly 19 protect people. That's what they were supposed 20 20 trained Brown was. to do. That's what they agreed to do. 21 And counsel represented to 21 They said they didn't ask for 22 Mr. Hauri at his deposition, he had worked there 22 sympathy for Mr. Brown. It's kind of sad that 23 23 for 4 years. He said oh, I didn't realize. he calls up Mr. Jenkins as the epitome of 24 That's why the excuse, why in his deposition he 24 whatever, and he's saying he feels so sorry for Page 94 Page 96 1 didn't know anything. 1 Mr. Brown, he's so sorry. 2 2 It turned out on redirect, if Not one time, not one time did one 3 3 you'll recall, at the time of his deposition, he of their witnesses say we feel sorry for the 4 4 was still working for AlliedBarton. families, we feel sorry for the victims. It's 5 5 Now, wouldn't you think after all about Mr. Brown. 6 6 of these years and what happened here, now he's MR. PATTON: Objection, motion in 7 7 questioned about not knowing anything, he would limine, move to strike that comment. 8 8 THE COURT: Was it granted on have learned something? He still hadn't learned 9 9 anything at the time of his deposition. At the motion in limine, counsel? 10 10 time of trial he still doesn't even know the MR. PATTON: Move to strike the 11 proper distance to keep from a potentially 11 comment. 12 aggressive person. So that's the evidence. 12 THE COURT: I'm going to strike --13 13 MR. JOSEPH POWER: What comment? And, counselor, he can do whatever 14 14 he wants. But I think you'll recall we had to It's been about Mr. Brown. 15 15 refresh Mr. Brown's memory about where we were MR. PATTON: No. I said expressing 16 positioned. And then, when he refreshed his 16 sympathy. 17 17 memory, he was the one that positioned us. He THE COURT: Sympathy. 18 18 said no, it was bulkier. MR. PATTON: Yeah. 19 19 Mr. Brown, didn't you tell me to MR. JOSEPH POWER: No, no. What is 20 20 make it bulkier? He said I did. Didn't you this about in terms of all this psychological 21 21 tell me he was almost hugging you? I did. treatment that they're claiming he has? How is 22 22 Wouldn't that look suspicious to that relevant in this case? 23 somebody like Mr. Chambers? Well, it looked 23 THE COURT: I don't know. I don't 24 24 suspicious to me. That was Mr. Brown. That know --Page 97 Page 95

1 MR. JOSEPH POWER: That's what 1 was shot and Mr. Goodson was shot, there was no 2 counsel was arguing in his case about Mr. Brown. 2 shooting going on. And that would have been the 3 3 MR. PATTON: I object to counsel time 4:30, 5:00, the doors were coming off, 4 arguing with the Court. 4 they're trying to pull the doors off. There was 5 5 MR. JOSEPH POWER: Your Honor, I no shooting at all on the 911 tape. So that's 6 don't understand what's being sustained. He 6 all we're saying. That's the evidence. 7 7 argued this. In fact, if you look at 8 8 THE COURT: No, no, what's being Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Jenkins said he didn't see 9 9 sustained is the statement that -- if you go Mr. Jackson. He heard a shot, and he saw some 10 10 back -- I don't want to say it in front of the plaster coming off the wall. 11 jury. Nobody expressed sympathy to the family. 11 But he never testified that he saw 12 12 MR. JOSEPH POWER: Okay. Mr. Jackson coming at him shooting, as counsel 13 I'm just saying it's all about 13 represented in his argument. Totally untrue. 14 14 Mr. Brown. That's what counsel is saying. It's The evidence doesn't bear it out on the 911 15 15 an appeal of sympathy. tape, nor does Mr. Jenkins back him up on that. 16 16 You all agreed when you were sworn He says he heard a shot. And, if 17 17 he did, Mr. Jenkins didn't hear a shot. It as jurors to not base your verdict on sympathy, 18 whether that's for the plaintiff or whether 18 could be explained if it came from someplace 19 that's for Mr. Brown. 19 other than the lobby that you wouldn't hear it 20 20 This isn't about Mr. Brown. This on the tape so ... 21 is about AlliedBarton and how poorly trained 21 But Mr. Jackson wasn't in the lobby 22 Mr. Brown was. And that's the truth. How could 22 shooting these guys. 23 23 anybody disagree with that? Admittedly. Mr. Brown who -- or should have 24 Defendant. He didn't know his 24 known that there were two ladies underneath the Page 98 Page 100 1 lessons, he flunked the test on the applicable 1 desk on 911 in making -- on that conversation, 2 2 stuff. There was no remediation. and no one helped -- helped them at all. In 3 3 They violated our contract. They fact, at certain points in time, you might 4 4 violated our contract when they were supposed to recall Ms. Murphy thought she was a goner. 5 5 train them, test them, and they did none of Now, he says that Robert's 6 6 that. immediate issue on the third floor was to get 7 Now, you may recall when they say 7 Jackson away from people. 8 8 about these shots being fired. We played with I'm not going to show that tape 9 9 Mr. -- their expert, Mr. MacGeoy. again, but Jackson took him over to the 10 10 At the end, before he retired for mid-rise. We don't see the red Xs any more, but 11 the night, I asked to play, and you may recall, 11 there were 14 or 15 red Xs that he took him over 12 after Ms. Murphy said on the 911 tape they're 12 to rather than taking him over to the high-rise 13 13 breaking the doors down, I played the tape for where there were no people there. 14 14 well over a minute. There were no signs of And he could have done something. 15 15 shots being fired. You may recall that. There I said to Mr. Brown he could have fainted. He's 16 16 are no shots fired on that tape. smart. It's true. You could faint. You could 17 17 tell him -- I said, ad he didn't talk about And I went through with Mr. MacGeoy 18 18 that. when the shots were fired. And at each time 19 19 that he recorded them, he even had it mixed up. Our expert talked about that, 20 20 He had Mr. Hoover being shot second. It wasn't. Mr. Hauri. You just say I can't swipe you 21 21 Mr. Hoover was third. through, you need your own pass, my pass won't 22 22 But until later on, when Mr. Tenton work for you, the alarms will go off. Talk to 23 arrived, we have around 10 minutes or so, we 23 him. Delay it. Don't try to convince Chambers 24 24 have Mr. Goodson. Between the time Mr. Hoover that everything is fine.

Page 101

1 And Chambers should have gone, put 1 are trying to bolster Mr. Chambers' credibility 2 it on lockdown, immediate lockdown, or put the 2 by showing this man, as he said, was probably 3 escalators on hold, recall the escalators. That 3 around there earlier. 4 could have been done in less than 2 minutes, 4 Why would he make that up? Why 5 5 less than 2 minutes. would he swear to testimony that is adverse to 6 So your decision here today is 6 him when he's under oath? It makes no sense. 7 7 going to be whether it's accessible for security We're not vouching for his 8 8 officers to not read their lessons, not follow capabilities. They vouched for his capabilities 9 9 when they put him in there. their contract, abandon their post, not follow 10 10 through, not question people early on. Was he incompetent? Yes. Should 11 We're not talking about, you know, 11 they have fired him? They probably never should 12 12 early on. You're there. You have a presence. have hired him. And they did fire him. They 13 You're deterring. That's the major point this 13 fired him because they said he abandoned his 14 whole time. And when they talk about 14 post. 15 15 Mr. Jackson, he's been around there. We saw Well, he abandoned his post here as 16 16 that tape. well, and three people died, and one person was 17 17 seriously injured as a result of the abandonment But Mr. Patton in opening said the 18 way we can distinguish Jackson is he's got the 18 of his post, a similar issue to be sure. 19 19 envelope. And that's true. Now, in respect to Robert, Robert 20 20 You've got 100,000 people coming in made himself to be a victim. At the end of the 21 there every day. They've produced nothing. 21 day, they put Robert in a bad position by not 22 We've whipped through hundreds of hours of tape 22 properly training him, not properly testing him; 23 23 and hundreds of thousands of people, and we can that the contract required. 24 24 And by the time Mr. -- Detective say he's not there. Page 102 Page 104 1 You know, if he's not carrying an 1 Tenton arrived, three people were already gone. 2 2 envelope, and he's coming in with 20,000 people, He didn't get up there for about 12 minutes. 3 3 it's hard to pick up. We're corroborating what Things had escalated well beyond control. 4 4 they're testifying about under oath. If you're going to control these 5 5 This is their agent. He's not things, as they teach, you have to do it 6 6 here. We're taking their agent's sworn initially in the beginning, and, nine times out 7 7 testimony under oath. of ten, it will work. 8 8 I don't know if he's as incompetent If the people on the third floor 9 9 as they suggest; maybe why they fired him. mattered, why didn't Mr. Brown take him to the 10 10 Maybe he was. We don't know that. left, rather than to the right? 11 Now, Mr. Jenkins said he's great. 11 Now, in respect to the damages, 12 He says everybody is great. They work together. 12 they knew what this case was about. You were 13 13 Of course. He's an expert. He's been sworn in as jurors. We said they were 14 14 designated an expert by them. So it's negligent, and you'll see the instructions about 15 15 predictable. all of the negligence we claim. We have to 16 I don't know. It's very strange. 16 prove one or more. 17 17 We're not vouching for Mr. Chambers' Would you, based on the law and the 18 18 capabilities. In a very short time, he was evidence, be able to return a verdict for 19 19 moved up to Supervisor, he was up in this many millions of dollars, and each of you said 20 20 position. you would. And they just said we didn't do 21 21 He was Account Manager. He wasn't anything wrong. We didn't do anything wrong. 22 22 paid as an Account Manager, and he didn't become Now, they want to come in and just 23 an Account Manager after the fact, as we know. 23 throw something out, which doesn't follow the 24 24 It's very strange, other than we instructions in this case, regarding the type of

Page 105

1 relationships, regarding the type of 1 (Discussion held off the 2 relationships they had between each of the 2 record.) 3 3 MR. JOSEPH POWER: But I believe parties. That will be for you to determine. 4 But, as I said, Michael McKenna had 4 our numbers are fair and reasonable. And I 5 5 thought about it because of "target." He says 23.1 more years with his family, with Matthew, 6 with Warren, with Amber, with Suzanne, with 6 everybody was a target. That's what he claims. 7 7 Jonah. Everybody was a target. That's what Mr. Patton 8 8 Put up number 63A-007. That was offered. 9 9 taken by Warren, the website. Officer Tenton said no, there 10 10 Pick out 63C-004. That's with his weren't targets there. There's one target, and 11 older -- with his older sons, Matthew and 11 there were other targets for lawyers. He said 12 12 Warren. he could have killed Mr. Danzig, but he didn't. 13 And 63C-006, I'm not going to go 13 He wasn't a target. He was targeting lawyers. 14 through all of these. That's with family 14 And they want to talk about their 15 15 visiting. evidence? They said they brought a witness in 16 16 I'm not going to revisit. You've to say Robert was helping people, knocking on 17 their doors? No. 17 seen the evidence. You've seen what type of man 18 Michael Malec McKenna was. You heard about the 18 They used their expert to look at 19 trips, the skiing, the fishing for smelt, all of 19 the police report of a lawyer named Paul Odell. 20 20 those things you heard. With your composite You may recall this came up through one of their 21 memories, think of all of the things he did, not 21 experts. Paul Odell saw a black gentleman in a 22 only for them, but for his community, for 22 gray suit, which we assumed was Mr. Brown, 23 23 everybody. You are to judge the McKenna knocking on a lawyer's door. 24 24 And Mr. Odell testified at his relationship. Page 106 Page 108 1 And I said you'll be instructed on 1 deposition that he heard someone telling a 2 2 the law because of the nature of the wrongful lawyer -- knocking on the door, asking him if 3 3 death case in the McKenna case. Based on the he's a lawyer. 4 4 fact that he left a wife and four children, the Then this guy came, a black 5 5 law presumes some substantial pecuniary loss. gentleman in a gray suit, came and knocked on my 6 6 It should not be for counsel, after door. And he said are you a lawyer? And he 7 7 he's had numerous misrepresentations throughout said I am. What should we do? And he said he 8 8 this whole trial, to now stand and suggest a didn't remember what he responded, and he just 9 9 figure that cheapens his life, that cheapens left. 10 10 Michael's life, because you are to judge the Paul Odell knew what to do. He 11 relationship that Michael Malec McKenna had with 11 knew that Michael had been shot. So that was 12 Matthew, Warren, Amber, Jonah and his wife, the 12 the actual testimony. 13 13 marital relationship that exists between Suzanne No one came in here to say Robert 14 14 and Michael. And you're going to put a value on Brown was a hero. Robert Brown was running the 15 15 that life. It should not be the cheap value other way. Mr. Jackson came to the left, where 16 16 that counsel suggests, in particular as to the the exit was, and Robert ran to the right. He 17 17 loss of society, the loss of the love, the couldn't find an exit, he came back, and he was frozen. That's the evidence in the case. 18 18 affection that was shared between these five 19 19 family members. The Court will divide it up, And I was getting to the point of 20 20 but, ladies and gentlemen, I suggest to you that why didn't Mr. Jackson kill Michael McKenna? 21 the numbers that I talk about, from 28 to 21 That was his target. He killed other people. 22 22 \$30 million for the loss of society, or the And he kept threatening saying I'm going to kill 23 other areas I've already discussed, it all 23 him, I'm going to kill him, and he didn't. He 24 24 depends on Officer Tenton's testimony -did ultimately, but during that whole period of

Page 109

1 time, he didn't kill him. 1 believe, will instruct you is that in evaluating 2 And I thought and thought why 2 the credibility of a witness, you may consider 3 3 didn't he do it? Why didn't he do it? And I that with the sensibility and opportunity to 4 thought do you know why he didn't do it? As sad 4 observe memory, manner, interest, bias, 5 5 as it is, you enjoyed watching him suffer. qualifications, experience, and previous 6 That's all I could conclude from the whole 6 inconsistent statements. 7 7 thing, that that must be the reason why he So when you saw video of prior 8 8 couldn't -- he didn't do it. depositions where the opposite answers, and 9 9 Now, at the end of the day, they different answers were given to the same 10 10 want to talk about Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson, he questions, those are inconsistent statements 11 11 was psychologically deranged, insane, I don't that you're supposed to weigh in evaluating the 12 12 credibility of witnesses. know. He behaved as an insane person. Insanity 13 is a defense. It's a condition. Whether he's 13 When you hear evidence that 14 14 assigned some fault by you, I don't know. describes the close-knit nature of the 15 15 I think they are the main problem, real estate rental market and the security 16 16 because they were supposed to prevent the companies, and how people go from one company to 17 Jacksons of the world from getting up beyond the 17 another and work from MB Real Estate to Allied 18 18 to Titan, those are -- that's relevant evidence third floor. 19 19 So whatever percentage, I think it to the biases. 20 20 should be 10, 10 percent, because it's 9 out of And, when you hear about people 21 10, 20 percent Mr. Jackson, but don't let him 21 like Mr. Jenkins, who came in here and fought 22 22 get off the hook by claiming oh, it was all tooth and nail with Mr. Power about simple 23 23 Jackson. It's all Jackson's fault. It isn't things, simple things, you have to weigh his 24 all Jackson's fault; it is their fault as well. 24 interest and bias in the -- when you consider Page 110 Page 112 1 It is their fault primarily because they're 1 his credibility. 2 2 supposed to be trained security officers, and He told you -- and I asked him -they didn't do their job from the beginning to 3 3 did you go up to the suite afterwards? And he 4 4 said he did. And he said he saw bodies in the 5 5 And just since James is not here, I 6 6 think it's insulting that they didn't even talk And the only person he expressed 7 7 about Ruth Leib and give a number. The numbers any concern for and sympathy for was Robert 8 8 that they gave were insulting to us, but they Brown. That's the only person he expressed 9 9 don't even address Ruth at all. So that's my sympathy and concern for. 10 10 comment for James and Ruth Leib. MR. PATTON: I object to that, 11 MR. PATTON: Objection as to time. 11 Judge. 12 THE COURT: I'm showing that I've 12 MR. ROGERS: I'll withdraw that. 13 13 got about 4 and a half to 5 minutes, counsel. That's the only person --14 PLAINTIFF HOOVER REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT 14 MR. PATTON: Can I ask the jury to 15 15 MR. ROGERS: Can you put up 65-003? disregard that comment? 16 This is a picture of Louise Hoover 16 THE COURT: I'll unring that bell 17 17 and her husband. She is the woman who lives with regard to the last statement. 18 every day without Mr. Hoover. And I just wanted 18 MR. ROGERS: He made it a point to 19 to touch upon a few things that counsel 19 tell you that he cried with Robert Brown. He 20 20 mentioned, and then I will take my seat. made it a point to tell you about his 21 21 You will receive an instruction relationship with Robert Brown, and that's all 22 22 from the Court, I believe, that tells you how to he expressed to you. 23 evaluate the credibility of witnesses. 23 Three people died, one person shot 24 24 One of the things the Court, I and seriously injured, he wanted to talk to you Page 111 Page 113

1 1 about Robert Brown. That's why we don't talk about percentages of 2 With respect to the credibility of 2 fault to him. 3 3 witnesses, you heard from three experts from the I'll stop. Thank you very much. 4 defense; Dr. Raphael they flew in from 4 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 5 5 California to render one opinion, and that Ladies and gentlemen, at this point 6 related to the absence of conscious pain and 6 I'm required to read to you the jury 7 7 suffering. They paid her \$30,000. \$30,000 to instructions on the law. I'm not going to 8 8 fly in from California. speed-read them. I know I've got a juror that 9 9 You heard from Mr. MacGeoy, you has to leave at 5:00. I respect that. I'm 10 10 heard from Dr. Scarborough. working toward that. 11 Dr. Scarborough thought Ms. Murphy 11 If I can't finish, I'll finish them 12 12 was one of the spouses of Mr. McKenna or in the morning, but I think I can do that 13 Mr. Hoover. He didn't even know she was the 13 without speed reading. You'll get a copy of 14 14 secretary. That matters, ladies and gentlemen. these -- don't worry. Some of them only have 15 15 That matters, what they put before you. one line on them. You'll get a copy of these 16 You heard from Mr. MacGeoy; paid 16 back in the jury room for your deliberations. 17 him \$42,000, and he couldn't tell you a detail 17 You don't have to sit and memorize them. 18 to save his life about this case. 18 JURY INSTRUCTIONS 19 Thank you for your time. We will 19 THE COURT: Now that the evidence 20 20 be awaiting your verdict. has concluded, I will instruct you as to the law 21 MR. KOTIN: Sixty seconds, 21 and your duties. The law regarding this case is 22 Your Honor. Okay? 22 contained within the instructions I will give to 23 23 THE COURT: Okay. you. 24 MR. KOTIN: Hold me to this. 24 You must consider the Court's Page 114 Page 116 1 PLAINTIFF GOODSON REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT 1 instructions as a whole, not picking out some 2 MR. KOTIN: Mr. Patton told you 2 instructions and disregarding others. 3 that the video doesn't lie. 3 It is your duty to resolve this 4 4 Do you know what else doesn't lie? case by determining the facts based on the 5 5 The contract. The contract that AlliedBarton evidence and following the law given in the 6 entered into to protect the lives of the people 6 instructions. 7 7 in the building, that doesn't lie. Your verdict must not be based upon 8 Do scenario training, folks. Teach 8 speculation, prejudice or sympathy. Each party, 9 9 your security officers what to do and how to whether a corporation or an individual, should 10 react, when somebody shows up with a gun. Is 10 receive your same fair consideration. 11 that such a crazy idea? Teach them, their 11 My rulings, my remarks or 12 security officers, to protect lives. Excuse me 12 instructions do not indicate any opinion as to 13 for yelling. 13 the facts. You will decide what facts have been 14 14 Mr. Patton said why aren't we proven. 15 15 talking about percentages for Joseph Jackson. Facts may be proven by evidence or 16 Because Joseph Jackson was the danger that 16 reasonable inferences drawn from the evidence. 17 AlliedBarton was hired to protect against. 17 Evidence consists of the testimony of witnesses 18 When Mr. Rogers gave you the 18 and the exhibits admitted by the Court. You 19 example of an umbrella that collapses and you 19 should consider all of the evidence, without 20 get rained on, you don't blame the rain that you 20 regard to which party produced it. 21 21 got wet. The umbrella was there to protect you You may use common sense gained 22 22 from your experiences in life in evaluating what from the rain. 23 AlliedBarton was there to protect 23 you see and hear during the trial. 24 24 you from Joseph Jackson. He was the danger. You are the only judges of the Page 115 Page 117 credibility of the witnesses. You will decide the weight to be given to the testimony of each of them.

