

APPENDIX-A

EXHIBITS 01 THROUGH 86

- Exhibit-01 Domestic Articles/For Profit, No. 20040560054; February 23, 2004: (4 pages)
- Exhibit-02 Amended Bill of Particulars; April 12, 2006: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-03 Claim Of Actual Innocence ("COAI"): (10 pages)
- Exhibit-04 Medina City Police Department's report by Detective Mark Kollar: Pages 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17: (10 pages)
- Exhibit-05 Letter to former Assistant Ohio Attorney General Erin C. Reed; October 16, 2011 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-06 Letter to former Medina County Chief Prosecutor Dean Holman; January 29, 2013 (with zip code correction from 44253 to 44256): (1 page)
- Exhibit-07 2017 Docket printout : (4 pages)
- Exhibit-08 My Pre-Trial History With Robyn Spencer-Speelman: (3 pages)  
Retyped for legibility, REDACTIONS, and [corrections]
- Exhibit-09 My Pre-Trial History With Danielle Sadowsky-Smith: (7 pages)  
Retyped for legibility, REDACTIONS, and [corrections]
- Exhibit-10 CSEA Administrative Order/ Establishment of Paternity; 10/14/2005: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-11 Who or what destroyed the Sadowsky marriage?: (3 pages)
- Exhibit-12 Facebook picture of Danielle Sadowsky "Smith": (1 page)
- Exhibit-13 About Danielle Facebook page of Danielle Sadowsky "Smith": (1 page)
- Exhibit-14 Akron Children's Hospital's Physical Examination Data page for S.L. : (1 page)
- Exhibit-15 Calendar(s) of October 2004: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-16 Facebook picture of Scott Michael Sadowsky: (1 page)
- Exhibit-17 Akron Children's Hospital's Suspected Child Abuse And Neglect Record: (1 page)

- Exhibit-18 Akron Children's Hospital's Social Work Intake Summary Form; Pages 1 of 5 and 2 of 5 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-19 Letters to the Ohio Innocence Project ("OIP"): March 10, 2015; June 6, 2015; August 31, 2015; November 3, 2015; May 12, 2016; June 30, 2016: (20 pages)
- Exhibit-20 Facebook postings of Scott Sadowsky and Danielle Sadowsky "Smith": (3 pages)
- Exhibit-21 Transcript Pages 341-347 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-22 Certified letter to Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity: January 12, 2014: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-23 Letter to Attorney Ronald R. Stanley from Court Reporter Donna A. Garrity: February 17, 2014: (1 page)
- Exhibit-24 Judgment Entry of Judge Judith A. Cross (retired): April 23, 1997 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-25 Warrant to Arrest on Indictment or Information: August 4, 2005 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-26 2014 Docket printout: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-27 Transcript Pages 559-560; with Court Reporter's CERTIFICATE: (1 page)
- Exhibit-28 Judgment Entry Adopting Magistrates' Decision Granting Adult Name Change: August 20, 2002: (1 page)
- Exhibit-29 Medina County Gazette article: Tuesday, August 16, 2005 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-30 Motion To Revoke Bond: February 17, 2006 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-31 Affidavit of Attorney Ronald R. Stanley: June 6, 2017: (1 page)
- Exhibit-32 Medina County Gazette article: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-33 Pictures of pictures taken by Detective Mark Kollar: (19 pages)
- Exhibit-34 The core of the *voir dire* testimony of the Ohio Attorney General's Leading Expert: M. Douglas Reed, Ph.D. : (4 pages)
- Exhibit-35 Transcript Pages 24-25 : (2 pages)

- Exhibit-36 Ohio Innocence Project (OIP) Application: March 10, 2015: (15 pages)
- Exhibit-37 Transcript Pages 266 and 271: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-38 Transcript Page 364: (1 page)
- Exhibit-39 Civil Protection Order: October 1, 2001 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-40 Entry Modifying or Vacating Ex Parte And/Or Civil Protection Order: July 25, 2002: (1 page)
- Exhibit-41 Transcript Pages 386-396: (3 pages)
- Exhibit-42 [RESERVED]
- Exhibit-43 Medina County Commissioner's Meeting – Monday, November 22, 2004: Pages 1, 2, and 8 : (3 pages)
- 
- Exhibit-44 Patient Care Communication Form: February 7, 2005: (1 page)
- Exhibit-45 Transcript Pages 461-464: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-46 The Kick-Ass Credentials of M. Douglas Reed, Ph.D. : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-47 Transcript Page 479: (1 page)
- Exhibit-48 Judge Christopher J. Collier (picture) : (1 page)
- Exhibit-49 Transcript Pages 483-487 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-50 Transcript Pages 17-18 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-51 Transcript Pages 529-540 : (4 pages)
- Exhibit-52 Transcript Page 514 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-53 Transcript Page 138 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-54 Transcript Pages 555-558: (1 page)
- Exhibit-55 Transcript Pages 1-7: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-56 Letter from Attorney F. Harrison Green: June 27, 2007 : (1 page)

- Exhibit-57 Motion For Disqualification Of Prosecutor's Office And For Retraction Of State's Brief Of Appellee: February, 26, 2015 : (6 pages)
- Exhibit-58 Frank P. Wood's Response To State's Brief In Opposition: April 3, 2015: (8 pages)
- Exhibit-59 Journal Entry With Instructions For Service: February 27, 2015 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-60 Certificate Of Assignment: April 17, 2015 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-61 Letter from Supreme Court of Ohio Office of Judicial Services: June 24, 2015: (1 page)
- Exhibit-62 Order On Defendant's Motion To Disqualify Prosecutor's Office And For Retraction Of State's Brief: October 7, 2015 : (3 pages)
- Exhibit-63 Brief Of Appellant: September, 26, 2006; Cover page, and pages 3, 5, 29, and 30: (5 pages)
- Exhibit-64 Application To Reopen Pursuant To Appellant Rule 26 (B): August 31, 2007: (12 pages)
- Exhibit-65 Decision And Journal Entry: June 4, 2007; Cover page, and pages 23, 24, and 26: (4 pages)
- Exhibit-66 Letter and Waiver of Ohio Attorney General: April 19, 2013: (2 pages)
- Exhibit-67 U.S. Supreme Court denial of Petition For Writ Of Certiorari: May 28, 2013 : (1 page)
- Exhibit-68 Motion For Disqualification Of State Court Judge And Conflict-Free Rehearings: Docketed Feb.21, 2017 with the Ohio Supreme Court as Case No. 17AP009; Docketed with the Medina County Clerk of Courts on February 24, 2017 : (23 pages)
- Exhibit-69 R.C. 2701.03 Affidavit Of Disqualification: Docketed Feb.21, 2017 with the Ohio Supreme Court as Case No. 17AP009; Docketed with the Medina County Clerk of Courts on February 24, 2017 : (18 pages)
- Exhibit-70 Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record (minus internal Exhibits): August 13, 2013: (3 pages)
- Exhibit-71 Brief In Response To Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record: August 27, 2013: (5 pages)

- Exhibit-72     Medical Research Report: #2 Differences in Hymenal Morphology Between Adolescent Girls With and Without a History of Consensual Sexual Intercourse: Joyce A. Adams, MD; Ann S. Botash, MD; Nancy Kellogg, MD; Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2004; 158: 280-285 : (5 pages)
- Exhibit-73     Defendant's Response To State's Brief In Opposition: July 18, 2014 : (8 pages)
- Exhibit-74     Journal Entry With Instructions For Service: September 15, 2014 : (6 pages)
- Exhibit-75     What I Look Forward To Every Day: September 8, 2017: (5 pages)
- Exhibit-76     Brief Of Appellant: December 1, 2014; Cover page, and pages 1, and 19-21: (5 pages)
- Exhibit-77     Brief Of Appellant Frank P. Wood ("Hammer Brief"): January 26, 2015 : (6 pages)
- Exhibit-78     Affidavit of Attorney Ronald R. Stanley: October 2, 2014 : (1 page)
- 
- Exhibit-79     Doctors who authored medical research article (Exhibit-72) : (7 pages)
- Exhibit-80     Frank P. Wood's letter to Doctors who authored medical research article: September 22, 2014 : (2 pages)
- Exhibit-81     Delayed Motion For New Trial Based On Newly Discovered Evidence Pursuant To Crim. R. 33(B): February 20, 2015; (contains internal "Exhibit-B"): (10 pages)
- Exhibit-82     Wood's Response Supporting His Motion For Leave To File Delayed Motion For New Trial: April 9, 2015: (7 pages)
- Exhibit-83     Order On Defendant's Second Application For Leave To File Delayed Motion For New Trial: October 7, 2015: (5 pages)
- Exhibit-84     Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment: March 30, 2015 : (6 pages)
- Exhibit-85     Wood's Response Vindicating His Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment: April 20, 2015 : (7 pages)
- Exhibit-86     Order On Defendant's Motion For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment: October 7, 2015: (4 pages)



DATE:	DOCUMENT ID	DESCRIPTION	FILING	EXPED	PENALTY	CERT	COPY
02/25/2004	200405600054	DOMESTIC ARTICLES/FOR PROFIT (ARF)	125.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

Exhibit-01

**Receipt**

This is not a bill. Please do not remit payment.

THE WOOD CONSTRUCTION CO.  
PO BOX 922  
MEDINA, OH 44258

# STATE OF OHIO CERTIFICATE

**Ohio Secretary of State, J. Kenneth Blackwell****1444018**

It is hereby certified that the Secretary of State of Ohio has custody of the business records for

**IRONWOOD CONSTRUCTION, INCORPORATED**

and, that said business records show the filing and recording of:

Document(s)

**DOMESTIC ARTICLES/FOR PROFIT**

Document No(s):

**200405600054**

United States of America  
State of Ohio  
Office of the Secretary of State

Witness my hand and the seal of  
the Secretary of State at Columbus,  
Ohio this 23rd day of February,  
A.D. 2004.

*J. Kenneth Blackwell*  
Ohio Secretary of State

Prescribed by **J. Kenneth Blackwell**

Ohio Secretary of State

Central Ohio: (614) 466-3910

Toll Free: 1-877-SOS-FILE (1-877-767-3453)

www.state.oh.us/sos

e-mail: bussary@sec.state.oh.us

Expedite this Form: (must pay)	
Send Form to the Office of the Secretary:	
<input type="radio"/> Yes	PO Box 1360 Columbus, OH 43216 *** Requires an additional fee of \$600 ***
<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	PO Box 670 Columbus, OH 43216

**INITIAL ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION**

(For Domestic Profit or Non-Profit)

Filing Fee \$125.00

THE UNDERSIGNED HEREBY STATES THE FOLLOWING:

(CHECK ONLY ONE (1) BOX)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (1) Articles of Incorporation Profit (113-ARF) ORC 1701	<input type="checkbox"/> (2) Articles of Incorporation Non-Profit (114-ARF) ORC 1702	<input type="checkbox"/> (3) Articles of Incorporation Professional (170-ARF) Profession _____ ORC 1705
--	---	--

Complete the general information in this section for the box checked above.

FIRST: Name of Corporation	Ironwood Construction, Incorporated	
SECOND: Location	MEDINA (City)	MEDINA (County)
Effective Date (Optional) (month/year)	Date specified can be no more than 90 days after date of filing. If a date is specified, the date must be a date on or after the date of filing.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Check here if additional provisions are attached		

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2004

J. KENNETH BLACKWELL  
SECRETARY OF STATE

Complete the information in this section if box (2) or (3) is checked. Completing this section is optional if box (1) is checked.

THIRD: Purpose for which corporation is formed

Complete the information in this section if box (1) or (3) is checked.

FOURTH: The number of shares which the corporation is authorized to have outstanding (Please state if shares are common or preferred and their par value if any)	100 (No. of Shares)	COMMON (Type)	NO PAR (Par Value)
(Refer to instructions if needed)			

Completing the information in this section is optional.

FIFTH: The following are the names and addresses of the individuals who are to serve as Initial Directors.

FRANK P. WOOD

(Name)

4754 POE RD.

(Street)

NOTE: P.O. Box Addresses are NOT acceptable.

MEDINA,

OH

44256

(City)

(State)

(Zip Code)

(Name)

(Street)

NOTE: P.O. Box Addresses are NOT acceptable.

(City)

(State)

(Zip Code)

(Name)

(Street)

NOTE: P.O. Box Addresses are NOT acceptable.

(City)

(State)

(Zip Code)

REQUIRED

Must be authenticated  
(signed) by an authorized  
representative  
(See instructions)

*Frank P. Wood*

Authorized Representative

FRANK P. WOOD

(print name)

4754 POE RD.

MEDINA, OH 44256

2-18-04

Date

Authorized Representative

(print name)

Date

Authorized Representative

(print name)

Date



Complete the information in this section if box (1), (2) or (3) is checked.

## ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY AGENT

The undersigned, being at least a majority of the incorporators of Ironwood Construction, Incorporated hereby appoint the following to be statutory agent upon whom any process, notice or demand required or permitted by statute to be served upon the corporation may be served. The complete address of the agent is

FRANK P. WOOD

(Name)

4754 POE RD.

(Street)

NOTE: P.O. Box Addresses are NOT acceptable.

MEDINA

Ohio

44256

(City)

(Zip Code)

Must be authorized by an  
authorized representative

Frank P. Wood  
Authorized Representative

2-18-04

Date

Authorized Representative

Date

Authorized Representative

Date

### ACCEPTANCE OF APPOINTMENT

The Undersigned,

FRANK P. WOOD

, named herein as the

Statutory agent for,

Ironwood Construction, Incorporated

, hereby acknowledges and accepts the appointment of statutory agent for said entity.

Signature:

Frank P. Wood  
(Statutory Agent)

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

COMMON PLEAS COURT  
06 APR 12 PM 1:13

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

) CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

) JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

) Exhibit-02

) 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. ), and the said S.L. (D.O.B. ), 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. not the spouse of the said FRANK P. WOOD, or cause "K.S." (D.O.B. ), 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. ), being less than thirteen years of age, whether or not the said FRANK P. WOOD knows the age of "K.S." (D.O.B. ), 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

reason, he has acted in good faith with truth and purpose.

Exhibit-03

Solely utilizing State's evidence, Wood now presents his claim of actual innocence to clarify his cause and to justify his actions.

#### CLAIM OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE

Wood is currently serving a Life-Sentence for the bogus and insolent charges of rape and gross sexual imposition. The rape charge allegedly involved S.L., the legal custodial daughter of Scott and Danielle Sadowsky. This charge had developed after Wood's affair with and impregnation of Danielle Sadowsky. The gross sexual imposition charge allegedly involved K.S., the daughter of Wood's former wife Robyn Spencer-Speelman. This charge came about immediately after Wood ceased to provide financial support to Robyn Spencer-Speelman.

In regards to the rape charge:

In the "beginning" of September 2004, Danielle Sadowsky (hereinafter 'Danielle'), became aware that she was pregnant with Wood's child (Tp.144, Ln.12-13; Tp.86, Ln.16). At this time Wood and Danielle were living together (Tp.86, Ln.21-22). The case involving the alleged rape of S.L. was signed in with Dr. Suzanne LeSure on September 24, 2004 with Scott Sadowsky signing "permission" in November 2004 (Tp.407, Ln.7-16). Permission for what? This remains a mystery. But the oddity is this: the allegations were alleged to occur between October 1-3, 2004; the following month (see: Amended Bill Of Particulars, Exhibit-A). Yet S.L. denied anything happened until January 11, 2005 (Tp.94, Ln.1-8), and these allegations were only made after months of badgering by Danielle (Tp.92-94, 167-172, 231-232). So who made the allegations in September for October? They must possess clairvoyant capabilities. As Danielle went to the Montville Township Police Department on October 20, 2004, and wanted to file rape charges against Wood (Tp.66, Ln.3-8), Officer McCourt

determined that the allegations had no merit and refused to file the charges, ultimately "terminat[ing]" the case against Wood (Tp.47, Ln.10-23). Now, concerning who made the allegations in September for October, Licensed Social Worker Elizabeth Morstatter testified that S.L.'s "mommy" told her she was raped (Tp.301, Ln.1-8).

With no physical evidence, DNA, or eyewitnesses to either support or sustain the conviction(s), and an "intact hymen" with "no abnormalities", or "signs of trauma" (Tp.262-269; Tp.272-278), the State declared:

"To put it directly, an intact hymen is not proof of virginity. Appellant seems to be relying on said myth." (State's Memorandum Opposing Jurisdiction @ p.12).

If a grown man had repeated vaginal intercourse with a nine-year-old child, the hymen would definitely be ruptured. Can anyone prove otherwise? NO. Also, if a hymen, that is easily ruptured or torn during vaginal intercourse, can grow back, and a woman can regain her virginity by such means, then why is it deemed to sacred? Evidently a rape never took place. But something did. Something the reviewing courts and the Attorney General do not want to discuss. As S.L. testified that she did not know 'who' or 'what' caused the pain in her private (Tp.244, Ln.2-15), which contradicts her pretrial statements, she did testify as to 'where' she was, 'who' she was with, and 'when' it happened in the following manner:

With the indicted dates of rape being Friday, October 1st-Sunday, October 3rd of 2004, and S.L.'s date of birth being October 3, 1994 (Tp.537, Ln.9-18), S.L. testified that she spent the entire weekend with her "dad" (legal guardian Scott Sadowsky), celebrating her tenth birthday in "Put-In-Bay" and "not at Frank Wood's house" (Tp.247, Ln.7-16). S.L.'s testimony was fully corroborated by Danielle who testified that S.L. was "typically" at Scott Sadowsky's house every Friday through Monday (Tp.87, Ln.17-22), and by Scott

Sadowsky who testified that S.L. was with him "traditionally" every Friday through Monday (Tp.185, Ln.8-9). This was confirmed where S.L. testified that she "always got to be with dad on the weekends" (Tp.250, Ln.21-22), and that the weekend of her tenth birthday party was her "dad's weekend" (Tp. 247, Ln.15-16). S.L. further testified that "it happened" right before her tenth birthday (Tp.230, Ln. 4-8), and on these specific dates (October 1-3, 2004), "...it really hurt...In my private (Tp.230, Ln.12-16). This testimony was solidified where S.L. testified, "Well I -- I really enjoyed the birthday, and it was fun, but it was the two days before that really--he hurt me the two days before" (Tp.230, Ln.6-8). As S.L. was asked about Wood's "dog", she blurted out "the two days before" TWICE. With her birthday falling on Sunday, October 3, 2004 (see: Calendar of October 2004 as Exhibit-B), she also testified that she celebrated her birthday

"on"

her birthday, and that she had another birthday party when she got back to Wood's house on Monday, October 4, 2004 (Tp.247, Ln.7-19). Whether it was "the two days before" Sunday, October 3rd, or Monday, October 4th of 2004, S.L. was sexually assaulted in Put-In-Bay, Ohio, on the indicted, testified to, and confirmed dates of abuse concerning October 1-3, 2004 while she celebrated her tenth birthday with her "dad" and "not at Frank Wood's house." No evidence was presented to the contrary.

Prosecutor Eisenhower reinforced this testimony and informed the cynical Jury with, "who doesn't remember their tenth birthday" (Tp.495, Ln.17-18), and confirmed the indicted dates of October 1-3, 2004 as the "first time" it happened, and the unindicted date of October 20, 2004, the same day Danielle and the children moved back in with Scott Sadowsky (Danielle: Tp.91, Ln.14-20; Scott: Tp.205, Ln.10-Tp.206, Ln.4), as the "last time" it happened.

Ultimately, the Prosecutor declared as "evidence" before a "cynical"

Jury:

"She sat here and told you, 'a couple of days before my tenth birthday.' And that's evidence. That's evidence. There's been no evidence to the contrary. None." (Tp.524, Ln.19-24).

Wood could not agree more. Especially with Scott Sadowsky being with S.L. on both dates in question.

With no one placing Wood at Put-In-Bay (such is Ottawa County), on the indicted, testified to, and confirmed dates of sexual assault, concerning S.L., on October 1-3, 2004 (for which Wood was indicted and tried in Medina County), and Put-In-Bay being the actual place of the alleged rape via State-proffered and proven evidence, clearly Wood could not have committed this crime. For it is highly unlikely, due to Wood's affair with and impregnation of Danielle (Sadowsky), that he was in Put-In-Bay celebrating S.L.'s tenth birthday with Scott Sadowsky. But a "cynical" Jury could not crystalize this fact in their malicious minds.

Yet the question still remains that neither the District Court nor the Attorney General are willing to answer: Who is "he"?

As an end note to the rape charge, the Trial Court, after alleging Danielle not to be "truthful in her testimony" (Tp.132, Ln.22-Tp.133, Ln.2), continued to let her testify as a State's witness and to present untruth to what the Trial Court believed to be, a "cynical" Jury (Tp.135, Ln.7-11). The Trial Court made this declaration after Danielle's testimony revealed that Attorney Ronald R. Stanley, Danielle's divorce lawyer in a case related to the case at bar, stood by Wood in truth as his co-counsel (for Conflict Of Interest see: Tp.123-141).

