

1 sometimes she had them slightly opened. Do you  
2 remember that? She was asked, "Did you see his  
3 private? His number one?"

4 The answer was, "No," she did not.

5 The only thing she really testified was that,  
6 "He touched me on my chest. I felt pressure between  
7 my legs - between my legs." She did acknowledge it  
8 hurt.

9 Well, I would assume if an adult man is - as  
10 what she's describing - is on top of her, it might  
11 hurt.

12 She said, "It hurt down there." It could hurt  
13 down there. That does not mean penetration.

14 You're charged with trying to determine if there  
15 was sexual conduct, which the Judge will be giving  
16 you the definition of sexual conduct. Do you  
17 remember what I talked to you about in opening  
18 statement? I talked to you about it individually  
19 when we were doing the voir dire. He's going to give  
20 you the elements of this case, and if -- and they're  
21 like links of a chain. If one is not there or one  
22 is weak, you must let him go, the chain falls  
23 away.

24 The State has the obligation to build that chain  
25 around them. I think there's an awful lot of

1 questions here that maybe could have been answered  
2 but haven't been. I think there's -- and I don't  
3 think you could get at those answers because they  
4 haven't been given to you. They haven't given you  
5 those videos, those recordings. Instead they tried  
6 to bluster you, through somebody's notes, through the  
7 social worker, the social worker who sees like five  
8 thousand patients in her career. To recall she had  
9 to review the tape, but she says she's testifying  
10 from her notes.

11 Then you got the officer who says he interviewed  
12 her with Ohio Job and Family Services, and you don't  
13 get anything other than that.

14 Let me comment on the pictures that Det. Kollar  
15 brought up. Pictures. Where are they? How come you  
16 didn't see them? He was able to identify some  
17 people. You're trusting him that he could not  
18 identify them. I'm not from Medina. If he showed  
19 me the pictures, I guarantee you I couldn't  
20 recognize any of them, unless it was one of these  
21 witnesses. And that's only after seeing them; I  
22 couldn't identify them. You couldn't identify them  
23 in all probability. So that's reasonable, that he  
24 couldn't.

25 He didn't say these were unusual poses. He

1 didn't tell you anything about the pictures, other  
2 than they were pictures predominately of females,  
3 young females. That's all he told you.

4 Innuendo. Innuendo. Trying to twist. More  
5 innuendo about the computer and what happened.  
6 Innuendo.

7 He says, well, as soon as he got that phone  
8 call. He couldn't identify the date.

9 Miss Eisenhower could not identify the date that  
10 that computer was smashed. Nick Stolph came in here  
11 and he acknowledged, "Yeah, we were up in Maine,"  
12 and, "Yeah, it rained and it was cold," and all that,  
13 and, "Frank was complaining about that computer."

14 And he told him, Frank told him, "Take a walk."  
15 Ms. Eisenhower tried to make something out of that.  
16 He said, "No. Frank does that all the time."

17 "Does Frank have a temper?"

18 "Yeah, he's got a temper."

19 He admitted that. He got mad at it, at the  
20 computer. Twisting.

21 Robyn Spencer on the pornographic magazine,  
22 whatever it was. I tried to find out what it was  
23 about. She couldn't tell us. She said, "I just knew  
24 it was because he was fondling himself," as she  
25 described it.

1 Well, you know, we've got some guys on this  
2 jury, sometimes we get an itch, and it may not be  
3 because we're looking at a magazine. She didn't know  
4 what was in the magazine, yet she characterized it as  
5 pornographic. When I questioned her on that, she  
6 couldn't say it was because she didn't know what it  
7 was, she didn't look at it, she just thinks so.

8 Now, if you're a mom - and we got several of  
9 them here - and you think that's a problem, having  
10 pornographic literature around, and you've got your  
11 kids in the house, aren't we going to do something  
12 about that, have a little talk? Say, "Let's get this  
13 out of here," or, "Why do you need this?"

14 No, there's no discussion. There's nothing  
15 further about it. Nothing further about it.

16 Common sense, people. And some of this common  
17 sense, I think, will lead you to the right  
18 conclusions.

19 You know, you've got a heavy burden here.  
20 because I know you want to be right in whatever your  
21 verdict is, you want to feel good about it. But as  
22 we've told you, the burden is not on us to prove that  
23 Mr. Wood is innocent. The burden is on the State to  
24 prove each and every element of the offenses for  
25 which he is charged. They have chosen to charge him

with rape, and rape only, with ~~REDACTED~~ ~~REDACTED~~. They have chosen to charge him with gross sexual imposition as to ~~REDACTED~~ ~~REDACTED~~, and that only. High thresholds in both of these cases.

You have to determine whether the evidence fits. I suggest it does not. We have all sorts of problems with dates and what took place - where, when, how. Do you remember I talked to you about that in the beginning, "What happened here?"

I don't think you have anything near sufficient evidence in the ~~REDACTED~~ ~~REDACTED~~ part of the case, because unfortunately she could not testify. And I have to believe that she's testifying -- or what she would have testified to, we don't know what it is, and we have to go on from there. What is said to Dr. LeSure later on, I don't know whether that comes from mom, I don't know where it comes from. I don't know if we have anything to verify where that all comes from and what it's about.

But it couldn't have been too serious. It couldn't have been too serious because Robyn Spencer says this was revealed to her sometime in 2004, and she doesn't take it very serious. She put her own family conflicts ahead of whatever was stated to her by ~~REDACTED~~. It couldn't have been that significant.

The ~~REDACTED~~ ~~REDACTED~~ case is disturbing because - because - Danielle testified that she made an incident report in October 2004 on this. An incident report. It didn't go anywhere. Evidently we don't know anything else about it, only that she testified she made an incident report. What did she do that for? Because she saw Frank in his underwear coming out of her daughter's room?

It's too bad for the child. I don't know what she is to anybody. I hope she gets adopted soon by Mr. Sadowsky so she can feel comfortable about herself and who she is.

But what was that about? A lot took place. And if you remember, there were -- I questioned her, you know, she's got these notes that she got off her phone. I'm not sure why they didn't plug that into a computer but, you know, she's transcribed these notes. Yet, when they are telling us about this - and you'll see there's a voice mail x'd out or something, that she erased from Mr. Wood - she talks about making phone calls to Scott Sadowsky. Something's going on, on January 11th. Something's going on.

But Scott Sadowsky says, "No, she didn't call me. She just showed up at my door."

I'm confused. What's this all about? Who's playing who? Unfortunately there's two victims in this. Two victims. Frank Wood didn't do anything to ~~REDACTED~~ on January 11th or 12th to cause the big stir. Something else happened in the background.

Folks, remember Dr. LeSure's diagnosis the first item - divorce. I think that's what's really happening in the case - divorce. It's important.

Do you remember we talked about, in the beginning, the standard? We talked about it, you know, reasonable doubt, no reasonable doubt. That scale drops to the bottom because of the weight of the evidence. The weight of the evidence. That relates to -- and the Court's going to instruct you on the credibility of the evidence, sufficiency of the evidence. They're going to talk to you about it.

But the weight of the evidence. Is it there, that there was a rape that took place on October 1st, 2nd, 3rd? Was there a rape?

And was there gross sexual imposition? And I think for the gross sexual imposition the dates are August through October - the Court will give you that - of 2000.

When we get into that credibility of the

witnesses, the year 2000 is a long time ago for a child, especially one of tender years, four years old, trying to remember what took place.

I've been criticised for talking to you about fantasies. What did ~~REDACTED~~ testify to about her mom? I understood it to be a bad dream. It didn't sound like a bad dream to me. She was getting her hair washed at the barber shop. She didn't observe that, she made that up.

I thought it was interesting to note, I didn't get a chance to cross-examine her, ~~REDACTED~~ comes in here with her Teddy Bear. What do kids do with Teddy Bears? They talk to them, and they say Teddy Bears talk back to them.

Hard to discern. You've got a tough job because you've got to figure out what exactly happened. And I contend that if you get to that point you'll say, "There's too many pieces missing here. I may not feel good about this, but I've got to feel good about it in terms of if I convict this man, I've got to be sure." And I don't think the evidence is there for you to be sure.

So on behalf of Mr. Wood, I ask you to acquit him on both of these counts.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Miss Eisenhower.

MS. EISENHOWER: When Mr.

Harrison came in here -- when Mr. Green -- when Mr. Harrison Green came in here, in his opening statement, he told you he was primarily a civil attorney out of Cincinnati, and perhaps that's why he neglected to tell you about the best evidence rule. And the best evidence rule is that when you have someone sitting here, telling you what happened, that's the best evidence. And you can bet a week's salary, that if I had put ~~SPREDACTED~~ up there and had her testify and then tried to introduce that tape, we'd have been over to sidebar quicker than you can say "what," and he would have objected to that. But he wants you to think I hid something from you. I did not. It simply wasn't going to come in, because the best evidence was sitting right here. Right here (indicating).

And he did get a chance to cross-examine ~~SPREDACTED~~. He chose not to.

So what did we give you. We gave you facts. We gave you evidence. We gave you testimony. We gave you things that dovetailed and fit and that you can understand and that you can rely on.

What has the defense given you? His opening statement was not evidence. His closing argument is not evidence. And, folks, most importantly, you need to remember that his questions are not evidence. His questions were the very definition of innuendo, with no evidence to support them. None.

And, in fact, when he tried to ask the State's witnesses to support that, they never did.

"No, I did not engineer this."

"No, I did not do this because he quit paying my car insurance."

"No," was the answer.

His questions are not evidence.

So what do we really have here? We have someone with an itch?

No. We have a defense like this.

"Well, it happened, but it did not happen here and here."

The Judge is going to tell you "on or about," but that's not -- that doesn't even matter. She sat here and told you "a couple of days before my birthday, two days before my birthday." And that's evidence. That's evidence. There's been no evidence presented to the contrary, none.

You heard Danielle Sadowsky take the stand, and

you heard her testify that during her divorce she was represented by Ron Stanley. There's a reason he's sitting over there.

MR. GREEN: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. EISENHOWER: He didn't

participate. He's sitting over there to manipulate the system at the Defendant's instructions, at the Defendant's instructions to intimidate the witness that I have brought in here because he knows things.

If Frank Wood can manipulate the system, and rely on attorney's questions, imagine -- imagine -- how he can manipulate two little girls. Imagine how he can manipulate those two mothers.

But what you, as a Jury, must remember is that the State of Ohio has given you cold evidence. Hard evidence. Evidence that you got to see. Evidence you get to interpret. Evidence you get to judge. Not questions, not innuendo, not imaginary, concocted plots.

Ask yourself how that's possible when you see two women come in who don't know each other, two girls who come in who don't know each other and they tell you the same thing. It's not possible. He

wishes it were true, but it isn't. It happened, and they came in and told you that it happened.

And then to stand here and say that ~~SPREDACTED~~ maybe wasn't telling you all the right details because, "Well, because she went down there and it's not that Frank asked her to look at porn, he just said 'Hey, wait until I'm finished looking at porn before I help you with your homework.'" Are you kidding? These are small girls.

And they should never have had to have gone through what they went through, what they have gone through. But the fact of the matter is, they did. And they came here and they told you about it, and there is no better evidence than that, and you can feel good about finding him guilty based on that. Because what it took for them to come here and do that, that's evidence, folks, and we request you find him Guilty of both counts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Folks, that ends the fourth stage of the trial. The fifth stage is when I read you these instructions. They're ten pages long, actually eleven pages long. I read about a page a minute, but I ad lib a little bit. You're going to get this thing in probably about fifteen minutes.

1 But first we're going to take a break. Don't  
2 discuss the case among yourselves or begin to form  
3 or express an opinion about the matter until you  
4 get the instructions of law and begin your  
5 deliberations.

6 See you in ten minutes.

7 (Recess taken.)

8 THE COURT: Thanks, folks,  
9 you all can be seated.

10 We are back on the record in Case Number 05 CR  
11 0365, State of Ohio versus Frank Wood.

12 MS. EISENHOWER: Judge, may we  
13 approach?

14 THE COURT: Sure, folks,  
15 go on out, we'll see you in about five minutes.  
16 Don't discuss the case among yourselves or begin to  
17 form or express an opinion. See you in five minutes.

18 (Whereupon, the further following proceedings  
19 were then held in the chambers of the Hon.  
20 Christopher J. Collier in the presence of the Court,  
21 Counsel, and the Defendant.)

22 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

23 MS. EISENHOWER: I apologize,  
24 your Honor. I had asked Christine if I could do this  
25 before the Jury came back in. I had a question about

1 the instructions.

2 And the question was that I believe we're  
3 entitled to an instruction on either the definition  
4 of "penetration" or that penetration be included as  
5 meaning "anything, however slight, by any object."  
6 And I was wondering if we can include that in the  
7 instruction?

8 THE COURT: Sure, I'll  
9 hunt for an instruction for you. Do you have a cite  
10 to OJI that you're going to give me? Or do you need  
11 me to find it?

12 MS. EISENHOWER: Well, I can go  
13 find one, real quick, if I can go --

14 THE COURT: I've got it  
15 right here.

16 MS. EISENHOWER: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: "Anything,  
18 however slight, is sufficient to complete vaginal or  
19 anal intercourse." Is that what you're looking for?

20 MS. EISENHOWER: Yes, your  
21 Honor.

22 THE COURT: All right,  
23 fine.

24 MS. EISENHOWER: Thank you.  
25 (Whereupon, the further following proceedings

1 were then held in open court in the presence of the  
2 Court, the Jurors, Counsel, and the Defendant.)

