## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERICA,	)	
				)	Case No.
			Plaintiff,	)	CR-04-127-S-RCT
vs.				) }	
				)	
DAVID 1	ROLAND I	IINE	CSON,	)	
				)	
			Defendant.	)	
			·	,	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD C. TALLMAN
JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT
SITTING BY DESIGNATION
(Sitting with a Jury)

Boise, Idaho January 21, 2005 (Fri)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS RE: TRIAL TO A JURY
(VOLUME 9, PAGES 1,997 THROUGH 2,299)

Prepared for:
WESLEY W. HOYT
ATTORNEY AT LAW

Reported by:

Lori A. Pulsifer, CSR, RMR, CRR

QNA Court Reporting

E-mail: realtimeqna@msn.com Telephone: (208) 484-6309

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERICA,	)	
				)	Case No.
			Plaintiff,	)	CR-04-127-S-RCT
				)	
vs.				)	
				)	•
DAVID 1	ROLAND I	INIE	KSON,	)	
				)	
	•		Defendant.	)	
				,	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD C. TALLMAN
JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT
SITTING BY DESIGNATION
(Sitting with a Jury)

Boise, Idaho January 21, 2005

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS RE: TRIAL TO A JURY (VOLUME 9, PAGES 1,997 THROUGH 2,299)

Prepared for:
WESLEY W. HOYT
ATTORNEY AT LAW

Reported by:

Lori A. Pulsifer, CSR, RMR, CRR

QNA Court Reporting

E-mail: realtimeqna@msn.com

Telephone: (208) 484-6309

#### APPRARANCES

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
Mr. Michael Patrick Sullivan Assistant United States Attorney U.S. Department of Justice 10th and Constitution, N.W. Room 2644 Washington, D.C. 20530

AND

Mr. Michael D. Tacay Assistant United States Attorney U.S. Department of Justice 601 D Street, N.W. Suite 6500 Washington, D.C. 20530

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
Mr. Wesley W. Hoyt
Attorney at Law
HC 66, Box 311A
Kooskia, Idaho 83539

AND

Mr. Thomas Nolan Atterney at Law NCLAN, ARMSTRCMS & BARTON, LLP 600 University Avenue Palo Alto, California 94301

. . .

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

INDEX OF RECEIVED EXHIBITS

Eddibit Number Page Received Government's Exhibit No. 7 . . . . . . . . . . . . 2067 Government's Exhibit No. 14 . . . . . . . . . . . 2158 Government's Exhibit No. 15 . . . . . . . . . . . . Government's Exhibit No. 16 . . . . . . . . . . . . Government's Eduibit No. 17 . . . . . . . . . . . . 

-		
3	Witness Page N	unber
4	SAMANIHA BURGS	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Hoyt	2013
6	Cross Examination by Mr. Taxay	2026
7	DAVID ROLAND HINKSON	
8	Further Direct Examination by Mr. Hoyt .	2028
9	Cross Examination by Mr. Sullivan	2042
10	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hoyt	2175
11	Recross Examination by Mr. Sullivan	2188
12	JERRY D. DCKE, Ph.D. (Without the Jury)	
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Nolan	2194
14	Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Taxxy	2195
15	Further Direct Examination by Mr. Nolan	2208
16	Cross Examination by Mr. Taxay	2232
17	ROBERT CRAIG ENGLE, Ph.D. (Without the Jury)	

INDEX OF EXAMINATION

Direct Examination by Mr. Taxay . . . . 2273

Cross Examination by Mr. Nolan . . . . .

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Good morning.

Mr. Hoyt or Mr. Nolan?

MR. HOYT: Yes, Your Honor. We have a matter to take up.

MR. NOLAN: I am going to try to --

MR. HOYT: Let's do the witness first, if it's dray with you.

Your Honor, we have a witness here who has a flight at 11:00 o'clock this morning and needs to be to the airport by 10:00. We would like to interject her.

THE COURT: In the middle of Mr. Hinkson?

MR. HOYT: We have advised the Government. I don't think there is an objection.

MR. SULLIVAN: No objection.

THE COURT: Fine. We will take Ms. Burke.

Are planes flying? This weather is --

> MR. HOYT: I think there have been a bunch of flights cancelled. She has the reservation. We don't know what to do. The fog may lift.