In evaluating the credibility of a witness, you may consider that witness' ability and opportunity to observe, their memory, manner, their interest, bias, qualifications, experience, and any previous inconsistent statement or act by the witness concerning an issue important to the case.

You should not do any independent research -- any independent investigation or research on any subject relating to the case.

What you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence. This includes any press, radio or television programs. It also includes any information available on the Internet. Such programs, reports, and information are not evidence, and your verdict must not be influenced in any way by such material.

For example, you must not use the Internet, including Google, Wikipedia, Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, or any other sources that

would be unfair to the parties, and a violation of your oath, to base your decision on information outside this courtroom.

You should feel free to remind each other that your verdict should be based only on the evidence admitted in court and that you cannot use information from my other sources.

If you become aware of any violation of these instructions, it is your legal duty to report this to me immediately.

Disobeying these instructions could cause a mistrial, meaning all of our efforts have been wasted, and we have to start all over again with a new trial. If you violate these instructions, you could be found in contempt of court.

An opening statement is what an attorney expects the evidence will be. A closing argument is given at the conclusion of the case and is a summary of what the attorney contends the evidence has shown.

If any statement or argument of an attorney is not supported by the law or the evidence, you should disregard that statement or

Page 118

Page 120

you might use every day to search for any information about the case, or the law which applies to the case, or the people involved in the case, including the parties, witnesses, lawyers and Judge.

You must not provide any information about the case to anyone by any means at all, and this includes posting information about the case or your thoughts about it on any device or Internet site, including blogs, chatrooms or any social networking website, such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, or any other means.

You cannot use any electronic devices or services to communicate about this case, and this includes cell phones, smartphones, laptops, the Internet, and any other tools of technology. The use of any such devices or services in connection with your duties is prohibited.

The reason for these instructions is that your verdict must be based only on the evidence presented in this courtroom and the law I will provide to you in my instructions. It

argument.

The testimony of several witnesses was presented by videotape and the reading of testimony. You should give this testimony the same consideration you would give it had the witness personally appeared in court.

A fact or a group of facts may, based on logic and common sense, lead you to a conclusion as to other facts. This is known as circumstantial evidence.

A fact may be proved by circumstantial evidence. For example, if you're in a building, and a person enters who is wet and is holding an umbrella, you might conclude that it's raining outside. Circumstantial evidence is entitled to the same consideration as any other type of evidence.

You have heard a witness give opinions about matters requiring special knowledge or skill. You should judge this testimony in the same way you judge the testimony from any other witness.

The fact that said person has given an opinion does not mean that you are required

Page 119

1 to accept it. Give the testimony whatever 1 decedents' and the plaintiffs' injuries. It 2 weight you think it deserves, considering the 2 need not be the only cause, nor the last or 3 reasons given for the opinion, the witness' 3 nearest cause. It is sufficient if it combines 4 qualifications, and all of the other evidence in 4 with another cause resulting in injury. 5 5 the case. When I say a party has the burden 6 When I use the word negligence in 6 of proof on any proposition or use the 7 7 these instructions, I mean the failure to do expression if you find or if you decide, I mean 8 8 something which a reasonably careful person you must be persuaded, considering all of the 9 9 would do, or the doing of something which a evidence in the case, that the proposition on 10 10 reasonably careful person would not under which he has the burden of proof is more 11 circumstances similar to those shown by the 11 probably true than not true. 12 evidence. 12 The plaintiffs have the burden of 13 The law does not say how a 13 proving each of the following propositions: 14 14 reasonably careful person would act under those First, that the defendants acted or 15 15 circumstances. That is for you to decide. failed to act in one of the ways claimed by the 16 When I use the words ordinary care, 16 plaintiffs as stated to you in these 17 I mean the care a reasonably careful person 17 instructions, and in so acting or failing to 18 would use under circumstances similar to those 18 act, the defendants were negligent. 19 shown by the evidence. 19 Second, that Michael Malec McKenna, 20 20 The law does not say how a Allen J. Hoover, and Paul Goodson were killed, 21 reasonably careful person would act under those 21 and Ruth Zak Leib was injured. 22 circumstances. That is for you to decide. 22 Third, that the negligence of the 23 23 An attorney is allowed, if the defendants was a proximate cause of death and 24 witness agrees, to talk to a witness to learn 24 injury. Page 122 Page 124 1 what testimony will be given. Such an interview 1 You are to consider these 2 2 by itself does not affect the credibility of the propositions as to each defendant separately. 3 3 witness. If you find from your consideration of all of 4 4 It was the duty of the defendants the evidence that each of these propositions has 5 5 before and at the time of the occurrence to use been proved as to any one or more of the 6 6 ordinary care for the safety of Michael Malec defendants, then your verdict should be for the 7 McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and Ruth 7 plaintiffs and against those defendants. 8 8 Zak Leib. This means that it was the duty of On the other hand, if you find from 9 9 defendants to be free from negligence. your consideration of all of the evidence that 10 10 More than one person may be to any of these propositions has not been proved as 11 blame for causing an injury. If you decide that 11 to one or more of the defendants, then your 12 12 the defendant was negligent and that their verdict should be for those defendants. I'm 13 13 negligence was a proximate cause of injury to trying. 14 14 the plaintiff, it is not a defense that some The plaintiffs, the Estate of 15 15 third person who is not a party to the suit may Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of 16 16 also have been to blame. Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 17 17 However, if you decide that the Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib's 18 18 sole proximate cause of injury to the plaintiffs complaints consist of wrongful death and 19 19 was the conduct of some person other than the negligence counts. 20 20 defendants, then your verdict should be for the The issues to be decided by you 21 21 defendants. under the wrongful death and negligence counts 22 22 When I use the expression proximate of the complaint are as follows: 23 cause, I mean a cause that, in the natural or 23 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 24 24 ordinary course of events, produced the Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of

Page 125

Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib, claimed that they were injured and sustained damage, and that the defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, Individually, and/or by and through its employee and agent, Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Sidney Chambers, and each of them, was negligent in one or more of the following respects: A, failing to ensure the safety of all persons on the property, including Michael Ruth Leib, in violation of the security contract. Or, B, failing to provide adequate Security personnel and services for the protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security personnel and services of Joseph Jackson. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. Cr, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages or Joseph Jackson. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. The Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor of the Soo
that the ywere injured and sustained damage, and that the defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, individually, and/or by and through its employee and agent, Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and and/or by and through its employee and agent Robert Brown, and and/or others and so with the property, including Michael Black McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Lelb, in violation of the security and services for the protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and falling to protect Ruth Lelb from injury, in violation of the security contract. 20 Or, C, falling to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 21 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. 22 or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. 3 order to alert fellow Mpersonnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 4 Or, C, failing to timely recall the promote of the use of duress codes to alert fellow AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton
that the defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, individually, and/or by and through its employee and agent, Robert Brown, and/or by and through its employee and agent sidney Chambers, and each of them, was negligent in one or more of the following respects: A, failing to ensure the safety of all persons on the property, including Michael Match McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Leib, in violation of the security contract. Cor, B, failing to provide adequate security protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect security personnel and services for the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry 24 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to be Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. The page 126 entry above the third floor of the 500 West oddes in an AlliedBarton active control post of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, E, failing to tracet duress oddes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton pest onder to roder to alert fellow MiledBarton personnel of orders to alert fellow MiledBarton personnel of ord
5 Services, LLC, individually, and/or by and through its employee and agent, Robert Brown, and address and agent, Robert Brown, and address and action of them, was negligent in one or more of the following respects: 9 In one or more of the following respects: 10 A, failing to ensure the safety of 10 A, failing to restrain Joseph Jackson when he posed a risk of harm to others in the building. 11 In one or more of the following respects: 12 Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and 12 Contract. 13 Ruth Leib, In violation of the security personnel and services for the 16 security personnel and services for the 16 security personnel and services for the 16 protection of life and safety of persons, 17 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and falling to protect 19 post. 18 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and falling to protect 19 post. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and falling to protect 19 post. 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 20 Gr., C, falling to inspect the 16 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 21 Or, C, falling to inspect the 16 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 22 Or, C, falling to for the 500 West 2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, and 3 individual possessing a weapon. 23 or, F, failing to treate duress 2 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 3 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 24 Or, H, failing to treate duress 2 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 3 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 3 or, H, failing to use the existing 4 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of a risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 3 or H, failing to use the existing 4 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of 6 in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in individual post and for the file of ders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 6 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or
trespassing. Trespassing are a fix of harm to security Trespassing. Trespassion arisk of harm to others and trespassion arisk of harm to others. Trespassing. Trespassion tresperts with others access to the testire frown and trespassion arisk of harm to security
7 and/or by and through its employee and agent 8 Sidney Chambers, and each of them, was negligent 9 in one or more of the following respects: 10 A, failing to ensure the safety of 11 all persons on the property, including Michael 12 Math Leib, in violation of the security 13 Ruth Leib, in violation of the security 14 contract. 15 Or, B, failing to provide adequate 16 security personnel and services for the 17 protection of Ilfe and safety of persons, 18 Including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 21 security contract. 21 Security personnel and services of the 22 or, c, failing to inspect the 23 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 24 Or, D, failing to deny entry 25 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 26 or, C, failing to inspect the 27 including bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 28 Or, D, failing to deny entry 29 Page 126 20 Or, C, failing to inspect the 20 including bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 21 or, C, failing to inspect the 22 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 23 or, C, failing to inspect the 24 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 25 Or, D, failing to often 500 West 26 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. 27 odes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 28 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 39 Or, H, failing to time building to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 30 order to alert fellow MilledBarton personnel of the first of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 30 order to alert fellow MilledBarton personnel of the first of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 31 order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the first of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 31 order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the f
Sidney Chambers, and each of them, was negligent in one or more of the following respects: in one or more of the following respects: in one or more of the following respects: in the building. Or, N, providing Joseph Jackson and access to the interior spaces and floors above the third floor the security personnel and services for the propertotinof life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and security personnel and services for the protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and falling to protect Ruth Leib from Injury, in violation of the security contract. 20
in one or more of the following respects: A, failing to ensure the safety of All persons on the property, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Lelb, in violation of the security contract. Or, B, failing to provide adequate security personnel and services for the rotection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Page 126 or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 page 128 includiad possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to create duress order to alert fellow personnel and sor others. Or, G, failing to read duress and around to security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel and sor of the security personnel and not make the mark of the security personnel and sor others. Or, C, failing to use the existing dures code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of a fisk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. In the building. Or, N, providing Joseph Jackson access to the interior spaces and floors above the third floor by Robert Brown using his security pass to provide Joseph Jackson entry through the unterstiles. Or, O, failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. security person was under dures and at risk of harm, and to timely respond. Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and security personnel and/or others. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
A, failing to ensure the safety of all persons on the property, including Michael Malec McKenna, Alled J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Leib, in violation of the security contract. Dr. B, failing to provide adequate security personnel and services for the protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Alled Barton protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security contract. Or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 Page 128 Tentry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, C, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing dures code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlledBarton personnel of coders to alert fellow places of the interior spaces and floors above the third floor of the security security personnel and services for the third floor by Robert Brown using his security personse late the third floor of the security security personse and services for the stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. Or, O, failing to take any steps to or, O, failing to recognize that Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of harm, and to timely respond. Dr. R, failing to provide adequate training on the provision of security services. Page 128 Page 128 Page 128 Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Rob
all persons on the property, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson and Ruth Leib, in violation of the security contract. 10 Or, B, failing to provide adequate 11 security personnel and services for the 12 protection of life and safety of persons, 13 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 14 bloover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 15 protection of life and safety of persons, 16 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 17 protection of life and safety of persons, 18 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 21 security contract. 21 Robert Brown was above the third floor. 22 Or, C, failing to inspect the 23 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 24 Or, D, failing to deny entry 25 Page 126 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West 26 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. 27 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 28 elevators. 29 Or, C, failing to treate duress 29 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 29 order to alert fellow personnel and/or others. 20 Or, G, failing to train security 21 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 22 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 30 Or, H, failing to use the existing 31 dure the fill floor of the sound in the foregoing was the 32 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 33 leib's injuries. 34 Or, H, failing to use the existing 35 derived the fillow AlliedBarton post 36 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 37 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 38 orders to alert fellow MiledBarton post 39 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 40 Or, H, failing to use the existing 41 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 41 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 41 Or, H, failing to use the existing 42 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or
the third floor by Robert Brown using his security pass to provide Joseph Jackson entry through the turnstiles. Or, B, failing to provide adequate for, D, failing to take any steps to security personnel and services for the for protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security contract. Or, D, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 Page 128 the third floor by Robert Brown using his security pass to provide Joseph Jackson entry through the turnstiles. Or, O, failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. Or, P, Robert Brown using his security pass to provide Joseph Jackson entry through the turnstiles. Or, O, failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. Or, P, Robert Brown using his security pass to provide Joseph Jackson entry through the turnstiles. Or, O, failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. Or, P, Robert Brown abandoning his post. Or, P, Robert Brown abandoning his Or, O, failing to recagnize that Roth Leib from injury, in violation of the 20 Or, C, failing to recagnize that 21 Robert Brown abandoning his Or, P, Robert Brown abandoning his Por, P, Robert Brown abandoning his Or, S, failing to recagnize that acces
Ruth Leib, in violation of the security contract. 15 Or, B, failing to provide adequate 16 security personnel and services for the 17 protection of life and safety of persons, 18 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 21 security contract. 22 Or, C, failing to inspect the 23 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 24 Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West 2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 3 Or, F, failing to create duress 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 10 personnel and/or others. 10 Or, H, failing to use the existing 11 draw by the thirds of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to Scodes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 10 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post orders to alert tellow AlliedBarton
contract. 15 Or, B, failing to provide adequate 16 security personnel and services for the 17 protection of life and safety of persons, 18 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 21 security contract. 22 Or, C, failing to inspect the 23 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 24 Or, D, failing to date and a failing to protect 25 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. 26 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 27 elevators. 28 Or, E, failing to oreate duress 29 or, C, failing to to implement 29 dadquate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide. 30 individual possessing a weapon. 31 individual possessing a weapon. 42 Or, E, failing to create duress 43 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. 44 Or, H, failing to use the existing 45 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 46 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 47 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 48 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 49 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 40 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post 41 orders or dealy Joseph Jackson from accessing the premises above the third floor. 41 by C, F, Gailing to recognize that 42 cor, C, failing to recognize that 42 or, R, failing to provide adequate 43 training on the provision of security services. 41 Page 126 42 Page 128 43 Page 128 44 Page 128 45 Or, S, failing to implement 46 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 47 scenario training to provide the security 48 services it contracted to provide. 49 Services it contracted to provide. 50 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 51 Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 62 Or, G, failing to train security 73 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 74 Illen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 75 Or, G, failing to train security 76 Deceased to five dures codes to alert 77 In defen
15 Or, B, failing to provide adequate 16 security personnel and services for the 17 protection of life and safety of persons, 18 including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. 19 Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect 20 Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the 21 security contract. 21 Or, C, failing to inspect the 22 incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 23 Or, D, failing to deny entry 24 Page 126 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West 2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel and/or others. 10 Or, E, failing to train security 11 personnel and/or others. 12 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 dures so de, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 10 orders to alert fellow personnel of 6 the situal, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from 16 orders to alert fellow personnel of 16 in doing any of the thirgs claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 18 or, O, R, failing to take any steps to stall, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from 19 accessing the premises above the third floor. 18 dati, distract or delay Joseph Jackson from 20 Or, P, Robert Brown abandoning his 20 Or, P, Robert Brown abandoning his 20 Or, Q, failing to recognize that 21 Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of 22 harm, and to timely respond. 22 Page 128 23 Or, R, failing to recognize that 24 Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of 25 harm, and to timely respond. 26 Or, S, failing to provide adequate 27 training on the provision of security services. 28 Page 128 29 Or, S, failing to implement 20 Adapta policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security 30 security services it contracted to provide. 31 Fine plaintiffs, the Estate of 32 Milen J. Hoover, Deceased, the E
security personnel and services for the protection of life and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security contract. Or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Page 126 rentry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing dures and safety of persons, including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Ropert Brown was under duress and at risk of harm to Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of harm to Robert Brown was under duress or, R, failing to recognize that Or, Q, failing to recognize that Page 122 Or, Q, failing to provide adequate training on the provision of security services. Page 128 Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
page 126 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to treat duress Or, E, failing to create duress Or, F, failing to recognize that security services. Description of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress Or, F, failing to create duress Or, F, failing to create duress Or, F, failing to recognize that Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of harm to security services. Page 126 Dr, C, failing to timely respond. Or, R, failing to provide adequate training on the provision of security services. Page 128 Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. Or, G, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others.
including Michael Malec McKenna, Allen J. Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Or, Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the correct Correct Correct Correct Correct Robert Brown was under duress and at risk of Correct
Hoover, Paul Goodson, and failing to protect Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security contract. Or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 Page 128 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress Cor, F, failing to create duress order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders, and delight for the first of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Order to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others.
Ruth Leib from injury, in violation of the security contract. 21
security contract. Or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 Page 128 Page 128 Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and sindividual possessing a weapon. Or, F, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post orde
22 Or, C, failing to inspect the incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. 24 Or, D, falling to deny entry Page 126 Page 126 Page 128 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of Pharm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Page 126 Dor, R, failing to timely respond. Or, R, failing to provide adequate training on the provision of security services. Page 128 Or, R, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Dara draw adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and security accessed, the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further proximate cause of
incoming bags and packages of Joseph Jackson. Or, D, failing to deny entry Page 126 Page 128 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress Or, G, failing to train security Page 128 Or, R, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the Or, G, failing to train security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Drown adequate training on the provide adequate training on the provide adequate training on the provide adequate to adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and security acquate policies, procedures, post orders, and adequate policies, procedures, post orders,
24 training on the provision of security services. Page 126 Page 128 1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an individual possessing a weapon. 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 10 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 12 fellow personnel and/or others. 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders and deny that any claimed act or
Page 126 Page 126 Page 128 Or, S, failing to implement adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. Page 128 Pa
1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West 2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, S, failing to implement 2 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 8 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 9 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 9 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, S, failing to implement 2 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 8 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 10 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 11 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 12 Leib's injuries. 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
1 entry above the third floor of the 500 West 2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, S, failing to implement 2 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 8 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 9 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 9 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, S, failing to implement 2 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 8 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 10 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 11 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 12 Leib's injuries. 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 6 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 9 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 10 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
2 Madison Street building to Joe Jackson, an 3 individual possessing a weapon. 4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 adequate policies, procedures, post orders, and 3 scenario training to provide the security 4 services it contracted to provide. 5 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 6 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 6 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 9 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 10 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
individual possessing a weapon. Or, E, failing to timely recall the elevators. Or, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post name to security personnel and/or others. Or, G, failing to train security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security or, H, failing to use the existing orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton post the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. individual possessing a weapon. scenario training to provide the security services it contracted to provide. The plaintiffs, the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
4 Or, E, failing to timely recall the 5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 or, H, failing to Robert Brown and/or others. 18 services it contracted to provide. 19 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 6 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 7 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 9 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
5 elevators. 6 Or, F, failing to create duress 7 codes in an AlliedBarton active control post 8 order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of 9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 The plaintiffs, the Estate of 16 Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Paul 18 Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further 19 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 10 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
Or, F, failing to create duress codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, G, failing to train security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
codes in an AlliedBarton active control post order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, G, failing to train security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. The defendants, AlliedBarton order to alert fellow personnel of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
order to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, G, failing to train security personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Boodson, Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib further claim one or more of the foregoing was the proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
9 harm to security personnel and/or others. 10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 9 claim one or more of the foregoing was the 10 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
10 Or, G, failing to train security 11 personnel on the use of duress codes to alert 12 fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security 13 personnel and/or others. 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 10 proximate cause of the decedents' death and Ruth 11 Leib's injuries. 12 The defendants, AlliedBarton 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
personnel on the use of duress codes to alert fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. Leib's injuries. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
fellow personnel of a risk of harm to security personnel and/or others. Or, H, failing to use the existing duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. The defendants, AlliedBarton Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny that they did any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
personnel and/or others. 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 Or, H, failing to use the existing 15 duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post 16 orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of 17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 13 Security Services, LLC, and Robert Brown deny 14 that they did any of the things claimed by the 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
Or, H, failing to use the existing that they did any of the things claimed by the duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. It is that they did any of the things claimed by the in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
duress code, Code 10, in the AlliedBarton post orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 15 plaintiffs. They deny that they were negligent in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
orders to alert fellow AlliedBarton personnel of the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 16 in doing any of the things claimed by the plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
17 the risk of harm to Robert Brown and/or others. 17 plaintiffs and deny that any claimed act or
19 steps to warn persons in the building, including 19 cause of the plaintiffs' claimed injuries.
those on the 38th floor, to a person who posed a 20 The defendant, Sidney Chambers,
21 risk of harm and gained access to the building. 21 does not admit or deny that he did any of the
22 Or, J, failing to recognize, and/or 22 things claimed by the plaintiffs.
23 adequately respond to a suspicious person, 23 The defendant, AlliedBarton
24 and/or a suspicious activity. 24 Security Services, LLC, by and through Robert
Page 127 Page 129

