

IN THE
MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
EASTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF MISSOURI,)	
)	
Respondent,)	
)	
vs.)	No. ED100807
)	
JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

LEGAL FILE
Volume I

AMY M. BARTHOLOW
Office of State Public Defender
1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, Bldg. 7, Ste. 100
Columbia, Missouri 65203
(573) 882-9855

Attorney for Appellant

SHAUN MACKELPRANG
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
(573) 751-3321

Attorney for Respondent

INDEX

<u>VOLUME I</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>FRANKLIN COUNTY CASE NO. 12AB-CR02409-01:</u>	
DOCKET SHEETS	1-19
INDICTMENT	20-22
SUBSTITUTE INFORMATION IN LIEU OF INDICTMENT	23-25
DEFENDANT’S REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY	26-29
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS	30-32
PRO SE MOTION TO DISMISS	33-35
DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO QUASH INDICTMENT	36-48
DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO SEVER THE CHARGES.....	49-52
DEFENDANT’S MOTION IN LIMINE / MOTION TO EXCLUDE.....	53-57
DEFENDANT’S VERIFIED ANNOUNCEMENT OF READY AND MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL	58-59
DEFENDANT’S SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES	60-65
DEFENDANT’S AMENDED SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES	66-71
DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION	72-106
DEFENDANT’S AMENDED MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION	107-140

DEFENDANT’S SECOND MOTION IN LIMINE.....	141-143
STATE’S MOTION IN LIMINE 1	144
DEFENDANT’S OPPOSITION TO STATE’S MOTION IN LIMINE	145-147
STATE’S MOTION IN LIMINE 2	148
DEFENDANT’S OPPOSITION TO STATE’S SECOND MOTION IN LIMINE.....	149-150

VOLUME II

DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL.....	151-152
DEFENDANT’S SECOND MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL.....	153-156
DEFENDANT’S SUPPLEMENTAL SUGGESTIONS OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF EACH OF HIS ORIGINAL, RENEWED & SECOND MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL	157-162
JURY INSTRUCTIONS.....	163-192
JURY’S QUESTIONS.....	193-194
VERDICTS	195-200
SENTENCING VERDICTS	201-204
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL	205-211
JUDGMENT	212-214
NOTICE OF APPEAL.....	215-222
CLERK’S CERTIFICATION.....	223-225
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	226

20TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
FRANKLIN COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT DOCKET SHEETDate: 06-Feb-2014
Time: 9:48:59AM
Page: 1**12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS****Security Level: 1 Public**

Case Type:	CC Felony	Case Filing Date:	28-Nov-2012
Status:	Judgment Entered		
Disposition:	Jury Verdict - Guilty	Disposition Date:	10-Oct-2013
OCN#:	J8007983		
Arresting Agency:	MOMHPCC00		
Speedy Trial:	Date Not Entered		

Related Case : 12AB-MC00990 SW-2360 HWY K ST CLAIR MO**Related Case :** 13AB-CC00289 JEFFREY WEINHAUS V STATE OF MISSOURI**Release/Status Reason**
Change Date

Judge	KEITH M SUTHERLAND (21509)		
Judge	GAEL D. WOOD (24684)	26-Feb-2013	Judge Transferred/Reas signed
Judge	I. I. LAMKE (28266)	04-Dec-2012	Judge Transferred/Reas signed
Defendant	JEFFREY R WEINHAUS (WEIJR3880)		
Prosecuting Attorney	ROBERT E PARKS II (36333)		
Attorney for Defendant	ROSS TYSON MUTRUX (63117)	14-Feb-2013	Attorney Withdrawn
Attorney for Defendant	HUGH ATHELSTAN EASTWOOD (62058)		
Co-Counsel for the Defendant	CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL COMBS (65512)		
Current Bond: \$250,000.00 19-Mar-2013			

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

	Charge #	Charge Date	Charge Code	Charge Description
Original Charge:	1	17-Aug-2012	3245000	Possession Of Controlled Substance Except 35 Grams Or Less Of Marijuana (Felony C RSMo : 195.202)
	Ticket No: 999999999			
Disposition:	10-Oct-2013	Jury Verdict-Guilty		
Order Date:	25-Nov-2013			Sentence or SIS: Incarceration DOC
Length:	2 Years			Start Date: 25-Nov-2013
Text:	2 YRS DOC			
Conc/Cons Case & County:	CONC W/CTS III, IV, V			
Original Charge:	2	17-Aug-2012	2921700	Tampering With Judicial Officer (Felony C RSMo : 565.084)
Disposition:	09-Oct-2013	Tried/Court-Not Guilty		
Original Charge:	3	17-Aug-2012	3245700	Possession Of Up To 35 Grams Marijuana (Misdemeanor A RSMo : 195.202)
	Ticket No: 999999998			
Disposition:	10-Oct-2013	Jury Verdict-Guilty		
Order Date:	25-Nov-2013			Sentence or SIS: Incarceration Jail
Length:	365 Days			Start Date: 25-Nov-2013
Text:	1 YR COUNTY JAIL			
Original Charge:	4	11-Sep-2012	1310000	Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off,Emrgncy Prsnnl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wrkr,Cble Wrkr Or P&P Offcr - 1st Degr (Felony A RSMo : 565.081)
Disposition:	10-Oct-2013	Jury Verdict-Guilty		
Order Date:	25-Nov-2013			Sentence or SIS: Incarceration DOC
Length:	30 Years			Start Date: 25-Nov-2013
Text:	30 YRS DOC			
Conc/Cons Case & County:	CONC W/CTS I, IV, V			
Original Charge:	5	11-Sep-2012	3101000	Armed Criminal Action (Felony Unclassified RSMo : 571.015)
Disposition:	10-Oct-2013	Jury Verdict-Guilty		
Order Date:	25-Nov-2013			Sentence or SIS: Incarceration DOC
Length:	30 Years			Start Date: 25-Nov-2013
Text:	30 YRS DOC			
Conc/Cons Case & County:	CONC W/CTS I, III, IV			

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

Original Charge: 6 11-Sep-2012 1310000 Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off, Emrgncy Prsnl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wkr, Cble Wkr Or P&P Offcr - 1st Degr (**Felony A RSMo : 565.081**)

Disposition: 10-Oct-2013 Jury Verdict-Not Guilty

Original Charge: 7 11-Sep-2012 3101000 Armed Criminal Action (**Felony Unclassified RSMo : 571.015**)

Disposition: 10-Oct-2013 Jury Verdict-Not Guilty

Original Charge: 8 11-Sep-2012 2702000 Resisting/Interfering With Arrest For A Felony (**Felony D RSMo : 575.150**)

Disposition: 09-Oct-2013 Tried/Court-Not Guilty

<u>Filing Date</u>	<u>Description</u>
--------------------	--------------------

28-Nov-2012

Judge Assigned**Order**

SPECIAL CONDITIONS SIGNED. SO ORDERED, I. I. LAMKE/JB

Grand Jury Indictment Filed

IN OPEN COURT THE GRAND JURY, BY ITS FOREMAN, RETURNS A TRUE BILL CHARGING DEFENDANT WITH THE LISTED COUNT(S). ASSOCIATE COURT DIVISION VII SENDS FILE TO CIRCUIT FOR GRAND JURY FILING. TRUE BILL ACCEPTED AND ORDERED FILED.

Judge/Clerk - Note

AT TIME OF CIRCUIT INITIATION ASSOCIATE WARRANT ISSUED, SERVED. DEFENDANT REMAINS IN CUSTODY

Order

AS A CONDITION OF RELEASE FOR DEFENDANT BOND IS SET AT \$250,000.00 CASH ONLY. GDW

Bond Set**Arraignment Scheduled****Scheduled For:** 04-Dec-2012; 10:00 AM; I. I. LAMKE; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County

03-Dec-2012

Motion for Disclosure

STATE'S MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE FILED. JB

Notice

NOTICE AND APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF JUDGE

Judge/Clerk - Note

NOTE TO MR M

Notice

NOTICE FOR HEARING ON SATES MOTION FOR CHANGE OF JUDGE

Motion for Change of Judge04-Dec-2012 **Motion Granted/Sustained**

04-Dec-2012

Judge Assigned

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

04-Dec-2012 **Hearing/Trial Cancelled**
REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF JUDGE FILED BY STATE. MOTION GRANTED. CASE
TRANSFERED TO DIV I. IILJB
Scheduled For: 04-Dec-2012; 10:00 AM; I. I. LAMKE; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
Motion Granted/Sustained
MOTION FOR CHANGE OF JUDGE GRANTED. CASE TRANSFERED TO DIV I. IIL/JB

07-Dec-2012 **Judge Assigned**
CASE ASSIGNED TO DIV I. GDW
Arraignment Scheduled
Scheduled For: 08-Jan-2013; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
ARRAIGNMENT

18-Dec-2012 **Motion Filed**
MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX
Motion for Discovery
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX
Motion Filed
MOTION TO MODIFY BOND
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX
07-Jan-2013 **Motion Denied**
Criminal Motion Hearing Sched
Scheduled For: 27-Dec-2012; 10:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
DEFT'S MOTION FOR BOND MODIFICATION

27-Dec-2012 **Hearing Held**
DEFENDANT IN PERSON, IN CUSTODY, AND WITH COUNSEL ROSS MUTRUX. STATE BY APA
BRIANNE BARR. ARGUMENT HEARD. BOND REDUCED TO \$50,000, CASH ONLY. CASE
CONTINUED TO 01/02/13 @ 11 A.M. FOR FURTHER ARGUMENT. GDW/RK
Scheduled For: 27-Dec-2012; 10:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
DEFT'S MOTION FOR BOND MODIFICATION
Bond Set
BOND REDUCED TO \$50,000 CASH ONLY. GDW/RK
Bond Reduction Hrng Scheduled
Scheduled For: 02-Jan-2013; 11:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
FURTHER ARGUMENT
Notice
FOR 12/27/12 @ 10 A.M. RK

02-Jan-2013 **Cause Taken Under Advisement**
CASE CALLED FOR FURTHER ARGUMENT ON DEFT'S MOTION FOR BOND MODIFICATION.
STATE APPEARS BY PA PARKS, DEFT APPEARS IN CUSTODY AND BY ATTY MUTRUX. DEFT
PRESENTS EVIDENCE. STATE PRESENTS EVIDENCE. MOTION TAKEN UNDER
ADVISEMENT. CASE SET FOR 3-DAY JURY TRIAL ON 4/30/13, SETTING #1. GDW/cw
Scheduled For: 02-Jan-2013; 11:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
FURTHER ARGUMENT

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

02-Jan-2013 **Hearing/Trial Cancelled**
Scheduled For: 08-Jan-2013; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
ARRAIGNMENT
Jury Trial Scheduled
Scheduled For: 30-Apr-2013 ; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days

07-Jan-2013 **Motion Denied**
REQUEST FOR FURTHER BOND MODIFICATION DENIED. GDW/cw
Waiver of Formal Arraignment
Judge/Clerk - Note

13-Jan-2013 **Request Filed**
APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR PREPARATION OF THE LEGAL FILE & TRANSCRIPT, FILED.
Filed By: AMY M BARTHOLOW

31-Jan-2013 **Filing:**
ENDORSEMENT OF WITNESS
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
Filing:
SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER TO DISCOVERY

06-Feb-2013 **Subpoena Served**
SGT H. FOLSOM

07-Feb-2013 **Criminal Motion Hearing Sched**
Scheduled For: 14-Feb-2013; 3:00 PM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
MOTION TO WITHDRAW

11-Feb-2013 **Motion for Leave**
TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX
Motion to Withdraw
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX
Notice of Hearing Filed
FOR 2/14/13 @ 3:00 PM
Filed By: ROSS T MUTRUX

13-Feb-2013 **Entry of Appearance Filed**
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS
Motion to Dismiss
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS
Request for Speedy Trial Filed
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS
Motion Filed
MOTION FOR SURETY BOND
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS
Motion for Summary Judgment

5

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public****Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Notice of Hearing Filed**

FOR 2/14/13

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

14-Feb-2013

Motion Filed

MOTION FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON BOND REDUCTION AND NOTICE OF HEARING

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Criminal Motion Hearing Sched****Scheduled For:** 21-Feb-2013; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County
MOTIONS**Hearing Held**STATE APPEARS BY PA PARKS, DEFT APPEARS IN CUSTODY AND BY ATTY MUTRUX. ATTY
MUTRUX'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW IS GRANTED. ARGUMENTS HEARD ON DEFT'S MOTION
FOR SURETY BOND. MOTION TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT. GDW/cw**Scheduled For:** 14-Feb-2013; 3:00 PM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
MOTION TO WITHDRAW**Judge/Clerk - Note**

19-Feb-2013

Motion Filed

MOTION TO PROCEED UNDER SUPREME COURT RULE 16

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS22-Feb-2013 **Motion Denied****Amended Motion/Petition Filed**

AMENDED MOTION FOR SURETY BOND

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Amended Motion/Petition Filed**

AMENDED MOTION FOR SURETY BOND

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS22-Feb-2013 **Motion Denied****Writ Requested**

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

21-Feb-2013

Hearing HeldSTATE APPEARS BY PA PARKS, DEFT APPEARS IN CUSTODY AND WITHOUT COUNSEL.
DEFT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IS ARGUED AND DENIED. DEFT'S MOTION FOR SURETY BOND
IS ARGUED AND TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT. DEFT'S ORAL MOTION FOR GAG ORDERS IS
SUSTAINED. DEFT IS FORMALLY ARRAIGNED AND PLEADS NOT GUILTY TO ALL COUNTS.
GDW/cw**Scheduled For:** 21-Feb-2013; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County
MOTIONS**Motion for Discovery****Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

22-Feb-2013

Judge/Clerk - Note

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

22-Feb-2013

Order

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED THAT ALL COURT PERSONNEL, THE FRANKLIN COUNTY PROSECUTOR, THE FRANKLIN COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S STAFF, THE DEFENDANT AND ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEFENDANT SHALL NOT COMMENT PUBLICLY ON THIS CASE. THIS ORDER IS SUBJECT TO THE EXCEPTIONS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI SUPREME COURT RULE 4-3.6.

s/GAEL D WOOD

cc: PA, DEFT c/o FCSO

Motion Denied

DEFT'S MOTION TO PROCEED UNDER SUPREME COURT RULE 16 IS DENIED. DEFT'S MOTION FOR SURETY BOND IS DENIED. GDW/cw

Judge/Clerk - Note

DEFT'S EXHIBITS A & B RETURNED TO DEFT AT FCSO

25-Feb-2013

Motion Filed

MOTION TO HEAR HABEAS CORPUS, VACATE DENIAL OF SURETY BOND OR IN ALTERNATIVE NEW JUDGE

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Correspondence Filed**

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESSED TO JUDGE RECEIVED AND PLACED IN SEALED ENVELOPE. NOT READ BY JUDGE.

26-Feb-2013

Order

DEFENDANT HEREIN HAS FILED A REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF JUDGE ON FEBRUARY 25, 2013. ALTHOUGH THIS IS NOT TIMELY, THE COURT HEREBY SUSTAINS SAID MOTION IN CHAMBERS AND THE SUPREME COURT IS REQUESTED TO ASSIGN A JUDGE FROM OUTSIDE OF THE 20TH, 23RD, 24TH AND 42ND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS TO HEAR ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IN THIS CASE.

s/GAEL D WOOD

Judge/Clerk - Note

FILE SENT TO PJ SECRETARY FOR SUPREME COURT ASSIGNMENT

Hearing/Trial Cancelled**Scheduled For:**30-Apr-2013 ; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days**Hearing/Trial Cancelled****Scheduled For:**01-May-2013 ; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days**Hearing/Trial Cancelled****Scheduled For:**02-May-2013 ; 9:00 AM; GAEL D. WOOD; **Setting:** 1; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days

06-Mar-2013

Judge Assigned

SUPREME COURT ASSIGNMENT TO JUDGE KEITH SUTHERLAND, FILED.

Judge/Clerk - Note

07-Mar-2013

Subpoena Served

VALERIE WEINHAUS, CHM MATTHEW FOX, PAT CUNNINGHAM, MICK MARUSCHAK, S. MERTENS, JAMES HOFFMAN, SGT PERRY SMITH, JEFF WHITE

Jury Trial Scheduled

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public****Scheduled For:** 30-Apr-2013 ; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days**Pre-trial Conference Scheduled****Scheduled For:** 19-Mar-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County

08-Mar-2013

Answer Filed

STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER TO DISCOVERY

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**List of Witnesses**

ENDORSEMENT OF WITNESS(ES)

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Answer Filed**

STATE'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANTS REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

11-Mar-2013

Motion to Dismiss

MOTION TO DISMISS FILED.

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Notice of Hearing Filed**

NOTICE FOR HEARING ON DISMISSAL OR ALTERNATIVE SURETY BOND

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

15-Mar-2013

Motion Filed

FOR RETURN OF PERSONAL EFFECTS.

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

18-Mar-2013

Motion to Quash**Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

19-Mar-2013

Hearing Held**Memorandum Filed**

MEMORANDUM ON NON WRITTEN WAIVER OF COUNSEL

Hearing Held

State by PA Robert Parks. Defendant in person and in custody. Case called on record for motions hearing and pre-trial conference. State requests leave to amend Indictment by interlineation to correct the body of Count V to read "the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count IV (not VI)," and to correct the body of Count VII to read "the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count VI (not IV)." Leave granted. Court takes up Motion for Return of Personal Effects. Motion granted in part, as to gold ring; motion denied in part, as to watch. Court takes up Motion to Quash Indictment. Motion denied. Court takes up Motion to Dismiss. Motion denied. Defendant advised of perils of self representation. Memorandum on Non-Written Waiver of Counsel filed and copy to each party. Defendant requests court take up Bond Motion. PA objects. Court allows motion, hears from defendant and PA. Court leaves bond set at \$50,000 cash only and sets \$250,000 surety bond. So Ordered: /s/ Keith Sutherland

Scheduled For: 19-Mar-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County**Judge/Clerk - Note**

COPY OF LOG SHEET FILED.

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

19-Mar-2013

Motion to Sever Charges

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SEVER THE CHARGES FILED.

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Bond Set**

Amount of Bond Set - \$250,000 SURETY; OR \$50,000 CASH ONLY.

Stipulation Filed

STIPULATION AS TO INTRODUCTION OF THE TAPE MADE BY DEFENDANT'S EX-WIFE INTO EVIDENCE FILED.

Order

Order to return to defendant or his representative (1) gold ring now in the possession of Troop C evidence officer; and to retain the Black and Silver Watch in the possession of Troop C evidence officer (see order). /s/ Keith Sutherland

Motion Denied18-Mar-2013 **Motion to Quash****Motion Denied**11-Mar-2013 **Motion to Dismiss****Motion Granted/Sustained**

IN PART, RING

15-Mar-2013 **Motion Filed****Motion Denied**

IN PART, WATCH

15-Mar-2013 **Motion Filed**

20-Mar-2013

Judge/Clerk - Note**Order**

SPECIAL CONDITION OF BOND: GPS MONITORING, IS TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN 24 HOURS WITH PROOF FILED. SO ORDERED. /S/ KEITH M. SUTHERLAND/RK

21-Mar-2013

Criminal Motion Hearing Sched**Scheduled For:** 25-Apr-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
ALL PENDING (AS OF 04/25) MOTIONS**Answer Filed**

STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER TO DISCOVERY.

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**List of Witnesses**

ENDORSEMENT OF WITNESS

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Motion for Disclosure**

STATE'S MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

01-Apr-2013

Objections Filed

DEFENDANT/VICTIM OBJECTION TO NON WRITTEN WAIVER OF COUNSEL AND MOTION TO DISMISS, BASED ON DISCOVERY.

Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

01-Apr-2013 **List of Witnesses**
ENDORSEMENT OF WITNESS
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

19-Apr-2013 **Motion for Bond Reduction**
REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY BOND REDUCTION HEARING FILED.
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

24-Apr-2013 **Motion to Quash**
STATE'S MOTION TO QUASH DEFENDANT'S ENDORSED WITNESSES FILED.
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

Notice of Hearing Filed
FOR 04/25/13 @ 9 A.M.
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

25-Apr-2013 **Judge/Clerk - Note**
COPY OF NOTICE OF ENTRY FOR DOCKET ENTRIES OF 04/25/13 TO PA AND DEFENDANT. RK

Motion In Limine
STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 1 FILED.
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
12-Sep-2013 **Order**

Judge/Clerk - Note

Hearing Held
DEFENDANT IN PERSON AND IN CUSTODY. STATE BY PA ROBERT PARKS. DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SEVER THE CHARGES ARGUED AND DENIED. DEFENDANT/VICTIM OBJECTION TO NON WRITTEN WAIVER OF COUNSEL AND MOTION TO DISMISS, BASED ON DISCOVERY ARGUED AND DENIED.
DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY BOND REDUCTION HEARING ARGUED AND DENIED.
STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 1 ARGUED AND GRANTED.
STATE'S ENDORSEMENT OF WITNESSES GRANTED.
STATE'S MOTION TO QUASH DEFENDANT ENDORSED WITNESSES GRANTED AS TO THOSE HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW.
COPY OF PROSPECTIVE JURORS QUESTIONNAIRES GIVEN TO PA AND DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT AND ANYONE ON HIS BEHALF ORDERED NOT TO COMMUNICATE WITH PROSPECTIVE JURORS PRIOR TO TRIAL IN ANY WAY.
DEFENDANT PROVIDES APPLICATION FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES TO COURT. COURT ORDERS APPLICATION BE DELIVERED TO PUBLIC DEFENDER BY CLERK. COPY OF APPLICATION FILED UNDER SEAL.
CASE REMAINS SET FOR JURY TRIAL 04/30 THRU 5/2/13. SO ORDERED: KEITH SUTHERLAND/RK
Scheduled For: 25-Apr-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
ALL PENDING (AS OF 04/25) MOTIONS

Judge/Clerk - Note
ORIGINAL APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES DELIVERED TO PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE. COPY PLACED IN SEALED ENVELOPE AND FILED.

Judge/Clerk - Note
COPY OF RECORDING LOG FILED.

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

26-Apr-2013 **Entry of Appearance Filed**
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

Motion for Continuance
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR TRIAL CONTINUANCE FILED.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
26-Apr-2013 **Motion Granted/Sustained**

Motion Granted/Sustained
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR TRIAL CONTINUANCE GRANTED BY CONSENT. CASE PASSED GENERALLY.
SO ORDERED: KEITH SUTHERLAND/cw

Hearing/Trial Cancelled
Scheduled For:30-Apr-2013 ; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days

Hearing/Trial Cancelled
Scheduled For:01-May-2013 ; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days

Hearing/Trial Cancelled
Scheduled For:02-May-2013 ; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days

02-May-2013 **Criminal Motion Hearing Sched**
Scheduled For: 12-Sep-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County

Jury Trial Scheduled
Scheduled For:08-Oct-2013 ; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County; **Length:** 3 Days
3-DAY JURY TRIAL

14-May-2013 **Subpoena Served**
SGT PERRY SMITH, MSHP

20-May-2013 **Subpoena Served**
CHM MATTHEW FOX, MSHP CRIME LABORATORY

24-May-2013 **Subpoena Served**
JEFF WHITE, LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ACADEMY
SGT H FOLSOM, MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL
MICK MARUSCHAK
CPL S MERTENS
PAT CUNNINGHAM
SGT H FOLSOM
JEFF WHITE, LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ACADEMY

06-Jun-2013 **Notice to Take Deposition**
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

18-Jun-2013 **Subpoena Served**
JAMES HOFFMAN

23-Jul-2013 **Certificate of Service**
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, NOTICE OF HEARING

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public****Filed By:** HUGH A EASTWOOD**Motion to Sever Charges**

DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

06-Aug-2013

Request for Speedy Trial Filed

VERIFIED ANNOUNCEMENT OF READY AND MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD**Amended Motion/Petition Filed**

AMENDED SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD12-Sep-2013 **Order****Motion to Dismiss**

MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

20-Aug-2013

Motion for Leave

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SUBSTITUTE INFORMATION IN LIEU OF INDICTMENT

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS12-Sep-2013 **Order****Notice of Hearing Filed**

FOR 09/12/13 @ 9 A.M.

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

21-Aug-2013

Notice of Hearing Filed

FOR 09/12/13 @ 9 A.M.

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Motion Filed**

MOTION TO TAX DEPOSITIONS AS COURT COSTS

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Request Filed**

REQUEST FOR MOTION TO TAX DEPOSITIONS AS COURT COSTS.

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

04-Sep-2013

Certificate of Service**Filed By:** HUGH A EASTWOOD**Notice of Hearing Filed**

FOR 09/12/13 @ 9 A.M.

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD**Suggestions in Opposition**

DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD**Motion In Limine**

DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE/MOTION TO EXCLUDE

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD12-Sep-2013 **Order**

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

04-Sep-2013 **Motion to Dismiss**
DEFENDANT'S AMENDED MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
12-Sep-2013 **Order**
Affidavit Filed
AFFIDAVIT OF JUDY KROPF
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

06-Sep-2013 **Motion Filed**
MOTION TO TAX DEPOSITIONS AS COURT COSTS
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
12-Sep-2013 **Order**
Notice of Hearing Filed
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

09-Sep-2013 **Exhibit Filed**
Exhibit A, Defendants Opposition to States motion in limine; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

11-Sep-2013 **Certificate of Service**
Certificate of Service; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

12-Sep-2013 **Hearing Held**
Scheduled For: 12-Sep-2013; 9:00 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
Substitute Information Filed
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
Order
DEFENDANT IS PRESENT IN PERSON, IN CUSTODY AND WITH COUNSEL, HUGH EASTWOOD. PA ROBERT PARKS IS PRESENT. STATE'S MOTION TO TAX DEPOSITIONS AS COURT COSTS HEARD AND GRANTED. DEFENDANT'S AMENDED MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION HEARD AND DENIED. DEFENDANT'S AMENDED SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES HEARD AND DENIED. STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 1 (THAT DEFENDANT NOT BE REFERRED TO AS "VICTIM") HEARD AND GRANTED EXCEPT AS TO CLOSING ARGUMENT. DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE/MOTION TO EXCLUDE HEARD AND GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART: PARA 1 GRANTED, PARA 2 GRANTED, PARA 3 GRANTED FOR SHOOTING AND OVERRULED FOR SPEECH, PARA 4 OVERRULED, PARA 5 GRANTED, PARA 6 GRANTED, PARA 7 GRANTED, PARA 8 GRANTED. STATE GRANTED LEAVE TO FILE SUBSTITUTE INFORMATION IN LIEU OF INDICTMENT. SO ORDERED: KEITH SUTHERLAND/RK
Order
GRANTING MOT TO TAX DEPOSITIONS FILED ON 09-06-13
Filing:
RECORDING LOG SHEETS FILED.

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

22-Sep-2013 **Motion In Limine**
Defendants Second Motion in Limine; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

01-Oct-2013 **Notice of Hearing Filed**
Notice of Hearing; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

Entry of Appearance Filed
Entry of Appearance; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: CHRISTOPHER M COMBS
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

Note to Clerk eFiling
Filed By: CHRISTOPHER M COMBS

02-Oct-2013 **Judge/Clerk - Note**
NOTIFIED PA AND DEFENSE COUNSEL THAT MOTION IN LIMINE AND OTHER MOTIONS NOTICED FOR 10/08/13 @ 9 A.M. WILL BE HEARD ON 10/08/13 @ 8:30 A.M. RK

Criminal Motion Hearing Sched
Scheduled For: 08-Oct-2013; 8:30 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County MOTIONS

03-Oct-2013 **Notice of Hearing Filed**
Notice; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

Motion Filed
Motion to tax depositions as court cost; proof of deposition cost; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

04-Oct-2013 **Subpoena Requested**
Subpoena, Heather R Clarke; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

Subpoena Requested
Subpoena, Steve Everhart; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

Subpoena Requested
Subpoena, Marty Leach; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

Subpoena Requested
Subpoena, Jeffrey White; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

07-Oct-2013 **Suggestions in Opposition**
Defendants Opposition to State s Motion in Limine 2; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public****Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

08-Oct-2013

Motion In Limine

STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 2

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS**Hearing Held****Scheduled For:** 08-Oct-2013; 8:30 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; **Setting:** 0; Franklin County
MOTIONS**Jury Trial Conducted**

STATE BY PA ROBERT PARKS. DEFENDANT IN PERSON, IN CUSTODY AND WITH COUNSEL HUGH EASTWOOD AND CHRISTOPHER COMBS. STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 2 FILED, ARGUED AND DENIED. CASE CALLED FOR JURY TRIAL. VOIR DIRE CONDUCTED. JURY OF TWELVE MEMBERS AND ONE ALTERNATE EMPANELED. TRIAL BEGAN. COURT RECESSED AT 5 P.M. FOR EVENING.

Jury Instructions Filed**Judge/Clerk - Note**

JUDGES NOTES

09-Oct-2013

Motion for Acquittal**Filed By:** HUGH A EASTWOOD**Jury Trial Conducted**

8:35 A.M. ALL PARTIES PRESENT AND TRIAL RESUMED. STATE RESTED AND JURY EXCUSED FOR EVENING AT 4:10 P.M. AT CONCLUSION OF STATE'S CASE, DEFENDANT FILED MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL. MOTION ARGUED AND GRANTED AS TO COUNTS II AND VIII AND DENIED AS TO COUNTS I, III, IV, V, VI, VII.

10-Oct-2013

Jury Trial Conducted

8:30 A.M. ALL PARTIES PRESENT AND TRIAL RESUMED. DEFENSE RESTED. JURY REMOVED FOR INSTRUCTION CONFERENCE. DEFENSE'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL RENEWED AND DENIED AS TO REMAINING COUNTS. INSTRUCTION CONFERENCE CONDUCTED. JURY SEATED AND INSTRUCTED. CLOSING ARGUMENTS HELD. ALTERNATE JUROR EXCUSED. JURY RETIRED TO JURY ROOM FOR DELIBERATION AT 10:52 A.M. VERDICT REACHED AT 2:20 P.M. AS FOLLOWS: GUILTY ON COUNTS I, III, IV, V; NOT GUILTY ON COUNTS VI AND VII. JURY POLLED. JURY REMOVED FOR INSTRUCTION CONFERENCE. CONFERENCE HELD. JURY SEATED AND INSTRUCTED. SENTENCING STATEMENTS MADE BY PA PARKS AND ADFT EASTWOOD. JURY RETIRED TO JURY ROOM FOR DELIBERATION AT 3:20 P.M. VERDICT REACHED AT 4:44 P.M. AS TO SENTENCING: COUNT I: 2 YRS DOC, COUNT III: 1 YR FRANKLIN COUNTY JAIL; COUNT IV: 30 YEARS DOC; COUNT V: 30 YEARS DOC. ALL VERDICTS ORDERED FILED. JURY THANKED AND EXCUSED.

>

> AT EACH BREAK DURING TRIAL, JURY INSTRUCTED PRIOR TO LEAVING COURTROOM.

>

> SAR ORDERED. SENTENCING HEARING SCHEDULED FOR 11/25/13 @ 9:30 A.M.
DEFENDANT GRANTED ADDITIONAL 10 DAYS FOR FILING MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL.

>

> SO ORDERED: KEITH M. SUTHERLAND

Jury Verdict - Guilty**Questions to Judge from Jury**

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

10-Oct-2013	Sent Assessment Report Ordered
11-Oct-2013	Sentencing Hearing Scheduled Scheduled For: 25-Nov-2013; 9:30 AM; KEITH M SUTHERLAND; Setting: 0; Franklin County MOTIONS/SENTENCING
16-Oct-2013	Motion for New Trial Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS 25-Nov-2013 Motion Denied
29-Oct-2013	Notice notice; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS Motion Filed motion to tax depositions as court costs; deposition cost; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS 25-Nov-2013 Motion Granted/Sustained Motion for New Trial Defendant s Motion for New Trial; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD 25-Nov-2013 Motion Denied Motion for Acquittal Defendant s Second Motion for Acquittal; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD 25-Nov-2013 Motion Denied Notice of Hearing Filed Notice of Hearing; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS
30-Oct-2013	Motion Filed Defendants Motion to Tax Depositions as Court Costs, and Other Court Costs; Ex A, Deposition Court Reporter Costs; Ex B, Clarke subpoena service fee; Ex C, Leach and Everhart subpoena service fees; Ex D, White subpoena service fee; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS 25-Nov-2013 Motion Granted/Sustained
01-Nov-2013	Notice of Hearing Filed notice; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
08-Nov-2013	Notice of Hearing Filed notice; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS Motion Filed States motion to forfeit weapon; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service. Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS 25-Nov-2013 Motion Granted/Sustained

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

15-Nov-2013

Response Filed

Defendant s Memorandum in Opposition to State s Motion to Forfeit Weapon; Exhibit A - Affidavit of Judy Kropf; Ex B - Receipt; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD**Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Suggestions Filed**

Defendant s Supplemental Suggestions of Law in support of each of his original, renewed & second motions for judgment of acquittal; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.

Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD**Filed By:** JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

22-Nov-2013

Sent Assessment Report Filed

25-Nov-2013

Motion Denied

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL DENIED. KMS

Motion Granted/Sustained

ALL MOTIONS TO TAX DEPOSITIONS AS COURT COSTS GRANTED. KMS

Motion Denied

DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION FOR ACQUITTAL DENIED. KMS

Motion Granted/Sustained

STATE'S MOTION TO FORFEIT WEAPON GRANTED. FORFEITURE STAYED PENDING APPEAL AND POST CONVICTION RELIEF PROCESSES. KMS

Defendant Sentenced

DEFENDANT IN CUSTODY, IN PERSON AND WITH COUNSEL HUGH EASTWOOD AND CHRISTOPHER COMBS. STATE BY PA ROBERT PARKS. ALLOCUTION GRANTED. COUNT I: 2 YRS DOC; COUNT III: 1 YR COUNTY JAIL; COUNT IV: 30 YRS DOC; COUNT V: 30 YRS DOC, ALL CONCURRENT. CC/CVF. 29.15/24.035 ADVISED AND NO PROBABLE CAUSE FOUND. SO ORDERED: KEITH M. SUTHERLAND

Judgment CVC Entered**Judgment Against:** JEFFREY WEINHAUS; **Amount:** \$68.00; **Satisfied Date:****Judgment Entered**

COURT COSTS

Judgment Against: JEFFREY WEINHAUS; **Amount:** \$20,006.25; **Satisfied Date:****Transfer Filed**

Commitment report; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.

Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS

26-Nov-2013

Record of Traffic Disp Issued

The Traffic Disposition was sent electronically to DOR and MSHP for charge number 3 violation 3245700 - Possession Of Up To 35 Grams Marijuana. The charge was disposed as Jury Verdict-Guilty

Record of Traffic Disp Issued

The Traffic Disposition was sent electronically to DOR and MSHP for charge number 1 violation 3245000 - Possession Of Controlled Substance Except 35 Grams Or Less Of Marijuana. The charge was disposed as Jury Verdict-Guilty

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

27-Nov-2013 **Notice of Appeal Filed**
Notice of Appeal form no 8-A; Criminal Case Information Form E D Local Rule 300; Judgment;
Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

03-Dec-2013 **Motion Filed**
MOTION FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY OR EVIDENCE
Filed By: ROBERT E PARKS
05-Dec-2013 **Motion Granted/Sustained**
23-Jan-2014 **Motion Granted/Sustained**

05-Dec-2013 **Ord Allow In Forma Pauperis**
Defendant granted leave to appeal in forma pauperis. s/Keith Sutherland via email
Filed By: KEITH M SUTHERLAND
Motion Granted/Sustained
MOTION FOR RETURN OF PROPERTY OR EVIDENCE GRANTED. SO ORDERED: KEITH M. SUTHERLAND

09-Dec-2013 **Certificate of Mailing**
NOTICE OF APPEAL, CRIIMINAL CASE INFORMATION FORM, PAUPERIS ORDER, & COPY OF JUDGMENT MAILED TO THE MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, TO ROBERT PARKS AND NOTICE OF ENTRY TO HUGH EASTWOOD.
Motion for Apptmnt of Counsel
Defendants Motion for Appointment of Counsel; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
10-Dec-2013 **Motion Granted/Sustained**
Memorandum Filed
Defendant-Appellants Statement of his Status; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Motion to Withdraw
Motion to Withdraw; Electronic Filing Certificate of Service.
Filed By: HUGH A EASTWOOD
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

10-Dec-2013 **Motion Granted/Sustained**
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL GRANTED. PUBLIC DEFENDER APPOINTED. SO ORDERED: KEITH SUTHERLAND

16-Dec-2013 **Receipt Filed**
MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS-EASTERN DISTRICT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTICE OF APPEAL, FILING
APPEALS COURT CASE NO. ED100807.

23-Dec-2013 **Correspondence Filed**
Letter to clerk, received & scanned.
Filed By: JEFFREY R WEINHAUS

24-Dec-2013 **Certificate of Mailing**
Notice of 12/23/13 correspondence, filing to Defendant.

Case continued from previous page.

12AB-CR02409-01 ST V JEFFREY R WEINHAUS**Security Level: 1 Public**

13-Jan-2014	Judge/Clerk - Note
17-Jan-2014	Judge/Clerk - Note STATE'S EXHIBITS #1 AND #2 FROM MOTION HEARING ON 02/21/13 RETURNED TO PROSECUTOR.
23-Jan-2014	Motion Granted/Sustained ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY OR EVIDENCE RECEIVED FROM JUDGE SUTHERLAND. (THIS MOTION ORIGINALLY GRANTED ON 12/05/2013.)
28-Jan-2014	Judge/Clerk - Note COPY OF ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR DISPOSAL OF PROERTY OR EVIDENCE MAILED TO SGT. VOLKMER AT MSHP, TROOP I, P O BOX 128, ROLLA MO 65402.
06-Feb-2014	Judge/Clerk - Note LEGAL FILE COPIED, COMPILED CERTIFIED AND MAILED TO, AMY BARTHOLOW, MISSOURI PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE, APPELLATE DIVISION, WOODRAIL CENTRE, 1000 W. NIFONG, BUILDING 7, SUITE 100, COLUMBIA, MO 65203

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF FRANKLIN
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,)
Plaintiff,) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409
VS) Division No. II
JEFFERY R WEINHAUS) OCN:
White/Male DOB: 10/06/1966) PA File No. 071131707
SSN: 486-80-3880)
2360 Highway K)
Saint Clair, MO 63077)
Defendant.) INDICTMENT

FILED
NOV 28 2012
BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

The Grand Jurors of the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, charge that:

COUNT I CLASS C FELONY POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
Charge Code Number: 3245022

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class C felony of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed Morphine, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT II CLASS C FELONY TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER
Charge Code Number: 2921706

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.084, RSMo, committed the class C felony of tampering with a judicial officer, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 17, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant, with purpose to harass or intimidate Judge Kelly Parker, a judicial officer, in the performance of the judicial officer's official duties, tampered with the judicial officer by threatening to try and execute Judge Kelly Parker for treason.

COUNT III CLASS A MISDEMEANOR POSSESSION OF UP TO 35 GRAMS MARIJUANA
Charge Code Number: 3245762

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class A misdemeanor of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.016, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed marijuana, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT IV CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER,
Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Sgt. Folsom was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by shooting him.

COUNT V CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

IV The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count ~~IV~~ **VI**, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VI CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER,

Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by shooting him.

COUNT VII CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

XI The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count ~~VI~~ **IV**, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VIII CLASS D FELONY RESISTING OR INTERFERING WITH ARREST FOR A FELONY

Charge Code Number: 2702099

The defendant, in violation of Section 575.180, RSMo, committed the class D felony of resisting an arrest, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 270.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Holson and Cpl Mertens, law enforcement officers, were making an arrest of for defendant possession of a controlled substance and the defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the officers were making an arrest, and the defendant, with the purpose of preventing the officers from effecting the arrest, resisted the arrest of defendant by using or threatening the use of violence or physical force.

A TRUE BILL

NOT A TRUE BILL

Larry E. Smith
Foreman

Clerk

Ruth E. Phillips
(Assistant) Prosecuting Attorney

As a condition of release for defendant bond is set in the amount of \$ 250,000⁰⁰ cash only.




Judge

STATE WITNESSES:

SGT H. Folsom, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Troop I Headquarters, Rolla, MO 65402
Kelly Parker

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF FRANKLIN
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Plaintiff,

VS

JEFFERY R WEINHAUS

White/Male DOB: 10/06/1966

SSN: 486-80-3880

Defendant.

)
) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409-01
) Division No. I
) Judge: SU
) OCN:
) PA File No. 071131707

) SUBSTITUTE INFORMATION
) IN LIEU OF INDICTMENT

FILED

SEP 12 2013

By BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI D.C.

The Prosecuting Attorney in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, charges that:

COUNT I CLASS C FELONY POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE

Charge Code Number: 3245022

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class C felony of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed Morphine, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT II CLASS C FELONY TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER

Charge Code Number: 2921706

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.084, RSMo, committed the class C felony of tampering with a judicial officer, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 17, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant, with purpose to harass or intimidate Judge Kelly Parker, a judicial officer, in the performance of the judicial officer's official duties, tampered with the judicial officer by threatening to try and execute the Judge Kelly Parker for treason.

COUNT III CLASS A MISDEMEANOR POSSESSION OF UP TO 35 GRAMS MARIJUANA

Charge Code Number: 3245762

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class A misdemeanor of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.016, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed marijuana, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT IV CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Sgt. Folsom was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by trying to draw a weapon to shoot at Sgt Folsom.

COUNT V CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count IV, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VI CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER,

Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by trying to draw a weapon to shoot at Cpl Mertens.

COUNT VII CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count VI, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VIII CLASS D FELONY RESISTING OR INTERFERING WITH ARREST FOR A FELONY

Charge Code Number: 2702099

The defendant, in violation of Section 575.150, RSMo, committed the class D felony of resisting an arrest, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom and Cpl Mertens, law enforcement officers, were making an arrest of for defendant possession of a controlled substance and the defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the officers were making an arrest, and, for the purpose of preventing the officers from effecting the arrest, resisted the arrest of defendant by using or threatening the use of violence or physical force.

ROBERT E. PARKS
Prosecuting Attorney
of the County of Franklin,
State of Missouri, by
/s/ Robert E. Parks

Robert E. Parks - 36333
Prosecuting Attorney

STATE WITNESSES:

Pat Cunningham, 1400 Independence Drive, Suite 1402, Rolla, MO
Mike Maruschak, 1400 Independence Drive, Suite 1402, Rolla, MO
Sarah Everhart,
SGT H. Folsom, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Troop I Headquarters, Rolla, MO 65402
CHM Matthew Fox, MSHP Crime Laboratory, 1510 East Elm Street, Jefferson City, MO 65101
Phil Gregory,
James Hoffman, 1616 Oak Knoll, Saint Clair, MO 63077
S. Mertens, Troop I Headquarters, Rolla, MO 65402
Kelly Parker,
SGT Perry Smith, Missouri State Highway Patrol, 891 Technology Drive, Saint Charles, MO 63304
Valerie Weinhaus, 711 S. Osteopathy, Kirksville, MO 63501
Jeff White, P.O. Box 568, Jefferson City, MO 65102

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY, STATE OF MISSOURI

State of Missouri,)
)
vs.) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409
)
Jeffrey Weinhaus,) Judge: Gael Wood
)
Defendant.)

FILED

DEC 18 2012

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY

COMES NOW defendant, by and through counsel, pursuant to Rules 25.03 and 25.04 Mo.R.Crim.P. and Section 565.032 RSMo (1986), and requests the following within ten (10) days and/or throughout the duration of this cause:

1. The names and last known addresses of persons whom the State intends to call as witnesses at any hearing or at the trial, together with their written or recorded statements, and existing memoranda reporting or summarizing part of all of their oral statements.
2. Should the defendant notify the State of its intent to rely upon the defenses of mental disease or defect pursuant to Section 552.030 RSMo or alibi, the defendant specifically requests the names and addresses of all witnesses the State intends to call as rebuttal witnesses, together with any written memoranda of their statements.
Wardius v. Oregon, 412 U.S. 470, 93 S.Ct. 2208, 37 L.Ed.2d 82 (1973); State v. Curtis, 544 S.W.2d 580 (Mo. banc 1976).
3. Any written or recorded statements and the substance of any oral statements made by the defendant or by a codefendant, a list of all witnesses to the making, and a list of all witnesses to the acknowledgment, or such statements, and last known addresses of such witnesses.
4. Those portions of any existing transcript of the grand jury proceedings which relate to the offense with which defendant is charged, containing testimony of the defendant or


- testimony or persons whom the State intends to call as witnesses at a hearing or trial.
5. Any existing transcript of the preliminary hearing of any prior trial held in the defendant's case if the State has such in its possession or if such is available to the State.
 6. Any reports or statements of experts, made in connection with the particular case, including results of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests, experiments or comparisons.
 7. Any books, papers, documents, photographs or objects which the State intends to introduce into evidence at the hearing or trial, or which were obtained from or belong to the defendant.
 8. Any record of prior criminal convictions of persons the State intends to call as witnesses at a hearing or trial.
 9. A written statement by counsel for the State setting forth the facts relating to the time, place, and persons making any photographic or electronic surveillance relating to the offense with which this defendant is charged.
 10. Any material or information, within the possession or control of the State, which tends to negate the guilt of the defendant as to the offense charged, mitigate the degree of the offense charged, or reduce the punishment.
 11. All items set out in the foregoing paragraphs which are known to the State to be in the possession or control of other government personnel.
 12. The statements of all persons who have been interviewed by an agent of the State in connection with the subject matter of this cause and whom the State does not presently intend to call at trial.
 13. The memoranda or summaries of any oral statement made to an agent of the State by any person in connection with the subject matter of this cause whether or not:

- a. the statement, if in writing, has been signed or approved by the witness, and
 - b. the statement relates to the proposed subject matter of the direct testimony of the witness at trial.
14. The statements of persons or memoranda or recordings of any oral statement pertinent to the subject matter of this case whether or not made to any agent of the State.
15. Any memoranda, documents or statements used by the State during the investigation of this case.
16. The names and addresses of all persons who may have some knowledge of the facts of the present case.
17. All reports and memoranda prepared on behalf of the State or otherwise used in connection with the investigation of this case.
18. All reports, memoranda and any other data in the hands of the State and its agents in regard to defendant.
19. Pursuant to RSMo 565.005, notice of all statutory and non-statutory aggravating circumstances the prosecution will rely upon if the death penalty is sought, and any material or information within the possession or control of the State which the prosecution intends to use as evidence of all aggravating circumstances or as evidence in general during any penalty phase in this cause.
20. Any material or information within the possession or control of the State relating to the mitigating circumstances of RSMo 565.032 (1986).
21. The names and addresses of persons known to the State or law enforcement agencies having information relating to the mitigating circumstances of RSMo 565.032 (1986).
22. Statements of any person or persons which were shown, read, played, or paraphrased to the defendant during any interrogation or interview conducted by any member of

any law enforcement agency.

23. Current or most recent addresses and telephone numbers, known to law enforcement agencies, of all persons interviewed in the course of the investigation of the incident.
24. Copies of booking forms of the defendant prepared by any law enforcement agencies relating to the defendant, this case, the incident, or the investigation.
25. All press releases prepared by any law enforcement agencies relating to the defendant, this case, the incident, or the investigation.
26. Copies of all 911 tapes, and other police radio calls or dispatches reflecting the initial call for assistance to and through those reflecting the arrest of the defendant.

Respectfully submitted,




Tyson Mutrux, #63117

Attorney for Defendant
1717 Park Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63104
p: 314-270-2273
f: 314-884-4333
Tyson@ArchDefender.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was sent U.S. Mail to Robert Parks, Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, 1 S. Church St., Room 201, Union, MO 63084, on this *December 14, 2012*.



FILED

DEC 18 2012

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

State of Missouri,

vs.

Jeffrey Weinhaus,
Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)

Cause No. 12AB-CR02409

MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS

Comes now Defendant, by and through his attorney, and moves this court pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23.04 of Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an order directing the Prosecuting Attorney to file a Bill of Particulars which sets forth sufficient facts to advise Defendant of the particulars of the offenses charged in order for Defendant to sufficiently prepare for his defense and avoid being placed twice in jeopardy.

1. Defendant is charged by Indictment with one count of Felony Possession of a Controlled Substance (Count I), one count of Felony Tampering with a Judicial Officer (Count II), one count of Misdemeanor Possession of up to 35 Grams of Marijuana (Count III), two counts of Attempted Assault on a Law Enforcement Officer (Counts IV and VI), two counts of Armed Criminal Action (Counts V and VII), and one count of Felony Resisting Arrest or Interfering with Arrest for a Felony (Count VIII).
2. The Indictment fails to advise the Defendant of sufficient facts to enable him to adequately prepare his defense and instead alleges the legal conclusions that Defendant engaged in the above offenses.
3. From the time of the Indictment, Defendant is unable to determine: (1) what illegal act or acts Defendant is alleged to have committed; (2) the locations where some of those acts are alleged to have occurred; (3) and the date on which those acts are alleged to have


occurred. Because of these deficiencies Defendant is unable to investigate or prepare a legal and factual defense to the alleged charges.

4. As to Count II, Defendant requests the prosecution to provide the following information:
 - a. As exact an approximation of the date and time of occurrence as is possible;
 - b. The location, by address, of each incident;
 - c. The exact statements that resulted in the allegation of Felony Tampering with a Judicial Officer;
5. As to the allegations in Counts IV-VIII, Defendant requests the prosecution to provide the following information:
 - a. An exact description of the actions taken by defendant that resulted in the allegations in Counts IV-VIII;
 - b. All witnesses to the allegations in Counts IV-VIII;
 - c. Address or location of each incident.
6. Defense counsel has had an opportunity to review discovery and it is impossible to relate from the discovery materials presented specifically what counts are referenced and the specific acts that allegedly constitute such occurrences.
7. Defendant has good reason to believe that many of the counts should be merged into single criminal events, if indeed said event occurred at all, and that such matters may be subject to double jeopardy guarantees pursuant to the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 19 of the Missouri Constitution.
8. Failure to require the State to set forth with particularity those allegations and facts which the State must prove would deny the Defendant the right to prepare his defense, challenge the venue of the proceedings, to conduct an appropriate investigation of the witnesses,

expose him to being placed twice in jeopardy, and deny him effective assistance of counsel all rights guaranteed by Article I, Section 18(a) and 19 of the Missouri Constitution and the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

WHEREFORE, Defendant requests this Court enter its Order directing the State of Missouri to file a Bill of Particulars in connection with the above entitled cause.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tyson Mutrux, #63117


The Mutrux Law Firm
Attorney for Defendant
1717 Park Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63104
p: 314-270-2273
f: 314-884-4333

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was mailed this December 14, 2012 by U.S. Mail to:

Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
15 S. Church St., Room 200
Union, MO 63084

By:



Tyson Mutrux, #63117

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI
VS
JEFFREY WEINHAUS

CRIMINAL

CASE # 12A-**FILED**

FEB 13 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By

MOTION TO DISMISS

COMES NOW DEFENDANT SEEKING DISMISSAL OF THIS
MATTER. THE ONLY PROPER PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT
IS TO PROTECT MAN'S RIGHTS. FIRST AND FOREMOST
OF THOSE RIGHTS IS TO PROTECT HIM FROM PHYSICAL
FORCE. THE ONLY INJURED PARTY IS DEFENDANT.
THE ONLY ONE SUFFERING A LOSS IS DEFENDANT.
THE ONLY ONE WHO HAS BEEN HARMED IN THESE
MATTERS IS THE DEFENDANT. DEFENDANT WAS
SHOT 4 TIMES IN AN ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION.
TWICE TO THE HEAD TWICE TO THE CHEST. DEFENDANT
THEN HAS SPENT 110 DAYS IN JAIL. DEFENDANT
HAD HIS COMPUTERS - CAMERAS IN EFFECT HIS PRINTING
PRESS STOLEN. THEN WAS LIED TO BY THE STATE
WHO TOLD HIM TO COME GET HIS PROPERTY - WHEN
HE ARRIVED WITHIN TWENTY SECONDS HE WAS
GUNNED DOWN WITHOUT EVEN A WARNING. THE
ONLY KNOWN RECORDINGS OF THIS EVENT ^{ARE} ~~IS~~ THE ONES
MADE BY DEFENDANT. THE AUDIO TAPE CLEARLY REVEALS
THERE WAS NO ORDER OF ARREST OR NO GET YOUR
HANDS IN THE AIR. JUST 5 SHOTS 4 WHICH
STROCK DEFENDANT IN HEAD AND CHEST.

MOTION TO DISMISS PAGE 2

THE ONLY BUSINESS SPECIFICALLY PROTECTED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION IS THE FREE PRESS. DEFENDANT HAS PUBLISHED A BULLETIN FOR THE LAST 16 YEARS. THE FOCUS OF HIS PUBLICATION AND WEBSITE IS EXPOSING COURT HOUSE AND POLICE CORRUPTION AND MISCONDUCT. DEFENDANT WAS ALSO RUNNING FOR CORONER IN CRAWFORD COUNTY. HE HAS MADE IT KNOWN THAT HE WOULD BE LOOKING INTO MURDERS THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY. ON AUGUST 27TH 2012 SGT FOLSON AND CPE MORTEN'S CAME TO DEFENDANT'S OFFICE TO INTERVIEW HIM ABOUT A VIDEO WHICH WAS POSTED ON AUGUST 17TH. ONCE THE INTERVIEW HAD CONCLUDED PROPERLY FOLSON ANNOUNCED THAT HE SMELLED MARIJUANA AND WAS GOING TO HAVE TO GET A SEARCH WARRANT. FOUR HOURS LATER HE RETURNED WITH SAID WARRANT. THE SCOPE OF THE WARRANT WAS SEIZURE OF COMPUTERS AND CAMERAS USED TO PRODUCE THE NEWS BULLETIN AND BULLETINMAN VIDEO BROADCAST. THE LAST THING LISTED TO SEIZE ON THE WARRANT WAS MARIJUANA. OBVIOUSLY THE WARRANT WAS ALL ABOUT TAKING THE TOOLS USED TO PRODUCE THE BULLETIN, IN EFFECT STOPPING THE PRESS. THOUGH ONLY FOR A MOMENT. WITH IN 48 HOURS BULLETINMAN WAS BACK ON THE AIR. AND CALLING EVERY ONE HE COULD ABOUT THE THREAT TO HIS COMPUTERS → CONT.

MOTION TO DISMISS PAGE 3

UNION

10235 1122405-51

3122:15-51

NOTICE OF SERVICE - THE FORGIVING WAS MAILED TO FRANKLIN COUNTY

INCLUSION BUT NOT LIMITED TO - FOLSON & MEETEN COMMANDING OFFICERS, ON SEPTEMBER 7TH 2012 A WRIT OF REPLEVIN WAS FILED WITH THE MISSOURI SUPREME COURT SEEKING THE RETURN OF THE PROPERTY STOLEN (SEIZED BY THE WARRANT WHEN CONDUCTED BY TROOPER FOLSON ON SEPT. 11 I ASSUMED IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN DUE TO THE ACTION IS ATTEMPTED TO INITIATE, THOUGH I DID CHECK CASENET AND NO WARRANTS WERE SHOWING TEN MINUTES LATER DEFENDANT WAS LAYING IN A POOL OF HIS 4 PINTS OF BLOOD. ONCE AGAIN THE ONLY ONE INJURED - SUFFERING LOSS ALREADY IS DEFENDANT. THE BODY OF THE CRIME IS THE DEFENDANTS CORPUS DELICTI THE BODY OF THE CRIME IS AN ACT THAT CAUSES INJURY OR HARM. JUST WHO HAS BEEN STOLEN FROM SHOT AND THEN JAILED? CAN THE STATE PROVE A VICTIM OTHER THAN DEFENDANT? THE SEARCH WARRANT IN AND OF ITSELF DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF RS 23.200. THE FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF DID NOT SERVE A DESIGNER WHEN THE SEARCH WARRANT WAS SERVED OR WHEN THE ALLEGED ARREST WAS MADE ON SEPTEMBER 11TH. SEE ALSO LETTER FROM SHERIFF TOLKE RE DEFENDANT MOTIONS THAT THE WARRANT BE QUASHED AND THIS MATTER DISMISSED. RESPECTFULLY JEFFREY WEINHAUS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

State of Missouri,

Plaintiff,

vs

Jeffrey R. Weinhaus,

Defendant

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

FILED

MAR 18 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO QUASH INDICTMENT

Comes now the Defendant, **Jeffrey R. Weinhaus**, acting Pro Se, and moves this Honorable Court to Quash the Indictment in the above captioned cause, and supports this motion with the following:

I.

On November 28th, 2012, the State obtained its eight-count indictment in this cause. To that indictment, the Defendant has pleaded not guilty.

II.

"It has been held repeatedly that an Indictment by a grand jury is prima facie evidence of the existence of probable cause, **unless the same is overcome by a showing in evidence that the indictment was obtained by false or fraudulent testimony**, or through improper means...'*Steppuhn v. Railroad*, 199 Mo. App. 571, 204 S. W. 579; *Van Sickle v. Brown*, 68 Mo. 627, 637; *Wilkinson v. McGee*, 265 Mo. 574, 586, 178 S. W. 471. *Campbell v. Myers*, 287 S.W. 842, 221 Mo.App. 858 (Mo. App., 1926)" [emphasis added]

Defendant contends that Sgt. Folsom provided false testimony to the grand jury, which

He

the grand jury relied upon in their indictment. In support of this contention, the Defendant submits the following;

Defendant's Motion to Quash Exhibit A -The Indictment. Count VIII of the indictment states the following;

**COUNT VIII CLASS D FELONY RESISTING OR INTERFERING WITH
ARREST FOR A FELONY**

Charge Code Number: 2702099

"The defendant, in violation of Section 575.150, RSMo, committed the class D felony of resisting an arrest, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom and Cpl Mertens, law enforcement officers, were making an arrest of for defendant possession of a controlled substance **and the defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the officers were making an arrest**, and, for the purpose of preventing the officers from effecting the arrest, resisted the arrest of defendant by using or threatening the use of violence or physical force." [emphasis added]

The indictment identifies the State's Witnesses as Sgt. H. Folsom, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Troop I Headquarters., Rolla, MO 65402, and Kelly Parker. No other identifying information for "Kelly Parker" was provided in the indictment. Defendant assumes that Kelly Parker is Judge Kelly Parker. Judge Kelly Parker, to the best of Defendant's knowledge is not alleged to be a witness to the events of the 11th of September 2012.

As Sgt. Folsom was the only witness that could have provided testimony to support a charge of resisting arrest, Defendant asks this Honorable Court to examine the Trooper's report from the 11th of September 2012. (Defendants Motion Exhibit B)

Item 4 on Page 1 (Exhibit B) of Sgt. Folsom's report states;

"At this point with all the units in place at approximately 1246 hours, I contacted Weinhaus by cellular telephone to request that he meet Corporal Mertens and I at the MFA Oil station near his residence under the ruse that we were going to return his computer equipment. Weinhaus answered the cellular telephone and I explained to him that Corporal Mertens and I wanted to return his computer equipment to him today. **Weinhaus immediately suggested that it would have to be a public place and that he did not trust me as he thought this might be a ploy to arrest him. I again assured him that, the meeting was to return his computers to him and that I wanted to make it as easy as possible for him.** I asked him if we could meet him at the MFA Oil station near his residence on Route K in Piney Park. Weinhaus agreed, but he informed me that he would have several persons with him when he arrived to check things out. I again informed him that only Corporal Mertens and I would be there and we did not want to cause any kind of incident by bringing other people. Weinhaus agreed to meet us in approximately 15 minutes." [emphasis added]

The report made by Sgt. Folsom clearly contradicts his latter testimony before the grand jury. Sgt. Folsom's report identifies that the Defendant suggested that the meeting was to arrest him, but was assured by Sgt. Folsom on the 19th of September 2012 that the meeting was to return his computers. Subsequent to that report, Sgt. Folsom testified to the grand jury that the Defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the officers were making an arrest. The grand jury testimony of Sgt. Folsom, the only witness to the event who testified before the grand jury, has been demonstrated to have provided fraudulent testimony to the grand jury.

Whereas the Defendant has demonstrated that the indictment has been "**overcome by a showing in evidence that the indictment was obtained by false or fraudulent testimony**" the Defendant prays this Honorable Court quash the indictment.

**MOTION TO QUASH
EXHIBIT A**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF FRANKLIN
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Plaintiff,

VS

JEFFERY R WEINHAUS
White/Male DOB: 10/06/1966
SSN: 486-80-3880
2360 Highway K
Saint Clair, MO 63077

Defendant.

)
) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409
) Division No. II
) OCN:
) PA File No. 071131707
)
)
)
)
)
) INDICTMENT

FILED
NOV 28 2012
BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____

The Grand Jurors of the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, charge that:

COUNT I CLASS C FELONY POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE
Charge Code Number: 3245022

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class C felony of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed Morphine, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT II CLASS C FELONY TAMPERING WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER
Charge Code Number: 2921706

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.084, RSMo, committed the class C felony of tampering with a judicial officer, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about August 17, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant, with purpose to harass or intimidate Judge Kelly Parker, a judicial officer, in the performance of the judicial officer's official duties, tampered with the judicial officer by threatening to try and execute Judge Kelly Parker for treason.

COUNT III CLASS A MISDEMEANOR POSSESSION OF UP TO 35 GRAMS MARIJUANA
Charge Code Number: 3245762

The defendant, in violation of Section 195.202, RSMo, committed the class A misdemeanor of possession of a controlled substance, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.016, RSMo, in that on or about August 22, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant possessed marijuana, a controlled substance, knowing of its presence and nature.

COUNT IV CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER,

Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Sgt. Folsom was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by shooting him.

COUNT V CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count VI, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VI CLASS A FELONY ATTEMPT ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER,

Charge Code Number: 1310099

The defendant, in violation of Section 565.081.1, RSMo, committed the class A felony of assault of a law enforcement officer in the first degree punishable upon conviction under Section 558.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the County of Franklin, State of Missouri, Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer, the defendant knew Cpl Mertens was a law enforcement officer and attempted to kill or to cause serious physical injury to him, by shooting him.

COUNT VII CLASS U ARMED CRIMINAL ACTION

Charge Code Number: 3101099

The defendant, in violation of Section 571.015, RSMo, committed the felony of armed criminal action, punishable upon conviction under Section 571.015.1, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, the defendant committed the felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer charged in Count IV, all allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference, and the defendant committed the foregoing felony of attempted assault of a law enforcement officer by, with and through, the knowing use, assistance and aid of a deadly weapon.

COUNT VIII CLASS D FELONY RESISTING OR INTERFERING WITH ARREST FOR A FELONY

Charge Code Number: 2702099

The defendant, in violation of Section 575.150, RSMo, committed the class D felony of resisting an arrest, punishable upon conviction under Sections 558.011 and 560.011, RSMo, in that on or about September 11, 2012, in the county of Franklin, State of Missouri, Sgt Folsom and Cpl Mertens, law enforcement officers, were making an arrest of for defendant possession of a controlled substance and the defendant knew or reasonably should have known that the officers were making an arrest, and, for the purpose of preventing the officers from effecting the arrest, resisted the arrest of defendant by using or threatening the use of violence or physical force.

A TRUE BILL

NO TRUE BILL


Foreman

Foreman


(Assistant) Prosecuting Attorney

As a condition of release for defendant bond is set in the amount of \$ 250,000⁰⁰ cash only.

Paul D. Cook
Judge

STATE WITNESSES:

SGT H. Folsom, Missouri State Highway Patrol, Troop 1 Headquarters, Rolla, MO 65402
Kelly Parker

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Plaintiff,

VS

Jeffery R Weinhaus

Defendant.

) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409
)
) Division No II
)
)
)

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF BOND

The Defendant is hereby ordered to comply with the following additional special conditions of bond:

- ☒ 1. **Laws:** Defendant shall not violate any Federal, State or municipal law.
- ☐ 2. **Abuse Prohibition:** Defendant will not engage in any abusive or assaultive behavior
- ☐ 3. **Domestic Violence Education Seminar (DVES):** Defendant will enter and successfully attend the DVES program until ordered otherwise by the court. Defendant will authorize the relevant treating professional to disclose to the Court information about Defendant's attendance & behavior.
- ☒ 4. **No Contact Provisions:** Defendant will have no contact with (the victim) (the victim's children) (or) (the victim's family). The Defendant will not initiate or maintain telephone, correspondence, personal or 3rd party contact with (the victim) (the victim's children) (or) (the victim's family) without the prior written approval of the Court. The Defendant will not enter into the premises, travel past or loiter near where (the victim) (the victim's children) (or) (the victim's family) resides or works. **YOU WILL BE IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER EVEN IF YOU ARE INVITED.**
- ☒ 5. **Weapons Prohibition:** Defendant will not purchase, possess, receive, or transport any firearms, ammunition, explosive device or any other deadly weapon. All weapons shall be surrendered at FCSO with 1 days.
- ☐ 6. **Parenting Class:** Defendant shall enter and successfully attend a parenting class.
- ☐ 7. **Supervised Custody Transfer or Visitation:** Defendant shall utilize a supervised custodial transfer program that is any custodial transfer as by Court order shall take place at the local (police station) (sheriff's department).
- ☐ 8. **Alcohol Prohibition:** Defendant shall not possess or imbibe any intoxicating beverage. Defendant shall not be at or near a location where alcohol is sold or served.
- ☐ 9. **SCRAM:** Defendant shall, within forty eight (48) hours of release from custody, or as soon thereafter as possible, report to the appropriate authority for the installation of the Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring device on Defendant's person. Such device shall remain in place until the conclusion of the criminal case.
- ☐ 10. **EMP Monitoring:** Defendant shall, until the Court orders otherwise, be connected to, pay for and abide by the conditions of the EMP device within three (3) days of being released on bond.
- ☒ 11. **GPS Monitoring:**
- ☐ 12. **Random Drug Testing:** Defendant shall appear for drug screen every seven (7) days at _____ to be paid for at Defendant's own cost.
- ☐ 13. **Association Prohibition:** Defendant shall not (be seen with) (contact) (live with) the other co-defendant's from this case.
- ☐ 14. **Other:**

SO ORDERED:

Date

4/28/12

Judge



Defendant's Motion to Quash
Exhibit B

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL
REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

STATE CONTROL NO.: 12 236 008 011
REPORTING OFFICER: SERGEANT H. J. FOLSOM 0557
OCC TYPE: THREATENING A JUDICIAL OFFICER
COUNTY: FRANKLIN
DATE/TIME: AUGUST 22, 2012
OFFENSE STATUS: INVESTIGATION CONTINUING
LOCATION: 2360 RT K, ST. CLAIR, MO

REPORT DATE: 08/22/12
TROOP OF OCCURRENCE: I
SCENE PROCESSED: N
DDCC AT SCENE: N

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

ARREST OPERATION OF JEFFEREY WEINHAUS

1. In continuing an investigation into allegations that Jeffrey Weinhaus threatened Judicial Officers in Franklin County via the Internet on August 17, 2012; On September 11, 2012, an arrest operation conducted for Jeffrey Weinhaus in Franklin County.
2. On September 11, 2012, Corporal Scott E. Mertens and I went to the Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, wherein I applied for and received an arrest warrant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, white male, date of birth October 06, 1966, of 2360 State Route K, St. Clair, Missouri. The charges on the arrest warrant stemmed from an earlier investigation, where Corporal Mertens and I contacted Weinhaus at his residence on August 22, 2012, reference threats he made against a Judicial Officer in Crawford County, Missouri.
3. On September 11, 2012, after obtaining the arrest warrant for Weinhaus, I contacted a member of the Franklin County Sheriff's Department to see if the local sheriff's department wanted to assist us in serving the arrest warrant. They declined to assist citing other calls for service were pending. I then contacted Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Patrick Cunningham and Mike Maruschak, who agreed to meet us in St. Clair, Missouri and assist us in serving the arrest warrant on Weinhaus. After meeting with Special Agent Cunningham and Special Agent Maruschak, we agreed to attempt to have Weinhaus meet with us at the Missouri Farmers Association (MFA) Oil Station on Missouri Route K between St. Clair and Piney Park, Missouri, which is in close proximity to Weinhaus' residence. It was further decided that the meeting with Weinhaus would be prearranged with him under the ruse that we were returning his computer equipment to him that was seized from his residence on August 22, 2012. Additionally I arranged for two fully marked cars from the Missouri State Highway Patrol's Troop C to participate in the arrest operation in the event Weinhaus tried to flee and a vehicular pursuit ensued.
4. At this point with all the units in place at approximately 1246 hours, I contacted Weinhaus by cellular telephone to request that he meet Corporal Mertens and I at the MFA Oil station near his residence under the ruse that we were going to return his computer equipment. Weinhaus answered the cellular telephone and I explained to him that Corporal Mertens and I wanted to return his computer equipment to him

today. Weinhaus immediately suggested that it would have to be a public place and that he did not trust me as he thought this might be a ploy to arrest him. I again assured him that the meeting was to return his computers to him and that I wanted to make it as easy as possible for him. I asked him if we could meet him at the MFA Oil station near his residence on Route K in Piney Park. Weinhaus agreed, but he informed me that he would have several persons with him when he arrived to check things out. I again informed him that only Corporal Mertens and I would be there and we did not want to cause any kind of incident by bringing other people. Weinhaus agreed to meet us in approximately 15 minutes. At this point, a safety briefing was conducted with the additional information that there may be other persons arriving with Weinhaus. While we were waiting a white truck drove into the oil station parking lot and two white male occupants exited the vehicle and began to work on the gutters on the front of the store.