In regards to the gross sexual imposition charge:

K.S., the daughter of Wood's former wife Robyn Spencer-Speelman (hereinafter

'Robyn'), apparently came forward with allegations between "July and September" of 2004 (Tp.421, Ln.24-Tp.422, Ln.2), reflecting that someone had improperly touched her between August and October of 2000 (see: Amended Bill Of Particulars as Exhibit-A). With K.S.'s date of birth being 2/09/96 (id), K.S. would have been approximately 4½ years of age at the time of the alleged incident. A solid 4 years lapsed between the alleged incident and the time of reporting. This would have been right around the time that K.S. came from living with Robyn's parents (and brother Ryan), to live with Wood and Robyn (Tp.135, Ln. 10-16). Roughly, "September of 2000" (id).

After Wood and Robyn divorced in January of 2002, Wood continued to provide financial support to Robyn (Tp.372, Ln.22-24). In "May of 2005" Wood ceased to provide any and all financial support to Robyn (Tp.380, Ln.13-Tp.381, Ln.6). Immediately afterwards Robyn took K.S. to Job & Family Services and "not the police" (Tp.365, Ln.21-Tp.366, Ln.30). On "June 17 2005" K.S. was referred to Dr. LeSure by Job & Family Services (Tp.247, Ln.2-9). Remarkably, Robyn waited nearly a year from the time the allegations were made until she reported them: when Wood ceased all financial support.

Robyn further testified that she "didn't want to go after Frank" (Tp.367, Ln.20), and that she "didn't want him to go to jail" (Tp.367, Ln.10-11). Robyn also testified that Wood never favored, out of three girls, one child over another (Tp.368, Ln.10-22; Tp.373, Ln.7-9), and that Wood was good to the children (Tp.373, Ln.10-11).

During K.S.'s voluntary in-court testimony, she TWICE revealed that a crime never took place (Tp.386, Ln.21; Tp.387, Ln.11). The Trial Court conceded this as fact and declared, "What I'm hearing her say is, "No, it didn't happen" (Tp.390, Ln.4-5). Why the Trial Court allowed for either charge to go before a "cynical" Jury for adjudication remains a mystery.



In closing on the GSI charge, after the Trial Court dismissed K.S. from the stand (Tp.387, Ln.13-14), and admonished the Prosecutor in regards to testifying for K.S. (Tp.388-Tp.394), the Prosecutor declared to the Trial Court, "I'm telling you that I made a pact with her..." (Tp.394, Ln.17-18). The Trial Court then permitted the recalling of K.S. to the stand. Making "pacts" with State child-witnesses must truly raise many ethical and professional questions.

Lastly, Robyn's brother Ryan Spencer was an alleged sex offender (Tp.375, Ln.23-Tp.376, Ln.25), and Dr. LeSure testified that Robyn had developed the "same coping mechanisms" as K.S. (Tp.422, Ln.13-22). That's interesting.

Finally, in regards to direct testimony concerning Wood's innocence, the State called Dr. Suzanne LeSure as their expert witness. In open court, under oath, this is what she professed:

When asked (during Voir Dire), is she "advises" her chld patients that their statements will be used in court, Dr. LeSure informs them that whatever they say is "private" (Tp.403, Ln.4-12). As Dr. LeSure is a "mandated child abuse reporter" (Tp.426, Ln.16-17), she "will provide support for the legal process" (Tp.406, Ln.6-8). Further, she "always anticipate[s] there might be testimony in a case like this" (Tp.407, Ln.10-22), and she "understood" that these statements "may well be used in court" (Tp.407, Ln.23-Tp.408, Ln.2).

It is now evident that Dr. LeSure deems it morally proper to lie to children and deceive them in order to get them to say what she wants them to say. This is verified as the coerced pre-trial out-of-court-statements made by both S.L. and K.S. were completely contradicted by their voluntary in-court testimonies. At this juncture, Dr. LeSure's testimony should be dismissed as less than credible as it was solicited by fraudulent means. (see NOTE below).

---

NOTE: Wood could not find one single case where Dr. LeSure testified for the defense.

Concluding the combined charges, let's look at the facts:

For the month of October, 2004 Wood Saw S.L. from "Tuesday through Thursday" (Tp.87, Ln.10-22). This would have placed S.L. in Wood's presence for a period of 8-9 days at the most. Especially since Danielle and the two children moved back in with Scott Sadowsky on October 20th (Tp.92, Ln.14-20; Tp.205, Ln.10-Tp.206, Ln.4). The Prosecutor confirmed the indicted dates of October 1-3, 2004 as the "first time", and the unindicted date of October 20th as the "last time" it happened (Tp.495, Ln.23-Tp.496, Ln.1). As S.L. was with Scott Sadowsky, her legal guardian, on both dates, the allegations initially called for "approximately fifty times" (Tp.280). Dr. LeSure testified that the alleged incidents ran, quoting S.L., "Sometime after my birthday and before Halloween" (Tp.416, Ln.16-17). Basically, the allegations ran the entire 31 days of October. Given the evidence that S.L. was sexually assaulted in Put-In-Bay on October 1-3, 2004, it is clear that S.L. did not tell Dr. LeSure everything. The Trial Court, Prosecutor Eisenhower, Lead Counsel Green, and Dr. LeSure were all aware that S.L. had prior sexual relations with her brother (Scott Sadowsky's son), A.S., prior to her meeting Wood (Tp.431-432). Further, as the charges were for October 1-3, what happened during the other "fifty times?" Specifically, what happened between October 20th and 31st? With this in mind, Danielle became aware that she was pregnant with Wood's child at the "beginning" of September, 2004 (Tp.144, Ln.12-13; Tp.86, Ln.16). S.L.'s case was signed in with Dr. LeSure shortly after on September 24, 2004 (Tp.402, Ln.7-16). K.S. allegedly came forward between "July and September" of 2004 (Tp.421, Ln.24-Tp.422, Ln.2). The fact that S.L.'s casw was signed in with Dr. LeSure in September with allegations for the following month of October (with Danielle telling S.L. that she was raped (Tp.301, Ln.1-8)), and K.S. allegedly coming forward in September (after Wood ceased all

financial support to Robyn (Tp.380, Ln.13-Tp.381, Ln.6)), with allegations that were 4½ years old, would certainly indicate that these allegations, at the very least, were orchestrated, if not perfectly coordinated. Keeping in mind Wood's affair with and impregnation of Danielle, and his ceasing all financial support to Robyn, everything transpired against Wood AFTER Danielle announced that she was pregnant with Wood's child: in September of 2004.

Let it be known that Wood neither testified, nor presented witnesses and/or evidence before the "cynical" Jury. He has successfully proven fraud, conspiracy, perjury, who committed the crimes, and his own actual innocence solely utilizing State's evidence. Now we can take a look at Wood's inability to commit such ignorant and heinous acts.

During the course of trial, Wood's Lead Counsel Green did manage to call Wood's only witness: Dr. Douglas M. Reed, Ph.D., a licensed clinical psychologist of thirty years experience. He has spent his entire 30 year professional career working with sociopaths and sex offenders (Tp.475, Ln.22-24). During Voir Dire, this is what Dr. Reed proffered as the core of his findings:in regards to his examination of Wood:

"[t]here is no sexual history or sexual desire or contact with minors, even when he was a minor" (Tp.468, Ln.25-Tp.469, Ln.1).

"--he has none of the typical drives that a pedophile would have or the typical abuser would have towards minor children. His Sexual Behavior Inventory shows that he has normal, healthy, sexual thoughts, and if you could--if you consider healthy masturbating to an adult person, rather a fantasy of an adult than that of a minor. His preferences are heterosexual. He has sexual attraction only to adult women. He is not sexually compulsive or addicted, in my professional opinion. His sexual behavior is under his control. He is not out of control. compulsive. (Tp.469, Ln.3-16).

"He's above average in intelligence" (Tp.469, Ln.19).

"In my professional opinion, to a degree of psychological certainty, Frank Wood does not meet the diagnostic criteria for pedophilia. He does not endorse or agree the three core beliefs or rationalizations used by pedophiles to justify their illegal

behavior" (Tp.475, Ln.2-7).

"He is not slick, conning, or manipulative" (Tp.475, Ln.16-17).

"Mr. Wood is not a sociopath or psychopath..." (Tp.475, Ln.11,14).

"Everything he believes and espouses would be violated if he were to touch a child sexually. In my professional opinion, he is also not a situational pedophile" (Tp.475, Ln.1-5).

As belief determines behavior, Dr. Reed, the State's leading expert (see: fn. 1), has unbiasedly and scientifically proven that Wood could not possibly psychologically achieve committing such ignorant and heinous acts. His testimony further corroborates the voluntary in-court testimonies of both alleged victims, ultimately solidifying Wood's actual innocence. Unfortunately, Dr. Reed was only permitted to speak *Voir Dire*, and the "cynical" Jury never heard any evidence on Wood's behalf. But at least we have established Wood's inability to commit such disgusting acts.

Knowing that Dr. LeSure lied to the children, Dr. Reed should have been allowed to testify before the "cynical" Jury. For a District Court to unjustly enforce an alleged procedural bar, that Wood defeated, in order to prevent the review of Dr. LeSure's Crawford violation (see: GROUND THREE where Crawford (2004), 541 U.S. 36 is asserted), and Dr. Reed's testimony, not only defeats the ends of justice, but works a true and insolent injustice.

In accord:

"...res judicata is not to be applied so rigidly as to defeat the ends of justice or as to work an injustice." State v. Simpkins, 2008-Ohio, Lexus 697, head Note 6; citing Grava v. Parkman Twp. (1995) 73 Ohio St. 3d 397, 386-87).

Failure to take these testimonies into consideration is detrimental to a reliable verdict as a "cynical" never heard these facts.

There can be no question that a reasonable jurist would encourage and

---

fn. 1 Dr. Reed developed the S.T.O.P. program for the State of Ohio: the leading program designed for sexually oriented offenders leaving prison.

goad Wood to proceed further; especially since he has not only surpassed the axiomatic standard of reasonable doubt, he has shattered it. He has done so by factually, medically, and psychologically proving his actual innocence.

The District Court deliberately ignored Wood's claim of innocence, and willfully avoided adjudicating on the facts. His claim barely received an 'honorable mention' in the reviewing court's opinion. As we have seen, this claim is truly worthy of a full review and a complete adjudication of the facts.

This is a clear case of abuse of discretion by a District Judge. Since a reasonable jurist can not possibly arrive at a reliable verdict with only half the facts, how could such a jurist not find the reviewing court's decision debatable?

#### Cause Three:

Wood's co-counsel Ronald R. Stanely was Danielle Sadowsky's (hereinafter 'Danielle'), divorce attorney. The divorce was a direct result of Wood's affair with and impregnation of Danielle. It is now evident that the divorce is directly related to the case at bar, and that Attorney Stanley's presence is the source of Wood's conflict of interest claim (a conflict conceded to exist as fact by the Ninth District Appellate Court).

When the conflict was revealed during Danielle's testimony, the Trial Court declared that Attorney Stanley's presence attached "jeopardy" to this case (Tp.136, Ln.4-5); that his presence proves Danielle's testimony to be "untruthful" (Tp.132, Ln.22-Tp.133, Ln.2); that "tainted" evidence exists; and that the "cynical" Jury "know[s]" and "believe[s]" Attorney Stanley possesses this critical information (Tp.134, Ln.9-25). But the Trial Court, despite its beliefs, and against all reason, continued to permit Danielle, an "untruthful" key State witness, to testify before a "cynical" Jury. Knowing

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
1

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748

NATURE: Child Abuse

CASE NUMBER: 02700

ADDR: Confidential

AREA: ZOR3

CITY: Medina

ST: OH ZIP: 44256

CONTACT:

COMPLAINANT: 6231

LAST: Confidential

FIRST:

MID:

ADDRESS:

CITY:

ST: ZIP:

TEL: ( ) -

DOB: \*\*/\*\*/\*\*

RACE:

SEX:

REPORTED: Sex Offense-Other

OBSERVED: Sex Offense-Other

OFFENSE

CODES: Sexual Child Abuse

CIRCUMSTANCES: Residence/Home

RESPONDING OFFICERS: Kollar M

239

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER: Kollar M

AGENCY: MCPD

RECEIVED BY: Stafinski C

LAST RADLOG: \*\*:\*\*:\*\* \*\*/\*\*/\*\*

HOW RECEIVED: T Telephone

CLEARANCE: OPN Open Case

WHEN REPORTED: 09:53:33 06/16/05

DISPOSITION: D1 DISP DATE: 06/16/05

OCCURRD BETWEEN: 09:53:26 06/16/05

JUDICIAL STS:

AND: 09:53:26 06/16/05

MISC ENTRY:

## INVOLVEMENTS:

Date	Description	Relationship
02/17/06	Booking#: 06-00172	Arrest/Offense
08/04/05	Booking#: 05-00779	Arrest/Offense
02/17/06	Warrant Service 06-005931	Related Incident
08/05/05	Warrant Service 05-018072	Related Incident
08/05/05	Warrant Service 05-018090	Related Incident
08/04/05	Warrant Service 05-017988	Related Incident
03/02/06		
02/21/06		
02/21/06		
02/15/06		
02/15/06		
08/18/05		
08/18/05		
08/18/05		
08/18/05		
08/08/05		
08/08/05		
06/17/05		
06/17/05		
06/17/05		
06/17/05		

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
2

06/17/05	Spielman, Eric	Mom's Boyfriend
06/16/05	Confidential,	Complainant
06/16/05	Madjerich, David A	Social Worker
06/16/05	Wood, Frank P Jr	Suspect
06/16/05	Spencer, Robyn	Mother of Victim
06/16/05	09:53:33 06/16/05 Sex Offense	Initiating Call
08/08/05	MUL CD-Compact Disk Misc Computer 0	Evidence
08/08/05	GRY Computer Hewlett Packard Pavillionzv	Evidence

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
9

INVOLVEMENTS:

Date	Description	Relationship
08/08/05	Child Abuse 05-013748	Evidence
08/08/05	Wood, Frank P Jr	Owner

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 1 \*\*:\*\*\* \*\*/\*\*/\*\*\*\*

Thu Jun 16 10:02:28 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

On this date, I was contacted by Social Worker David Madjerich of the Medina County Job and Family Services in regards to an alleged sex offense involving a then 6 year old child that took place in the City of Medina several years ago, but was just now coming to light. The suspect in the incident is Frank Wood, who reportedly was recently investigated by the Montville PD for allegedly raping another child (no charges filed). I was advised an interview with the child and the child's mother, Robin Spencer, had been arranged for 8:00 AM, Friday, June 17, 2005 at MCJFS offices at which time additional information will be gained and reported.

Case continues.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 2 Kollar M 14:41:34 06/17/2005

Fri Jun 17 14:41:35 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

On June 16, 2005, I met with Officer Travis McCourt of the Montville PD to discuss his previous case. It has not been prosecuted due to insufficient evidence at this time. McCourt also provided me with a video of Wood's interview, which I will review prior to attempting to question him in this matter.

On June 17, 2005, Social Worker David Madjerich and I met with the victim, victim's mother, and victim's sister at the Medina County Job and Family Services building. The subsequent conversations with the involved parties were digitally audio recorded.

We first spoke with the victim's mother, Robyn Spencer, and her current boyfriend, Eric Spielman. Robyn advised she lived with Frank Wood at 219 N Jefferson, Medina from August of 2000 until October, 2000. At that time, they moved to 69 Longacre in Chippewa Lake where they resided together until sometime in 2001 (possibly March). Robyn was married to Frank from May, 2000 until their divorce was final on January 31, 2002. (Upon later talking to the victim, the victim could only specifically remember incidents that occurred at the Chippewa Lake residence, although she stated it happened at every house they lived at). During the marriage, Robyn advised she saw one pornographic magazine of Frank's once, and that he didn't own a computer at the time. The victim, K, has never known her biological father, who left before K's birth. The other two siblings, J and H, have Michael Zane as a biological father. Zane sees those two girls every other week.

Robyn stated that about one year ago, K's class at school was talking about "good touch, bad touch." At that time, K came forward to Robyn, and Robyn's mother, advising Frank had touched her inappropriately. As



07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
10

Robyn feared Frank, Frank no longer had access to any of her children, and she had not noticed anything behaviorally abnormal with K nothing was ever said or done about it. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Robyn stated that she did not wish Frank contacted or questioned regarding the incident because she was afraid of him and did not feel that he would be able to be prosecuted based solely on K's word.

Madjerich then spoke with 9 year old K S regarding the incident, with me observing. Robyn was also present in the room, at K's insistence, but was seated behind K to avoid any assisting or prompting. After introducing ourselves, Madjerich went over the rules with K (Tell the truth and say you don't know if you don't know the answer to a question). He tested her understanding of the rules and she appeared to have a firm understanding. When asked, K stated she was there to talk about Frank Wood, whom she didn't like. She remembered living with him in Chippewa Lake, but had no recollection of the North Jefferson Street address.

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

493  
Page: 11

Frank's private was never on her private, [REDACTED]

In response to further questioning, K [REDACTED] stated she felt bad that she wasn't telling her mom, so one day she "confessed" (implying she felt like she had done something wrong). She also stated she told her grandmother, about a year ago. Also in response to questioning, K [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] she never touched him and was never made to touch him.

She stated he never put his private into her private. She stated she was never physically hurt by his actions.

Based on my training and experience, as well of that of Madjerich and the lay opinion of K [REDACTED] mother, we were all in agreement that we felt K [REDACTED] was being honest and that she has been emotionally traumatized by the incident(s). We believed that her statement of it happening every night, at every house was probably not accurate in reality, but that to K [REDACTED] who would have only been 5-6 years old at the time, it likely seemed like reality. Again, based on my training and experience, this would not be unusual for a child victim of this age to say and does not necessarily detract from the veracity of the rest of her statement. [REDACTED] Robyn [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She planned on making arrangements with Dr Suzanne Lesure to do so.

Upon the conclusion of the interviews, I spoke again with Robyn and Eric. They were concerned about their safety if Frank is contacted in regards to this allegation, stating he was not stable. They further reiterated not wanting him contacted or questioned. I told them that it may be necessary to contact him, but that things could be done to assist in their protection should they feel it needed (such as obtaining a protection order). I advised them I would speak with the prosecutor's office regarding this incident and make a determination on how to proceed from there. I assured them that before I would make any contact with Frank, I would notify them and discuss it with them first. Case continues.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 3 Kollar M 14:57:39 08/02/2005

Tue Aug 02 14:57:40 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

On this date, I presented this case before the Medina County Grand Jury for consideration of one count of GSI. Further, I presented the case for Montville Twp PD against the same same suspect, Frank Wood, for Rape with a

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

493  
Page: 12

life imprisonment specification (05-MV0199).

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse

INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 4 Kollar M

22:16:14 08/04/2005

Thu Aug 04 22:16:17 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

On this date, I received the indictment in this case, as well as the related Montville PD case. Wood was indicted on F-1 Rape (<10) 2907.02A1bB with a life imprisonment specification and F-3 Gross Sexual Imposition 2907.05A4.

I contacted Wood via phone to see if he was willing to come in to speak with me. I did not tell him what it was in regards to or that there was a warrant for him. Wood declined to speak with me until he consulted his attorney, Ron Spears, and had Spears present. Wood advised he would contact Spears the next morning to make arrangements.

Sgt Ryba of the Montville PD accompanied me to Wood's residence to serve the warrant. Upon our arrival at his house, Wood was sitting outside with his dog. I paced Wood under arrest, advising him of the indictment. He was handcuffed behind the back, checked for tightness, and searched incident to arrest, finding no contraband. I Mirandized Wood which he acknowledged understanding but did not wish to waive. While responding to Wood's requests to bring in his dog and lock up his residence, a laptop computer was observed in plain view within the residence.

Wood was served his copy of the indictment, taken to the MCSO Jail and incarcerated. His bond was set at \$200,000 cash only.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse

INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 5 Kollar M

12:02:46 08/08/2005

#### SEARCH & SEIZURE REPORT

1. State basis for search:  
Probable Cause-

Warrant-

Search warrant for two residences

Consent (verbal or written)-

Exigent Circumstances-

K-9 Alert-

2. Contraband found (Y/N): Yes  
If Yes, List items found: Computer and CD's

3. Detailed description of searched person/vehicle (include Sex/Age/Race Make/Model/Plate/Year):

4885 Gateway Drive, Medina and 5800 Ryan Rd, Medina

4. Charges filed (Y/N): Yes

Charges pending (Y/N): No

List charges filed or to be filed:

Rape, GSI

5. Detective contacted (Y/N): Yes, self

If Yes, which detective and results of contact:

Det Kollar

6. Comments:

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

493  
Page: 14

[REDACTED]  
Rapenchuk advised she met Wood while she was working at Home Depot. He was a frequent customer. She stated they began dating about 4 months ago. She stated he was very verbally abusive towards her, a fact that worried her family and friends. She stated Wood was never allowed to be alone with any of her children, so she is certain they were not victimized. [REDACTED]

On 8/8/2005, I returned both search warrants to Judge Chase at the Medina Municipal Court.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 7 Kollar M 12:50:27 08/18/2005

Thu Aug 18 12:50:29 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

During the execution of the search warrant at Wood's residence, numerous pictures of children, including the victims, were found in a locked briefcase. A Brunswick youth football trading card was also observed, depicting a young female by the name of ' '. With the assistance of the Brunswick Police Department, the child was identified as ' '. On this date, I contacted ' 's mother, Dorothy Sheehan. Dorothy was unaware of who Frank Wood was, or why he would have a photograph of her daughter. Dorothy agreed to allow her daughter to be questioned by MCJFS and myself. An appointment will be arranged.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 8 Kollar M 16:48:10 08/18/2005

Thu Aug 18 16:48:11 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

An appointment was set between Dorothy and Sheehan, Social Worker Dave Madjerich and myself for 10:00 AM, Tuesday, Aug 23, 2005 at JFS. Case continues.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 9 Kollar M 15:14:43 08/19/2005

Fri Aug 19 15:14:51 EDT 2005 Det Mark Kollar

On this date, I met with Dorothy Sheehan at her place of employment and showed her a picture of the child in question. She stated that it was not her daughter, She , although it looked very similar. She stated there are a number of at Brunswick around her age, but didn't know this particular one. Additional attempts will be made at identifying this child.