1 Brown, further deny that the Estate of Michael 1 next-of-kin, the law recognizes a presumption 2 Malec McKenna, Deceased, the Estate of Allen 2 that the lineal next-of-kin have sustained some 3 3 J. Hoover, Deceased, the Estate of Paul Goodson, substantial pecuniary loss by reason of the 4 Deceased, and Ruth Zak Leib, were injured or 4 death. 5 5 sustained damages to the extent claimed. The weight to be given this 6 If you decide for the plaintiffs on 6 presumption is for you to decide from the 7 7 the question of liability, you must then fix the evidence in the case. 8 8 amount of money which will reasonably and fairly In determining pecuniary loss, you 9 9 compensate Ruth Leib for any of the following may consider what the evidence shows concerning 10 10 elements of damages proved by the evidence to the following: 11 have resulted from the wrongful conduct of the 11 One, what money, benefits, goods 12 12 and services the Decedent customarily defendants, taking into consideration the 13 nature, extent, and duration of the injury, loss 13 contributed in the past. 14 14 of a normal life experience, and reasonably Two, what money, benefits, goods 15 15 certain to be experienced in the future, the and services the Decedent was likely to have 16 pain and suffering experience, and reasonably 16 contributed in the future. 17 17 certain to be experienced in the future, the Three, decedent's personal 18 18 emotional distress experienced, and reasonably expenses. 19 certain to be experienced in the future, the 19 Four, what instruction and moral 20 20 value of earnings and benefits lost, and the training the Decedent might reasonably have been 21 present cash value of the earnings and benefits 21 expected to give his child, had he lived. 22 reasonably certain to be lost in the future. 22 Five, his age. 23 23 Six, his sex. Whether any of these elements of 24 24 Seven, his health. damages has been proved by the evidence is for Page 130 Page 132 1 you to determine. 1 Eight, his habits of industry, 2 2 When I use the expression loss of a sobriety, and thrift. Nine, his occupational abilities. 3 3 normal life, I mean the temporary or permanent 4 4 inability to enjoy life. This includes the Ten, the relationship between Allen 5 5 person's inability to pursue the pleasurable E. Hoover and Annette Haring and Allen 6 6 aspects of life. J. Hoover. 7 If you decide for Ruth Leib on the 7 Eleven, the marital relationship 8 8 question of liability, you may not deny or limit that existed between Louise Hoover and Allen 9 9 her right to damages resulting from this J. Hoover. 10 10 occurrence, because of any injury resulting from If you decide for the plaintiff on 11 an aggregation of a preexisting condition, or a 11 the question of liability, you must then fix the 12 preexisting condition which rendered her more 12 amount of money which will reasonably and fairly 13 13 susceptible to injury. compensate the lineal next-of-kin of the 14 If you decide for the plaintiff on 14 Decedent, Michael Malec McKenna, for the 15 15 the question of liability, you must then fix the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have 16 16 amount of money which will reasonably and fairly resulted to the lineal next-of-kin of the 17 17 Decedent. compensate the lineal next-of-kin of the 18 18 Decedent, Allen J. Hoover, for the pecuniary Pecuniary loss may include loss of 19 19 loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to money, benefits, goods, services, and society, 20 20 the lineal next-of-kin of the Decedent. and sexual relations. 21 21 Pecuniary loss may include loss of Where a decedent leaves lineal 22 22 money, benefits, goods, services, and society next-of-kin, the law recognizes a presumption 23 and sexual relations. 23 that the lineal next-of-kin have suffered some 24 24 Where a decedent leaves lineal substantial pecuniary loss by reason of the Page 131 Page 133

		_	
1	death.	1	concerning the following:
2	The weight to be given this	2	What benefits, goods and services
3	presumption is for you to decide from the	3	the Decedent customarily contributed in the
4	evidence in this case.	4	past.
5	In determining pecuniary loss, you	5	Two, what benefits, goods and
6	may consider what the evidence shows concerning	6	services the Decedent was likely to have
7	the following:	7	contributed in the future.
8	What money, benefits, goods, and	8	Three, his age.
9	services the Decedent customarily contributed in	9	Four, his sex.
10	the past.	10	Five, his health.
11	Two, what money, benefits, goods,	11	Six, his physical and mental
12	and services the Decedent was likely to have	12	characteristics.
13	contributed in the future.	13	Seven, his habits of industry,
14	Three, decedent's personal	14	sobriety, and thrift.
15	expenses.	15	Eight, his occupational abilities.
16	Four, what instruction, moral	16	Nine, the relationship between
17	training, and superintendence of education the	17	Howard Goodson, Roger Goodson, and John Goodson,
18	Decedent might have expected to give his child,	18	and Paul Goodson.
19	had he lived.	19	Whether the pecuniary loss has been
20	Five, his age.	20	proved by the evidence is for you to determine.
21	Six, his sex.	21	In determining pecuniary loss, you
22	Seven, his health.	22	may not consider the following:
23	Eight, his habits of industry,	23	One, the pain and suffering of the
24	sobriety and thrift.	24	Decedent.
	souriety and time.		233333
	Page 134		Page 136
		_	
1	Nine, his occupational abilities.	1	Two, the grief or sorrow of the
1 2	Nine, his occupational abilities. Then, the relationship between	1 2	Two, the grief or sorrow of the next-of-kin.
	Nine, his occupational abilities. Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett,		_
2	Then, the relationship between	2	next-of-kin.
2	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett,	2 3	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of
2 3 4	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna.	2 3 4	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin.
2 3 4 5	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship	2 3 4 5	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover,
2 3 4 5 6	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and	2 3 4 5 6	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of
2 3 4 5 6 7	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna.	2 3 4 5 6 7	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the collateral next-of-kin from the death of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real plaintiffs whose damages you are to determine if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the collateral next-of-kin from the death of the Decedent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real plaintiffs whose damages you are to determine if you decide for the Executor of the Estate of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the collateral next-of-kin from the death of the Decedent. Pecuniary loss may include loss of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased andokay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real plaintiffs whose damages you are to determine if you decide for the Executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the collateral next-of-kin from the death of the Decedent. Pecuniary loss may include loss of benefits, goods, services and society.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real plaintiffs whose damages you are to determine if you decide for the Executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover. The plaintiff, Suzanne Malec
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Then, the relationship between Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, Amber Burnett, Jonah McKenna, and Michael Malec McKenna. Eleven, the marital relationship that exists between Suzanne Malec McKenna and Michael Malec McKenna. I don't know how much more I can do to get you out of here by 5:00. I'm just to go until 5:00. Are you okay if we leave by 5:00? Okay. If you decide on the plaintiff on the question of liability, you must then fix the amount of money which will reasonably and fairly compensate the collateral next-of-kin of the Decedent Paul Goodson for the pecuniary loss proved by the evidence to have resulted to the collateral next-of-kin from the death of the Decedent. Pecuniary loss may include loss of benefits, goods, services and society. In determining the pecuniary loss,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	next-of-kin. Or, three, the poverty or wealth of the next-of-kin. The plaintiff, Louise Hoover, brings this action in the capacity by reason of her being the executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover, Deceased. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring, the widow and next-of-kin of the Deceased and okay. I'm sorry. Let me read that again. She represents herself, Louise Hoover, Allen E. Hoover, and Annette Haring. She's the widow and the next-of-kin of the Deceased and the Estate of the Deceased. They are the real parties of interest in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, are the real plaintiffs whose damages you are to determine if you decide for the Executor of the Estate of Allen J. Hoover. The plaintiff, Suzanne Malec McKenna, brings this action in a representative

1 Estate of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased. 1 injuries and the time of his death, taking into 2 She represents herself, Suzanne 2 consideration the nature, extent, and duration 3 3 Malec McKenna, Matthew McKenna, Warren McKenna, of the injury: 4 Amber Burnett, and Jonah McKenna. 4 Loss of a normal life experienced, 5 5 The widow and next-of-kin of the the pain and suffering experienced as a result 6 Deceased, and the Estate of the Deceased, they 6 of the injuries, the emotional distress 7 7 are the real parties in this lawsuit, and the experienced; whether any of these elements of 8 8 damages you'll determine if you decide for the damages has been proved by the evidence is for 9 9 Executor of the Estate of Michael Malec McKenna. you to determine. 10 10 The plaintiff brings this action in If you decide for the plaintiff 11 his capacity as being the Executor of the Estate 11 Teiji Abe, as the Executor of the Estate of Paul 12 of Paul Goodson, deceased. 12 Goodson, Deceased, on the question of liability, 13 He represents the Estate of John 13 you must then fix the amount of money which will 14 Goodson, Howard Goodson, and the Estate of the 14 reasonably and fairly compensate the Estate for 15 15 Deceased. They are the real parties in any of the following elements of damages proved 16 interests in this lawsuit, and, in that sense, 16 by the evidence to have resulted from the 17 are the real plaintiffs of the damages you are 17 negligence of the defendant during the period 18 to determine if you decide for the Executor of 18 between the time of the decedent's injuries and 19 the Estate of Paul Goodson. 19 the time of his death, taking into consideration 20 20 If you decide for the plaintiff the nature, extent, and duration of the injury: 21 Louise Hoover, as the Executor of the Estate of 21 Loss of a normal life experienced, 22 Allen J. Hoover, deceased, on the question of 22 the pain and suffering experienced as a result 23 23 liability, you must then fix the amount of money of the injuries, the emotional distress 24 which will reasonably and fairly compensate the 24 experienced. Whether any of these elements of Page 138 Page 140 damages has been proved by the evidence is for 1 Estate for any of the following elements of 1 2 2 damages proved by the evidence to have resulted you to determine. 3 3 from the negligence of the defendants from the When I use the term society in 4 4 period during the time of decedent's injuries these instructions, I mean the neutral benefits 5 5 until the time of his death, taking into that each family member receives from the 6 6 consideration the nature, extent, and duration other's continued existence, including love, 7 7 of the injury: affection, care, attention, companionship, 8 Loss of a normal life experience, 8 comfort, guidance, and protection. 9 9 the pain and suffering experienced as a result I think that's all I can get you 10 10 of the injuries, the emotional distress and let you go at 5:00. I need -- I know you're 11 experienced. 11 in a bind. We'll have to meet again tomorrow 12 Whether any of these elements of 12 morning at 9:30, and I will read these, and then 13 damages has been proved by the evidence is for 13 you will deliberate. Okay? 14 14 Thank you, folks. you to determine. 15 15 If you decide for the plaintiff, THE DEPUTY: All rise for the jury. 16 Suzanne Malec McKenna, as Executor of the Estate 16 THE COURT: Just remember, even 17 17 of Michael Malec McKenna, Deceased, on the though you've heard all of the evidence, you 18 18 question of liability, you must then fix the still can't talk about the facts of this case 19 19 amount of money which will reasonably and fairly with anybody yet. 20 20 compensate the Estate for any of the following (At 4:58 p.m. the trial was 21 elements of damages proved by the evidence to 21 adjourned to December 12, 2017, 22 22 have resulted from the negligence of the at 9:30 a.m.) 23 defendants during the period of time -- during 23 24 the period between the time of the decedent's 24 Page 139 Page 141

1	CERTIFICATE
2	OF
3	CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
4	
5	I, DERALYN GORDON, a Certified
6	Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, and
7	Notary Public in County of Cook, do hereby
8	certify that I reported in shorthand the
9	proceedings had at the hearing aforesaid, and
10	that the foregoing is a true, complete and
11	correct transcript of the proceedings of said
12	hearing as appears from my stenographic notes so
13	taken and transcribed under my personal
14	direction.
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto
16	set my hand at Chicago, Illinois, this 12th day
17	of December, 2017.
18	
19	
20	DERALYN GORDON, CSR, CRR
21	License No. 084-003957
22	
23	
24	
	Page 142

A	59:23,24 65:20	85:20 87:23	amount 89:10	82:1 98:7
a.m 141:22	66:14	90:8	91:17 130:8	arguing 17:21
abandon 102:9	active 127:7	agreed 50:16	131:16 133:12	43:6 85:2 98:2,4
abandon 102.7	activity 127:24	51:20 56:15	135:15 138:23	argument 4:3,7
104:13,15	actual 109:12	88:5 89:8 93:1	139:19 140:13	8:20 9:14,19,24
abandoning	ad 101:17	96:20 98:16	and/or 6:12 126:5	10:21 11:19,23
128:18	add 10:13	agrees 55:17,17	126:7 127:9,13	11:24 12:1,10,15
abandonment	added 15:23	122:24	127:17,22,24	13:12 14:7 19:1
104:17	92:11	al 1:4,8	128:2,4	19:2 20:3 21:15
abbreviated 19:9	addition 58:9	alarms 101:22	angle 78:15	81:22 82:17
Abe 140:11	additional 63:21	alert 127:8,11,16	Annette 133:5	83:11,12 85:7
abided 84:1	92:1,3	alerted 60:4	137:10,14	91:12 100:13
abilities 133:3	address 13:12	allegations 11:16	announcing 89:9	111:14 115:1
135:1 136:15	67:12 80:24	alleged 32:14	answer 35:4 40:20	120:19,22 121:1
ability 118:5	111:9	Allen 123:7	44:3,7,8	arguments 58:20
able 50:6 81:5	addressed 71:23	124:20 125:16	answers 112:8,9	86:3,7
82:14 86:2,11	adequate 126:15	126:1,12,18	anybody 42:17	armed 52:18,19
92:17 105:18	128:23 129:2	129:7 130:2	74:12 80:19	52:24 53:1
above-entitled	adequately	131:18 133:4,5,8	90:17 98:23	arrange 52:20
1:15	127:23 128:2	137:7,10,14,21	141:19	arrest 63:18
absence 114:6	adjourned 141:21	138:22	anymore 33:16	arrived 99:23
absolute 19:6	adjust 69:20	Allied 1:7 112:17	AON 39:19	105:1
absolutely 13:16	admissible 86:5	AlliedBarton 2:23	apart 82:12	aside 68:21
18:11 19:21	admit 129:21	21:23 25:9	apparently 41:23	asked 7:2 11:24
34:7,18 42:16	admitted 11:11	26:14 51:11,21	appeal 98:15	39:3 44:19
43:10 68:5	117:18 120:6	53:20 70:24	APPEARANCES	53:15,22 54:17
83:20	Admittedly 98:23	75:10,20 80:20	2:2	61:18 83:7
absurd 96:3,5	adverse 104:5	91:21 95:4 96:8	appeared 121:6	92:19 96:7,9
accept 6:9 122:1	affect 123:2	98:21 115:5,17	appears 142:12	99:11 113:2
access 8:16 41:19	affection 107:18	115:23 126:4	apple 67:7 80:23	asking 63:8 109:2
127:21 128:11	141:7	127:7,15,16	applicable 99:1	aspects 131:6
accessible 102:7	aforesaid 142:9	129:12,23	applies 83:9 119:3	assess 23:5 35:10
accessing 8:17	afraid 10:10 48:2	AlliedBarton's	apply 12:11	70:3,23
128:17	48:7	80:9	approximately	assigned 110:14
Account 103:21	afternoon 21:17	allotted 91:16	93:6	assumed 108:22
103:22,23	age 132:22 134:20	allow 81:21 86:9	area 71:17 84:10	assuming 56:17
act 43:22 63:13	136:8	allowed 82:7	areas 74:20	assure 22:24
71:12 118:9	agent 103:5 126:6	86:15 122:23	107:23	attack 38:24 39:1
122:14,21	126:7	allowing 9:10 19:8	argue 14:3 19:5	40:4
122.14,21	agent's 103:6	84:16 86:23	19:16,17,19,20	attempting 14:3
124.13,18	aggregation	alternative 40:21	21:22 38:4	attend 79:16
acted 124:14	131:11	Amber 106:6	67:23 68:1	attention 10:4
acting 47:3 60:8	aggressive 95:12	107:12 135:3	82:18 85:3 86:2	22:1,4 58:4 73:9
124:17	ago 12:23 27:13	138:4	86:11 87:17,17	87:15 141:7
action 137:6,23	31:17	amended 7:2	88:4	attorney 67:8
138:10	agree 22:7 43:16	amendment 6:10	argued 7:20 11:17	120:18,20,23
actions 19:24 20:1	54:9 62:3,4	7:3	13:3 19:7 20:2	122:23
actions 17.24 20.1	02.5,1			
	•			•