3 THE COURT: Come on in,  
4 folks. You can be seated.

5 I'm going to try to read you these jury  
6 instructions now.

#### 7 CHARGE

8 THE COURT: Members of the  
9 Jury, it is now the duty of the Court to instruct you  
10 on the law that applies to this case. You and I have  
11 separate functions. You decide the disputed facts,  
12 and I give you these instructions of law.

13 Now, it's your sworn duty to apply the law as I  
14 give it to you. You are not permitted to change the  
15 law or to apply your own conception of what you think  
16 the law should be.

17 A criminal case begins with the filing of an  
18 indictment. An indictment informs the Defendant that  
19 he's been charged with a criminal offense. The fact  
20 that an indictment was filed cannot be considered by  
21 you for any purpose. The plea of Not Guilty is a  
22 total denial of the charge and puts into issue all of  
23 the essential elements of each of the offenses.

24 The Defendant is presumed innocent in this case  
25 until his guilt is established to you beyond a

1 reasonable doubt. The Defendant must be acquitted  
2 unless the State produces evidence which convinces  
3 you beyond a reasonable doubt of each and every  
4 element of the offenses charged in this indictment.

5 "Reasonable doubt." Reasonable doubt is present  
6 when, after you've carefully considered and compared  
7 all of the evidence, you cannot say you're firmly  
8 convinced of the truth of the charge.

9 Reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and  
10 common sense.

11 Reasonable doubt is not mere possible doubt,  
12 because everything relating to human affairs or  
13 depending on moral evidence is open to some possible  
14 or imaginary doubt.

15 Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof of such  
16 character that an ordinary person would be willing to  
17 rely and act upon it in the most important of his or  
18 her own affairs.

19 What is "evidence"? Evidence is all the  
20 testimony you get from the witness stand, any  
21 exhibits admitted during the trial, any facts agreed  
22 to by counsel, or any facts that I require - the  
23 Court requires - you to accept as true.

24 Evidence can be direct or circumstantial or a  
25 combination of both.

Direct evidence is the testimony given by a witness who has seen or heard the things concerning which he or she testified. It also includes the physical exhibits admitted during trial.

Circumstantial evidence has a more difficult definition. I'll try to define it for you the way that the law gives it to me and then I'll stop.

"Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts or circumstances by direct evidence from which you may reasonably infer other related or connected facts which would naturally or logically follow according to the common experience of mankind.

"To infer, or to make an inference, is to reach a reasonable conclusion of fact which you may, but are not required to, make from other facts which you find have been established by direct evidence. Whether an inference is made rests entirely with you."

That's the definition of circumstantial evidence. I don't think I like that definition very much. You've got to abide by it, but let me give you an example of circumstantial evidence so that you understand what it is.

You know what direct evidence is, right? If a witness saw something or heard something and then

testified to it, that's direct evidence.

Circumstantial evidence must mean something different, and to explain that to you, let me take you back to a situation that happened to me when I was a little boy back in Euclid, Ohio, back in 1964.

I was ten years old and it was Christmastime. My little brother Marcus and I, we grew up in a small house. Christmas Eve is a big time in my family. Christmas was important, but sledding was more important actually.

And on Christmas Eve 1964, right before we went to bed, my brother looked outside the window and confirmed what I had seen - which is no snow. It's going to be a bad Christmas because we can't go sledding.

We pulled the drapes closed and went to bed. It was actually a blanket that we had kind of hung up over a couple of nails in the window. It was warmer than the drapes were.

The next morning Marcus gets up and pulls down the blanket - which always got us into trouble - and it almost blinded us, because there was, that morning, Christmas Day 1964, six, freshly-fallen inches of snow on the ground.

Marcus and I went outside, we ran out of the

back of the house and grabbed the garbage can lids. I don't know if you all remember, but you don't have sleds for heaven's sake, you've got garbage can lids. They're better than you can possibly imagine.

We put our boots on - come on, you remember, those were the boots with the little snap things, the big ones that had five or six different snaps, they came up to here on you (indicating) - and we ran across the street, down Briardale, down to where it crosses Lakeshore Boulevard. There's a really nice place north of the Boulevard, it goes down the hill to where the lake is, and we slid on our garbage can lids until almost 2 o'clock. My parents didn't mind too much because they could see our tracks. And it was Euclid 1964; Mr. Montenegro was watching, everyone's watching.

It was the best Christmas I've ever had.

Now, here's my question for you. Could I have testified by direct evidence that it snowed that night, Christmas Eve? You're right, I couldn't. Because I didn't see it, right?

But is there circumstantial evidence that I could rely on that it snowed? Sure. Because circumstantial evidence is proof of facts or circumstances by direct evidence from which I may

reasonably infer other related or connected facts.

What direct evidence am I talking about? Well, there was no snow the night before, I saw that; the next morning there was snow, I saw that. I could infer that it snowed that night. Do you see that? That is an inference that you may make if you want to as a Jury, but you don't have to make it. Whether an inference is made rests entirely with you. You can decide to make that inference or not.

Now, let me step back, now that I've defined for you circumstantial evidence and I've given you an example. Direct evidence - what the witnesses see and hear and testify to - and circumstantial evidence - what you can infer, as I've described - are of equal weight. No one is better than the other. Under the law they're of equal weight. Isn't that interesting?

Do you see that those are the kinds of evidence? Okay, good.

What's not evidence? We talked a little bit about this. The indictment, the opening statements of counsel, the closing arguments of counsel, are not evidence. Opening statements and closing arguments are always interesting, always fascinating, but they're never evidence, right? The opening

statements and closing arguments are designed to assist you only.

Statements or answers that were stricken by the Court, you're to disregard. They're also not evidence. You have to treat them as though you never heard them. And you can do that, you're big boys and girls, you all know how to do that.

You must not speculate as to why I sustained an objection to any question - please, don't do that - or what the answer to that question might have been. That's also not important.

You must not draw any inference or speculate on the truth of any suggestion included in a question that wasn't later answered.

Okay. So what are you supposed to do? This is it.

You are the sole judges of the facts in this case, the credibility of the witnesses, and the weight to be given to their testimony. That's your job.

To weigh the evidence, you have got to consider the credibility of the witnesses, and please apply the tests of truthfulness that you are accustomed to applying in your daily lives. Here's what the tests are you that you're to use for each witness.

Consider the appearance of the witness upon the stand; his or her manner of testifying; the reasonableness of that testimony; the opportunity that that witness had to see and to hear and to know the things concerning which he or she testified; his or her accuracy of memory; his or her frankness to you, or lack of it; his or her intelligence, interest, and bias, if any; together with all the facts and circumstances surrounding that witness' testimony.

Folks, apply these tests to each witness' testimony and determine the weight you'll give the testimony of that witness. You will assign to the testimony of each witness such weight as you deem proper.

Now look, folks, you're not required to believe the testimony of any witness simply because he or she was under oath. You can believe or disbelieve all or any part of the testimony of any witness. Because it's your province to determine what testimony is worthy of belief and what testimony is not worthy of belief. That's exactly what jurors do. That's your job.

Now, the Defendant did not take the witness stand in his own behalf. That's not necessary. He

has a Constitutional right not to testify, and the fact that he did not testify must not be considered by you for any purpose.

Now let's talk about the charges. The Defendant's been charged with one count of rape and one count of gross sexual imposition. These are two separate charges that will be described for you separately, and you're to consider them separately.

"Rape." The Defendant is charged with rape. Before you can find the Defendant guilty, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the 1st day of October 2004 through the 3rd day of October 2004, and in Medina County, Ohio, that the Defendant purposely engaged in sexual conduct with the child with the initials S.L., the date of birth being REDACTED, and that the said S.L., date of birth being REDACTED, being less than ten years of age at that time. Okay? That's the charge.

Let's define some of the terms.

"Sexual conduct," what does "sexual conduct" mean? Sexual conduct means vaginal intercourse between a male and a female, or anal intercourse or fellatio or cunnilingus between persons regardless of sex, without privilege to do so. Penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete vaginal or

anal intercourse.

"Vaginal intercourse" means penetration of the penis into the vagina.

"Anal intercourse" means penetration of the penis into the anal opening of a man or woman.

"Fellatio" means a sexual act committed with the penis and the mouth.

"Cunnilingus" means a sexual act committed with the mouth and the female sex organ.

That's sexual conduct; I've defined it for you. It's probably pretty much common sense, so now you've got the legal definition of it.

"Purposely." Purpose to engage in sexual conduct is an essential element of the crime of rape.

A person acts purposely when it is his specific intention to cause a certain result. It must be established in this case that at that time in question there was present in the mind of this Defendant a specific intention to engage in sexual conduct with the victim.

When the essence of the offense is a prohibition against conduct of a certain nature, a person acts purposely if his specific intention was to engage in conduct of that nature, regardless of what he may

have intended to accomplish by his conduct.

Purpose is a decision of the mind to do an act with a conscious objective of engaging in specific conduct. To do an act purposely is to do it intentionally and not accidentally. Purpose and intent mean the same thing. The purpose with which a person does an act is known only to himself unless he expresses it to others or indicates it by his conduct.

The purpose with which a person does an act is determined from the manner in which it is done, the means used, and all the other facts and circumstances in evidence.

If you find that the State of Ohio proved beyond a reasonable doubt all the essential elements of the offense of rape as I've defined them for you, your verdict must be Guilty on that charge.

If you find that the State of Ohio has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any one of the essential elements of the offense of rape, then your verdict must be Not Guilty to that charge.

I'm also going to include a request for special findings from you, and that has to do with the age of S.L. This special finding reads as follows - you'll see this attached to the verdict form - it says, "We

the Jury in this case, duly impaneled and sworn and affirmed, further find that the victim with the initials S.L. was or was not less than ten years of age at the time of the commission of the offense of rape against her." You'll make that determination with regard to the special findings about the victim S.L., and you'll circle "was" or "was not." It's not an additional element, it's the same element, it's just on a separate page.

The Defendant is charged with gross sexual imposition. Before you can find the Defendant Guilty, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that on or about the 1st day of August 2000 through the 31st day of October 2000, and in Medina County, Ohio, that the Defendant purposely had sexual contact with K.S., date of birth [REDACTED], who is not his spouse, to have sexual contact with him, and the said K.S., date of birth [REDACTED], was less than thirteen years of age at the time of the commission of the offense, whether or not the Defendant knew the age of such person.

"Sexual contact" means any touching of an erogenous zone of another, including without limitation the thigh, genitals, buttock, pubic region, or if the person is a female, the breast, for purpose of sexually arousing or gratifying either

person. That's what sexual contact means.

"Purposely" was defined for you before. You'll use that definition here.

Purpose to engage in sexual contact is an essential element of the crime of gross sexual imposition.

If you find the State of Ohio proved beyond a reasonable doubt all the essential elements of the offense of gross sexual imposition, your verdict must be Guilty to that charge.

If you find the State of Ohio has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt any one of the essential elements of gross sexual imposition, then your verdict must be Not Guilty to this charge.

I'm also going to give you a special finding with regard to that related to the age of the purported victim in that particular case. That special finding will read, "We the Jury in this case, duly impaneled and sworn and affirmed, further find that the victim with the initials K.S. was or was not less than thirteen years of age at the time of the commission of the offense of gross sexual imposition against her."

This will be attached to the Guilty verdict form. If you find the Defendant did not commit this

offense, you won't consider that. It's not in addition to the offense. In other words, I'm not adding an additional element to the offense, I just need it on a separate form.

You may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment. Your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of this Defendant. In the event that you find the Defendant guilty, the duty to determine punishment is placed by law on me alone.

You must not be influenced by any consideration of sympathy or prejudice. It's your duty in this case to carefully weigh the evidence, to decide all the disputed questions of fact, to apply these instructions to your findings, and to render your verdict accordingly.

In fulfilling your duty, folks, your efforts must be to arrive at a just verdict. Consider all of the evidence and make your findings with intelligence and impartiality, and without bias, sympathy, or prejudice, so that both the State of Ohio and the Defendant will feel that their case was fairly and impartially tried. If you keep that in front of you, you can't go wrong.

Look, this is important. If during the course



1 of the trial the Court - and when I say "the Court" I  
2 mean me - did or said anything to give you any  
3 indication about the Court's views - my views - of  
4 the facts of this case, put it aside. That is not my  
5 job. It's your job to determine the facts of this  
6 case.

7 It's going to be difficult for you to remember  
8 all of these written instructions. If during your  
9 deliberations you can't remember something or are in  
10 doubt about a portion of the instructions, please  
11 review the written instructions that I will provide  
12 to you. They are right here (indicating). The  
13 answer to any question that you might have when  
14 you're back there deliberating will probably be found  
15 in the instructions themselves.

16 However, if you still have a question after  
17 reviewing the instructions, you may request that  
18 information. The foreman must put your question in  
19 writing, indicating specifically what is requested.  
20 That written communication must be delivered to  
21 the bailiff by knocking on the door of the jury  
22 room.

23 Now, your initial conduct in entering the jury  
24 room is a matter of some importance. It's not wise  
25 to immediately insist on a certain verdict, because

1 if your sense of pride is aroused, you may hesitate  
2 to change your opinion if you later decide that  
3 you're wrong.

4 Each of you should consult with one another  
5 and deliberate with an objective of reaching an  
6 agreement if you can do so without disturbing your  
7 individual judgment. Each of you has to decide the  
8 case for yourselves, but you should do so only  
9 after a discussion of the case with your fellow  
10 jurors.

11 Don't hesitate to change your opinion if you  
12 later decide that you're wrong, but don't give up  
13 honest opinions in order to be congenial or friendly  
14 with the other jurors.