Also on this date, I contacted Sharon Yarwood to discuss the situation

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
15

with her. She admitted that Frank would make statements to her daughter about her being pretty. However, after a long pause after being asked if she would classify any of the comments as inappropriate, she eventually said "no." Sharon stated she has asked her daughter several times if Frank had done anything to her, which M has denied. Sharon agreed to allow M to be interviewed by MCJFS and myself. A tentative date and time was arranged for 1:00 PM, Thursday, August 25, 2005 (pending contact with Dave Madjerich of CSB).

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
16

been having with the laptop. He stated he had been having the laptop serviced "locally", but didn't know where.

I spoke with Sharon Yarwood [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] an appointment was set to interview M. Y. at CSB at 1:00 PM, Aug 25, 2005.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 12 Kollar M 10:00:40 02/24/2006

Fri Feb 24 10:00:43 EST 2006 Det Mark Kollar

On 8-26-05, David Madjerich and I interviewed M Y at MCJFS office. No disclosure was made.

Numerous database searches were conducted on Frank Wood/Freiberg, utilizing BCI. These checks included INTERPOL, FincEN, EPIC, TECS, INS and NCIC. Nothing of value was found.

Through the Brunswick Youth Football Association, the K that was listed on the trading card was determined to be K H I was eventually able to locate K mother, Arlene Harmon, in Seville. Arlene had advised that she used to date Frank. She advised there was some odd behavior by Frank around K, as well as a neighbor girl, which apparently lead to their break-up. Arlene did not feel K was ever actually molested though, and didn't wish to get involved. She initially agreed to be interviewed and to allow an interview of K, however she currently is not returning phone calls.

As the trial date approached, Beth Rapenchuk began communicating with me, being more open now that she and Frank were split-up. There were some concerns that Rapenchuk's 6 year old daughter, C, may have been victimized by Frank (She has been having nightmares). Anne Eisenhower spoke with C who advised that she and Frank had secrets. An appointment was arrangement with MCJFS in order to have a social worker interview C in regards to these secrets. During the first interview, conducted by Dave Madjerich, C again stated that she and Frank had secrets, "bad secrets", but would not tell what the secrets were, other than "mommy has spikey hair." A second interview of C with Madjerich has been scheduled.

07/24/17  
15:08

Medina Police Department

Page: 493  
17

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 13 Kollar M 14:37:47 02/24/2006

Fri Feb 24 14:37:50 EST 2006 Det Mark Kollar

On this date, Dave Madjerich interviewed C R for a second time. She still claimed that she and Frank had a secret, but would not reveal what the secret was. She stated the secret worried her, and that she was afraid Frank would get into trouble if she told.

Case continues.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

Supplemental Narrative: Seq: 14 Vozar K 15:28:47 03/02/2006

Thu Mar 02 15:28:52 GMT-05:00 2006 Detective Kirk T Vozar

On the above date I spoke with Beth Rapenchuk in regards to a possible intimidation of a witness related to this case. Ms. Rapenchuk was directed to come to M.P.D. by Prosecutor Eisenhower in order to make a statement about an incident that took place on the above date with Lisa Willis. Willis is Frank Wood's girlfriend. On 3-2-06 Willis phoned Rapenchuk around 1415 hours and advised Rapenchuk that she [REDACTED] had a copy of Rapenchuk's personal journal. Willis advised Rapenchuk that she was going to turn over the journal to the authorities and to her soon to be ex-husband. Rapenchuk took this as a threat thinking that this could be used against her in order to have her children taken away from her. The journal confirms that she was in violation of a court order because she had contact with Wood even though she was not supposed to have contact with Wood as stated in her divorce court order. A statement was obtained from Wood and Prosecutor Eisenhower was given a copy for charge consideration.

INCIDENT NUMBER: 05-013748 NATURE: Child Abuse INCIDENT DATE: 06/16/05

October 16, 2011

Erin C. Reed  
Assistant Attorney General  
150 East Gay Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Exhibit-05

Re: Wood v. Hall

USDC/ND Case No. 1:09CV0044

Attorney Reed:

On September 3rd of 2010 I filed a pro se Objection into the Northern District in regards to the above captioned case. Within this brief I raised a claim of manifest miscarriage of justice to defeat a procedural bar this is powerless under the standards of Cause & Prejudice. I did this with proof of actual innocence from the face of the trial record. Since then 13½ months have lapsed and your office never challenged the claim.

I am readily aware that earlier this year my family sent you documents in regards to my innocence. Enclosed you will find the originals that these were predicated upon. I have also enclosed the letter to former Ohio Governor Ted Strickland (minus exhibits). Now you have the rest of what you did not know. Should you require any documents mentioned they will be forwarded at your request.

Having read my Objection you can see that I have proven fraud, conspiracy, perjury, who committed these crimes, and my actual innocence all from the face of the trial record. Have you ever seen that done before? And as I neither testified nor presented witnesses and/or evidence before the Jury, it is the State's evidence that proves my innocence for me. Further, as you did not challenge my claim you evidently saw the facts in the proper light of truth. I remain under the impression that you elected not to challenge and to let true justice run its course. In a manner, I thank you for this election. But now I am asking you to further justice; I am asking you to formally withdraw the State's Argument via Motion and to aid in setting this insolent injustice right.

I do thank you kindly for your time and patience, and look forward to hearing from you and/or meeting with you in the near future.

With respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

encl/



True  
Copy

January 29, 2013

Dean Holman/Chief Prosecutor  
Medina County Prosecutor's Office  
72 Public Square  
Medina, Ohio 44256

Exhibit-06

Re: Case No. 05-CR-0365

Mr. Holman:

Thank you for taking the time to review this correspondence. Understanding the value of time I shall be brief.

Your Office elected not to challenge my 26(B) pro se claims in the State Courts and declared that I can not be retried in response to my Direct Appeal. In accord, the Northern District Federal Magistrate declared that I can not be retried due to several grounds of double jeopardy not raised in my appellate briefs. The Magistrate also declared that it is "not this Court's position to determine guilt or innocence." I never raised a claim of innocence. I merely proved that I was not at the F-1 crime scene to support a claim of prosecutorial misconduct. The Magistrate then raised erroneous claims of procedural bars which forced me to raise a full claim of actual innocence. A claim which the Ohio Attorney General's Office elected not to challenge.

Eventually the Northern District denied me Habeas relief. I then requested a Certificate of Appealability in the 6th Circuit. Despite both the State's and the Attorney General's elections not to challenge, I was denied relief once again. The most amazing part is this: In its ruling, the Circuit Court not only failed to adjudicate on my claim of actual innocence and its merits, but also failed to mention that the claim even exists. Evidently all parties involved know that one can not pick up the proverbial turd from the clean end. Indeed, no one wants to get dirty.

With a deep understanding, I have elected to file for clemency. This will provide a 'safe out' with a 'no harm-no foul' ending for all parties involved. Since we both have what the other needs, I am asking for you to work with me in my pursuit for clemency; and I also ask that you come and speak with me regarding this matter.

Mr. Holman, I thank you for your time and patience, and look forward to meeting with you in the near future.

With due respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
G.C.I.  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

Case Information				
Case #	Caption	Filed Date	Status	Exhibit-07
05CR0035	STATE OF OHIO - VS - FRANK P. WOOD #A504-107 (APS, #08CA0044-M; 14CA0093-M)	04-Aug-2005	DISPOSED	
Parties Involved				
Name	Address			
WOOD #A504-107, FRANK (Defendant)	2500 S. AVON BELDEN RD., GRAFTON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, GRAFTON OH, 44044			
FISH, JOHN (Bonding Company)	STANDARD BUILDING, 1370 ONTARIO, STE 1014, CLEVELAND OH, 44113			
GREGG, F. (Def Attorney)	EXECUTIVE PARK, SUITE 130, 4015 EXECUTIVE PARK DRIVE, CINCINNATI OH, 45241			
KERN, MATTHEW (Pro Asst)	72 PUBLIC SQUARE, MEDINA OH, 44258			
Case Charges				
Offense Date	Charge Description	Plea Date	Plea Desc	Citation Number
01/02/2004	(b)(5) RAPE (VICTIM <10 YRS. OLD) (F-1)			
01/02/2004	GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION (VICTIM <13 YRS. OLD) (F-3)			
Actions				
Action Date	Action Description	Notes	Document	
27/Fg/2017	JUDGMENT ENTRY		<a href="#">View</a>	
24/Fg/2017	LETTER RECEIVED FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO		<a href="#">View</a>	
24/Fg/2017	MOTION	FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF STATE COURT JUDGE AND CONFLICT-FREE REHEARINGS. FILED PRO SE.	No Document	
21/Fg/2017	MOTION	FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF STATE COURT JUDGE AND CONFLICT-FREE REHEARINGS. FILED PRO SE.	No Document	
11/Jg/2017	MOTION	FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF STATE COURT JUDGE AND CONFLICT-FREE REHEARING. FILED PRO SE.	No Document	
21/Dg/2015	MOTION	FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF STATE COURT JUDGE AND CONFLICT-FREE REHEARING. FILED PRO SE.	No Document	
07/Q2/2015	ORDER DENYING DEF'S MOTION		<a href="#">View</a>	
07/Q2/2015	ORDER DENYING DEF'S MOTION		<a href="#">View</a>	
07/Q2/2015	ORDER DENYING DEF'S MOTION		<a href="#">View</a>	
07/Q2/2015	COPY OF JE SENT VIA REG. MAIL TO ATTY'S/PARTIES		<a href="#">View</a>	
20/J2/2015	CERTIFIED COPY		<a href="#">View</a>	
08/A2/2015	CERTIFICATE OF ASSIGNMENT FILED		<a href="#">View</a>	
20/A2/2015	DEF'S RESPONSE		No Document	
09/A2/2015	DEF'S RESPONSE		No Document	
08/A2/2015	BRIEF IN OPPOSITION		<a href="#">View</a>	
03/A2/2015	DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE		No Document	
30/A2/2015	REQUEST		No Document	
27/A2/2015	BRIEF IN OPPOSITION		<a href="#">View</a>	
24/A2/2015	STATE'S BRIEF		No Document	
27/P2/2015	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
27/P2/2015	COPY OF JE SENT VIA REG. MAIL TO ATTY'S/PARTIES		<a href="#">View</a>	
26/P2/2015	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
26/P2/2015	COPY OF JE SENT VIA REG. MAIL TO ATTY'S/PARTIES		<a href="#">View</a>	
26/P2/2015	MOTION		No Document	
20/P2/2015	MOTION		No Document	
20/P2/2015	APPLICATION FOR		No Document	
18/P2/2014	TRANSCRIPT OF DOCKET & JOURNAL ENTRIES FILED		No Document	
28/Q2/2014	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
14/Q2/2014	DOCKETING STATEMENT		<a href="#">View</a>	
14/Q2/2014	NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED	*** 14CA0093-M ***	<a href="#">View</a>	
14/Q2/2014	PRAECIPE TO COURT REPORTER		<a href="#">View</a>	
14/Q2/2014	CERTIFICATE		No Document	
14/Q2/2014	AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY		No Document	
14/Q2/2014	FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE/AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY		No Document	
14/Q2/2014	DEFENDANTS		<a href="#">View</a>	
14/Q2/2014	DEFENDANT'S MOTION		<a href="#">View</a>	
15/P2/2014	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
25/D14	NON ORAL HEARING CR1		No Document	
18/D14	DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO STATE'S OPPOSITION		No Document	
07/D14	BRIEF IN OPPOSITION		<a href="#">View</a>	
30/D14	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
13/D14	APPLICATION		<a href="#">View</a>	
13/D14	MOTION		<a href="#">View</a>	
22/J2/2014	JOURNAL ENTRY WINSTRUCTIONS		<a href="#">View</a>	
09/J2/2014	COPY OF		<a href="#">View</a>	
08/J2/2014	REQUEST FOR LEAVE		<a href="#">View</a>	
09/2013	DEF'S RESPONSE		<a href="#">View</a>	
27/2013	BRIEF FILED		No Document	
27/2013	NOTICE		<a href="#">View</a>	
04/2017	DECISION & JOURNAL ENTRY BY COURT OF APPEALS		No Document	

22/May/2007	NUNC PRO TUNC SENTENCING ENTRY	No Document
22/May/2007	MOTION	No Document
05/Apr/2007	NUNC PRO TUNC SENTENCING ENTRY	No Document
02/Apr/2007	MOTION	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPTS	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPT	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPT	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPT	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPT	No Document
03/Aug/2006	TRANSCRIPT	No Document
07/Jul/2006	ORDER DENYING DEFT'S MOTION	No Document
06/Jul/2006	MOTION	No Document
05/Jul/2006	JOURNAL ENTRY FILED	No Document
12/Jun/2006	TRANSCRIPT OF DOCKET & JOURNAL ENTRIES FILED	No Document
12/Jun/2006	NUNC PRO TUNC	No Document
25/May/2006	FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE/AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY	No Document
25/May/2006	PRAECIPE TO COURT REPORTER	No Document
25/May/2006	DOCKETING STATEMENT	No Document
25/May/2006	NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED	No Document
19/May/2006	COSTS WAIVED	No Document
18/May/2006	ORDER APPOINTING ATTORNEY	No Document
18/May/2006	AFFIDAVIT OF DISCHARGE OF BONDS SENT	No Document
15/May/2006	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES	No Document
15/May/2006	SENTENCING ENTRY FILED	1442497-498. COURT FINDS DEFT. CONVICTED OF RAPE 2907.02(A)(1) (b)(8) (F-1) W/ A FINDING THAT THE CHILD WAS UNDER THE AGE OF 10; & GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION 2907.05(A)(4) (F-3) W/ A FINDING THAT THE CHILD WAS UNDER THE AGE OF 13. DEFT. IS SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON (MANDATORY) FOR RAPE & 3 YRS. IN PRISON FOR GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION. THESE SENTENCES ARE TO BE SERVED CONSECUTIVELY. CREDIT FOR 110 DAYS SERVED. ALL COSTS WAIVED. DEFT. SHALL SUBMIT TO DNA SAMPLE. AFTER A HEARING, DEFT. WAS FOUND TO BE A SEXUAL PREDATOR & A CHILD VICTIM PREDATOR & WAS ADVISED OF HIS DUTIES TO REGISTER UNDER THE LAW. THE COURT MAKES A FINDING THAT THE DEFT. HAS BEEN CONVICTED OF AN AGGRAVATED SEXUAL ORIENTED OFFENSE. DEFT. WAS AFFORDED HIS APPELLATE RIGHTS.
15/May/2006	CERTIFIED COPY OF SENTENCE ISSUED TO SHERIFF	No Document
15/May/2006	J.E./NOTICE TO REG AS SEX ORIENTED OR CHILD OFFENDER	1442491-495. COURT FINDS DEFT. HAS A DUTY TO REGISTER AS A SEXUAL PREDATOR.
15/May/2006	ORDER	1442496. DEFT. WAS IN COURT W/ COUNSEL, F. HARRISON GREEN & RONALD STANLEY. PRIOR TO SENTENCING, THE COURT CONSIDERED DEFT'S MOTIONS. DEFT'S MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL FILED 5-10-2006 WAS DENIED. DEFT'S MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL FILED 5-10-2006 WAS DENIED.
09/May/2006	APPLICATION	FOR BAIL - POST CONVICTION - CRIM. R. 46(E)(1)
10/May/2006	MOTION	FOR ACQUITTAL UNDER CRIM. R. 29(C)
09/May/2006	MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL	
15/May/2006	TRIAL ENTRY	1441/119. DEFT WAS IN COURT FOR TRIAL ON 4/24/06 W/ COUNSEL, F. HARRISON GREEN AND RONALD STANLEY. JURY WAS IMPANELED AND SWORN. DEFT MOVED FOR ACQUITTAL AND WAS OVERRULED. ON 5/1/06 THE JURY RETURNED VERDICT OF GUILTY OF R.C. 2907.02 (A)(1)(b)(8), RAPE, (F-1), W/ A FINDING THE CHILD WAS UNDER AGE 10; AND R.C. 2907.05(A)(4), GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION, (F-3). DEFT THEN POLLED THE JURY. DEFT REMANDED TO MEDINA COUNTY JAIL. SENTENCING SET FOR 5/15/06 AT 8:30 A.M.
03/May/2006	MOTION	TO ALLOW MARRIAGE AT JAIL.
03/May/2006	ORDER DENYING DEFT'S MOTION	1440/753. MOTION TO APPOINT TEMPORARY CLERK TO PROCESS MARRIAGE LICENSE AT JAIL IS DENIED.
03/May/2006	ORDER DENYING DEFT'S MOTION	1440/752. MOTION ALLOWING MARRIAGE AT JAIL IS DENIED.
03/May/2006	MOTION	TO APPOINT TEMPORARY CLERK TO PROCESS MARRIAGE LICENSE AT JAIL.
11/May/2006	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES	6 DAYS
11/May/2006	SPECIAL FINDING	1440475A. THE VICTIM "K.S." WAS LESS THAN 13 YRS. OF AGE AT THE TIME OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE OF GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION
11/May/2006	VERDICT GUILTY	1440474. GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION
11/May/2006	SPECIAL FINDING	1440475B. THE VICTIM "S.L." WAS LESS THAN 10 YRS. OF AGE AT THE TIME OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE OF RAPE
11/May/2006	VERDICT GUILTY	1440475. RAPE (CHILD LESS THAN 10)
31/Apr/2006	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT	OF MOTION TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE AS TO THE BURDEN OF GOING FORWARD.
21/Apr/2006	STATE OF OHIO'S	SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON THE SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE.
21/Apr/2006	AMENDED BILL OF PARTICULARS	
21/Apr/2006	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES	
21/Apr/2006	AMENDED BILL OF PARTICULARS	AMENDING THE AMENDED BILL OF PARTICULARS
21/Apr/2006	ORDER	1437/105A. CRT ORDERING CORNERSTONE TO FORWARD TO THIS COURT FOR IN CAMERA INSPECTION THE RECORDS OF "S.L." FOR PURPOSE OF REVIEWING THE RECORDS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THERE IS ANY EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE FAVORABLE TO THE DEFT.
11/Apr/2006	STATE OF OHIO'S	MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY
11/Apr/2006	STATE OF OHIO'S	RESPONSE TO DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS
11/Apr/2006	NOTICE	
11/Apr/2006	MOTION TO SUPPRESS	EVIDENCE & STATEMENTS
11/Mar/2006	NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY	
11/Mar/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY	