THE COURT: The court certainly has no objection to taking her out of order.

Mr. Nolan?

MR. NOLAN: I am going to try to make this as

succint as possible. Mr. Hoyt wishes to ask Mr. Hinkson on the stand about his understanding about a conspiracy.

Here is the evidence that we have of the conspiracy:

A witness by the name of Bott (sic.), who is on our witness list --

MR. HOYT: Webb.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

/22

23

24

25

MR. NCLAN: Webb -- excuse me -- overheard in the year 2000 Annette --

THE COURT: Hasalone?

MR. NOLAN: -- Hasalone speaking to

Mr. Gunderson who is someone -- anyway, Mr. Gunderson,
saying that, in effect, she is going to try to get
everything she can from Mr. Hinkson, et cetera.

Mr. Gunderson --

MR. HOYT: And put him in jail.

MR. NOLAN: And put him in jail.

Mr. Gunderson has a longstanding hostility toward Mr. Hinkson because of the Art Bell matter where Mr. Hinkson allegedly said something that he and Mr. Gunderson got into it about. And Mr. Gunderson is a good friend of Mr. Hilder, and Mr. Harding is associated with Mr. Hilder.

MR. HOYT: And Henderson.

MR. NOLAN: And that Mr. -- and that he has,

## QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

suggested to counsel that maybe we didn't need to call those witnesses if Mr. Hinkson could testify as to his belief in this conspiracy, rather than put on all of these witnesses who would say there was a conspiracy.

THE COURT: Let me hear from the Government, and then let me ask you a few legal questions.

MR. NCIAN: Right. Again, I've just tried to succently state it.

THE COURT: I think I understand your request.

Go ahead, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: It sounds like Mr. Nolan is trying to wrap the hearsay exception of state of mind around a set of facts that are not otherwise proveable.

But because Hinkson believes it, even if they are outlandish, if the moon is made of blue cheese and if he believes it, he can testify to it. State of mind has some limits on it, I'm sure.

THE COURT: Here is my legal question. If I understand Mr. Nolan correctly, he is seeking to introduce, under the co-conspirator exception of Federal Rule of Evidence 801(D)(2)(e), statements that were made in 2000 by persons in regard to a conspiracy about which the court has heard virtually no evidence, at least certainly not evidence that is sufficient to establish a prima facie case that such a conspiracy existed.

at this time, a belief that all of these people are involved in a conspiracy to get him.

To the extent that he was aware at the time, he was aware of certain things at the time of the events, that would show his hostility towards Mr. Albers and Ms. Hasalone.

THE COURT: In 2000?

2

3

7

ß

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NOLAN: In, I believe --

MR. HDYT: Yes, Your Honor, in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003.

MR. NCLAN: He was not aware of the connection to Gunderson and Hilder until the nature of this case -until this case was going on.

And, therefore, his bias and attitude -- his attitude on the stand today about these people is relevant to show his state of mind or bias.

THE COURT: At that time?

MR. NCLAN: Well, no. I'm sorry. His bias -his testimony now -- his state of mind now on bias is, I think, the connection that we can get in on that.

In other words, as he's testifying now, he has this belief that Harding, Hilder, and Gunderson are involved in the conspiracy with Hasalone.

Now, this question is very important to the defendant. We have these other witnesses lined up. I

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

So at this point in the trial, I am not going to permit, under 801(D)(2)(e), those statements to be admitted because I just don't see that such a conspiracy actually existed, which may mean that you are going to have to bring in those other witnesses in order to lay the foundation. I would certainly then permit you to recall Mr. Hinkson at that point.

But I recall yesterday at midebur, when this whole issue came up with respect to the Hilder conspiracy -- I know Mr. Hoyt was expressed some concern that, you know, everyone was surprised and making light of it.

Frankly, the court was surprised because it's the first time the court has heard any suggestion of such a conspiracy.

So at this point, I don't think that the state of mind exception is broad enough to permit Mr. Hinkson to tentify to what his state of mind was as a result of hearing these statements he would be testifying to which would have to come in under 801(D) (2) (e); but before the jury could hear them, in order to lay the foundation so that he could then say, "Once I heard that, then it changed my state of mind," thus and so.