15 Two alternates were selected to serve in the  
16 event of any misfortune to one of the members of the  
17 panel. I'm looking. They're looking pretty healthy  
18 to me.

19 It won't be necessary for you to serve any  
20 longer, but stay right there. Here's what's going to  
21 happen.

22 First, you're not to discuss this matter or tell  
23 anyone else how you would have voted until after the  
24 Jury has returned a verdict, so act as you have  
25 throughout the proceedings. Don't discuss the case

1 with anyone or allow them to discuss it in your  
2 presence. Don't talk to each other about the case  
3 until after the Jury comes back with their verdict.  
4 I'm saying this for two reasons.

5 First, you're not permitted to do so; and  
6 second, if something should happen to one of the  
7 jurors, I want you on deck. I want to be able to put  
8 you in there, okay? So zip, nothing.

9 Now, you can spend the rest of the afternoon  
10 with me, or whatever period of time the Jury takes  
11 to reach a verdict. You'd probably be crazy to do  
12 so.

13 The other possibility is, if you give my bailiff  
14 your telephone number, I promise to call you and  
15 we'll let you know what the verdict was.

16 So thank you for your hard work here. It's  
17 especially difficult for the alternates because you  
18 go through the whole thing and you don't get a chance  
19 to deliberate. Thank you.

20 Chris is going to walk in with all of you and  
21 then you'll be excused.

22 I am now going to place in your possession the  
23 exhibits and the verdict forms and these  
24 instructions. The foreman or forelady will retain  
25 possession of these forms.

1 The foreman or forelady will see that your  
2 discussions are orderly and that each of you has the  
3 opportunity to discuss the case and cast his or her  
4 vote; otherwise, the authority of the foreman or  
5 forelady is the same as any other juror. You're  
6 going to elect a foreman or forelady; that's your  
7 job.

8 Until your verdict is announced in open  
9 court, don't disclose to anyone else the status  
10 of your deliberations or the nature of your  
11 verdict.

12 Now, there's a paragraph in here that tells  
13 me I'm supposed to thank you. You've been with me  
14 now for a week; you know how I feel about you.

15 After your verdict is returned, you can discuss  
16 this case with anybody, but you're not required to do  
17 so. You can discuss the case with counsel, the  
18 press, or anyone else after your verdict is returned;  
19 it's completely up to you. You can tell them to buzz  
20 off. It doesn't matter to me; it's a matter of your  
21 own free choice.

22 Now, please retire and select a foreman or a  
23 forelady, and whenever all twelve of you - and I  
24 repeat, all twelve of you - agree on a verdict, you  
25 will sign that verdict in ink and advise the bailiff



1 by knocking on the door. You will then be returned  
2 to the courtroom.

3 Does either counsel for the State of Ohio or the  
4 Defendant have any additions, corrections, or  
5 objections?

6 MS. EISENHOWER: No, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Counsel for the  
8 Defendant?

9 MR. GREEN: Your Honor, we  
10 would object.

11 THE COURT: Come on up.

12 (Whereupon, the further following proceedings  
13 were then held at sidebar out of the hearing of the  
14 Jurors.)

15 THE COURT: Sir.

16 MR. GREEN: I believe on  
17 Page 8 you said, "You may not discuss or consider the  
18 subject of punishment."

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MR. GREEN: "Your duty is  
21 confined to the determination of the guilt or  
22 innocence of the Defendant."

23 THE COURT: Right.

24 MR. GREEN: We object to  
25 the use of the word "innocence" because they don't

1 decide the innocence.

2 THE COURT: Okay. I think  
3 it comes straight from OJI.

4 MR. GREEN: I know.

5 THE COURT: Actually, it  
6 comes directly from that, and I'm reluctant to  
7 deviate from that. So thank you.

8 MR. GREEN: I just wanted  
9 to put that on the record.

10 THE COURT: Got it.

11 (Whereupon, the further following proceedings  
12 were then held in the presence of the court, the  
13 Jurors, Counsel, and the Defendant.)

14 THE COURT: Okay, here's  
15 what's going to happen, folks. I'm where I need to  
16 be. What's going to happen right now is, I'm going  
17 to have you go back into the jury room, and the first  
18 thing I want you to do is order lunch. It's going to  
19 take about forty-five minutes to an hour for your  
20 lunch to arrive. My bailiff will be in there with  
21 you, she'll give you a menu, we order from one of the  
22 places here. She'll find out what you want for  
23 lunch. Give that to my bailiff. You're not to  
24 deliberate at this point; just get your lunch  
25 information to her.

1 Once my Bailiff withdraws from your jury room,  
2 when you're done ordering - okay? - you can begin  
3 your deliberations. That way you will all know  
4 something is coming. I don't know about you guys,  
5 but I'm pretty much kind of a regular guy when it  
6 comes to eating. I want to make sure you all get  
7 your food by 12:45.

8 All right. The case is yours now. Thank you.

9 (Whereupon, the proceedings stood in recess as  
10 the Jury entered the jury room to commence their  
11 deliberations.)

12 THE COURT: Hey, folks,  
13 please be seated. This is just going to take a  
14 second. I neglected to read you something, and my  
15 court reporter reminded me. I want to read to you  
16 the verdict forms so you know what you're looking  
17 at.

18 I indicated to you that you're looking at two  
19 counts. There are two verdict forms for each count.  
20 The first one is a charge of rape. The first one  
21 says "Guilty" at the top. It says "Court of Common  
22 Pleas, Medina County, Ohio, State of Ohio versus  
23 Frank P. Wood, Indictment for Rape (child less  
24 than ten)," and it's got the case number, 05 CR  
25 0365.

1 It says, "We, the Jury in this case, duly  
2 impaneled and sworn and affirmed, find the Defendant,  
3 Frank P. Wood, Guilty of rape in the manner and form  
4 as he stands charged in the indictment."

5 And then there's a place for the date and a  
6 place for all twelve signatures.

7 There's a Not Guilty verdict form, it looks like  
8 the Guilty verdict form, but it says, "Verdict - Not  
9 Guilty" at the top, so you really can't get confused.  
10 It reads, "Court of Common Pleas, Medina County,  
11 Ohio, State of Ohio versus Frank P. Wood, Indictment  
12 for Rape (child less than ten)," again, the same case  
13 number, 05 CR 0365.

14 And it reads, "We, the Jury in this case, duly  
15 impaneled and sworn and affirmed, find the Defendant,  
16 Frank P. Wood, Not Guilty."

17 And then there's a place for the date and a  
18 place for all twelve jurors to sign.

19 Attached to the Guilty verdict form is that  
20 special finding that I indicated you have. It's a  
21 long form, it looks like this (indicating), and it  
22 says, "We, the Jury in this case, duly impaneled and  
23 sworn and affirmed further find that the victim with  
24 the initials S.L. was" or "was not" - circle the  
25 correct answer - "less than ten years of age at the

time of the commission of the offense of rape against her."

Obviously, you only use that form if you find the Defendant Guilty.

The second count relates to gross sexual imposition. It says "Verdict - Guilty" at the top of the form, "Court of Common Pleas, Medina County, Ohio," same caption, "State of Ohio versus Frank P. Wood," same case number.

"We, the Jury in this case, duly impaneled and sworn and affirmed, find the Defendant, Frank P. Wood, Guilty of gross sexual imposition, in the manner and form as he stands charged in the Indictment." There's a blank space for the date and a place for all twelve of your signatures.

Then of course there is a Not Guilty form that says "Verdict - Guilty" at the top, "Court of Common Pleas, Medina County, Ohio, State of Ohio versus Frank P. Wood," same case number, 05 CR 0365, "Indictment for gross sexual imposition."

It reads, "We, the Jury in this case, duly impaneled and sworn and affirmed, find the Defendant, Frank P. Wood, Not Guilty."

And again, it's dated blank day of April, 2006, and there's a place for all twelve of your

signatures.

Attached to the Guilty verdict form, if you find the Defendant Guilty, you will make the determination on the special finding form. Again, it's not an additional element, it's just something separate, that the child K.S. was less than thirteen years of age at the time of the commission of the offense of gross sexual imposition. If you find the Defendant Guilty, you'll make that determination, you'll circle "was" or "was not."

I always read these things to the Jury so that you know what you're looking at when you take the forms back with you. I didn't do that this time, and my court reporter walked out and said, "Hey, you should read these forms to these people," and she's absolutely right. That's why Chris and Donna and these folks here are so good and I'm so lucky to have them.

All right. There you go. You can go order your lunch now.

(Whereupon, the proceedings stood in recess as the Jury entered the jury room to commence their deliberations.)

THE COURT: Come on in, folks, and have a seat. There you go, you can be

seated.

We're back on the record in Case Number 05 CR 0365, that's State of Ohio versus Frank Wood.

My bailiff has indicated to me that the Jury is going to need more time, and that's perfectly fine. I'm going to dismiss you at this time and we're going to come back to do further deliberations on Monday morning at 9 o'clock.

Now, you know my standard admonition. Don't discuss the case among yourselves or with anyone else. Don't form or express an opinion about the matter until you're back together on Monday and continue with your deliberations.

I want you to spend a little more time reflecting on that now. It's very important that you don't discuss the case among yourselves or anyone else. You're done deliberating for the weekend. You quit that when you leave the jury room. You go out, you have yourself the weekend you're supposed to, you don't read the newspaper. We've got newspaper people here. You don't discuss this case with anyone. You don't permit anybody to discuss the case with you. This is a very, very delicate stage of the proceedings and we need to know that you're going to come back in the exact same way that you've

gone out. Fair enough? Can you do that for me? Good.

I'm going to send you home now and we will see you Monday morning at 9 o'clock. Until then, we're at recess.

Thank you.

(Hearing adjourned.)

1 JURY IN THIS CASE, DULY IMPANELED AND SWORN AND  
2 AFFIRMED, FURTHER FIND THAT THE VICTIM WITH THE  
3 INITIALS S.T. WAS LESS THAN TEN YEARS OF AGE AT THE  
4 TIME OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE OF RAPE AGAINST  
5 HER. AND IT'S DATED THE SAME DATE, APRIL 28TH,  
6 2005, AND IT'S SIGNED BY THE SAME TWELVE JURORS.  
7 IN COUNT NUMBER II, THE VERDICT FORM READS AS  
8 FOLLOWS:  
9 "WE, THE JURY IN THIS CASE, DULY IMPANELED AND  
10 SWORN AND AFFIRMED, FIND THE DEFENDANT, FRANK P.  
11 WOOD, GUILTY OF GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION, IN THE  
12 MANNER AND FORM AS HE STANDS CHARGED IN THE  
13 INDICTMENT."  
14 AND THAT'S DATED MAY 1ST, 2006, AND IT'S SIGNED  
15 BY ALL TWELVE JURORS.  
16 THE SPECIAL FINDING THAT I REQUESTED THE JURY TO  
17 MAKE STATES, "WE, THE JURY IN THIS CASE, DULY  
18 IMPANELED AND SWORN AND AFFIRMED, FURTHER FIND THAT  
19 THE VICTIM WITH THE INITIALS K.S. WAS LESS THAN  
20 THIRTEEN YEARS OF AGE AT THE TIME OF THE COMMISSION  
21 OF THE OFFENSE OF GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION AGAINST HER  
22 WHETHER OR NOT THE DEFENDANT KNEW THE AGE OF K.S."  
23 AND IT'S DATED THE 1ST OF MAY, 2006, LIKE THE VERDICT  
24 IN THE GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION CASE. IT'S ALSO  
25 SIGNED BY ALL TWELVE JURORS.

557

NEW CAN - LAMAR REPORTING SERVICE, INC. CO. 888-888-8888

1 DOES EITHER COUNSEL FOR THE STATE OR COUNSEL FOR  
2 THE DEFENDANT WANT THE JURY POLLED?  
3 COUNSEL FOR THE STATE?  
4 MS. EISENHOWER: NO, YOUR HONOR.  
5 THE COURT: COUNSEL FOR THE  
6 DEFENDANT?  
7 MR. GREEN: YES, YOUR  
8 HONOR.  
9 THE COURT: WHAT THAT MEANS  
10 IS THAT THE STATE OF OHIO AND THE -- I'M SORRY, BOTH  
11 THE STATE OF OHIO AND THE DEFENDANT HAVE THE RIGHT TO  
12 ASK THAT I ASK EACH OF THE JURORS IF THE VERDICTS AND  
13 THE SPECIAL FINDINGS THAT I JUST READ ARE THEIR  
14 VERDICTS. I'LL ASK YOU, "ARE THE VERDICTS I JUST  
15 READ YOUR VERDICTS," AND YOU'LL ANSWER, "YES, IT IS."  
16 "NO, IT'S NOT."  
17 AND, MA'AM, I'M GOING TO START IN THE BACK WITH  
18 YOU.  
19 MA'AM, ARE THE VERDICTS I READ YOUR VERDICTS?  
20 MS. O'CONNOR: YES.  
21 THE COURT: SIR, ARE THE  
22 VERDICTS THAT I READ YOUR VERDICTS?  
23 MR. GARNON: YES.  
24 THE COURT: SIR, ARE THE  
25 VERDICTS THAT I READ YOUR VERDICTS?