23/Mar/2008	ORDER	1435/540. STATE IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE DEFT W/ COPIES OF MEDINA COUNTY JOB AND FAMILY SERVICE RECORDS KEPT UNDER ROBYN SPENCER AND DANIELLE SADOWSKY.	No Document
23/Mar/2008	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
07/Mar/2008	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
01/Mar/2008	HEARING ON MOTION(S)	1432/473. DEFT IN CRT WATTY F. HARRISON GREEN FOR A MOTION FOR A BOND HEARING. CRT PREVIOUSLY REVOKED DEFT'S BOND ON 2/17/08. AFTER HEARING TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES & EVIDENCE PRESENTED, CRT FINDS THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT THE DEFT VIOLATED THE CONDITIONS OF BOND. DEFT'S BOND IS REVOKED.	No Document
27/Feb/2008	COPY OF LETTER		No Document
23/Feb/2008	MOTION	FOR IMMEDIATE HEARING ON BOND VIOLATION	No Document
23/Feb/2008	MOTION FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY		No Document
21/Feb/2008	MOTION IN LIMINE		No Document
17/Feb/2008	MOTION		No Document
17/Feb/2008	ORDER	1430/1013. HRG. ON 2-18-2008 ON SEVERAL MATTERS. DEFT. WAS PRESENT W/ COUNSEL, F. HARRISON GREEN. DEFT. EXECUTED A SPEEDY TRIAL WAIVER IN OPEN COURT & UPON THE RECORD. THE FOLLOWING DATES WERE SET BY THE COURT & AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES: 3-23-08 AT 1:00 P.M. - DISCOVERY STATUS CONFERENCE; 4-12-2008 AT 1:00 P.M. - SUPPRESSION ISSUES/FINAL PRETRIAL; 4-24-2008 AT 1:00 P.M. - TRIAL DATE.	No Document
17/Feb/2008	ORDER TO REVOKE BOND	1430/1012.	No Document
16/Feb/2008	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
16/Feb/2008	WAIVER OF SPEEDY TRIAL	1430/503.	No Document
16/Feb/2008	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		No Document
13/Feb/2008	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
09/Feb/2008	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
07/Feb/2008	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	FILED BY THE STATE.	No Document
06/Feb/2008	MOTION IN LIMINE		No Document
10/Jan/2008	ORDER	1423/598. CRT ORDERS MEDINA COUNTY PROS OFFICE TO PRODUCE MEDINA COUNTY JOB & FAMILY SERVICES RECORDS PERTAINING TO THIS CASE FOR IN-CAMERA INSPECTION.	No Document
20/Dec/2005	ORDER DENYING DEFT'S MOTION	1420/257. CRT DENIED DEFT'S MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO ALLOW DEFT TO PARTICIPATE IN FAMILY EVENTS	No Document
16/Dec/2005	MOTION	FOR PERMISSION TO ALLOW DEFT. TO PARTICIPATE IN FAMILY EVENTS & THE PRACTICE OF HIS RELIGION	No Document
12/Dec/2005	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		No Document
07/Dec/2005	NUNC PRO TUNC	1418/77. STATUS HRG ENTRY NUNC; CORRECTING THE DATE OF TRIAL TO 2/13/08. @ 1:00 PM. THE REST OF THE ORIGINAL ENTRY REMAINS THE SAME. 1417/486	No Document
02/Dec/2005	MOTION	MOTION TO PRODUCE RECORDS FOR IN CAMERA INSPECTION BY THE COURT.	No Document
02/Dec/2005	STATUS HEARING ENTRY	1417/488. CONFERENCE WAS HELD ON 11/23/05. ALL MOTIONS ARE TO BE FILED BY 12/5/05 & WILL BE HEARD ON 12/12/05. TRIAL DATE FOR 2/13/05. @ 1:00 PM. TRIAL TIME IS TOLLED.	No Document
02/Dec/2005	MOTION TO MODIFY BOND	CONDITIONS OF BOND	No Document
30/Nov/2005	STATE OF OHIO'S	RESPONSE TO MOTION TO MODIFY CONDITIONS OF BOND	No Document
30/Nov/2005	STATE OF OHIO'S	RESPONSE TO MOTION TO PRODUCE RECORDS FOR IN CAMERA INSPECTION BY THE COURT	No Document
30/Nov/2005	ORDER GRANTING WITHDRAWAL AS COUNSEL	1417/310. COUNSEL IS GRANTED LEAVE TO WITHDRAW.	No Document
25/Nov/2005	ORDER FOR HIV TEST	1416/563. DEFT IS ORDERED TO BE TESTED WITHIN 30 DAYS @ THE MEDINA COUNTY HEALTH DEPT TO DETERMINE IF HE IS SUFFERING FROM ANY VENEREAL DISEASE OR SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASE.	No Document
23/Nov/2005	MOTION FOR HIV TEST		No Document
23/Nov/2005	MOTION TO WITHDRAW	FILED BY ATTY SPEARS	No Document
28/Oct/2005	JURY TRIAL		No Document
06/Oct/2005	ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE	1408/255 TRIAL CONT'D TO NOV. 28, 2005 @ 1PM. SPEEDY TRIAL TIME TOLLED UNTIL NOV. 28, 2005.	No Document
03/Oct/2005	ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE	1408/288 TRIAL CONT'D TO NOV. 28, 2005 @ 1PM	No Document
29/Sep/2005	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE		No Document
19/Sep/2005	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL	FILED BY F. HARRISON GREEN	No Document
07/Sep/2005	DISCOVERY RESPONSE		No Document
02/Sep/2005	DEMAND FOR DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
02/Sep/2005	BILL OF PARTICULARS		No Document
02/Sep/2005	ANSWER TO DEFENDANT'S DEMAND/REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY		No Document
28/Aug/2005	REPARATION ROTARY AFF. STATING MONEY WILL BE PAID		No Document
26/Aug/2005	RECOGNIZANCE OF ACCUSED SURETY	SURETY JOHN FISH, TUROCY BONDING COMPANY	No Document
25/Aug/2005	BOND ORDER FILED	1398/218, \$200,000 BAIL BOND W/CONDITION OF NO CONTACT W/ANYONE UNDER THE AGE OF 18.	No Document
25/Aug/2005	MOTION TO AMEND BOND		No Document
25/Aug/2005	ORDER	1398/218. DEFT'S BOND IS AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE CONDITION OF NO CONTACT W/ANYONE UNDER THE AGE OF 18.	No Document
19/Aug/2005	REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY BY DEFENDANT		No Document
18/Aug/2005	ARRAIGNMENT ENTRY FILED	1398/549. DEFT. WAS IN COURT W/ COUNSEL, RONALD SPEARS. NOT GUILTY PLEA ENTERED. BOND CONT'D. TRIAL SET FOR 10-5-2005 AT 9:00 A.M.	No Document
15/Aug/2005	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		No Document
12/Aug/2005	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		No Document
12/Aug/2005	ORDER OF RECUSAL	1395/543. JUDGE KIMBLER RECUSES HIMSELF.	No Document
12/Aug/2005	ORDER		No Document

1385/544. CASE TRANSFERRED FROM JUDGE KIMBLER TO JUDGE COLLIERS DOCKET.		
11/Aug/2005	OBJECTION	No Document
10/Aug/2005	MOTION TO REDUCE BOND	No Document
09/Aug/2005	WARRANT TO ARREST RETURNED & FILED	ARRESTED ON 08/04/2005 No Document
08/Aug/2005	BOND ORDER FILED	1383/570, \$200,000 CASH No Document
04/Aug/2005	SHERIFF NOTIFIED WARRANT READY	No Document
03/Aug/2005	CASE IMAGES	No Document
03/Aug/2005	CRIMINAL CASE FILED	No Document
03/Aug/2005	BOND RECOMMENDATION	No Document
03/Aug/2005	INDICTMENT AND REQUEST FILED FOR WARRANT	No Document

In April of 1998 I opened my construction company as 'The Wood Construction Company'. My legal status at that time was Sole-proprietor. It was not until 2002 that I incorporated as 'The Ironwood Construction Company, Incorporated' with the legal status of an S-corp.

Somewhere around June of 1999 I was building a deck on the back of a home for a builder at 375 W. Sturbridge in Medina, Ohio. The builder, Pelton Design & Construction, just sold the home to Jay and Lynda Spencer. Jay's position with Motorola shifted and forced the Spencers to relocate here from Florida. The Spencers also came here with their two sons: Ryan and Colyn Spencer. Ryan was the oldest son and freshly discharged from the Navy. Colyn was the youngest of four and attending college. Robyn Spencer is the third oldest. At the time of the Spencer family's relocation, Robyn was married and going to college in Kansas. There is an older sister, the eldest of the siblings, who also lived in Florida. I believe her name is Crystal.

While working on the deck, Ryan asked for a job. At that time I was working solo and needed the help. I hired him. During that summer we worked side-by-side. On several occasions he would make unusual comments about younger girls. Comments such as, "I'd ---- her!", or "She'll be a real hottie when she grows up." I told him that I was not comfortable with his ways or speech. He toned down for a while. Having heard stories about sailors, I guessed that is what he learned overseas. I was wrong.

Thanksgiving of that year was a turning point. I met Robyn and her two daughters: K—— S—— who was not yet four, and J—— Z—— who was not yet two. We all got along very well from the start. Robyn and I spent a lot of time together. She informed me that she was still married to a man named Michael Zane, and came here to get away from her marriage for a while and to think. But our friendship grew into something more.

Robyn decided she wanted to stay, get divorced, and go back to college. I then bought a car for her use. In fact, Robyn helped me select the car. It was purchased, primarily, for her and the children, and so she could go back to school and get back on her feet. Her mother Lynda was not happy about the car. She referred to the purchase as "That's too much." Her brother Ryan seemed, for lack of a better word, jealous.

Ryan was clearly not happy about the relationship that developed between Robyn and me. He would complain or get angry when we did not include him in our private discussions or adventures. Then I saw the situation develop into what I know it to be; the reality. K—— was changing her clothes by the Christmas tree. Being so young it did not phase me. At least not until I saw Ryan change his position to watch her. I could see his eyes as he scanned her from top-to-bottom. When his eyes met mine he turned away. I didn't say a word until later. Not until I was sure that something was wrong; and something was.

One day right before Christmas, I was out measuring jobs. It was late afternoon when Robyn called and invited me over. I had a few questions for her father and she said that he was up in the computer room. The computer room was an upstairs middle bedroom that served as Jay's home office. As I went up to see Jay, I noticed that Ryan's light was on and I heard the TV. I glanced to my right with intention of saying 'Hello', but what I saw caused me to refrain

from doing so. Ryan was in his bed with K—— on his far right side. I guessed they were watching a movie. But Ryan was rubbing, almost massaging, K——'s undeveloped breasts with his right hand. I turned abruptly and walked into Jay's home office. It took me a long minute to regain composure. After our talk I left. [As I made a left exiting Jay's office, Ryan's bedroom door was straight ahead with the stairs on the right. Ryan had both of his hands clasped behind his head, while K—— had her arms at her sides with eyes closed, pretending to be asleep.] When I got back downstairs I told Robyn that we needed to talk. We went out for a while. After I told Robyn about the incidents she told me, "When we were younger, we had some problems with Ryan." I could tell that this was upsetting her, so I did not pry. She then said that she would have a talk with Ryan and handle the situation. It was not until Dr. Suzanne LeSure testified that "Robyn had developed the same coping mechanisms as K——", that I put it together: Ryan hurt Robyn when she was young.

After Robyn had her talk with Ryan, he became somewhat aggressive. Around mid-December, I was in the living room watching TV with the kids. I looked up and saw Ryan massaging Robyn's shoulders and trying to look down her shirt. When our eyes met, Ryan was defiant and full of hate. The look he gave me was 'And there's not a damn thing you can do about it'. Robyn's look was one of pleading. I stood up and calmly asked her to walk me out. She seemed relieved. Once outside I asked her if she really spoke to him. She said that she did, and that she was very uncomfortable with what just happened. However, the results of their talk were Ryan's increased anger, jealousy, and possessiveness.

Christmas of 1999 came and went peacefully. Then, on or about December 28th, I stopped in to see Robyn around 4:00 pm. Ryan was still working for me and I was unsure how to handle this hair-trigger bomb. Eventually, Robyn, Ryan, and myself, were all sitting at the kitchen table. Then the children called me into the living room for a game of some sort. (The kitchen, eating area, and living room are one long room). When I looked back into the eating area, Ryan was wedging his feet up in between Robyn's on the rung of her chair. I left without saying a word. Robyn followed me out and asked what was wrong. I told her what I saw and that "I'm not into this hillbilly shit!" Then I left.

Around 5:45 pm that same day, Robyn showed up at my residence in Chippewa Lake with the two girls. All three were upset. Once we settled them in, Robyn told me what happened. Evidently, she went back in and confronted Ryan. They ended up in a screaming match. About that time Lynda came home and stepped in the chaos. Ryan rushed Robyn. He then kicked J—— down the steps into the garage, ripped K—— out of Robyn's arms and passed her to Lynda. Ryan then pinned Robyn backwards over the washer/dryer and shouted, "And I'll kill Frank, too!" Although the police were called and all of this is in the police report, neither the police nor Job & Family Services pressed charges against Ryan.

That night Robyn and I went shopping to get what ever she and the children needed. She then told me about the situation between her and her mother, and why she was afraid that they would take K—— from her again. When Robyn lived in Florida and was going to college, she became pregnant with K——. Before delivery, Lynda told K——'s father that the baby was going to be born "messed up", and had him forfeit his paternal rights. While Robyn was recovering from delivery, Lynda had Robyn sign "guardianship" of K—— over to her; supposedly for medical benefits while Robyn was still in school. The only problem was this: under Florida Law, guardianship is the same as full custody. No one ever told this to Robyn before she signed. What strikes the hardest,

looking back, is that Lynda had these papers prepared before K—— was born.

The next day the police called. Lynda produced the guardianship papers and we were forced to return K——. Now we had to figure out a way to get her back. To fulfill the requirements of the guardianship and reverse it, Robyn and I married on May 12th of 2000; she became a stay-at-home-mom; I ran the business; and I obtained medical benefits for her and the children. To accomplish this I hired four attorneys in three States (Ohio, Kansas, and Florida). In the end, Robyn got divorced and kept custody of J——, the guardianship was reversed, and K—— came home in early September of 2000. In and amongst all of this, a child was born into our marriage: H—— A——. DNA testing revealed that she was not my child, but the biological daughter of Michael Zane. Robyn's former husband.

We quickly took notice that K—— was prone to outbursts and slamming doors. As the Trial Record reveals, I kept an "open-door policy" in the house per Robyn's testimony (Tp.114). Robyn agreed to this, and eventually, so did K——. It was not until I walked into the living room that I became worried. I went back into the kitchen to get Robyn and told her, "You need to see this." Robyn and I stood in shock as K—— used her Barbi and Ken dolls to mimic two people having sexual relations. She did this with sound and motion. I then asked Robyn, in regards to past conversations, "Now do you see?" She just bowed her head and said, "Yes." By the beginning of October I moved all of us out of Medina and back into Chippewa Lake to get away from her family.

Robyn's parents were persistent and would not leave us alone. After a plethora of Civil and Temporary Protection Orders, one too many lawyers, combined with the pre-DNA testing knowledge that H—— was not my child, I sought a divorce. We separated in early spring of 2001. Robyn and her children then moved back in with her parents and brother Ryan. In early September of 2001 Robyn fought with her family again. She stated that the conflict became physical and showed me the bruises on her hip. I then told her to get the girls and their belongings and stay with me until she sorted things out. Robyn and I argued. At one point she was stabbing wine glasses with a kitchen knife. She then threw a music box at me twice. I then picked her up, carried her out of the house, stood her on the deck, closed and locked the door, and called 911 (for the second time in our relationship), on my cell phone. But the police arrested me because I picked her up. Judge Mary Kovack found Robyn's story to be less than credible and reduced the charges of Domestic Violence to Disorderly Conduct. It was after that hearing that Robyn swore to ruin me for leaving her. My sister V—— P—— and friend Almee Dudash were present at that time.

Robyn and I divorced in January of 2002, but we continued to see each other from time to time. It was during that time that I helped her with some financial concerns (e.g., furniture, cash, etc.) Robyn also informed me that she needed help with her insurance. So I had her put me on her account as a signer and assumed the payments until May of 2005. Charges came forth after the payments stopped.

As an end note, according to Robyn, her brother Ryan impregnated and married his aunt. Although she is his aunt by marriage, it is still wrong. Evidently, Ryan and his new family settled in Florida.

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood



MY PRE-TRIAL HISTORY WITH DANIELLE SADOWSKY-SMITH Exhibit-09

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 nurt 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 wtestling 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 Killar 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



**MEDINA COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCY**  
 142 HIGHLAND DRIVE P.O. BOX 1389 MEDINA, OH 44258-1389 (330) 722-9398 (800) 706-2732

**CSEA ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER  
 ESTABLISHMENT OF PATERNITY**  
 (Genetic Testing, Ohio Revised Code section 3111.46)

Exhibit-10

Case #: 7055902246

Name of (alleged) Father <u>FRANK P. WOOD</u> First M. Last	Address: Street <u>4885 GATEWAY DR</u> <u>MEDINA, OH 44256-7946</u> City State Zip	Social Security Number <u>073-58-0327</u>
Name of Mother <u>DANIELLE M. SADOWSKY</u> First M. Last	Address: Street _____ _____ City State Zip	Social Security Number _____
Name of Child _____ First M. Last Sex: <u>M</u>	Address: Street _____ _____ City State Zip	Date of Birth _____ (Month/Day/Year)

the results of the genetic testing performed upon the child, the mother, and the father indicate that there is a probability of NINETY-NINE AND NINETY-NINE HUNDREDTH (S) percent (99.99 %) that the above-named man is the father of the minor child. A copy of the results is attached here to and incorporated by reference herein. Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 3111.46, the Administrative Officer therefore finds that the man is the natural father of the child born 05/18/2005 to the mother.

is therefore ordered that a father-child relationship exists between the man and the child mentioned above.

you are hereby notified that either the mother or the father or the guardian or legal custodian of the child may object to this administrative termination of the existence of the parent-child relationship by bringing an action pursuant to sections 3111.01 to 3111.18 of the Revised Code, within thirty days of the date of the administrative order indicated below in the juvenile court or other court with jurisdiction under 3101.022 or 2301.03 of the Revised Code in the county which the CSEA that employs the Administrative Officer is located. If neither the mother or the alleged father or guardian or legal custodian brings an action within the thirty (30) day period, this administrative order is final and enforceable by a court and may not be challenged in an action or proceeding under Chapter 3111. of the Revised Code. If a court action is requested, a copy of the request shall be presented to the CSEA. Indigent persons may petition the court for appointed counsel.

Anthony P. Freyschlag  
 Administrative Officer

10/14/2005  
 Date

Distributed to:

CSEA

Mother

Alleged Father

CTA/CTR

MEDINA County CSEA

142 HIGHLAND DRIVE

P.O. BOX 1389

MEDINA, OH 44258-1389

330-722-9398

Phone Number





## Parentage Test Results

Case 175268  
MEDINA, OH, 7055902246

Tested Man:	FRANK WOOD	(C)	05-24354	09/30/05
Mother:	DANIELLE SADOWSKY	(C)	05-24352	09/30/05
Child:	G S		05-24353	09/30/05

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: FRANK WOOD is NOT EXCLUDED as the biological father of


Combined Paternity Index = 20232  
Probability of paternity = 99.995% (50% prior probability)

TEST	OBSERVED PHENOTYPES			Paternity Index
	Mother	Child	Tested Man	
D16S539	12, 13	12	9, 12	1.56
D18S51	11, 15	15	12, 15	2.98
D19S433	15, 16	15	14, 15	3.70
D21S11	29	29, 31	30.2, 31	7.69
D2S1338	24, 25	20, 25	17, 20	3.23
D3S1358	15, 16	15, 16	16, 17	1.04
D8S1179	11, 13	12, 13	12, 15	3.50
FGA	19, 21	21, 22	21, 22	2.34
TH01	9, 9.3	8, 9.3	6, 8	4.55
vWA	16, 18	16, 18	15, 16	1.23

### Conclusion:

*The alleged father, FRANK WOOD, is not excluded as the biological father of the child, Based on the genetic test results obtained by DNA analysis, the probability of paternity is 99.995% as compared to an untested, unrelated random person of the Caucasian population.*

This is to certify that all the biological samples were drawn and forwarded to Reliagene Technologies, Inc., as stated in the attached Chain of Custody Documentation. Reliagene Technologies, Inc. is accredited by the Parentage Testing Committee of the American Association of Blood Banks. The conclusions are correct to the best of my knowledge. In calculating the PI value, where applicable, the mutation frequency is taken into consideration.

  
Sudhir K. Sinha, Ph.D., Lab Director  
Anthony Carter, Ph.D., Asst. Director  
Megan D. Shaffer, Ph.D., Asst. Director  
Jaiprakash Shewale, Ph.D., Asst. Director

Date: 10/10/05

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



The Court-declared "untruthful" Danielle  
and the source of  
the State-utilized perjury!

Son

Exhibit-13

Liz Gibson Locker

Stepmother

### About Danielle

married to Brad Smith and very BLESSED with 3 BEAUTIFUL children: **REDACTED**  
. i love to cook-especially Mexican & trying new dishes; I love skiing and sledding with my kids in winter and water sports in the summer;love good red wine; love to take long road trips and see as much of this country as I can; PRO-LIFE-"a persons a person no matter how small" ; I love the freedom honesty brings and being able to speak my mind because "those who mind don't matter and those who matter don't mind"-Dr. Suess.

### Places Lived

Medina, Ohio

Current City

Cincinnati, Ohio

Hometown

### Basic Information

Gender      Female

Relationship Status Married to Brad Smith

Languages      English

### Life Events

- - 1990
    - - Graduated from Sycamore High School
- - - Started School at Cleveland State University
    - Started School at Sycamore High School
    - Started School at Miami University



Akron  
**Children's**  
Hospital

RE: S L  
UNIT #0674719  
DOB [REDACTED]

## SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT RECORD

### PHYSICAL EXAMINATION DATA

Exhibit-14

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. *SA*


Exhibit-15

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						



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

DEFENDANT'S  
EXHIBIT

D



**PERPETRATOR #1!**

4720Like · Share



**Scott Sadowsky**

February 15 near Medina, OH

Nice move!