Am I making any sense here? That is the way I'm trying to analyze this thing.

2004

l

2005

\_\_\_\_

MR. NOIAN: I think that it may be that we are anticipating some cross-examination. In other words, if his credibility is challenged or a bias is established, then we might be able to ask him on the stand: Do you feel there is a conspiracy among these people?

THE COURT: I think that might be a fair question, depending upon how the cross goes.

MR. NOLAN: Right, right.

THE COURT: Which sort of might eliminate the whole evidentiary issue that I'm wrestling with under the 801(D)(2)(e) issue.

MR. NOLAN: I don't think I can bring it in on the direct. Depending upon what happens on cross, we may be able to say, "Do you think it's a conspiracy?" It may be relevant based on the cross.

THE CCURT: I think if it is going to come in without laying the prima facie foundation, the rules otherwise contemplate that is the only other way I know how to do it.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Nolan.

MR. SULLIVAN: I note, if we are going to discuss conspiracy, if they are going to attempt to enter what is otherwise a hearsay statement under the 801(D)(2)(e) exception, which is not really an

### QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Well, it also seems to -- I think

I will let you respond to that, Mr. Nolan. I think Mr. Sullivan is right, now that he reminds me of the application of the rule.

you are absolutely correct as a matter of law.

The other problem is this clearly is a collateral issue with respect to the attempt to impeach Mr. Harding. Under 803(b), what you are asking me to do is to allow you to prove up by extrinsic evidence the existence of such a conspiracy as it would inform the jury as to Mr. Harding's bias and motive in testifying against Mr. Hinkson.

I think, in the exercise of my discretion, based upon the state of the record at this point, I am not going to permit it.

MR. NOLAN: It may very well be, though, that we can establish that Mr. Hinkson believes there is a conspiracy. To the extent that he can say why he believes there is a conspiracy, it's not for the truth of the matter and it might be admissible for that --

THE COURT: No, because the problem is what you are really trying to introduce it for is to get in, through Mr. Hinkson's so-called state of mind, his belief as to why Mr. Harding is testifying against him and Harding's motive. I don't think that's proper

exception --

R

THE COURT: It is not hearsay, as a matter of law.

MR. SULLIVAN: There has to be one proof of a conspiracy, as Your Honor stated, but the exception -it goes on that the statement to be admitted, under (e), must be by a co-conspirator of a party and not just some conspiracy that exists out there somewhere. It must be a conspiracy of a party.

THE COURT: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Hinkson cannot testify to statements of another

co-conspirator in a conspiracy in which he was not a

member.

That is your point; right?

MR. SULLIVAN: Exactly. And that the Government was not a member of a conspiracy. Pirot of all, the rule only applies to a party. It's a statement of a party.

That's the basis of the -- you know, like any admission, it's a statement of a party. So if the statement of the party is admissible against the defendant, it's a statement by the Government. It's admissible as a party.

But Mr. Gunderson and Mr. Hilder and the whole crew of mock conspirators are not a party.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

impeachment of Harding. I don't think you can do it that way.

MR. NCLAN: I think that we have resolved, as far as right now, for the benefit of the jury,
Mr. Hinkson's -- the question of Mr. Hinkson.

As far as whether or not we are allowed to call those witnesses, we might want to address that later today --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NCIAN: -- and, you know, give it some more thought.

THE CCURT: Let's handle it this way:

Mr. Hoyt, when you get to that point on redirect of

Mr. Hinkson, before you ask the question, call for a

sidebar so that we don't get, you know, bogged down in

front of the jury over it.

MR. HOYT: Understood. It seems to me -- I think I understand the court's ruling -- that it wouldn't, in any event, be appropriate for me on his direct examination to ask him a series of questions, so I won't do that. I won't do that.

THE COURT: Cleay.

MR. HOYT: What I am hearing is that, should some examination during cross bring up the subject, he may be allowed to testify about that; and then there is QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WaterOz?

2012

2

7

13 14 15

17 16 19

16

24 25

> 6 7

19

24

25

the further issue as to whether or not we can get into the subject of his conspiracy. And that's scnething we can just take up later?

THE COURT: Yes.