5. A short time later at approximately 1300 hours, I observed a green Subaru passenger vehicle slowing to turn into the north entrance of the parking lot. I immediately recognized the driver as Jeffrey R. Weinhaus and I also observed that he was rapidly removing his seatbelt as he entered the parking lot. Corporal Mertens and I began to exit his patrol vehicle as Weinhaus accelerated through the parking lot and drove in a circular pattern past our vehicle. He abruptly stopped his vehicle past our location as I exited the passenger side of Corporal Mertens' patrol vehicle. I then began to approach the rear of Corporal Mertens' patrol vehicle when I saw Weinhaus had already exited his vehicle. I then noticed that his vehicle was parked in a manner which gave him tactical advantage and an immediate escape route from the parking lot. Weinhaus paused at the driver's door of his vehicle and did not approach our vehicle. I continued towards Weinhaus' location and at this point I began an attempt to engage him in conversation. I had a manila folder in my right hand, which I held up in the air, and stated to Weinhaus that I had the papers right here for him to sign to get his computers back. At this point, I saw him look from left to right as if to look to see who was in the parking lot. Corporal Mertens and I met near the rear of Weinhaus' vehicle as we were both simultaneously approaching Weinhaus on the driver side of his vehicle. I immediately recognized that Weinhaus was not responding to my conversation and he had remained in his stationary position along side of his vehicle. I then asked Corporal Mertens to go to the trunk of his patrol car and open it in an attempt to continue the ruse and to see if Weinhaus would step towards the rear of his vehicle once the trunk was open. I then continued to approach the rear of Weinhaus' vehicle with the file folder in my hand, from this vantage point; I could see that Weinhaus was standing with his body angled toward my location with his right side out of my view. I was able to see both of his hands were empty.

6. I then stepped from the rear of Weinhaus' vehicle with the file folder still in my right hand. Weinhaus then turned toward me exposing his right hip, which had a green U.S. Army issued type holster containing a black in color semi-automatic pistol attached to his belt on his right side. I then began to draw my service pistol from my left side and positioned it at the low ready when I asked Weinhaus in a loud voice Jeff, what are you doing with that gun? Weinhaus replied, "What are you doing with your gun?" I ordered Weinhaus to get on the ground and he refused to comply with my request. I was now standing approximately ten feet away from him. I then saw him reach his right

Notes type
 hand towards his holstered pistol and began to open the flap on the holster and sweep it free of the holster in a drawing motion. I focused on the front sight of my service pistol and I could see the front sight clearly and could see Weinhaus' right hand now resting on the holstered pistol. I immediately recognized that the back drop area behind Weinhaus contained explosive hazardous materials and several persons who were in plain view in front of the MFA Oil Station. I began to step left at an angle away from cover in an attempt to gain a good sight picture with a clear back drop. Weinhaus then paused and began to shake as if he had a cold chill. I then ordered Weinhaus to get his hand off the gun. Weinhaus refused to comply. Weinhaus stated, "You are going to have to shoot me," as he began to draw the pistol with his right hand from the holster on his right hip while keeping his eyes focused on me. I continued to step left at an angle to maintain good sight picture with a clear back drop. I saw Weinhaus' right hand continuing to draw the weapon from the holster as his eyes were fixed on me. At this point, I was in immediate fear for my life and the life of Corporal Mertens. I gained a good sight picture with a clear back drop and as Weinhaus was still continuously drawing the weapon from the holster, I fired two shots to the chest and one shot to the head of Weinhaus.

7. I began to hear screaming from the area of the MFA Oil Station. I began to scan left past Weinhaus' location to determine if there were any additional threats present when I heard a loud gunshot, which I thought came from my right side towards the area of Weinhaus. I then scanned right again toward the area where Weinhaus was standing and I saw his body rotating with his hand still on the weapon. I fired one more shot from my service pistol at Weinhaus simultaneously as I stepped left again in an effort to keep the back drop area clear. Weinhaus immediately fell to the ground and was motionless. I saw that Corporal Mertens was covering my right rear position and I went towards Weinhaus to secure his weapon as I continuously heard screaming from the area of the MFA Oil Station. I then saw that Weinhaus was laying flat on his stomach with the weapon and holster positioned beneath him. The weapon was still in his right hand and partially out of the holster by just a few inches. I did not see his finger or any other hazard near the trigger guard area of the pistol. I grabbed the weapon from the right hand of Weinhaus and jammed it into the holster. I removed the holster from his belt and tossed the green holster and weapon behind me towards Corporal Mertens' location. I then saw that Special Agent Maruschak was rapidly approaching my location and I yelled for him to cover me while I handcuffed Weinhaus with his hands behind his back. I handcuffed Weinhaus and he remained there motionless. I asked Special Agent Maruschak to call 911 for an ambulance when I heard Corporal Mertens indicate he had already contacted Troop C and one was in route. I then began to ask Special Agent Maruschak if anyone else was injured and he replied there were no other persons injured. At this point, I assisted Corporal Mertens in rolling Weinhaus onto his right side, into a recovery position, and Corporal Mertens attempted to give further medical treatment to Weinhaus' injuries. I could see that Weinhaus had suffered a gunshot wound to the head as well as several other wounds to the torso. I asked Corporal Mertens if he had fired his weapon and he indicated to me that he thought he had fired at least one shot from his service pistol at Weinhaus.

8. I then contacted Special Agent Cunningham to determine the status of the others near the oil station. Special Agent Cunningham advised

me that he was secure and he identified witnesses at the scene. I then contacted Lt. George Knowles to inform him of the officer involved shooting incident. A short time later, emergency medical personnel arrived and began to treat Weinhaus for his injuries. Weinhaus was transported from the scene by ambulance for further medical care.

9. This investigation is now continuing by the Missouri State Highway Patrol's Troop C Criminal Investigative unit due to the Troop Investigative unit's officer involved shooting incident.

H. J. Folsom, Sergeant
D/DCC, Troop I Unit


HJF:jlw

cc: GHQ - Troop I File - D/DCC, Troop I Unit - D/DCC, Troop C Unit - Franklin County PA - Franklin County Sheriff's Department - Federal Bureau of Investigations (Rolla).

STATE CONTROL NO.: 12 261 015 017
REPORTING OFFICER: SERGEANT P. L. SMITH 0993
OCCURRENCE TYPE: OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING
CITY: FRANKLIN
DATE/TIME: 09/11/2012
OFFENSE STATUS: INVESTIGATION CONTINUING
LOCATION: FRANKLIN COUNTY
REPORT DATE: 09/12/2012
TROOP OF OCCURRENCE: C
SCENE PROCESSED: N
DDCC AT SCENE: N

WITNESS NAME: FOLSOM, H. J.
ADDRESS: SERGEANT, MISSOURI STATE HWY PATROL
DOB:
PHYSICAL DESC: SEX: RACE:
PHONE NUMBER: HOME WORK

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeffrey R. Weinhaus', written over a horizontal line.

Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Signature above certifies that the foregoing document was forwarded to Bob Parks, PA,
15 S. Church St., Room 204, Union MO 63084 on 3/5/13

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED

MAR 19 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

State of Missouri,

Plaintiff,

vs

Jeffrey R. Weinhaus,

Defendant

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SEVER THE CHARGES

Comes now the Defendant, **Jeffrey R. Weinhaus**, acting Pro Se, and moves this Honorable Court to sever the charges levied against him into three separate cases, pursuant to the court rule and statute controlling joinder, and due to the substantial prejudice Defendant would suffer if the charges remain joined. The Defendant suggests, and prays this court to group the cases as follows; the first case being the charge of tampering with judicial officer (RSMo 565.084), the second case being the two drug charges (RSMo 195.202 and 195.202), and the third being the charges of attempted assault, armed criminal action, and resisting arrest (RSMo 565.081, 571.015, and 575.150.)

As grounds in support thereof, the Defendant states the following:

1. The charges were improperly joined, contrary to Missouri Supreme Court Rule 23.05 and RSMo 545.140.0.

Rule 23.05 states; "All offenses that are of the same or similar character or based on two or more acts that are part of the same transaction or on two or more acts or transactions that are connected

or that constitute parts of a common scheme or plan may be charged in the same indictment or information in separate counts." and RSMo, Section 545.140.2 states; "*Notwithstanding Missouri supreme court rule 24.07, two or more offenses may be charged in the same indictment or information in a separate count for each offense if the offenses charged, whether felonies or misdemeanors or infractions, or any combination thereof, are of the same or similar character or are based on the same act or transaction or on two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan.*" The Missouri Court of Appeals for the Southern District in *State v Smith*, (Mo. App. 2012) stated;

"'Connected' has its ordinary meaning and includes 'united . . . by dependence or relation, or by order in a series' and 'joined or linked together [in] a series, having the parts or elements logically related[.]' *State v. McKinney*, 314 S.W.3d at 341-42 (citing dictionary definitions); see also *State v. McDonald*, 321 S.W.3d 313, 318-19 (Mo.App. 2010) ("connected" includes "things that are joined or linked together in a series or that have logically related parts or elements"). "A common scheme or plan" requires that the offenses "be the product of a single or continuing motive." *State v. Morant*, 758 S.W.2d 110, 114 (Mo.App. 1988)."

In *State v McKinney* (Mo. App. 2009) the Court reminded us "[W]e explained the interplay between evidentiary considerations and the joinder rule in *State v. Buford*, 582 S.W.2d 298 (Mo. App. W.D. 1979)."

"To be properly joined, the offenses must be part of the same transaction or part of a common scheme or plan, because to join offenses otherwise would expose the defendant to prejudice by allowing proof of the commission of unrelated crimes. Thus, to avoid the emasculation of the evidentiary rule, the joinder rule must be construed so *that joinder is*

permitted only when proof or evidence of the commission of one crime must be necessary to the proof of the commission of the other crime." [emphasis added]


The charges, are not all the same or similar, nor are they all part of the same transaction. They are not all connected transactions, nor are they all part of a common scheme or plan. The joining of these cases is repugnant to both the statutory provision and court rule. As such, the Defendant prays this court take judicial notice of the statutory provision and court rule and sever the charges.

2. Pursuant to Missouri Supreme Court Rule 24.07, the Defendant moves this court to sever the charges into separate cases. Even if this court considers that the cases were properly joined (thereby denying the first part of this motion), if tried together, the Defendant would suffer substantial prejudice as a result. RSMo 545.885.2 states that "*substantial prejudice*" shall mean "*a bias or discrimination against the defendant or the state which is actually existing or real and not one which is merely imaginary, illusionary or nominal*". The Defendant asserts that joining the charges of attempted assault on a law enforcement officer (RSMo 565.081), and armed criminal action (RSMo 571.015) (which are alleged to have taken place on 9/11/2012 at one location) with the Tampering with judicial officer (RSMo 565.084) (which allegedly took place on 8/16/2012 at a separate, and an unrelated location) would create a substantial prejudice. In particular, a failure to sever these cases would limit the defendant's ability to testify in his own defense on some charges, while reserving his right to not testify in others. In addition, the jury would surely be unduly influenced by being exposed to separate, and completely unrelated, charges. Further, as this court should recognize, and in the current political climate, the introduction of the alleged use of a firearm by the defendant is bound to severely affect the mindset of jury members improperly influencing them to convict out of fear, and its effect of moving the bar as to what constitutes "reasonable doubt".

The Defendant understands that some courts would assert a requirement, that in order to particularize how the Defendant would be substantially prejudiced, that he should identify what testimony would prejudice him, and how that would influence/effect the other charges. The Defendant finds that to be a bar set too high to reach without the court also violating the Defendant's Fifth Amendment right to not "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself".

WHEREFORE, Defendant moves this court to sever the charges in accordance with the above prayed grouping, or as the court would find to be in accordance with State Law and Court Rule, so as to not prejudice the Defendant.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Signature above certifies that the foregoing document was forwarded to Bob Parks, PA,
15 S. Church St., Room 204, Union MO 63084 on 3/18/13

FILED

SEP 04 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,)
)
v.) Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01
)
JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,)
)
Defendant.)

DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE / MOTION TO EXCLUDE

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as
Defendant's Motion in Limine / Motion to Exclude:

Any mention of the following items before the jury would (a) deny Plaintiff a fair trial,
(b) be inadmissible for any purposes, and (c) cause improper prejudice, wherefore Defendant
moves the court to prohibit the State from either mentioning or referring to the following items in
voir dire, opening statement, examination of witnesses, presentation of evidence, or closing
argument, or at any other time in the presence of the jury:

1. The particulars of Defendant's Bulletinman statements and publications, other than the
Youtube video of August 17, 2012¹, and subsequent Youtube videos viewed by Sgt. H.J.
Folsom prior to Defendant's arrest on September 11, 2012. Defendant's speech is
generally and perhaps commonly known generally to be controversial in nature, anti-
government in subject matter, and hyperbolic in tone, but the particulars of other
statements would be prejudicial to the Defendant and have little to no probative value.

The potential for gross prejudice looms as the jury could convict the Defendant based on

¹ There are two videos of August 17: one with captions, the other without. Defendant has
already moved to dismiss the tampering charge based on the video without captions, since Judge
Parker's name is not mentioned in the speech, and thus the State cannot bring a prosecution
based on an alleged threat to Judge Parker.

a general dislike of the content and tone of his controversial and extreme speech. (This
Granted ✓ Overruled _____

2. Defendant's target shooting at his home. The State plans to call a witness, Defendant's neighbor James Hoffman, to testify as to Defendant and his ex-wife alleged practice of target shooting on their property prior to the September 11, 2013 shooting of Defendant by Highway Patrol trooper Sgt. Folsom. Given that the Highway Patrol admitted that Defendant came to the gas station on September 11 on the ruse that his computers were being returned to Defendant, such evidence is prejudicial to Defendant, suggests a bad intent, propensity and/or state of mind, all with no substantive corroborating evidence, and thus its prejudicial effect outweighs its small probative value. *State v. Barriner*, 34 S.W.3d 139 (Mo.banc, 2000) (citing *State v. Bernard*, 849 S.W.2d 10, 13 (Mo. banc 1993) ("evidence of prior uncharged misconduct is inadmissible for the purpose of showing the propensity of the defendant to commit such crimes.")). Thus James Hoffman should be excluded, or at least precluded from testifying as to the target shooting.

Granted ✓ Overruled _____

3. Judge Kelly Parker's reaction to the shooting. Judge Parker's reaction to Defendant's speech is irrelevant and subjective under an objective First Amendment analysis and the case law briefed in "Defendant's motion to dismiss the tampering with judicial officer charge based on defect in the institution of the prosecution." It also is likely to be given too much weight and importance by a jury, and thus its prejudicial effect far outweighs its probative value.

Granted ✓ Overruled ✓
shooting *speech*

4. Uniformed law enforcement officers (with or without weapons) as spectators in the courtroom. Defendant anticipates that the State will seek to paint him as an attempted cop killer. Accordingly, the *en masse* presence of uniformed law enforcement officers, with or without weapons, as spectators in the courtroom is inherently prejudicial because it may create an outside influence on the jury, affecting the presumption of innocence necessary for a fair trial and impacting the harshness of the sentence imposed. *State v. Johnson*, SC92448 (Jul. 16, 2013) (Breckenridge, J., dissent at 6-12) (citing *Ward v. State*, 105 So. 3d 3 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2012); *Shootes v. State*, 20 So. 3d 434 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2009) (*see also Id.*, fn. 4.)). If the officers appear at trial in uniform, and particularly with weapons, then the jurors will then conclude that the officers are more trustworthy than Defendant. Law enforcement officers should therefore be prohibited from appearing in court either in uniform or with weapons. Further, any law enforcement witnesses endorsed by the State should be excluded from the courtroom until they are called for testimony.

Granted _____ Overruled ☒

5. Any prior criminal convictions. Defendant has certain misdemeanor convictions: 2003 for harassment; 2006 for trespassing; and a 2007 Suspended Execution of Sentence (SES) for assaulting a police officer. That evidence is more prejudicial than probative of Defendant's intent here, if used improperly. *See generally State v. Nelson*, 178 S.W.3d 638 (Mo. 2005); *State v. Helm*, 892 S.W.2d 743, 745 (Mo. App. E.D. 1994) ("trial courts should be wary of evidence of other crimes due to the highly prejudicial character of such evidence."); *State v. Burns*, 978 S.W.2d 759, 761 (Mo. banc 1998) ("showing the defendant's propensity to commit a given crime is not a proper purpose for admitting

evidence, because such evidence "may encourage the jury to convict the defendant because of his propensity to commit such crimes without regard to whether he is actually guilty of the crime charged."");

Granted ☒ Overruled ☐

6. Voir dire prohibition. At the voir dire stage, the State cannot discuss the Defendant's prior offenses, or his potential punishment if convicted.

Granted ☒ Overruled ☐

7. Undisclosed evidence or witnesses. The State cannot bring any evidence or witnesses that have not been disclosed to Defendant. The Court may revisit this issue only if the State seeks to bring evidence in rebuttal to Defendant's case.

Granted ☒ Overruled ☐


8. Other civil actions involving Defendant. Any and all other civil actions involving Defendant are irrelevant, particularly the details of his two divorces, as well as an ongoing foreclosure proceeding, and additionally their probative value on issues in dispute is zero and their prejudicial effect would be immense. Defendant concedes that he and the State may note that he is divorced.

Granted ☒ Denied ☐

9. Defendant reserves the right to move further *in limine* based on the State's proposed evidence at trial.

WHEREFORE Defendant prays this Court SUSTAIN his motion in limine/motion to exclude, and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorney for Defendant



Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

So Ordered,



Hon. Keith M. Sutherland, Circuit Judge

Date:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on 9/03, 2013 (s)he served this document on:
Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084



The method(s) of service: by first class mail.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED
AUG - 6 2013
BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.G.

STATE OF MISSOURI,)
)
v.) Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01
)
JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,)
)
Defendant.)

**DEFENDANT'S VERIFIED ANNOUNCEMENT OF READY AND
MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL**

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and under
(a) the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, (b) Article 1, § 18(a)
of the Missouri Constitution, and (c) RSMo. 545.780:

1. Announces that Defendant is ready for trial¹, and
2. Moves for a speedy trial.²
3. Defendant affirms that his life is disrupted by his arrest and the presence of unresolved criminal charges.³
4. Further, there are numerous witnesses to the events in question and delay may cause them to misremember the events, or to move or die and thus be unavailable for trial.
5. A delay of more than seven months is presumptively prejudicial for a case of this nature.⁴

WHEREFORE, Defendant requests a speedy trial.

¹ *State ex rel. McKee v. Riley*, 240 S.W.2d 720, 729 (Mo.2007)


² *Id.*

³ *Id.* at 728.

⁴ *Id.* at 729 and *State v. Bolin*, 643 S.W.2d 806, 814 (Mo.1983).

I hereby verify and affirm that I have read and understood this document. I declare under oath and under penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge all the statements in the document are true and correct.

are true and correct.



Jeffrey R. Weinhaus

State of Missouri)
County of Franklin) ss

HUGH ATHELSTAN EASTWOOD
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for St. Louis County
My Commission Expires: Dec. 22, 2014
COMMISSION #10127298

Subscribed and sworn before me this 6 day of August, 2013.

Notary Public

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant

Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 16
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
theastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on 3/06, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084

The method(s) of service: by hand.

FILED
JUL 23 2013
BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,)
)
v.) Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01
)
JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,)
)
Defendant.)

DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as his second motion to sever offenses:

Introduction

Improper joinder, and failure to sever charges, involve a two-step analysis. *State v. Love*, 293 S.W.3d 471, 475 (Mo.App. E.D.2009). First, the court determines whether joinder of the charges is proper as a matter of law. *Id.* If joinder is not proper, then prejudice is presumed and severance of the charges is mandatory. *Id.* If, on the other hand, joinder is proper, "severance is within the trial court's discretion." *Id.*

I. Three distinct, unrelated events fail nexus requirement for Rule 23.05 joinder

Defendant has been charged with serious felony offenses occurring weeks apart, without any common characteristic, tactics, transactions, connectedness, or common scheme or plan nexus as required by the various prongs of Rule 23.05. It would be substantially prejudicial to Defendant's due process right to a fair trial to submit all the charges to a single jury in a single proceeding.

Particularly:

1. Defendant is charged with Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo: 565.084, for a August 16, 2012 Youtube video posted to the world wide web from Defendant's computer. (The "August 16 Youtube charge")
2. Defendant is charged with each of (1) Possession Of Controlled Substance Except 35 Grams Or Less Of Marijuana { Felony C RSMo: 195.202 }, and (2) Possession Of Up To 35 Grams Marijuana { Misdemeanor A RSMo: 195.202 } based on a subsequent search of Defendant's home on August 17, 2012. That search warrant was issued on August 17, 2012 *only* because trooper Sgt. Folsom of the Missouri Highway Patrol claimed he smelled marijuana on Defendant's breath and generally in the curtilage of his front porch. *See* Ex. 1 (Police Report) (The "August 17 drug charges")
3. Defendant is charged with 5 felony counts related to his September 11, 2012 arrest at a gas station: (1) Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off, Emrgncy Prsnl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wkr, Cble Wkr Or P&P Offer - 1st Degr { Felony A RSMo: 565.081 }, (2) Armed Criminal Action { Felony Unclassified RSMo: 571.015 }, (3) Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off, Emrgncy Prsnl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wkr, Cble Wkr Or P&P Offer - 1st Degr { Felony A RSMo: 565.081 }, (4) Armed Criminal Action { Felony Unclassified RSMo: 571.015 }, and (5) Resisting/Interfering With Arrest For A Felony { Felony D RSMo: 575.150 }. (The "September 11th arrest-related charges")

a. Discussion

Joinder is proper where the charged offenses are of the same or similar character, are based on two or more connected acts or transactions, or are part of a common scheme or plan.

RSMo. 545.140.2; Rule 23.05; *Love*, 293 S.W.3d at 475. Rule 23.05 states that joinder is proper where the manner in which the crimes were committed:

are of the same or similar character or based on two or more acts that are part of the same transaction or on two or more acts or transactions that are connected or that constitute parts of a common scheme or plan may be charged in the same indictment or information in separate counts.

In the interest of judicial economy, Missouri courts favor liberal joinder of offenses. *State v.*

Dizer, 119 S.W.3d 156, 161 (Mo.App. E.D.2003). In applying the rule and the statute's

requirement of "connectedness," courts use the ordinary, dictionary definition. *State v.*

Bechhold, 65 S.W.3d 591, 594-95 (Mo. App. 2002). That is, "connectedness" requires things

that are joined or linked together in a series or that have logically related parts or elements. *State*

v. McDonald, 321 S.W.3d 313, 318 (Mo.App.S.D. 2010).

Joinder is improper here. There is nothing as to the character, connectedness, or common scheme or plan as to each of the three above fact patterns to link the Youtube, drug, and arrest-related charges. The Youtube charges are based on politically extreme public statements by the Defendant in a public forum on the internet as to alleged official and judicial corruption. The drug charges are based on a visit and subsequent search warrant served by Missouri Highway Patrol troopers to the Defendant's home. The arrest-related charges are based on the shooting of Defendant incident to his arrest nearly a month later where, by the troopers' own admission, they lured Defendant to a gas station on the pretext that they were returning his computer equipment to him.

There are no "similar circumstances" here; there is no "same transaction" here; nor are there two or more "acts or transactions that are connected or that constitute part of a common scheme or plan" by Defendant. (That they may be part of a common investigation by the troopers irrelevant.) Therefore, *each prong fails* for Rule 23.05 joinder to survive, particularly in light of the prejudice to Defendant. It would be substantially prejudicial to the Defendant to have three separate, discrete, unrelated incidents submitted to one jury in one proceeding.

Due process of law requires that the defendant's right to a fair trial must be given priority over considerations of expense, efficiency and convenience. *State v. Townes*, 941 S.W.2d 756, 758 (Mo. App. E.D., 1997). The State's interest in the convenience of calling prosecution witnesses, for example, is not a legitimate factor in favor of joinder.

Given that there are eight offenses, occurring over three days separated in time by nearly a month, and given the complexity of the evidence—ranging from Defendant's August 16 public political speech, to his August 17 alleged possession of drugs, to the September 11 shooting of Defendant by the troopers at a gas station a month later—a jury could not reasonably distinguish the evidence and apply the law to each separate offense. *State v. Vinson*, 834 S.W.2d 824, 827 (Mo.App. E.D.1992). This is particularly true because the *same* troopers were involved in each incident, but the underlying facts are unrelated and distinct. Further, the offenses involve dissimilar victims, dissimilar tactics, and dissimilar locations (as to the August and September incidents), and were not proximate in time. That too, counsels this Court to sever the offenses. *State v. French*, 308 SW 3d 266, 271 (Mo. App., 2010).

The State has previously suggested that *McDonald*, 321 S.W.3d at 318 is apposite because of its facts. It is not. In *McDonald*, the charges were linked by the Defendant's four-day crime spree in which he stole credit cards, a van, and then assaulted the arresting officer who was attempting to apprehend him. Those facts are readily distinguishable from the facts above.

Defendant made a Youtube video on August 16 and broadcast it. That was separate from the possession of marijuana and a morphine tablet for which a search warrant was issued after Sgt. Folsom smelled the pot on August 17. And both events were very separate and did not directly connect in time to Defendant's arrest on September 11 under the ruse of returning his computers. Simply put, there was no crime spree, nor logical connection between the crimes.

The facts here are also distinguishable from the cases cited by *McDonald*, e.g., *Morrow*, 968 S.W.2d at 109 (murder, robbery, stealing a car, and stealing a purse all sufficiently connected for joinder); *Nichols*, 200 S.W.3d at 119-20 (continuous chain of activity, burglaries leading to sale of contraband and drugs, directly leading to Defendant's arrest); *Bechhold*, 65 S.W.3d at 594-95 (attempting to manufacture meth and tampering with motor vehicle linked since car transported the items to the meth cooking site).

II. In the alternative, if joinder is proper, the Court can and should sever for a fair trial and the avoidance of substantial prejudice under Rule 24.07

In the alternative, if the Court finds joinder to be proper, the Court is in its discretion can find that the public notoriety of Defendant's political speech and public statements demands that Defendant can only be afforded a fair trial and avoid substantial prejudice if the three sets of charges are severed, or at least the August and September charges are severed. The severance of criminal offenses is governed by RSMo. 545.885 and Rule 24.07.

The threat of substantial prejudice is real. Defendant faces being put on trial on all eight charges prejudiced by the shadow of his extreme political views as broadcast in the Youtube video, which some or many jurors may find repugnant or reprehensible. Further, Defendant intends to introduce evidence at trial of his other Youtube and paper "Bulletinman" publications to further place his Youtube tape of August 16 in context of his other public statements and lack of violent history.¹ Defendant's prior speech is controversial in nature and contain statements against public corruption and immorality by groups ranging from Jews to law enforcement to


¹ "Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the charge of Tampering with Judicial Officer based on Defect in the Institution of the Prosecution" will brief the issue of how Defendant's do not constitute a true threat under the Eight Circuit factors set forth in *United States v. Dinwiddie*, 76 F.3d 913 (8th Cir. 1996). Further, First Amend. speech on matters of public corruption is to be evaluated for its public concern, which includes the factors of content, form and context. *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 749, 761.

British citizens and their Royal Family. In essence, the need to place Defendant's extremist but protected political speech in context will also surely make the jury dislike the Defendant even more.

WHEREFORE Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus moves this Court to SUSTAIN his second motion to sever offenses, and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant




Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on July 23, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084



The method(s) of service: by hand.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED

AUG - 6 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS.

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

DEFENDANT'S AMENDED SECOND MOTION TO SEVER OFFENSES

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as his amended second motion to sever offenses:

Defendant's undersigned counsel files this amended motion to correct two dating errors.

The substance of the motion is the same.

Introduction

Improper joinder, and failure to sever charges, involve a two-step analysis. *State v. Love*, 293 S.W.3d 471, 475 (Mo.App. E.D.2009). First, the court determines whether joinder of the charges is proper as a matter of law. *Id.* If joinder is not proper, then prejudice is presumed and severance of the charges is mandatory. *Id.* If, on the other hand, joinder is proper, "severance is within the trial court's discretion." *Id.*

I. Three distinct, unrelated events fail nexus requirement for Rule 23.05 joinder

Defendant has been charged with serious felony offenses occurring weeks apart, without any common characteristic, tactics, transactions, connectedness, or common scheme or plan nexus as required by the various prongs of Rule 23.05. It would be substantially prejudicial to Defendant's due process right to a fair trial to submit all the charges to a single jury in a single proceeding.

Particularly:

1. Defendant is charged with Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo: 565.084, for a August 16, 2012 Youtube video posted to the world wide web from Defendant's computer. (The "August 16 Youtube charge")
2. Defendant is charged with each of (1) Possession Of Controlled Substance Except 35 Grams Or Less Of Marijuana { Felony C RSMo: 195.202 }, and (2) Possession Of Up To 35 Grams Marijuana { Misdemeanor A RSMo: 195.202 } based on a subsequent search of Defendant's home on August 17, 2012. That search warrant was issued on August 22, 2012 *only* because trooper Sgt. Folsom of the Missouri Highway Patrol claimed he smelled marijuana on Defendant's breath and generally in the curtilage of his front porch. *See* Ex. 1 (Police Report) (The "August 22 drug charges")
3. Defendant is charged with the following counts related to his September 11, 2012 conduct as officers attempted to serve a current warrant at a gas station¹: (1) Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off, Emrgncy Persnsl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wrkr, Cble Wrkr Or P&P Offer - 1st Degr { Felony A RSMo: 565.081 }, (2) Armed Criminal Action { Felony Unclassified RSMo: 571.015 }, (3) Assault/Attempt Assault - LEO, Corr Off, Emrgncy Persnsl, Hwy Wkr, Utility Wrkr, Cble Wrkr Or P&P Offer - 1st Degr { Felony A RSMo: 565.081 }, (4) Armed Criminal Action { Felony Unclassified RSMo: 571.015 }, (5) Resisting/Interfering With Arrest For A Felony { Felony D RSMo: 575.150 }. (The "September 11th arrest-related charges")

a. **Discussion**

¹ Defendant was not arrested until September 1, 2013 after a lengthy hospitalization at St. John's Mercy Hospital in St. Louis County recovering from shooting wounds caused by Missouri State Highway Patrol troopers.

Joinder is proper where the charged offenses are of the same or similar character, are based on two or more connected acts or transactions, or are part of a common scheme or plan.

RSMo. 545.140.2; Rule 23.05; *Love*, 293 S.W.3d at 475. Rule 23.05 states that joinder is proper where the manner in which the crimes were committed:

are of the same or similar character or based on two or more acts that are part of the same transaction or on two or more acts or transactions that are connected or that constitute parts of a common scheme or plan may be charged in the same indictment or information in separate counts.