☒ FOR EVALUATION OF SUSPECTED SEXUAL ABUSE/ASSAULT (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

01/26/05

	DESCRIBED BY PATIENT			DESCRIBED BY HISTORIAN		
	YES	NO	UNK	YES	NO	UNK
<b><u>PHYSICAL SYMPTOMS</u></b>						
<input type="checkbox"/> ABDOMINAL/PELVIC PAIN					/	
<input type="checkbox"/> VULVAR DISCOMFORT OR PAIN						
<input type="checkbox"/> VULVAR REDNESS						
<input type="checkbox"/> DYSURIA						
<input type="checkbox"/> URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS						
<input type="checkbox"/> ENURESIS (DAYTIME OR NIGHTTIME)						
<input type="checkbox"/> VAGINAL ITCHING						
<input type="checkbox"/> VAGINAL DISCHARGE						
<input type="checkbox"/> VAGINAL BLEEDING						
<input type="checkbox"/> RECTAL PAIN						
<input type="checkbox"/> RECTAL BLEEDING						
<input type="checkbox"/> RECTAL DISCHARGE						
<input type="checkbox"/> CONSTIPATION						
<input type="checkbox"/> INCONTINENT OF STOOL (DAYTIME OR NIGHTTIME)						
<input type="checkbox"/> LAPSE OF CONSCIOUSNESS						
<input type="checkbox"/> VOMITING						
<input type="checkbox"/> PHYSICAL INJURIES, PAIN, OR TENDERNESS - DESCRIBE BELOW:						↓
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER SYMPTOMS						
<i>No hunting to inge</i>					✓	
<b><u>BEHAVIORAL/EMOTIONAL SYMPTOMS</u></b>						
<input type="checkbox"/> SLEEP DISTURBANCES						
<input type="checkbox"/> EATING DISORDERS						
<input type="checkbox"/> SCHOOL						
<input type="checkbox"/> SEXUAL ACTING OUT						
<input type="checkbox"/> FEAR						
<input type="checkbox"/> ANGER						
<input type="checkbox"/> DEPRESSION						

**FOR SEXUAL ABUSE ONLY: LENGTH OF TIME BETWEEN ONSET OF ABUSE AND INITIAL DISCLOSURE** \_\_\_\_\_

**POST-SEXUAL ASSAULT HYGIENE:**  
Please refer to MEDICAL REPORT FORM FOR  
SEXUAL ASSAULT EXAMINATION AND  
FORENSIC LABORATORY ANALYSIS.



UNIT NO: 0674-719  
REFERRAL DATE: 1-26-2005  
TIME: 0910

Exhibit-18

SOCIAL WORK INTAKE AND SUMMARY FORM

Page 1 Of 5

Patient's Name L S		Sex F	Date of Birth [REDACTED]	Phone-Home [REDACTED]	Phone-Work
Parent's Name(s) MOTHER DECEASED-FATHER NOT INVOLVED- LG= DANIELLE AND SCOTT SADOWSKY			Address [REDACTED] MEDINA, OHIO 44256 MEDINA		
Referred From CARE CENTER			Doctor/Nurse Practitioner ABBOTT		
Reason for Referral FACILITATE MEDICAL EVALUATION			Tentative Diagnosis SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE		
Social Worker ELIZABETH MORSTATTER, LSW			Phone Extension 38830		
Date	Time	Summary of Social Work Assessment			
1-26-05	1345	I. REFERRAL:			
		A. PATIENT SEEN IN: (circle and fill in) CARE CENTER ED, Clinic Other			
		B. REFERRAL SOURCE: (circle and fill in) PMD , CPS , LEA , Medical Facility , Walk-in , Other			
		II. PRESENTING CONCERNS:			
		A HISTORY BY PRESENTING CAREGIVER: Name: Danielle Marie Sadowsky / Scott Sadowsky Relationship to child: Adoptive mother/father (Including additional history of abuse to patient and/or siblings, disclosure process, behavioral observations, developmental level/history, other pertinent information.) *Was child present? (circle) Y N If so, why?			
		-Met with Danielle and D. Abbott, CPNP- CARE Center. She reports patient is "husband's cousin's daughter". Biological mother is Denise- deceased- brain cancer- 2001. Father is Rick Lazard- no contact with patient before patient came into the care of Danielle and Scott. Danielle and Scott have permanent custody. MGM- Alice - raised patient until she was age 5 years. Patient has no biological siblings.			
		-Danielle and Scott are getting a divorce. They separated last June. They have shared parenting. Danielle left and moved in with Frank Wood- age 37 years- at 4754 Poe Road- Medina. Danielle left Frank in October because she had "high suspicion" that he was behaving inappropriately with patient. She saw him walking out of patient's room. Mother said Frank - "raped her"- patient told mother Frank "touched me in my privates".			
		-Danielle said Montville Police Department is handling the investigation- Officer Travis McCort. BCI is involved and has some of patient's clothing.			
		-Patient has been interviewed by Tricia Carshetti- Medina County worker, Officer McCort, Danielle, Scott, paternal grandmother- Scott's mother, and Dr. LeSura- Cornerstone Psychological Services, and Julie Root- school counselor, Erin Simpson- 4 <sup>th</sup> grade teacher, and patient has talked to "a few friends".			
		-Danielle described patient's over all health as "good". Patient at one time told grandma Joyce that it "hurts too much to pee".			

*Elizabeth Morstatter*



Children's  
Hospital Medical Center

UNIT NO: 0674-719

REFERRAL DATE: 1-26-2005

TIME: 0910

1-26-05	1345	-Talked with Danielle about interview procedure. Danielle agreed to let me talk alone with patient- Danielle aware that interview would be recorded.
		-Met with Danielle, Scott, and Abbott. Abbott explained medical findings. Provided them with brochure on Victim's Rights and Responsibilities and information about billing for medical exam.
		<b>B. HISTORY BY CHILD:</b> (Note behavioral observations, as well as quotes, etc.) What follows is a summary of patient's interview. Interview was recorded on DVD format. *If child not interviewed separately from caregiver, specify who was present and why.
		-Met with patient in CARE Center interview room. Showed her location of cameras and told her that interview was being recorded.
		-Patient spelled her first and last name- is age 10 years- DOB is [REDACTED] this month is January- 2005- Wednesday- did not know today's date- daytime- estimated time to be 9- actual time "not good with time"- (0945). It is after breakfast. Patient had oatmeal for breakfast- she ate it alone- "daddy upstairs getting dressed". She took ½ cup oats and 1cup of water and heated it in the microwave for 1 minute- put "Splenda" on it and "eat away". Splenda is "substitute for sugar"- "so that I'm not so hyper"- "hyper" means "all up and shaky". Sometimes patient gets "hyper from Tootsie rolls".
		-Talked with patient about purpose of interview to facilitate medical evaluation. Patient likes to "run around like a horse"- "I love horses"- in the spring she will ride horses. Patient has seen a doctor before- regular doctor is Dr. Jedacek. It is important to tell a doctor the truth "so they can help you". If you lie to a doctor, "probably think you have that problem"- "wasting money". Patient defined telling the truth as "you should always tell the truth"- "set you free". She defined telling a lie as "you aren't caring". Patient has a brother, A 5. When given the example of A 1d cookies, patient differentiated between truth and lie.
		-Patient attends 4 <sup>th</sup> grade at HG Blake. Her teacher is Mrs. Simpson- described as "funny". Patient's grades are As, Bs, and Cs and Ss. S means "satisfactory" on report cards. Patient had a perfect report card and she should have brought it to show me. Except for a "down 1 place" in Gym- "I wasn't hyper enough to do Gym"- "S"- "forgot my Gym shoes"- "just once". They are doing "long division and partial quotients" in Math- see attached. Patient's best friends are N M and K they play at recess- M is a new friend- she has sleep overs with N
		-Patient lives with her brother- A age 5 years, "fish"- "11 of them", and dad- Scott works at Technical Equipment- "sells machines"- "won a trip to Las Vegas". They live at [REDACTED] Medina- 44256. Mother doesn't live there- they are "divorced"- it is "kind of hard"- "my mom wanted to move in with Frankie"- mother lived with Frankie for 5 months and "with us 2 weeks"- now has an apartment. Brother lives at mother's house- "I just visit"- "my dad is adopting me". These are "not my birth parents"- "I hate talking about it"- "my birth parents were divorced" and patient was "taken to my grandma's"- "I took many trips to Connecticut"- they were "very nice to me".
		-Patient was brought here because "I heard that Frankie"- "he had raped me"- Frankie is "mom's boyfriend". Who said Frankie raped you?- "momma". Patient said Frankie "always came in"- "at night"- "laid on top of me"- showed her "pictures of naked men and women".
		-Patient said her "pants at my ankles"- "he had taken my pants off"- and "laid on top of me"- "rubbing me in a very very bad way". When asked about his clothes, patient said she thought they were off, too.

*[Handwritten signature]*

March 10, 2015

Ohio Innocence Project  
P.O. Box 210040  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

Exhibit-19

Re: State of Ohio vs. Frank P. Wood  
Medina County Case No. 05CR0365

factual innocence/newly discovered evidence (2pieces)  
Brady evidence/missing and altered transcripts  
implanted memories/bad faith/malicious prosecution

To whom this may concern:

Thank you for granting me brief audience. Understanding that time is our most priceless and personal asset, I respectfully take a moment to introduce myself. My name is Frank P. Wood and I am the former owner of the now extinct Ironwood Construction, Incorporated out of Medina, Ohio.

In years past, both your Office and that of the OPD Wrongful Conviction Project determined that there was not enough evidence available for representation/vindication. Since then, things have dramatically changed. Currently I am in possession of the following: Two pieces of newly discovered evidence; Court records proving Brady evidence; State's evidence proving my innocence and who committed the crimes; and Court records proving that my incomplete and materially altered Transcripts are currently being used as "evidence" in another case in my Court of conviction by a retired Federal Law Enforcement Agent to prove a pattern of corruption. All of the above, and additional evidence proving my innocence, will be explained through the enclosed OIP Application, and attached Documents and Exhibits cited below.

Historically, in 2006 I was sentenced to a term of 13-Life for the bogus and insolent charges of rape and gross sexual imposition. Having since fought the appellate wars with altered and incomplete Transcripts, on August 27, 2013, I filed a Notice Of Dismissal Of Counsel Of Record (Doc #1) into the Medina County Court Of Common Pleas. As I was never permitted to testify, this document contains my testimony in the form of Pre-Trial Histor[ies], the core of an expert witness Voir Dire that proves I do not possess the psychological capacities to commit such ignorant and heinous acts (belief determines behavior), and my uncontested Claim Of Actual Innocence (comprised solely of State's evidence from the face of the incomplete and altered Trial Record). The State panicked and filed a brief in response that same day urging the Trial Court not to act. On September 9, 2013, I filed my Response (Doc #2) which contains my first piece of newly discovered evidence in the form of a medical research paper. This research proves the alleged rape victim was a temple virgin; untouched and pure at the time of Trial. I included law that allowed the Court to act and invited the Court to do so. After a lengthy wait, neither Court nor State responded.

On June 13, 2014, I filed an Application (Doc #3) and delayed Motion (Doc #4)

for new trial based on my first piece of new evidence, inter alia. The Motion contains proof of my missing and altered Transcripts and Brady evidence. On July 7, 2014, the State filed a brief in opposition challenging admission. My Response (Doc #5) was filed on July 18, 2014. On September 15, 2014, the Court acted in bad faith and prejudicially denied my request for leave (Doc #6).

On December 1, 2014, I filed my Brief Of Appellant (Doc #7) into the Ninth Appellate District. On January 12, 2015, with an extension of time, the State filed a tainted reply brief. On January 26, 2015 I filed my Reply Brief (Doc #8): an interesting read. Currently awaiting results.

As an end note on the first piece of new evidence, on November 18, 2014, my Notice (Doc #1), Response (Doc #2), and their Exhibits were officially made part of the "Record" (Doc #9) pertaining to these proceedings. Considering their contents and admission went unchallenged, somebody in that Courthouse believes me. Also, I have enclosed the web site information for the Doctors who authored this medical research (Doc #10), and the Affidavit of Attorney Ronald R. Stanley (Doc #11), my co-counsel from Trial, who sent me this data. Attorney Stanley is someone I trust at my kitchen table. Mr. Stanley has tried to contact these Doctors, as have I, to no avail. Perhaps your Office will achieve better results.

For direction on the F-3 GSI, after the alleged victim testified TWICE that she doesn't remember being at a crime scene with me (Doc #1, Exhibit-D, p.10), the Trial Court declared, "What I'm hearing her say is, "No, it didn't happen" (Id). Ultimately, after refusing to dismiss this charge, the Trial Court allowed for what it declared to be a "cynical" Jury (Id, p.9) to send me to prison.

On December 5, 2014, I received my second piece of newly discovered evidence in the form of a Facebook transmission. The alleged rape victim, now a twenty year-old married adult, claims I abused her two years prior to our meeting. With this evidence, not only have I proven multiple counts of implanted memories (e.g., her "mother" told her that I raped her (Tp.301)), but who she was with on every date of alleged abuse. With this new evidence, on February 20, 2015, I filed a second Application (Doc #12) and delayed Motion (Doc #13) for new trial.

Regarding the second Application/Motion for new trial, on February 25, 2015, the Trial Court filed a Journal Entry With Instructions For Service (Doc #14) scheduling a non-oral hearing. On February 26, 2015, I filed a Motion For Disqualification Of Prosecutor And For Retraction Of State's Brief Of Appellee (Doc #15). This was filed because I am an adverse and hostile witness against the Offices of both Judge and Prosecutor in the Hartman case (see below). In response, on February 27, 2015, the Court filed another Journal Entry With Instructions For Service (Doc #16). Here, both Medina County Court Of Common Pleas Judges recused themselves from my case.

The very day I received the recusal, I was prepared to file an R.C. 2701.03 Affidavit Of Disqualification (Doc #17) against my Trial Judge into the Supreme Court Of Ohio. Notarized and signed, as this is evidence, the Affidavit and Motion to disqualify (Doc #15) reveal that the Offices of Judge and Prosecutor acted in bad faith, knew I was innocent pre-indictment, fraudulently revoked my \$200,000.00 cash bond, committed malicious prosecution, altered my Transcripts, and imprisoned me for profit. Copies

have been sent to Agent Hartman (see below).

As to the altered and missing Transcripts, in 2014 I was put in contact with a retired Federal Law Enforcement Agent: Mr. Paul M. Hartman. Evidently, his son is also innocent and has suffered at the hands of my Judge, Stenographer, and Prosecutor's Office. Through an extensive investigation, Mr. Hartman discovered that my Judge and Stenographer have been altering Transcripts since, at least, 2003, in order to sustain unjust convictions and to hide the wrongdoings of both Court and State.

With this knowledge, I immediately assembled an Affidavit with supporting documentation (Doc #18) and forwarded them to Mr. Hartman. The Attorney Mr. Hartman hired, Marilyn A. Cramer from Cleveland, utilizing my documents as "Exhibit Twenty-Two," eFiled a Motion To Dismiss, With Prejudice, On Grounds Of Prosecutorial And Judicial Bad Faith And Misconduct as State v. Hartman, Medina County Case No. 09CR0229 on November 10, 2014. The Hartman filing that contains 60 Exhibits comprising approximately 300 pages can be easily viewed on Mr. Hartman's blog at <http://medinacorruption.blogspot.com>.

Closing on my altered and missing Transcripts, the enclosed documentation will reveal that during February of 2014, via Attorney Stanley, I received a letter from the Court Reporter (Donna A. Garrity) stating that her notes from Trial are no longer available for production (Doc #4, Exhibit-D). To the contrary, on October 28, 2014, the Trial Court (Judge Collier) filed a Journal Entry (Doc #19) stating that the Transcripts are available on microfilm with the Clerk of Courts. Two questions remain: 1) Ms. Garrity, a Court Reporter, did not know this? and 2) Are they the complete or incomplete version? Either way, this justifies one of my Grounds for new trial in (Doc #4). For if the Record is complete, why did I not receive it for the purposes of appeal? If the Record is incomplete, it matches what I have.

In support of the above, recently Attorney Stanley investigated the mysterious appearance of these Transcripts. Upon review, they match my incomplete and altered version, with one exception. With Exhibits my version contains approximately 580 pages. What Attorney Stanley found is comprised of 699 pages. In the process of obtaining them.

Documents and Exhibits will be contained in approximately three large legal envelopes. I have enclosed this plethora of paper

Since the truth is always embedded in a vast network of conditions, the broader your outlook is, the greater the possibility of success at constructing something positive or undoing something negative,

-Tenzin Gyatso, the 14th Dalai Lama

as in the instant case.

In this light, I seek your representation and am asking for you to swing the hammer that I have forged and to drive this nail home. For I am The Innocent Man and I cannot do this alone.

Remaining open to interview and/or correspondence, I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.



With integrity and respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

June 6, 2015

Mark Godsey, Director  
The Ohio Innocence Project  
University of Cincinnati College of Law  
P.O. Box 210040  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0040

Re: State of Ohio vs. Frank P. Wood  
Medina County Case No. 05CR0365

Mr. Godsey:

Recently I received your correspondence dated May 28, 2015. Encouraged that your team will soon place my already pending case/evidence under review, I have taken the liberty to forward recent filings and additional documentation that will aid in the decision making process.

Pertaining to the enclosed, on p.10 at question #38 of the OIP Application, I ended with a copy of the Witness List as (DOC #20). Continuing with this numerical sequencing, on March 24, 2015, the State filed a brief in opposition to my Motion For Disqualification Of Prosecutor And Retraction Of State's Brief Of Appellee (DOC #15). On March 27, 2015, the State then filed a brief challenging my Application (DOC #12) and Motion (DOC #13) regarding my second piece of new evidence. On March 30, 2015, I filed a Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment (DOC #21). On April 2, 2015, the Ninth Appellate District Court filed a Notice Of Submission Without Oral Argument (DOC #22), placing the admission of my first piece of new evidence under review. On April 3, 2015, I answered the State's challenge to my motion for disqualification (DOC #15) with Frank P. Wood's Response To State's Brief In Opposition (DOC #23). On April 8, 2015, with a mere two-page token response, the State challenged my request for Brady hearing. On April 9, 2015, I filed Wood's Response Supporting His Motion For Leave To File Delayed Motion For New Trial (DOC #24). On April 20, 2015, I filed Wood's Response Vindicating His Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment (DOC #25). Then, on April 17, 2015, The Supreme Court of Ohio filed a Certificate Of Assignment placing Judge Patricia Ann Cosgrove to preside over my case (DOC #26). Although it was docketed on May 6, 2015, I was never notified of the assignment. Attorney Ronald R. Stanely found it on line and forwarded it to me. Judge Cosgrove is also assigned to the Hartman case: the same case in which I am an injured party and adverse witness against the Offices of Judge, Prosecutor, and Stenographer.

Supporting my Application (DOC #12) and Motion (DOC #13) for new trial based on my second piece of new evidence, I recently received the Affidavit of Nelson Charles Coe (DOC #27). As noted in the Application/Motion, Mr. Coe was key in generating the Facebook transmission.

I have also enclosed the Physical Examination Data page from the Akron Children's Hospital medical report that was presented during Trial as (DOC #28). As you review the section that reads "FEMALE" and go down to "HYMEN," you will notice that the description of the untouched hymen fully

supports, and is supported by, my first piece of new evidence.

Mr. Godsey, I understand that the review will take some time. As I am no stranger to the "hurry-up-and-wait" process, I remain grateful that the right minds are being applied to this delicate but serious matter. And, as your sagacious team will see, I have completely dismantled this insolent injustice, legally and factually, by reverse-engineering each and every bogus element. In the end, I sit confident that your office will elect representation. Until then, in similar fashion, I will keep your office apprised of any changes.

Thank you for your time and patience.

With integrity and respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Corr. Inst.  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

encl:doc#21-28

August 31, 2015

Mark Godsey, Director  
The Ohio Innocence Project  
University of Cincinnati College of Law  
P.O. Box 210040  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0040

Re: State of Ohio v. Frank P. Wood  
Medina County Case No. 05CR0365

Mr. Godsey:

The purpose of this correspondence is to update my file regarding recent events and research. I entrust the enclosed will prove to be enlightening and further assist in the decision making process.

Consistent with my previous historical presentations and numerical sequencing, on July 20, 2015, the Ninth District Appellate Court filed a Decision and Journal Entry (see Appendix of enclosed DOC #29) regarding my Brief of Appellant (DOC #7) and the admission of my first piece of new evidence. As the exonerating effects of the evidence went ignored, the court ruled that I could be held to the standards of an attorney, and that I could have found and filed the evidence sooner. This was their best shot at the title. Undoubtedly the State validated the evidence and fears it. I know they did because I gave them the means to do so (DOC #10 & #11). The Court also stated that trial counsel and I "have a duty to make a 'serious effort' to discover potential favorable evidence" (Decision, ¶11). As evidenced in (DOC #1), I did just that. While on bond I assembled a series of documents that contained medical, legal, and financial records to support my case and innocence. When Lead counsel Green offered them to the Trial Court, the Court refused their admission (Tp.129, Ln.21-Tp.130, Ln.9). From there, the dialogue between Court and Counsel progressed on the subject of "tainted evidence" (Tp.130, Ln.16). The State so feared this evidence that it moved for "mistrial" (Tp.129, Ln.2-4). Although the Court declared I was "adversely affected" (Tp.132, Ln.22) and that "jeopardy attached" (Tp.136, Ln.4-5), no mistrial was declared.

Disgusted with the Ninth District's lack of honor and integrity, on August 12, 2015, I filed an Affidavit of Indigency (no doc), a Notice of Appeal (no doc), and a Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction (DOC #29) into the Supreme Court of Ohio. Due to causes and conditions presented, the Law of the Case Doctrine is moot, giving me free reign. Therefore I do believe the Supreme Court will grant Review and take jurisdiction of my uncontested Claim Of Actual Innocence (DOC #1, Exhibit-D).

After a thorough review of the Akron Children's Hospital medical report regarding the alleged rape victim S.L., the Narrative History Of Incident (DOC #30) was quite enlightening. Within the last five lines S.L. alleges that I placed my private in her private and her butt, it hurt, but there was

no blood. A lot of pain, no signs of trauma, no blood, and no additional indicted charge. The sum total reveals another implanted memory. To confirm, I turned to the Historical Data (DOC #31). Here, vaginal and anal penetration by penis were alleged, but the Physical Examination Data Sheet (DOC #28) reveals otherwise.