attorneys 21:20	behavior 70:21	bloody 76:9	52:4,5,9,14 59:2	capacity 137:6,24
23:17 24:23	87:5	blurry 78:15	61:17 64:12	138:11
26:8 28:18	belief 47:2	bodies 113:4	91:21 115:7	Captain 31:19
available 118:18	believable 37:11	bogged 13:21 17:6	121:13 127:2,19	capture 29:6,7
Avenue 2:19	65:10,12	17:8	127:21 128:9	captured 29:9
awaiting 114:20	believe 8:5 9:14	boloney 77:15	bulkier 95:18,20	car 68:20
aware 120:8	23:7 50:20	bolster 104:1	bulky 128:4	care 15:13 44:24
awful 81:2,3	59:17 60:2 66:2	book 15:11	bullet 24:17 34:14	45:3,4,9,10 47:8
	69:7 108:3	boom 36:18 66:22	37:16	57:8 69:9,9
B	111:22 112:1	break 24:18 39:11	bulletproof 48:3	70:22 71:6,7,8
B 126:15	believed 46:5	65:9 81:13 86:6	bullets 35:22	74:1 79:6 87:15
back 21:7,22 26:9	bell 113:16	breaking 99:13	74:15	122:16,17 123:6
26:19 27:2,5	belongs 24:11	Brief 5:14	bunch 70:4	141:7
34:22,22 46:21	Ben 3:2	bring 63:23 76:10	burden 13:22	careful 71:9,12
47:5,19,24 48:6	beneficiaries	bringing 12:6	21:20 64:8,9	122:8,10,14,17
48:12 49:9,17	69:19	34:11 81:9	81:1 124:5,10,12	122:21
50:23 54:9 61:9	benefits 130:20,21	brings 137:6,23	Burnett 135:3	cares 27:1
61:14 73:4,11,15	131:22 132:11	138:10	138:4	carrying 103:1
73:15 76:10	132:14 133:19	bristle 22:24		case 10:15 14:5
79:21 83:6	134:8,11 135:22	broke 24:21 47:10	C	17:14 18:20
89:21,23 91:5	136:2,5 141:4	broken 35:17,19	C 126:22	19:12,12,23 20:1
92:6,17 93:2,16	berating 44:3	brought 22:16	calculations 67:20	22:6,8,12 23:2
98:10 100:15	best 15:10 52:6,7	23:18,24 25:24	88:16	24:7,9,13 25:2
109:17 116:16	66:3 80:4	34:8 37:12	California 114:5,8	25:23 26:20
bad 36:11 39:24	bet 32:18 46:18	108:15	call 36:20 47:6,18	27:8 30:20 33:9
40:12,14 42:23	57:14 64:8	Brown 26:12	56:20 58:19	33:13 34:3,19
77:1,11 79:6	better 75:24	27:16 28:6,13	60:10 63:22	35:4,23 36:11
104:21	beyond 11:10	76:12,12 82:2,18	68:4 93:23 94:1	37:2,4,13 43:21
bags 126:23	12:20 105:3	83:17 84:7,8	94:4,5	44:10 47:15
balance 51:8	110:17	94:11,16,20	called 44:17 61:24	51:4,14,14,16
barely 20:18	bias 112:4,24	95:19,24 96:1,9	73:22 91:9	53:7 55:17
BARTON 1:7	118:7	96:22 97:1,5,14	calling 13:10	63:21 64:6 66:4
base 98:17 120:2	biases 112:19	98:2,14,19,20,22	69:16	67:4,12,21,24
based 9:18 86:11	big 43:24 48:3	100:23 101:15	calls 96:23	69:3 70:2 75:18
105:17 107:3	53:7 76:11	105:9 108:22	calm 40:22 44:11	81:9 96:16
117:4,7 119:22	bind 141:11	109:14,14 113:8	44:13 45:12,14	97:22 98:2
120:5 121:8	bit 29:1 66:21	113:19,21 114:1	45:15,18 46:4,4	105:12,24 107:3
bat 58:3	70:1 90:10	126:6 127:17	47:4	107:3 109:18
battle 17:20	bite 67:6 80:22	128:12,18,21	calvary 59:7	114:18 116:21
bear 100:14	black 108:21	129:13 130:1	60:19	117:4 118:10,13
bearing 19:9	109:4	Brown's 95:15	camera 78:15	119:2,3,4,7,9,16
beg 47:1 73:2	blame 54:13	bucks 47:4	cameras 29:6,7	120:20 122:5
begging 41:1	115:20 123:11	building 24:10	candid 60:24	124:9 132:7
beginning 87:9	123:16	30:5 31:10 32:9	candidate 52:3	134:4 141:18
105:6 111:3	blaming 23:17	32:10 33:22	Canine 75:6	cash 67:19 130:21
behalf 21:23	blanket 54:20	38:9 41:15	capabilities	catch-22 64:22
behaved 110:12	blogs 119:11	45:24 47:5 49:2	103:18 104:8,8	caught 10:3 58:12

				i age 113
61:11	changed 7:14	clip 28:22 29:23	102:20 103:2	131:11,12
cause 1:15 9:16	26:17 27:9	32:13 64:21	comment 97:7,11	conduct 58:8
69:6 70:17	characteristics	76:22	97:13 111:10	123:19 130:11
120:12 123:13	136:12	clock 5:7 29:23	113:15	conference 6:3
123:18,23,23	chase 41:22,22	57:23 88:16,19	comments 26:14	18:4
124:2,3,4,23	chatrooms 119:11	88:23 89:6	96:4	confronted 44:12
129:10,19	cheap 107:15	90:11 93:4,17,21	committed 10:19	45:17
causing 123:11	cheapens 107:9,9	clocks 88:20	11:12 19:24	confuse 26:9
cell 32:17 119:16	check 60:16 71:18	close 9:14	common 117:21	86:20
Center 1:17	Chicago 1:18 2:6	close-knit 112:14	121:8	confusing 60:3
central 34:17	2:13,20 36:1	closing 4:3,7	communicate	connection 119:19
certain 101:3	59:17 60:11	21:15,19 86:3,7	119:15	conscious 34:15
130:15,17,19,22	62:16 63:22	91:12 96:4	community	114:6
certainly 24:8	74:17 142:16	111:14 115:1	106:22	consider 13:18
56:15 60:9	child 132:21	120:19	companies 52:13	15:10 72:5
83:10	134:18	code 41:19 53:6,8	75:5,8,9,21	87:11 112:2,24
CERTIFICATE	childhood 65:15	53:16,20,23 54:5	112:16	116:24 117:19
142:1	children 107:4	54:6,16 127:15	companionship	118:5 125:1
Certified 142:3,5	choice 42:7,14,22	127:15	141:7	132:9 134:6
certify 142:8	choices 43:8,9	codes 53:13 54:9	company 32:17	135:24 136:22
chained 35:20	45:11	54:11 96:3	52:22 112:16	consideration
49:24	chose 84:19	127:7,11	company's 25:8	74:21 117:10
chair 33:14	CIRCUIT 1:1	coincidence 65:20	compare 80:17	121:5,16 125:3,9
challenging 72:16	circumstances	73:19	compelling 68:6	130:12 139:6
chamber 49:13	47:8 71:9,13	collapses 115:19	compensate 130:9	140:2,19
Chambers 24:20	122:11,15,18,22	collateral 135:16	131:17 133:13	considered 69:7
25:12,12,14,17	circumstantial	135:19	135:16 138:24	considering 70:5
26:15 27:15,21	121:10,12,15	combat 62:7	139:20 140:14	86:18 122:2
28:4 30:12,15,17	citizen 63:20	combines 124:3	complaint 125:22	124:8
36:5 39:7 56:17	civil 13:1	come 21:22 33:10	complaints	consist 125:18
59:21 60:3,8	claim 12:9 13:2,4	47:12 50:12,23	125:18	consists 117:17
61:24 64:20,23	54:20 59:21	59:7 60:13	complete 17:12	Consolidated 1:4
65:2,8,13,19	60:2 105:15	64:14,17 79:21	19:9 142:10	constant 36:10,12
66:1,8,12,17,17	129:9	80:20 96:13	comply 44:9,9	contacted 58:2
73:12 74:2,11	claimed 124:15	105:22	composite 106:20	contained 116:22
82:2 83:15 94:5	126:2 129:14,16	comes 30:2 31:24	concern 113:7,9	contempt 120:15
95:23 101:23	129:17,19,22	32:12 43:23	concerned 13:20	contends 120:21
102:1 126:8	130:5	47:16 48:12	60:7,12	continued 141:6
129:20	claiming 14:18	49:9 54:4 60:20	concerning 118:9	continues 32:16
Chambers' 32:3	55:13 57:2 59:7	70:5 73:11	132:9 134:6	contract 33:17
41:10 103:17	97:21 110:22	90:22	136:1	62:5 91:23 92:1
104:1	claims 68:24	comfort 141:8	conclude 110:6	92:2,6,12,15
chance 20:19	108:6	coming 9:4 28:5	121:14	99:3,4 102:9
21:18 35:7 39:7	clear 55:17	29:5,19 30:6	concluded 116:20	104:23 115:5,5
39:10,16 40:17	clearly 58:9 86:10	31:9 32:9 33:21	conclusion 120:19	126:14,21
42:10	client 32:5 82:21	51:12 54:16	121:9	contracted 58:15
change 19:17 41:8	clients 67:11	68:6 100:3,10,12	condition 110:13	129:4

contradicts 57:19	19:20,20 87:3	Court's 87:18	cry 47:1 73:1	111:18 119:1
85:7	counts 41:10,11	88:2 91:5	crying 40:24	142:16
contributed	48:8,9 125:19,21	116:24	CSR 1:24 142:20	dead 74:5
132:13,16 134:9	County 1:1,1	courtroom 23:1	cure 12:15	deal 9:8,9 13:1
134:13 136:3,7	142:7	46:16,21 81:4	custom 64:4	43:24 50:9
contribution 12:9	couple 15:17 51:6	88:19,23 89:6	customarily	76:11 85:14
13:2,4 87:3	61:3 76:5	118:15 119:23	132:12 134:9	dealings 92:20
control 60:4 105:3	course 34:9 38:20	120:3	136:3	dealt 38:8
105:4 127:7	41:23 42:9	cover 51:6 74:20	cut 6:22 92:17	death 36:20,21
conversation	45:23 46:7,20	covered 28:24		107:3 124:23
101:1	47:9 57:19	covers 16:2	D	125:18,21
convince 64:2	58:13 65:5	CPD 47:6	D 2:18 126:24	129:10 132:4
101:23	66:19 69:12	cranium 34:16	daily 25:9	134:1 135:19
Cook 1:1 142:7	70:18 82:22	crazy 45:19 47:3	Daley 1:17	139:5 140:1,19
copy 116:13,15	103:13 123:24	115:11	damage 126:3	DeBartolo 3:1
corner 28:5 49:4	courses 79:24	create 62:21 127:6	damages 64:7	deceased 1:4
50:3	court 1:1,16 3:1	creation 75:23	67:3,5,9,13 68:5	125:15,16,17,24
corporation 117:9	5:5,6,12,17,23	credibility 25:2	69:5,7 105:11	126:1,2 129:6,7
correct 16:3 78:18	6:4,8,16 7:6,16	28:19 69:1,2	130:5,10,24	129:8 130:2,3,4
142:11	8:8,14 9:3,8	76:7 104:1	131:9 137:19	137:8,11,16,16
corrected 16:5	10:2,10,23 11:5	111:23 112:2,12	138:8,17 139:2	138:1,6,6,12,15
corroborating	11:20 12:4,16	113:1 114:2	139:13,21 140:8	138:22 139:17
103:3	13:5,8,19,24	118:1,4 123:2	140:15 141:1	140:12
counsel 8:10 9:24	14:9,16 15:2,15	credible 75:16	dan@tkklawfir	decedent 131:18
10:20 12:10	15:20 16:3,6,13	cried 63:12	2:14	131:20,24
13:19 14:3,18,23	16:23 17:2,5,10	113:19	danger 52:2	132:12,15,20
15:23 17:5,13	17:13,24 18:5,12	crimes 11:12	115:16,24	133:14,17,21
18:16 20:8	18:16,21,24	criminal 9:16,20	dangerous 41:17	134:9,12,18
21:14 24:4 44:2	19:11 20:8,12,23	9:20 11:7,16	51:10 61:16	135:17,20 136:3
44:5 53:10	21:7,9,14 23:20	12:7,18,24 13:10	DANIEL 2:12	136:6,24
77:19 81:10,11	24:3 27:24	15:8 18:20	Danzig 34:10	decedent's 132:17
81:24 83:22	81:10,19,23	19:12,24 20:1	36:24 37:18	134:14 139:4,24
84:13 85:8 86:7	82:14 83:22	70:21 87:5	48:18 50:4,8,12	140:18
93:4 94:15,21	84:13,18 85:4,8	criminality 19:14	73:6 108:12	decedents' 70:19
96:2 97:9 98:2,3	85:12,18,22	criticism 61:15	dare 74:24 75:2	124:1 129:10
98:14 100:12	86:12,16 87:16	criticize 32:5	dark 27:24 28:11	December 1:18
107:6,16 111:13	88:1,7,9,14,17	80:20	DAVID 2:18	79:17 141:21
111:19 116:4	88:24 89:5,14,22	criticizing 24:14	day 10:16 25:14	142:17
counsel's 9:13,18	90:2,12,15,20	27:5,6 87:1	25:14,18,19	decide 71:13 81:5
9:24 12:14 14:7	91:7 97:8,12,17	cross-examine	28:23 30:12	91:20 117:13
counselor 95:13	97:23 98:4,8	34:20	31:5 32:4,12,19	118:1 122:15,22
count 41:9,10	107:19 111:12	cross-examined	42:18,22 43:17	123:11,17 124:7
50:24 57:6	111:22,24	32:1,24	48:9,11 50:23	130:6 131:7,14
counted 48:11	113:16 114:23	cross-examining	58:4 64:23	132:6 133:10
counterclaim	116:4,19 117:18	30:24	68:18 69:10	134:3 135:13
12:13,14 14:1,2	120:6,16 121:6	crowded 71:17	83:6 102:21	137:20 138:8,18
14:4,10 19:6,7	141:16	CRR 1:24 142:20	104:21 110:9	138:20 139:15

140.10	1 107.24	P 1104.16	0.24.0.0.120.16	52 16 20 54 11
140:10	depends 107:24	died 104:16	8:24 9:9 128:16	53:16,20 54:11
decided 125:20	deposition 32:3	113:23	distracting 56:21	96:3 127:6,11,15
deciding 19:11	65:23 83:16,17	difference 67:22	distractors 56:21	128:21
decision 71:14	83:19 92:24	80:12	distress 130:18	duties 116:21
87:9 102:6	94:22,24 95:3,9	different 7:15	139:10 140:6,23	119:20
120:2	109:1	11:6 57:18	divide 107:19	duty 19:5,6 67:11
decisions 26:10	depositions 112:8	86:22 88:10,20	DIVISION 1:1	92:9,10,11 117:3
deescalation	DEPUTY 21:5	89:9 112:9	document 79:22	120:10 123:4,8
44:17,18	91:5 141:15	direction 142:14	doing 30:21,21	
defendant 2:23	DERALYN 1:23	directly 85:6	32:5 62:8 67:19	<u>E</u>
98:24 123:12	142:5,20	Director 24:9	73:7 85:18	E 1:2,16 127:4
125:2 129:20,23	deranged 110:11	33:24	122:9 129:16	133:5 137:10,14
140:17	derogatory 72:2	disagree 14:13,20	dollar 68:13,16	earlier 7:15 25:13
defendants 1:9	described 45:15	98:23	69:18	25:19 28:21,23
123:4,9,20,21	describes 112:14	disagreement	dollars 68:15,24	29:22 30:9,12
124:14,18,23	descriptions	22:11	105:19	31:4 32:3 34:2
125:6,7,11,12	45:13	disagrees 43:13	door 10:1,21 20:4	45:4 47:13
126:4 129:12	deserve 37:1	disarm 58:14 61:2	20:7 35:20 48:6	64:21 65:14
130:12 139:3,23	deserves 71:5	disaster 64:15	49:24 65:9	85:17 93:5
defendants' 21:15	122:2	discovery 80:5	72:20,24 82:11	104:3
129:18	designated 103:14	discussed 6:21	82:12 84:7	early 102:10,12
defense 5:23	desk 73:1 101:1	107:23	108:23 109:2,6	earnings 16:8
21:11 67:4,8	detail 114:17	discussion 5:21	doors 24:18,21	130:20,21
96:15,16 110:13	details 40:9	8:11 18:17	29:20 30:7	easy 5:8,16 18:8
114:4 123:14	detect 62:15	43:18,21 84:11	35:17,18,19	economists 67:16
defense's 12:22	Detective 34:2	90:23 108:1	48:15 99:13	edited 20:24
degree 75:11 79:2	49:11,17,18 59:2	Disobeying	100:3,4 108:17	education 134:17
delay 7:19,24 9:1	61:6 104:24	120:11	double 56:23	eerily 48:1
9:9 101:23	deter 62:15	disparaging 46:17	75:21	effort 36:10,12
128:16	determination	display 76:6	doubt 11:11 12:20	efforts 24:23
delayed 57:20	86:21	dispute 44:22	64:22	120:12
deleted 7:14	determine 52:7	50:18	downstairs 49:8	eight 92:4 133:1
deliberate 141:13	79:5 106:3	disputing 52:15	Dr 31:2,8 34:12	134:23 136:15
deliberations 22:5	131:1 136:20	disregard 113:15	43:16 51:20	either 34:9 86:17
116:16	137:19 138:8,18	120:24	53:11,11,23	electronic 119:14
demonstrated	139:14 140:9	disregarding	114:4,10,11	elements 130:10
36:16	141:2	117:2	draw 49:16	130:23 139:1,12
demonstration	determining	disrespectful	drawn 117:16	139:21 140:7,15
77:15	117:4 132:8	42:16,17	drop 61:8	140:24
demoted 65:21	134:5 135:23	dissuade 49:21	dryan@pattonr	elevator 27:18
deny 36:7 126:24	136:21	distance 19:14	2:21	44:17 45:22
129:13,15,17,21	deterring 102:13	95:11	Duct 35:20	48:11 57:21
130:1 131:8	device 119:10	distinguish	duplicative 5:20	58:1,1 59:10,10
department 1:1	devices 119:15,19	102:18	6:1 7:21 8:15,19	elevators 57:18
60:11 62:16	dialogue 24:11	distinguishes	duration 130:13	94:6,8 127:5
63:23	dictated 52:16	75:20	139:6 140:2,20	Eleven 133:7
depending 69:21	die 22:19 50:17	distract 7:19,23	duress 53:6,7,13	135:5
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, ,	