So that we are clear on it at this point, my ruling is:

It is not admissible through Mr. Hinkson's testimony on his direct examination.

Depending upon how the cross-examination goes, if you feel on redirect that the door has been opened by the Government, when you get to that point in your redirect examination, single me for a sidebar so I will know where we are going.

MR. HOYT: Excellent. One quick question: Has the court received from the National Records any response vet?

THE COURT: No. And I can tell you I was expecting a Federal Express package to be delivered yesterday from my office in Seattle, and it didn't make it to Boise because of the fact that the Boise Airport was closed.

So I am afraid that those air courier services may be suffering from these fog-related weather problems that we are experiencing here in Boise.

And I haven't received anything, as far as I

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me take a look at it. Okay. Let's bring in the jury.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, would you resume the witness stand, please?

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, were you going to permit us to call our witness out of order?

THE COURT: With the court's permission, ladies and gentlemen, because of a witness travel problem, I am going to allow the defense to interrupt the examination of Mr. Hinkson so that we can call a witness who is going to try and make an 11:00 o'clock flight out of here this morning.

With that, go ahead.

MR. HOYT: Thank you, Your Honor. At this time Mr. Hinkson would call Samentha Burke.

THE COURT: Ms. Burke, would you step forward and be sworn, please?

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

#### SAMANTHA BURKE.

having been called, sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Thank you. Please take

know, unless Ms. Longstreet has received an e-mail or

2011

THE COURTROOM CLERK: No. I checked this morning.

THE COURT: We haven't heard from anybody at the Records Center.

MR. HOYT: We did follow up. We know the package that we sent was received.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. HOYT: And, B, they did go ahead and put the records that were requested in an overnight pouch, probably Fed-Ex, and it was sent out yesterday. Of course, we have the local fog problem.

THE COURT: Hopefully, it will be here by Monday, in which case I think it will still be timely.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Judge, I have one document that I would like to turn over to the court on this matter for in-camera review to be done when these other documents reach you. We do have one document.

THE COURT: Is it a 302?

MR. SULLIVAN: No. It's a document from the Department of the Navy.

> THE COURT: Is this in regard to Mr. Swisher? MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

the stand. If you would, state your name and spell your last name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Samantha Burke, B-u-r-k-e.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HOYT:

Good morning, Ms. Burke.

Good morning.

Ms. Burke, where do you live?

I live in Yakima, Washington.

And what formal education do you have in the way of post high school?

I have a pharmaceutical tech degree. A.

And from what institution did you receive that О. decree?

That was Big Bend Community College in Moses A. Lake, Washington.

Q. Have you ever worked in a pharmacy situation?

Yes, I have. I worked in two pharmaceuticals. A.

And have you ever worked at WaterOz? Q.

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Do you remember when you started at WaterOz?

A. I started at WaterOz on October 29th of 2002.

Q. What was your last day that you worked at

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1 A. December 1,
2 O. By whom wern

Q. By whom were you hired?

A. By Jeri Gray.

Q. And was Mr. Hinkson at WaterOz when you were

hired?

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

A. No. He was cut of the country.

Q. And when did he return to WaterOz?

A. I believe, a couple weeks.

MR. TAXAY: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. HOYT:

Q. Did you work with Mr. Hinkson?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And what were your job assignments at WaterOz?

A. I was to answer the telephone, customer

service and telephones, like, take orders. I also did a copy -- all of the copying work. And, also, I created

the newsletter the last two months that I was working there.

19 there

Q. And during that period of time, did you get to

21 know Mr. Hinkson?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And did you ever hear Mr. Hinkson make any

threats towards either Mr. Albers or towards federal

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

A. Yes, I did.

Q. At one point in time, were you aware that she lived in Mr. Hinkson's house?

A. Yes. I was.

Q. When she first arrived, how did she treat

Mr. Hinkson?

A. She seemed to be a very health-conscious woman

and her goals were to, you know, get a job and --MR. TAXAY: Objection. Non-responsive.

THE COURT: Sustained. That is not

responsive.

BY MR. HOYT:

Q. How did she treat Mr. Hinkson when she first

14 arrived?

MR. TAXAY: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, that question is a specific question designed to impeach the testimony of Ms. Bates.