558

1 (CONTINUATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
2 ABOVE-CAPTIONED CASE ON MONDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF MAY,  
3 2006, COMMENCING AT APPROXIMATELY 9:00 A.M., THE  
4 JURY CONTINUED WITH ITS DELIBERATIONS.)  
5  
6 VERDICT  
7 THE COURT: WE'RE ON THE  
8 RECORD IN CASE NUMBER 05 CR 0365, THAT'S THE STATE OF  
9 OHIO VERSUS FRANK WOOD.  
10 WE BEGAN THIS TRIAL WITH JURY SELECTION ALMOST  
11 EXACTLY ONE WEEK AGO. IT IS NOW 11:25 ON THE 1ST DAY  
12 OF MAY, 2006.  
13 MY BALIFF HAS INDICATED TO ME THAT THE JURY HAS  
14 REACHED A VERDICT ON THE TWO COUNTS IN THE CASE.  
15 WHAT HAPPENS IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF MINUTES IS A  
16 MATTER OF SOME IMPORTANCE, SO I NEED YOU TO BEAR WITH  
17 ME.  
18 FIRST, DID THE JURY SELECT A FOREMAN OR  
19 FORELADY, AND IF SO, WHO IS HE OR SHE?  
20 MR. GARNON: (INDICATING.)  
21 SIR, HAS YOUR  
22 JURY REACHED A VERDICT?  
23 MR. GARNON: YES, WE HAVE.  
24 THE COURT: HAVE YOU FILLED  
25 OUT THE APPROPRIATE VERDICT FORMS?

555

NEW CAN - LAMAR REPORTING SERVICE, INC. CO. 888-888-8888

1 MR. GARNON: DID YOU HAVE  
2 YOUR JURY SIGN THOSE VERDICT FORMS IN INK?  
3 MR. GARNON: YES, WE DID.  
4 THE COURT: DID YOU HAND  
5 THOSE VERDICT FORMS TO MY BALIFF WHEN YOU CAME IN?  
6 MR. GARNON: YES, I DID.  
7 THE COURT: I'M GOING TO  
8 TAKE IT OVER FROM HERE.  
9 CHRIS, CAN I HAVE THE VERDICT FORMS, PLEASE.  
10 THE BALIFF: YES.  
11 THE COURT: THANKS.  
12 YOU NEED TO STAND UP AT THIS TIME.  
13 IN CASE NUMBER 05 CR 0365, THE VERDICT IS AS  
14 FOLLOWS:  
15 STATE OF OHIO VERSUS FRANK P. WOOD, INDICTMENT  
16 FOR RAPE, "WE, THE JURY IN THIS CASE, DULY IMPANELED  
17 AND SWORN AND AFFIRMED, FIND THE DEFENDANT, FRANK P.  
18 WOOD, GUILTY OF RAPE OF A CHILD LESS THAN TEN IN THE  
19 MANNER AND FORM AS HE STANDS CHARGED IN THE  
20 INDICTMENT."  
21 AND IT'S DATED APRIL 28TH, 2005, AND IT'S SIGNED  
22 BY ALL TWELVE JURORS.  
23 I ASKED THE JURY TO MAKE A SPECIAL FINDING WITH  
24 REGARD TO THE AGE OF THE CHILD, AND IT SAYS, "WE, THE  
25

556

MR. SHOOK: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MS. LANCE: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MS. MACKAY: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MR. COMBS: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MS. PARK: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MS. LAMIELLE: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MR. PART: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 MS. DEROSE: THE COURT: Yes.  
 Yes. Ma'am, are the verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?

© 2004 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc.

STATE OF OHIO,  
COUNTY OF MEDINA,  
I, SS:  
I, Donna A. Garrity, Official Court Reporter and  
Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio, duly  
commissioned and qualified, hereby certify that before the  
giving of their testimony, all witnesses were first duly  
sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing  
but the truth in the case aforesaid and that the testimony  
was taken by me by means of stenotypy in the presence of  
said witnesses.  
I further certify that said hearing was held at  
the time and place specified in the above caption and was  
adjourned on the 1st day of May, 2006.  
Further, I certify that I am not a relative, counsel,  
or attorney at law for any party to this suit, nor am I  
interested in the event of same.  
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and  
affixed my seal of office at Medina, Ohio this 3rd day of  
August, 2006.



PERPETRATOR #1!

4720Like · Share



20.

Scott Sadowsky

February 15 near Medina, OH

Nice move!

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

APR 12 PM 1:13

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

) CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

)

) JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

AMENDED  
BILL OF PARTICULARS

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

Now comes the State of Ohio, by and through the prosecuting attorney, and provides the following Bill of Particulars:

- 1 That on or about the 1st day of October, 2005 through the 3rd day of October, 2005, within the County of Medina, aforesaid FRANK P. WOOD unlawfully and purposely did engage in sexual conduct with S.L. (D.O.B. 10/03/1994), and the said S.L. (D.O.B. 10/03/1994), being less than ten (10) years of age, in violation of Section 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) of the Ohio Revised Code, "Rape (<10)", a felony of the first degree.
2. That on or about the 1st day of August, 2000 through the 31st day of October, 2000, within the County of Medina, aforesaid FRANK P. WOOD unlawfully and purposely did have sexual contact with "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), not the spouse of the said FRANK P. WOOD, or cause "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), not the spouse of the said FRANK P. WOOD, to have sexual contact with the said FRANK P. WOOD, the said "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), being less than thirteen years of age, whether or not the said FRANK P. WOOD knows the age of "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), in violation of Section 2907.05(A)(4) of the Ohio Revised Code, "Gross Sexual Imposition", a felony of the third degree.

Respectfully submitted,

DEAN HOLMAN, Prosecuting Attorney

By:



ANNE EISENHOWER (#0067322)

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

72 Public Square

Medina, Ohio 44256

(330) 723-9536

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A copy of the foregoing Amended Bill of Particulars was sent by ordinary U.S. Mail to Ronald Scott Spears, attorney for defendant, at Marco, Marco & Bailey, 52 Public Square, Medina, Ohio 44256, on this 12th day of April, 2006.



ANNE EISENHOWER

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney



14843  
05-002373

**WARRANT TO ARREST  
ON INDICTMENT OR INFORMATION  
RULE 9(B)**

Exhibit-D

Court of Common Pleas, Medina County, Ohio

THE STATE OF OHIO

CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

v.

JUDGE JAMES L. KIMBLER

FRANK P. WOOD  
4754 POE ROAD  
MEDINA, OH 44256

**WARRANT ON INDICTMENT**

To: Medina County Sheriff &/OR DET. MARK KOLLAR (MEDINA CITY POLICE DEPT.

An indictment, a copy of which is attached hereto, has been filed in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas charging FRANK P. WOOD with

2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) RAPE (<10) (F-1)  
2907.05(A)(4) GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION (F-3)

You are ordered to arrest FRANK P. WOOD, said defendant, and bring him/her before said court without unnecessary delay.

Special instructions to executing officer: **DET. MARK KOLLAR FROM MEDINA CITY PD TO SERVE WARRANT**

DOB: 12/1/1967

W / M

5' 10" / 170 LBS.

HAIR: BLK / EYES: BRO

Given under my hand and the seal of said Court of Common Pleas at Medina, on August 4, 2005.

KATHY FORTNEY, CLERK OF COURTS

*Loretta Seibert*  
Deputy Clerk

**RECEIPT OF WARRANT BY EXECUTING AUTHORITY**

First receipt:

Received this warrant on Aug 4, 20 05, at 11:30 o'clock A.m.

Det. Mark #239 Medina P.D.  
Officer, Title

COPY TO:  
Pros  
Aug 9, 2005

(5) (see back)

Subsequent receipt:

Received this warrant on \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock \_\_\_\_\_m.

COMMON PLEAS COURT

05 AUG -9 AM 10:31

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

### RETURN OF EXECUTED WARRANT

#### FEES

Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

#### SHERIFF'S FEES:

REC & DIS = \$10.00

TOTAL \$

COURT OF APPEALS

06 JUN 12 AM 9:27

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

#### FEES

Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL \$ \_\_\_\_\_

I received this warrant on the 4<sup>TH</sup> day of AUGUST,  
20 05, at 11:30 o'clock, A .M., and pursuant to its  
command, on AUG 4<sup>TH</sup>, 20 05, I arrested  
FRANK P. WOOD, gave him her a copy  
of this warrant with a copy of the indictment attached and brought him her  
to MCSO JAIL  
(state the place)

DET. M/LH #239 MEDINA P.D.  
Arresting Officer, Title

### RETURN OF UNEXECUTED WARRANT

I received this warrant on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_,  
20\_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock, \_\_\_\_\_M. On the \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_, I attempted to execute this  
warrant but was unable to do so because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(state specific reason or reasons and additional information regarding C.D.'s whereabouts)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executing Officer, Title

5

---

STATE OF OHIO	)	
	)	SS: Affidavit of Verity and Confinement
COUNTY OF RICHLAND	)	

---

¶01 I, Frank P. Wood, Affiant in the instant matter, having been duly advised of the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Ohio, declare that I am mentally fit and competent to testify, that I have direct personal knowledge of and to support the facts contained hereinafter, and that these facts are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, beliefs and experiences.

¶02 Currently I am The Innocent Man: a prisoner who is unlawfully restrained of his liberty and wrongfully imprisoned at the Richland Correctional Institution, 1001 Olivesburg Road, County of Richland, Mansfield, Ohio, 44905 in direct violation of my *Human & Constitutional Rights*.

No one shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 9 (1949)

The General Assembly of the United Nations

¶03 The individual who currently presides over my custody at the Richland Correctional Institution is Warden Harold May.

¶04 A true copy of my original commitment papers: Medina County Court of Common Pleas; Judgment Entry: 06 MAY 15 is attached to the back of this Affidavit as (DOC # 01).

¶05 A true copy of my second commitment papers: Medina County Court of common Pleas; *Nunc Pro Tunc*, Judgment/Sentencing Entry: 07 MAY 22 is attached to the back of this Affidavit as (DOC # 02).

¶06 I was never served a copy of my second commitment papers by the Medina County Court of Common Pleas or the Medina County Prosecutor's Office. I received it from the Ohio Attorney General's Office in 2008: two (2) years post-sentencing.

¶07 As I am detained without any legal authority, all statements made and copies of Exhibits submitted by Attorney Ronald R. Stanley (#0040766) ("Counsel") on my behalf are true, factual and correct.

¶08 With uncontradictable evidence in hand:

1. Merit Affidavit of Frank P. Wood; August 28, 2018; A Blueprint for Wrongful Imprisonment:<sup>1</sup> 877 pages with 86 Exhibits, save one (1)
2. A stenographer certified copy of the Transcript of Proceedings from State of Ohio, Plaintiff vs. Frank P. Wood, Defendant, Medina County Court of Common Pleas Case No. 05CR0365

I am willing, under oath and in the presence of my Counsel,

- i. To sit through Direct- and Cross-examination regarding all statements made and copies of Exhibits submitted on my behalf
- ii. To sit through depositions regarding all statements made and copies of Exhibits submitted on my behalf
- iii. To sit through interviews with State-investigative agencies that are necessary to the administration of and the ends of justice regarding the instant matter

¶09 The Warrant on Indictment: Indictment for Rape (<10) 2907.02 (A)(1)(b)(B) (F-1) and Gross Sexual Imposition 2907.05 (A)(4) (F-3); August 4, 2005 (DOC # 03 of this Affidavit) contains materially false information:

- i. The charges themselves in regards to myself
- ii. The jurisdiction in which the alleged F-1 rape was supposedly committed

¶10 The Indictment for Rape and Gross Sexual Imposition was illegally secured by former

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.freefrankpwood.com](http://www.freefrankpwood.com)

Detective Mark Kollar of the Medina City Police Department outside of his jurisdiction in violation of R.C. § 2921.52 Using Sham Legal Process.

¶11 I am legally and factually innocent of all charges alleged in the Warrant on Indictment.

¶13 The Amended Bill of Particulars: 06 APR 12 (DOC # 04 of this Affidavit) contains materially false information:

- i. The charges themselves in regards to myself
- ii. The jurisdiction in which the alleged F-1 was supposedly committed

¶14 I am legally and factually innocent of both charges alleged in the Amended Bill of Particulars.

¶15 During Trial, State's best and direct evidence proved that the alleged F-1 rape of S.L. occurred in Put-In-Bay, Ottawa County, Ohio on the indicted dates of October 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> of 2004.

¶16 State's best and direct evidence proves that Scott Michael Sadowsky raped S.L. with "Penetration, however slight" (Tp.537, Ln.24-Tp.538, Ln.3) in Put-In-Bay, Ottawa County, Ohio on the indicted dates of October 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> of 2004.

¶17 Via his own testimony, Scott Michael Sadowsky placed himself at the Put-In-Bay, Ottawa County, Ohio crime scene on the indicted dates of October 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> of 2004.

¶18 The testimony both Danielle Sadowsky and S.L. also placed Scott Michael Sadowsky at the Put-In-Bay, Ottawa County crime scene on the indicted dates of October 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> of 2004.

¶20 With "No supplemental indictments" (Tp.17, Ln.16-17), no one placed me at the Ottawa County Crime Scene (Tp.1-560).

¶21 I have never been to Put-In-Bay, Ottawa County, Ohio.

¶22 I lived with Danielle Marie Sadowsky (n.k.a. "Smith") ("Danielle") and S.L.: the rape victim in the instant matter. I personally knew the inner-workings of their family at the time the

bogus allegations were made. I also know the motives behind the allegations and why Danielle left the sanctity of her marriage bed.

¶23 Evidence exists proving that Scott Michael Sadowsky sexually abused S.L. on other unindicted dates.

¶21 I want to testify. Something I have been denied thus far.

**AFFIANT FURTHER SAYETH NAUGHT.**

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)

Affiant

Sworn to or affirmed, and subscribed in my presence on this 23 day of  
September, 2019.

Monica DeJulius  
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 2-26-22.