Also contained within the Narrative History (DOC #30), S.L. claims that I showed her pictures of adults on a computer. Under testimony (Tp.254-255), S.L. gave a different story, but mentioned she specifically saw "Yahoo" (Tp.255, Ln.5) on the same computer as the adults. Not only did Scott Sadowsky (hereinafter "Scott") and Danielle Sadowsky (hereinafter "Danielle") have "Yahoo" accounts, I had Roadrunner. What child would forget a Warner Brother's® cartoon character and replace it with Yahoo? A frightened and manipulated child. Another unindicted allegation, this is an implanted/transplanted memory.

Confirming implanted/transplanted memories,

The logic of the emotional mind is associative; it takes elements that symbolize a reality, or trigger a memory of it, to be the same as that reality.

-Emotional Intelligence: Why it matters more than IQ.  
Daniel Goleman, Ph.D.; Harvard graduate and professor  
p.294, Copyright 1995

Considering the manipulations of this child, Dr. Reed's Voir Dire reveals that I am not slick, conning, or manipulative (DOC #1, Exhibit-C). To the contrary, it was easy for Scott and Danielle to manipulate the emotional mind of S.L.; a previously sexually abused child who was suffering from a "series of recent stresses" (Tp.413, Ln.17). Also, for your Team's appraisal, per Elizabeth Morstatter, Akron Children's social worker, it was Danielle who provided the history of events for the Narrative History (DOC #30), (Tp.294-295). As you will see below, this is key.

I have also included Akron Children's Social Work Intake Summary Form (DOC #32). On p.3 at ¶2 & ¶5, with Danielle present, S.L. alleged that she was afraid that I would hurt her. In contrast, S.L. testified that she was not afraid of me (Tp.246, Ln.21-22). Once again, S.L.'s coached pre-trial out-of-court statements were contradicted by her voluntary in-court testimony.

It's amazing how much of the Akron Children's Hospital report went unindicted, untestified to, and contradicted in open court.

Supporting the above, it was announced during Trial that the video interview of S.L. by Medina County Job & Family Services (MCJ&FS) reveals "coaching," and that "most of the information came from mom" (Tp.507, Ln.10-11). And, since the State refused to show this video to the Jury (Tp.506, Ln.17-Tp.507, Ln.11), I strongly urge your Team to acquire it and study it carefully. As with the reports from Akron Children's, Montville Twp. Police, and MCJ&FS, your Team will find Danielle right in the middle of it "coaching" S.L., thus controlling the dialogue.

Concerned about Danielle's coaching, I reviewed the testimony of Dr. Suzanne LeSure of Cornerstone Psychological Services. Dr. LeSure was S.L.'s treating psychologist. Her testimony reveals that S.L.'s relationship with Scott was strong (Tp.437, Ln.23-24), but not so with Danielle (Tp.438, Ln.5-6). Dr. LeSure also stated she received some type of "history" from the parents

(Tp.414, Ln.3-4), but "Both mother and child reported that Frank Wood was the person who was involved with sexual abuse" (Tp.415, Ln.1-3). Once again we find Scott in the shadows when it comes to the criminal allegations, and Danielle, the distant parent, embedded in the investigation, "coaching," and telling the story as if she lived it. Amazingly enough, Danielle told me that she filed the initial complaint (Tp.165, Ln.1-10), but she never told me that she filed it in September (DOC #1, Exhibit-D, p.12-13) while we were living together. Remember, the charges were for the following month of October.

Dr. LeSure further testified that

S        expressed anger toward her mother for getting her in a situation with a man who sexually offended against her. And  
S        also expressed confused feelings about the fact that her half-brother was to be the child of the man that offended against her (Tp.438, Ln.11-15).

This is very deep and advanced thought for a ten-year old child. In fact, I guarantee this is Scott talking via previous arguments I had with Danielle. Further, some of these arguments took place via voice mail and text, but Danielle's testimony reveals that certain voice mails and texts were deleted pre-trial and kept from the Jury (Danielle, Tp.95-97; Closing, Tp.520).

Tricia Carchedi was the unlicensed social worker for MCJ&FS who conducted the above video interview with S.L. Unlicensed, Ms. Carchedi had no business testifying as an expert. Regardless, her testimony reveals that Danielle participated in the interview while Scott periodically walked in and out (Tp.308, Ln.9-16). Regarding Scott's intermittent presence, within my original Discovery package, MCJ&FS/Children's Services submitted a document stating that "Samantha was very nervous due to her father's presence." I strongly encourage your Team to acquire this document.

Ms. Carchedi's testimony was quite revealing. At one point she sent a letter to the Prosecutor stating there was "no evidence" against me (Tp.341-342; DOC #21). She then declared "there was not any evidence to support the allegations of sexual abuse" (Tp.346, Ln.5-6). Indeed, this is the State's leading investigative agency.

After further research of the Record regarding the additional unindicted allegation for October 20, 2004, the following came to light. On this morning I took care of S.L., Danielle and the children moved back in with Scott (Tp.192, Ln.14-20; Tp.205, Ln.10-Tp.206, Ln.4), and Danielle took S.L. to the Montville Twp. Pol. Dept. without Scott (Tp.169, Ln.4-17).

Regarding October 20th, between the Prosecutor's Opening Argument (Tp.34), the testimonies of Officer McCourt (Tp.57-58), Danielle (Tp.88-105, 114), Scott (Tp.187-188), and S.L. (Tp.224-231), the indictment remained silent. This reveals another implanted/transplanted memory. For clarity, the above testimonies place Scott with S.L. on all three dates of alleged abuse: October 1-3, 2004; October 20, 2004; and when S.L. was "8" (DOC #12 & #13).

Although S.L. denied any wrongdoing by me (Tp.192, Ln.5-14), Danielle badgered S.L. at least a "half dozen times" between October 20, 2004, and January 11, 2005 (Tp.94, Ln.1-9). Eventually S.L. caved and told Danielle the story Scott wanted to hear.

Danielle testified that after S.L. gave her new story in January 2005, she called Scott and he told her, "You need - -," but was cut off by an

objection (Tp.169, Ln.18-Tp.170, Ln.2). Yes, Scott controlled the situation through Danielle and kept his distance. This is verified where Scott testified that he took "no action" when the allegations surfaced (Tp.206, Ln.19). In fact, with allegations surfacing in September (DOC #13, Exhibit-D, p.6), Scott didn't sign "permission" for anything until late November 2004 (Tp.407, Ln.7-16). Excellent parenting. Why did he hesitate?

Soon after Danielle's call to Scott, an interview took place at Danielle's residence with Ms. Carchedi and Officer McCourt. Per Danielle, Scott watched over their son so she "could participate with Samantha" (Tp.170, Ln.25-Tp.171, Ln.10).

Thus far, Danielle has participated in and controlled every interview while Scott lurked in the Shadows. Why? In sync with LeSure's testimony, per Scott and Danielle's testimonies, she took care of their son while he took care of S.L. (Tp.196, Ln.8-14; DOC #13, Exhibit-L). Why the abrupt role reversal?

With the above in mind, Scott and Danielle glorified each other under oath (Tp.509, Ln.22-Tp.510, Ln.4). Yet no one asked Danielle why she left the sanctity of their marriage and sought intimacy and affection elsewhere.

An affair, a pregnancy, a brutal divorce, and criminal allegations. Now we have a major role reversal while Danielle and Scott glorified each other under oath. Families only do such things when they're hiding something.

In this light, consider this fact: Regarding S.L. and K.S., no extended family testified. No grandparents, aunts, uncles, or friends of family. Interesting and unusual.

As to Scott as master and Danielle as pitbull, Danielle became pregnant in September of 2004 with a child she said was mine but believed was Scott's. This is why when our son was born Danielle told me that she gave him Scott's last name for "practical reasons," and explains her protection of Scott. DNA later ruined their plans. Had she known the child was mine pre-birth and pre-allegation, Scott would be in prison.

Looking at Danielle's deceitfulness and willingness to harm a child's mind for her own gain, not only does our son not know I exist, she gave him her new husband's last name without my consent in 2014.

Wrapping up the recent studies of the alleged rape of S.L., I believe it best to apprise your Team of a critical issue. During the "untruthful" testimony of Danielle (Tp.132, Ln.22-Tp.133, Ln.2), it was revealed that my Co-counsel, Attorney Ronald R. Stanley, was her divorce attorney (Tp.123, Ln.12-16). With the divorce being the result of our affair, which no one testified to, and Scott's inappropriate actions with S.L., this is why the conversation of "tainted evidence" took place. Although Attorney Stanley stood by my side in truth, and this matter was discussed at great length (Tp.123-Tp.141), the Court never asked Attorney Stanley, "Why are you here?" and "What do you know?" Evidently nobody wanted to hear the answers to those questions.

Regarding the alleged gsi of K.S., I noticed a symmetry in the Prosecution's case. When Lead-counsel Green mentioned the State's refusal to show the video interview of K.S. to the "cynical" Jury (Tp.135, Ln.10-11), the Prosecutor stepped in with an "Objection" (Tp.513, Ln.20-25). I ask that your Team acquire this video, and, as with the video of S.L. (Supra), study

it carefully and determining who is controlling the dialogue. Thank you.

Mr. Godsey, should any changes occur, or additional facts come to light, I shall inform your Office without delay.

Thank you for your time and patience.

With integrity and respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

cc: rrs  
nc

encl/doc#29-32



November 3, 2015

Mark Godsey, Director  
The Ohio Innocence Project  
University of Cincinnati College of Law  
P.O. Box 210040  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0040

Re: State of Ohio vs. Frank P. Wood  
Medina County Case No. 05CR0365

Mr. Godsey:

Continuing with my previous historical presentations and numerical sequencing, the following is being submitted to apprise your Team of recent events.

On October 7, 2015, a Judgment Entry (DOC #33) was filed in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas regarding three of my pro se filings. Below I have itemized each Motion and the Court's rulings.

Answering my second Application/Motion for new trial (DOCs #12, 13, & 24), the Court filed its Order On Defendant's Second Application For Leave To File A Delayed Motion For New Trial (DOC #34). Within its decision, the Court erroneously

- Stated that I filed my first piece of new evidence in 2014. Irrelevant to current proceedings, Court Records reveal that it was filed in 2013 (DOC #2). This is a bone of contention for the Prosecutor in the Supreme Court of Ohio;
- Ignored the timeliness of my filing. This was the only legal hurdle I was required to overcome;
- Illegally denied my evidentiary hearing;
- Conducted an illegal evidentiary hearing without the presence of counsel, witnesses, or myself, for the Court reached a decision on the merits against cited Ohio Supreme Court decisions and Crim.R. 33(A)(6);
- Claimed there is ample evidence that I repeatedly raped S.L. What evidence? I want indicted on the additional counts of this libel;
- Stated the FaceBook transmission was not properly authenticated. The Court ignored the fact that my witnesses and affidavits for authentication purposes, by operation of law, were to be present at my evidentiary hearing (DOC #24, p.4, Crim.R. 33 (A)(6));
- Ignored proof of several implanted memories; and
- Accused me of filing a frivolous motion and threatened that I could be sued for vexatious litigation if I file anything else. Medina has now resorted to mobster strong-arm tactics.

Regarding my Motion For Disqualification Of Prosecutor And For Retraction Of State's Brief Of Appellee (DOCs #15 & 23), the Court filed its Order On Defendant's Motion To Disqualify Prosecutor's Office And For Retraction Of

State's Brief Of Appellee (DOC #35). Here, with a lack of inquiry and understanding, the Court stated that

- The Medina County Prosecutor's Office has had no involvement in the Hartman case. The Court conveniently overlooked the fact that Pros. Kern, in challenging my Motion, attacked the credibility of Hartman's Attorney and investigator, accusing them of fabricating evidence (DOC #23). What more, Hartman's filings reveal that a Medina County Prosecutor drove to Columbus to file an Affidavit of Disqualification in order to remove a previously assigned judge from the Hartman case. These events took place after the Medina Office was disqualified. In finality, the Prosecutor's Office is a defendant and I am an adverse witness. Disqualification is mandatory;

- Admits as "fact" that the Jury Voir Dire was never transcribed. This alone is grounds for new trial. Evidently the Court forgot its powers of sua sponte but recalled them with threats of vexatious litigation to protect the Prosecutor;

- Relied on irrelevant case law to deny me relief; and

- Declared that I did not suffer prejudice, ignoring the Prosecutor's conflict of interest and my rights to Due Process and Equal Protection.

I have a surprise for all interested parties which reveals that not only are my Trial Transcripts incomplete, but have been materially altered. After the Court's offensive ruling, I began to review old filings. Below is what I discovered.

On September 22, 2006, Attorney Joseph F. Salzgeber filed my first Brief Of Appellant after receiving my Trial Transcripts from Court and Stenographer. On p.3 of the Brief, Atty. Salzgeber states in a footnote that there are multiple transcript volumes. On p.5, he then cites the Sentencing Hearing Transcripts four (4) times. In my original Affidavit to the Hartman Defense Team (DOC #18), I believed my Sentencing Hearing Transcripts were never transcribed (Id @ ¶15). Now I have physical proof that my Trial Record was at one time complete, but has been materially altered. As this gives credibility to my original Affidavit, let it be known that Atty. Salzgeber is a former Medina County Prosecutor. In support, I have enclosed a new Affidavit (DOC #36) with Exhibits to verify the above. A copy has been forwarded to the Hartman Defense Team.

As a note, my on line Docket has been altered repetitively. Certain filings, as with the Brief Of Appellant above and my 26(B) Application, have disappeared in their entirety, while others are no longer available for public "view." The changes take place every time I file proof of what they did to me. They're backtracking, but can only go so far: to the source of the lie. Time to run the rabbit out of options; all the way back to Scott and Danielle Sadowsky. Allow for me to explain.

Those out there in the "Free World" who have been helping me came through. We have located the biological father of S.L., the alleged rape victim. His name is Rick Lazard and he is here in Ohio. Mr. Lazard originally gave S.L. up for adoption to Scott and Danielle. He is in regular contact with S.L. on FaceBook. Currently awaiting his contact information. Will forward a copy to your Team upon receipt.

You may be questioning what makes Mr. Lazard such a valuable asset to my cause. Understood. During the cross-examination of Danielle, when asked about Mr.

Lazard, Danielle became flustered and the Prosecutor objected (Tp.108, Ln.1-6). If you will recall my most recent correspondence to you, when S.L.'s Grandma Alice was mentioned, the Prosecutor objected again. I strongly believe that Mr. Lazard is in the possession of useful and valuable information.

Pertaining to my Request For Brady Hearing And Dismissal Of Indictment (DOCs #21 & 25), the Court responded with its Order On Defendant's Motion For Brady Hearing And To Dismiss Indictment (DOC #37), and

- Again claims my first piece of new evidence was filed in 2014, when, as previously noted, it was filed in 2013. Why keep hammering this issue? Simple. Judge Collier's refusal to respond to my request for relief caused an additional nine-month delay;
- Ignored State's proof of innocence presented. Ignoring something neither invalidates it nor makes it go away;
- Claims there is a plethora of medical evidence to support the allegation of rape. Obviously the Court never read the Physical Examination Data page from Akron Children's Hospital (DOC #28) and the uncontested Claim Of Actual Innocence that has been cited in every filing since 2013;
- Ignored the fact that due to the ineffective assistance of counsel, I had no knowledge of this evidence until I received the molested Trial Record one year post-trial;
- Ignored Federal and Constitutional law presented, denying me every DUPOL and Equal Protection right known;
- Mis-applied Brady's ruling to the distinguishing facts of my case;
- Claimed the "Defendant" objected to the admission of this evidence. A blatant lie, so the Record reveals. Why would I object to the admission of State's evidence proving my innocence?
- Admits the "alleged exculpatory records were discussed during the trial by the attorneys and Court." Yes, without my knowledge. The Record reveals I was not privy to that sidebar;
- Claims that my Attorney and I knew of the evidence at the time of Trial. Nowhere in the Trial Record or my filings will you find such a statement. Another blatant lie; and
- Claimed that my Attorney and I sought to have the evidence "excluded" from the Trial. Another blatant lie, so the Record reveals. Why would any Defense Team seek to have State's exonerating evidence excluded from a trial?

Conclusion: In the most frightening fashion, it is as if a Prosecutor wrote the Court's decisions and the Judge blindly signed. I say this because these rulings not only reveal a lack of honor and integrity, but a true lack of judicial inquiry (Unless, of course, the Visiting Judge has a vested interest in my case). It could not have been Pros. Kern who wrote them. We have been going at each other's jugulars for so long, I now his catch-phrases, key words, and line of litigation; and he knows mine. We're like an old married couple arguing in code: At times, no one knows what we're arguing about but us. The author of these decisions had to be another Prosecutor. It is quite logical, for why would a Visiting Judge lie?

While typing this correspondence, I received a denial from the Supreme Court

Of Ohio regarding jurisdiction and the admission of my first piece of new evidence (DOC #38). This ruling reflects that the Higher Court deliberately elected to ignore its own case precedence. I knew this piece of evidence would be a difficult issue, for it exonerates many.

Appealing would only place me in a continuous loop of litigation. This is specifically due to the fact that I lack representation. Without face, voice, or presence, my evidence is powerless. Yes, I truly need and seek your Team's assistance. Fortunately I can pursue Rick Lazard and the Hartman case is still going forward.

Although I have other grounds, with threats of being sued for vexatious litigation, what am I to do? My filings and line of litigation have been complimented by many higher minds. There is nothing frivolous about them. What more, the Prosecutor made neither suggestion nor request to have me declared vexatious. Did a Prosecutor prompt the Judge to take such a position? Indeed, men do their greatest evil when they're afraid. I finally have their undivided attention.

Mr. Godsey, I shall continue to fight for justice on my end. Until your Team reaches a decision, I shall apprise your Office of any changes or discoveries in similar fashion.

Undaunted,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

encl: docs #33-38

May 12, 2016

The Ohio Innocence Project  
University of Cincinnati College of Law  
P.O. 210040  
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0040

Re: State of Ohio vs. Frank P. Wood  
potential new witness/additional data

Miranda Anandappa and Alex Barengo:

In sync with my previous historical presentations and numerical sequencing, the following is being submitted to apprise your Office of recent events.

In receipt of your correspondence dated January 22, 2016, I understand that it will take some time to study the documents I sent your Office and to compile your first set of questions. Eager to be of some use, I held steadfast in my pursuit of Rick Lazard: the biological father of S.L. I have done so because

- Pre-trial Danielle Sadowsky (hereinafter 'Danielle') told me that Rick Lazard was an alcoholic who died in prison, only to change her false story during Trial and declared she knew nothing about him (Tp.108). She was raising his daughter.
- The Prosecutor did not want Mr. Lazard discussed during Trial (Tp.108).
- Pre-trial Danielle told me that Denise Lazard, the maternal parent of S.L., was a drug addict and a prostitute who used to entertain clients with S.L. in the room. During Trial Danielle stated that she knew nothing about her (Tp.109).
- Scott Sadowsky (hereinafter 'Scott') contradicted Danielle and testified that Denise Lazard and Grandma Alice were at A.S.'s baby shower (Tp.191). A.S. is the biological son of Scott and Danielle.

For clarity, Grandma Alice is the mother of Denise Lazard. Denise is the mother of S.L. and first cousin to Scott. As Denise is the daughter of Scott's uncle, this renders S.L. to be Scott's second cousin, by blood relation.

- Dr. Suzanne LeSure, S.L.'s treating psychologist, testified that Children Services became involved because they were concerned about Grandma Alice supervising S.L. (Tp.434), and that S.L. was "picking" before the alleged abuse in my case (Tp.437).

The "picking" of skin until it bleeds is not just a sign of stress, it is a symptom of long-term abuse.

- When Dr. LeSure was asked about the "problems" with Grandma Alice, the Prosecutor objected (Tp.438-439).

The State absolutely refused to discuss that side of the family. Why?

- Dr. LeSure confirmed that Children Services got involved and evidently removed S.L. from Grandma Alice's home (Tp.440-441). This is how Scott and Danielle become guardians of S.L.
- Pre-trial Danielle told me that S.L. had been sexually abused prior to obtaining guardianship of her. During Trial Danielle changed her story and declared she had no idea what type of abuse S.L. suffered (Tp.109). One would think that Children Services would have told the Sadowskys what type of abuse S.L. suffered and what signs to look for should she need continuing therapy. Yes?
- Danielle claimed S.L. had "no counseling" when she came into their custody, but changed her story a moment later (Tp.110). On the other hand, Scott testified that S.L. had "always" been in some sort of counseling (Tp.204).

In addition to Danielle's lack of honor and integrity, and her willingness to harm the mind of a child for selfish gain, on 4/27/16 she convinced a judge to allow her new husband to illegally adopt my son Gabriel (DOC #39). More lies to cover more lies. Powerless to stop this, the Gordian Knot continues to grow. I pray you wield an effective sword.

An example of the untruth and hypocrisy that resides in Danielle's mind was recently discovered on her Facebook account (DOC #40). Coming from someone who lacks honor and ethics, I found this to be hysterical.

Attorney Ronald R. Stanley, my Co-counsel from Trial, performed an on line search for Mr. Lazard (DOC #41). This is accompanied by another search (DOC #42) that was performed by Mr. Martinson; a good friend who's English is still being perfected. After cross-referencing results and memory, below is what came to light.