	105 15 16 00 04	124 0 125 4 0	124.10	6 4 27 12 72 9
emotional 130:18	125:15,16,23,24	124:9 125:4,9	134:18	fact 27:12 72:8
139:10 140:6,23	126:1 129:5,6,7	130:10,24	expects 120:18	75:1 84:16
employee 126:6,7	130:1,2,3 137:7	131:19 132:7,9	expenses 68:19	100:7 101:3
employment	137:16,20 138:1	133:15 134:4,6	132:18 134:15	103:23 107:4
79:15,22	138:6,9,11,13,14	135:18,24	experience 112:5	121:7,11,23
encompassed	138:19,21 139:1	136:20 139:2,13	118:8 130:14,16	facts 33:11 117:4
16:17	139:16,20	139:21 140:8,16	139:8	117:13,13,15
encompasses	140:11,14	141:1,17	experienced 63:7	121:7,9 141:18
16:17	estimate 88:18	ex-Account 75:15	68:5 130:15,17	failed 124:15
enhanced 92:9,9	et 1:4,8	exact 8:2 87:7	130:18,19 139:9	failing 6:11 7:18
enjoy 131:4	evaluate 35:10	exactly 12:12	139:11 140:4,5,7	8:14 9:10
enjoyed 110:5	44:23 111:23	49:15 78:10,12	140:21,22,24	124:17 126:10
ensure 126:10	evaluating 28:17	exam 75:12,13	experiences	126:15,19,22,24
entered 94:11	112:1,11 117:22	79:2	117:22	127:4,6,10,14,18
115:6	118:4	examination 76:2	expert 40:15	127:22 128:1,5,7
enters 121:13	events 23:3 70:19	example 52:1 70:7	43:15 75:18	128:15,20,23
entitled 121:16	123:24	115:19 118:22	94:15 99:9	129:1
entrances 29:7	eventually 9:17	121:12	101:19 103:13	failure 122:7
entry 126:24	everybody 19:24	exceed 70:21	103:14 108:18	faint 8:22,23
127:1 128:13	36:1 48:9 53:5	exceeded 80:2,9	expert's 39:9,11	101:16
envelope 40:6	70:13 71:20	exception 38:23	experts 10:16	fainted 101:15
55:9,9,14 76:9	74:12 89:9	exchange 24:23	23:18 25:24	fair 22:5 23:6 33:3
76:21 77:5,9,12	103:12 106:23	46:12	31:1,12,20 43:15	63:9 69:11,22
78:3 102:19	108:6,7	exchanging 61:7	50:16 54:8	83:11 108:4
103:2 128:3	everybody's 48:11	excuse 45:6 55:2	56:14 62:3,4	117:10
eons 12:23	58:10 78:16	94:24 115:12	75:8 80:20	fairly 130:8
epitome 96:23	evidence 7:22	executor 1:3	108:21 114:3	131:16 133:12
equate 15:9	10:13 12:7 15:8	137:7,20,24	explained 100:18	135:15 138:24
equivalent 13:11	15:13 16:9 22:2	138:9,11,18,21	explanation 34:13	139:19 140:14
errors 15:17	23:7,13 25:22	139:16 140:11	express 57:21	fake 29:21 30:23
Escalate 45:21	27:8 30:20	exercised 45:10	expressed 98:11	69:1
escalated 57:13	34:18 35:16	69:10 79:5	113:6,8,22	families 40:19
58:10 105:3	51:13,15,16	exercising 44:24	expressing 97:15	68:10 97:4
escalation 44:18	62:24 63:1	Exhibit 93:3	expression 123:22	family 38:15
escalator 28:12	64:10 66:4	exhibits 117:18	124:7 131:2	55:16 98:11
93:19	71:10 85:1,2,5	exist 31:11	extent 130:5,13	106:5,14 107:19
escalators 30:2	95:12 100:6,14	existed 133:8	139:6 140:2,20	141:5
102:3,3	105:18 106:17	existence 141:6	eye 25:8 35:12	far 19:14
eschew 70:14	108:15 109:18	existing 127:14	61:20	fast 49:16
escort 47:5	112:13,18	exists 107:13	eyeballing 30:15	fathers 22:23
especially 8:16	116:19 117:5,15	135:6	eyes 50:13	fault 22:21 23:6
10:16	117:16,17,19	exit 37:8 109:16		24:11 70:7,14
Esposito 7:3	117.10,17,19	109:17	$\overline{\mathbf{F}}$	88:3 110:14,23
Esposito 7.3 Esposito's 5:11	119:23 120:6,18	exiting 7:24	F 2:18 127:6	110:24,24 111:1
established 9:15	120:21,24	extring 7.24 expectations	face 37:17	116:2
estate 1:4 112:15	120:21,24	26:14	Facebook 118:23	fearless 49:21
112:17 125:14			119:12	feel 12:21 22:20
112.1/123.14	122:4,12,19	expected 132:21	117.12	1661 12.21 22.20
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

85:23 97:3,4	five 49:18 107:18	124:13 126:9	gained 117:21	91:23 92:2,3,6
120:4	132:22 134:20	130:9 132:10	127:21	93:2,3,7,11,12
feeling 35:13	136:10	134:7 136:1,22	game 83:11	93:16 94:3 96:6
86:19	fix 68:20 130:7	139:1,20 140:15	gates 31:1	98:9 101:22
feels 96:24	131:15 133:11	follows 125:22	GED 75:1	106:13 112:16
feet 55:1,4	135:14 138:23	foot 66:18	general 84:9	113:3 135:9
fellow 58:2 127:8	139:18 140:13	force 31:20	gentleman 108:21	141:10
127:12,16	flat 55:9,9	forced 66:10	109:5	goes 30:1 36:23
felonies 10:18	flew 114:4	forcing 57:16	gentlemen 21:16	47:24 48:15
felt 26:24 52:2	flights 46:13	foregoing 129:9	36:11 72:19	72:14,15
54:15 61:8	floating 37:4	142:10	107:20 114:14	going 5:7 9:11
65:14,17,17	floor 8:18 24:16	foreseeable 51:21	116:5	11:5 13:20 17:6
66:17 67:9	25:16,21 30:13	62:4 71:22	getting 35:8 40:17	18:13 21:11,21
fence 86:17	30:14 31:14,15	forget 73:18,19	109:19 110:17	22:16 26:5 29:4
fight 58:14 63:23	32:20 36:16	76:15,15 79:7	give 12:12 18:2	30:6,8,8,16 33:7
figure 10:7 26:11	37:6,22 39:1,2	form 15:17	21:18 31:12	35:2,6,21 40:4
107:9	39:13 40:11	former 31:19	40:21 42:7	40:16,22,22,23
file 79:22	41:5,14 42:3,6	forth 6:24	52:18 53:6,17	40:23,24 41:1
film 45:14	42:17 43:3,6	forward 22:5 81:8	69:19 111:7	42:10,11 43:20
find 29:12,12	44:15 46:11	fought 34:22,22	116:22 121:4,5	45:1,18 46:6
109:17 124:7	48:10,16 49:2	112:21	121:18 122:1	49:21,22 50:7
125:3,8	50:15,21,24	found 29:14 31:4	132:21 134:18	51:3 53:13
fine 101:24	51:18 56:4,9	120:15	given 5:16 21:21	54:23 57:5,9
finger 84:5	57:22 59:10,11	founding 22:22	31:8 86:13	58:5 59:23 60:6
fingers 78:3	59:22 64:3	four 26:16 107:4	112:9 117:5	60:21,21 62:1,2
finish 31:21,23	65:12,18 66:6	132:19 134:16	118:2 120:19	62:24 63:15
90:7 116:11,11	70:14 71:2,15	136:9	121:23 122:3	66:4 67:1,7
fire 104:12	72:3,7 92:8,13	freaky 45:16	123:1 132:5	69:14 70:2,16
fired 26:3 47:17	92:21 101:6	free 45:24 120:4	134:2	71:8,16,18 72:11
49:17,18 60:15	105:8 110:18	123:9	gives 34:12	72:15 76:9
61:9 65:21,24	127:1,20 128:12	Friday 92:22	giving 12:15 43:9	79:14 80:15,19
79:3 82:1,13,19	128:17	friendly 6:10 7:3	70:15	84:14 85:11,13
82:24 99:8,15,16	floors 29:8 128:11	front 42:8 49:5	glass 35:17 48:15	85:22 87:16
99:18 103:9	flunked 75:12,13	63:14 76:10,18	gloves 76:10	89:10,21,22 93:8
104:11,13	76:1 99:1	85:16 98:10	go 27:17 29:23	93:19,21 97:12
fires 24:24 73:12	flunking 79:2	frozen 109:18	36:15 38:14	100:2 101:8
firm 52:1	fly 114:8	full-time 92:13	39:21 40:7	102:7 105:4
first 14:12 25:15	folder 77:12	functions 5:20	41:22 45:7 46:4	106:13,16
25:20 29:20	folks 21:24 39:16	further 129:8	46:6,12 48:14	107:14 109:22
30:13,22,24	42:6,16 90:20	130:1	50:1,12 53:2,14	109:23 116:7
31:14,16 32:13	115:8 141:14	future 130:15,17	54:5 55:16	goner 101:4
32:22 33:2 38:8	follow 13:12 67:18	130:19,22	57:16 58:24	good 21:17 39:24
40:8,8 58:18	102:8,9 105:23	132:16 134:13	60:5 61:13 65:4	40:2,3,12 53:8
71:20 76:3 82:8	followed 84:7	136:7	66:12 72:23	62:9 91:20
91:23,24 93:23	following 5:1 21:1	G	73:1,14 79:9	goods 131:22
124:14	27:16 81:15	-	80:16 89:10,21	132:11,14
fishing 106:19	91:1 117:5	G 127:10	89:22 90:1,14,16	133:19 134:8,11

135:22 136:2,5	43:8,24 44:4,4,6	39:23 41:23	114:3,9,10,16	13:15 14:22
Goodson 2:15	44:8,19 45:6,6	44:16 56:15	118:14 121:18	15:9 18:15,19
49:4 74:8 99:24	47:2 48:3,19,22	61:23 68:13,15	141:17	21:13 23:19
100:1 115:1	49:13,16 54:7,16	75:4 95:6	hearing 5:3 21:3	24:1 35:9 70:2
123:7 124:20	55:2 60:9 61:20	happening 27:21	34:3 47:16	81:20 88:22
125:17 126:2,12	62:8,19 63:13	59:8 62:19	51:24 63:15	89:21 91:14
126:19 129:8	74:5 77:20	85:24	81:17 91:3	98:5 114:22
130:3 135:17	115:10	happens 11:19	142:9,12	HONORABLE
136:17,17,17,18	gunfire 61:7	hard 68:17 103:3	heartfelt 68:11	1:16
138:12,14,14,19	guns 23:24 24:3	Haring 133:5	held 5:21 18:17	hook 110:22
140:12	62:7,23	137:10,14	77:21 84:11	Hoover 2:10 68:8
Google 118:23	gurgle 36:21	harm 15:2,5,6	90:23 108:1	70:10 91:11
GORDON 1:23	guy 26:2 33:12,19	127:9,12,17,21	hell 47:10	99:20,21,24
142:5,20	33:19 40:3,3	128:8,22	help 37:7 72:21	111:14,16,18
gotten 73:16	44:21 45:12,17	Hauri 31:2,8,18	73:2,16	114:13 123:7
grabs 49:3	47:3 48:24	31:19 32:21	helped 101:2,2	124:20 125:16
Grant 3:2 93:13	57:10 61:11,16	39:4 40:15	helping 87:22	126:1,12,19
granted 97:8	63:15 64:1 65:4	42:23 43:15	108:16	129:7 130:3
graphic 34:13,13	109:4	46:10,13 94:15	hereunto 142:15	131:18 133:5,6,8
gray 108:22 109:5	guy's 60:8	94:15,22 101:20	hero 24:21 33:19	133:9 137:5,8,10
great 10:14 65:4,4	guys 53:11 74:3,4	Hauri's 38:24	38:15 47:14	137:10,14,14,21
65:5 69:12	85:22 87:7	head 24:18 79:10	49:10,11 55:15	138:21,22
103:11,12	100:22	health 132:24	64:23 65:8	Hoover's 67:24
Greg 24:9 74:10		134:22 136:10	96:10,17 109:14	hoping 77:23
80:18	H	hear 6:14 21:11	heroes 47:15 82:3	hostage 10:19
grief 137:1	H 127:14	21:19 23:1	heroic 24:8	43:12,14,16,19
grilling 77:16	habits 133:1	24:14 35:6	herrings 56:20	56:1 57:9 58:6
ground 24:17	134:23 136:13	38:10 43:18	hesitant 14:22	59:9 70:12
80:11	half 69:13 82:13	45:3 46:17 48:1	hey 60:16	73:24
group 78:6,18	111:13	54:19 58:20	hide 72:23 73:1	hostages 36:18
88:9 121:7	halfway 31:1	61:5,22 72:23,24	high 75:11 79:2	66:23
guard 44:24 45:5	hallway 46:9	80:19 82:9 84:1	high-rise 101:12	hour 1:19 36:15
46:1 47:7 62:22	48:14,14 63:15	100:17,19	high-risk 51:11	69:13
63:17 65:5 75:3	72:15	112:13,20	hired 23:18,24	hours 75:22 79:23
75:7	hallways 36:17	117:23	24:3 80:19	80:1 92:22
guards 52:18,19	hand 38:21 40:8,8	heard 5:11 10:3	104:12 115:17	102:22
54:15 58:2 60:8	55:7,10,13 77:19	21:9 27:11,12	hold 90:3 102:3	Howard 136:17
62:6 69:9 75:24	125:8 142:16	28:21 34:2,8	114:24	138:14
92:21	hand-to-hand	35:16 47:12	holding 121:14	hug 78:6,19
guess 14:13 72:17	62:6	52:12 53:10,12	hole 24:17	hugging 95:21
74:21,23	hands 53:4	57:15,24 59:13	hollering 45:18	hundreds 102:22
guests 38:2	hands-off 53:3	59:14 60:24	69:15	102:23
guidance 141:8	hang 56:6	63:6,10 64:20	home 38:14 55:16	hunting 35:22
guided 84:6,8,8	happen 25:12	67:15 70:1 73:3	homicidal 37:10	36:23 50:8
guilty 10:7	30:18 34:7 39:4	75:12 82:17	41:6 57:11	husband 111:17
gun 37:18 39:14	39:5 81:4	86:24 100:9,16	Honor 5:16 6:15	
40:5 42:4,8,19	happened 23:8,10	106:18,20 109:1	6:21 7:18 11:3	I
		·		
L				

	i	į	<u> </u>	1
idea 115:11	68:18	insinuate 83:4	investigation	62:1 65:11,18
ideas 38:7	incoming 126:23	inspect 126:22	23:15 25:3 26:4	66:5,8,11,15
identified 15:17	incompetent	128:2,4	33:20,23 118:12	67:1 69:1 70:2,6
Illinois 1:1,18 2:6	103:8 104:10	Instagram 118:24	involved 22:2	70:20 72:10,11
2:13,20 62:5,11	incomplete 17:9	119:13	119:3	72:14 73:9,10
63:17,19,19	inconsistent 112:6	instruct 11:6	issue 5:16 8:4 9:12	74:6 77:13
75:22 142:6,16	112:10 118:8	89:12 112:1	19:6 31:7 34:11	78:11 79:7 87:4
image 62:22	inconsolable	116:20	85:21 86:7	94:11 96:8,11,13
immediate 41:2	63:11	instructed 11:4	87:16 92:15	100:9,12,21
44:15 71:23	increased 92:4	107:1	101:6 104:18	101:7,9 102:15
101:6 102:2	independent	instruction 12:6	118:10	102:18 109:15
immediately 8:7	118:11,12	12:13 15:11	issues 5:9,10	109:20 110:10
120:10	INDEX 4:1	18:4 19:3 20:5	15:14 54:23	110:10,21,23
impact 14:4	indicate 117:12	45:2 54:24 69:5	67:12 73:17	115:15,16,24
implement 6:11	indicated 7:5,21	71:7 111:21	125:20	126:23 127:2
129:1	86:8	132:19 134:16	items 5:9	128:8,10,13,16
import 9:21	individual 32:15	instructions 4:13		Jackson's 12:8
important 24:5,10	35:12 117:9	5:10 9:22 10:5	<u>J</u>	56:11 110:23,24
25:23 27:8	127:3	17:23 18:2	J 1:17 123:7	Jacksons 110:17
28:17 31:7 59:3	individually 126:5	20:15 35:9	124:20 125:16	Jake 43:13
61:4 74:21	individuals 43:12	69:24 86:3,11	126:1,12,18	James 2:5 111:5
118:10	industry 133:1	87:15,18 90:7	127:22 129:7	111:10
improper 20:3	134:23 136:13	105:14,24 116:7	130:3 131:18	jamespower@p
improperly 19:21	inferences 117:16	116:18,22 117:1	133:6,9 137:8,21	2:8
19:22	influenced 118:20	117:2,6,12	138:22	Jenkins 24:9 25:1
inability 131:4,5	information 60:14	119:21,24 120:9	Jackson 7:24 9:16	25:6 26:2,17,23
inaccurately	65:22 118:17,19	120:11,15 122:7	10:7 14:2 19:23	33:12 35:1 36:4
14:11	119:2,7,9 120:3	124:17 141:4	22:11 23:3,6	36:8 52:11
inappropriate	120:7	insulting 111:6,8	24:24 25:13,15	62:13 63:12
11:3,19	initial 81:21	interact 25:9	25:17,19,20	64:24 65:3,5
inappropriately	initially 105:6	interaction 66:7	27:16 28:6,13,21	73:12,18 74:10
10:21	injured 104:17	interest 112:4,24	28:22 29:5,12,13	75:14 79:13
inaudible 6:13	113:24 124:21	118:7 137:17	29:22 30:23	80:18 82:2,22
incident 51:21	126:3 130:4	interested 59:6	31:4,13,13 32:1	83:19 84:4
75:4	injuries 70:20	78:24	32:14,20 33:22	92:18 94:7
include 15:22	124:1 129:11,19	interesting 38:23	35:5 36:14,22	96:23 100:8,8,15
18:9,13 131:21	139:4,10 140:1,6		37:4 38:5,7,13	100:17 103:11
133:18 135:21	140:18,23	interests 138:16	39:14 40:4	112:21
included 7:5 25:4	injury 123:11,13	interior 128:11	41:13,24 43:1	jeopardize 63:4
includes 9:15	123:18 124:4,24	Internet 118:18	44:12,21 45:14	JOAN 1:16
118:16,17 119:8	126:20 130:13	118:23 119:10	45:24 46:7 47:3	job 111:3
119:16 131:4	131:10,13 139:7	119:17	47:10,21 48:19	Joe 14:2 22:11
including 62:10	140:3,20	interpreted 26:7	48:21,23 49:9,20	23:3,6 29:5,12
118:23 119:4,11	inquire 38:11	60:19	50:4,5,9,14 51:1	29:13,19 31:4
126:11,18	insane 110:11,12	interview 123:1	52:2,4 53:24	32:14,20 35:5
127:19 141:6	Insanity 110:12	interviewed 25:12	55:13 57:3	36:14 37:4 38:5
income 67:23,24	inside 46:4	introduce 19:8	59:15 61:2,7,16	38:7,13,22 39:14
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