Seal of the State of Ohio:



COMMON PLEAS COURT

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

DOC # 01

06 MAY 15 AM 11:25

FILED  
STATE OF OHIO  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS  
Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

) CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

) JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

) JUDGMENT ENTRY

On May 15, 2006, defendant's sentencing hearing was held pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 2929.19. The assistant prosecuting attorney, Anne Eisenhower, and defense attorneys, F. Harrison Green and Ronald Stanley, were present, as was defendant who was afforded all rights pursuant to Crim. R. 32. The Court has considered the record, oral statements, any victim impact statement and presentence report prepared, as well as the principles and purposes of sentencing under Ohio Revised Code section 2929.11.

The Court finds that the defendant has been convicted of "Rape", a violation of Revised Code section 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B), a felony of the first degree, with a finding the child was under age 10, subject to a mandatory prison term under division (F) of section 2929.13 and 2907.03(A)(1)(b)(B) of the Ohio Revised Code; and of "Gross Sexual Imposition", a violation of Revised Code section 2907.05(A)(4), a felony of the third degree, with a finding the child was under age 13.

It is therefore ordered that the defendant serve a stated prison term of life in prison, of which life is a mandatory prison term pursuant to Revised Code section (F) of 2929.13 and 2907.03(A)(1)(b)(B) for the "Rape" under 10 and 3 years in prison for the "Gross Sexual Imposition", pursuant to R.C. 2929.13.

These sentences are to be served consecutively.

The Court has further notified the defendant that post release control is mandatory in this case up to a maximum of 5 years, as well as the consequences for violating conditions of post release control imposed by the Parole Board under Revised Code section 2967.28. As part of this sentence, the defendant is ordered to serve any term of post release control imposed by the Parole Board, and any prison term for violation of that post release control.

A1



The defendant is therefore ordered conveyed to the custody of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Credit for 110 days is granted as of this date, along with future custody days while the defendant awaits transportation to the appropriate state institution. All costs of prosecution, court appointed counsel costs, and any fees permitted pursuant to Revised Code section 2929.18(A)(4) are hereby waived.

The defendant shall submit to a DNA sample and a DNA sample shall be collected pursuant to R.C. 2901.07.

After a hearing, the defendant was found to be a sexual predator and a child victim predator and was advised of his duties to register under the law. As the defendant was convicted of "Rape" of a child under 10 pursuant to R.C. 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B), the Court makes the finding that the defendant has been convicted of an aggravated sexual oriented offense pursuant to R.C. 2950.01 and 2919.19(B)(4).

The defendant was afforded all of his appellate rights.



---

THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO**

COMMON PLEAS COURT  
07 MAY 22 PM 3:18

STATE OF OHIO

CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

Plaintiff,

-v-

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

NUNC PRO TUNCJUDGMENT / SENTENCING ENTRY

On May 15, 2006, Defendant's sentencing hearing was held pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2929.19. The Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Anne Eisenhower, and Defendant's attorneys, F. Harrison Green and Ronald Stanley, were present, as was Defendant who as afforded all rights pursuant to Crim.R. 32. The Court has considered the record, oral statements, any victim impact statements, and any pre-sentence investigation reports prepared, as well as the principles and purposes of sentencing under Ohio Revised Code Section 2929.11.

At arraignment, Defendant entered a plea of "not guilty" to the indictment filed in this case. On May 1, 2006, following a week-long trial by jury, the jury returned verdicts of "guilty" as to both counts of the indictment.

Pursuant to those jury verdicts of guilty, the Court hereby finds the Defendant guilty of the charged offense of "Rape" in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B), a felony of the first degree, with a finding that the first child was under the age of 10 years old, subject to the mandatory prison term under division (F) of Section 2929.13 and 2907.03(A)(1)(b)(B) of the Ohio Revised Code, and guilty of the charged offense of "Gross Sexual Imposition" in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section 2907.05(A)(4), a felony of the third degree, with a finding that the second child was under the age of 13 years old.

After a hearing conducted prior to imposition of sentence, the Defendant was found to be a sexual predator and a child victim predator, and he was advised of his duties to register under Chapter 2950 of the Ohio Revised Code. As the Defendant was convicted of "Rape" of a child under 10 years old pursuant Ohio Revised Code Section 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B), the Court makes the finding that the Defendant has been convicted of an aggravated sexually oriented offense pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2950.01 and 2919.19(B)(4).

It is therefore Ordered that the Defendant serve a stated prison term of life in prison, of which life is a mandatory prison term pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2929.13 and 2907.03(A)(1)(b)(B) for the offense of "Rape" where the victim is under the age of 10 years old, and an additional prison term of three (3) years for the offense of "Gross Sexual Imposition" pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2929.13. Those sentences are to be served consecutively.

The Court has further notified the Defendant that post-release control is mandatory in this case up to a maximum of five (5) years, as well as the consequences for violating conditions of post-release control imposed by the Parole Board under Ohio Revised Code Section 2867.28. As part of this sentence, the Defendant is ordered to serve any term of post-release control imposed by the Parole Board, and any prison term for violation of that post-release control.

The Defendant is therefore Ordered conveyed to the custody of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Jail time credit for One Hundred Ten (110) days is granted as of May 15, 2006, along with future days served at the Medina County Jail while Defendant waits transportation to the appropriate state institution. All costs of prosecution, court-appointed counsel costs, and any fees permitted pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2929.18(A)(4) are hereby waived.

The Defendant shall submit a DNA sample and a DNA sample shall be collected from him pursuant to Ohio Revised Code Section 2901.07.

The Defendant was afforded all of his appellate rights.

IT IS SO ORDERED

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

14843  
05-002373

**WARRANT TO ARREST  
ON INDICTMENT OR INFORMATION  
RULE 9(B)**

**DOC # 03**

**Court of Common Pleas, Medina County, Ohio**

**Exhibit-25**

**THE STATE OF OHIO**

**CASE NO. 05-CR-0365**

**v.**

**JUDGE JAMES L. KIMBLER**

**FRANK P. WOOD  
4754 POE ROAD  
MEDINA, OH 44256**

**WARRANT ON INDICTMENT**

**To: Medina County Sheriff &/OR DET. MARK KOLLAR (MEDINA CITY POLICE DEPT.**

**An indictment, a copy of which is attached hereto, has been filed in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas charging FRANK P. WOOD with**

**2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) RAPE (<10) (F-1)  
2907.05(A)(4) GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION (F-3)**

**You are ordered to arrest FRANK P. WOOD, said defendant, and bring him/her before said court without unnecessary delay.**

**Special instructions to executing officer: DET. MARK KOLLAR FROM MEDINA CITY PD TO SERVE WARRANT**

**DOB: 12/1/1967**

**Given under my hand and the seal of said Court of Common Pleas at Medina, on August 4, 2005.**

**W / M**

**5' 10" / 170 LBS.**

**HAIR: BLK / EYES: BRO**

**KATHY FORTNEY, CLERK OF COURTS**

*Kathy Fortney*  
**Deputy Clerk**

**RECEIPT OF WARRANT BY EXECUTING AUTHORITY**

**First receipt:**

**Received this warrant on** Aug 4, 20 05, at 11:30 o'clock A.m.  
Det. Mark #239 Medina P.D.  
**Officer, Title**

**COPY TO:**

Pros  
Aug 9, 2005

(5) (see back)

Subsequent receipt:

Received this warrant on \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock \_\_\_\_\_m.

COMMON PLEAS COURT

05 AUG -9 AM 10:31

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

### RETURN OF EXECUTED WARRANT

**FEES**  
Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**SHERIFF'S FEES:**

**REC & DIS = \$10.00**

**TOTAL**

COURT OF APPEALS  
06 JUN 12 AM 9:27

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

I received this warrant on the 4<sup>TH</sup> day of August,  
20 05, at 11:30 o'clock, A.M., and pursuant to its  
command, on AUG 4<sup>TH</sup>, 20 05, I arrested  
FRANK P. WOOD, gave him her a copy  
of this warrant with a copy of the indictment attached and brought him her  
to MC50 JAIL  
(state the place)

DET. M/L #239 MEDINA P.D.  
Arresting Officer, Title

### RETURN OF UNEXECUTED WARRANT

**FEES**  
Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL**

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

I received this warrant on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_,  
20\_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock, \_\_\_\_\_M. On the \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_, I attempted to execute this  
warrant but was unable to do so because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(state specific reason or reasons and additional information regarding C.D.'s whereabouts)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executing Officer, Title

5

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

DOC # 04

APR 12 PM 1:13

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

AMENDED

BILL OF PARTICULARS

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

Now comes the State of Ohio, by and through the prosecuting attorney, and provides the following Bill of Particulars:

1. That on or about the 1st day of October, 2005 through the 3rd day of October, 2005, within the County of Medina, aforesaid FRANK P. WOOD unlawfully and purposely did engage in sexual conduct with S.L. (D.O.B. 10/03/1994), and the said S.L. (D.O.B. 10/03/1994), being less than ten (10) years of age, in violation of Section 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) of the Ohio Revised Code, "Rape (<10)", a felony of the first degree.
2. That on or about the 1st day of August, 2000 through the 31st day of October, 2000, within the County of Medina, aforesaid FRANK P. WOOD unlawfully and purposely did have sexual contact with "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), not the spouse of the said FRANK P. WOOD, or cause "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), not the spouse of the said FRANK P. WOOD, to have sexual contact with the said FRANK P. WOOD, the said "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), being less than thirteen years of age, whether or not the said FRANK P. WOOD knows the age of "K.S." (D.O.B. 2/09/1996), in violation of Section 2907.05(A)(4) of the Ohio Revised Code, "Gross Sexual Imposition", a felony of the third degree.



Respectfully submitted,

DEAN HOLMAN, Prosecuting Attorney

By:



ANNE EISENHOWER (#0067322)

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

72 Public Square

Medina, Ohio 44256

(330) 723-9536

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A copy of the foregoing Amended Bill of Particulars was sent by ordinary U.S. Mail to Ronald Scott Spears, attorney for defendant, at Marco, Marco & Bailey, 52 Public Square, Medina, Ohio 44256, on this 12th day of April, 2006.



ANNE EISENHOWER

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney



Akron  
**Children's**  
Hospital

RE: S L  
UNIT #0674719  
DOB [REDACTED]

## SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT RECORD

Exhibit-F

### PHYSICAL EXAMINATION DATA

GENERAL APPEARANCE (INCLUDE CONDITION OF CLOTHING): Clean,  
appropriately dressed.

EMOTIONAL STATUS (OBJECTIVE OBSERVATIONS): Pleasant; cooperative.

BODY SURFACE (LOCATE AND DESCRIBE INJURY, DRAW FINDINGS ON PICTURES,  
PAGE 6):

MOUTH/FACE: No trauma.

HEAD/NECK: No trauma.

BACK: No trauma.

BUTTOCKS: No trauma.

CHEST/BREAST: No trauma.

ABDOMEN: No trauma.

UPPER EXTREMITIES: No trauma.

LOWER EXTREMITIES: No trauma.

EXTERNAL GENITALIA (DESCRIBE PUBERTAL STATUS AND GENERAL  
APPEARANCE): Tanner 1.

#### FEMALE:

VULVA/LABIA: No erythema, bruises, or lesions.

URETHRAL MEATUS, CLITORIS: Within normal limits.

POSTERIOR COMMISSURE: 2-3mm superficial tear during examination.

FOSSA NAVICULARIS: No tears or scarring.

HYMEN (DESCRIBE IN DETAIL): Crescentic; smooth, ample rim; no  
tears or disruptions.

X SUPINE

KNEE-CHEST

VAGINAL OPENING DIAMETER: Approximately 4-5mm.

VAGINAL CANAL: No discharge.

PELVIC EXAM: CERVIX: Not examined.

UTERUS AND ADNEXA: Not examined.

ANUS: No spontaneous dilatation; numerous symmetric skin folds.

MALE: Not applicable.

PENIS:

SCROTUM:

TESTICLES:

ANUS:

NURSE(S) ASSISTING EXAM: Barb DuVall, LPN.

OTHERS PRESENT DURING EXAM: Mother.

STUDENT OBSERVER(S): None. *DA*

MY PRE-TRIAL HISTORY WITH DANIELLE SADOWSKY-SMITH

In the early fall of 2003, I was hired by a builder to perform warranty work on the home of Scott and Danielle Sadowsky in Medina, Ohio. Scott was difficult to talk to, so I primarily dealt with Danielle. At that time there was one child born of their marriage: A— S———. There was a second child who was a few years older than A—. At first I thought she was their own biological daughter. It was later revealed that S——— L——— was their legal custodial child.

Danielle and I forged a bond while I was working on the house. We soon began a mutual affair. After the job was completed we continued to see each other. It was during this time that Danielle told me about S——— and how she came into their custody. Evidently, S———'s mother was a drug addict and a prostitute who entertained clients with her in the room. Eventually, S———'s mother died in prison, and her father passed soon after. S———'s father was Scott's cousin. The family agreed that someone had to take her in. According to Danielle, she had just given birth to A— and was not prepared to take in a second child. She and Scott argued, and against Danielle's wishes, Scott signed and took her in with the promise of adopting her in the near future. Danielle claimed that Scott did this just to "look good" to his mother. But at the time of trial, nearly six years later, S——— was still not adopted.

As we spent more time together, our conversations went deeper into the private areas of our family lives. This is when Danielle informed me about S——— suffering from severe sexual abuse before they obtained custody of her. S——— had been in counseling with Dr. LeSure for quite some time by now, and she was prone to picking her skin to make herself bleed. Not only is this a sign of long-term sexual abuse, the "picking" was "another reason" why she was in counseling (Tp.115, Ln.18-20). It was also made clear to me that Medina County Job & Family Services told Scott and Danielle about the sexual abuse and what signs to look for should she need further counseling.