From DOC #41

25643 Rustic Lane  
Westlake, OH 44145-5744

This address has turned up in several previous searches and is tied to a criminal conviction. Records may be obtainable and I believe this may be the residence of close relatives.

1333 Cove Ave.  
Apt. 306  
Lakewood, OH 44107-2156

Moved from this location in early 2014.

From previous Facebook postings, this is S.L.'s current address and she is now married to H D

From p.2 of DOC #42

3548 Brook  
Avon, OH 44011

Possible current address. This page also contains several phone numbers and Denise Lazard is listed as a relative.

1960 W. 50th St.  
Cleveland, OH 44102-3365

Possibly his work or small business.

From two previous searches, Mr. Lazard has Divorce & Marriage Records listed in Cleveland, OH. As Cleveland is Cuyahoga County, such records are

considered Public Record and therefore obtainable. From the current searches you will see that Mr. Lazard's full name is Richard H. Lazard, his month and year of birth are 9/1971, and the first five digits of his Social Security Number are 285-84-XXXX. Hopefully this data will prove useful, for I firmly believe that Mr. Lazard has information worth obtaining.

As an endnote on the searches, DOC #42 contains phone numbers and the most recent addresses, but I believe it best for your Office to attempt contact. Unless otherwise directed, I will leave this up to you.

Past Facebook transmissions revealed that Mr. Lazard and S.L. argued often. Unfortunately, a current search revealed that Mr. Lazard closed his Facebook account. However, thanks to the Patriot Act, since 2010 all Facebook transmissions that were "public" remain public whether or not the account is closed or an active account removed the "public" status of a transmission. This renders all 2010-current "public" transmissions subject to subpoena.

In finality, regarding my Brady violation (DOCs #21 & 25), if I was not legally and factually correct, then Judge Cosgrove would have had no need to lie about the evidence. The Court's ruling also failed to cite a single Transcript Page or Line Number.

Should any other evidence surface or facts come to light, I will notify your Team without delay.

Thank you for your time and patience.

With integrity and respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, OH 44044

encl: docs 39-41

June 30, 2016

The Ohio Innocence Project  
University of Cincinnati College of Law  
P.O. Box 210040  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0040

RE: State of Ohio vs. Frank P. Wood  
Medina County Case No. 05CR0365

SUBJ: Transcripts

Brittany Johns and Elle Bruns:

In receipt of your June 7, 2016 correspondence, I thank you for keeping me updated regarding my case being transferred from previous Fellows to your Team. Studying for my Series 7, I am one who thrives on data. Your continuity in communication is greatly appreciated.

To date, I have sent your Office five correspondences dated

- March 10, 2015;
- June 6, 2015 (date correction from 2105);
- August 31, 2015;
- November 3, 2015;
- May 12, 2016; and

42 Documents. Should anything appear incomplete or missing, please do not hesitate to inform me. I understand what can happen when a project gets transferred in a large office environment. To be forthright, I miss those days. Such is the good chaos.

On June 24, 2016 I received an email from Attorney Ronald R. Stanley. He informed me that you contacted him seeking the Trial Record and that he directed you to the Clerk of Courts. I had a full-size copy and mailed it home when I received the minimized version from the Ohio Attorney General, who, in turn, received it from the Medina County Prosecutor (DOC #18, ¶17). I have taken the liberty to forward a true copy of the minimized version as (DOC #43) for cross-referencing and comparison, should you need it. You may even find its format to be advantageous.

As a note, from Arraignment on, the Record is void of all pre-trial hearings, save one, which is included at the beginning of DOC #43 (Tp.6-24).

Regarding the materially altered and incomplete Trial Record, thus far, all I know is that the Hartman Case is still going forward (see correspondence dated March 10, 2015 @ p.3).

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at will.

Thank you for your time and patience.




With integrity and respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Institution  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

encl: doc#43/tp



Share


o 2 people like this.

13.



Danielle Smith shared a link.

February 22



1Share




19.

Danielle Smith shared a link.

October 4, 2013

As a mother of a 3rd grader I experience the frustration with this firsthand. Why take something that can b solved in 2 steps and add 3 steps to it??? RETARDED!



[4Like](#) · [Share](#)



36.

[Scott Sadowsky](#) shared a [link](#).

[February 2](#)

Tough match to make it to the finals! [Joyce Reich](#), [Chad Stewart](#), [Bruce Nevin](#), [Kimberly Stewart](#), [Christine Norris Sadowsky](#), [Tony Joseph Vetturini](#), [Danielle Smith](#)

# Exhibit-21

341

you also got a letter.

MR. GREEN: Your Honor, may

I approach?

THE COURT: Come on up.

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

THE COURT: Sir.

MR. GREEN: What I want to

get into is what was given to us in the Job and Family Services file. There are things I would like to go into because she has there a specific referral that she made to the Montville Police and, also, to the prosecutor's office that I'd like to go into, which would be inconsistent with what she just testified to, more than just sending it.

MS. EISENHOWER: No. This wasn't sent to us. It's the police letter she referred to. That's what we got (indicating).

MR. GREEN: Well --

MS. EISENHOWER: That's what we got (indicating). It's not inconsistent with what she said.

THE COURT: I haven't seen the letters. Let me take a look at this.

342

MS. EISENHOWER: (Providing.)

THE COURT: Is this the one

that indicated sexual abuse?

MS. EISENHOWER: No. That's just a referral.

MR. GREEN: Hold on here. She said she sent a report to the prosecutor --

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

MR. GREEN: -- up here.

"No evidence."

THE COURT: So you talked to her about this letter. Do you have any objection to him talking to her about this letter?

MR. GREEN: Excuse me, your Honor. I was told the record was sent to the prosecutor.

MS. EISENHOWER: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. EISENHOWER: That isn't that (indicating). This is the letter she sent (indicating).

MR. GREEN: This states it was sent to you.

MS. EISENHOWER: To the perpetrator.

343

THE COURT: Okay. She just got done indicating --

MS. EISENHOWER: No.

THE COURT: Stop.

MS. EISENHOWER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: She just got done indicating that there is an alleged sexual abuse and this is the letter that's sent to the prosecutor's office.

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

THE COURT: Is that right?

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. EISENHOWER: But when she says "they" got a letter indicating abuse, that's to the Sadowskys. This is this (indicating).

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going --

MS. EISENHOWER: It's two different things.

THE COURT: I understand --

MS. EISENHOWER: Yeah.

THE COURT: I understand she sent one to the prosecutor, and that's this one (indicating), and she --

344

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

THE COURT: -- sent one

over --

MS. EISENHOWER: Right.

THE COURT: -- to the --

MR. GREEN: Sadowskys.

THE COURT: -- family member. That's this one (indicating).

MS. EISENHOWER: Hm-hm.

THE COURT: I don't have any problem letting you talk to her about this, these two letters, sure.

MR. GREEN: Okay. Just these two? Because she -- I'm trying to get into the whole thing.

THE COURT: That's fine.

(Whereupon, the further following proceedings were then held in the presence of the Court, the Jurors, Counsel, and the Defendant.)

BY MR. GREEN:

Q Miss Carchedi, if you know, is this the letter you sent?

A We send -- like I said before, this is what we send to --

THE COURT: A little

louder, please.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

A The enforcement -- there a -- there's a law enforcement letter that goes on the top of this -- this page, actually Page 2. But what happens is, this is -- this gets sent over to -- um, when we have an indicated or substantiated abuse allegation, we do send over to the prosecutor and they get, um, a copy of it. Also, Montville Police would also get a copy.

THE COURT: The letter that you talked about just before?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. EISENHOWER: That's what's sent to Montville and --

A Montville Township Police would have gotten a copy of this letter, along with -- as it says down there, along with the county prosecutor.

Q And you indicated that you did so on that.

A Correct.

Q I think it's about February 25th. Would that be right?

A Correct.

Q Okay. And in there, did you not refer to -- in the second sentence in the paragraph of the summary --

A Hm-hm.

Q -- is that your writing or is that someone else's?

A No, that would have been mine.

Q What did you say?

A Um, what I say is, there was not any evidence to support the allegations of sexual abuse. But I did indicate it in -- I -- when I stated the reason I didn't indicate -- I do believe what SPERLUTH told me, um, wholeheartedly; I think that she was honest and truthful about what happened and -- but there wasn't -- um, it wasn't like I had Mr. Wood saying he did it. I didn't have anything other than the child telling me what happened.

Q Who did the report? You did a whole report, right, on your intake report, your --

A Okay.

Q -- assessment and everything?

A Right.

Q Who's it distributed to?

A Um, that's -- it stays in the Medina County Job and Family Services records. Um, I -- I don't know who would come in and do -- I mean, I suppose there's people that come in and do discovery on -- through our legal department. I don't distribute that report to any -- my reports to anybody other than what I just showed you.

Q Did you interview Mr. Wood?

A No, I did not.

Q Never did.

A I watched a -- his videotape that was done by, um, Montville Police.

Q And you used that in your report?

A Yes.

Q Okay. In that videotape, or that information you received, Mr. Wood indicated problems between SPERLUTH and her mother, correct?

A Um, I believe he might have mentioned something about that during his interview.

Q And did you substantiate that?

A No. I -- I -- I never saw Mrs. Sadowsky. She knew nothing about what was occurring towards her daughter.

Q Okay.

A She seemed compliant. She did everything I asked her to do immediately.

Um, I -- I did not see Mrs. Sadowsky not comfortable. She was great with her daughter the, um, entire time.

Q Okay. Now, you sent this letter to the Sadowskys, correct?

A Yes.

Q And in there you say, I guess, nothing indicated --

A Hm-hm.

Q -- right?

"Indicated" means something's been reported to you, right?

A No. It -- it means -- we have three different things how we can do this. We can, you know, substantiate, we can indicate --

THE COURT: Really, really slow. You talk so fast.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm Italian.

THE COURT: I'm Italian, too. It's my heritage as well. You still need to slow down.

A We have, um, unsubstantiated, we have indicated, and we have substantiated.

"Indicated" is used when we truly believe something happened. We, um, may not have a -- a perpetrator admit that he did anything wrong. This is, generally speaking, in physical neglect and sexual abuse but, um, we still believe that this happened.

And "unsubstantiated" is when we believe that it did not occur at all; there is nothing indicated, um, definitely where our agency does feel that the allegation this child is making is truthful.

January 12, 2014

Exhibit-22

Donna A. Garrity  
Official Court Reporters  
Common Pleas Court  
Courthouse  
93 Public Square  
Medina, Ohio 44256-4407

Re: Case No. 05-CR-0365

Ms. Garrity:

Thank you for taking a moment to review this correspondence. Remaining under the impression that your position demands your time I shall be brief.

In regards to the above captioned case, I have been trying to obtain a written estimate from you, via third party, for the Jury Selection portion of my trial. This has proven unsuccessful so I elected to contact you myself. My apologies for any confusion.

As the Jury Selection portion of my trial was never produced (transcribed) post trial, selection was approximately 2½ days and you were the attending stenographer. Hopefully this information will aid in pricing. Also, there was a question of an available 'medium' to transcribe the record and the possibility that this cannot be done. If you were to help me to better understand this I would be most grateful.

Ms. Garrity, I understand your requirement for payment, and as a former business owner, I seek your understanding as to my need for a written estimate. The estimate is needed to satisfy the requirements and to meet the demands of others to obtain their assistance.

I thank you for your time and assistance, and look forward to hearing from you in the near future. An S.A.S.E. has been enclosed for convenience.

With respect,

Frank P. Wood

Frank P. Wood (#A504-107)  
Grafton Correctional Camp  
2500 S. Avon Belden Rd.  
Grafton, Ohio 44044

encl/sase

U.S. Postal Service  
**CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT**  
(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)  
For delivery information visit our website at [www.usps.com](http://www.usps.com)  
**OFFICIAL USE**

Postage \$ 46  
Certified Fee 310  
Return Receipt Fee (Postage Required) —  
Restricted Delivery Fee (Postage Required) —  
Total Postage & Fees \$ 356

To: DONNA A GARY  
Official Court Responses  
Attn: Common Pleas Court / Courthouse  
Box No. 93 Public Square  
State, ZIP+4 Medina OH 44256-4407  
Form 3800, June 2002 See Reverse for Instructions

Approved By: Frank P Wood

Ship Via: Certified Mail

DRC 1004 (Rev. 3/01) DISTRIBUTION: WHITE - Cashier CANARY - Inmate PINK - ACA 4046

467  
Dollars: 3 Cents: 10

Date: 1-13-14

Reporters, Common Pleas Court, Courthouse  
**PAID JAN 13 2014**

State: Ohio Zip Code: 44256-4407

Misc. WOOD ☐ Check-out CK # —

Post verifies that the information listed above has been read to or in error in the address which results in the return of this package,

Number: A504-107 Block & Cell Number: C-2 2-T

Witnessed: Richard Wood Richard Wood

Date Processed: Jan 13/14



MEDINA COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS  
209 North Broadway Street  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 723-2482  
e-mail: MCRMedina@msn.com

**Exhibit-23**

February 17, 2014

In Re: State of Ohio v Frank Wood


Dear Mr. Stanley:

Enclosed please find the letter I received from your client Frank Wood regarding the preparation of the voir dire portion of his trial. I am not in the habit of contacting litigants once they are represented by counsel, and since you approached me first, I send this response to you.

As I explained to you, it was unlikely that those notes still existed due to the passage of time. You asked me to look, and I was reluctant to do so because of the time it would take to search for them. Again, as I explained to you, they were on an old court reporting program that we no longer use.

After receiving the letter from your client, I did search for the notes and they are no longer available. I have attached a copy of an order pertaining to the retention of our notes.

Yours truly,  
Donna A. Garrity



IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

Exhibit-24

IN RE: RETENTION AND PRESERVATION :  
OF COURT REPORTER NOTES :

1997 APR 23 PM 2:58  
CLERK OF COURT

JUDGMENT ENTRY


Pursuant to O.R.C. 2301.20(A), as amended, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the Court Reporter shall retain and preserve all notes, with the exception of notes pertaining to a capital case, for a period of seven (7) years. At the end of such period of time, the Court Reporter may dispose of said notes.

Pursuant to O.R.C. 2301.20(B), as amended, all notes taken in a capital case shall be retained and preserved for the longer of ten (10) years, or until the final disposition of the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



PHILLIP A. BAIRD  
Presiding and Administrative Judge



JUDITH A. CROSS  
Judge

14843  
05-002373

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

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

*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. MKL #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

**FEEES**  
Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

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)

**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

Det. Miller #239 Medina P.D.  
Arresting Officer, Title

### RETURN OF UNEXECUTED WARRANT

**FEEES**  
Mileage \$ \_\_\_\_\_

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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

5

## Exhibit-26

5/22/2007	MOTION	TO ISSUE NUNC PRO TUNC FINAL JUDGMENT/SENTENCING ENTRY.	No Document
4/5/2007	NUNC PRO TUNC SENTENCING ENTRY	1507/384-386, ADDING THE PARAGRAPH THAT THE CRT FINDS THAT ON MAY 1, 2006 THE JURY RETURNED VERDICTS OF GUILTY AS TO BOTH COUNTS OF THE INDICTMENT & THE CRT FINDS THE DEFT "GUILTY" OF 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) RAPE, F-1 W/A FINDING THAT THE FIRST CHILD WAS UNDER 10 YRS OLD & SUBJECT TO MANDATORY PRISON TERM & "GUILTY" OF 2907.05(A)(4) GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION, F-3 W/ A FINDING THAT THE SECOND CHILD WAS UNDER 13 YRS OLD. THE REST OF THE ORIGINAL ENTRY REMAINS THE SAME. 1442/497-498	No Document
4/2/2007	MOTION	TO ISSUE NUNC PRO TUNC FINAL JUDGMENT/SENTENCING ENTRY	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPTS	OF PROCEEDINGS (DATED DECEMBER 12, 2005; FEBRUARY 16, 2006; APRIL 12, 2006; MAY 15, 2006; AND 3 VOLUME TRIAL TRANSCRIPT) FILED IN COURT OF APPEALS.	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPT	OF PROCEEDINGS (3 VOLUME TRIAL TRANSCRIPT) FILED.	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPT	OF PROCEEDINGS ( DATED MAY 15, 2006) FILED.	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPT	OF PROCEEDINGS (DATED APRIL 12, 2006) FILED.	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPT	OF PROCEEDINGS (DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2006) FILED.	No Document
8/3/2006	TRANSCRIPT	OF PROCEEDINGS (DATED DECEMBER 12, 2005) FILED.	No Document
7/6/2006	ORDER DENYING DEFT'S MOTION	1451/188. COURT DENIES DEFT'S MOTION TO ALLOW TRANSPORT TO BANKRUPTCY HEARING.	No Document
7/6/2006	MOTION	TO ALLOW TRANSPORT TO BANKRUPTCY HEARING	No Document
7/5/2006	JOURNAL ENTRY FILED	1450/646 COURT ORDER RE: COURT REPORTER REQUEST FOR 30 DAY EXTENSION OF TIME TO COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT FOR APPEAL.	No Document
6/12/2006	NUNC PRO TUNC	1446/924. CASE IS TRANSFERRED FROM THE DOCKET OF THE HONORABLE JAMES L. KIMBLER TO THE DOCKET OF THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER. (THE ORIGINAL ENTRY FILED 8-12-2005 MISTAKENLY SAID THAT THE CASE WAS TRANSFERRED TO JUDGE KIMBLER FROM THE DOCKET OF JUDGE COLLIER.)	No Document
6/12/2006	TRANSCRIPT OF DOCKET & JOURNAL ENTRIES FILED	IN COURT OF APPEALS	No Document
5/26/2006	FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE/AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY		No Document
5/26/2006	PRAECIPE TO COURT REPORTER		No Document
5/26/2006	DOCKETING STATEMENT		No Document
5/26/2006	NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED	*** 06CA0044-M ***	No Document
5/19/2006	COSTS WAIVED		No Document
5/18/2006	AFFIDAVIT OF DISCHARGE OF BONDS SENT	TO JOHN T. FISH, TUROCZY BONDING CO.	No Document
5/18/2006	ORDER APPOINTING ATTORNEY	1443/033. COURT APPOINTS JOSEPH SALZGEBER FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL.	No Document
5/15/2006	CERTIFIED COPY OF SENTENCE ISSUED TO SHERIFF		No Document
5/15/2006	SENTENCING ENTRY FILED	1442/497-498. COURT FINDS DEFT. CONVICTED OF RAPE 2907.02(A)(1)(b)(B) (F-1) W/ A FINDING THAT THE CHILD WAS UNDER THE AGE OF 10; & GROSS SEXUAL IMPOSITION 2907.05(A)(4) (F-3) W/ A FINDING THAT THE CHILD WAS UNDER THE AGE OF 13. DEFT. IS SENTENCED TO LIFE IN PRISON (MANDATORY) FOR RAPE & 3 YRS. IN PRISON FOR GROSS	No Document

	STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		Document
4/12/2006	AMENDED BILL OF PARTICULARS		No Document
4/10/2006	STATE OF OHIO'S	RESPONSE TO DEFT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS	No Document
4/10/2006	NOTICE	OF INTENT OF THE STATE TO USE <u>404(b)</u> EVIDENCE W/CERT. OF SERVICE AND BRIEF	No Document
4/7/2006	MOTION TO SUPPRESS	EVIDENCE & STATEMENTS	No Document
3/28/2006	NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
3/27/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
3/23/2006	ORDER	1435/540. STATE IS ORDERED TO PROVIDE DEFT W/ COPIES OF MEDINA COUNTY JOB AND FAMILY SERVICE RECORDS KEPT UNDER ROBYN SPENCER AND DANIELLE SADOWSKY.	No Document
3/23/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
3/7/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY		No Document
3/1/2006	<u>HEARING ON MOTION(S)</u>	1432/473. DEFT IN CRT W/ATTY F. HARRISON GREEN FOR A MOTION FOR A BOND HEARING. CRT PREVIOUSLY REVOKED DEFT'S BOND ON 2/17/06. AFTER HEARING TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES & EVIDENCE PRESENTED, CRT FINDS THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT THE THE DEFT VIOLATED THE CONDITIONS OF BOND. DEFT'S BOND IS REVOKED.	No Document
2/27/2006	COPY OF LETTER	TO F. HARRISON GREEN FROM ANNE EISENHOWER RE: MOTION TO RETURN PROPERTY.	No Document
2/23/2006	MOTION FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY		No Document
2/23/2006	MOTION	FOR IMMEDIATE HEARING ON BOND VIOLATION	No Document
2/21/2006	<u>MOTION IN LIMINE</u>		No Document
2/17/2006	ORDER	1430/1013. HRG. ON 2-16-2006 ON SEVERAL MATTERS. DEFT. WAS PRESENT W/ COUNSEL, F. HARRISON GREEN. DEFT. EXECUTED A SPEEDY TRIAL WAIVER IN OPEN COURT & UPON THE RECORD. THE FOLLOWING DATES WERE SET BY THE COURT & AGREED UPON BY THE PARTIES: 3-23-06 AT 1:00 P.M. - DISCOVERY STATUS CONFERENCE; 4-12-2006 AT 1:00 P.M. - SUPPRESSION ISSUES/FINAL PRETRIAL; 4-24-2006 AT 1:00 P.M. - TRIAL DATE.	No Document
2/17/2006	ORDER TO REVOKE BOND	1430/1012.	No Document
2/17/2006	MOTION	TO REVOKE BOND W/CERT. OF SERVICE FILED.	No Document
2/16/2006	WAIVER OF SPEEDY TRIAL	1430/503.	No Document
2/16/2006	CERT FOR COURT STENOGRAPHER'S FEES		No Document
2/16/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
2/13/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
2/9/2006	SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY FILED BY THE STATE		No Document
2/7/2006	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	FILED BY THE STATE.	No Document
2/6/2006	<u>MOTION IN LIMINE</u>		No

*Fraudulently revoked bond*

1 MR. SHOOK: Yes.  
 2 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 3 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 4 MS. LANCE: Yes.  
 5 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 6 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 7 MS. MACKAY: Yes.  
 8 THE COURT: Sir, are the  
 9 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 10 MR. COMBS: Yes.  
 11 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 12 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 13 MS. PARK: Yes.  
 14 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 15 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 16 MS. LAMIELLE: Yes.  
 17 THE COURT: Sir, are the  
 18 verdicts that I've read in open court your verdicts?  
 19 MR. EARL: Yes.  
 20 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 21 verdicts that I've read to you in open court your  
 22 verdicts?  
 23 MS. DEPOSE: Yes.  
 24 THE COURT: Ma'am, are the  
 25 verdicts that I've read to you in open court your

## Exhibit-27

1 STATE OF OHIO, )  
 2 ) SS:  
 3 COUNTY OF MEDINA. )

## CERTIFICATE

4 I, Donna A. Garrity, Official Court Reporter and  
 5 Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio, duly  
 6 commissioned and qualified, hereby certify that before the  
 7 giving of their testimony, all witnesses were first duly  
 8 sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing  
 9 but the truth in the case aforesaid and that the testimony  
 10 was taken by me by means of stenotypy in the presence of  
 11 said witnesses.