41:13 44:12,14	19:11 20:14	74:1 108:12	114:13 115:4	25:23 26:17
46:7 47:21	21:4,6,17 22:23	109:21 124:20	116:8 135:8	45:8 67:4 74:7
48:21,23 49:16	35:8 45:2 69:24	killing 37:21	141:10	78:7 108:11,13
49:20 50:4,5,14	81:18 84:1 85:3	63:16 70:9	knowing 95:7	119:5
50:21 51:1	85:17 86:11,20	73:11	knowledge 121:20	lead 121:8
53:24 56:16	87:11 90:9 91:4	kills 49:4	known 80:6	learn 122:24
61:2,7,16 69:1,2	98:11 113:14	kind 15:2 22:1,16	100:24 121:9	learned 34:21
70:2,6,20 79:7	116:6,16,18	28:24 50:21	knows 14:23,24	95:8,8
90:3 127:2	141:15	54:10 57:19	42:4 47:17	leave 37:8 49:1
Joe's 32:18 54:7	justice 23:5,5 33:4	64:22 75:16	Kotin 2:12,12	50:15,22 55:22
joepower@prsl	36:13 71:4 76:4	86:16 96:22	4:11 88:22 89:1	55:23 84:9
2:7	77:14 78:20	kindly 57:12	90:14 114:21,24	90:21 116:9
John 2:17 136:17	81:6,9	knew 22:15 46:7	115:2	135:11
	81.0,9			
138:13	K	58:3 71:16	kvaughn@patt 2:22	leaves 131:24
Jonah 106:7	K 128:1	77:11 78:10,12	2.22	133:21
107:12 135:4	KASSERMAN	94:16,17,17	L	leaving 61:17
138:4	2:12	105:12 109:10	L 1:4,5,5,6 128:5	72:10 90:4
Joseph 2:5 4:9	KATHRYN 2:19	109:11	labor 15:4	led 18:22
20:21 81:20,24	keep 9:11 16:23	knife 35:22 36:23	lacked 40:9	left 40:8 48:5,6
84:15,24 85:6,11	25:8 38:18 51:2	50:8	ladies 21:16 36:10	55:24 72:15
89:3,20,24 90:6		knocked 109:5		88:13 105:10
91:13 93:15	51:22 53:3	knocking 72:20	100:24 107:20	107:4 109:9,15
97:13,19 98:1,5	60:17 74:2	108:16,23 109:2	114:14 116:5	legal 120:10
98:12 108:3	95:11	know 6:16 8:14	language 7:4	Leib 2:10 52:2
115:15,16,24	keeps 14:6	9:19 10:13,20,23	17:19 38:4	68:9 70:10
126:23 128:7,10	Kennedy 31:2,8	10:24 13:5,8,21	54:17	72:10 74:9
128:13,16	43:16 51:20	14:4,9,14 17:12	laptops 119:17	111:7,10 123:8
JR 2:4,5,17	53:11,11	17:24 18:12	Larry 2:4 87:20	124:21 126:2,13
jryan@pattonr	kept 31:21 44:11	19:13 25:11	89:16	126:20 129:8
2:20	44:12 50:7 69:8	34:6,11 35:18	LaSalle 2:13	130:4,9 131:7
judge 1:16 65:19	72:11 77:24	38:19 39:15	law 1:1 9:17 14:11	Leib's 125:17
76:3 85:15	78:13 109:22	41:13,24 44:8,11		129:11
106:23 107:10	kick 40:8	47:9,18 53:19,19	63:17,19,20 64:4	lessons 94:17 99:1
113:11 119:5	kidnapping 10:19	54:18,24 56:2,3	71:11 75:22	102:8
121:20,21	20:5 70:12	57:5,15 58:5,5	105:17 107:2,5	let's 6:16 25:6
judges 117:24	kids 40:19	58:19 60:7,9,11	116:7,20,21	28:15 29:15,23
judging 45:1	kill 36:3 38:14	60:16 61:1	117:5 119:2,23	39:21,22 41:12
July 79:18	42:5 43:23	64:14,19 66:20	120:23 122:13	41:13 42:2,3,21
jumping 69:14	49:19,22 50:8	67:6 68:10,11	122:20 132:1	43:3 44:23
juncture 8:13	55:3,18 56:3,8	71:15,19 73:6	133:22	49:14,14 58:7,24
juror 5:12,12 10:2	57:5 74:7,12,16	76:12,14 77:15	lawsuit 33:21	58:24 60:5 65:7
10:2 116:8	74:16,16 109:20	81:21 87:7 90:9	137:18 138:7,16	66:9 76:22
jurors 5:13 90:21	109:22,23 110:1	90:10,12 95:1,10	lawyer 36:3,18	81:13 89:12,13
98:17 105:13	killed 39:7,7,17	97:23,24 98:24	45:19,19 108:19	90:14
jury 4:13 5:4 10:5	42:10,11,24 43:1	102:11 103:1,8	109:2,3,6	lettering 7:14
11:4 13:20 15:4	43:3,20 45:22	103:10,16,23	lawyer's 108:23	letters 7:15 8:8
15:11 17:6 18:3	56:16 63:3,14	110:4,12,14	lawyers 23:23	level 52:7,16
13.11 17.0 10.3	ĺ	110.1,12,17		1010102.7,10
	ı	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

liability 10:22	LLC 2:12,17	72:1 74:3 80:15	maniac 41:6	74:24 83:13,14
19:13 64:7	126:5 129:13,24	80:16 81:2,3	57:11	92:16 121:24
67:10 69:6	lobby 39:9,23	louder 59:24	manila 40:6 55:9	122:7,17 123:23
130:7 131:8,15	43:1 49:10 73:4	Louise 111:16	55:14 77:5,9,12	124:7 131:3
133:11 135:14	82:10 100:19,21	133:8 137:5,9,13	manner 112:4	141:4
138:23 139:18	lock 72:24	138:21	118:7	meaning 120:12
140:12	lockdown 94:6	love 107:17 141:6	marital 107:13	means 30:11
License 1:24	102:2,2	loved 43:5 69:22	133:7 135:5	43:19 70:18
142:21	locked 35:18,20	lrogersjr@prsla	market 112:15	71:8 73:24
lie 115:3,4,7	logic 121:8	2:8	match 39:10	119:8,13 123:8
LIEB 91:11	long 59:1 67:2,2	lying 74:5	material 118:21	meet 141:11
life 41:1,10,11	longer 45:24		materials 96:9,10	meeting 72:12
47:1 48:7,8,9,11	57:21	M	96:12,14	member 141:5
53:13 55:21	look 13:17 22:5	M 2:12 8:1,8,16	math 61:24	members 107:19
57:6 63:6 73:2	27:20 29:21	128:7	matter 71:21	memories 81:3
73:13 107:9,10	35:11 41:16	MacGeoy 43:15	mattered 105:9	106:21
107:15 114:18	53:23 60:16	99:9,17 114:9,16	matters 55:21	memorize 116:17
117:22 126:17	76:18,18,19,19	macho 74:1	63:6 114:14,15	memory 29:2
130:14 131:3,4,6	77:1,11 79:6	Madison 2:6 29:5	121:19	95:15,17 112:4
139:8 140:4,21	81:8 93:3,24	33:16 51:9	Matthew 106:5,11	118:6
lifetime 68:21	95:22 100:7	73:16 127:2	107:12 135:3	mental 73:17
light 36:12	108:18	magically 32:21	138:3	136:11
lights 28:1	looked 17:11 22:3	main 110:15	MB 33:14 52:10	mention 19:3
limine 24:2 97:7,9	43:13 61:19	maintain 30:6,16	54:14 64:13	mention 19.3 mentioned 12:18
limit 131:8	65:14 95:23	31:15	112:17	12:19 71:6
limited 34:4	looking 8:16 25:4	major 102:13	McKENNA 1:2,4	111:20
line 16:8 32:17	51:14 66:9	making 77:2	2:10 15:24	mentions 25:18
59:6 60:20 75:6	90:11	101:1	24:17 34:4,6,14	82:11
	looks 19:15 55:20	Malec 1:2,4	35:13 36:19	
116:15	78:15	106:18 107:11		mess 26:18
lineal 131:17,20	loose 47:10	123:6 124:19	48:18 52:1	message 72:10
131:24 132:2		125:15,24	59:13,16 67:21	messed 14:23
	lopsided 128:4	126:12,18 129:6	68:8 70:10	methodical 45:16
Linke 67:15,16	loss 15:18,21,23	130:2 133:14	72:12 73:5	methodology
Linke's 68:2	16:1,15,17,18	135:4,6,7 137:22	91:11 106:4,18	67:19
LinkedIn 118:24	17:4 107:5,17,17	138:1,3,9 139:16	106:23 107:3,11	Michael 1:4 106:4
listen 20:14 75:17	107:22 130:13	139:17	109:20 114:12	106:18 107:11
little 29:1 31:17	131:2,19,21,21	malign 36:12 73:8	123:7 124:19	107:14 109:11
51:8 60:3 66:21	132:3,8 133:15	78:4 82:21	125:15,24	109:20 123:6
70:1 87:10	133:18,18,24	maligning 72:6,13	126:12,18 129:6	124:19 125:15
88:19 90:10	134:5 135:17,21	74:23	130:2 133:14	125:24 126:11
92:6	135:21,23	man 24:12 44:19	135:3,3,4,4,6,7	126:18 129:6
lived 132:21	136:19,21 139:8		137:23 138:1,3,3	130:1 133:14
134:19	140:4,21	104:2 106:17	138:3,4,9 139:16	135:4,7 138:1,9
lives 41:9,9 50:24	lost 16:8 37:7	managed 36:24	139:17	139:17
58:11 62:17	38:12 130:20,22	Manager 75:15	mean 8:13 10:8	Michael's 107:10
71:21 111:17	lot 22:2,4 35:1,22	103:21,22,23	18:19 33:9	mid-rise 57:17
115:6,12	62:10 67:24	managing 25:7	36:14 64:5	101:10

militia 52:19	mixed 99:19	murderous 51:2	119:12	November 79:16
million 69:20	moment 27:13	murders 23:16	neuter 12:10	number 106:8
107:22	48:24	Murphy 34:10	neutral 141:4	111:7
millions 68:14,14	Monday 92:22	82:11 99:12	never 14:22 16:20	numbers 68:1
68:14,23,23	money 47:5 68:21	101:4 114:11	25:13,18 30:7,8	107:21 108:4
105:19	68:23 130:8	myth 37:3	30:12 33:1,6	111:7
mind 32:19 76:5	131:16,22	myui 37.3	38:3 40:6 51:18	numerous 107:7
minimize 23:2	131.10,22	N	51:19 60:21,21	numerous 107.7
minimum 80:1	133:12,19 134:8	N 8:1,9 128:10	62:1,24 66:4,6	0
minute 10:6 12:4	133.12,19 134.8	NACA 33:14 52:9	66:18 73:15	O 5:11,15,23 7:7
39:21 58:7	134.11 133.13	54:14	76:2 78:3 83:4,7	7:12,13 128:15
77:20 82:13	140:13	NACA/MB 62:12	83:9 100:11	oath 103:4,7
99:14	monster 71:1	nail 112:22	104:11	104:6 120:2
99.14 minutes 50:2	months 73:15	name 53:17		object 14:22 16:2
61:21 81:14	moral 132:19	named 40:15	never-ending 36:12	16:20 82:16
	134:16	108:19	new 120:14	83:20 98:3
83:23 88:6,7,23 88:24 89:4,5,7	Moreau 75:14	names 69:16	new 120:14 news 39:24,24	113:10
1 ' '		National 75:5	,	objected 14:13,21
89:11 90:16	79:11,14,24	natural 70:18	40:2,3,12,13,14 next-of-kin	85:12
93:13,14,16 94:2	morning 17:14	123:23		objecting 5:24
94:10 99:23	21:10 31:10	nature 107:2	131:17,20 132:1	objecting 5.24
102:4,5 105:2	116:12 141:12	112:14 130:13	132:2 133:13,16	14:14 16:11,12
111:13	motion 24:2 58:21	139:6 140:2,20	133:22,23	23:19 24:1 87:6
misapplying	59:1 97:6,9	nearest 20:2 124:3	135:16,19 137:2	87:23 97:6
23:12	motions 20:20	need 16:18 69:11	137:4,11,15	111:11
misdirection 23:2	motive 33:18	81:12 89:15	138:5	observe 46:1
misinterpret	MOTZ 2:18 5:8	90:9 101:21	nice 37:23 38:4	58:15 62:15
33:11	5:15,19 6:2,18	124:2 141:10	53:1,2	112:4 118:6
misinterpretation	7:7,9,12 8:1,5	needed 56:8	Nicole 3:1	obstructing 70:8
28:16	9:12 10:9,12	needs 11:4	night 75:6 86:18	obvious 22:8
misinterpreted	11:2,8,14,18,22	negatively 14:8	99:11	obviously 68:8
27:10,12,13	12:3,5 13:14,22	negligence 10:14	nine 105:6 133:3	82:15
misleading 23:12	14:1,10,23 15:5	12:8 13:11,18	135:1 136:16	occupational
misrepresent	15:19 16:1,10,15	19:10,12 105:15	non 68:3	133:3 135:1
33:11 34:23	17:15,18 18:1,8	19.10,12 103.13	noneconomic 68:4	136:15
misrepresentati	18:14 88:6,11,15	124:22 125:19	Nonsense 54:6	occurrence 123:5
107:7	89:12,16	124.22 123.19	NORA 53:22,23	131:10
misrepresenting	move 61:14 97:7	123.21 139.3,22	54:4	Odell 108:19,21
23:12	97:10	negligent 105:14	normal 130:14	108:24 109:10
missed 15:17	moved 83:8	123:12 124:18	131:3 139:8	
49:19 74:19	103:19	125:12 124:18	140:4,21	offer 85:13,16 91:17
missing 58:3	movie 58:21 73:13	negotiate 50:10	North 2:19	offered 9:23 108:8
mission 30:1	movies 43:22	50:11	Notary 142:7	office 6:11 72:24
37:10 74:12	73:22	Nelson 48:13	note 77:6,8,13	officer 63:18 70:9
misspeak 20:17	MSO 75:14		notes 5:10,11	
mistake 20:22	MSOs 75:19,23	61:12,14 nervous 34:17	10:15 22:4 61:4	80:13 107:24 108:9
74:6	murder 20:5		81:3 93:24	
mistrial 120:12	50:18	networking	142:12	officers 10:17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

	1	1	1	1
102:8 111:2	53:3 57:10 63:2	particular 13:7	peek 48:14	127:20,23
115:9,12	94:16 127:16	44:10 92:12	people 22:19	person's 131:5
oh 37:7 50:22	129:2	107:16	23:16 26:3	personal 1:3
52:21 55:2	ordinary 44:24	particularly 72:2	37:21 38:1 39:8	132:17 134:14
93:10 94:23	45:3,4,9,10 47:8	parties 11:12	39:22 40:18	142:13
110:22	57:8 69:9 70:18	106:3 119:4	41:4 42:24	personally 121:6
okay 5:17 6:5,8	70:22 71:6,7	120:1 137:17	44:11 50:23	personnel 92:1,3
7:11,16 16:6	79:6 122:16	138:7,15	53:4 57:14	126:16 127:8,9
17:2 18:14 21:9	123:6,24	partner 37:19	62:10,23 63:16	127:11,12,13,16
24:3 50:9 53:13	other's 141:6	48:13 49:11	64:17,24 68:17	persons 126:11,17
54:3 55:14 56:8	ought 33:12 70:5	party 87:3 117:8	71:24 72:16	127:19
81:13,19 88:1,1	72:5	117:20 123:15	73:4 74:17	persuaded 36:24
88:14 90:2 91:7	outcome 33:13	124:5	91:24 92:8,13	47:23 49:1,7,7
93:15 98:12	outside 5:2 81:16	pass 56:7,8,10	96:19 101:7,13	50:6,15 124:8
114:22,23	118:15 120:3	71:20 101:21,21	102:10,20,23	Peter 75:14
135:11,12	121:15	128:13	103:2 104:16	phone 32:17
137:12 141:13	overnight 31:21	passage 71:19	105:1,8 108:16	phones 119:16
older 106:11,11	Overruled 23:20	path 79:5	109:21 112:16	phony 77:15
omission 129:18	owes 44:22 45:20	Patton 2:17,17	112:20 113:23	physical 136:11
Once 90:21	owner's 25:7	4:5 21:12,13,16	115:6 119:3	pick 28:11 103:3
ones 9:1 16:19	owners 52:9	23:21 24:5 28:2	percent 23:7	106:10
43:5 52:15	owns 64:12	29:19 82:15	39:10 40:17	picking 117:1
69:22		83:3 85:15,20	42:24 67:17	picture 39:13
open 20:4,7 24:21	P	87:20,22 88:2,8	68:2 90:5	111:16
85:12	P 128:18	90:3,8 97:6,10	110:20,21	place 23:15 51:11
opened 9:24 10:20	P.C 2:4	97:15,18 98:3	percentage 22:21	76:3
opening 12:21	p.m 1:11,19	102:17 108:7	35:10,23 51:3	plaintiff 2:15
27:7 84:8	141:20	111:11 113:10	70:24 110:19	98:18 111:14
102:17 120:17	package 38:11	113:14 115:2,14	percentages 37:1	115:1 123:14
opinion 16:16	55:6,7,12,20	Paul 2:18 108:19	70:3 115:15	131:14 133:10
46:14 114:5	77:17,23 78:19	108:21 109:10	116:1	135:13 137:5,22
117:12 121:24	128:3	123:7 124:20	period 109:24	138:10,20
122:3	packages 126:23	125:16 126:1,12	139:4,23,24	139:15 140:10
opinions 31:4	page 4:4 6:6 92:4	126:19 129:7	140:17	plaintiffs 1:5 2:9
121:19	paid 75:18 103:22	130:3 135:17	permanent 131:3	21:10 22:12,20
opportunity 38:19	114:7,16	136:18 138:12	person 24:6,8	32:13 47:21
46:2 58:19	pain 34:15 114:6	138:19 140:11	26:24 35:21,24	64:6 67:17
112:3 118:6	130:16 136:23	pause 5:14	37:1,20,22 49:6	81:11 91:8
opposite 112:8	139:9 140:5,22	pay 68:19 87:15	50:14 57:9	123:18 124:12
order 6:23 41:15	panic 40:23	paying 22:3 58:4	60:12,19 65:2	124:16 125:7,14
41:16 89:15	panicked 44:13	PD 36:2	66:14 71:9,12	125:23 129:5,15
127:8	paper 73:21	pecuniary 107:5	72:21 95:12	129:17,22 130:6
orders 6:12,13,23	paraphrase 17:15	131:18,21 132:3	104:16 110:12	137:19 138:17
37:24 39:19	17:19	132:8 133:15,18	113:6,8,13,23	plaintiffs' 21:20
40:15 41:21	part 11:9 32:16	133:24 134:5	121:13,23 122:8	23:17 70:20
42:19 43:7	58:8 82:9 83:24	135:17,21,23	122:10,14,17,21	91:11 124:1
46:22 51:23	92:20,23 129:18	136:19,21	123:10,15,19	129:19