In the interest of judicial economy, Missouri courts favor liberal joinder of offenses. *State v. Dizer*, 119 S.W.3d 156, 161 (Mo.App. E.D.2003). In applying the rule and the statute's requirement of "connectedness," courts use the ordinary, dictionary definition. *State v. Bechhold*, 65 S.W.3d 591, 594-95 (Mo. App. 2002). That is, "connectedness" requires things that are joined or linked together in a series or that have logically related parts or elements. *State v. McDonald*, 321 S.W.3d 313, 318 (Mo.App.S.D. 2010).

Joinder is improper here. There is nothing as to the character, connectedness, or common scheme or plan as to each of the three above fact patterns to link the Youtube, drug, and arrest-related charges. The Youtube charges are based on politically extreme public statements by the Defendant in a public forum on the internet as to alleged official and judicial corruption. The drug charges are based on a visit and subsequent search warrant served by Missouri Highway Patrol troopers to the Defendant's home. The arrest-related charges are based on the shooting of Defendant incident to his attempted arrest nearly a month later where, by the troopers' own admission, they lured Defendant to a bus station on the false pretext that they were returning his computer equipment to him.

There are no "similar circumstances" here; there is no "same transaction" here; nor are there two or more "acts or transactions that are connected or that constitute part of a common

scheme or plan” by Defendant. (That they may be part of a common investigation by the troopers irrelevant.) Therefore, *each prong fails* for Rule 23.05 joinder to survive, particularly in light of the prejudice to Defendant. It would be substantially prejudicial to the Defendant to have three separate, discrete, unrelated incidents submitted to one jury in one proceeding.

Due process of law requires that the defendant's right to a fair trial must be given priority over considerations of expense, efficiency, and convenience. *State v. Townes*, 941 S.W.2d 756, 758 (Mo. App. E.D., 1997). The State's interest in the convenience of calling prosecution witnesses, for example, is not a legitimate factor in favor of joinder.

Given that there are eight offenses, occurring over three days separated in time by nearly a month, and given the complexity of the evidence—ranging from Defendant's August 16 public political speech, to his August 17 alleged possession of drugs, to the September 11 shooting of Defendant by the troopers at a gas station a month later—a jury could not reasonably distinguish the evidence and apply the law to each separate offense. *State v. Vinson*, 834 S.W.2d 824, 827 (Mo.App. E.D.1992). This is particularly true because the *same* troopers were involved in each incident, but the underlying facts are unrelated and distinct. Further, the offenses involve dissimilar victims, dissimilar tactics, and dissimilar locations (as to the August and September incidents), and were not proximate in time. That too, counsels this Court to sever the offenses. *State v. French*, 308 SW 3d 266, 277 (Mo. App., 2010).

The State has previously suggested that *McDonald*, 321 S.W.3d at 318 is apposite because of its facts. It is not. In *McDonald*, the charges were linked by the Defendant's four-day crime spree in which he stole credit cards, cash, and then assaulted the arresting officer who was attempting to apprehend him. These facts are readily distinguishable from the facts above.

Defendant made a Youtube video on August 16 and broadcast it. That was separate from the possession of marijuana and a morphine tablet for which a search warrant was issued after Sgt. Folsom smelled the pot on August 22. And both events were very separate and did not directly connect in time to the attempt to arrest Defendant on September 11 under the ruse of returning his computers. Simply put, there was no crime spree, nor logical connection between the crimes. The facts here are also distinguishable from the cases cited by *McDonald, e.g., Morrow*, 968 S.W.2d at 109 (murder, robbery, stealing a car, and stealing a purse all sufficiently connected for joinder); *Nichols*, 200 S.W.3d at 119-20 (continuous chain of activity, burglaries leading to sale of contraband and drugs directly leading to Defendant's arrest); *Bechhold*, 65 S.W.3d at 594-95 (attempting to manufacture meth and tampering with motor vehicle linked since car transported the items to the meth cooking site).

II. In the alternative, if joinder is proper, the Court can and should sever for a fair trial and the avoidance of substantial prejudice under Rule 24.07

In the alternative, if the Court finds joinder to be proper, the Court is in its discretion can find that the public notoriety of Defendant's political speech and public statements demands that Defendant can only be afforded a fair trial and avoid substantial prejudice if the three sets of charges are severed, or at least the August and September charges are severed. The severance of criminal offenses is governed by RSC 545.885 and Rule 24.07.


The threat of substantial prejudice is real. Defendant faces being put on trial on all eight charges prejudiced by the shadow of his extreme political views as broadcast in the Youtube video, which some or many jurors may find repugnant or reprehensible. Further, Defendant intends to introduce evidence at trial of his other Youtube and paper "1000toman" publications to further place his Youtube tape of August 16 in context of his other public statements and lack

of violent history.² Defendant's prior speech is controversial in nature and contain statements against public corruption and immorality by groups ranging from Jews to law enforcement to British citizens and their Royal Family. In essence, the need to place Defendant's extremist but protected political speech in context will also surely make the jury dislike the Defendant even more.

WHEREFORE Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus moves this Court to SUSTAIN his second motion to sever offenses, and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant



Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1600
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on August 7, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084



The method(s) of service: by hand.

² "Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the charge of Tampering with Judicial Officer based on Defect in the Institution of the Prosecution" briefs the issue of how Defendant's do not constitute a true threat under the Eight Circuit factors set forth in *United States v. Dinwiddie*, 76 F.3d 913 (8th Cir. 1996). Further, First Amend. speech on matters of public corruption is to be evaluated for its public concern, which includes the factors of content, form and context. *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 438 U.S. 749, 761.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED

AUG - 6 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING WITH
JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROSECUTION**

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as his Rule 24.04(b) motion to dismiss the charge of Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo. 565.084, for defect in the institution of the prosecution:

I. Judicial Tampering Charge

1. Defendant was charged in the Amended Indictment, *inter alia*, with Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C, RSMo. 565.084.
2. Defendant hereby moves to dismiss that charge on the basis that as a matter of law his speech is protected by the First Amendment and does not rise to the level of a reasonable threat to any Judicial Officer, and thus—particularly as it is colorful and unpopular political speech nevertheless granted constitutional protection—his speech cannot go to a jury.
3. Defendant also moves to dismiss that charge because the statements were conditional and in nature and thus as a matter of law do not rise to a true threat.

II. Facts

4. The *actus reus* alleged is a Youtube video published to the world wide web on August 17, 2012, featuring Defendant and entitled "Bulletinman Broadcast 8-16-12 The Party's

Over! With Notes," *available at*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qHw0sDThkN8&list=UUzc6JzO6mcusCX-YtNj02ug&index=7>.

5. (There is also a second video that does not feature captions. It appears from discovery that both were reviewed by the State and both were reviewed by the arresting troopers whose probable cause statements formed the basis of Defendant's arrest warrant. Since the second video, lacking captions, does not mention Judge Kelly Parker, any prosecution based on the second video fails as a matter of law since there is no evidence to support a finding of probable cause, let alone guilt.)
6. The written caption on the Youtube page is:

Explicit but oh so true. Bulletinman has had enough of the Insanity. Constitution day is September 17th and September 14th will be the last day of the Defacto Court. You all is fired and will be considered trespassers after that time. The power belongs to be people and we got an easy 70% that say you got to go. We the People now realize just what a fraud the Court is not only upon itself but the Constitution, the People and GOD Almighty. No victim no crime. No justice no peace. Know JESUS know peace. Where the Spirit of the LORD is there is Liberty.
7. Defendant begins the video with statements on various matters of public concern such as the poor state of the economy and unemployment.
8. The video threatens that the People will "fire" various Missouri officials including the State Courts Administrator, elected Circuit Judges, lawyers and policemen through a "Redress and Revocation Petition" on 9-11-2012.
9. At 1:17 Defendant generally references corrupt officials and "my right to blast you motherfuckers out of there if we have to. I don't want to come down to that. I really don't."

10. At 2:04 he states generally “we have the right to remove you use of force. Now, we’re not going to go out and kill you like you do other people.”
11. Defendant states at 8:33 that “I’m being generous in a giving you a month to do it,” which the Court can infer to mean the time frame for the above-described people to resign.
12. A text caption appears at 8:40 that cites Mo. Const. sec. 3, particularly as to the right of the people “to alter and abolish their Constitution and form of government whenever they may deem it necessary ...”
13. Defendant then states at 8:50-9:10 that elected officials who resist will be arrested, tried by treason by a jury of their peers, and executed for treason and other crimes against the American people.
14. The video is 9:38 minutes long.
15. Defendant references a laundry list of judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, court clerks, etc., some with particularity and some without.
16. Nowhere does Defendant himself threaten to arrest, try or execute any person.
17. Particularly, nowhere does Defendant state the name of Judge Kelly Parker of Crawford County.
18. Judge Parker’s name appears briefly in a caption at 2:47, some six minutes before Defendant’s statements about occupying the court house and putting officials on trial for treason.
19. Other officials are named besides Judge Parker in a laundry list, lessening to each of a reasonable speaker and a reasonable listener that Judge Parker is being singled out among the allegedly corrupt officials.

20. The foregoing features a caption stating "Bill of Rights 6," presumably the Sixth Amend., U.S. Const.
21. At 9:20 the Defendant accuses the U.S. government of killing 55 million babies, which the Court can infer to mean a reference to legalized abortion.
22. The video is part of a recurring series of print publications and broadcasts issued by Defendant as a citizen journalist since 1996. *See, e.g., Exs. 1-B* (Bulletinman print publication), authenticated by *Ex. 1-A* (Affidavit of Judy Kropf). Particularly, Bulletinman videos have been broadcast on Youtube since 2009, *at* <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>.
23. The overall thrust and dominant theme of Bulletinman publications and broadcasts are statements (oft expressed humorously and vulgarly) as to matters of public concern, particularly that:
 - a. Most Missouri elected officials including elected judges are corrupt and subverting the Constitution, and
 - b. The sovereign People pursuant to the Constitution have a right to "fire" elected officials, to try them for treason according to due process by a jury of their peers, and to execute them if found guilty of treason.
24. The correctness or error of the Bulletinman statements is irrelevant to this analysis.
25. The World Wide Web, which anyone may access at anytime with an internet connection, is an archetypal public forum.
26. Defendant has no prior record of provoking violence pursuant to the Bulletinman publications.
27. Defendant has no criminal history other than minor traffic violations.

III. The First Amendment prohibits criminal prosecution of Defendant's speech

28. RSMo. 565.084 prohibits speech that would threaten harm to a judicial officer or his immediate family, insofar affects ability of judicial officer to carry out his duties.
29. In context, a reasonable person cannot take Defendant's speech to be a true threat or fighting words to Judge Parker.
30. In the alternative, in the totality of the circumstances, Defendant's speech is protected by the First Amendment.
31. The Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment—"Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech"—as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment can defeat as a matter of law charges of tampering or harassment that do not constitute a true threat or a reasonable apprehension of harm. *See, e.g., State v. Wooden*, No. SC92846 (Jan. 8, 2013). That is particularly true in the context here where Defendant is a citizen journalist and blogger with a long history of lively and sometimes offensive critical statements against elected officials, but no record of violence.
32. (First Amendment analysis of political speech of public concern is appropriate also under the free speech provision of Mo. Const., art. I, sec. 8. Missouri's free speech rights track those of the federal Constitution.)
33. Defendant's speech is a matter of public concern, as determined by all the circumstances of the case. "[S]peech on 'matters of public concern' ... is 'at the heart of the First Amendment's protection.'" *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U. S. 749, 758-759 (1985) (opinion of Powell, J.) (quoting *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U. S. 765, 776 (1978)). The First Amendment reflects "a profound national

commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open.” *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U. S. 254, 270 (1964). That is because “speech concerning public affairs is more than self-expression; it is the essence of self-government.” *Garrison v. Louisiana*, 379 U. S. 64, 74-75 (1964). Accordingly, “speech on public issues occupies the highest rung of the hierarchy of First Amendment values, and is entitled to special protection.” *Connick v. Myers*, 461 U. S. 138, 145 (1983) (internal quotation marks omitted).

34. Although the boundaries of what constitutes speech on matters of public concern are not well defined, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that speech is of public concern when it can “be fairly considered as relating to any matter of political, social, or other concern to the community,” *id.* at 146, or when it “is a subject of general interest and of value and concern to the public,” *San Diego v. Roe*, 543 U. S. 77, 83-84. A statement’s arguably “inappropriate or controversial character... is irrelevant to the question whether it deals with a matter of public concern.” *Rankin v. McPherson*, 483 U. S. 378, 387.
35. To determine whether speech is of public or private concern, this Court must independently examine the “‘content, form, and context,’” of the speech “‘as revealed by the whole record.’” *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U. S. 749, 761. In considering content, form, and context, no factor is dispositive, and it is necessary to evaluate all aspects of the speech.
36. Speech deals with matters of public concern when it can “be fairly considered as relating to any matter of political, social, or other concern to the community,” *Connick, supra*, at 146, or when it “is a subject of legitimate news interest; that is, a subject of general interest and of value and concern to the public,” *San Diego, supra*, at 83-84. *See Cox*

Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U. S. 469, 492-494 (1975); *Time, Inc. v. Hill*, 385 U. S. 374, 387 (1967). The arguably “inappropriate or controversial character of a statement is irrelevant to the question whether it deals with a matter of public concern.”

Rankin v. McPherson, 483 U. S. 378, 387 (1987).

37. The “content” of Defendant’s video plainly relates to broad issues of interest to society at large, rather than matters of “purely private concern.” *Dun & Bradstreet, supra*, at 759.
38. While the tone of these messages may fall short of refined social or political commentary, the issues the video highlights—the American economy and unemployment, elected official and elected judicial corruption, abortion—are matters of public import. The video broadcasts Defendant’s statements on those issues, in a manner designed to reach as broad a public audience as possible.
39. Judge Kelly Parker’s name appears in a pop-up caption at 2:47 in the video, some six minutes before the alleged threat made by Defendant at 8:50-9:10. Even if the video is viewed as containing a message related to Judge Kelly Parker specifically, that would not change the fact that the overall thrust and dominant theme of Defendant’s video spoke to broader public issues than Judge Parker. That is particularly true as other law enforcement and elected officials are also listed by name in pop-up captions.
40. Given that Defendant’s speech was in a public forum on a matter of public concern, that speech is entitled to “special protection” under the First Amendment. Such speech cannot be restricted merely because it is upsetting or arouses contempt. “If there is a bedrock principle underlying the First Amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable.” *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U. S. 397, 414 (1989). Indeed, “the point of all

speech protection ... is to shield just those choices of content that in someone's eyes are misguided, or even hurtful." *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston, Inc.*, 515 U. S. 557, 574 (1995).

41. Nor can the State argue that Defendant's video must go to the jury because the speech is outrageous. "Outrageousness" is a highly malleable standard with "an inherent subjectiveness about it which would allow a jury to impose liability on the basis of the jurors' tastes or views, or perhaps on the basis of their dislike of a particular expression." *Hustler*, 485 U. S., at 55 (internal quotation marks omitted). In a case such as this, a jury is "unlikely to be neutral with respect to the content of [the] speech," posing "a real danger of becoming an instrument for the suppression of ... 'vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasan[t]'" expression. *Bose Corp.*, 466 U. S., at 510 (quoting *New York Times*, 376 U. S., at 270).
42. Such a risk is unacceptable; "in public debate [we] must tolerate insulting, and even outrageous, speech in order to provide adequate 'breathing space' to the freedoms protected by the First Amendment." *Boos v. Barry*, 485 U. S. 312, 322 (1988) (some internal quotation marks omitted).
43. What Defendant said, in the whole context of how and where he chose to say it, is entitled to "special protection" under the First Amendment, and that protection cannot be overcome by a potential jury finding that the video was outrageous.
44. The purpose of free speech is to invite dispute, even where it incites people to anger; in fact, the provocative and inflammatory content of speech can potentially be seen as positive. *Terminiello v. City of Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949) (Douglas, J.).

45. “The Constitution is not neutral. It was designed to take the government off the backs of the people.” Justice William O. Douglas, *The Court Years* at 8 (1980).
46. Defendant concedes that free speech does not permit “fighting words”, *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 315 U.S. 568 (1942) (upholding conviction for breach of peace where Appellant verbally attacked a marshal by shouting “you’re a damned Fascist” in a public street).
47. But here, as discussed *infra*, we are dealing not with fighting words but rather with an alleged true threat, that is, speech that would put a reasonable person in apprehension of harm.
48. Under the totality of the circumstances—the form, content and context—Defendant’s speech does not objectively constitute fighting words, nor does it put Judge Parker or anyone else in a reasonable apprehension of harm by threatening to interfere with the performance of Judge Parker’s judicial duties.

IV. Defendant’s speech in context is hyperbole, not literal

49. Defendant’s speech is hyperbolic in tone, not literal. Hyperbole is marked by the use of exaggeration as a rhetorical device or figure of speech. It may be used to evoke strong feelings or to create a strong impression, but is not meant to be taken literally.
50. In our tradition of criticism of public officials, this Court can take judicial notice that hyperbolic statements against public officials have been routinely made both generally and with particularity but do not necessarily intend what their plain language states:
- a. In 2010, former Gov. Sarah Palin (R-AS) produced a political ad putting certain U.S. congressmen “in the crosshairs” and showing a map of congressional seats

with a rifle scope view superimposed and a list of the congressmen. *See* Jeff Muskus, *Sarah Palin's PAC Puts Gun Sights On Democrats She's Targeting In 2010*, Huffington Post, Jan. 9, 2011, at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/03/24/sarah-palins-pac-puts-gun_n_511433.html); *see also* Gabrielle Giffords was on Sarah Palin's crosshairs map – A history of violent words used against Giffords, S.F. Sentinel, Jan. 9, 2011, available at <http://www.sanfranciscosentinel.com/?p=102900>).

- i. U.S. Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-AZ) was among those targeted by Palin's speech.
 - ii. Giffords was later shot by a mentally ill individual named Jared Loughner, who subsequently pleaded guilty to various related felonies. *U.S. v. Loughner*, 11CR-187TUC (D.Az.).
 - iii. A reasonable person would not believe Gov. Palin advocated the actual shooting of any congressman, including Rep. Giffords.
 - iv. Gov. Palin has never been charged with a crime.
- b. Scientifically reliable and widely accepted polling indicates some 29 percent of Americans think that an armed revolution in order to protect liberties might be necessary in the next few years, with another five percent unsure. In light of such popular views, Defendant's speech can be read either as a hyperbolic extrapolation of such a belief, or as a statement referencing a popular sentiment—but in context not as a direct threat by Defendant to Judge Parker. *See Beliefs about Sandy Hook Cover-Up, Coming Revolution Underlie Divide On Gun*

Control, Fairleigh Dickinson Poll (Mar. 31, 2013), available at <http://publicmind.fdu.edu/2013/guncontrol/>.

51. Here, given the lengthy history of Defendant's hyperbolic publications and broadcasts against public officials, a reasonable person would not view the video in context as an actual threat to try and then execute Judge Kelly Parker.
52. The particular reaction of Judge Kelly Parker to the video is irrelevant to this analysis as such a reaction is subjective and has nothing to do with the objection reasonableness of Defendant's speech.
53. It appears that the State concurs with the foregoing, as it has not designated Judge Parker as a trial witness. Defendant has not designated Judge Parker as a witness either in his supplemented disclose to the State.

V. Defendant's statements are conditional, and do not constitute a true threat under the subjective/objective factors of *Dinwiddie* analysis

54. True threats do not merit First Amendment protection. *Watts v. United States*, 394 U.S. 705 (1969).
55. In evaluating whether speech is a true threat, this Court must be guided by the multi-factor analysis set forth by the Eighth Circuit in *United States v. Dinwiddie*, 76 F.3d 913 (8th Cir. 1996). The factors include:
 - a. The reaction of the recipient of the threat and of other listeners,
 - b. Whether the threat was conditional,
 - c. Whether the threat was communicated directly to its victim,

- d. Whether the maker of the threat had made similar statements to the victim in the past, and
 - e. Whether the victim had reason to believe that the maker of the threat had a propensity to engage in violence.
56. Defendant's video does not constitute a true threat under this analysis.
- a. Under the reasonable listener test, *United States v. J.H.H.*, 22 F.3d 821, 827-28 (8th Cir. 1994), given the entire factual context, the recipient of the alleged threat could not reasonably conclude that it expresses "a determination or intent to injure presently or in the future."
 - b. The speech was conditional.
 - c. The speech was not communicated directly to Judge Parker.
 - d. Defendant had made no prior speech directed at Judge Parker.
 - e. Defendant had no propensity to engage in violence, had no criminal record, and was not viewed as a dangerous person by the Missouri troopers who executed his arrest warrant. *See* Depo. of Folsom, at 30:21-22.
57. The conditionality of defendant's speech is particularly important to the analysis. The court can reasonably surmise that Defendant's intention was not to intimidate or frighten Judge Parker but rather to make a political statement to his audience. This intention was fairly clear from the context: Defendant made the alleged threat for purposes of rhetorical hyperbole rather than to intimidate, frighten, or coerce Judge Parker beyond what is allowable political advocacy.
58. In context, Defendant's statements cannot reasonably be construed by this Court to purposely, knowingly, or recklessly intimidate or coerce Judge Parker, and a reasonable

- person would not view the statement as threatening. Rather, Defendant's speech promotes open debate and vigorous advocacy over allegations of judicial corruption.
59. (In the alternative, Defendant suggests that this Court can adopt the Ninth Circuit's reasoning and require that the State prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant intended his words or conduct to be understood by Judge Parker as a threat. *See United States v. Bagdasarian*, 652 F.3d 1113 (9th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Cassel*, 408 F.3d 622 (9th Cir. 2005). Mere negligence with regard to the victim's understanding is insufficient.)

VI. The Eighth Circuit splits with other circuits as to whether threats are to be evaluated objectively or subjectively

60. Defendant acknowledges that the federal appellate circuits are split on whether the threat is to be evaluated objectively or subjectively. Compare *Dinwiddie* with *Bagdasarian* with *United States v. White*, 670 F.3d 498, 512 (4th Cir. 2012) with *Turner*, as discussed below.
61. Defendant concedes that the Eighth Circuit in *Dinwiddie* has held the reaction of the recipient can be one of a multitude of factors in analyzing the speech. Here, however, Defendant's speech was in a public forum and not a communication directly transmitted to Judge Kelly Parker.
62. Indeed, Judge Parker ought not to be able to testify at trial, either, as his subjective reaction to the speech would prejudice the jury as to any objective evaluation—legally or factually—of the reasonable listener's reaction to the speech itself. *United States v. J.H.H.*, 22 F.3d 821, 827-28 (8th Cir. 1994). The admission of recipient reaction

testimony is overly prejudicial because it may have a tendency to be overweighted by juries. This is true because members of a jury will trust the recipient's characterization over their own instinct. In addition, members of the jury are likely to be swayed by the emotional impact of the recipient's testimony. **Jennifer E. Rothman, *Freedom of Speech and True Threats***, 25 Harv. J.L. & Public Policy 1 (2001).

63. The Court can also find Defendant's speech is not a true threat under other circuits' analyses. Compare the Second Circuit's recent analysis of true threats against federal appellate judges in Chicago in *U.S. v. Turner*, No. 11-196-cr (June 21, 2013). Defendant's speech is distinguishable both under the facts of *Turner*, and under its legal tests for true threats.
64. The Defendant in *Turner* published a blog on the internet. His blog posts included statements such as:
- a. "Obey the Constitution or die."
 - b. The blood of the three judges would "replenish the tree of liberty."
 - c. The judges "didn't get the hint" sent by a gunman who murdered another federal judge in Chicago.
 - d. The judges had not "faced REAL free men willing to walk up to them and kill them for their defiance and disobedience."
 - e. The ruling on a particular case was "so sleazy and cunning as to deserve the ultimate response," and
 - f. That the judges "deserved to be killed."

65. Turner also posted photographs, work addresses, and room numbers for each judge, as well as a map to the courthouse where they worked, and a photograph of “anti-truck bomb barriers” outside that courthouse.
66. Turner had a history of links to violent groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and Aryan World Congress, and at one point was an FBI informant as to his website visitors who shared their intentions to commit violent acts (Turner was later dropped by the FBI).
67. Turner’s website revealed a history of statements with threats against other officials, together with threats to divulge their home addresses and mention of “having enough bullets to put them down too.”
68. These facts are distinguishable from the instant case in that:
 - a. Weinhaus never made reference to executing any particular judge (but for the most strained reading of a six-minute lapse between a caption with Judge Parker’s name and statements regarding execution for treason).
 - b. Weinhaus never referenced other murders.
 - c. Weinhaus did not exhort others to kill Judge Parker with any particularity.
 - d. Weinhaus never posted maps or business information about Judge Parker’s courthouse.
 - e. Weinhaus never threatened to occupy any particular courthouse, and indeed “occupying a courthouse” is merely civil disobedience and not a threat to commit murder (Sgt. Folsom, who attempted to arrest Defendant on September 11, 2012, conceded there were at least three courthouses that Weinhaus might occupy, therefore no courthouse was actually designated with particularity, and conceded that occupation itself can be peaceful). *See, e.g., Ex. 3* (Depo. of Folsom).

69. The *Turner* jury convicted upon instruction for a “true threat.”
70. A split Second Circuit panel affirmed the instruction and conviction on appeal, based on the following factors:
- a. The “seriousness of the extended discussion of killing [the judges].”
 - b. Turner’s references to past acts of violence, particularly the murder of another federal judge in Chicago.
 - c. Turner’s past statements calling for the death of a federal judge, and approvingly noting her subsequent actual murder.
 - d. Posting photographs, work addresses and maps for the threatened judges’ chambers.
71. The *Turner* court also found that intimidation can constitute a true threat when the intent is to place the victim in fear of bodily harm or death, citing the U.S. Supreme Court case proscribing cross burning. *Virginia v. Black*, 538 U.S. 343, 360 (2003).

VII. Defendant’s speech is not incitement under the *Brandenburg* test

72. The U.S. Supreme Court has long distinguished incitement from the mere “advocacy of the use of force or of law violation.” *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 449 (1969). The former is illegal; the latter is First Amendment protected.
73. To determine incitement, the proper test is to look whether the statement “is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.” *Id.*; see also *Hess v. Indiana*, 414 U.S. 105, 108-09 (1973).

74. Incitement is distinguishable from a true threat. *New York ex. rel. Spitzer v. Operation Rescue Nat'l*, 273 F.3d 184, 196 (2d Cir. 2001); *United States v. Howell*, 719 F.2d 1258, 1260 (5th Cir. 1983).
75. Even language such as that in Defendant's Youtube broadcast, which might seem threatening, is protected under an incitement analysis if made in public as part of a political communication. *See, e.g., NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware*, 458 U.S. 886, 902 (1982) (affording First Amendment protection to statements at public rallies threatening to "break [the] damn neck[s]" of those who broke a boycott of segregated retail stores).
76. Defendant's speech here in a public forum, the world wide web, did not rise to the level of an "unequivocal, unconditional and specific expression[] of intention immediately to inflict injury." *United States v. Kelner*, 534 F.2d 1020, 1027 (2d Cir. 1976). In that case, by contrast, the *Kelner* Defendant's conviction was affirmed for the statement, "[W]e are planning to assassinate Mrs. Arafat ... everything is planned in detail." *Id.* at 1025.

VIII. Defendant's speech does not constitute fighting words, and is factually distinguishable from *Wooden*

77. The Missouri Supreme Court recently affirmed convictions for harassment under RSMo. 565.090.1(2)1 and 565.090.1(5), where the Defendant sent individual emails and letters to a St. Louis City alderwoman calling her a "bitch" and a "Jezebel" and threatening to "go Gabrielle Giffords" on her with a "sawed off shotgun" and "pop" her "cherry" like assassinated president John F. Kennedy. *State v. Wooden*, No. SC92846 (Jan. 8, 2013).
78. Although the harassment crime in *Wooden* is distinct from judicial harassment under RSMo. 565.084, for the purpose of analysis they are substantially the same. RSMo.

565.090.1(2)1 and 565.090.1(5) require a showing that the threats put the victim in “reasonable apprehension of offensive physical contact or harm.” The judicial tampering statute requires the speaker’s purpose to be to “harass, intimidate or influence a judicial officer in the performance of such officer’s official duties.” Although the showing is different, both are essentially an objective reasonable person standard as to the imminent harm or harassment effect of the speech.

79. In *Wooden*, the Mo. Supreme Court rejected the Defendant’s appeal on First Amendment grounds because, after a detailed factual inquiry into his speech, it found the speech contained words that, taken together, “through their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace” and are not protected by the First Amendment or the Missouri Constitution. *Id.* at 6, quoting *Chaplinsky, supra*, 315 U.S. at 571-72.
80. Defendant’s speech here is factually distinguishable from that of *Wooden* in at least five respects:
 - a. Wooden sent emails directly to the Alderwoman he threatened. Defendant, by contrast, made his speech only in a public forum (the world wide web), in the context of a regular broadcast and publication of Bulletinman, which criticizes alleged official corruption.
 - b. Wooden had no reputation as a harmless but colorful political commentator. Defendant is a citizen journalist and blogger, known in Crawford County (where Judge Parker sits) for his anti-government views. Context matters as to the statement.

- c. Wooden made references to dusting off a sawed-off shotgun, and that he was going to make “a mess of everything with his sawed-off.” Defendant made no threats to his personal use of deadly force.
- d. Wooden referenced himself as a domestic terrorist and referenced the shootings of President Kennedy, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, and U.S. District Court Judge John Roll. Defendant references no other shootings or murders.
- e. Wooden’s tone was maniacal and menacing. Defendant’s tone is hyperbolic, but not menacing.
- f. Wooden had a history of serious criminality. Defendant has none.

IX. The Court can take judicial notice that Google has not removed the speech from its website, despite Youtube’s “Community Guidelines” and “Terms of Service”

- 81. Defendant’s speech was broadcast from the Youtube website, owned by Google Incorporated.
- 82. Defendant’s speech is still posted publicly on the Youtube website, at <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>. See Ex. 2-A, Affidavit of Hugh A. Eastwood.
- 83. Youtube maintains “Terms of Service”, Ex. 2-B, available at <http://www.youtube.com/static?template=terms>, and “Community Guidelines”, Ex. 2-C, available at http://www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, for Youtube users.
- 84. The Community Guidelines include, *inter alia*:
 - a. “Things like predatory behavior, stalking, threats, harassment, intimidation, invading privacy, revealing other people’s personal information, and inciting others to commit violent acts or to violate the Terms of Use are taken very

seriously. Anyone caught doing these things may be permanently banned from YouTube.”

85. The Terms of Service include, *inter alia*, at 6.E:

- a. “You further agree that you will not submit to the Service any Content or other material that is contrary to the YouTube Community Guidelines, currently found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, which may be updated from time to time, or contrary to applicable local, national, and international laws and regulations.”


86. While Defendant suggests that the standard for a threat is an objective one, he acknowledges that the federal appellate circuits are split on this legal standard (as discussed above), and therefore if this Court adopts a partially subjective standard, the continued presence of Defendant’s speech on the Youtube website suggests that Google and Youtube do not find Defendant’s speech to have violated their “Community Guidelines” and “Terms of Service.”

WHEREFORE Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus moves this Court to SUSTAIN his motion to dismiss the charge of Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo: 565.084, for defect in the institution of the prosecution, in that Defendant’s speech does not:

1. Constitute a true threat,
 2. Put Judge Kelly Parker in a reasonable apprehension of harm,
 3. Constitute incitement, nor
 4. Incite an imminent breach of the peace,
- and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant



Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


The undersigned certifies that on April 6, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

Robert E. Parks, II

Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney

15 S. Church St., Room 204

Union, MO 63084



The method(s) of service: by hand.

FILED

AUG - 6 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

AFFIDAVIT OF JUDY KROPF

Comes now Judy Kropf and states for her Affidavit:

1. My name is Judy Kropf and I am an adult capable of making this Affidavit.
2. Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus is my former husband. Our marriage was legally dissolved in May of 2013.
3. Attached as Exhibits 1-B are true copies of various editions of "Bulletinman," a publication written and produced Defendant.
4. Through my former marriage to Defendant, I have personal knowledge of "Bulletinman" generally and these representative copies in particular.
5. For the past 16 or so years, "Bulletinman" was produced in print format and distributed at various public places in Jefferson County, in Crawford County as an attachment to the "Bourbon Bystander" newspaper (also published by Defendant), and in other places in Missouri.
6. "Bulletinman" has also been created, produced and distributed by my former husband Defendant through the internet, on the Bulletinman.com website and on Youtube at <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>.
7. Further Affiant sayeth not.

DEFENDANT'S
Exhibit
1-A

I hereby verify and affirm that I have read and understood this document. I declare under oath and under penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge all the statements in this document are true and correct.