12 I further certify that said hearing was held at  
 13 the time and place specified in the above caption and was  
 14 adjourned on the 1st day of May, 2006.

15 Further, I certify that I am not a relative, counsel,  
 16 or attorney at law for any party to this suit, nor am I  
 17 interested in the event of same.

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and  
 19 affixed my seal of office at Medina, Ohio this 3rd day of  
 20 August, 2006.

21  
 22 Donna A. Garrity  
 23 Official Court Reporter  
 24 Notary Public  
 25 within and for the State of Ohio.  
 My commission expires June 18, 2008.

IN THE COURT OF COMM. PLEAS  
PROBATE DIVISION  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO  
PROBATE COURT  
FILED  
JUDGE JILL R. HECK

2002 AUG 20 AM 8:40

Re: The Name Change of Frank P Freiberg To Frank P Wood Jr

Case No. 2002 06 NC 00047

Exhibit-28

JUDGE JILL R. HECK  
MAGISTRATE ALBERT D. SHIRER

**JUDGMENT ENTRY ADOPTING MAGISTRATE'S DECISION  
GRANTING ADULT NAME CHANGE**

The Court after review of the Magistrate's decision filed in the above captioned case on August 15, 2002 and after verification to its own satisfaction of the correctness of the Decision on its face, adopts the Magistrate's Decision and hereby makes it an ORDER of this Court.

You are hereby notified that pursuant to Civil Rule 53 (E)(3)(a), the Court adopts this Decision and enters Judgment without waiting for timely objections by the parties. Objections may be filed within 14 days of the Magistrate's Decision. The filing of timely written objections shall operate as an automatic stay of execution of this Judgment entry until the Court disposes of the objections and vacates, modifies, or adheres to the Judgment entered herein.

This is a final appealable order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

  
JUDGE JILL R. HECK

**CERTIFICATION OF JUDGMENT ENTRY**

The above Judgment Entry Adopting Magistrate's Decision Granting Adult Name Change and attached Magistrate's Decision is a true copy of the original kept by me as custodian of the records of this Court.

JILL R. HECK  
Medina County Probate Court Judge

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Clerk

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
MICRO ROLL NO.

739

**DOCKETED**



Gazette Staff Columnist John Gladden writes the late Tim Feron continuously served his community. Opinion, A4



TICKET TO RIDE



The Mid-Ohio School gives licensed drivers a chance to learn about racing from professionals. Accent, C1

GIMME SHELTER



Pet Lady Sandy Barnosky profiles Medina County's new dog warden, Del Saffie. Critters, C4

FAIR RESULTS

Are you a winner? Know someone who is? Results of the Sunday and Thursday culinary, photography, flowers and draft horses competitions from the Medina County Fair are in today's Gazette. Inside, A9-12



INSIDE

Classified ..... B5-12

Todd J. Goodson, 28, was sentenced Monday on three counts of aggravated robbery, a first-degree felony, and two counts of robbery, a second-degree felony. "This is necessary to protect the public," Common Pleas Judge Christopher J. Collier said after the sentencing. "This was horrific for the people involved." Goodson expressed remorse to the victims and his family, saying his young children "will not have a father for a while."

drugs for many years, his attorney Beau Schultz said. "Much of the crimes were in blackouts," Schultz said. "He did the incidents." Schultz said Goodson was motivated by money, needed drugs or alcohol. County Prosecutor

Exhibit-29

See GOODSON, A7

Medina Twp. man denies 2 sex counts

By DENISE SULLIVAN Staff Writer  
MEDINA — A Medina Township man accused of raping a young girl pleaded not guilty Monday to two felony charges in Common Pleas Judge Christopher J. Collier's court.

Frank P. Wood, 37, of 4885 Gateway Drive, is charged with rape, a first-degree felony, and gross sexual imposition, a third-degree felony. Wood could face up to 15 years in prison if convicted on both charges at his Oct. 5 trial. Wood allegedly raped a 9- or 10-year-old girl last October and had sexual contact with a 4-year-old girl between August and October 2000, court records show.

Wood appeared for his arraignment last Friday in Common Pleas Judge James L. Kimbler's court, but Kimbler recused himself from the case. Prosecutors informed Kimbler last week an employee he fired in June could be called as a witness during Wood's trial, Kimbler explained.

Kimbler said Monday he is unsure about the length and exact nature of their relationship. Wood is the owner of Ironwood Construction Inc. and is needed to run the business, which currently has four full-time employees. states a motion to reduce bond filed by his attorney, Ron Spears. Prosecutors filed an objection, saying Wood has two Social Security numbers and has recently changed his name. He has lived in or has ties to at least three other

See WOOD A3

**GAZETTE**

**TUESDAY**

**August 16, 2005**

**Hail to**  
Bob Hitzelber  
Street drivew  
Cleveland Indi  
lawn ornamen

**Medina finance chief Durnam files**

"(Barrick) said the can had \$29 in it, but the victim said it was \$40," Kinney asserted.

Kinney alleged Barrick used the money to pay rent, buy cigarettes and "pay back some money he owed."

Barrick was living with

related. "That includes houses, apartments and hotel rooms."

He was in the Medina County Jail on \$100,000 bond Monday, a jail spokesman said.

Cassano may be reached at 330-721-4060 or cassano@ohio.net.

## Lodi house blaze sends firefighters to hospital

LODI — An electrical problem is believed to be the cause of a Saturday afternoon fire that gutted a two-story Medina Street home and sent several firefighters suffering from heat exhaustion to the hospital, village Fire Chief Roland Jenkin said.

The fire is believed to have started in the first-floor living room, from where flames burned up a rear wall into the home's second floor.

At the time the call came in for the fire at 412 Medina St., "we had people on station so the response was quick," Jenkin said Monday.

There was no immediate loss estimate.

A mutual aid call brought firefighters from Westfield

Fire and Rescue, and firefighters from Chatham, Canaan, Lafayette and Spencer townships.

Lodi's emergency medical services chief, Jeremy Patalon, said 10 firefighters sustained heat exhaustion, nine from mutual aid departments and one from Lodi.

Saturday afternoon temperatures were in the mid-to upper 80s with humidity near 100 percent.

Jenkin said the owner and his son, who rents the home, were not inside at the time the fire broke out, but apparently were across the street when they called 911.

A spokesman for the Medina County Sheriff's Department dispatch said the fire call came in at 1:01 p.m.

Four diamond rings totaling \$3,298 in value were reported stolen about 8:45 p.m. Aug. 6 from Ultra Gold and Diamond Outlet, 9909 Avon Lake Road, Harrisville Township.

The surveillance tape showed one man taking items from a case while another man distracted the sales clerk.

The mailbox at a house

novation Drive, Lin Township.

The compressor chained at the time theft.

The manager Evans, 10054 Stelzer Harrisville Township reported \$250 missing from register about 4:15 p.m. 2.

Compiled from iff's reports.

## Rowe

Continued from A1

Salzgeber said he sent a copy of the appeals court's ruling to Rowe and his mother and is waiting for their feedback on whether to file another appeal.

The charges stem from incidents at Rowe's home Jan. 31, 2004, when he and Twigg were smoking marijuana and wrestling in his room.

Prosecutors at his trial said Rowe picked up a nearby knife and stabbed Twigg, piercing his internal organs and severing a major vein. Twigg died about 10 hours later at Akron General

Medical Center.

Rowe insisted he meant to hurt his mother. His attorney, Stephen Brown, said during trial that Twigg fell on knife while wrestling Rowe over a chair.

Police arrested that afternoon when found him kneeling parking lot next to holding his head cradling his head records show.

The knife was found zipped bag behind a Rowe's room, records show.

Sullivan may be reached at 721-4064 or dsullivan@ohio.net

## Wood

Continued from A1

states and one foreign country, increasing the risk of flight, the objection states.

Collier denied Spears' request and continued Wood's \$200,000 bond. He is being held in the county jail.

Sullivan may be reached at 330-721-4064 or dsullivan@ohio.net.

## Rainbow Tours

WHEELING ISLAND RACETRACK AND SLOTS  
Tues. Sept. 6, 2005

\$22.00

AMISH COUNTRY TOUR  
Thurs. Sept. 18, 2005

\$50.00

330-715-5953

It shows in the way you feel inside (and outside)

cardio strength stretch



jazzercise  
It shows.

Try ONE WEEK FREE

Then ONE MONTH FREE

Medina: 330-722-3141  
Wadsworth: 330-334-3347

Offer expires 2/30/06. New Students Only

Happy 25th Anniversary  
Cory & Rob



Traditional Liturgy

Salvation

Life



Sunday Worship  
9:30am

989 N Portage Path  
Akron OH  
330.564.4244

Grace Lutheran  
www.grace-luth.com

TAP JAZZ PILATES HIPHOP BALLET POETRY

Abby Dance Center

20' Great Oaks Trail Wadsworth 330-334-3347  
REGISTRATION IN PERSON ONLY

05-013748

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

COMMON PLEAS COURT

06 FEB 17 PM 2:31

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK P. WOOD,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 05-CR-0365

JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. COLLIER

FILED  
KATHY FORTNEY  
MEDINA COUNTY  
CLERK OF COURTS

Exhibit-30


MOTION TO REVOKE BOND

Now comes the State of Ohio, by and through the prosecuting attorney, and moves this Court for an order revoking defendant's bond. As a condition for said bond, the court ordered defendant to have no contact with anyone under the age of 18. It has come to the attention of the Medina County Prosecutor's Office that the defendant is having frequent contact with a child under the age of 18. For the foregoing reason, the State respectfully requests that the Court revoke defendant's bond.

Respectfully submitted,

DEAN HOLMAN, Prosecuting Attorney

By:

  
SCOTT G. SALISBURY (#0041024)  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney  
72 Public Square  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 723-9536

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the foregoing Motion to Revoke Bond was sent by ordinary U.S. Mail to F. Harrison Green, attorney for defendant, at Executive Park, Suite 130, 4015 Executive Park Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio 45241, on this 17th day of February, 2006.


  
SCOTT G. SALISBURY  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney

State of Ohio       )  
County of Medina )   ss:

Exhibit-31

Now comes RONALD R. STANLEY and states as follows:


1. I am an attorney, licensed to practice in the State of Ohio;
2. I have assisted Frank Wood with a number of legal issues throughout the past 10 years including his defense in criminal case 05CR0365 in the Medina County Court of Common Pleas;
3. On or about February 17, 2006, before that trial began, Frank's bond was revoked due his alleged contact with a minor child;
4. At a hearing to reinstate the bond, on or about March 1, 2006, Detective Kollar testified that the reason for revoking the bond was that the minor daughter of Frank's girlfriend might have seen the back of Frank's head as he left the girlfriend's home;
5. On or about May 24, 2006 while the trial was proceeding, one of the jurors had some problem and apparently wanted to be excused;
6. The attorneys, court reporter, Detective Kollar and the juror when into chambers where Judge Collier listened to the juror and then asked the juror to stay on by saying "Will you please do this for me?";
7. On or about May 27, 2006, Dr. Reed was prepared to provide his expert opinion testimony that the Defendant, Frank Wood, was not inclined to do what the Prosecutor insisted that he had done;
8. After Judge Collier listened to an overview of Dr. Reed's testimony without the jury present, Prosecutor Eisenhower said to Judge Collier, "We can't let the jury hear this.";
9. Judge Collier agreed and Dr. Reed was not allowed to testify;
10. Despite the fact that a distinguished expert in the related field of pedophiles was not allowed to testify, a child psychologist, Dr. Lesure was allowed to testify about her conversations with the minor S.L. to the effect that while she (Lesure) did not know what happened, she was sure that something happened; and
11. Further Affiant does not say.

  
Ronald R. Stanley

6 Sworn to me, a notary in and for the above State and County, by Ronald R. Stanley, this  
day of June 2017.



SHARON MATTISON  
Notary Public State of Ohio  
My Comm. Expires May 17, 2020

  
Notary Public



# GAZETTE

TUESDAY

May 16, 2006

Exhibit-32

KON (AP) "One of a local church, while critics of the procrastinating nation's program met at a pharmacy near the Capitol and urged the administration to extend the midnight 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 enrollment, more than people with little need for health care now to still consider applying up for a private insurance plan, warning, "As you age, it's likely you'll add medications to your health care."

See MEDICARE, A3

the model online these with more pay the full month," Cohen prays before that is available

## 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 4385 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. Harrison Green, requested an eight- to 10-year prison sentence, which is the normal amount of time for first-degree felonies.

"There is no physical evidence that penetration had

taken place," he said.

Green noted several witnesses testified the rape victim 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 nicknames."

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

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



Staff photo by BRIDGET COMARISO

Frank Wood is led out of court Monday after being sentenced to life in prison for sexually abusing two young girls.

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

See WOOD, A11

U.S. to will WA  
The  
treator  
being  
moving  
perhaps  
return  
day?  
Godd  
remot  
mass  
credit  
rocks  
"p  
ment  
that  
decis  
leade  
terr  
mast  
tary  
Rice  
mov  
ya.

...of Janet by of the justice system.  
 ns' issues.

Allison says his opposition  
 tunity for to the death penalty was only  
 who my one motivation. "Also, I felt  
 y says of the government was prosecut-  
 it he gave ing the wrong guy because  
 ncing — they had to punish some-  
 tern had body," says Allison, 56, of  
 I wanted Lyme, N.H. He also was con-  
 isn't just cerned about Moussaoui's  
 Howard mental state.

"Did I suffer? Absolutely,"  
 Moussaoui he says. "But we all experi-  
 nted a ence loss differently. We're all  
 cruse of at different places in that  
 victims journey."

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

"I'm going to be spending  
 the rest of my life seeking my  
 ally. scribed scribe approval," he remem-  
 to his bers telling the judge. "I think  
 before today I have it."

# congratulations

Brian Hoagland of  
 the Hoffman Group for being  
 ed one of Westfield Insurance's  
 t Valuable Producers in 2005!

Proud to represent



WESTFIELD  
 INSURANCE  
 1000 Westfield Building North

United States will upgrade its diplo-  
 matic office in Tripoli to a full embassy fol-  
 lowing a 15-day waiting period and discus-  
 sions with Congress, the State Department

show. Wood molested the 5-year-old be-  
 tween August and October 2000 and raped  
 the 9-year-old in October 2004.

## Wood

Continued from A1

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

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

oil to the United States, far ahead of Libya at  
 No. 21, but relations between Chavez and the  
 Bush administration have sharply deterio-  
 rated. Chavez has called Bush a "terrorist"  
 and denounced the U.S.-led war in Iraq.

Common Pleas Judge Christopher J.  
 predator, the most serious category.  
 Sullivan may be reached at dsullivan@ohio.net or  
 330-721-4064.

show. Wood molested the 5-year-old be-  
 tween August and October 2000 and raped  
 the 9-year-old in October 2004.

Common Pleas Judge Christopher J.  
 predator, the most serious category.  
 Sullivan may be reached at dsullivan@ohio.net or  
 330-721-4064.

Guaranteed Dining Deal








ENTER TO WIN  
 A \$50.00 Gift Certificate

From


NINE  
 bistro

1 WINNER  
 PER DAY






















*Seaside Cards*  
ALEXANDER KAM  
President  
1200 1st Ave  
1200 1st Ave

**Photo Gifts Christmas Programs**

**25 Cards \$11.99**

Send Personal Family Greetings For The Holidays!

See Order Form Above

**400 Designs**

Design	Price
1. 12x12	\$1.99
2. 12x12	\$1.99
3. 12x12	\$1.99
4. 12x12	\$1.99
5. 12x12	\$1.99
6. 12x12	\$1.99
7. 12x12	\$1.99
8. 12x12	\$1.99
9. 12x12	\$1.99
10. 12x12	\$1.99
11. 12x12	\$1.99
12. 12x12	\$1.99
13. 12x12	\$1.99
14. 12x12	\$1.99
15. 12x12	\$1.99
16. 12x12	\$1.99
17. 12x12	\$1.99
18. 12x12	\$1.99
19. 12x12	\$1.99
20. 12x12	\$1.99
21. 12x12	\$1.99
22. 12x12	\$1.99
23. 12x12	\$1.99
24. 12x12	\$1.99
25. 12x12	\$1.99

**400 Designs**

Design	Price
1. 12x12	\$1.99
2. 12x12	\$1.99
3. 12x12	\$1.99
4. 12x12	\$1.99
5. 12x12	\$1.99
6. 12x12	\$1.99
7. 12x12	\$1.99
8. 12x12	\$1.99
9. 12x12	\$1.99
10. 12x12	\$1.99
11. 12x12	\$1.99
12. 12x12	\$1.99
13. 12x12	\$1.99
14. 12x12	\$1.99
15. 12x12	\$1.99
16. 12x12	\$1.99
17. 12x12	\$1.99
18. 12x12	\$1.99
19. 12x12	\$1.99
20. 12x12	\$1.99
21. 12x12	\$1.99
22. 12x12	\$1.99
23. 12x12	\$1.99
24. 12x12	\$1.99
25. 12x12	\$1.99

**400 Designs**

Design	Price
1. 12x12	\$1.99
2. 12x12	\$1.99
3. 12x12	\$1.99
4. 12x12	\$1.99
5. 12x12	\$1.99
6. 12x12	\$1.99
7. 12x12	\$1.99
8. 12x12	\$1.99
9. 12x12	\$1.99
10. 12x12	\$1.99
11. 12x12	\$1.99
12. 12x12	\$1.99
13. 12x12	\$1.99
14. 12x12	\$1.99
15. 12x12	\$1.99
16. 12x12	\$1.99
17. 12x12	\$1.99
18. 12x12	\$1.99
19. 12x12	\$1.99
20. 12x12	\$1.99
21. 12x12	\$1.99
22. 12x12	\$1.99
23. 12x12	\$1.99
24. 12x12	\$1.99
25. 12x12	\$1.99

**400 Designs**

Design	Price
1. 12x12	\$1.99
2. 12x12	\$1.99
3. 12x12	\$1.99
4. 12x12	\$1.99
5. 12x12	\$1.99
6. 12x12	\$1.99
7. 12x12	\$1.99
8. 12x12	\$1.99
9. 12x12	\$1.99
10. 12x12	\$1.99
11. 12x12	\$1.99
12. 12x12	\$1.99
13. 12x12	\$1.99
14. 12x12	\$1.99
15. 12x12	\$1.99
16. 12x12	\$1.99
17. 12x12	\$1.99
18. 12x12	\$1.99
19. 12x12	\$1.99
20. 12x12	\$1.99
21. 12x12	\$1.99
22. 12x12	\$1.99
23. 12x12	\$1.99
24. 12x12	\$1.99
25. 12x12	\$1.99









No. 000002

RECEIPT

Mc  
REC  
00 S  
1/8" X 1

ADAMS B  
D IN USA

UNDER DOORS  
AGE DOORS

...A, KS 66603

C1182



Page 7




1000 Interstate  
Akron-behavior  
www.lexus.com  
1-800-  
When  
People  
Truly Make

RECEIPT

No. 000002



200 SETS



















☐ Order  
 25 Cards \$11.99  
 50 Cards \$22.99  
 8.99  
 4.99  
 9.99

al  
 use the  
 EGATIVES  
 ced  
 stem  
 prints  
 FRAMING #



Olan Mills  
 © 21

Ph

ORDERS

PHO

☐ 11oz. 1

☐ Photo

☐ Photo

☐ Photo

☐ 8 1/2"

(Print to  
Please to)

Name

Address

Day Phone





(330) 725-0030

(330) 336-0006

(330) 273-5696

Fax (330) 722-4888



divorce file. In the  
wsky is in fact your  
complaint. Also, I  
a DNA test which  
s heard on August

y and get Danielle to