Danielle called me crying in January of 2004. She was very upset and all she could say was, "She was molesting my son! S——— was molesting my son!" Evidently she found S——— and A— behind her bed. S——— and A—, according to Danielle, were completely naked and S——— was fondling A—. For some reason, Danielle didn't report this until much later in July of 2004 (Tp.159, Ln.12-13), which was before we lived together. During trial, Prosecutor Eisenhower illegally suppressed this under the Rape Shield Law (Tp.159-Tp.160). I was never made aware that Danielle reported this incident or to whom she reported it. I did ask why she called me instead of Scott. She said that she did call him and his response was, "Handle it!" The more I reflect, the more I understand what Danielle meant when she said that she "lived under Scott's thumb for twelve years."

Danielle informed me that she and Scott argued over S——— constantly, and that S——— was a primary source of conflict that contributed to their divorce. As this was confirmed by the combined testimonies of both Scott and Danielle, Scott testified that Danielle actually resented S——— (Tp.202, Ln.1-7).

In the very next month, February of 2004, Danielle called me and ended our relationship. It was more like a temporary blackout because we resumed our relationship in early June that same year.

By July Danielle moved in with me. A— and S——— began to live with

us by mid-August on a part-time basis. With limited contact[], I interacted with S—— for about 27-28 days. Running my business kept me very busy. I usually saw the children before I left for work and when I got home from Tuesday through Thursday. Scott traditionally had them from Friday through Monday. On a few occasions Scott had them from Thursday through Monday. A few days I did take off work so Danielle and I could take the children canoeing or to the fair. A few nights we made smores around the campfire in the back yard after dinner, and a few times I met Danielle and the children at Bob Evan's for lunch. Also, there were a few evenings that we watched movies in the living room. All of these events were as a group: Danielle, myself, and the children.

Before the children moved in with us, Scott purchased dressers for them at Value City, but I had to pick them up. Afterwards, annoyed that he promised to purchase their beds and failed to do so, I went to the Original Mattress Factory in Medina and purchased them myself. Although Danielle testified otherwise, all commercial checks are copied under banking laws. A simple audit of my commercial account would render her statement untruthful.

During the summer of 2004, Scott made repeated threats to Danielle. He threatened that if she married me, he had a "million cash" to take A—— from her. A—— was used as a weapon against Danielle. This was the one way Scott knew that he could hurt Danielle and keep her under his control.

August and September of 2004 was like running through a gauntlet. It was one explosive event after another. For instance, one day S—— said to me, "Frankie, if you like smoking cigarettes and getting drunk, then Put-In-Bay is the place for you." I waited until S—— went outside and then spoke to Danielle about this. Danielle said that she would take care of it. Another time S—— came back from Put-In-Bay and told me how "grandpa", Scott's step-father, was full drunk on all fours growling. In this manner, he backed S—— into a closet until she was afraid to come out. Again, Danielle and I spoke. She said that she would talk to Scott, but she never told me if she did. For the record, Danielle was with me when S—— made these comments.

Another time, A—— wanted to wrestle. During our match, S—— jumped in. I immediately wrapped my arm around her waist with my hand closed, and stood her in front of Danielle. She was disappointed when I told her, "Young ladies don't wrestle with boys," but she understood. Then, for her own reasons, Danielle said, "Thank you, Frankie."

Within a few days of the wrestling match I came home from work expecting to see A—— and S—— rush out to greet me as usual. A—— was sitting on the front steps sulking. I asked him what was wrong. He replied, "Dad said we're not allowed to love you." I went inside and discussed this with S——. She added, "It's true." I then asked Danielle if she knew about this. Evidently, Scott called her about the wrestling. In turn, I called Scott. He contended that I should not have been wrestling with S——. Obviously Danielle did not tell him the truth. However, I told him what I thought of him for using the children's hearts as weapons of choice, and that if he treated Danielle better, she would not be with me.

Shortly after this event, Danielle began to ask me questions about my former wife. She wanted to know her name, where she worked, and about her children. I did not figure out why until I put it together with the Trial Record. It was Scott and his "million cash" that wanted to know. A few days later, right around the first of September, I ran in the house, grabbed Danielle and kissed her. She pushed me away in anger. I asked her what was wrong. She then

replied, "Trust me. The honeymoon's over." It was a few days after this that Danielle told me she was pregnant. This is confirmed by the Trial Record as the "beginning" of September (Tp.144, Ln.12-13; Tp.186, Ln.16), through Danielle's own testimony. A day or two later Danielle told me that Scott knew, but claimed the children told him. Following this series of events, S-----'s case, in regards to this criminal case, was signed in with Dr. Suzanne LeSure on "September 24, 2004" (Tp.402, Ln.7-16). Danielle and I were living together and she never told me. With this in mind, the allegations were for "October 1-3, 2004", and Scott signed "permission" in November of 2004 (Tp.407, Ln.7-16). Two questions come to mind: What took Scott so long to agree after the case was signed in? And, what exactly did he sign permission for? Further, it must be concluded that Danielle signed this case in at Scott's instructions.

The weekend of S-----'s tenth birthday was approaching. Scott took both A--- and S----- on Thursday, September 30, 2004 to his family summer home in Put-In-Bay. They stayed there and celebrated S-----'s tenth birthday "on" Sunday, October 3, 2004 (Tp.247, Ln.7-19). On Monday, October 4, 2004, after the children returned to my house, we had another birthday party for S----- (id). S----- was very withdrawn. Distant. She wanted nothing to do with the adults. My sister, Danielle's mother, and I noticed this. Danielle's mother kept looking at me with a worried expression. My sister noticed this as well. My sister interpreted this worried expression as fear; she was in fear for me. She knew, and so did Danielle.

The following weekend, October 8-10 of 2004, S----- and A--- spent the weekend at Scott's house in Medina. On Monday, October 11th, they returned. That night S----- and I were working on her math at the kitchen table. This was something we did often. At one point S----- said, "Frankie, can I tell you something?" I told her that she could be open with me. S----- then said, "The other night I was in my bedroom and my Dad came in and his towel fell off. He said, 'Oops! Excuse me.'" (S----- mimicked Scott as she covered her mouth with one hand, and picked up an imaginary towel and covered her groin area with it). She continued, "Then he took off running down the hall. His butt cheeks were jiggling like this." (She moved her hands rapidly back and forth). She finished with, "It was really funny." Then horror struck her face and she looked down. I looked behind me and Danielle was standing firm, arms crossed, and in anger, staring down S-----. Now I know why Danielle wanted out of her marriage. She knew and never told me. Lastly, on this incident, Scott weighs about 235 pounds. The "jiggling" seems to be a realistic statement.

Danielle and I argued that night. Eventually she said she would call Scott and take care of this. I came home from work the next day and S----- was very subdued. I asked her what was wrong, and all she could say was, "Nothing." I went in to get Danielle and called her into the garage so we could talk. I asked her if she talked to Scott. She said that she did, and S----- "must have been confused." I went inside and grabbed her cell phone and flicked through the menu. There were at least a dozen calls to and from Scott that day. S----- was not confused. In all actuality, she was quite clear.

In and amongst all of this, one day I was prepared to leave for work and talking to Danielle in the kitchen, when S----- came up and asked if I liked her dress. I replied, "Yes, S-----. It's very pretty." Danielle became angry. When I asked her what she was angry about, she shouted, "I'm even jealous of my own daughter wanting your attention!" No. Not my attention, but Scott's.



As revealed by the Trial Record, S----- suffered from violent and repeated nightmares (Tp.435-437). These bad dreams were happening long before October of 2004. Most of the dreams, according to S-----, were of either her "grandma Alice" or her "real mom" trying to kill her. My former wife and I had to learn to deal with her middle daughter J--- and her "night terrors." At Medina Pediatrics, J---'s pediatrician explained what to do and what not to do. In regards to such, do not wake the child, and do hold the child's hand or cradle the child while whispering positive affirmations until the nightmare passes. I did and it worked. So, as the Trial Record will show that Danielle favored her biological son A--- over S-----, it further reflects that Danielle harbored some sort of resentment towards S-----, and that S-----'s presence contributed to the divorce of Scott and Danielle. Knowing this to be true, whenever S----- would come into our bedroom crying, "Mom, I had a bad dream," Danielle would respond, "O, shut up, S-----. You're fine. Go back to bed." S----- was undoubtedly the emotional whipping post that stood between Scott and Danielle. I then chose to assume the role of father and took care of S----- at night whenever she needed her medicines or had bad dreams. Such is revealed by the by the very testimony of Danielle.

In brief, there was turmoil at the kitchen table on October 19th, 2004. S----- and Danielle began to argue over something she said to her brother A---. S----- broke down and declared that she wanted to die, that she wanted the baby to die, and that her Dad wanted both me and the baby to die. At that time I was sick with a pounding headache and sinus infection. Earlier that day I was at South Court Family Physicians in Medina, Ohio, where I received treatment. After being diagnosed with sinusitis I was prescribed antibiotics. I have no trouble signing to release my medical records for verification. They reveal that I had a fever for two weeks. Fever and antibiotics clearly show that I was contagious. If I were having repeated sexual relations with S-----, why didn't she take ill?

The morning of October 20th, 2004, I got up around 5:45 a.m. to use the restroom. S----- was crying. Being aware of my illness I washed my hands and sat on the floor next to her bed. I held her hand and spoke gently to her. Within a few minutes she was calm, and I fell asleep with my head on the edge of the bed. Next I hear Danielle yelling my name. Our rooms are directly, literally directly, across the hall from each other. The bathroom light is always on, and, again, the Trial Record reveals that I kept an "open door" policy in the house via Danielle's own testimony. It was two steps to the bedroom door. I stood there wondering why she was yelling. She then started yelling at me. My head was pounding and I was too sick to argue. I asked if we could talk about this in the morning and went back to sleep. Danielle, as supported by the Trial Record, never went back in and checked on S-----. Instead, she went and slept with her son A---. Danielle knew there was nothing going on. That's why she didn't check on S-----. Although Danielle testified that I was wearing only socks, t-shirt, and underwear, she knew that I was also wearing my pale-gray sweatpants. She used to tease me about wearing so many clothes to bed because she slept in the nude.

Danielle took the two children and moved back in with Scott that same day. She went so far as to go to the Montville Township Police Department to file "rape" charges against me. Officer McCourt obviously didn't believe her and refused to file the charges. Such is revealed by the Trial Record. It's amazing that Danielle did this knowing that it was not true, and only later testified that I was uncomfortable being intimate with the children in the house.

Since S——— denied anything happening, now I know where the bogus rape charges came from. This is verified as S———'s "mommy" told her she was raped. So says the Trial Record (Tp.301, Ln.1-8).

A few weeks later, Scott wanted Danielle out of the house. I rented a U-Haul so she could move into an apartment. We began to talk more, and eventually started seeing each other again. We argued a lot about Scott and S———. The arguments were weekly. I was in a losing battle because I knew Scott was in full control. Every time I would think about our upcoming baby, I would stop arguing with Danielle. It was almost like arguing submissively and getting nowhere. My reason behind this was Danielle's diabetes. She is Type-1 diabetic, and the pregnancy was high-risk due to this factor. Neither she nor the baby needed the added stress. There was just no way to make her see clearly, so I usually just shut up and, in that fashion, ended the arguments. Danielle told me that she married Scott because he represented the "father image," and that she had been sexually abused by her step-father for six years. These two combined forces kept her under his control. There was nothing I could do.

Around mid-January of 2005, Danielle sent me a brutal text message claiming that S——— said I sexually assaulted her. As supported by the Trial Record, this was after Danielle badgered S——— for months until she gave the story that Danielle wanted to hear. Further, Danielle's having been previously abused by her step-father put her in a position where she should have never questioned S———. Case research shows that Danielle's questioning was biased and may have planted "false memories" in S———'s already stressed mind.

Eventually, Montville P.D. called me in for an interview. While there, I denied the presence of counsel because I had nothing to hide. I answered their questions, agreed to DNA testing, and let them search my home without a warrant. When they asked if I would submit to a polygraph, I said, "Yes. But only with the presence of counsel." Their reply was, "We can't do that." This video interview was never played at trial, and I was never permitted to testify. After this interview, as supported by the Trial Record, Montville P.D. "terminated" the case against me.

In the late spring of 2005, Danielle sent me a hate letter. She accused me of taking advantage of a girl that was previously sexually abused. This is contrary to her own testimony where Danielle testified repeatedly that she did not know what type of abuse or neglect that S——— suffered from. That letter was an icy stab for a woman who used me to get out of her marriage and away from her perverted husband. In all actuality, I was nothing more than a doormat to wipe her feet on when the situation ended. But looking back, Scott was successful too. He regained control of Danielle, used her to take revenge of me for our affair, and sent me to prison to cover up his sins. What I find to be most amazing is that Danielle helped him do it.

After receiving this letter, I called her divorce attorney Ronald R. Stanley. I asked what he was permitted by law to tell me about Scott. He answered, "I can't tell you much, but I can tell you this: according to Danielle, after your case was investigated and terminated, Scott said, 'That's not good enough.'" It wasn't until much later that Scott's threat made sense.

Eventually our son G———C——— was born, Scott and Danielle got divorced, and I was arrested on August 3, 2005. After 22 days in the Medina County Sheriff's Department, I bonded out with the help of family and John Fish of the Turoczy Bonding Company in Cleveland, Ohio. I'll never forget what he said: "You were under investigation for nearly a year and you didn't



run?" I answered, "No." He replied, "You're innocent. I'll have you out of here by tomorrow. And that he did.