Judith A Kropf
Judy Kropf

State of Missouri)
) ss
County of St. Louis)

Subscribed and sworn before me this August 2, 2013

Andrew L. Thurmond
Notary Public

Americans, indeed all free men, remember that inn the final choice, a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains. Ike

Bulletinman.Com - 314-800-3652

Backpage

A na
that
duce
purch
tual
ment

DEFENDANT'S

Exhibit

1-B

Downtown Deli

Main and Boyd
DeSoto

Sit Down or Carry Out
Fresh sliced deli meat, top tier no junk here. Fresh baked bread, sandwiches, soups hot lunch specials call 636-586-1977
Mon-Fri 7 to 7
Sat 7-2 Closed Sunday

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-6399

Open Weds-Sun Noon to 6
Republic of Tea Teas
Ravens Brew Coffee.
Your One Stop Gift

Heartland Realty

50 Jefferson Square
DeSoto 636-337-0600

Buying or Selling Real Estate
call Patty and her agents
**THEY SIMPLY
GET RESULTS**

GOWERS AUTOMOTIVE

Athena School & Flucom off
67 Desoto.
636-337-5501

You can trust Paul & Terry
If it's Broke they will fix it
If it's not they will tell you!
Honest Mechanics are Priceless
Computer Diagnostics
**Safety and Emissions
Inspections**

General Signs and Graphics

306 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-9296

Banners-T-Shirts
All your Sign Needs
Printing Too

"A sign of a good business is a good sign"

Meanwhile back at the Ranch. In Jefferson County still Judge Bouchard sits on the bench and Tammy Berg is raking it in. Have you seen the drug court contract? In your face evidence that the Court is a fraud upon not only it self but everyone who it comes in contact with. Our government is so screwed up. The land records are now ruined since the Recorders of Deeds has accepted the MERS filings. Do you really believe that the vote count is honest? If they are voting with anything but paper ballots hand counted it can be rigged. In this day and age even without a vigilant County clerk. Assessor, personal property tax? Land tax? How about a sales tax to pave the roads and put out fires like the Constitution calls for. With a flat sales tax our government could function in the capacity it was created for. To protect and maintain our God given rights. Keep praying. Have not heard from Chuck about his lot next to the Courthouse. Though there was a protest at the Jail on Saturday June 16th in honor of Bradley Kingery who was found dead in the jail on Memorial Day morning at 3:30. Brad was 24 being held on I believe a failure to appear traffic related warrant. The JCSD would not even let the Mother look at the body and refused to turn over his belongings. Now his brother is in there on some BS! What is up with that? To top it off finding a lawyer to sue the Sheriff's department is impossible without a huge sum of cash upfront. In Jeffco carpet bagger lawyers are coming down from the City and County to do business with the Court because most of local attorney's have screwed at least one member of every family in the county. The people are flat broke, busted not to be trusted and now the trickle up effect is starting to show. When people lose it all that is when they lose it. There is a case that has been going on in Jeffco for over 7 years hung jury once now they are trying to get these people again based on the testimony of a 12 year old. These folks have spent \$250,000 on lawyers and the problem has not gone away. These charges should not have even been filed in the first place. Secondly the lawyer they hired who said that became the PA in Jeffco. Now you would think that after these people paid Forrest 30 and Brain Hammond 20 thousand that is, this "matter" would have vanished. No it got to transferred to St. Louis County and they went and gave the big city lawyers another 50 and they still owe them 100 for a hung jury. They are now lawyer less and broke. The matter has not gone away even though the alleged victim has changed her story at least three times and the one who took her to the police and started the whole ball rolling was just picked up and released after he was on Jeffco's most wanted list. My GOD people you just can't make stuff like this up. By the way the "system" placed the trouble young lady into the home of the actual abuser who was the accused brother. In short order! That is just one of a hundred stories I could share and the Bulletin has a very small footprint. Sad what have we become? Is there any accountability left? I for one can not get any justice under this system and I'm afraid I'm not the only one. They that be with us are a whole lot more than they that be with them. The real scary part of this is that there are certain people who are starting to figure this out who are trained killers under oath to defend our Constitution. That spells TROUBLE for the people who make a living under the color of law. In Crawford County same story though different faces. They first stole the election from Larry in Bourbon and on May 23rd the "task force" raided his place of business terrorizing the customers and children. This all went down because Larry was selling the incense that some people use to get high even though it is labeled not for human consumption and is 100% totally legal. They stole thousands of dollars worth of inventory, computers, cash, cashiers checks, and to top it all off froze his bank accounts. Though keep in mind he is innocent until proven guilty. They even arrested his helper for selling this "illegal" product even though he never took any money. What is it going to take? How much more must we endure? You the tax paying citizens of this once great state are paying these terrorist. Now is the time to open your eyes and see who the real enemy is. You have been lied too, deceived and brain washed into thinking that the USA and the police are the good guys. I hate to burst your bubble though the ones wearing black masks and carrying machine guns are your "trusted public servants". Would you please put aside your pride and open your eyes realizing that the devil is a liar. The enemy has come in like a flood though the good news is that God is still on the throne and prayer changes things. It is my prayer for another great awakening to occur and for people to realize that our enemy is within and cast them out while there is still time. No More Lies! Fire them all let GOD sort them out!

licens
You will ge
and reach :
35-
Cheap Fi
Trans
228 N. 3r
636-
Off Road V
Par
Save a ton w
Before you

6696 VETERANS DR. CEDAR HILL, MO 63016 (636)-274-9979
ACROSS FROM SAVE-A-LOT ON HWY BB

VIP
850 Commercial Blvd
Parts • Serv
All Make
636-475-74
• Scooters • ATVs
• Utility Vehicles
Layaway/Fin
www.vip

It is curious that physical courage should be so common in the world and moral courage so rare. ~Mark Twain

Courage is doing what you're afraid to do. There can be no courage unless you're scared.
~Edward Vernon Rickenbacker

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

February 1 2012

Fall upon the ROCK before the ROCK falls on you

When a man asks himself what is meant by action he proves he is not a man of action. When a man asks himself what is meant by action he proves he is not a man of action. Action is a lack of balance. In order to act you must be somewhat insane. A reasonably sensible man is satisfied with thinking.
Georges Clemenceau action.

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main Desoto
636-586-6399

A Real Deal Awaits U
Over 35 Dealers Ravens
Brew Coffee Republic of
Tea Teas Greeting Cards

You and Me x 3
Resale Mercantile
920 Commerical
St. Clair Mo
Mon-Sat 10-6

JEFFCO Contracting

Fully Insured, Concrete,
Retaining Walls Flat Work,
Natural Stone, Water
Features
Dan 314-807-2570

Viper Trailer Sales

850 Commerical Blvd
Herky 636-475-7487
Utility Trailers Cargo
Enclosed Best Price Service 2

Two Car Guys

Treating People The Way We
Want to Be Treated
Hwy 67 Next Midwest 68 Festus

KT POWERSPORTS

Exclusive
Hammerhead Cart HQ
Motor Scooters, Mopeds,
4 Wheelers
228 N. 3rd Street
636-937-3298
Festus MO

Dave's 509 Liquor

W. Main Festus Drive Thru
Import Beers Local Wines
636-931-5090

YOUR AD HERE

314-800-3652

"Democrats Pray to God
Republicans Talk directly
to Him, but gun owners are
His Chosen People" Rich Ford
Ford's Bait and Tackle
636-285-2564 On The Banks of
Big River in Cedar Hill
Open 6:30 to 8:00

Fast Returns
Big or Small

Debbie Does Them All

Meanwhile, back at the Ranch. Well just when you think there is no hope you get a call and by GOD you get confirmation. Paul Curtman the State Rep from House Springs I think it is district 105 called me. My first words to him was a simple question, are we doomed and he said that we are. Which confirms what I have been writing in this BULLETIN. But he went on to tell me that articles of impeachment have been filed against a sitting Judge for the first time well we really don't know, we do know that there has not been a judge impeached in Missouri since 1960. Yea it has been 52 years since we got rid of a Judge in Missouri but Paul and a few other courageous reps have actually got an impeachment going it is number 333 a Judge from Adair County named Russell E. Steele. We will certainly keep you up to date on this matter. Paul is a former Marine who actually honors his oath and loves this Country. Though let me share this with you they are few and far between in Jeff City. If you are a praying person please pray for Paul and all our State Reps and Senators. Pray for the Sheriff and his deputies to wake up and realize that they are the instruments of oppression. Should revival not come to the law enforcement community and they keep on enforcing laws that are in direct violation of the Constitution there will be a blood bath. If they keep on pushing the people some will push back. When people lose it all that is when they lose it. I would not want to be a member of the law enforcement community or even be within 500 yards of a court-house. The American dream has become a nightmare and not every one out there are like the Bulletinman. Most can't read much less write, the only thing they know how to do is shoot and make bombs. Most of the American people don't realize that we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against spiritual wickedness in high places. Most people don't realize it is not the Sheriff or the policeman who is driving that car that pulls them over and that pulls up to their house to evict them. It is a spirit that has possessed that body to do the works of the devil. Most will not pray, most will simply roll over and take it. Though there are a few who will think that the cop, judge, lawyer, banker is the one who is carrying out this evil and some will shoot them down. I for one realize that my problem is not a person it is the devil and I have power over all the power of the enemy. Though I'm not of this world. I may be in it for now though I'm just passing through. The ones who are buying all the guns are not buying them to go deer hunting or target shooting. They are buying them because they no longer trust the government and their agents. Boy I'm glad that I'm on the right side and not out stealing from the well armed weak, poor and uneducated mass of people who have just about been pushed as far as they are going to be.

COMPUTAX ACCOUNTING

& Tax Preparation
636-931-2000

Heartland Realty

50 Jefferson Sqaure
DeSoto Mo 636-337-0600
Patty Hammond
Broker/Owner

McKinley Jewelers

Gifts Rings Jewels
Diamonds for Valentines
308 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-3342

Internet Service & Computer Repair

Call Rick 636-789-9050

Kennedy Tire

New and Used Tires
Hwy 67 Just South of CC
Festus 636-933-9622
1206 Telegraph Road
Arnold, MO 63010
(636) 467-8108

Mo Vet Outlet

Vets helping Vets in DeSoto. An outlet shop where you will save @ The same time helping those who have given so much.

East Main in DeSoto

Davison Jewelry

Pawn Shop

Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's Big Sale

Iced Lilac

418 S. Main DeSoto
next to Town South Hair
Offering Discounts and Close-
outs on Cosmetics, Health &
Beauty Stop in and check it out.
Hundreds Of \$1 Items
Call 314-402-8369

CAN-DO MAINTENANCE

MR. FIX-IT

BIG OR SMALL
314-488-8123
IN DeSOTO

Certified IRS
E-File

Years of Expertise



D
Pri
We
Vinyl
Silk Scr
314-5

0090 VETERANS DR. CEDAR HILL, MO 63016 (636)-2/4-99/9
ACROSS FROM SAVE-A-LOT ON HWY BB



All human actions have one or more of these seven causes: chance, nature, compulsion, habit, reason, passion, and desire.
Aristotle

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

June 26 2010.

America's state religion, is patriotism, a phenomenon which has convinced many of the citizenry that "treason" is morally worse than murder or rape.

William Blum

Fall upon the ROCK before the ROCK falls on you

Rick's Lakeside Grill

12202 State Highway O
On the way to Grayhawk
(Rocky Ridge) Daily
Lunch Specials
Fresh Hot Pizza Delivery
Closed Monday
573-483-3077

Pure Pleasure Mega Center

"all your lovelife needs"
North Truman Crystal
The Best 4 Less Except
Sunday

Down on Main St Antiques-Collectables Resale Shop

Downtown Desoto
514 S. Main
636-586-7113

Viper Trailer Sales

850 Commercial Blvd
Herky 636-475-7887
Utility Trailers & Car Em
Best Price Good Quality

Need Painting-Decorating?

Contract a Professional
Jimmy 314-277-8113

www.photos-by-shell.com
no sitting fees

636-678-3102

Dave's 509 Liquor

W. Main Festus
Drive Thru
636-931-6990

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main Desoto
Bigger and Better
More Room
Re-Open May 2010

Pams Monogram & the Hobby Girls

4628 House Springs Plaza
Embroidery and Quilts for
Everyone
636-378-1991

Meanwhile back at the ranch, Oh the dirty tricks and the lies that spew forth from the JCSD!!!!The devil is indeed a liar. If you really wanted to be a criminal wouldn't it make sense to be a cop? Yea it would, you are on the inside. Well let me share this with you the taxpaying citizen of Jefferson County Missouri. You are being ripped off and every dollar that you spend in our fair county about 2 cents goes to the local not-sees!!!! Retired on Duty? Yea one who has been with the JCSD since I can remember is ED KEMP and I heard that he is proud to say that he is retired on duty! I called ED and he called me back. I ask him if he really only showed up one day a week @ Hellsboro. He said that he is not always in Hellsboro. He is mobile Now Ed wants to be your State Rape oh I mean Rep. He is one of them there "Democrats" there are 45 elected offices in Jeffco 44 are occupied by Democrats the other one is Republican but he appears to be the biggest turd of them all Darrel Missey is his name and he is a corrupt judge who allows child molesters to live in apartment complexes and as now sent the Children which were molested by their step father to a place called Epworth were they are molested on a regular basis. Tim Miller is the girls lawyers and he is in on this child slavery ring as well. These people folks are beyond corrupt I could sit here for the next five years and not be able to share with you all the "horror" stories that spew forth from the Synagoge of Satan's local branch The Courthouse!!!!

Misery is created there on a daily basis and it is going to cease and desist as long as I'm alive I will expose these evil doers and run their ass out of town. The whole point of a free press to tell the people just how bad their government has become! Listen I love my county, city and country enough to tell the people the Truth. Our elected leaders take you all for fools. Dumbass self centered people who are only concerned about getting laid and where their next high is going to come from. As long as the check is there everything is a ok. It won't be long until the payments that silence the masses run out.

It won't be long until the People realize that there country is being stolen from them. It won't be long until the Billion rounds of Ammo that where bought in the last year start coming out of the 10 million guns that were bought as well. I really think that "they" have no idea just what danger "they" have put themselves and their poor-pitiful families in. I feel the Rising Force coming and when it comes my goodness. The lightning is going to strike and "they" will never know what hit "them". JAH's judgement is coming and in one hour this country is going to change overnight it will be all over. Are you ready to meet JESUS. Every knee will bow better to bow now. Today is the day of salvation!!!

The Pet Care
Extraordinaire
& Personalized Pet
Sitting Call Shayna
@ 636-253-1292

Actions lie louder
than words.

Miss Carries Treasures

636-586-0884
End of Summitt Drive Off 67
and Long Road
Furn-Collectables-Clothes For
a good cause Wed-Sat

Dave Messer Construction

DAVE CAN DO IT
636-931-0705

Ram Tire & Wheels

Just south of CC on 67
New and Used Treads
Call Mel @ 933-9878

Card Corner

Sport/Gaming Cards
Comics all kinds of
636-933-0999
106 Main Festus

Dwight Spurgin

Glass Painting
Promo Windows
Holidays, Hand Painted
Signs He'll even paint
your face!
636-633-3600

Davison Jewelry

Pawn Shop

Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's
Buying Gold

Junkie's Tire Service

You need a Tire
Call 636-797-4500
314-401-7373

Pro-Star Kleaning

Professional Cleaning You Expect Star Treatment, You Deserve Pro Janitorial Service, Home Carpet Care, Complete Office Cleaning, Tax Cleaners, Construction, Complete Floor Care as well Insured and Bonded for your protection Call 4 free Est. Call Dwight Now @ 636-633-9600



D
Pri

W
Vinyl
Silk Sc
5158
Imperia
636

MADABELLA'S



An ignorant person is one who doesn't know what you have just found out.

Will Rogers

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

July 14th 2009 Bastille Day

Soon!

Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable
JFK

Bam's Bar

Hwy-00 LRD
Between 55 and 61
Great Drink Spends
Live Entertainment on
Weekend
Call 573-483-8005
A Great Time All the Time

AD HERE 314-806-3652
K-JEFF.COM
BULLETINMAN.COM
Contact me about Gov't
Corruption

ALL OUT WILDLIFE CONTROL

ANIMALS YOU NEED
GONE? CALL DAVE
24/7-636-308-5567

Viper Racing

850 Commercial Blvd
Herky 636-475-7187
Go-Karts, Motorbikes
Scooters-ATVs

**Wholesale Tea Tree
Products**
636-931-0333

Broken English Rocks
brokenenglishstl.com

Dave's 509 Liquor
W. Main Festus
Drive Thru
636-931-5090

Do you realize that your tax dollars pay the salaries of little Nazi who go around knocking grandma's out of homes and won't do anything about the theft of property of the elderly. Shame on you for shopping in Jeff County

**Four Winds
Restaurant**
Hwy B Blackwell
636-586-5563

Affordable Fine Dining

Raven's Brew Coffee
Republic of Tea Pens
Primrose Herbs Ozark Crystals

Meanwhile back at the ranch, my name stays the same now tell who is the one to blame? My name is Bulletinman and I've come to set the captives free and preach the coming Kingdom of Jesus Christ. To expose, identify and destroy the works of the Devil. I may not be able to predict my demise but you can bet it won't be on my knees. Defiance to Tyrants is obedience to GOD. This Beast has become a Tyrant. If you haven't figured it out be now, we be the Beast. America is still controlled by Great Britain and is about to be sacrificed so that a New World Order will arise out of the ashes of America. Now the way I read the Book the KJV Authorized Bible. He that letteth will let until he be taken out of the way. In a moment a twinkling of an eye things are going to change. Then that wicked one will be revealed. That wicked one I believe is Prince William and he makes Barrack look like a pimply idiot. It all goes back to England and their minions here in America are the lawyers. The court and it's officers are on a mission to separate you from your money, your family and all you hold dear. The lawyers are in bed with everyone and they run the show. Isn't it time that we do something about them. I'm all for a peaceful exodus from the promised land. We can give all members of the BAR (British Accrediation Registry) 48 hours starting on September 17th to leave the country. If they are still in the country they will be rounded up, tried, convicted and executed. They along with the cops, politicians and other accomplices will be brought up on charges. By the people.

You see if you got rid out of the judges and outlawed their little terrorist cult we could rid America of 90% of the evil. We can ship them all back to England or Israel. Most of course will end up in Isrealhell, though the love of money isn't a racial or semite thing. It is universal. Though being a Jew by blood it is hard to over come. I find myself very tight fisted at times and I know better. My eyes are open and still I don't give what I should. Greed is not good!! Give and it shall be given. You see it's about giving. Generous Jeff is what I want to be known as, not Greedy Grant. Or Teflon Ron, Or Cold Be Hyenas, or Kurt blown away in the breeze. Why screw over your neighbor? Your brother! hey I remember the quote My loathings are simple: stupidity, oppression, crime, cruelty, soft music.

Vladimir Nabokov. I bet you Ronald and his thieving children like Perry Como and Lawrence Welk, though I out of 5 isn't bad. Mel from Ram Tire wanted me to mention the Judas Priest show. Went to see the Priest @ the Family Arena and they where amazing very loud and hard. Brought back a lot of memories and thoughts. They did the British Steel album and it was a delight. You can check it out on youtube. You can also check out BULLETINMAN on you tube as well. I try to post something new every day. Check it out you'll like it..or your money back!

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main the home of the DeSoto Historical Society
Desoto 636-586-6399

Pure Pleasure Mega Center.

Simply the Best
Lowest Price Largest
Selection
N, Truman BLVD
Crystal City

Miss Carries Treasures
636-586-0884
End of Summitt Drive Off 67
and Long Road
Furn-Collectables-Clothes

**DAVE MESSER
CONSTRUCTION**
DAVE CAN DO IT
636-931-0705

Ram Tire & Wheels
Just south of CC on 67
New and Used Treads
Call Mel @ 933-9878

Card Corner
Sport/Gaming Cards
Comics all kinds of
636-933-0999
106 Main Festus

Shoppers Paradise
Leadington Free
Outside Set-Up

Davison Jewelry
Pawn Shop
Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's

Angel Nail's
New Location Across
From Sam Ogle
Hair Nails Tan

**Junkie's Tire
Service**
636-797-4500
314-401-7373

Expert Advice from the Pros
One of a Kind rare finds
Tues-Sat 12-6



D
Pril

We
Vinyl
Silk Screen
5158 9
Imperial
636-4

DISCOVER A NEW
See yourself in a who
misadvent. Find a new
personality, your life. C
that's uniquely you. You
Adrienne
Mary Kay indepr
www.marykay.com
314

WARD
HOP
TRANS DR.
101.63019
51545
1400



About

Channel

Copyright

Safety

Creators & Partners

Advertising

Upload

Down

DEFENDANT'S Exhibit 2-B

TERMS OF SERVICE

[Pay Content Terms of Service](#)
[Collecting Society Notices](#)
[Copyright Notices](#)
[Community Guidelines](#)

Terms of Service

Community Guidelines

1. Your Acceptance

- A. By using or visiting the YouTube website or any YouTube products, software, data feeds, and services provided to you on, from, or through the YouTube website (collectively the "Service") you signify your agreement to (1) these terms and conditions (the "Terms of Service"), (2) Google's Privacy Policy, found at <http://www.google.com/intl/en/policies/privacy/> and incorporated herein by reference, and (3) YouTube's Community Guidelines, found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines and also incorporated herein by reference. If you do not agree to any of these terms, the Google Privacy Policy, or the Community Guidelines, please do not use the Service.
- B. Although we may attempt to notify you when major changes are made to these Terms of Service, you should periodically review the most up-to-date version www.youtube.com/t/terms. YouTube may, in its sole discretion, modify or revise these Terms of Service and policies at any time, and you agree to be bound by such modifications or revisions. Nothing in these Terms of Service shall be deemed to confer any third-party rights or benefits.

2. Service

- A. These Terms of Service apply to all users of the Service, including users who are also contributors of Content on the Service. "Content" includes the text, software, scripts, graphics, photos, sounds, music, videos, audiovisual combinations, interactive features and other materials you may view on, access through, or contribute to the Service. The Service includes all aspects of YouTube, including but not limited to all products, software and services offered via the YouTube website, such as the YouTube channels, the YouTube "Embeddable Player," the YouTube "Uploader" and other applications.
- B. The Service may contain links to third party websites that are not owned or controlled by YouTube. YouTube has no control over, and assumes no responsibility for, the content, privacy policies, or practices of any third party websites. In addition, YouTube will not and cannot censor or edit the content of any third-party site. By using the Service, you expressly relieve YouTube from any and all liability arising from your use of any third-party website.
- C. Accordingly, we encourage you to be aware when you leave the Service and to read the terms and conditions and privacy policy of each other website that you visit.

3. YouTube Accounts

- A. In order to access some features of the Service, you will have to create a YouTube or Google account. You may never use another's account without permission. When creating your account, you must provide accurate and complete information. You are solely responsible for the activity that occurs on your account, and you must keep your account password secure. You must notify YouTube immediately of any breach of security or unauthorized use of your account.
- B. Although YouTube will not be liable for your losses caused by any unauthorized use of your account, you may be liable for the losses of YouTube or others due to such unauthorized use.

4. General Use of the Service—Permissions and Restrictions

YouTube hereby grants you permission to access and use the Service as set forth in these Terms of Service, provided that:

- A. You agree not to distribute in any medium any part of the Service or the Content without YouTube's prior written authorization, unless YouTube makes available the means for such distribution through functionality offered by the Service (such as the Embeddable Player).
- B. You agree not to alter or modify any part of the Service.
- C. You agree not to access Content through any technology or means other than the video playback pages of the Service itself, the Embeddable Player, or other explicitly authorized means YouTube may designate.
- D. You agree not to use the Service for any of the following commercial uses unless you obtain YouTube's prior written approval:
 - the sale of access to the Service;
 - the sale of advertising, sponsorships, or promotions placed on or within the Service or Content; or
 - the sale of advertising, sponsorships, or promotions on any page of an ad-enabled blog or website containing Content delivered via the Service, unless other material not obtained from YouTube appears on the same page and is of sufficient value to be the basis for such sales.

E. Prohibited commercial uses do not include:

- uploading an original video to YouTube, or maintaining an original channel on YouTube, to promote your business or artistic enterprise;
- showing YouTube videos through the Embeddable Player on an ad-enabled blog or website, subject to the advertising restrictions set forth above in Section 4 D; or
- any use that YouTube expressly authorizes in writing.

(For more information about what constitutes a prohibited commercial use, see our FAQ.)

- F. If you use the Embeddable Player on your website, you may not modify, build upon, or block any portion or functionality of the Embeddable Player, including but not limited to links back to the YouTube website.
- G. If you use the YouTube Uploader, you agree that it may automatically download and install updates from time to time from YouTube. These updates are designed to improve, enhance and further develop the Uploader and may take the form of bug fixes, enhanced functions, new software modules and completely new versions. You agree to receive such updates (and permit YouTube to deliver these to you) as part of your use of the Uploader.
- H. You agree not to use or launch any automated system, including without limitation, "robots," "spiders," or "offline readers," that accesses the Service in a manner that sends more request messages to the YouTube servers in a given period of time than a human can reasonably produce in the same period by using a conventional on-line web browser. Notwithstanding the foregoing, YouTube grants the operators of public search engines permission to use spiders to copy materials from the site for the sole purpose of and solely to the extent necessary for creating publicly available searchable indices of the materials, but not caches or archives of such materials. YouTube reserves the right to revoke these exceptions either generally or in specific cases. You agree not to collect or harvest any personally identifiable information, including account names, from the Service, nor to use the communication systems provided by the Service (e.g., comments, email) for any commercial solicitation purposes. You agree not to solicit, for commercial purposes, any users of the Service with respect to their Content.
- I. In your use of the Service, you will comply with all applicable laws.
- J. YouTube reserves the right to discontinue any aspect of the Service at any time.

5. Your Use of Content

In addition to the general restrictions above, the following restrictions and conditions apply specifically to your use of Content.

- A. The Content on the Service, and the trademarks, service marks and logos ("Marks") on the Service, are owned by or licensed to YouTube, subject to copyright and other intellectual property rights under the law.
- B. Content is provided to you AS IS. You may access Content for your information and personal use solely as intended through the provided functionality of the Service and as permitted under these Terms of Service. You shall not download any Content unless you see a "download" or similar link displayed by YouTube on the Service for that Content. You shall not copy, reproduce, distribute, transmit, broadcast, display, sell, license, or otherwise exploit any Content for any other purposes without the prior written consent of YouTube or the respective licensors of the Content. YouTube and its licensors reserve all rights not expressly granted in and to the Service and the Content.
- C. You agree not to circumvent, disable or otherwise interfere with security-related features of the Service or features that prevent or restrict use or copying of any Content or enforce limitations on use of the Service or the Content therein.
- D. You understand that when using the Service, you will be exposed to Content from a variety of sources, and that YouTube is not responsible for the accuracy, usefulness, safety, or intellectual property rights of or relating to such Content. You further understand and acknowledge that you may be exposed to Content that is inaccurate, offensive, indecent, or objectionable, and you agree to waive, and hereby do waive, any legal or equitable rights or remedies you have or may have against YouTube with respect thereto, and, to the extent permitted by applicable law, agree to indemnify and hold harmless YouTube, its owners, operators, affiliates, licensors, and licensees to the fullest extent allowed by law regarding all matters related to your use of the Service.

6. Your Content and Conduct

- A. As a YouTube account holder you may submit Content to the Service, including videos and user comments. You understand that YouTube does not guarantee any confidentiality with respect to any Content you submit.
- B. You shall be solely responsible for your own Content and the consequences of submitting and publishing your Content on the Service. You affirm, represent, and warrant that you own or have the necessary licenses, rights, consents, and permissions to publish Content you submit, and you license to YouTube all patent, trademark, trade secret, copyright or other proprietary rights in and to such Content for publication on the Service pursuant to these Terms of Service.
- C. For clarity, you retain all of your ownership rights in your Content. However, by submitting Content to YouTube, you hereby grant YouTube a worldwide, non-exclusive, royalty-free, sublicensable and transferable license to use, reproduce, distribute, prepare derivative works of, display, and perform the Content in connection with the Service and YouTube's (and its successors' and affiliates') business, including without limitation for promoting and redistributing part or all of the Service (and derivative works thereof) in any media formats and through any media channels. You also hereby grant each user of the Service a non-exclusive license to access your Content through the Service, and to use, reproduce, distribute, display and perform such Content as permitted through the functionality of the Service and under these Terms of Service. The above licenses granted by you in video Content you submit to the Service terminate within a commercially reasonable time after you remove or delete your videos from the Service. You understand and agree, however, that YouTube may retain, but not display, distribute, or perform, server copies of your videos that have been removed or deleted. The above licenses granted by you in user comments you submit are perpetual and irrevocable.
- D. You further agree that Content you submit to the Service will not contain third party copyrighted material, or material that is subject to other third party proprietary rights, unless you have permission from the rightful owner of the material or you are otherwise legally entitled to post the material and to grant YouTube all of the license rights granted herein.
- E. You further agree that you will not submit to the Service any Content or other material that is contrary to the YouTube Community Guidelines, currently found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, which may be updated from time to time, or contrary to applicable local, national, and international laws and regulations.
- F. YouTube does not endorse any Content submitted to the Service by any user or other licensor, or any opinion, recommendation, or advice expressed therein, and YouTube expressly disclaims any and all liability in connection with Content. YouTube does not permit copyright infringing activities and infringement of intellectual property rights on the Service, and YouTube will remove all Content if properly notified that such Content infringes on another's intellectual property rights. YouTube reserves the right to remove Content without prior notice.

7. Account Termination Policy

- A. YouTube will terminate a user's access to the Service if, under appropriate circumstances, the user is determined to be a repeat infringer.
- B. YouTube reserves the right to decide whether Content violates these Terms of Service for reasons other than copyright infringement, such as, but not limited to, pornography, obscenity, or excessive length. YouTube may at any time, without prior notice and in its sole discretion, remove such Content and/or terminate a user's account for submitting such material in violation of these Terms of Service.

8. Digital Millennium Copyright Act

- A. If you are a copyright owner or an agent thereof and believe that any Content infringes upon your copyrights, you may submit a notification pursuant to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA") by providing our Copyright Agent with the following information in writing (see 17 U.S.C. 512(c)(3) for further detail):

- A physical or electronic signature of a person authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed;
- Identification of the copyrighted work claimed to have been infringed or, if multiple copyrighted works at a single online site are covered by a single notification, a representative list of such works at that site;
- Identification of the material that is claimed to be infringing or to be the subject of infringing activity and that is to be removed or access to which is to be disabled and information reasonably sufficient to permit the service provider to locate the material;
- Information reasonably sufficient to permit the service provider to contact you, such as an address, telephone number, and, if available, an electronic mail;
- A statement that you have a good faith belief that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner, its agent, or the law; and
- A statement that the information in the notification is accurate, and under penalty of perjury, that you are authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed.

Your designated Copyright Agent to receive notifications of claimed infringement is Shadie Farazian, 901 Cherry Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94066, email: copyright@youtube.com, fax: 650 513 8513. For clarity, only DMCA notices should go to the Copyright Agent, any other feedback, comments, requests for technical support, and other communications should be directed to YouTube customer service through [//support.google.com/youtube/?hl=en-US](http://support.google.com/youtube/?hl=en-US). You acknowledge that you intend to comply with all of the requirements of this Section 512(c)(3) DMCA notice may not be valid.

- B. Counter-notice: If you believe that your Content that was removed (or to which access was disabled) is not infringing, or that the removal of the Content was based on the authorization from the copyright owner, the copyright owner's agent, or pursuant to the law, to post and use the material in your Content, you may send a counter-notice containing the following information to the Copyright Agent:

- A physical or electronic signature;
- Identification of the Content that has been removed or to which access has been disabled and the location at which the Content appeared before it was removed or disabled;
- A statement that you have a good faith belief that the Content was removed or disabled as a result of mistake or misidentification of the Content; and
- Your name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address; a statement that you consent to the jurisdiction of

If a counter-notice is received by the Copyright Agent, YouTube may send a copy of the counter-notice to the original content provider informing that person that it may replace the removed content or cease disabling it in 10 business days. However, if the copyright owner files an action seeking a court order against the Content provider, member or user, the removed content may be replaced, or access to it restored, in 10 to 14 business days or more after receipt of the counter-notice, at YouTube's sole discretion.

YOU AGREE THAT YOUR USE OF THE SERVICES SHALL BE AT YOUR SOLE RISK, TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW. YOUTUBE, ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, AND AGENTS DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, IN CONNECTION WITH THE SERVICES AND YOUR USE THEREOF. YOUTUBE MAKES NO WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THIS SITE'S CONTENT OR THE CONTENT OF ANY SITES LINKED TO THIS SITE AND ASSUMES NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY ERRORS, OMISSIONS, MISTAKES, OR INACCURACIES OF CONTENT. (ii) PERSONAL INJURY OR PROPERTY DAMAGE, OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, RESULTING FROM YOUR ACCESS TO AND USE OF OUR SERVICES. (iii) ANY UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO OR USE OF OUR SECURE SERVERS OR ANY AND ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION AND/OR FINANCIAL INFORMATION STORED THEREIN. (iv) ANY INTERRUPTION OR CESSATION OF TRANSMISSIONS OR SERVICES FROM OUR SERVICES. (v) ANY BUGS, VIRUSES, WORMS, HORSES, OR THE LIKE WHICH MAY BE TRANSMITTED TO OR THROUGH OUR SERVICES BY ANY THIRD PARTY, AND/OR (v) ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN ANY CONTENT OR FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE USE OF ANY CONTENT POSTED, EMAILED, TRANSMITTED, OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE VIA THE SERVICES. YOUTUBE DOES NOT WARRANT, ENDORSE, GUARANTEE, OR ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY PRODUCT OR SERVICE ADVERTISED OR OFFERED BY A THIRD PARTY THROUGH THE SERVICES OR ANY HYPERLINKED SERVICE, OR ANY CONTENT STORED IN ANY BANNER OR OTHER ADVERTISING, AND YOUTUBE WILL NOT BE A PARTY TO OR IN ANY WAY BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING ANY TRANSACTION BETWEEN YOU AND THIRD-PARTY PROVIDERS OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES. AS WITH THE PURCHASE OF A PRODUCT OR SERVICE THROUGH ANY MEDIUM OR IN ANY ENVIRONMENT, YOU SHOULD USE YOUR BEST JUDGMENT AND EXERCISE CAUTION WHERE APPROPRIATE.