				.
plan 22:15 47:7	policies 6:12	97:13,19 98:1,5	83:8 104:2,11	62:11 92:10
70:15	129:2	98:12 108:3	124:11	119:6,24 126:15
planned 36:17	policy 53:3	112:22	problem 10:4 54:4	128:13,23 129:3
67:2	poorly 94:18,19	powers 63:18,21	66:11 90:4	129:4
planning 73:7	98:21	practice 64:4	110:15	provides 52:17
plans 35:14	portion 11:22	predictable	procedures 6:12	providing 8:16
plaster 100:10	posed 127:20	103:15	129:2	128:10
plate 19:15	128:8	preexisting	proceedings 1:14	proving 124:13
play 27:19 29:16	position 18:23	131:11,12	5:2 21:2 81:16	provision 128:24
79:3 82:7,14	52:6,7 57:20	prejudice 117:8	91:2 142:9,11	proximate 70:17
83:13,14,16,18	82:20 87:24	prejudiced 12:14	produce 64:10	123:13,18,22
83:23,24 84:14	91:20 103:20	14:8 86:10	produced 70:19	124:23 129:10
84:16 85:9,13	104:21	prejudicial 86:14	72:18 102:21	129:18
99:11	positioned 95:16	premeditated	117:20 123:24	psychological
played 27:22	95:17	36:16	programs 118:17	97:20
29:18 32:16	positions 78:11	premises 7:24	118:18	psychologically
64:20 65:16	possessing 127:3	8:17 128:17	prohibit 128:5	110:11
82:5 83:5 84:2	possibilities 61:23	prepares 25:17,18	prohibited 119:20	Public 142:7
84:19,19 99:8,13	possible 22:19	preparing 96:16	proof 13:23 21:21	pull 100:4
playing 64:2	23:21,22	presence 5:3 21:3	64:8,10 81:1	pulled 79:15
65:23	possibly 20:7	81:17 91:3	86:22 124:6,10	82:11 84:6
please 21:5,7,14	70:23 86:9	102:12	proper 20:3 67:18	pulling 82:12
27:19 29:24	post 6:12,13,23,23	present 3:1 67:19	82:6 95:11	pulls 49:13 50:8
55:20 91:6	37:24 39:19	130:21	properly 80:12	puppets 65:15
pleasurable 131:5	40:15 41:15,16	presented 119:23	104:22,22	purpose 34:4
plenty 94:5	41:21 42:19	121:3	property 126:11	pursue 131:5
plot 22:14	43:7 46:22	presenting 77:7	proposition 124:6	pursuing 33:4
PM 90:18,19	51:22 53:2	preserves 85:21	124:9	put 15:3 17:18
pmotz@pattonr	55:22,23,24	press 118:16	propositions	34:5,12,17 36:11
2:21	57:10 63:1	presumes 107:5	124:13 125:2,4	39:20 44:9
point 12:22 34:10	94:16 102:9	presumption	125:10	48:22 54:13
35:14 46:14	104:14,15,18	132:1,6 133:22	protect 96:19	55:10 58:10
72:6 87:7	127:7,15 128:19	134:3	115:6,12,17,21	76:9,22 84:5,21
102:13 109:19	129:2	pretty 22:4 27:24	115:23 126:19	87:10,14 93:22
113:18,20 116:5	posted 60:17	28:11	protecting 71:20	93:23 102:1,2
pointed 44:20	posting 119:8	prevent 110:16	protection 126:17	104:9,21 106:8
45:6,6 54:7	potential 10:14	previous 112:5	141:8	107:14 111:15
63:13 67:18	potentially 95:11	118:8	prove 105:16	114:15
93:4	poverty 137:3	primarily 111:1	proved 121:11	putting 10:4
pointing 37:18,18	POWELL 1:16	print 18:9	125:5,10 130:10	
37:19	Power 2:4,5,5 4:9	prior 6:5 112:7	130:24 131:19	Q
points 44:2 101:3	8:22 12:19	private 63:20	133:15 135:18	qualifications
police 10:17 31:20	20:21 75:7	probably 22:8,10	136:20 139:2,13	112:5 118:7
58:16,19 59:18	81:20,24 84:15	28:8 35:6,16	139:21 140:8,15	122:4
60:5,11 61:24	84:24 85:6,11	36:15 38:10	141:1	quarter 69:20
62:16 63:18,22	89:3,20,24 90:6	52:20 60:23	proven 117:14,15	89:21
70:9 108:19	91:10,13 93:15	69:15,22 80:6	provide 52:13	quarterly 80:8,9

80:11	20:16 116:13	101:4 102:3	97:22 112:18	reported 1:23
quasi 52:19	121:3	108:20 127:4	reliance 87:13,18	142:8
question 7:10	ready 65:4	receive 111:21	reload 49:14	reporter 3:1 5:6
59:4 75:1 80:7	real 45:18 47:4	117:10	reloaded 61:9	6:14 142:3,6
102:10 130:7	73:13 112:15,17	receives 141:5	reloading 61:13	reports 118:19
131:8,15 133:11	137:17,18 138:7	Recess 90:18	reloads 49:12	representation
135:14 138:22	138:15,17	recognize 127:22	reluctant 67:5	53:12
139:18 140:12	reality 56:22	128:1,20	relying 32:2,4	representations
questioned 95:7	realize 94:23	recognizes 132:1	34:21	28:18 51:7
questioning 36:8	really 37:11 45:16	133:22	remaining 46:12	94:14
77:22	59:17 65:12	recollection 5:19	remarks 117:11	representative 1:3
questions 35:3	73:23 75:13	6:3 8:6	remediation 99:2	25:8 137:23
61:3 68:7 73:21	78:21 79:4	record 5:22 18:18	remember 7:17	represented 28:22
112:10	94:17	34:23 84:12	8:10,21 9:3,4	94:21 100:13
quibbling 11:15	Realty 33:14	90:24 108:2	14:17 24:12	Representing 2:9
quick 81:13	52:10 54:15	recorded 99:19	25:6 31:2,18	2:15,23
quickly 59:14,15	64:13	records 79:15	36:6,8 39:18	represents 137:9
60:12,14 61:9	realy 13:20	red 56:20 75:6	45:13 46:10	137:13 138:2,13
quiet 21:8 48:1	rearguing 8:4	101:10,11	47:20 48:23	request 82:14
91:6	20:19	redefined 22:12	51:24 53:11,15	required 104:23
quite 22:1	reason 16:21	22:13	59:3,9 61:12	116:6 121:24
quoted 17:13	22:20 37:23	redirect 95:2	76:6,8,11,17	requirement
	38:17 86:22	reentertain 86:8	77:17,24 78:6,8	75:21
R	110:7 119:21	reference 6:10,22	78:14 79:12,18	requirements
R 1:4 2:4,19	132:3 133:24	13:7	80:4 84:20,22	80:10
128:23	137:6,24	refresh 29:2 95:15	92:5 94:13,14	requires 23:5
radio 118:16	reasonable 11:11	refreshed 95:16	109:8 141:16	requiring 121:19
raging 35:12	12:20 47:2 57:7	regard 5:8 86:1	remind 7:6 120:4	reraised 86:7
rain 115:20,22	108:4 117:16	113:17 117:20	reminded 92:24	rescue 26:2
rained 115:20	127:18	regarding 19:13	remove 6:10	research 118:12
raining 121:15	reasonably 46:5,5	105:24 106:1	render 114:5	118:13
raising 37:17	71:8,12 122:8,10	116:21	rendered 131:12	resisting 70:8
Rambo 64:3	122:14,17,21	related 114:6	renewed 33:16	resolve 117:3
ran 109:16	130:8,14,16,18	relating 118:13	rental 112:15	respect 69:17
range 69:19	130:22 131:16	relations 15:22,24	reorder 20:19	92:20 104:19
Raphael 34:12	132:20 133:12	16:16,18 20:22	reordering 17:22	105:11 114:2
114:4	135:15 138:24	131:23 133:20	rep 25:7	116:9
re-ask 14:16	139:19 140:14	relationship	repeatedly 82:1	respects 126:9
re-asked 14:19	reasoning 38:17	106:24 107:11	repeating 96:11	respond 127:23
react 115:10	reasons 122:3	107:13 113:21	rephrase 11:24	128:2,22
reaction 40:18	rebuttal 4:7 35:7	133:4,7 135:2,5	rephrased 87:5	responded 26:19
57:8	38:10 82:6 88:5	136:16	report 25:18,20	60:16 109:8
read 10:13 20:15	91:9,12,18	relationships	27:5 41:22,22	response 56:1,11
96:8 102:8	111:14 115:1	106:1,2	46:2 58:15	responsibility
116:6 137:12	recall 6:22 8:20	relevance 19:10	59:21 60:15	69:3 70:11
141:12	92:18 94:8 95:3	relevant 15:12	62:15,18 108:19	rest 66:13 80:7
reading 4:13 10:6	95:14 99:7,11,15	17:18 35:4	120:10	restrain 8:15 9:10

29.20 129.7	20.7 15 40.2 22	00.22 111.15	49.17.50.22	seconds 50.12.12
38:20 128:7	39:7,15 40:3,22	90:22 111:15	48:17 59:22	seconds 59:12,12
result 104:17	42:3,4,5,15,21	113:12,18	63:1 65:14 81:4	93:17,18 94:3
139:9 140:5,22	43:12,16 44:3,3	115:18	100:9,11 102:15	114:21
resulted 130:11	44:5,10,19 45:1	Rogers' 9:13	108:21 112:7	secretary 114:14
131:19 133:16	46:4,14,18,24	role 58:13	113:4	security 1:7 2:23
135:18 139:2,22	47:22 49:6 54:3	room 1:17 43:4	saying 5:24 8:22	24:9 33:24
140:16	54:7,23 55:19	60:4 116:16	12:11 32:3	44:23 45:5 46:1
resulting 124:4	56:7,16 57:24	rounds 49:18	42:15 53:21	52:8,13,17,22
131:9,10	58:8 59:15	66:13	55:6,7,24 74:2	58:2 60:7 62:5
retire 68:22	64:15 65:6,11	rule 23:3 38:11	76:8 77:1,24	62:22 63:17
retired 99:10	66:8,10 69:3	ruled 6:4 18:7	78:13 90:9	65:5 75:3,7,21
return 105:18	70:12,21,24	86:4	96:24 98:13,14	75:23 80:12
reverse 18:23	71:14,22 72:2,6	rules 41:18 56:5	100:6 109:22	91:20,22 92:9
revisit 106:16	72:13,15,20,23	57:5,6 81:1	says 13:17 15:11	102:7 111:2
Rhein 37:13,14	73:1,3,12,14	ruling 20:9,11,13	25:20 32:22	112:15 115:9,12
ribs 78:20	74:10,23 77:1,10	83:23 87:14,19	39:6 41:16 42:6	126:4,13,16,21
Richard 1:17	77:13,16,22 78:5	rulings 117:11	44:6 45:3 46:13	127:9,10,12
rid 54:3	78:8,11,13,22	run 40:23 46:13	49:12 55:19	128:13,24 129:3
right 6:19 22:23	79:5,13 80:2,10	46:15,19,24 73:7	78:8 83:15,17	129:13,24
26:10 28:7 30:2	82:18 83:5,9	73:8 85:23	93:13 96:2	see 10:8 26:5
30:2,10 31:1	104:19,19,21	90:10	100:16 101:5	27:20,20 28:4
34:16 37:17	108:16 109:13	running 73:1,11	103:12 108:5	29:4,6 30:6,8,8
40:8,11 41:17,19	109:14,16 113:7	109:14	Scarborough	30:16 32:1,9,10
42:1 44:17	113:19,21 114:1	rush 49:14,14	67:15,18 114:10	33:14 41:7
45:11 48:15	126:6 127:17	Ruth 111:7,9,10	114:11	45:13 66:5,7,12
49:5,5,10,17	128:12,18,21	123:7 124:21	Scarborough's	71:1 72:11
50:3,10,10,13,22	129:13,24	125:17 126:2,13	68:1	73:21 78:2
53:16 56:16	Robert's 38:19	126:20 129:8,10	scenario 115:8	93:17,19 100:8
58:3 59:13 60:5	41:10 48:8	130:4,9 131:7	129:3	101:10 105:14
61:9 63:14	55:21 63:5	RYAN 2:17,18	school 75:11 79:2	117:23
72:15 76:23	79:11 101:5		Scorsese 58:21	seeing 25:19 27:6
77:17 81:11	Roger 136:17	S	screaming 34:3,6	27:21 32:22
85:19 89:22	Rogers 2:4,4 4:10	S 5:15,23 6:19,20	34:9,15 36:19	33:1 63:14
90:21 96:10,14	5:18 6:6,9,20	7:10,10 129:1	45:18 69:15	seek 81:6,7
105:10 109:16	7:8,11,13,17 8:3	sacrifices 68:19	screams 63:16	seeking 76:4
131:9	8:12,19 9:6	sad 96:22 110:4	screwed 35:13	seen 10:15 51:12
rightfully 87:1	11:13,17 12:2	safe 41:15 52:5	search 23:4 38:11	106:17,17
rise 21:5 141:15	13:3,6,9,16	safety 92:11 123:6	55:12,20 119:1	118:14
risk 58:11 69:13	14:12,20 15:1,7	126:10,17	searched 55:5	sees 25:10 48:13
127:8,12,17,21	15:16,21 16:5,7	savagery 36:15	searching 77:14	48:17,18,18 49:3
128:8,21	16:21,24 17:3,8	save 114:18	78:20	segment 28:8 82:8
roam 45:24	17:11,16,21 18:3	saved 64:24	seat 111:20	84:2 92:6
Robert 21:14,24	18:6,10,15,19,22	saving 62:17	seated 21:8 91:6	sense 43:10 104:6
23:9,14 24:22	19:2,16 20:10,18	saw 24:17 25:13	second 11:9 30:14	117:21 121:8
26:12 27:5,16	23:19 24:1	25:15,20 26:9,18	31:14 80:22	137:18 138:16
28:6,13 36:5,7	27:14 83:1 86:1	26:19 30:12	92:2,4,15 99:20	sensibility 112:3
36:11,13 38:14	87:2,13,21 89:18	32:3,15 34:24	124:19	separate 10:22
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			I

		<u> </u>		
separately 125:2	83:16,18,20	Sidney's 38:20	society 15:18,22	speed-read 116:8
Sergeant 37:12,13	84:17 99:20	significant 22:11	15:23 16:1,17	spend 10:5 32:19
seriously 104:17	100:1,1,9,16,17	signs 99:14	17:4 107:17,22	68:20
113:24	109:11 113:23	silently 20:16	131:22 133:19	spent 35:12 36:6
service 52:21,22	shots 24:24 26:3	similar 14:19 47:7	135:22 141:3	50:2 53:12
services 1:8 2:23	47:17 60:15	71:10 104:18	sole 123:18	69:21 73:17
52:8,13,16,17	79:2 82:1,4,12	122:11,18	solid 61:11	76:24
58:14 119:15,19	82:19,23 84:3	simple 112:22,23	somebody 25:1	spot 49:5
126:5,16 128:24	99:8,15,16,18	Simultaneous	26:1 29:8 33:17	spouses 114:12
129:4,13,24	show 32:13 33:7,8	11:1	38:16 41:16	spun 27:10
131:22 132:12	47:13 70:22	single 10:18	43:23 62:7	squared 67:16
132:15 133:19	78:1,14,14 79:23	sir 32:6 37:7 56:2	63:14 64:12,12	stab 36:23
134:9,12 135:22	101:8	66:21 76:15	95:23 115:10	stake 33:13,19
136:2,6	showed 28:21	77:2	someplace 100:18	75:18
session 1:11 21:7	29:14 30:23	sit 23:1 46:16	sons 106:11	stall 7:18,23 8:24
91:6	41:14 78:17	116:17	soon 49:3,12,12	9:8 128:16
sessions 79:17	79:22	site 119:10	59:14 61:13	stand 34:5 38:3
set 57:18 68:20,21	showing 26:21	sitting 49:10	sorrow 137:1	47:13 68:6
142:16	29:22 31:14	situation 12:17	sorry 5:12 6:13	73:17 79:11
seven 46:12	47:8 77:8 93:18	41:7 44:14	18:16 20:8 56:2	82:19 107:8
132:24 134:22	104:2 111:12	45:21 46:6	84:13 85:10	standard 11:7
136:13	shown 30:13,15	50:12 56:22	96:24 97:1,3,4	12:7 15:12 45:1
sex 132:23 134:21	71:10 77:12	57:13 58:10	137:12	54:10 69:9
136:9	93:10 120:21	situations 64:22	sort 54:16	86:22
sexual 15:22,24	122:11,19	six 91:24 132:23	sought 67:3	standby 91:24
16:15,18 20:22	shows 23:7 27:15	134:21 136:11	sound 27:23 29:18	standing 48:19
131:23 133:20	55:8 61:15	Sixty 114:21	36:21 37:22	Stanson 3:2
share 23:6	79:16 82:9	skiing 106:19	72:21 82:9	start 40:24,24
shared 107:18	115:10 132:9	skill 121:20	sounds 8:15 12:23	57:9 81:11
shoot 35:24 37:15	134:6 135:24	sledgehammer	51:9 53:8 54:12	90:17 120:13
50:13	Sid 64:15	35:15	54:13	started 5:6 90:22
shooting 25:15	side 49:24	slow 58:21,22,24	sources 118:24	starts 39:8 49:14
39:8 70:8,9,10	sidebar 88:12,12	59:1	120:7	State 142:6
82:10 100:2,5,12	88:18 89:7	smart 101:16	South 2:13	stated 12:24 14:11
100:22	sidebars 89:2	smarter 79:8	space 78:8	124:16
shopping 32:19	sidetracked 87:12	smartphones	spaces 128:11	statement 14:19
32:20	Sidney 24:20	119:17	speak 59:24 69:14	21:19 98:9
short 103:18	26:15 27:6,15	smelt 106:19	speaking 11:1	113:17 118:9
shorthand 142:3	39:15 40:4	smile 38:1,2	special 121:19	120:17,22,24
142:6,8	42:15,21 45:2	SMITH 2:4	specialist 91:22	statements 27:7
shortly 64:9	49:7 53:23 54:3	snapshots 29:15	specific 13:10	112:6,10
shot 12:24 36:1,2	64:1,20,23 65:2	29:16	specifically 6:21	statute 11:10 17:9
36:4,4,5,7,9	65:8,13,19 66:1	sneaks 47:19	7:1 9:13	statutes 13:7,10
37:14 40:17	66:5,17,17,24	snow 80:11	specified 17:3	13:11 15:8,10
42:10,11,18	70:24 74:2,11	sobriety 133:2	speculation 117:8	stay 40:22 56:5
62:10 65:8	78:11 83:15	134:24 136:14	speeches 45:4	58:7
66:22 82:23	126:8 129:20	social 119:11	speed 116:13	stayed 61:14
			l	I