After my \$200,000 cash bond was posted, I met John at the Medina Courthouse. He informed me that I had to check in with him daily by phone, and that the only stipulation of my bond was that I was to have "no contact with anyone under the age of eighteen." But when he asked Judge Collier to clarify "No contact," Collier refrained from doing so. From the courthouse my sister drove me to my house. As we were turning on to my street, Danielle cut us off in traffic. Clearly she had something to say, because she had no business being on that side of town. I stared at her wondering what she was thinking until she turned away.

While out on bond, on September 27th of 2005, I was parked at South Court Family Physicians. I remained in/at my vehicle while my brother was inside seeking medical treatment. Officer Kerr of the Medina City Police Department approached while I was standing next to my vehicle conducting business on my phone. As Danielle drove by, Officer Kerr said that I might be in violation of my bond and that "Somebody called in." She then declared that there was a day-care behind the building and called Detective Kollar. While Officer Kerr called Kollar, I called John Fish. Detective Kollar, according to Officer Kerr, declared that I was not in violation and let me go. For the remainder of my bond release I conducted business, went to dinners and movies, and shopped. No one said a word because I strictly maintained "No contact" with anyone under the age of eighteen.

A few weeks out on bond I ended up in the presence of two Medina County Deputy Sheriffs (who will remain in anonymity for the moment). One informed me to "Watch your back, Frank. You're not the first person we've seen the Prosecutor's Office set up." Having conducted business in Medina for nearly eight years, and being aware of the "Good Ol' Boy's Club", I sought counsel from afar. This is what led me to Attorney F. Harrison Green out of Cincinnati.

Sometime later, after our first or second meeting, Attorney Green called me. He asked if I was aware that my case had been closed twice. I was aware and informed him of such. He then asked, "Who would have enough money to reopen your case?" I informed him of 'who' and 'how much' was available when I told him about Scott and his access to a "million cash" through his step-father. That was when I remembered "That's not good enough." It's amazing how all of this fits together. It's no small wonder that they wouldn't let me testify or present witnesses and/or evidence to the Jury.

While on bond I was fortunate to be led to my private investigator: Tom Pavlish of Empire Investigations in Cleveland, Ohio. We met and spoke several times. Out of every conversation, one thing remains. He said, "I believe you. You are the only one to never change your story." That's because when a man tells the truth the first time, he never has to worry about what he said the second time.

After I told Attorney Green about Scott and his "million cash", he was very difficult to get a hold of. Then, about two weeks prior to trial he called and said that we were "ready for trial." A week later, on February 16, 2006, we attended a pre-trial hearing. The State, via Prosecutor Eisenhower, requested a continuance. Upon refusing to concede to this, Attorney Green looked at me and said, "You might as well sign. I have another trial to do next week." Lost and not understanding my rights, I signed the paper. The very

next day, February 17th of 2006, my bond was fraudulently revoked. So much for, "ready for trial." They planned this.

On March 1, 2006 there was a bond hearing to []consider reinstatement. At the hearing Detective Mark Kollar said that my friend Leisa's daughter "might have seen" the back of my head. Attorney Green asked him if he considered that to be "contact." As soon as Detective Kollar said, "Yes", as if on cue, Judge Collier said, "I agree." They seemed desperate to have me incarcerated for trial. But this opinion contradicts Kollar's earlier assessment at the doctor's office with Officer Kerr, when he ran into me at On-Tap Restaurant, and when he ran into me at the Cracker Barrel in Medina. Both Leisa and my sister-in-law Laura, who was the manager on duty that day at the Cracker Barrel, were present at the time. In accord, during these run-ins, families were present with children. Detective Kollar never said a word, and I strictly maintained "No contact."

While out on bond, Danielle text-messaged me twice. The first time was to tell me that I didn't love her. The second time was to wish me "Happy 38th" for my birthday on December 1st of 2006. I never responded to her messages.

After my \$200,000 cash bond was fraudulently revoked, Attorney Ronald R. Stanley came to see me at the Sheriff's Department. I asked him to stand by my side as co-counsel, and he had no problem with electing to do so. As a reminder, Attorney Stanley was Danielle's divorce lawyer.

Attorney Stanley came to visit me at the Sheriff's Department several times during trial. At one of our meetings I became very concerned. He asked me, in regards to Attorney Green (my lead counsel), "Where did you get this guy? He won't tell me anything." According to Attorney Stanley, Attorney Green refused to inform him of any type of trial strategy.

After I was erroneously found guilty and sent to prison, at my request, my sister Tina managed to see my son G—— and spend time with him. This was permitted until Danielle remarried a man named '[Brad] Smith'. According to my sister, Danielle's new husband didn't want her to have any communication with my family [control freak like Scott], and claimed that he was going to adopt my son. No. He will not. At one of our visits my sister told me that Danielle said, "I feel like such a sinner." Unfortunately, Danielle never elaborated on that comment. It's truly amazing how a guilty conscience speaks.

While I was incarcerated at Lebanon Correctional in Southern Ohio, in December of 2006 I received a letter from Danielle. She went on to tell me how "we are both suffering for our sins." No. I am suffering for the sins of Scott and Danielle Sadowsky. She ended the letter with, "I know you'll emerge from prison the man I fell in love with." No. I won't. I'm leaving here a much better man. I did send this letter to Leisa, and discussed it with Attorney Stanley via mail, but the letter has long been lost.

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood

Who or what destroyed the Sadowsky marriage?

From the testimony of Danielle Sadowsky (Tp.82-83):

Scott Sadowsky (hereinafter 'Scott'), claims that Frank Wood (hereinafter 'Wood'), destroyed his marriage with Danielle Sadowsky (hereinafter 'Danielle'). To the contrary, Danielle testified that the onset of the affair between her and Wood was "mutual" (Tp.84, Ln.24-Tp.85, Ln.9). Considering this, why did Danielle seek companionship and comfort outside their marriage?

The Prosecutor asked Danielle if she ever planted ideas in S.L.'s head about Wood. Danielle denied ever doing this (Tp.100, Ln. 2-4). However, Licensed Social Worker Elizabeth Morstatter testified (Tp.283-284), that S——— L——— (hereinafter 'S.L.'), told her "I heard that Frankie -- He raped me," and that S.L.'s "mother" told her this (Tp.300, Ln.22-Tp.301, Ln.8).

Let us not forget that, at the time of trial, S.L. had an "intact hymen" with "no abnormalities" or "signs of trauma" (Tp.262-269; Tp.272-278), per the testimony of Nurse Practitioner Donna Abbott (Tp.258-259).

There is a second set of implanted memories. S.L. testified (Tp.221-222), that on the indicted dates of sexual assault that "...it really hurt...In my private" (Tp.230, Ln.12-16), while she spent the entire weekend with her "Dad" in Put-In-Bay celebrating her tenth birthday and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Tp.247, Ln.7-16).

Danielle declared that Wood spent extra time with S.L. (Tp.100, Ln.25-Tp.101, Ln.2). The reason behind this is two-fold. First, Wood did so because Danielle rejected S.L. and does not possess the maternal abilities to nurture a child not her own. This is confirmed by Scott's testimony where he stated that Danielle had an issue with S.L. because she was not Danielle's biological child (Tp.196, Ln.15-17). Second, Scott testified that Danielle favored her son A — S ——— (hereinafter 'A.S.'), and placed the parenting responsibilities of S.L. on Scott (Tp.196, Ln.8-14); the same thing she did with Wood.

Danielle testified that she and Scott argued about S.L. when she first came into the house (Tp.102, Ln.1-3).

Danielle stated that S.L. contributed to their marriage coming to an end (Tp. 103, Ln.4-7).

Prior to trial, Danielle informed Wood that S.L.'s father Richard Lazard was an alcoholic who went to prison and eventually died. But here she changed her story and claims she knows nothing about him. Why? And why would the Prosecutor object to any information concerning Mr. Lazard? (Tp.108, Ln.17-19).

Prior to trial, Danielle informed Wood that S.L.'s mother was a drug addict and a prostitute who used to entertain clients with S.L. in the room. Here she changes her story, again, and claims she knows nothing about S.L.'s biological mother (Tp.109, Ln.7-11).

Prior to trial, Danielle informed Wood that S.L. had been sexually abused for years. Here she changes her story and claims that she does not know if the abuse was sexual or not. Then she changed her story again and testified that she was told that S.L. had not been sexually abused (Tp.109, Ln.2-22). What was she trying to hide? Job & Family Services/Children Services has a specific protocol to disclose such information to guardians who take placement of an abused/neglected child. This knowledge helps the guardians look for signs that would indicate the need for therapy or treatment. It's obvious that Danielle

never cared enough about S. ——— to look into what type of abuse or neglect she suffered in her past.

After Danielle believed that Wood had acted inappropriately with S.L., she never checked on S.L. Instead, she checked on her son A.S. and fell asleep with him. Danielle claims she never could understand why she never checked on S.L. (Tp.114, Ln.3-21). But the answer is obvious: Danielle rejected S.L., favored A.S., and knew Wood did no wrong. Belief determines behavior.

Note that Danielle testified that Wood kept an "open door" policy in the house (Tp.114, Ln.7-11).

Danielle testified that she and Scott fought over S.L., but she and Wood never did (Tp.121, Ln.5-13).

Danielle testified that Wood's co-counsel at trial, Attorney Ronald R. Stanley, was her divorce attorney (Tp.123, Ln.3-18).

The Trial Court discusses this conflict (Tp.124-142), and declares that Attorney Stanley has information that might demonstrate that Danielle is "untruthful" in her testimony (Tp.132, Ln.24-25). Evidently, Attorney Stanley stood by Wood's side in truth.

Again Danielle testifies that she did not check on S.L. (Tp.158, Ln.3-4).

Danielle asked S.L. if Wood had done anything wrong and S.L. said "No" (Tp. 158, Ln.10-21).

Although Danielle testified that she had no reason to be concerned for A.S., she went to him instead of S.L. (Tp.159, Ln.6-11).

Danielle testified that she contacted Children Services in July of 2004 (Tp. 159-161). She did so because this is the second time that S.L. was sexually active with A.S. Danielle moved in with Wood at the end of July of 2004 (Tp.86, Ln.17-23), and the children moved in on a part-time basis later in August of that same year.

From the testimony of Scott Sadowsky (Tp.178-179):

Scott testified that S.L. was the focal point of problems in his marriage to Danielle (Tp.192, Ln.7-12).

Scott testified that S.L. was comfortable sleeping with him in her own bedroom (Tp.194, Ln.2-10), and that this arrangement existed "prior to" his finding out about the affair (Tp.195, Ln.23-25). That's interesting.

Again Scott testified that S.L. was a problem between Danielle and him (Tp. 196, Ln.3-7).

Scott's testimony reveals that S.L. was an issue in saving their marriage and that Danielle "resented" S.L. (Tp.201, Ln.22-Tp.202, Ln.7).

Although Danielle repeatedly denied that S.L. was ever in counseling, Scott testified that S.L. was in counseling since she came to live with them (Tp. 204, Ln.24-Tp.205, Ln.6). All this counseling and Danielle never knew what type of abuse S.L. suffered?

Scott testified that he believed S.L. was truthful when she denied any wrongdoing by Wood (Tp.216, Ln.2-14).

Danielle claims that Wood emerged from S.L.'s bedroom in his underwear, yet Scott testified that he usually walks around the house in his underwear (Tp.

218, Ln.17-21).

The Prosecutor asked Scott if he ever walked around in just a towel (Tp.218, Ln.22-23). This is an isolated and specific question that coincides with the night that S.L. told Wood, with Danielle present, that her "Dad" came into her bedroom wearing only a towel that fell off him. It is obvious that S.L. told the truth to somebody, for only S.L., Scott, Danielle, and Wood knew about this incident.

Tricia Carchedi, a Medina County Job & Family Services social worker, testified (Tp.307-308), that her office sent letters to the Sadowskys and Wood indicating sexual abuse, and declaring Wood to be an alleged perpetrator (Tp.340, Ln.14-25). Wood's Lead-Counsel then declared that there were inconsistencies in Ms. Carchedi's testimony (Tp.341, Ln.9-16), and pointed out that MCJ&FS also sent a report to the Medina County Prosecutor's Office stating that there was "no evidence" against Wood (Tp.342, Ln.6-10). Unfortunately, Wood's attorney was only permitted to question Ms. Carchedi regarding the letters sent to the Sadowskys and Wood (Tp.344, Ln.9-16).

To summarize, Danielle left her marriage with Scott because of his inappropriate actions with S.L. In pursuit of divorce, Scott threatened to take A.S. from Danielle to keep her loyal. Then Scott utilized the trial to cover up his own sins and exact revenge on Wood for the affair. Scott and Danielle both testified that S.L. was the cause of their divorce and that neither of them wanted S.L. in their home. After trial, six years after S.L. came to live with them, Scott adopted S.L. in an attempt to control her. But Scott could not stop what he was doing. Scott and S.L. fought, then he threw her in foster homes to get rid of her. It is now evident that Scott and Danielle used S.L. to get through trial: Scott walked away free and clear, and Danielle kept A.S. Indeed, they used her, abused her, and threw her away like yesterday's trash.

That's twisted.