WE AND OUR SERVICE PROVIDERS, INCLUDING YOUTUBE, ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, AGENTS, BE LIABLE TO YOU FOR ANY DIRECT OR INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, PUNITIVE, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES WHATSOEVER RESULTING FROM ANY OF OUR ERRORS, MISTAKES, OR INACCURACIES OF ANY KIND, (II) PERSONAL INJURY OR PROPERTY DAMAGE, OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, RESULTING FROM YOUR ACCESS TO AND USE OF OUR SERVICES, (III) ANY UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO OR USE OF OUR SERVICE SERVERS AND/OR ANY AND ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION AND/OR FINANCIAL INFORMATION STORED IN OUR SYSTEMS, (IV) ANY INTERRUPTION OR CESSATION OF TRANSMISSION TO OR FROM OUR SERVICES, (V) ANY MALICIOUS VIRUSES, TROJAN HORSES, OR THE LIKE, (VI) ANY BE TRANSMITTED TO OR THROUGH OUR SERVICE BY ANY THIRD PARTY, AND/OR (V) ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN ANY CONTENT OR FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND INCURRED AS A RESULT OF YOUR USE OF ANY CONTENT POSTED, EMAILED, TRANSMITTED, OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE VIA THE SERVICE. WE DO NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY, CONTRACT, TORT, OR ANY OTHER LEGAL THEORY, AND WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE, THE FOREGOING LIMITATION OF LIABILITY SHALL APPLY TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW IN ANY APPLICABLE JURISDICTION.

the Service is not intended to be, and is not, offered by YouTube from its facilities in the United States or any other country in the United States or any other country in the United States of America. YouTube makes no representation that the Service is appropriate or available for use in other localities. Those who access or use the Service from other localities do so at their own volition and are responsible for compliance with local law.

12. Ability to Accept Terms of Service

10. Assignment. You agree that any rights and licenses granted hereunder, may be transferred or assigned by you, but may not be assigned without restriction.

THE BARRELS



Language: **English** ▼

Country: **Worldwide** ▼

Safety: **Off** ▼

Help ▲

About **Press & Blogs** **Copyright** **Creators & Partners** **Advertising** **Developers**
Terms **Privacy** **Policy & Safety** **Send feedback** **Try something new!**



ABOUT YOUTUBE

Getting Started

Data & Privacy Guidelines

Contact Us

Careers

YouTube Merchandise

YouTube Community Guidelines

Respect the YouTube Community

We're not asking for the kind of respect reserved for nuns, the elderly, and brain surgeons. We mean don't abuse the site. Every cool new community feature on YouTube involves a certain level of trust. We trust you to be responsible, and millions of users respect that trust. Please be one of them.

Don't Cross the Line

Here are some common-sense rules that will help you steer clear of trouble:

- YouTube is not for pornography or sexually explicit content. If this describes your video, even if it's a video of yourself, don't post it on YouTube. After we released that we work closely with law enforcement and we reject child exploitation. Please respect privacy, consent and stay safe on YouTube.
- Don't post videos showing bad stuff like animal abuse, drug abuse, under-age drinking and smoking, or bomb making.
- Graphic depictions of violence is not allowed. If your video shows someone being physically hurt, attacked, or humiliated, don't post it.
- YouTube is not a shock site. Don't post gross-out videos of accidents, dead bodies or similar things intended to shock or disgust.
- Respect copyright. Don't upload videos that you made or that you are authorized to use. This means don't upload videos you didn't create, or content in your videos that someone else owns the copyright to, such as music tracks, snippets of copyrighted movies, or videos made by other users, without necessary authorizations. Read our Copyright Tips for more info.
- We encourage free speech and defend everyone's right to express unpopular points of view. But we don't permit hate speech (speech that attacks or demeans a group based on race or ethnicity, religion, disability, gender, age, veteran status, and sexual orientation/gender identity).
- Things like cyberbullying, harassment, stalking, threats, harassment, intimidation, invading privacy, revealing other people's personal information, and inciting others to commit violent acts or to violate the Terms of Use are taken very seriously. Anyone caught doing these things may be permanently banned from YouTube.
- Everyone has a right to privacy. Don't create misleading descriptions, tags, titles or thumbnails in order to increase views. It's not okay to post harassing comments of untargeted, unwanted or repetitive content, including comments and private messages.

Please take these guidelines seriously and take them to heart. Don't try to look for loopholes or try to lawyer your way around the guidelines—just follow them and try to respect the spirit in which they were created. If you'd like more details, check out our Community Guidelines Tips.


We Enforce These Guidelines

Okay, this one's a little different than you. YouTube staff review flagged videos 24 hours a day, seven days a week to determine when they violate our Community Guidelines. When they do, we remove them. Sometimes a video doesn't violate our Community Guidelines, but may not be appropriate for everyone. These videos may be age-restricted. Accounts that repeatedly violate our Community Guidelines violations and serious or repeated violations can lead to account termination. If your account is terminated, you won't be allowed to create any new accounts. For more information about how the Community Guidelines work and the consequences of violating them, please visit the Help Center.

YouTube is for the community

Remember that YouTube is for the community! Each and every user of YouTube makes the site what it is, so don't be afraid to dig in and get involved.

- Have fun with Equipment. There's a lot to see here, and lots of folks making amazing stuff—one of them might be you! It's easier and easier to use all the time, so dive in and enjoy.
- Let folks know what you think. Feedback's part of the experience, and when it's done with respect, can be a great way to improve. Spend your time on YouTube richer, better, and more interesting. Give feedback, rate videos, make your own content, enter contests of interest—there's a lot going on and a lot of ways to participate.
- You may be tempted to click on something you don't like. Some of the content here may interest you. If you find that it violates our Terms of Use, then click the "Flag" under the video you're watching. Report it for review by YouTube staff. If it's not something you don't like—why waste time watching videos you don't like?

Flagging on
YouTube: TheStaying Safe on
YouTube

That's it! The
---The YouTube

Community Guidelines

Want a little more information about the limits and exceptions in the Community Guidelines? Here are some helpful examples and tips:

Sex and Nudity

Hate Speech

Shocking and Disturbing

Dangerous Illusions

While it might not seem like it, it's not always obvious when a video is intended to incite violence or encourage dangerous, illegal activities that have an inherent risk of death. This means not posting videos on things like instructional bomb making, ninja assassin training, sniper attack tutorials, or tips on illegal street racing. Any depictions like these should be educational or documentary in nature and shouldn't be designed to help or encourage others to imitate them.

Children

Copyright

Privacy

Harassment

It comes down to this: YouTube is all about sharing and interacting with the community in respectful ways. If you're not sure whether a video crosses the line, follow a simple rule of thumb: if you wouldn't say it to someone's face, it's not for YouTube. And if you're looking to attack, harass, threaten, or impersonate others, go elsewhere.

Impersonation

Threats

Users shouldn't feel threatened when they're on YouTube. Period. Don't leave threatening comments on other people's videos.

Language **English** ▼

Country **United States** ▼

Ads **Off** ▼

Help ▲

About **Press & Blogs** **Copyright** **Creators & Partners**

Terms **Privacy** **Policy & Safety** **Send feedback** **Try new!**

Rising **Developers**

Page 29

1 Q Did the -- Do you know what the results of the
2 federal investigation was?
3 A I just talked to Special Agent Maruschak and
4 he sent it up to his SAC in St. Louis, and their opinion
5 was that they thought the video to be threatening,
6 however, they didn't believe that the video in, itself,
7 was criminal.
8 Q Okay. And did you notify the Franklin County
9 sheriff about the arrest warrant?
10 A On the arrest warrant, yes. I notified, after
11 the judge signed it, I came downstairs outside the other
12 Courthouse and I called the sheriff's department to
13 inform them that we had obtained an arrest warrant and
14 asked them to assist me in the arrest.
15 Q Did they assist you in the arrest?
16 A No. They stated that they had other calls
17 pending and were not available to assist me.
18 Q Okay.
19 A However, they felt like I could go ahead and
20 serve the warrant on my own.
21 Q Who did you talk to at the sheriff's
22 department?
23 A It was one of their non-sworn.
24 Q Do you remember his name?
25 A I don't remember his name.

Page 30

1 Q And then how did you make contact with Jeff,
2 too?
3 A I called him on his phone.
4 Q Okay. And did you tell him that you were
5 going to arrest him?
6 A No, sir. I did not.
7 Q Why not?
8 A I wanted to not tell Jeff that I was, you
9 know, going to arrest him, because I didn't think that
10 he would want to turn himself in, or I didn't want to
11 have any problems with that.
12 I felt like if I would come up with a ruse to
13 meet him and return some of his equipment, I could explain
14 to him in person that I had an arrest warrant, versus
15 doing it over the phone and potentially, you know, getting
16 into more trouble.
17 Because if I'd of told him there's an arrest
18 warrant, and maybe he'd try to barricade the area, or barricade
19 himself, or do a number of things. I just told him that
20 I needed to meet with him to give him his computers back.
21 Q Did you believe Jeff was dangerous?
22 A At that point, not really.
23 Q Okay. And where did you arrange to meet Jeff?
24 A Originally we had, we had set up to have him
25 meet us at the MFA station, however, when I talked to

Page 31

1 him he even said a public place, and I logically
2 suggested that, since we were sitting there, and he said
3 it was okay, that he would meet us there.
4 So we ended up meeting on the MFA station on K
5 highway just up the road from his house a little ways.
6 Q Why did you choose that location?
7 A It was public, it was private. It was not a
8 lot of traffic there, and it was a location that he knew
9 fairly well.
10 It was also, tactically, one road in and one
11 road out, I would be able to secure each end of the road
12 with a marked unit, so it provided the best opportunity.
13 You know, and I did not want to return to his
14 house in any way, because he'd made a video saying that he
15 was on death row four, and carrying guns, and I just felt
16 like to go back to his house would spark an incident.
17 Q Why didn't you choose an alternate location,
18 such as Troop A or Troop I for him to meet with you?
19 A Like I said, we wanted an isolated place where
20 there weren't a lot of entrances and exits, where no one
21 could get -- could be possibly hurt if anything went
22 wrong.
23 Q You think would it be more dangerous for him
24 to come to a highway patrol troop station?
25 A Well, typically, I wouldn't have him go to

Page 32

1 Troop C, that's an hour and a half away, I've only been
2 there once in my career, I would just have him meet me.
3 Since it was a Franklin County warrant, I would
4 normally have the people meet me somewhere in Franklin
5 County and take them down to the department.
6 Q Okay. Were you concerned about your safety at
7 the gas station or the MFA station?
8 A Initially, no. I mean, we were well -- we
9 brought several firearms. We had several, you know, our
10 safety equipment with us and things. The only thing
11 that concerned me was that day, when I spoke to Jeff on
12 the phone he was agitated, and he hadn't been agitated
13 the times when I dealt with him before.
14 He was not happy about things that occurred, but
15 he didn't seem agitated, and that day he seemed agitated.
16 Q How so? Can you just tell me, when you use
17 the word agitated, what statements or behaviors did
18 he --
19 A Just his tone of voice. He was talking real
20 fast, he was real curt, and he, he -- I don't think he
21 trusted me, and he told me he didn't trust me, so he was
22 on edge as well.
23 Q Okay. Were you concerned about the presence
24 of gas pumps or fuel pumps at this location?
25 A I wasn't initially, because

FILED

SEP 04 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

**DEFENDANT'S AMENDED MOTION TO DISMISS THE CHARGE OF TAMPERING
WITH JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR DEFECT IN THE INSTITUTION OF THE
PROSECUTION**

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as his Rule 24.04(b) motion to dismiss the charge of Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo. 565.084, for defect in the institution of the prosecution:

This amended motion is filing to correct the record. Since filing the original motion to dismiss, undersigned counsel has learned of certain past misdemeanor convictions of Defendant (the mention of which before the jury Defendant is moving to exclude in limine in a separate motion). This amended motion simply corrects that issue but is otherwise unchanged.

I. Judicial Tampering Charge

1. Defendant was charged in the Amended Indictment, *inter alia*, with Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C, RSMo. 565.084.
2. Defendant hereby moves to dismiss that charge on the basis that as a matter of law his speech is protected by the First Amendment and does not rise to the level of a reasonable threat to any Judicial Officer, and thus—particularly as it is colorful and unpopular political speech nevertheless granted constitutional protection—his speech cannot go to a jury.

3. Defendant also moves to dismiss that charge because the statements were conditional and in nature and thus as a matter of law do not rise to a true threat.

II. Facts

4. The *actus reus* alleged is a Youtube video published to the world wide web on August 17, 2012, featuring Defendant and entitled "Bulletinman Broadcast 8-16-12 The Party's Over! With Notes," *available at* <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qHw0sDThkN8&list=UUzc6JzO6mcusCX-YtNj02ug&index=7>.
5. (There is also a second video that does not feature captions. It appears from discovery that both were reviewed by the State and both were reviewed by the arresting troopers whose probable cause statements formed the basis of Defendant's arrest warrant. Since the second video, lacking captions, does not mention Judge Kelly Parker, any prosecution based on the second video fails as a matter of law since there is no evidence to support a finding of probable cause, let alone guilt.)
6. The written caption on the Youtube page is:

Explicit but oh so true. Bulletinman has had enough of the Insanity. Constitution day is September 17th and September 14th will be the last day of the Defacto Court. You all is fired and will be considered trespassers after that time. The power belongs to be people and we got an easy 70% that say you got to go. We the People now realize just what a fraud the Court is not only upon itself but the Constitution, the People and GOD Almighty. No victim no crime. No justice no peace. Know JESUS know peace. Where the Spirit of the LORD is there is Liberty.
7. Defendant begins the video with statements on various matters of public concern such as the poor state of the economy and unemployment.

8. The video threatens that the People will “fire” various Missouri officials including the State Courts Administrator, elected Circuit Judges, lawyers and policemen through a “Redress and Revocation Petition” on 9-11-2012.
9. At 1:17 Defendant generally references corrupt officials and “my right to blast you motherfuckers out of there if we have to. I don’t want to come down to that. I really don’t.”
10. At 2:04 he states generally “we have the right to remove you use of force. Now, we’re not going to go out and kill you like you do other people.”
11. Defendant states at 8:33 that “I’m being generous in a giving you a month to do it,” which the Court can infer to mean the time frame for the above-described people to resign.
12. A text caption appears at 8:40 that cites Mo. Const. sec. 3, particularly as to the right of the people “to alter and abolish their Constitution and form of government whenever they may deem it necessary ...”
13. Defendant then states at 8:50-9:10 that elected officials who resist will be arrested, tried by treason by a jury of their peers, and executed for treason and other crimes against the American people.
14. The video is 9:38 minutes long.
15. Defendant references a laundry list of judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, court clerks, etc., some with particularity and some without.
16. Nowhere does Defendant himself orally state a threat to arrest, try or execute any person.
17. Particularly, nowhere does Defendant state the name of Judge Kelly Parker of Crawford County.

18. Judge Parker's name appears briefly in a caption at 2:47, some six minutes before Defendant's statements about occupying the court house and putting officials on trial for treason.
19. Other officials are named besides Judge Parker in a laundry list, lessening to each of a reasonable speaker and a reasonable listener that Judge Parker is being singled out among the allegedly corrupt officials.
20. The foregoing features a caption stating "Bill of Rights 6," presumably the Sixth Amend., U.S. Const.
21. At 9:20 the Defendant accuses the U.S. government of killing 55 million babies, which the Court can infer to mean a reference to legalized abortion.
22. The video is part of a recurring series of print publications and broadcasts issued by Defendant as a citizen journalist since 1996. *See, e.g., Exs. 1-B* (Bulletinman print publication), authenticated by *Ex. 1-A* (Affidavit of Judy Kropf). Particularly, Bulletinman videos have been broadcast on Youtube since 2009, *at* <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>.
23. The overall thrust and dominant theme of Bulletinman publications and broadcasts are statements (oft expressed humorously and vulgarly) as to matters of public concern, particularly that:
 - a. Most Missouri elected officials including elected judges are corrupt and subverting the Constitution, and
 - b. The sovereign People pursuant to the Constitution have a right to "fire" elected officials, to try them for treason according to due process by a jury of their peers, and to execute them if found guilty of treason.

24. The correctness or error of the Bulletinman statements is irrelevant to this analysis.
25. The World Wide Web, which anyone may access at anytime with an internet connection, is an archetypal public forum.
26. Defendant has no prior record of provoking violence directly related to his Bulletinman publications.
27. (On information and belief, Defendant has three misdemeanor convictions in Missouri: 2003 for harassment; 2006 for trespassing; and a 2007 Suspended Execution of Sentence (SES) for assaulting a police officer.)

III. The First Amendment prohibits criminal prosecution of Defendant's speech

28. RSMo. 565.084 prohibits speech that would threaten harm to a judicial officer or his immediate family, insofar affects ability of judicial officer to carry out his duties.
29. In context, a reasonable person cannot take Defendant's speech to be a true threat or fighting words to Judge Parker.
30. In the alternative, in the totality of the circumstances, Defendant's speech is protected by the First Amendment.
31. The Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment—"Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech"—as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment can defeat as a matter of law charges of tampering or harassment that do not constitute a true threat or a reasonable apprehension of harm. *See, e.g., State v. Wooden*, No. SC92846 (Jan. 8, 2013). That is particularly true in the context here where Defendant is a citizen journalist and blogger with a long history of lively and sometimes offensive critical statements against elected officials, but no record of violence.

32. (First Amendment analysis of political speech of public concern is appropriate also under the free speech provision of Mo. Const., art. I, sec. 8. Missouri's free speech rights track those of the federal Constitution.)
33. Defendant's speech is a matter of public concern, as determined by all the circumstances of the case. "[S]peech on 'matters of public concern' ... is 'at the heart of the First Amendment's protection.'" *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U. S. 749, 758-759 (1985) (opinion of Powell, J.) (quoting *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U. S. 765, 776 (1978)). The First Amendment reflects "a profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open." *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U. S. 254, 270 (1964). That is because "speech concerning public affairs is more than self-expression; it is the essence of self-government." *Garrison v. Louisiana*, 379 U. S. 64, 74-75 (1964). Accordingly, "speech on public issues occupies the highest rung of the hierarchy of First Amendment values, and is entitled to special protection." *Connick v. Myers*, 461 U. S. 138, 145 (1983) (internal quotation marks omitted).
34. Although the boundaries of what constitutes speech on matters of public concern are not well defined, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that speech is of public concern when it can "be fairly considered as relating to any matter of political, social, or other concern to the community," *id.* at 146, or when it "is a subject of general interest and of value and concern to the public," *San Diego v. Roe*, 543 U. S. 77, 83-84. A statement's arguably "inappropriate or controversial character... is irrelevant to the question whether it deals with a matter of public concern." *Rankin v. McPherson*, 483 U. S. 378, 387.

35. To determine whether speech is of public or private concern, this Court must independently examine the “‘content, form, and context,’” of the speech “‘as revealed by the whole record.’” *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U. S. 749, 761. In considering content, form, and context, no factor is dispositive, and it is necessary to evaluate all aspects of the speech.
36. Speech deals with matters of public concern when it can “be fairly considered as relating to any matter of political, social, or other concern to the community,” *Connick, supra*, at 146, or when it “is a subject of legitimate news interest; that is, a subject of general interest and of value and concern to the public,” *San Diego, supra*, at 83-84. *See Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U. S. 469, 492-494 (1975); *Time, Inc. v. Hill*, 385 U. S. 374, 387 (1967). The arguably “inappropriate or controversial character of a statement is irrelevant to the question whether it deals with a matter of public concern.” *Rankin v. McPherson*, 483 U. S. 378, 387 (1987).
37. The “content” of Defendant’s video plainly relates to broad issues of interest to society at large, rather than matters of “purely private concern.” *Dun & Bradstreet, supra*, at 759.
38. While the tone of these messages may fall short of refined social or political commentary, the issues the video highlights—the American economy and unemployment, elected official and elected judicial corruption, abortion—are matters of public import. The video broadcasts Defendant’s statements on those issues, in a manner designed to reach as broad a public audience as possible.
39. Judge Kelly Parker’s name appears in a pop-up caption at 2:47 in the video, some six minutes before the alleged threat made by Defendant at 8:50-9:10. Even if the video is viewed as containing a message related to Judge Kelly Parker specifically, that would not

- change the fact that the overall thrust and dominant theme of Defendant's video spoke to broader public issues than Judge Parker. That is particularly true as other law enforcement and elected officials are also listed by name in pop-up captions.
40. Given that Defendant's speech was in a public forum on a matter of public concern, that speech is entitled to "special protection" under the First Amendment. Such speech cannot be restricted merely because it is upsetting or arouses contempt. "If there is a bedrock principle underlying the First Amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable." *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U. S. 397, 414 (1989). Indeed, "the point of all speech protection ... is to shield just those choices of content that in someone's eyes are misguided, or even hurtful." *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston, Inc.*, 515 U. S. 557, 574 (1995).
41. Nor can the State argue that Defendant's video must go to the jury because the speech is outrageous. "Outrageousness" is a highly malleable standard with "an inherent subjectiveness about it which would allow a jury to impose liability on the basis of the jurors' tastes or views, or perhaps on the basis of their dislike of a particular expression." *Hustler*, 485 U. S., at 55 (internal quotation marks omitted). In a case such as this, a jury is "unlikely to be neutral with respect to the content of [the] speech," posing "a real danger of becoming an instrument for the suppression of ... 'vehement, caustic, and sometimes unpleasan[t]'" expression. *Bose Corp.*, 466 U. S., at 510 (quoting *New York Times*, 376 U. S., at 270).
42. Such a risk is unacceptable; "in public debate [we] must tolerate insulting, and even outrageous, speech in order to provide adequate 'breathing space' to the freedoms

protected by the First Amendment.” *Boos v. Barry*, 485 U. S. 312, 322 (1988) (some internal quotation marks omitted).

43. What Defendant said, in the whole context of how and where he chose to say it, is entitled to “special protection” under the First Amendment, and that protection cannot be overcome by a potential jury finding that the video was outrageous.
44. The purpose of free speech is to invite dispute, even where it incites people to anger; in fact, the provocative and inflammatory content of speech can potentially be seen as positive. *Terminiello v. City of Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949) (Douglas, J.).
45. “The Constitution is not neutral. It was designed to take the government off the backs of the people.” Justice William O. Douglas, *The Court Years* at 8 (1980).
46. Defendant concedes that free speech does not permit “fighting words”, *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 315 U.S. 568 (1942) (upholding conviction for breach of peace where Appellant verbally attacked a marshal by shouting “you’re a damned Fascist” in a public street).
47. But here, as discussed *infra*, we are dealing not with fighting words but rather with an alleged true threat, that is, speech that would put a reasonable person in apprehension of harm.
48. Under the totality of the circumstances—the form, content and context—Defendant’s speech does not objectively constitute fighting words, nor does it put Judge Parker or anyone else in a reasonable apprehension of harm by threatening to interfere with the performance of Judge Parker’s judicial duties.

IV. Defendant’s speech in context is hyperbole, not literal

49. Defendant's speech is hyperbolic in tone, not literal. Hyperbole is marked by the use of exaggeration as a rhetorical device or figure of speech. It may be used to evoke strong feelings or to create a strong impression, but is not meant to be taken literally.
50. In our tradition of criticism of public officials, this Court can take judicial notice that hyperbolic statements against public officials have been routinely made both generally and with particularity but do not necessarily intend what their plain language states:
- a. In 2010, former Gov. Sarah Palin (R-AS) produced a political ad putting certain U.S. congressmen "in the crosshairs" and showing a map of congressional seats with a rifle scope view superimposed and a list of the congressmen. *See* Jeff Muskus, *Sarah Palin's PAC Puts Gun Sights On Democrats She's Targeting In 2010*, Huffington Post, Jan. 9, 2011, at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/03/24/sarah-palins-pac-puts-gun_n_511433.html); *see also* *Gabrielle Giffords was on Sarah Palin's crosshairs map – A history of violent words used against Giffords*, S.F. Sentinel, Jan. 9, 2011, available at <http://www.sanfranciscosentinel.com/?p=102900>).
 - i. U.S. Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-AZ) was among those targeted by Palin's speech.
 - ii. Giffords was later shot by a mentally ill individual named Jared Loughner, who subsequently pleaded guilty to various related felonies. *U.S. v. Loughner*, 11CR-187TUC (D.Az.).
 - iii. A reasonable person would not believe Gov. Palin advocated the actual shooting of any congressman, including Rep. Giffords.
 - iv. Gov. Palin has never been charged with a crime.

b. Scientifically reliable and widely accepted polling indicates some 29 percent of Americans think that an armed revolution in order to protect liberties might be necessary in the next few years, with another five percent unsure. In light of such popular views, Defendant's speech can be read either as a hyperbolic extrapolation of such a belief, or as a statement referencing a popular sentiment—but in context not as a direct threat by Defendant to Judge Parker. *See Beliefs about Sandy Hook Cover-Up, Coming Revolution Underlie Divide On Gun Control, Fairleigh Dickinson Poll* (Mar. 31, 2013), available at <http://publicmind.fdu.edu/2013/guncontrol/>.

51. Here, given the lengthy history of Defendant's hyperbolic publications and broadcasts against public officials, a reasonable person would not view the video in context as an actual threat to try and then execute Judge Kelly Parker.
52. The particular reaction of Judge Kelly Parker to the video is irrelevant to this analysis as such a reaction is subjective and has nothing to do with the objection reasonableness of Defendant's speech.
53. It appears that the State concurs with the foregoing, as it has not designated Judge Parker as a trial witness. Defendant has not designated Judge Parker as a witness either in his supplemented disclose to the State.

V. Defendant's statements are conditional, and do not constitute a true threat under the subjective/objective factors of *Dinwiddie* analysis

54. True threats do not merit First Amendment protection. *Watts v. United States*, 394 U.S. 705 (1969).

55. In evaluating whether speech is a true threat, this Court must be guided by the multi-factor analysis set forth by the Eighth Circuit in *United States v. Dinwiddie*, 76 F.3d 913 (8th Cir. 1996). The factors include:
- a. The reaction of the recipient of the threat and of other listeners,
 - b. Whether the threat was conditional,
 - c. Whether the threat was communicated directly to its victim,
 - d. Whether the maker of the threat had made similar statements to the victim in the past, and
 - e. Whether the victim had reason to believe that the maker of the threat had a propensity to engage in violence.
56. Defendant's video does not constitute a true threat under this analysis.
- a. Under the reasonable listener test, *United States v. J.H.H.*, 22 F.3d 821, 827-28 (8th Cir. 1994), given the entire factual context, the recipient of the alleged threat could not reasonably conclude that it expresses "a determination or intent to injure presently or in the future."
 - b. The speech was conditional.
 - c. The speech was not communicated directly to Judge Parker.
 - d. Defendant had made no prior speech directed at Judge Parker.
 - e. Defendant had no propensity to engage in violence, had no criminal record, and was not viewed as a dangerous person by the Missouri troopers who executed his arrest warrant. *See Depo. of Folsom*, at 30:21-22.
57. The conditionality of defendant's speech is particularly important to the analysis. The court can reasonably surmise that Defendant's intention was not to intimidate or frighten

Judge Parker but rather to make a political statement to his audience. This intention was fairly clear from the context: Defendant made the alleged threat for purposes of rhetorical hyperbole rather than to intimidate, frighten, or coerce Judge Parker beyond what is allowable political advocacy.

58. In context, Defendant's statements cannot reasonably be construed by this Court to purposely, knowingly, or recklessly intimidate or coerce Judge Parker, and a reasonable person would not view the statement as threatening. Rather, Defendant's speech promotes open debate and vigorous advocacy over allegations of judicial corruption.
59. (In the alternative, Defendant suggests that this Court can adopt the Ninth Circuit's reasoning and require that the State prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant intended his words or conduct to be understood by Judge Parker as a threat. *See United States v. Bagdasarian*, 652 F.3d 1113 (9th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Cassel*, 408 F.3d 622 (9th Cir. 2005). Mere negligence with regard to the victim's understanding is insufficient.)

VI. The Eighth Circuit splits with other circuits as to whether threats are to be evaluated objectively or subjectively

60. Defendant acknowledges that the federal appellate circuits are split on whether the threat is to be evaluated objectively or subjectively. Compare *Dinwiddie* with *Bagdasarian* with *United States v. White*, 670 F.3d 498, 512 (4th Cir. 2012) with *Turner*, as discussed below.
61. Defendant concedes that the Eighth Circuit in *Dinwiddie* has held the reaction of the recipient can be one of a multitude of factors in analyzing the speech. Here, however,

Defendant's speech was in a public forum and not a communication directly transmitted to Judge Kelly Parker.

62. Indeed, Judge Parker ought not to be able to testify at trial, either, as his subjective reaction to the speech would prejudice the jury as to any objective evaluation—legally or factually—of the reasonable listener's reaction to the speech itself. *United States v. J.H.H.*, 22 F.3d 821, 827-28 (8th Cir. 1994). The admission of recipient reaction testimony is overly prejudicial because it may have a tendency to be outweighed by juries. This is true because members of a jury will trust the recipient's characterization over their own instinct. In addition, members of the jury are likely to be swayed by the emotional impact of the recipient's testimony. **Jennifer E. Rothman**, *Freedom of Speech and True Threats*, 25 Harv. J.L. & Public Policy 1 (2001).
63. The Court can also find Defendant's speech is not a true threat under other circuits' analyses. Compare the Second Circuit's recent analysis of true threats against federal appellate judges in Chicago in *U.S. v. Turner*, No. 11-196-cr (June 21, 2013). Defendant's speech is distinguishable both under the facts of *Turner*, and under its legal tests for true threats.
64. The Defendant in *Turner* published a blog on the internet. His blog posts included statements such as:
 - a. "Obey the Constitution or die."
 - b. The blood of the three judges would "replenish the tree of liberty."
 - c. The judges "didn't get the hint" sent by a gunman who murdered another federal judge in Chicago.

- d. The judges had not “faced REAL free men willing to walk up to them and kill them for their defiance and disobedience.”
 - e. The ruling on a particular case was “so sleazy and cunning as to deserve the ultimate response,” and
 - f. That the judges “deserved to be killed.”
65. Turner also posted photographs, work addresses, and room numbers for each judge, as well as a map to the courthouse where they worked, and a photograph of “anti-truck bomb barriers” outside that courthouse.
66. Turner had a history of links to violent groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and Aryan World Congress, and at one point was an FBI informant as to his website visitors who shared their intentions to commit violent acts (Turner was later dropped by the FBI).
67. Turner’s website revealed a history of statements with threats against other officials, together with threats to divulge their home addresses and mention of “having enough bullets to put them down too.”
68. These facts are distinguishable from the instant case in that:
- a. Weinhaus never made reference to executing any particular judge (but for the most strained reading of a six-minute lapse between a caption with Judge Parker’s name and statements regarding execution for treason).
 - b. Weinhaus never referenced other murders.
 - c. Weinhaus did not exhort others to kill Judge Parker with any particularity.
 - d. Weinhaus never posted maps or business information about Judge Parker’s courthouse.

- e. Weinhaus never threatened to occupy any particular courthouse, and indeed “occupying a courthouse” is merely civil disobedience and not a threat to commit murder (Sgt. Folsom, who attempted to arrest Defendant on September 11, 2012, conceded there were at least three courthouses that Weinhaus might occupy, therefore no courthouse was actually designated with particularity, and conceded that occupation itself can be peaceful). *See, e.g., Ex. 3* (Depo. of Folsom).
69. The *Turner* jury convicted upon instruction for a “true threat.”
70. A split Second Circuit panel affirmed the instruction and conviction on appeal, based on the following factors:
- a. The “seriousness of the extended discussion of killing [the judges].”
 - b. Turner’s references to past acts of violence, particularly the murder of another federal judge in Chicago.
 - c. Turner’s past statements calling for the death of a federal judge, and approvingly noting her subsequent actual murder.
 - d. Posting photographs, work addresses and maps for the threatened judges’ chambers.
71. The *Turner* court also found that intimidation can constitute a true threat when the intent is to place the victim in fear of bodily harm or death, citing the U.S. Supreme Court case proscribing cross burning. *Virginia v. Black*, 538 U.S. 343, 360 (2003).

VII. Defendant’s speech is not incitement under the *Brandenburg* test

72. The U.S. Supreme Court has long distinguished incitement from the mere “advocacy of the use of force or of law violation.” *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 449 (1969). The former is illegal; the latter is First Amendment protected.
73. To determine incitement, the proper test is to look whether the statement “is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.” *Id.*; see also *Hess v. Indiana*, 414 U.S. 105, 108-09 (1973).
74. Incitement is distinguishable from a true threat. *New York ex. rel. Spitzer v. Operation Rescue Nat’l*, 273 F.3d 184, 196 (2d Cir. 2001); *United States v. Howell*, 719 F.2d 1258, 1260 (5th Cir. 1983).
75. Even language such as that in Defendant’s Youtube broadcast, which might seem threatening, is protected under an incitement analysis if made in public as part of a political communication. See, e.g., *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware*, 458 U.S. 886, 902 (1982) (affording First Amendment protection to statements at public rallies threatening to “break [the] damn neck[s]” of those who broke a boycott of segregated retail stores).
76. Defendant’s speech here in a public forum, the world wide web, did not rise to the level of an “unequivocal, unconditional and specific expression[] of intention immediately to inflict injury.” *United States v. Kelner*, 534 F.2d 1020, 1027 (2d Cir. 1976). In that case, by contrast, the *Kelner* Defendant’s conviction was affirmed for the statement, “[W]e are planning to assassinate Mrs. Arafat ... everything is planned in detail.” *Id.* at 1025.