73:10	suggesting 51:10	98:6,9 126:3	58:17 61:17	53:17 57:24
stealth 30:7	suggests 107:16	130:5 132:2	62:17 67:1,5	60:6 61:6 63:6
stenographic	suicidal 22:18	Suzanne 1:2	70:4 71:24 72:8	66:2,21 67:4
142:12	37:10 41:6 51:2	106:6 107:13	72:9 87:4,4	70:17 74:8,9,9
step 6:16	57:11	135:6 137:22	91:19 94:14	74:11 76:1 77:3
steps 7:18 127:19	suicide 50:19	138:2 139:16	101:17,22	78:23,23 95:19
128:15	suit 108:22 109:5	SWAT 37:15	102:14 107:21	95:21 101:17
Steve 93:4	123:15	61:19,21 74:15	108:14 110:10	113:19,20
Steven 3:2	suite 2:6,13,19	74:17	111:6 113:24	114:17
sticking 20:9,10	48:9 72:19	swear 104:5	116:1 122:24	telling 14:6 25:24
78:19	113:3,5	swipe 101:20	141:18	26:1,21 38:18
stood 43:2	suits 53:1,2	swiped 56:23	talked 7:9 8:21	50:7 59:24
stop 74:17 94:6,8	summary 120:20	sworn 39:11 98:16	9:4 22:22 37:5,9	62:13 63:12
116:3	superintendence	103:6 105:13	37:21 70:16	64:9 72:11
stopped 47:11	134:17	sympathy 63:8	92:7 94:19	79:19 86:12
57:3 59:8 62:2	Supervisor 103:19	96:22 97:16,17	101:19	109:1
story 80:18	supported 120:23	98:11,15,17	talking 6:18 7:2	tells 26:3 44:21
straight 38:3	supports 17:14	113:7,9 117:8	14:15 15:7	50:9 54:3 87:16
59:10,11	supposed 17:22	system 34:17	30:19 59:11	111:22
strange 103:16,24	19:19 26:13		67:9 74:24 79:1	temporary 131:3
street 2:6,13 47:6	46:8 63:2 66:19	T	79:11 87:2	ten 105:7 133:4
74:5 127:2	92:8,12 96:19	table 33:15	102:11 115:15	tenants 27:1 38:2
stretched 78:3	99:4 110:16	take 7:18 22:19	tape 27:6,9,15,19	tend 67:5
stricken 8:6	111:2 112:11	27:20 37:14	28:16 29:4,10,12	tendered 9:23
strike 11:21 83:8	sure 20:17 43:2	40:5 41:1 42:19	31:8,9,13,13	16:19
97:7,10,12	53:13 74:19	43:8 45:21 46:8	35:20 43:14	Tenton 34:1,2
Strong 53:23	84:9,21 104:18	56:3,9 59:1 61:1	65:16 66:3	36:2 45:15
struck 11:22	surely 31:6,7	61:20 62:19,23	76:21,22 77:5	47:12,14,24
stuck 49:23,24	54:14 64:11	71:14 74:15	78:9,10 79:4	48:13,20 49:3,5
study 29:11	surveillance 25:4	76:2 77:19	82:5,7 83:4,7,9	49:11,17,18,23
stuff 8:2 33:21	26:5,6 27:9,15	81:13 87:15	83:14,15 85:9	50:9,18 59:2
96:14 99:2	28:16 29:4,10	89:1 90:16	99:12,13,16	60:14,22 61:18
suballegations 9:7	33:7 43:14	105:9 111:20	100:5,15,20	74:8 99:22
subject 118:13	45:14 66:3	127:18 128:15	101:8 102:16,22	105:1 108:9
substantial 107:5	76:22 77:4	taken 10:14 38:23	tapes 81:22	Tenton's 48:8
132:3 133:24	78:10	43:12,14,16,19	target 108:5,6,7	61:11 107:24
sued 71:3	susceptible	47:22 56:1	108:10,13	term 141:3
suffer 110:5	131:13	57:12,17,21	109:21	terms 7:3 15:14
suffered 133:23	suspicious 55:21	73:24 90:18	targeting 108:13	16:16 22:13
suffering 34:16	59:22 60:8,12,19	106:9 142:13	targets 108:10,11	68:3 72:5 92:15
114:7 130:16	65:15 66:9,16,21	takes 36:22 49:4	teach 105:5 115:8	97:20
136:23 139:9	77:17,23 95:22	49:13 72:14	115:11	terrorizing 70:13
140:5,22	95:24 127:23,24	73:9	technology 119:18	70:13
sufficient 124:3	128:3	talk 9:1,7 28:15	Teiji 140:11	test 99:1,5
suggest 69:13	sustain 11:20	34:3,5 38:1,1,2	television 118:16	testified 68:9,10
72:4 103:9	sustained 9:18	43:11 48:21,21	tell 7:12 36:2	100:11 108:24
107:8,20	14:13 24:4 87:6	50:3,4 55:11	37:14 48:4 50:2	testifies 34:24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

testify 84:4,5	60:13 63:21	threatens 43:23	25:3,13,14 26:12	trial 1:11,15 9:5
testifying 10:17	64:5,5 65:1,3	three 78:7 104:16	27:7,14 28:19	22:1 36:7 44:2
103:4	66:20 68:17	105:1 113:23	37:9 38:14 45:7	93:5 95:10 96:7
testimony 11:15	69:4,6,11,18	114:3 132:17	48:2,17 50:18	107:8 117:23
22:9 26:19 39:9	75:10 76:7	134:14 136:8	52:4 55:2 57:1	120:14 141:20
39:12 46:10	80:14 81:24	137:3	60:22,23,24	Trickery 78:4,4
47:20 68:6	82:6 86:20	thrift 133:2	61:12,18 63:19	tried 12:10 24:18
83:17,19 103:7	87:11 90:9,13,15	134:24 136:14	63:20 65:19	34:23 48:21,21
104:5 107:24	95:5,14 96:13	throw 105:23	66:3,10 72:19	49:19 62:21
109:12 117:17	106:21 110:15	throwing 51:22	73:5,17 75:14,19	72:9 74:20 83:3
118:2 121:2,4,4	110:19 111:6	68:14	80:1 91:7 113:2	trigger 38:21
121:21,22 122:1	116:12 122:2	tied 83:5,10	115:2	trips 106:19
123:1	141:9	time 5:6 21:21	TOMASIK 2:12	true 26:22,22
testing 104:22	thinking 54:1,2	23:15,22,23	tomorrow 141:11	64:15 65:7
thank 21:13,24	61:7 66:15 74:7	25:15,20 29:9,20	tonight 38:15	101:16 102:19
81:8,10 91:13	thinks 46:18	30:3,3,10,22,24	55:16 89:12	124:11,11
114:19 116:3,4	third 8:18 25:16	31:16 32:2,13,19	tools 119:18	142:10
141:14	25:21 37:6,21	32:22 33:2,20	tooth 112:22	truly 23:4
they'd 38:6 41:5,8	39:1,2,13 40:11	36:6 45:15	topics 51:7	trustworthy 24:7
43:6	41:4 42:17 43:6	57:22 59:6,18	toss-up 86:17	truth 34:18 78:21
thing 5:7,9 16:14	44:15 48:10	60:20 66:5,16,16	Totally 100:13	80:17 98:22
22:14 32:18	49:2 50:14,21,24	67:2,17 69:21	touch 111:19	try 26:18 34:20
48:1 74:22	51:18 59:22	76:24 84:21	tough 34:24 74:3	40:4 42:19
77:18 110:7	64:3 65:11,18	85:23 88:5,13,17	toughest 74:4	45:21 48:20
things 18:5 20:6	66:6 71:2,15	89:20 91:15,16	town 74:4,4	62:19 68:20,21
26:21,21 37:23	72:3 87:3 92:8	91:17 93:4,7,11	tragedy 64:15	101:23
38:12 46:17	92:13,21 99:21	93:16,20,22,23	train 99:5 127:10	trying 9:19 10:7
50:5 56:13,14	101:6 105:8	94:1,3,4,5,10	trained 42:20	10:21 13:9 15:9
60:24 62:18	110:18 123:15	95:3,9,10 96:3	61:1,2,20 79:14	36:7 43:7 44:3
68:9 72:2 77:24	124:22 127:1	96:13 97:2,2	80:12 94:18,20	50:3,4,4 64:2
79:4 80:15	128:12,17	99:18,24 100:3	98:21 111:2	72:21 73:3,18,19
92:17 105:3,5	third-floor 58:8	101:3 102:14	training 62:6,9,12	73:20 76:14,15
106:20,21	Thirty-five 93:17	103:18 104:24	62:13,14 65:4	76:24 77:3 79:3
111:19,24	thought 59:3 61:4	110:1 111:11	74:22 79:12,17	82:20 100:4
112:23,23	88:8 89:6 101:4	114:19 123:5	79:20 80:2	104:1 125:13
129:14,16,22	108:5 110:2,2,4	139:4,5,23,24	104:22 115:8	Tuesday 31:22
think 16:1 18:8	114:11	140:1,18,19	128:24 129:3	turn 28:1,2 76:19
22:8,10 23:9	thoughts 119:9	timely 127:4	132:20 134:17	turned 44:5 48:5
26:23 27:2,4	thousands 102:23	128:22	transcribed	48:5 95:2
30:19 31:7,22	threat 41:2 42:12	timer 93:18	142:13	turning 84:20
35:21 38:12,22	44:15 55:18	times 105:6	transcript 1:14	turns 42:5 49:11
39:4,5 40:18,20	71:15,23	timing 93:2	6:7,19 142:11	57:10
41:3,5,8 42:13	threatened 43:20	Titan 112:18	trauma 73:22	turnstile 57:17
44:1 52:14	56:3,8 65:17,17	title 62:22	traumatic 83:24	59:9 93:8,9,22
53:16,24 54:2,11	73:24	today 26:6 28:21	treatises 34:22	turnstiles 27:17
56:11 57:7,8,11	threatening 42:5	102:6	treatment 97:21	28:14 41:18
57:12 59:21	66:15 109:22	told 14:9 15:23	trespassing 128:6	56:24 94:4,12

128:14	117:21 118:22	52:3	warns 72:16	we've 10:15 18:3
Twenty-seven	119:1,14,18	violent 15:10	Warren 106:6,9	20:18 29:11,15
88:6,7	120:7 122:6,16	visiting 106:15	106:12 107:12	39:24,24 60:11
Twitter 119:12	122:18 123:5,22	voluntary 75:24	135:3 138:3	64:20 69:8,8
two 5:9,13 8:7	124:6 127:11,14	76:1	washroom 90:1	93:5 102:22
18:5 23:18	131:2 141:3	vote 41:3,5 42:13	90:16	wealth 137:3
37:15 66:23	utter 64:14	vouched 104:8	wasn't 30:7 32:20	wearm 137.3 weapon 20:6
67:16 74:15	utter 04.14	vouching 103:17	33:6 47:3,3	127:3
92:8,13,21	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	104:7	51:13 55:9 61:1	weapons 22:16
100:24 132:14	valid 58:16,16	vs 1:6	61:2 62:3 65:24	63:24
134:11 136:5	value 67:19 68:13	VS 1.0	66:8,15,24 67:23	wear 53:2
137:1	68:15,23 69:17	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	70:15,16 71:18	wearing 53:1
type 105:24 106:1	107:14,15	W 2:17	70:13,16 71:18	website 106:9
106:17 121:17	130:20,21	Wabash 2:19	,	119:12
	VAUGHN 2:19	wait 12:4 46:1	76:20 77:5,11 88:2 96:1 99:20	
typo 20:17	vendor 52:17	waiting 54:19		Wednesday 31:22
U	verdict 15:16	64:16 89:16,18	100:21 103:21 108:13	weekly 25:9
ultimately 24:20	98:17 105:18	walk 32:17 37:6		weigh 112:11,23
109:24	114:20 117:7	41:17,19 66:12	wasted 120:13	weight 118:2
umbrella 115:19	118:20 119:22	walked 65:11	watch 28:9	122:2 132:5 134:2
115:21 121:14	120:5 123:20	66:18	watched 26:4,6	- '
unarmed 26:3	125:6,12	walking 28:10	watching 27:16	well-crafted 23:1
62:5 63:24	versus 60:14	walking 20.10 wall 100:10	110:5	went 22:18 24:16
underneath	vest 48:3	want 100.10 want 10:5 15:3	Waukegan 31:19	24:22 26:2,11
100:24	vicinity 56:18	16:24 20:15	way 7:13 10:12	34:16 42:23
understand 12:19	vicious 36:22 51:2	28:1,2 36:2	11:3,8 18:24	48:6 56:13
12:22 15:20	victim 104:20	38:14 45:7,19	30:11,22 32:14	63:10 75:5
18:21 23:14	victims 97:4	50:20 52:18,19	36:1 40:5,6 41:5	76:17 94:1
84:24 98:6	video 25:5 27:22	52:21,21,24 53:1	41:9,12 43:2	99:17
understands	29:3,15,17 30:13	53:2,5,6 56:3	45:2 47:19,24	weren't 35:18
73:23	30:14 32:8 33:7	59:5 62:8,12	50:17 54:1,8	78:24 79:3
unequivocal	55:8 78:14	64:7 65:1,2 66:1	59:20 61:10	84:16 108:10
11:15	112:7 115:3	69:4 73:8 76:1	62:9 74:13 83:5	West 2:6 29:5
uneven 128:3		84:21 87:12	85:17 86:18	33:15 51:9
unfair 120:1	videotape 58:24 78:1,2 121:3	94:13 98:10	88:3 102:18	73:16 127:1
unring 113:16	Videotechnician	105:22 108:14	109:15 118:20	wet 115:21 121:13
unstoppable	3:2,2	110:10	121:21	whatsoever 13:7
49:20 51:1	view 28:7 38:24	wanted 25:11	ways 124:15	14:5 15:6,14
	violate 11:9	43:1 52:8 54:15	we'll 5:5 40:21	17:20
unsuspecting 39:16	120:14		47:4 52:18 53:1	WHEREOF
untrue 100:13	violated 6:23 56:7	61:16 74:16	53:3,6 90:22	142:15
untrue 100:13 upper 28:5	99:3,4	96:18 111:18 113:24	91:17 141:11	whipped 102:22
	·		we're 8:3 17:22	white 77:6,8,13
upstairs 44:22 45:7	violating 41:18 43:7 56:5 57:4	wanting 78:21 wants 23:14 40:15	26:5 52:24	whopper 28:20
			58:20,21 59:11	whys 78:24
use 15:12 20:5	violation 120:1,9	73:21 88:4	62:14 85:18	widow 17:4
53:9,10 56:19	126:13,20	95:14	100:6 102:11	137:11,15 138:5
71:9 81:22 85:2	violence 51:18	warn 73:4 127:19	103:3,6,17 104:7	wife 107:4,12

Wikipedia 34:21	92:22 95:4	129:8 130:4	2015 1:4	42,000 114:17
118:23	116:10	zero 62:6	2016 1:5,5,6	46 93:18
willing 35:24 65:8	workplace 51:22	Ze10 02.0	2010 1.3,3,0 2017 1:18 141:21	40 93.10
wish 9:3 80:23	52:3	0	142:17	5
84:4	works 64:13	000159 1:5	2018 92:3	5 30:3 80:2 83:23
withdraw 7:10		000160 1:5	2016 92.3 21 4:5	93:6,8,19 111:13
	world 110:17	000161 1:6		5-325 96:6
113:12 witness 24:7	worms 12:21	012124 1:4	22 88:12	5:00 90:4,21
	worries 68:22	084-003957 1:24	23.1 106:5	100:3 116:9
37:13 63:11,11	worry 116:14	142:21	236-9381 2:7	135:9,10,11
72:18 108:15	wouldn't 43:4	172.21	2506 1:17	141:10
112:2 118:5,9	44:13 52:8,10,10	1	264 6:6	50 40:17 42:24
121:6,18,22	67:8 83:24 95:5	192:6	27 89:4,7	50/50 39:6,16 41:6
122:24,24 123:3	95:22 100:19	1,000 44:22 45:8	28 107:21	42:9 94:19
142:15	wrestle 42:8	45:12,19,20 46:6	29 88:23,24 89:5	500 29:5 33:15
witness' 118:5	wrestling 39:10	46:9 47:4	2920 2:13	51:9 73:16
122:3	39:14 62:7	1:41 1:19	3	127:1
witnesses 24:13	write 10:15 39:19	10 2:13 23:11 26:7	394:9	5500 2:6
26:20 29:1	writing 76:13,14	26:8 29:6 53:23	3:00 29:6 30:4	3300 2.0
75:15,17 97:3	written 27:5	54:5 75:3,4	93:6,8,19	6
111:23 112:12	76:20	99:23 110:20,20	3:01 93:9	6 55:1,4 93:13,14
114:3 117:17	wrong 26:11 27:1	110:21 127:15	3:02:36 93:10	93:16
118:1 119:4	64:13,18 69:8	100 23:7 39:10	3:12:51 93:24	6'2 74:1
121:2	105:21,21	100,000 102:20	3:34 90:18	6'4' 74:2
woman 111:17	wrongful 107:2	1019 91:24	3:55 90:19	6-foot 38:11
won 74:5	125:18,21	11 23:11 26:7,8	30 107:22	6:48 93:21,21
wonder 51:4,4	130:11	29:11,12 31:5	30,000 114:7,7	60-01 9:22 11:8
55:14	X	33:10 73:18	31 94:9	12:5,13,15 13:14
wondering 23:10	$\frac{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{s}}{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{s}} = 101:10,11$	79:23 94:2	312 2:7,14	13:17 19:3 20:5
68:12	AS 101.10,11	111 4:10	31st 46:11 59:10	86:3 87:17
Woods 52:1	Y	115 4:11	330 2:19	60-01s 19:8,17,18
word 56:20 81:12	yeah 8:3 51:13	116 4:13	37 89:11	86:2
87:7 91:8 122:6	88:12 97:18	11th 1:18	38 35:22 38:21	605-8800 2:14
worded 11:9	year 75:22 80:3	12 94:10 105:2	55:13	60602-4212 2:6
13:15	years 23:11,11	141:21	3800 2:19	60603 2:13
words 38:16 50:21	26:7,7,8 29:11	12th 142:16	38th 24:16 41:14	60611 2:20
60:1 122:16	29:12 31:5	14 101:11	42:3,6 43:3	63A-007 106:8
work 33:15 50:5	33:10,17 35:12	140 93:3	48:16 56:4,9	63C-004 106:10
54:20 60:20,21	35:13 51:17,17	15 101:11	57:22 59:11	63C-006 106:13
60:21,22 62:1	51:18 73:18	16 75:22	72:3,6 127:20	65 68:2
68:18 73:15	75:3,4 94:23	18 88:8,11	12.3,0 121.20	65-003 111:15
75:9,16 101:22	95:6 106:5		4	
103:12 105:7	yelling 115:13	2	4 80:1 94:23	7
112:17	yellow 77:11	2 102:4,5	111:13	70 2:6
worked 38:5,13		20 51:17,17,18	4:30 100:3	75 90:5
53:17 54:7,14,19	Z	55:1 110:21	4:58 141:20	750,000 69:19
55:15 94:22	Zak 123:8 124:21	20,000 103:2	40 50:2 61:21 94:2	
working 65:24	125:17 126:2	2006 79:18		8
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

		Page I	
8 75:22			
9			
9 110:20			
9:30 141:12,22 90 67:17			
91 4:9			
911 79:3 81:22			
82:5 83:4,7,8,14			
93:23 94:1,4 99:12 100:5,14			
101:1			