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood



M. Douglas Reed Ph.D.

## Warren County Forensic Psychology Center

Dr. Douglas Reed

### Credentials

1. Dr. Reed is a licensed psychologist who has been in clinical practice in Ohio since 1977; Ohio License #2347. He earned his Ph.D. in Counseling from the University of Maryland in 1970. He also earned his M.Ed. in Counseling from the University of Maryland in 1968.
2. He was a counselor from 1968 to 1977, when he became a licensed psychologist.
3. Dr. Reed earned his B.A. and an M.A. from Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.
4. Dr. Reed is a Board-Certified founding Diplomate-Fellow of the American College of Advanced Practice Psychologists (FACAPP).
5. Dr. Reed is a Diplomate-Fellow Psychopharmacologist with the International College of Prescribing Psychologists (FICPP) and the Prescribing Psychologists' Register (FPPR): a 450 hour post-doctoral training program. Psychologists with his advanced training have prescriptive privileges in places where the law allows (i.e., New Mexico, Guam, Department of Defense, and Louisiana).
6. Dr. Reed holds the Master Psychopharmacologist certification from the National Education Institute. This certification reflects over 200 hours of post-doctoral continuing education training in Psychopharmacology, taught by Psychiatrists and other M.D.s.
7. He is a Board Certified Diplomate-Fellow in Serious Mental Illness of the International College of Prescribing Psychologists (FSMI).
8. He is a Board Certified Diplomate-Fellow Forensic Psychologist of the International College of Prescribing Psychologists (FSICPP).
9. Dr. Reed is a Board Certified Diplomate-Fellow in Advanced Child & Adolescent Psychology of the International College of Prescribing Psychologists (FCICPP).
10. He is a Board Certified Diplomate-Fellow in Advanced Geriatric Psychology of the International College of Prescribing Psychologists (FGICPP).
11. Dr. Reed holds a Diplomate of the Board in Clinical Forensic Counseling, of the American College of Certified Forensic Counselors, Division of Psychology (DCFC).

He holds seven other specialties within that group:

- a. Certified Sex Offender Treatment Specialist

- b. Criminal Offender Counseling
- c. Youthful Offender Counseling
- d. Certified Forensic Addictions Examiner
- e. Forensic Assessment and Evaluation
- f. Child Custody Evaluation
- g. Clinically Certified Domestic Violence Counselor

12. He holds a Certificate of Proficiency in the Treatment of Alcohol and Other Psychoactive Substance Use Disorders from the American Psychological Association (CAPA).

13. Dr. Reed is a Certified Master Addictions Counselor of the National Board of Addiction Examiners.

14. He is a Diplomate-Fellow Forensic Psychologist of the American College of Forensic Examiners (DABFE).

15. Dr. Reed is a Diplomate of the American Board of Psychological Specialties (DABPS). He holds eleven psychological specialties within that group:

Forensic Clinical Psychology Child Custody Evaluations Tests and Measurements Psychotherapy  
Psychopharmacology Family/Marital/Domestic Relations Psychology

Sexual Abuse Behavioral Science Counseling Psychology Substance Abuse Psychology

16. He is a Board Certified, Founding Fellow of the American College of Advanced Practice Psychologists (FACAPP).

17. Dr. Reed is designated as an expert on the Ohio Attorney General's Databank of Experts on Child Abuse. (D.E.C.A. List).

THE CORE OF THE VOIR DIRE TESTIMONY OF  
M. DOUGLAS REED, PH.D.,  
THE OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S LEADING EXPERT,  
CONCERNING THE MIND AND BELIEFS OF  
FRANK P. WOOD

Dr. Reed, the *State's Leading Expert*, is a licensed clinical psychologist (Tp.480, Ln.1-2) who spent his entire thirty-year career working with pedophiles and sociopaths (Tp.478, Ln.16-18). Of my own volition, Dr. Reed put me through a battery of psychological tests that are readily accepted by the working psychiatric community (Tp.465-480). Below is the core of his reliable findings and conclusions regarding my mind and beliefs.

- 1) \*\*\* there is no sexual history of sexual desire or contact with minors, even when he was a minor. His first sexual contact was when he was eighteen, so he has no – he has none of the typical drives that a pedophile would have or the typical abuser would have towards minor children (Tp.468, Ln.25-Tp.469, Ln.5).

Note: Lost my virginity on my 18<sup>th</sup> birthday to a beautiful, intelligent, and classy woman.

- 2) His Sexual Behavior Inventory shows that he has normal, healthy sexual thoughts, and if you could – if you consider healthy would be masturbating to an adult person, rather [] a fantasy of an adult rather than that of a minor (Tp.469, Ln.6-10).

Note: What can I say? I'm a guy!

- 3) His preferences are heterosexual. He has sexual attraction *only* to adult women (Tp.469, Ln. 11-12). [*Emphasis added*].

Note: That should quash a few hopeful rumors in prison that turned hateful.

- 4) He's not sexually compulsive or addicted, in my professional opinion (Tp.469, Ln.13-14).
- 5) His sexual behavior is under his control. He is not out of control, compulsive (Tp.469, Ln.15-16).

Note: As 'trust' means to allow without fear, you can trust a man with self-control and no vices.

- 6) His mental exam status indicated he has no organic brain damage, he is able to think straight, he's above average in intelligence (Tp.469, Ln.17-19).



Note: Obviously, I am too intelligent to commit such ignorant and heinous acts. Further, when Dr. Reed concluded this statement, the Court Reporter stopped her typing and everyone in the courtroom looked straight at me with eyes wide open and full of worry. I would have to say that, at that very moment, they knew they screwed up.

- 7) The conclusions from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory was that he had no psychopathology; none of the ten clinical scales were elevated (Tp.473, Ln.4-8).

Note: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory (MMPI) is a reliable scientific instrument of psychological analysis and discovery.

- 8) He does not see himself as narcissistic, which is an important finding, and he, he does not come across – he does not test as being narcissistic (Tp.474, Ln.9-10).

Note: Narcissism is an important part of the FBI's profile for a real sex offender.

- 9) He does use rationalization and externalization as defense mechanisms (Tp.474, Ln.9-10).

Note: In problem solving, I am well adept at separating myself from situation to analyze it.

- 10) He has high ego strength (Tp.474, Ln.11).

Note: I am a confident man.

- 11) In my professional opinion, to a degree of psychological certainty, Frank Wood does not meet the diagnostic criteria for pedophilia. He does not endorse the three core beliefs or rationalizations used by pedophiles to justify their illegal behavior (Tp.475, Ln.2-7).

Note: Although I still do not know what these beliefs and rationalizations are, Dr. Reed was still able to extrapolate this from my mind.

- 12) He has no history, apart from the index offense charges, of sexual behavior with a minor, even when he was a minor (Tp.475, Ln.8-10).

Note: Never have and never will.

- 13) Mr. Wood is not a sociopath or psychopath (Tp.475, Ln.11).

Note: To the contrary, I am a compassionate and empathic man.

- 14) He does not match the profile for a psychopath. \*\*\*. He is not slick, conning, or manipulative (Tp.475, Ln.14-17).

Note: I am neither a pathological liar, deceiver, nor manipulator.

- 15) He does not have a stash of child pornography. If he were to be someone who would be a serious or, historically, sex abuser type, he would undoubtedly have had a stash. In my thirty years working with pedophiles and sociopaths, they all have had a stash somewhere. He did not have any (Tp.475, Ln.19-24).

Note: Both of my houses were searched by either Officer McCourt and/or Det. Kollar (Tp.452, Ln.4-9), (Affidavit: Exhibit-04, p.12).

- 16) He has no organic brain impairment which keeps him from knowing right from wrong. Everything he believes and espouses would be *violated* if he were to touch a child sexually (Tp.475, Ln.25-Tp.476, Ln.3). [*Emphasis added*].

Note: Not only do I possess a strong moral fiber and conscience, as

Belief determines behavior,  
-Max Lucado

***I am psychologically prohibited from harming a child or someone I love!!!***

- 17) In my professional opinion, he is also *not* a situational pedophile. \*\*\*. He was being sexually active regularly, therefore, he would not have needed to turn to a prepubescent child (Tp.476, Ln.4-10). [*Emphasis added*].

Note: To do so would be disgusting and dishonorable. 'Honor' means respecting others and ourselves in our thoughts, speech, and actions.

- 18) He has no mental illness, no mental disorder according to the MMPI-2, Mental Status Exam. None of the ten clinical scales were elevated to the clinical range (Tp.476, Ln.11-14).

Note: Nice to know I am sane, for only a crazy nut would harm a child.

- 19) He's not in a job where he is usually brought into contact with minors, so there's no – there's no predatory deductive manner there (Tp.477, Ln.5-7).

Note: In my line of work, I took what was broken, fixed it, and gave it back. This should reveal more of the core of the man I am.

20) Those were my conclusions and opinions (Tp.477, Ln.8).

Note: Reader, now you see why Judge Collier stated that Dr. Reed's findings and conclusions "aren't relevant" (Tp.481, Ln.10-11), and why he and Pros. Eisenhower refused to allow for Dr. Reed to testify before the Court-declared "cynical" Jury (Tp.135, Ln.7-11) with its Court-elected Juror who was "molested" in her youth (Affidavit: Exhibit-31), and its Medina City elementary school teacher.

-Σ-

Assembled from the face of my materially altered and incomplete Trial Record regarding State of Ohio v. Frank P. Wood, Medina County Case No. 05 CR0365.

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)

View any month, any year, in the Gregorian calendar. Click any day for more information.

 **October 2004** 

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	<div>CONFIDENTIAL EXHIBIT</div> <div>D</div>					

# GAZETTE

TUESDAY

May 16, 2006

## Exhibit-L

IRON (AP) — "One of a local church, while critics of the procrusteaning seniors program met at a pharmacy near re's operators busy the Capitol and urged the adminis- ing the final hours of en- tration to extend the midnight the government's new deadline and waive a financial penalty for late enrollees.

Laura Bush and top on officials attended Shiloh Baptist Church, Laura registration drive at Bush met volunteers and some

last-minute enrollees, saw from people with little need for medi- cine now to still consider submit- up for a private insurance plan, warning, "As you age, it's likely you'll add medications to your health care."

See MEDICARE, A3

## Medina Twp. man gets life in prison for abuse of 2 girls

By DENISE SULLIVAN  
Staff Writer

MEDINA — Frank Wood will spend his life in prison for sexually abusing two girls ages 5 and 9.

Wood, 38, of 4885 Gateway Drive, Medina Township, was convicted earlier this month on a first-degree felony count of rape and a third-degree felony count of gross sexual imposition.

The rape charge carried a life sentence because the victim was younger than 10 at the time of the incident.

Wood's attorney, F. Harri- son Green, requested an eight- to 10-year prison sen- tence, which is the normal amount of time for first- degree felonies.

"There is no physical evi- dence that penetration had

taken place," he said.

Green noted several wit- nesses testified the rape vic- tim was in the custody of her father the weekend the prosecution alleged the rape took place, making the claim impossible.

"(Wood) has had various relationships with women with young children," county Assistant Prosecutor Anne Eisenhower said. "He seeks them out and becomes friends with their children, gives them presents and nick- names."

Wood preys upon women and children who need attention, she noted.

"Both victims are in counseling," Eisenhower said. "It was extremely dif- ficult for those young girls to come in here and face an adult who came into their home and they learned to

**The Village Booksmith**  
Store-Closing sale in May!  
See [www.thevillagebooksmith.com](http://www.thevillagebooksmith.com)

See WOOD, A11



Staff photo by BRIDGET COMMISSO  
Frank Wood is led out of court Monday after being sen- tenced to life in prison for sexually abusing two young girls.

the most value those with need pay the full 6 month," Cleveland proven believe that is available

U.S. to full wi

WA  
The  
reson  
Hans  
move  
refers  
infant  
day,  
Cadi  
remot  
house  
gradin  
porche  
"up  
ment  
that  
decis  
lead-  
terr-  
mas-  
tary  
Rice  
movi  
ya.

gov. Janet... of the justice system.

Allison says his opposition to the death penalty was only one motivation. "Also, I felt the government was prosecuting the wrong guy because they had to punish somebody," says Allison, 56, of Lyme, N.H. He also was concerned about Mousaoui's mental state.

"Did I suffer? Absolutely," he says. "But we all experience loss differently. We're all at different places in that journey."

As for Gahan, his journey didn't end with his day in court. He is eagerly awaiting the trials of the nightclub's owners, and is also pushing for more stringent fire safety laws.

"I'm going to be spending the rest of my life seeking my son's approval," he remembers telling the judge. "I think today I have it."

## Conjugal Violations

Brian Hoagland of the Hoffman Group for being one of Westfield Insurance's Most Valuable Producers in 2005!

Proud to represent



WESTFIELD

INSURANCE

United Nations... were best used as a bargaining chip. The United States will upgrade its diplomatic office in Tripoli to a full embassy, following a 15-day waiting period and discussions with Congress, the State Department

## Wood

Continued from A1

trust, who violated them in such a heinous way."

Each victim is a relative of women Wood had been married to or dated, court records

show. Wood molested the 5-year-old between August and October 2000 and raped the 9-year-old in October 2004. Common Pleas Judge Christopher J. Collier ordered Wood be labeled a sexual predator, the most serious category. Sullivan may be reached at dsullivan@ohio.net or 330-721-4064.

show. Wood molested the 5-year-old between August and October 2000 and raped the 9-year-old in October 2004. Common Pleas Judge Christopher J. Collier ordered Wood be labeled a sexual predator, the most serious category. Sullivan may be reached at dsullivan@ohio.net or 330-721-4064.

## Conjugal Violations

ENTER TO WIN  
A \$50.00 Gift Certificate

From

NINE  
bistro

1 WINNER  
PER DAY