VIII. Defendant’s speech does not constitute fighting words, and is factually distinguishable from *Wooden*

77. The Missouri Supreme Court recently affirmed convictions for harassment under RSMo. 565.090.1(2)1 and 565.090.1(5), where the Defendant sent individual emails and letters to a St. Louis City alderwoman calling her a “bitch” and a “Jezebel” and threatening to “go Gabrielle Giffords” on her with a “sawed off shotgun” and “pop” her “cherry” like assassinated president John F. Kennedy. *State v. Wooden*, No. SC92846 (Jan. 8, 2013).
78. Although the harassment crime in *Wooden* is distinct from judicial harassment under RSMo. 565.084, for the purpose of analysis they are substantially the same. RSMo. 565.090.1(2)1 and 565.090.1(5) require a showing that the threats put the victim in “reasonable apprehension of offensive physical contact or harm.” The judicial tampering statute requires the speaker’s purpose to be to “harass, intimidate or influence a judicial officer in the performance of such officer’s official duties.” Although the showing is different, both are essentially an objective reasonable person standard as to the imminent harm or harassment effect of the speech.
79. In *Wooden*, the Mo. Supreme Court rejected the Defendant’s appeal on First Amendment grounds because, after a detailed factual inquiry into his speech, it found the speech contained words that, taken together, “through their very utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace” and are not protected by the First Amendment or the Missouri Constitution. *Id.* at 6, quoting *Chaplinsky, supra*, 315 U.S. at 571-72.
80. Defendant’s speech here is factually distinguishable from that of *Wooden* in at least five respects:
- a. Wooden sent emails directly to the Alderwoman he threatened. Defendant, by contrast, made his speech only in a public forum (the world wide web), in the

context of a regular broadcast and publication of Bulletinman, which criticizes alleged official corruption.

- b. Wooden had no reputation as a harmless but colorful political commentator. Defendant is a citizen journalist and blogger, known in Crawford County (where Judge Parker sits) for his anti-government views. Context matters as to the statement.
- c. Wooden made references to dusting off a sawed-off shotgun, and that he was going to make “a mess of everything with his sawed-off.” Defendant made no threats to his personal use of deadly force.
- d. Wooden referenced himself as a domestic terrorist and referenced the shootings of President Kennedy, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, and U.S. District Court Judge John Roll. Defendant references no other shootings or murders.
- e. Wooden’s tone was maniacal and menacing. Defendant’s tone is hyperbolic, but not menacing.
- f. Wooden had a history of serious criminality. Defendant has none.

IX. The Court can take judicial notice that Google has not removed the speech from its website, despite Youtube’s “Community Guidelines” and “Terms of Service”

- 81. Defendant’s speech was broadcast from the Youtube website, owned by Google Incorporated.
- 82. Defendant’s speech is still posted publicly on the Youtube website, at <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>. See Ex. 2-A, Affidavit of Hugh A. Eastwood.

83. Youtube maintains “Terms of Service”, *Ex. 2-B*, available at <http://www.youtube.com/static?template=terms>, and “Community Guidelines”, *Ex. 2-C*, available at http://www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, for Youtube users.
84. The Community Guidelines include, *inter alia*:
- a. “Things like predatory behavior, stalking, threats, harassment, intimidation, invading privacy, revealing other people’s personal information, and inciting others to commit violent acts or to violate the Terms of Use are taken very seriously. Anyone caught doing these things may be permanently banned from YouTube.”
85. The Terms of Service include, *inter alia*, at 6.E:
- a. “You further agree that you will not submit to the Service any Content or other material that is contrary to the YouTube Community Guidelines, currently found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, which may be updated from time to time, or contrary to applicable local, national, and international laws and regulations.”
86. While Defendant suggests that the standard for a threat is an objective one, he acknowledges that the federal appellate circuits are split on this legal standard (as discussed above), and therefore if this Court adopts a partially subjective standard, the continued presence of Defendant’s speech on the Youtube website suggests that Google and Youtube do not find Defendant’s speech to have violated their “Community Guidelines” and “Terms of Service.”


WHEREFORE Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus moves this Court to SUSTAIN his motion to dismiss the charge of Tampering With Judicial Officer, Felony C RSMo: 565.084, for defect in the institution of the prosecution, in that Defendant's speech does not:

1. Constitute a true threat,
2. Put Judge Kelly Parker in a reasonable apprehension of harm,
3. Constitute incitement, nor
4. Incite an imminent breach of the peace.

and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant




Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on 9/03, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084



The method(s) of service: by U.S. mail, first class.

FILED

SEP 04 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

AFFIDAVIT OF JUDY KROPF

Comes now Judy Kropf and states for her Affidavit:

1. My name is Judy Kropf and I am an adult capable of making this Affidavit.
2. Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus is my former husband. Our marriage was legally dissolved in May of 2013.
3. Attached as Exhibits 1-B are true copies of various editions of "Bulletinman," a publication written and produced Defendant.
4. Through my former marriage to Defendant, I have personal knowledge of "Bulletinman" generally and these representative copies in particular.
5. For the past 16 or so years, "Bulletinman" was produced in print format and distributed at various public places in Jefferson County, in Crawford County as an attachment to the "Bourbon Bystander" newspaper (also published by Defendant), and in other places in Missouri.
6. "Bulletinman" has also been created, produced and distributed by my former husband Defendant through the internet, on the Bulletinman.com website and on Youtube at <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>.
7. Further Affiant sayeth not.

DEFENDANT'S
Exhibit
1-A

I hereby verify and affirm that I have read and understood this document. I declare under oath and under penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge all the statements in this document are true and correct.

Judith A Kropf
Judith Kropf

State of Missouri)
) ss
County of St. Louis)

Subscribed and sworn before me this August 2, 2013

Lawrence L. Thurmond
Notary Public

Americans, indeed all free men, remember that inn the final choice, a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains. Ike

Bulletinman.Com - 314-800-3652

Backpage

A na
that
duce
purch
tual
ment

DEFENDANT'S

Exhibit

1-B

W
Fe
Fr
er

You have to
licens
You will ge
and reach :
35-
Cheap Fi
Trans
228 N. 3r
636-
Off Road Vi
Par
Save a ton w
Before you

6696 VETERANS DR. CEDAR HILL, MO 63016 (636)-274-9979
ACROSS FROM SAVE-A-LOT ON HWY 88

Downtown Deli

Main and Boyd
DeSoto

Sit Down or Carry Out
Fresh sliced deli meat, top tier no
junk here. Fresh baked bread,
sandwiches, soups hot lunch
specials call 636-586-1977
Mon-Fri 7 to 7
Sat 7-2 Closed Sunday

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-6399

Open Weds-Sun Noon to 6
Republic of Tea Teas
Ravens Brew Coffee.

Your One Stop Gift

Heartland Realty

50 Jefferson Square
DeSoto 636-337-0600

Buying or Selling Real Estate
call Patty and her agents

**THEY SIMPLY
GET RESULTS**

GOWERS AUTOMOTIVE

Athena School & Flucom off
67 Desoto.

636-337-5501

You can trust Paul & Terry
If it's Broke they will fix it
If it's not they will tell you!
Honest Mechanics are Priceless
Computer Diagnostics
Safety and Emissions
Inspections

General Signs and Graphics

306 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-9296

Banners-T-Shirts
All your Sign Needs
Printing Too

"A sign of a good busi-
ness is a good sign"

Meanwhile back at the Ranch. In Jefferson County still Judge Bouchard sits on the bench and Tammy Berg is raking it in. Have you seen the drug court contract? In your face evidence that the Court is a fraud upon not only it self but everyone who it comes in contact with. Our government is so screwed up. The land records are now ruined since the Recorders of Deeds has accepted the MERS filings. Do you really believe that the vote count is honest? If they are voting with anything but paper ballots hand counted it can be rigged. In this day and age even without a vigilant County clerk. Assessor, personal property tax? Land tax? How about a sales tax to pave the roads and put out fires like the Constitution calls for. With a flat sales tax out government could function in the capacity it was created for. To protect and maintain our God given rights. Keep praying. Have not heard from Chuck about his lot next to the Courthouse. Though there was a protest at the Jail on Saturday June 16th in honor of Bradley Kingery who was found dead in the jail on Memorial Day morning at 3:30. Brad was 24 being held on I believe a failure to appear traffic related warrant. The JCSD would not even let the Mother look at the body and refused to turn over his belongings. Now his brother is in there on some BS! What is up with that? To top it off finding a lawyer to sue the Sheriff's department is impossible without a huge sum of cash upfront. In Jeffco carpet bagger lawyers are coming down from the City and County to do business with the Court because most of local attorney's have screwed at least one member of every family in the county. The people are flat broke, busted not to be trusted and now the trickle up effect is starting to show. When people lose it all that is when they lose it. There is a case that has been going on in Jeffco for over 7 years hung jury once now they are trying to get these people again based on the testimony of a 12 year old. These folks have spent \$250,000 on lawyers and the problem has not gone away. These charges should not have even been filed in the first place. Secondly the lawyer they hired who said that became the PA in Jeffco. Now you would think that after these people paid Forrest 30 and Brain Hammond 20 thousand that is, this "matter" would have vanished. No it got to transferred to St. Louis County and they went and gave the big city lawyers another 50 and they still owe them 100 for a hung jury. They are now lawyer less and broke. The matter has not gone away even though the alleged victim has changed her story at least three times and the one who took her to the police and started the whole ball rolling was just picked up and released after he was on Jeffco's most wanted list. My GOD people you just can't make stuff like this up. By the way the "system" placed the trouble young lady into the home of the actual abuser who was the accused brother. In short order! That is just one of a hundred stories I could share and the Bulletin has a very small footprint. Sad what have we become? Is there any accountability left? I for one can not get any justice under this system and I'm afraid I'm not the only one. They that be with us are a whole lot more than they that be with them. The real scary part of this is that there are certain people who are starting to figure this out who are trained killers under oath to defend our Constitution. That spells TROUBLE for the people who make a living under the color of law. In Crawford County same story though different faces. They first stole the election from Larry in Bourbon and on May 23rd the "task force" raided his place of business terrorizing the customers and children. This all went down because Larry was selling the incense that some people use to get high even though it is labeled not for human consumption and is 100% totally legal. They stole thousands of dollars worth of inventory, computers, cash, cashiers checks, and to top it all off froze his bank accounts. Though keep in mind he is innocent until proven guilty. They even arrested his helper for selling this "illegal" product even though he never took any money. What is it going to take? How much more must we endure? You the tax paying citizens of this once great state are paying these terrorist. Now is the time to open your eyes and see who the real enemy is. You have been lied too, deceived and brain washed into thinking that the USA and the police are the good guys. I hate to burst your bubble though the ones wearing black masks and carrying machine guns are your "trusted public servants". Would you please put aside your pride and open your eyes realizing that the devil is a liar. The enemy has come in like a flood though the good news is that God is still on the throne and prayer changes things. It is my prayer for another great awakening to occur and for people to realize that out enemy is within and cast them out while there is still time. No More Lies! Fire them all let GOD sort them out!

VIP
850 Commercial Bldg
Parts • Serv
All Make
636-475-74
• Scooters • ATV
• Utility Vehicles
Layaway/FI
www.vip

It is curious that physical courage should be so common in the world and moral courage so rare. -Mark Twain

Courage is doing what you're afraid to do. There can be no courage unless you're scared.
-Edward Vernon Rickenbacker

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

February 1 2012

Fall upon the ROCK before the ROCK falls on you

When a man asks himself what is meant by action he proves he is not a man of action. When a man asks himself what is meant by action he proves he is not a man of action. Action is a lack of balance. In order to act you must be somewhat insane. A reasonably sensible man is satisfied with thinking.
Georges Clemenceau

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main Desoto
636-586-6399

A Real Deal Awaits U
Over 35 Dealers Ravens
Brew Coffee Republic of
Tea Teas Greeting Cards

You and Me x 3
Resale Mercantile
920 Commerical
St. Clair Mo
Mon-Sat 10-6

JEFFCO Contracting

Fully Insured, Concrete,
Retaining Walls Flat Work,
Natural Stone, Water
Features
Dan 314-807-2570

Viper Trailer Sales

850 Commerical Blvd
Herky 636-475-7487
Utility Trailers Cargo
Enclosed Best Price Service 2

Two Car Guys

Treating People The Way We
Want to Be Treated
Hwy 67 Next Midwest 66 Festus

KT POWERSPORTS

Exclusive
Hammerhead Cart HQ
Motor Scooters, Mopeds,
4 Wheelers
228 N. 3rd Street
636-937-3298
Festus MO

Dave's 509 Liquor

W. Main Festus Drive Thru
Import Beers Local Wines
636-931-5090

YOUR AD HERE

314-800-3652

"Democrats Pray to God
Republicans Talk directly
to Him, but gun owners are
His Chosen People" Rich Ford
Ford's Bait and Tackle
636-285-2564 On The Banks of
Big River in Cedar Hill
Open 6:30 to 8:00

Meanwhile, back at the Ranch. Well just when you think there is no hope you get a call and by GOD you get confirmation. Paul Curtman the State Rep from House Springs I think it is district 105 called me. My first words to him was a simple question, are we doomed and he said that we are. Which confirms what I have been writing in this BULLETIN. But he went on to tell me that articles of impeachment have been filed against a sitting Judge for the first time well we really don't know, we do know that there has not been a judge impeached in Missouri since 1960. Yea it has been 52 years since we got rid of a Judge in Missouri but Paul and a few other courageous reps have actually got an impeachment going it is number 333 a Judge from Adair County named Russell E. Steele. We will certainly keep you up to date on this matter. Paul is a former Marine who actually honors his oath and loves this Country. Though let me share this with you they are few and far between in Jeff City. If you are a praying person please pray for Paul and all our State Reps and Senators. Pray for the Sheriff and his deputies to wake up and realize that they are the instruments of oppression. Should revival not come to the law enforcement community and they keep on enforcing laws that are in direct violation of the Constitution there will be a blood bath. If they keep on pushing the people some will push back. When people lose it all that is when they lose it. I would not want to be a member of the law enforcement community or even be within 500 yards of a court-house. The American dream has become a nightmare and not every one out there are like the Bulletinman. Most can't read much less write, the only thing they know how to do is shoot and make bombs. Most of the American people don't realize that we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against spiritual wickedness in high places. Most people don't realize it is not the Sheriff or the policeman who is driving that car that pulls them over and that pulls up to their house to evict them. It is a spirit that has possessed that body to do the works of the devil. Most will not pray, most will simply roll over and take it. Though there are a few who will think that the cop, judge, lawyer, banker is the one who is carrying out this evil and some will shoot them down. I for one realize that my problem is not a person it is the devil and I have power over all the power of the enemy. Though I'm not of this world. I may be in it for now though I'm just passing through. The ones who are buying all the guns are not buying them to go deer hunting or target shooting. They are buying them because they no longer trust the government and their agents. Boy I'm glad that I'm on the right side and not out stealing from the well armed weak, poor and uneducated mass of people who have just about been pushed as far as they are going to be.

Heartland Realty

50 Jefferson Sqaure
DeSoto Mo 636-337-0600
Patty Hammond
Broker/Owner

McKinley Jewelers

Gifts Rings Jewels
Diamonds for Valentines

308 S. Main DeSoto
636-586-3342

Internet Service

& Computer Repair
Call Rick 636-789-9050

Kennedy Tire

New and Used Tires
Hwy 67 Just South of CC
Festus 636-933-9622
1206 Telegraph Road
Arnold, MO 63010
(636) 467-8108

Mo Vet Outlet

Vets helping Vets in DeSoto. An
outlet shop where you will save
@ The same time helping those
who have given so much.

East Main in DeSoto

Davison Jewelry

Pawn Shop

Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's Big Sale

Iced Lilac

418 S. Main DeSoto
next to Town South Hair
Offering Discounts and Close-
outs on Cosmetics, Health &
Beauty Stop in and check it out.
Hundreds Of \$1 Items
Call 314-402-8369

CAN-DO MAINTENANCE

MR. FIX-IT

BIG OR SMALL
314-488-8123
IN DESOTO

Certified IRS

E-File
Years of Expertise

Fast Returns
Big or Small
Debbie Does Them All

COMPUTAX ACCOUNTING

& Tax Preparation
636-931-2000



D
Pri
We
Vinyl
Sill Scr
314-!

0070 VETERANS DR. CEDAR HILL, MO 63010 (636)-674-7777
ACROSS FROM SAVE-A-LOT ON HWY BB



850 Commercial B
Parts & Service
636-475-
Scooters • AT
Utility Vehicles
Layaway
www.vip

All human actions have one or more of these seven causes: chance, nature, compulsion, habit, reason, passion, and desire.
Aristotle

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

June 26 2010.

America's state religion, is patriotism, a phenomenon which has convinced many of the citizenry that "treason" is morally worse than murder or rape.

William Blum

Fall upon the ROCK before the ROCK falls on you

Rick's Lakeside Grill

12202 State Highway O
On the way to Greyhawk
(Rocky Ridge) Daily
Lunch Specials
Fresh Hot Pizza Delivery
Closed Monday

573-483-3077

Pure Pleasure Mega Center

"all your lovelife needs"
North Truman Crystal
The Best 4 Less Except
Sunday

Down on Main St Antiques-Collectables Resale Shop

Downtown DeSoto
514 S. Main
636-588-7066

Viper Trailer Sales

850 Commerical Blvd
Herky 636-475-7487
Utility Trailers We Got Em
Best Price Good Quality

Need Painting-Decorating?

Contract a Professional
Jimmy 314-277-9113

www.photos-by-shell.com

no sitting fees

636-678-3102

Dave's 509 Liquor

W. Main Festus
Drive Thru
636-931-5090

Spotted Horse Antiques & More

200 S. Main Desoto
Bigger and Better
More Room
Re-Open May 2010

Pams Monogram & the Hobby Girls

4628 House Springs Plaza
Embroidery and Crafts for
Everyone
636-375-5100

Meanwhile back at the ranch, Oh the dirty tricks and the lies that spew forth from the JCSD!!!!The devil is indeed a liar. If you really wanted to be a criminal wouldn't it make sense to be a cop? Yea it would, you are on the inside. Well let me share this with you the taxpaying citizen of Jefferson County Missouri. You are being ripped off and every dollar that you spend in our fair county about 2 cents goes to the local not-sees!!!! Retired on Duty? Yea one who has been with the JCSD since I can remember is ED KEMP and I heard that he is proud to say that he is retired on duty! I called ED and he called me back. I ask him if he really only showed up one day a week @ Hellsboro. He said that he is not always in Hellsboro. He is mobile Now Ed wants to be your State Rape oh I mean Rep. He is one of them there

"Demoncrats" there are 45 elected offices in Jeffco 44 are occupied by Demoncrats the other one is Republican but he appears to be the biggest turd of them all Darrel Missey is his name and he is a corrupt judge who allows child molesters to live in apartment complexes and as now sent the Children which were molested by their step father to a place called Epworth were they are molested on a regular basis. Tim Miller is the girls lawyers and he is in on this child slavery ring as well. These people folks are beyond corrupt I could sit here for the next five years and not be able to share with you all the "horror" stories that spew forth from the Synagoge of Satan's local branch The Courthouse!!!!

Misery is created there on a daily basis and it is going to cease and desist as long as I'm alive I will expose these evil doers and run their ass out of town. The whole point of a free press to tell the people just how bad their government has become! Listen I love my county, city and country enough to tell the people the Truth. Our elected leaders take you all for fools. Dumbass self centered people who are only concerned about getting laid and where their next high is going to come from. As long as the check is there everything is a ok. It won't be long until the payments that silence the masses run out.

It won't be long until the People realize that there country is being stolen from them. It won't be long until the Billion rounds of Ammo that where bought in the last year start coming out of the 10 million guns that were bought as well. I really think that "they" have no idea just what danger "they" have put themselves and their poor-pitiful families in. I feel the Rising Force coming and when it comes my goodness. The lighting is going to strike and "they" will never know what hit "them". JAH's judgement is coming and in one hour this country is going to change overnight it will be all over. Are you ready to meet JESUS. Every knee will bow better to bow now. Today is the day of salvation!!!

The Pet Care
Extraordinaire
& Personalized Pet
Sitting Call Shayna
@ 636-253-1292

Actions lie louder
than words.

Miss Carries Treasures

636-586-0884
End of Sumitt Drive Off 67
and Long Road
Furn-Collectables-Clothes For
a good cause Wed-Sat

Dave Messer Construction

DAVE CAN DO IT
636-931-0705

Ram Tire & Wheels

Just south of CC on 67
New and Used Treads
Call Mel @ 933-9878

Card Corner

Sport/Gaming Cards
Comics all kinds of
636-933-0999
106 Main Festus

Dwight Spurgin

Glass Painting
Promo Windows
Holidays, Hand Painted
Signs He'll even paint
your face!
636-633-3600

Davison Jewelry Pawn Shop

Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's
Buying Gold

Junkie's Tire Service

You need a Tire
Call 636-797-4500
314-401-7373

Pro-Star Kleaning

Professional Cleaning You Expect Star Treatment. You Deserve Pro Janitorial Service. Home Carpet Care, Complete Office Cleaning, Foreclosures. Construction, Complete Floor Care as well Insured and Bonded for your protection Call 4 free Est. Call Dwight Now @ 636-633-9600



D

Pri

We
Vinyl
Silk Sc
5158
Imperic
636-

MADABELLA'S



An ignorant person is one who doesn't know what you have just found out.

Will Rogers

Backpage

www.bulletinman.com

July 14th 2009 Bastille Day

Soon!

Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable
JFK

Bam's Bar

Hwy-00-DD
Between 55 and 61
Great Drink Specials
Live Entertainment on
Weekends
Call 573-483-9005
A Great Time All the Time

AD HERE 314-800-3652
K-JEFF.COM
BULLETINMAN.COM
Contact me about Gov't
Corruption

ALL OUT WILDLIFE CONTROL

ANIMALS YOU NEED
GONE? CALL DAVE
24/7 - 636-368-5567

Viper Racing

850 Commerical Blvd
Herky 636-475-7487
Go-Karts-Mopeds-
Scooters-ATV's

**Wholesale Tea Tree
Products**
636-931-0333

Broken English Rocks
brokenenglishstl.com

Dave's 509 Liquor
W. Main Festus
Drive Thru
636-931-5090

Do you relaize that your tax dollars pay the salaries of little Nazi who go around kicking grandma's out of homes and won't do anything about the theft of property of the elderly. Shame on you for shopping in Jeff County

**Four Winds
Restaurant**
Hwy E Blackwell
636-586-5563
Affordable Fine Dining

Raven's Brew Coffee
Republic of Tea Teas
Primrose Herbs Ozark Crystals

Meanwhile back at the ranch, my name stays the same now tell who is the one to blame? My name is Bulletinman and I've come to set the captives free and preach the coming Kingdom of Jesus Christ. To expose, identify and destroy the works of the Devil. I may not be able to predict my demise but you can bet it won't be on my knees. Defiance to Tyrants is obedience to GOD. This Beast has become a Tyrant. If you haven't figured it out be now, we be the Beast. America is still controlled by Great Britain and is about to be sacrificed so that a New World Order will arise out of the ashes of America. Now the way I read the Book the KJV Authorized Bible. He that letteh will let until he be taken out of the way. In a moment a twinkling of an eye things are going to change Then that wicked one will be revealed. That wicked one I believe is Prince William and he makes Barrack look like a pimpling idiot. It all goes back to England and their minions here in America are the lawyers. The court and it's officers are on a mission to separate you from your money, your family and all you hold dear. The lawyers are in bed with everyone and they run the show. Isn't it time that we do something about them. I'm all for a peaceful exodus from the promised land. We can give all members of the BAR (British Accrediation Registry) 48 hours starting on September 17th to leave the country. If they are still in the country they will be rounded up, tried, convicted and executed. They along with the cops, politicians and other accomplices will be brought up on charges. By the people. You see if you got rid out of the judges and outlawed their little terrorist cult we could rid America of 90% of the evil. We can ship them all back to England or Israel. Most of course will end up in Isrealhell, though the love of money isn't a racial or semite thing. It is universal. Though being a Jew by blood it is hard to over come. I find myself very tight fisted at times and I know better. My eyes are open and still I don't give what I should. Greed is not good! Give and it shall be given. You see it's about giving. Generous Jeff is what I want to be known as, not Greedy Grant. Or Teflon Ron, Or Cold Be Hyenas, or Kurt blown away in the breeze. Why screw over your neighbor? Your brother! hey I remember the quote My loathings are simple: stupidity, oppression, crime, cruelty, soft music. Vladimir Nabokov. I bet you Ronald and his thieving children like Perry Como and Lawrence Welk, though 4 out of 5 isn't bad. Mel from Ram Tire wanted me to mention the Judas Priest show. Went to see the Priest @ the Family Arena and they where amazing very loud and hard. Brought back a lot of memories and thoughts. They did the British Steel album and it was a delight. You can check it out on youtube. You can also check out BULLETINMAN on you tube as well. I try to post something new every day. Check it out you'll like it..or your money back!

Spotted Horse Antiques & More
200 S. Main the home of the DeSoto Historical Society
Desoto 636-586-6399

Pure Pleasure Mega Center.

Simply the Best
Lowest Price Largest
Selection
N. Truman BLVD
Crystal City

Miss Carries Treasures
636-586-0884
End of Sumitt Drive Off 67
and Long Road
Furn-Collectables-Clothes

**DAVE MESSER
CONSTRUCTION**
DAVE CAN DO IT
636-931-0705

Ram Tire & Wheels

Just south of CC on 67
New and Used Treads
Call Mel @ 933-9878

Card Corner

Sport/Gaming Cards
Comics all kinds of
636-933-0999
106 Main Festus

Shoppers Paradise
Leadington Free
Outside Set-Up

Davison Jewelry
Pawn Shop
Hwy 61 Festus
636-931-9326
Get Your Gun's

Angel Nail's

New Location Across
From Sam Ogle
Hair Nails Tan

Junkie's Tire Service

636-797-4500
314-401-7373

Expert Advice from the Pros
One of a Kind rare finds
Tues-Sat 12-6



D
Pril

We
Vinyl
Silk Screen
5158 9
Imperial
636-4

DISCOVER A NEW
See yourself in a whole
makeover! Find a look
personality, your life. C
that's uniquely you. Your
Adrienne
Mary Kay Indepe
www.marykay.com
314

the
5-1545
40.63016
ans Dr.
"HOP"
ARD

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.


Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

AFFIDAVIT OF HUGH A. EASTWOOD

Comes now Hugh A. Eastwood and states for his Affidavit:


1. My name is Hugh A. Eastwood and I am an adult capable of making this Affidavit.
2. Attached as Exhibits 2-B and 2-C are, respectively, true copies of the Google YouTube "Terms of Service" and "Community Guidelines."
3. I downloaded these documents from the world wide web on August 5, 2013.
4. At that time, Defendant's YouTube video of August 16, 2012 is still posted and freely available on the Google Youtube website at <http://www.youtube.com/user/bulletinman>.
5. Further Affiant sayeth not.

I hereby verify and affirm that I have read and understood this document. I declare under oath and under penalty of perjury that to the best of my knowledge all the statements in this document are true and correct.


Hugh A. Eastwood

State of Missouri)
) ss
County of St. Louis)

Subscribed and sworn before me this Aug. 6, 2013


Notary Public

DEFENDANT'S
Exhibit
2-A

SANDRA L. THURMOND
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for St. Louis City
My Commission Expires: Aug. 29, 2014
COMMISSION #10430135



About

Press & Blogs

Copyright

Safety

Creators & Partners

Advertising

Upload

DEFENDANT'S
Exhibit
2-B

TERMS OF SERVICE

Pay Content Terms of Service

Collecting Society Notices

Copyright Notices

Community Guidelines

Terms of Service

Community Guidelines

1. Your Acceptance

- A. By using or visiting the YouTube website or any YouTube products, software, data feeds, and services provided to you on, from, or through the YouTube website (collectively the "Service") you signify your agreement to (1) these terms and conditions (the "Terms of Service"), (2) Google's Privacy Policy, found at <http://www.google.com/intl/en/policies/privacy/> and incorporated herein by reference, and (3) YouTube's Community Guidelines, found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines and also incorporated herein by reference. If you do not agree to any of these terms, the Google Privacy Policy, or the Community Guidelines, please do not use the Service.
- B. Although we may attempt to notify you when major changes are made to these Terms of Service, you should periodically review the most up-to-date version www.youtube.com/t/terms. YouTube may, in its sole discretion, modify or revise these Terms of Service and policies at any time, and you agree to be bound by such modifications or revisions. Nothing in these Terms of Service shall be deemed to confer any third-party rights or benefits.

2. Service

- A. These Terms of Service apply to all users of the Service, including users who are also contributors of Content on the Service. "Content" includes the text, software, scripts, graphics, photos, sounds, music, videos, audiovisual combinations, interactive features and other materials you may view on, access through, or contribute to the Service. The Service includes all aspects of YouTube, including but not limited to all products, software and services offered via the YouTube website, such as the YouTube channels, the YouTube "Embeddable Player," the YouTube "Uploader" and other applications.
- B. The Service may contain links to third party websites that are not owned or controlled by YouTube. YouTube has no control over, and assumes no responsibility for, the content, privacy policies, or practices of any third party websites. In addition, YouTube will not and cannot censor or edit the content of any third-party site. By using the Service, you expressly relieve YouTube from any and all liability arising from your use of any third-party website.
- C. Accordingly, we encourage you to be aware when you leave the Service and to read the terms and conditions and privacy policy of each other website that you visit.

3. YouTube Accounts

- A. In order to access some features of the Service, you will have to create a YouTube or Google account. You may never use another's account without permission. When creating your account, you must provide accurate and complete information. You are solely responsible for the activity that occurs on your account, and you must keep your account password secure. You must notify YouTube immediately of any breach of security or unauthorized use of your account.
- B. Although YouTube will not be liable for your losses caused by any unauthorized use of your account, you may be liable for the losses of YouTube or others due to such unauthorized use.

4. General Use of the Service—Permissions and Restrictions

YouTube hereby grants you permission to access and use the Service as set forth in these Terms of Service, provided that:

- A. You agree not to distribute in any medium any part of the Service or the Content without YouTube's prior written authorization, unless YouTube makes available the means for such distribution through functionality offered by the Service (such as the Embeddable Player).
- B. You agree not to alter or modify any part of the Service.
- C. You agree not to access Content through any technology or means other than the video playback pages of the Service itself, the Embeddable Player, or other explicitly authorized means YouTube may designate.
- D. You agree not to use the Service for any of the following commercial uses unless you obtain YouTube's prior written approval:
- the sale of access to the Service;
 - the sale of advertising, sponsorships, or promotions placed on or within the Service or Content; or
 - the sale of advertising, sponsorships, or promotions on any page of an ad-enabled blog or website containing Content delivered via the Service, unless other material not obtained from YouTube appears on the same page and is of sufficient value to be the basis for such sales.
- E. Prohibited commercial uses do not include:
- uploading an original video to YouTube, or maintaining an original channel on YouTube, to promote your business or artistic enterprise;
 - showing YouTube videos through the Embeddable Player on an ad-enabled blog or website, subject to the advertising restrictions set forth above in Section 4.D; or
 - any use that YouTube expressly authorizes in writing.

(For more information about what constitutes a prohibited commercial use, see our FAQ.)

- F. If you use the Embeddable Player on your website, you may not modify, build upon, or block any portion or functionality of the Embeddable Player, including but not limited to links back to the YouTube website.
- G. If you use the YouTube Uploader, you agree that it may automatically download and install updates from time to time from YouTube. These updates are designed to improve, enhance and further develop the Uploader and may take the form of bug fixes, enhanced functions, new software modules and completely new versions. You agree to receive such updates (and permit YouTube to deliver these to you) as part of your use of the Uploader.
- H. You agree not to use or launch any automated system, including without limitation, "robots," "spiders," or "offline readers," that accesses the Service in a manner that sends more request messages to the YouTube servers in a given period of time than a human can reasonably produce in the same period by using a conventional on-line web browser. Notwithstanding the foregoing, YouTube grants the operators of public search engines permission to use spiders to copy materials from the site for the sole purpose of and solely to the extent necessary for creating publicly available searchable indices of the materials, but not caches or archives of such materials. YouTube reserves the right to revoke these exceptions either generally or in specific cases. You agree not to collect or harvest any personally identifiable information, including account names, from the Service, nor to use the communication systems provided by the Service (e.g., comments, email) for any commercial solicitation purposes. You agree not to solicit, for commercial purposes, any users of the Service with respect to their Content.
- I. In your use of the Service, you will comply with all applicable laws.
- J. YouTube reserves the right to discontinue any aspect of the Service at any time.

5. Your Use of Content

In addition to the general restrictions above, the following restrictions and conditions apply specifically to your use of Content.

- A. The Content on the Service, and the trademarks, service marks and logos ("Marks") on the Service, are owned by or licensed to YouTube, subject to copyright and other intellectual property rights under the law.
- B. Content is provided to you AS IS. You may access Content for your information and personal use solely as intended through the provided functionality of the Service and as permitted under these Terms of Service. You shall not download any Content unless you see a "download" or similar link displayed by YouTube on the Service for that Content. You shall not copy, reproduce, distribute, transmit, broadcast, display, sell, license, or otherwise exploit any Content for any other purposes without the prior written consent of YouTube or the respective licensors of the Content. YouTube and its licensors reserve all rights not expressly granted in and to the Service and the Content.
- C. You agree not to circumvent, disable or otherwise interfere with security-related features of the Service or features that prevent or restrict use or copying of any Content or enforce limitations on use of the Service or the Content therein.
- D. You understand that when using the Service, you will be exposed to Content from a variety of sources, and that YouTube is not responsible for the accuracy, usefulness, safety, or intellectual property rights of or relating to such Content. You further understand and acknowledge that you may be exposed to Content that is inaccurate, offensive, indecent, or objectionable, and you agree to waive, and hereby do waive, any legal or equitable rights or remedies you have or may have against YouTube with respect thereto, and, to the extent permitted by applicable law, agree to indemnify and hold harmless YouTube, its owners, operators, affiliates, licensors, and licensees to the fullest extent allowed by law regarding all matters related to your use of the Service.

6. Your Content and Conduct

- A. As a YouTube account holder you may submit Content to the Service, including videos and user comments. You understand that YouTube does not guarantee any confidentiality with respect to any Content you submit.
- B. You shall be solely responsible for your own Content and the consequences of submitting and publishing your Content on the Service. You affirm, represent, and warrant that you own or have the necessary licenses, rights, consents, and permissions to publish Content you submit; and you license to YouTube all patent, trademark, trade secret, copyright or other proprietary rights in and to such Content for publication on the Service pursuant to these Terms of Service.
- C. For clarity, you retain all of your ownership rights in your Content. However, by submitting Content to YouTube, you hereby grant YouTube a worldwide, non-exclusive, royalty-free, sublicenseable and transferable license to use, reproduce, distribute, prepare derivative works of, display, and perform the Content in connection with the Service and YouTube's (and its successors' and affiliates') business, including without limitation for promoting and redistributing part or all of the Service (and derivative works thereof) in any media formats and through any media channels. You also hereby grant each user of the Service a non-exclusive license to access your Content through the Service, and to use, reproduce, distribute, display and perform such Content as permitted through the functionality of the Service and under these Terms of Service. The above licenses granted by you in video Content you submit to the Service terminate within a commercially reasonable time after you remove or delete your videos from the Service. You understand and agree, however, that YouTube may retain, but not display, distribute, or perform, server copies of your videos that have been removed or deleted. The above licenses granted by you in user comments you submit are perpetual and irrevocable.
- D. You further agree that Content you submit to the Service will not contain third party copyrighted material, or material that is subject to other third party proprietary rights, unless you have permission from the rightful owner of the material or you are otherwise legally entitled to post the material and to grant YouTube all of the license rights granted herein.
- E. You further agree that you will not submit to the Service any Content or other material that is contrary to the YouTube Community Guidelines, currently found at www.youtube.com/t/community_guidelines, which may be updated from time to time, or contrary to applicable local, national, and international laws and regulations.
- F. YouTube does not endorse any Content submitted to the Service by any user or other licensor, or any opinion, recommendation, or advice expressed therein, and YouTube expressly disclaims any and all liability in connection with Content. YouTube does not permit copyright infringing activities and infringement of intellectual property rights on the Service, and YouTube will remove all Content if properly notified that such Content infringes on another's intellectual property rights. YouTube reserves the right to remove Content without prior notice.

7. Account Termination Policy

- A. YouTube will terminate a user's access to the Service if, under appropriate circumstances, the user is determined to be a repeat infringer.
- B. YouTube reserves the right to decide whether Content violates these Terms of Service for reasons other than copyright infringement, such as, but not limited to, pornography, obscenity, or excessive length. YouTube may at any time, without prior notice and in its sole discretion, remove such Content and/or terminate a user's account for submitting such material in violation of these Terms of Service.

8. Digital Millennium Copyright Act

- A. If you are a copyright owner or an agent thereof and believe that any Content infringes upon your copyrights, you may submit a notification pursuant to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA") by providing our Copyright Agent with the following information in writing (see 17 U.S.C 512(c)(3) for further detail):
 - A physical or electronic signature of a person authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed;
 - Identification of the copyrighted work claimed to have been infringed, or, if multiple copyrighted works at a single online site are covered by a single notification, a representative list of such works at that site;
 - Identification of the material that is claimed to be infringing or to be the subject of infringing activity and that is to be removed or access to which is to be disabled and information reasonably sufficient to permit the service provider to locate the material;
 - Information reasonably sufficient to permit the service provider to contact you, such as an address, telephone number, and, if available, an electronic mail;
 - A statement that you have a good faith belief that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner, its agent, or the law; and
 - A statement that the information in the notification is accurate, and under penalty of perjury, that you are authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed.

YouTube's designated Copyright Agent to receive notifications of claimed infringement is Shadie Farazian, 901 Cherry Ave., San Bruno, CA 94066, email: copyright@youtube.com, fax: 650-872-8513. For clarity, only DMCA notices should go to the Copyright Agent; any other feedback, comments, requests for technical support, and other communications should be directed to YouTube customer service through support.google.com/youtube/?hl=en-US. You acknowledge that if you fail to comply with all of the requirements of this Section 5(D), your DMCA notice may not be valid.

- B. Counter-Notice. If you believe that your Content that was removed (or to which access was disabled) is not infringing, or that you have the authorization from the copyright owner, the copyright owner's agent, or pursuant to the law, to post and use the material in your Content, you may send a counter-notice containing the following information to the Copyright Agent:

- Your physical or electronic signature;
- Identification of the Content that has been removed or to which access has been disabled and the location at which the Content appeared before it was removed or disabled;
- A statement that you have a good faith belief that the Content was removed or disabled as a result of mistake or a misidentification of the Content; and
- Your name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address, a statement that you consent to the jurisdiction of

federal court in San Francisco, California, and a statement that you will accept service of process from the person who provided notification of the alleged infringement.

If a counter-notice is received by the Copyright Agent, YouTube may send a copy of the counter-notice to the original complaining party informing that person that it may replace the removed Content or cease disabling it in 10 business days. Unless the copyright owner files an action seeking a court order against the Content provider, member or user, the removed Content may be replaced, or access to it restored, in 10 to 14 business days or more after receipt of the counter-notice, at YouTube's sole discretion.

9. Warranty Disclaimer

YOU AGREE THAT YOUR USE OF THE SERVICES SHALL BE AT YOUR SOLE RISK. TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW, YOUTUBE, ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, AND AGENTS DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, IN CONNECTION WITH THE SERVICES AND YOUR USE THEREOF. YOUTUBE MAKES NO WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THIS SITE'S CONTENT OR THE CONTENT OF ANY SITES LINKED TO THIS SITE AND ASSUMES NO LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY (I) ERRORS, MISTAKES, OR INACCURACIES OF CONTENT, (II) PERSONAL INJURY OR PROPERTY DAMAGE, OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, RESULTING FROM YOUR ACCESS TO AND USE OF OUR SERVICES, (III) ANY UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO OR USE OF OUR SECURE SERVERS AND/OR ANY AND ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION AND/OR FINANCIAL INFORMATION STORED THEREIN, (IV) ANY INTERRUPTION OR CESSATION OF TRANSMISSION TO OR FROM OUR SERVICES, (V) ANY BUGS, VIRUSES, TROJAN HORSES, OR THE LIKE WHICH MAY BE TRANSMITTED TO OR THROUGH OUR SERVICES BY ANY THIRD PARTY, AND/OR (V) ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN ANY CONTENT OR FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE USE OF ANY CONTENT POSTED, EMAILED, TRANSMITTED, OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE VIA THE SERVICES. YOUTUBE DOES NOT WARRANT, ENDORSE, GUARANTEE, OR ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY PRODUCT OR SERVICE ADVERTISED OR OFFERED BY A THIRD PARTY THROUGH THE SERVICES OR ANY HYPERLINKED SERVICES OR FEATURED IN ANY BANNER OR OTHER ADVERTISING, AND YOUTUBE WILL NOT BE A PARTY TO OR IN ANY WAY BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING ANY TRANSACTION BETWEEN YOU AND THIRD-PARTY PROVIDERS OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES. AS WITH THE PURCHASE OF A PRODUCT OR SERVICE THROUGH ANY MEDIUM OR IN ANY ENVIRONMENT, YOU SHOULD USE YOUR BEST JUDGMENT AND EXERCISE CAUTION WHERE APPROPRIATE.

10. Limitation of Liability

IN NO EVENT SHALL YOUTUBE, ITS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, OR AGENTS, BE LIABLE TO YOU FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, PUNITIVE, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES WHATSOEVER RESULTING FROM ANY (I) ERRORS, MISTAKES, OR INACCURACIES OF CONTENT, (II) PERSONAL INJURY OR PROPERTY DAMAGE, OF ANY NATURE WHATSOEVER, RESULTING FROM YOUR ACCESS TO AND USE OF OUR SERVICES, (III) ANY UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS TO OR USE OF OUR SECURE SERVERS AND/OR ANY AND ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION AND/OR FINANCIAL INFORMATION STORED THEREIN, (IV) ANY INTERRUPTION OR CESSATION OF TRANSMISSION TO OR FROM OUR SERVICES, (V) ANY BUGS, VIRUSES, TROJAN HORSES, OR THE LIKE, WHICH MAY BE TRANSMITTED TO OR THROUGH OUR SERVICES BY ANY THIRD PARTY, AND/OR (V) ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN ANY CONTENT OR FOR ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE OF ANY KIND INCURRED AS A RESULT OF YOUR USE OF ANY CONTENT POSTED, EMAILED, TRANSMITTED, OR OTHERWISE MADE AVAILABLE VIA THE SERVICES, WHETHER BASED ON WARRANTY, CONTRACT, TORT, OR ANY OTHER LEGAL THEORY, AND WHETHER OR NOT THE COMPANY IS ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES. THE FOREGOING LIMITATION OF LIABILITY SHALL APPLY TO THE FULLEST EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW IN THE APPLICABLE JURISDICTION.

YOU SPECIFICALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT YOUTUBE SHALL NOT BE LIABLE FOR CONTENT OR THE DEFAMATORY, OFFENSIVE, OR ILLEGAL CONDUCT OF ANY THIRD PARTY AND THAT THE RISK OF HARM OR DAMAGE FROM THE FOREGOING RESTS ENTIRELY WITH YOU.

The Service is controlled and offered by YouTube from its facilities in the United States of America. YouTube makes no representations that the Service is appropriate or available for use in other locations. Those who access or use the Service from other jurisdictions do so at their own volition and are responsible for compliance with local law.

11. Indemnity

To the extent permitted by applicable law, you agree to defend, indemnify and hold harmless YouTube, its parent corporation, officers, directors, employees and agents, from and against any and all claims, damages, obligations, losses, liabilities, costs or debt, and expenses (including but not limited to attorney's fees) arising from: (i) your use of and access to the Service; (ii) your violation of any term of these Terms of Service; (iii) your violation of any third party right, including without limitation any copyright, property, or privacy right; or (iv) any claim that your Content caused damage to a third party. This defense and indemnification obligation will survive these Terms of Service and your use of the Service.

12. Ability to Accept Terms of Service

You affirm that you are either more than 18 years of age, or an emancipated minor, or possess legal parental or guardian consent, and are fully able and competent to enter into the terms, conditions, obligations, affirmations, representations, and warranties set forth in these Terms of Service, and to abide by and comply with these Terms of Service. In any case, you affirm that you are over the age of 13, as the Service is not intended for children under 13. If you are under 13 years of age, then please do not use the Service. There are lots of other great web sites for you. Talk to your parents about what sites are appropriate for you.

13. Assignment

These Terms of Service, and any rights and licenses granted hereunder, may not be transferred or assigned by you, but may be assigned by YouTube without restriction.

14. General

You agree that: (i) the Service shall be deemed solely based in California; and (ii) the Service shall be deemed a passive website that does not give rise to personal jurisdiction over YouTube, either specific or general, in jurisdictions other than California. These Terms of Service shall be governed by the internal substantive laws of the State of California, without respect to its conflict of laws principles. Any claim or dispute between you and YouTube that arises in whole or in part from the Service shall be decided exclusively by a court of competent jurisdiction located in Santa Clara County, California. These Terms of Service, together with the Privacy Notice at <http://www.google.com/intl/en/policies/privacy/> and any other legal notices published by YouTube on the Service, shall constitute the entire agreement between you and YouTube concerning the Service. If any provision of these Terms of Service is deemed invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the invalidity of such provision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of these Terms of Service, which shall remain in full force and effect. No waiver of any term of this these Terms of Service shall be deemed a further or continuing waiver of such term or any other term, and YouTube's failure to assert any right or provision under these Terms of Service shall not constitute a waiver of such right or provision. YouTube reserves the right to amend these Terms of Service at any time and without notice, and it is your responsibility to review these Terms of Service for any changes. Your use of the Service following any amendment of these Terms of Service will signify your assent to and acceptance of its revised terms. YOU AND YOUTUBE AGREE THAT ANY CAUSE OF ACTION ARISING OUT OF OR RELATED TO THE SERVICES MUST COMMENCE WITHIN ONE (1) YEAR AFTER THE CAUSE OF ACTION ACCRUES. OTHERWISE, SUCH CAUSE OF ACTION IS PERMANENTLY BARRED.

8/5/13

Dated: June 9, 2010

Terms of Service - YouTube

Language: English ▼

Country: Worldwide ▼

Safety: Off ▼

Help ▲

[About](#) [Press & Blogs](#) [Copyright](#) [Creators & Partners](#) [Advertising](#) [Developers](#)
[Terms](#) [Privacy](#) [Policy & Safety](#) [Send feedback](#) [Try something new!](#)



Upload

Sign in

About

Press & Blogs

Copyright

Safety

Creators & Partners

Advertising

Developers

Help

ABOUT YOUTUBE

Getting Started

Community Guidelines

Contact Us

Careers

YouTube Merchandise

YouTube Community Guidelines

Respect the YouTube Community

We're not asking for the kind of respect reserved for nuns, the elderly, and brain surgeons. We mean don't abuse the site. Every cool new community feature on YouTube involves a certain level of trust. We trust you to be responsible, and millions of users respect that trust. Please be one of them.

DEFENDANT'S
Exhibit
2-C

Don't Cross the Line

Here are some common-sense rules that will help you steer clear of trouble:

- YouTube is not for pornography or sexually explicit content. If this describes your video, even if it's a video of yourself, don't post it on YouTube. Also, be advised that we work closely with law enforcement and we report child exploitation. Please read our Safety Center and stay safe on YouTube.
- Don't post videos showing bad stuff like animal abuse, drug abuse, under-age drinking and smoking, or bomb making.
- Graphic or gratuitous violence is not allowed. If your video shows someone being physically hurt, attacked, or humiliated, don't post it.
- YouTube is not a shock site. Don't post gross-out videos of accidents, dead bodies or similar things intended to shock or disgust.
- Respect copyright. Only upload videos that you made or that you are authorized to use. This means don't upload videos you didn't make, or use content in your videos that someone else owns the copyright to, such as music tracks, snippets of copyrighted programs, or videos made by other users, without necessary authorizations. Read our Copyright Tips for more information.
- We encourage free speech and defend everyone's right to express unpopular points of view. But we don't permit hate speech (speech which attacks or demeans a group based on race or ethnic origin, religion, disability, gender, age, veteran status, and sexual orientation/gender identity).
- Things like predatory behavior, stalking, threats, harassment, intimidation, invading privacy, revealing other people's personal information, and inciting others to commit violent acts or to violate the Terms of Use are taken very seriously. Anyone caught doing these things may be permanently banned from YouTube.
- Everyone hates spam. Don't create misleading descriptions, tags, titles or thumbnails in order to increase views. It's not okay to post large amounts of untargeted, unwanted or repetitive content, including comments and private messages.



Flagging on
YouTube: The



Staying Safe on
YouTube

Please take these rules seriously and take them to heart. Don't try to look for loopholes or try to lawyer your way around the guidelines—just understand them and try to respect the spirit in which they were created. If you'd like more details, check out our Community Guideline Tips.

We Enforce These Guidelines

Okay, this one is more about us than you. YouTube staff review flagged videos 24 hours a day, seven days a week to determine whether they violate our Community Guidelines. When they do, we remove them. Sometimes a video doesn't violate our Community Guidelines, but may not be appropriate for everyone. These videos may be age-restricted. Accounts are penalized for Community Guidelines violations and serious or repeated violations can lead to account termination. If your account is terminated, you won't be allowed to create any new accounts. For more information about how the Community Guidelines are enforced and the consequences of violating them, please visit the Help Center.

YouTube is for the Community

Remember that this is your community! Each and every user of YouTube makes the site what it is, so don't be afraid to dig in and get involved!

- Have fun with the site. There's a lot to see here, and lots of folks making amazing stuff—one of them might be you! Equipment's getting cheaper and easier to use all the time, so dive in and enjoy.
- Let folks know what you think. Feedback's part of the experience, and when done with respect, can be a great way to make friends, share stories, and make your time on YouTube richer. So leave comments, rate videos, make your own responses to videos that affect you, enter contests of interest—there's a lot going on and a lot of ways to participate.
- You may not like everything you see. Some of the content here may offend you—if you find that it violates our Terms of Use, then click the button that says "Flag" under the video you're watching to submit it for review by YouTube staff. If it doesn't, then consider just clicking on something else—why waste time watching videos you don't like?

That's it! Thanks for reading!

—The YouTube Team

Community Guideline Tips

Want a little more insight into the limits and exceptions in the Community Guidelines? Here are some helpful examples and tips:

Sex and Nudity

Hate Speech

Shocking and Disgusting

Dangerous Illegal Acts

While it might not seem fair to say you can't show something because of what viewers theoretically might do in response, we draw the line at content that's intended to incite violence or encourage dangerous, illegal activities that have an inherent risk of serious physical harm or death. This means not posting videos on things like instructional bomb making, ninja assassin training, sniper attacks, videos that train terrorists, or tips on illegal street racing. Any depictions like these should be educational or documentary and shouldn't be designed to help or encourage others to imitate them.

Children

Copyright

Privacy

Harassment

It comes down to respect. YouTube is all about sharing and interacting with the community in respectful ways. If you're not sure whether a video or comment you've made crosses the line, follow a simple rule of thumb: if you wouldn't say it to someone's face, don't say it on YouTube. And if you're looking to attack, harass, demean, or impersonate others, go elsewhere.

Impersonation

Threats

Users shouldn't feel threatened when they're on YouTube. Period. Don't leave threatening comments on other people's videos.

Language: English

Country: Worldwide

Safety: Off

Help

[About](#) [Press & Blogs](#) [Copyright](#) [Creators & Partners](#) [Advertising](#) [Developers](#)
[Terms](#) [Privacy](#) [Policy & Safety](#) [Send feedback](#) [Try something new!](#)

Page 29

1 Q Did the -- Do you know what the results of the
2 federal investigation was?

3 A I just talked to Special Agent Maruschak and
4 he sent it up to his SAC in St. Louis, and their opinion
5 was that they thought the video to be threatening,
6 however, they didn't believe that the video in, itself,
7 was criminal.

8 Q Okay. And did you notify the Franklin County
9 sheriff about the arrest warrant?

10 A On the arrest warrant, yes. I notified, after
11 the judge signed it, I came downstairs outside the other
12 Courthouse and I called the sheriff's department to
13 inform them that we had obtained an arrest warrant and
14 asked them to assist me in the arrest.

15 Q Did they assist you in the arrest?

16 A No. They stated that they had other calls
17 pending and were not available to assist me.

18 Q Okay.

19 A However, they felt like I could go ahead and
20 serve the warrant on my own.

21 Q Who did you talk to at the sheriff's
22 department?

23 A It was one of their majors.

24 Q Do you remember his name?

25 A I don't remember his name.

Page 30

1 Q And then how did you make contact with Jeff,
2 too?

3 A I called him on his phone.

4 Q Okay. And did you tell him that you were
5 going to arrest him?

6 A No, sir, I did not.

7 Q Why not?

8 A I wanted to not tell Jeff that I was, you
9 know, going to arrest him, because I didn't think that
10 he would want to turn himself in, or I didn't want to
11 have any problems with that.

12 I felt like if I would come up with a ruse to
13 meet him and return some of his equipment, I could explain
14 to him in person that I had an arrest warrant, versus
15 doing it over the phone and possibly, you know, getting
16 into more trouble.

17 Because if I'd of told him there's an arrest
18 warrant, and maybe he'd try to flee the area, or barricade
19 himself, or do a number of things, so I just told him that
20 I needed to meet with him to give him his computers back.

21 Q Did you believe Jeff was dangerous?

22 A At that point, not really.

23 Q Okay. And where did you arrange to meet Jeff?

24 A Originally we had, we had set up to have him
25 meet us at the MFA station, however, when I talked to

Page 31

1 him he even said a public place, and I logically
2 suggested that, since we were sitting there, and he said
3 it was okay, that he would meet us there.

4 So we ended up meeting on the MFA station on K
5 highway just up the road from his house a little ways.

6 Q Why did you choose that location?

7 A It was public, it was private. It was not a
8 lot of traffic there, and it was a location that he knew
9 fairly well.

10 It was also, tactically, one road in and one
11 road out, I would be able to secure each end of the road
12 with a marked unit, so it provided the best opportunity.

13 You know, and I did not want to return to his
14 house in any way, because he'd made a video saying that he
15 was on death con four, and carrying guns, and I just felt
16 like to go back to his house would spark an incident.

17 Q Why didn't you choose an alternate location,
18 such as Troop C, or Troop I for him to meet with you?

19 A Like I said, we wanted an isolated place where
20 there weren't a lot of entrances and exits, where no one
21 could get -- could be possibly hurt if anything went
22 wrong.

23 Q You think would it be more dangerous for him
24 to come to a highway patrol troop station?

25 A Well, typically, I wouldn't have him go to

Page 32

1 Troop C, that's an hour and a half away, I've only been
2 there once in my career, I would just have him meet me.

3 Since it was a Franklin County warrant, I would
4 normally have the people meet me somewhere in Franklin
5 County and take them down to the department.

6 Q Okay. Were you concerned about your safety at
7 the gas station, at the MFA station?

8 A Initially, no. I mean, we were well -- we
9 brought several firearms. We had several, you know, our
10 safety equipment with us and things. The only thing
11 that concerned me was that day, when I spoke to Jeff on
12 the phone he was agitated, and he hadn't been agitated
13 the times when I dealt with him before.

14 He was not happy about things that occurred, but
15 he didn't seem agitated, and that day he seemed agitated.

16 Q How so? Can you just tell me, when you use
17 the word agitated, what statements or behaviors did
18 he --

19 A Just his tone of voice. He was talking real
20 fast, he was real curt, and he, he -- I don't think he
21 trusted me, and he told me he didn't trust me, so he was
22 on edge as well.

23 Q Okay. Were you concerned about the presence
24 of gas pumps, fuel pumps at this location?

25 A I wasn't initially, because

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

DEFENDANT'S SECOND MOTION IN LIMINE

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as Defendant's Second Motion in Limine:

Any mention of the following items before the jury would (a) deny Plaintiff a fair trial, (b) be inadmissible for any purposes, and (c) cause improper prejudice, wherefore Defendant moves the court to prohibit the State from either mentioning or referring to the following items in voir dire, opening statement, examination of witnesses, presentation of evidence, or closing argument, or at any other time in the presence of the jury:

1. Contents of Defendant's car – shotgun and handgun. The troopers recovered a shotgun and a handgun from Defendant's car after they shot Defendant. Those two weapons stayed in the car after Defendant exited the car. The troopers' own testimony to date indicates that they used a ruse of returning seized computer equipment to lure Defendant to the gas station to serve an arrest warrant. The recording of Defendant indicates that his state of mind was that he believed the ruse, in that he triumphantly declared that he had "won" and that his seized property was being returned. There are no charges involving unlawful possession or use of the shotgun and handgun. There is no collateral evidence of bad intent by Defendant. Yet the State wants to argue Defendant was "loaded for

bear” and intended to use an arsenal of weapons against the troopers. The shotgun and handgun in the car have nothing to do with the attempted assault and resisting arrest charges against Defendant, particularly as they were unknown to the troopers until long after they shot Defendant. The prejudicial effect of allowing the State to present evidence of the shotgun and handgun is overwhelming, but the probative effect is low and misleading.

Granted _____ Overruled _____

2. Defendant reserves the right to move further *in limine* based on the State’s proposed evidence at trial.

WHEREFORE Defendant prays this Court SUSTAIN his second motion in limine, and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,
Attorney for Defendant

/s/ Hugh A. Eastwood
Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

So Ordered,

Hon. Keith M. Sutherland, Circuit Judge

Date:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on September 22, 2013 (s)he served this document on:

The method(s) of service: Missouri courts e-filing system.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED

APR 25 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
By FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI D.C.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Plaintiff,

VS

Jeffery R Weinhaus

Defendant.

) Cause No. 12AB-CR02409-01
)
) Division No.
) Judge: Sutherland
)
)
)

STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 1

COMES NOW, the State of Missouri, by and through Prosecuting Attorney Robert E. Parks, and moves that the attorney for the defendant, the defendant, and defense witnesses during voir dire, opening statement, presentation of evidence and final arguments be instructed not to mention or be permitted to elicit testimony either directly or indirectly by question or comment the following:

That defendant is the victim of a crime in this case and not the defendant.

Defendant has signed several documents filed with the court as "defendant/victim". Defendant is not the victim of any crime as charged by the State in this cause. Victims in this cause are The State, Judge Kelly Parker Sgt Folsom and Cpl Menden.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Parks- 36333
Prosecuting Attorney
County of Franklin
Union, Missouri 63084

PROOF OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the above and foregoing was hand delivered to defendant in open Court on April 25, 2013



FILED

SEP 04 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Circuit Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood, and states as his Opposition to State's Motion in Limine:


1. The State has moved in limine to exclude Defendant from referring to himself as a victim.
2. The basis of the State's motion is that Judge Kelly Parker and Sgt. H.J. Folsom are the victims in the case, respectively, of Defendant's alleged judicial tampering, and his alleged assault on a law enforcement officer and resisting arrest.
3. It is uncontroverted, however, that Sgt. H.J. Folsom used his firearm to shoot and grievously wound Defendant multiple times in the course of attempting to serve an arrest warrant on Defendant on September 11, 2012. (Cpr. Scott Mertens also shot at but may or may not have struck Defendant.)
4. Defendant required air lifting to the trauma unit at St. John's Mercy Hospital in St. Louis County.
5. Multiple documents produced by the State refer to the Defendant as the victim of a police shooting; these include documents created by the Missouri State Highway Patrol. *See, e.g., Ex. A* (Highway Patrol supplemental report 33).

6. The issue for the jury is not just whether the Defendant committed the charged offenses, but also whether Defendant posed a threat to the troopers that justified their shooting Defendant. Thus, Defendant needs to be referred to, factually accurately, as the victim of a police shooting in order to defend himself against the charges.
7. Accordingly, it would substantially prejudice Defendant not to be referred to, factually accurately, as the victim of a police shooting.
8. Furthermore, in his defense a criminal defendant has an "almost unlimited" catalogue of permissible defense arguments. After all, it can only possibly be error if the Defendant's argument is curbed. See "*What parties may argue*" in Dierker, 28 Mo. Prac., Criminal Practice Handbook §29.3 (2013 ed.).

WHEREFORE, Defendant prays this Court DENY the State's motion in limine, and for such other relief as may be just, meet and reasonable.


Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Defendant


Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Vox (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on 9/03, 2013 (s)he served this document on:
Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084


The method(s) of service: by first class mail.

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL
REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

STATE CONTROL NO.: 12 261 015 033	REPORT DATE: 10/12/12
REPORTING OFFICER: SERGEANT P. L. SMITH	0993 TROOP OF OCCURRENCE: C
OCC TYPE: OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING	
COUNTY: FRANKLIN	SCENE PROCESSED: N
DATE/TIME: 09/11/2012	
OFFENSE STATUS: INACTIVE	DDCC AT SCENE: N
LOCATION: FRANKLIN COUNTY	

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

SUMMARY

1. The victim of the shooting in this investigation is:
 - a. Jeffrey R. Weinhaus who is described as a white male, date of birth October 6, 1966, residing at 2360 Highway K, St. Clair, Missouri, phone number 314-800-3652.
2. A chronological synopsis of events is as follows:
 - a. On Tuesday, September 11, 2012, at approximately 1221 hours, Missouri State Highway Patrol Division of Drug and Crime Control Sergeant H. Folsom and Corporal S. Mertens contacted Missouri State Highway Patrol Troop C Communications, via Troop I Communications, and requested a road Trooper to assist with the arrest of Jeffrey Weinhaus. Earlier that day, warrants for the arrest of Weinhaus were issued in Franklin County for the charges of: Possession of Controlled Substance Except 35 grams or Less Marijuana (Felony Class C), Tampering with Judicial Officer (Felony Class C), and Possession of up to 35 grams Marijuana (Misdemeanor Class A).
 - b. At approximately 1228 hours, Missouri State Highway Patrol Troop C Trooper Servais, 827, was assigned to assist and contacted Sergeant Folsom.
 - c. At approximately 1240 hours, Jeffrey Weinhaus called Valerie Weinhaus. Valerie Weinhaus was in class at the time and missed the call.
 - d. At approximately 1256 hours, Trooper Servais contacted Sergeant Folsom on the parking lot of the MFA Oil Parkway Store located at 1535 Highway K, St. Clair, Missouri. Sergeant Folsom informed Trooper Servais of their intentions and asked him to post south of their location. He also asked that Trooper Servais have Corporal Keathley post north of their location.
 - e. Shortly after 1300 hours, Valerie Weinhaus returned Jeffrey Weinhaus' phone call. During their conversation,

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,)	
Plaintiff,)	Cause No. 12AB-CR02409-01
)	
VS)	Division No.
)	Judge: Sutherland
Jeffery R Weinhaus)	
Defendant.)	

STATE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 2

COMES NOW, the State of Missouri, by and through Prosecuting Attorney Robert E. Parks, and moves that the attorney for the defendant, the defendant, and defense witnesses during voir dire, opening statement, presentation of evidence and final arguments shall be instructed not to mention or be permitted to elicit testimony either directly or indirectly by question or comment the following:

Any reference to Defendants U-Tube Videos still being shown on U-Tube.

Although Defendants U-Tube videos are still being shown on U-Tube such information is irrelevant to these proceedings as the issue before the jury is their effect in August and September of 2012. Any reference to their present statue would not be probative to the jury and would be out weighted by their prejudicial effect.

Sustained ☒

Denied ☐

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Robert E. Parks

Robert E. Parks- 36333
Prosecuting Attorney
County of Franklin
Union, Missouri 63084

FILED

OCT - 6 2013

BILL D. MILLER, Clerk
FRANKLIN COUNTY MISSOURI
By _____ D.C.

PROOF OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the above and foregoing E -mailed to the attorney of record.
/s/ Robert E. Parks

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FRANKLIN COUNTY
20th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,

v.

JEFFREY R. WEINHAUS,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 12AB-CR02409-01

DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO STATE'S SECOND MOTION IN LIMINE

Comes now Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus, by counsel Hugh A. Eastwood and Christopher M. Combs, and states as his Opposition to the State's "Motion in Limine 2":

The Court has already ruled that the jury shall hear the Youtube video published August 17, 2013 entitled "The Party's Over" in which the Defendant makes certain statements and also certain captions called "annotations" appear. It is uncontroverted that this video was disseminated by Google's Youtube service, which the court can take judicial notice is a public forum available to anyone with internet access to the world wide web. There is no evidence that the video was mailed or otherwise specifically directed to Judge Kelly Parker.

The question for the jury is whether the video constitutes judicial tampering with Judge Kelly Parker under the elements of RSMo. 565.084 / MAI 3d 329.85. The Court has already ruled that the subjective reaction of Judge Kelly Parker is admissible testimony, and thus the Court has indicated that the jury is not simply to make an objective evaluation of the speech, but also a subjective evaluation. Whether the speech constitutes judicial tampering is not just a question limited to August and September 2012; the jury must determine whether Defendant's speech was reasonably calculated to harass Judge Parker and whether the Defendant so acted

with the purpose to harass Judge Kelly Parker in the performance of the judicial officer's official duties.

As such, the fact that Google's Youtube service has "Terms Of Service" and "Community Guidelines", that the Youtube video is still present on the website, and whether the investigating trooper contacted Google / Youtube in the course of his investigation is also a fair line of inquiry on cross examination. What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

WHEREFORE Defendant Jeffrey R. Weinhaus moves this Court to DENY the State's "Motion in Limine 2", and for such other relief as is just, meet and reasonable.

Respectfully Submitted,

Attorney for Defendant

/s/ Hugh A. Eastwood

Hugh A. Eastwood, MBE # 62058
7777 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 1603
St. Louis, Missouri 63105-1941
heastwood@eastwoodlawstl.com
Fax (314) 727 4473
Tel. (314) 727 3533
Cell (314) 809 2343

/s/ Christopher M. Combs

Christopher M. Combs, MBE #65512
4242 Laclede Ave., Unit 104
St. Louis, MO 63108
combschris1@gmail.com
Tel: 314 578 1465
Fax: 314 531 1069

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on 10/07/2013 (s)he served this document on:
Robert E. Parks, II
Franklin County Prosecuting Attorney
15 S. Church St., Room 204
Union, MO 63084

/s/ Hugh A. Eastwood