THE COURT: With that representation, I will allow it. Go ahead.

22 MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, it calls for a 23 conclusion and opinion.

THE COURT: I am going to allow her to answer the question. Let's see how it goes.

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Did you observe how it was that Mr. Hinkson

3 | worked at WaterOz?

1

2

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

25

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2016

A. Yes, I did. He was very, very, very observant and busy with everything.

MR. TAXAY: Objection. Beyond the scope.

THE COURT: I agree. Sustained.

BY MR. HOYT:

Q. Were you there -- that is, in the sense of -were you working at WaterOz when the Government raid cocurred on November 21, 2002?

A. No, we didn't work that day.

Q. Now, after that time, did you ever meet a person by the name of Annie Bates?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And who was the worker at WaterOz who was the closest in age to Ms. Bates?

MR. TAXAY: Objection.

THE COURT: I am assuming he is laying a foundation. I will overrule it and allow her to answer that question.

23 THE WITNESS: I was.

24 BY MR. HOYT:

Q. Did you socialize with Ms. Bates?

## QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

2017

Go ahead. BY MR. HOYT:

O. How did she treat Mr. Hinkson?

A. At first, she treated Mr. Hinkson like she was very health conscious and that she was an immocent gal that needed a place to work and needed a home.

MR. TAXAY: Objection.

THE COURT: I am going to -- ladies and gentlemen, you may disregard that last answer. Let me see counsel at sidebar.

MR. HOYT: I would move to strike the answer.

THE COURT: I am striking the question and the answer. Do you want to ask another question? Let's do that.

15 BY MR. HOYT:

Q. Did she seem to have any personal interest in Mr. Hinkson?

MR. TAXAY: Objection.

MR. HOYT: This is the impeaching question.

THE COURT: I think it is. Overruled.

Go ahead

MR. TAXAY: Calls for a conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Yes, she did.

BY MR. HOYT:

Q. What was that?

A. She seemed, to me, as though she wanted to be with David and that she was looking --MR. TAXAY: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. Counsel, you have to lay a foundation as to what she observed, not what Ms. Burke assumed or speculated. BY MR. HOYT: Ms. Burke, were you able to see Mr. Hinkson 10 and Ms. Bates together from time to time while you were working there? 11 12 A. Yes. And did you see the way that she treated him? 13 ο. Yes. 14 A. And did those observations assist you in 15 ο. making the conclusions that you just arrived at? 16 17 And did you feel like she had a personal 18 interest in Mr. Hinkson at that time? 19 20 MR. TAXAY: Objection. Conclusion. 21 Relevance. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. It is also 22 leading. Please have her testify to her observations. 23 24 BY MR. HOYT: What was your observation, Ms. Burke? CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2020 used him, basically. She lived in his house? 2 She lived in his house, borrowed his car, used him for money. She had no interest in him personally. 5 MR. TAXAY: Objection. Move to strike. THE COURT: The jury will disregard the last 6 portion of that answer as to whether she had an interest 7 in him. R BY MR. HOYT: 9 10 She gave the appearance that she was a prim and proper person when she arrived; is that right? 11 12 Yes, yes. MR. TAXAY: Objection. 13 THE COURT: Sustained. The jury will 14 disregard the question and the answer. 15 BY MR. HOYT: 16 17 I want the specifics now. Did you become suspicious of Arme Bates while she was working at WaterOz? 19 20 MR. TAXAY: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. Improper question. 21 BY MR. HOYT: /22 What job assignment was Arme Bates given when 23 she first started working at the factory? 24 25 She worked one day in bottling; and then she

What I observed was that I felt that Annie was attracted to David. 3 MR. TAXAY: Objection. THE COURT: Not what you felt. What you saw. 5 I just want you to tell the jury, as best you can remember or explain it, what you saw about Ms. Bates. 6 THE WITNESS: I saw that Armie Bates was making a pass toward David. R 9 BY MR. HOYT: 10 And that was at first. Did that change over time? 11 12 A. Yes, it did. 13 And after she had been there for a while, how did she begin to treat Mr. Hinkson? 14 15 Then she treated David like she was not really A. 16 interested in him. 17 MR. TAXAY: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. You have to confine 18 it, counsel, to specific observations. 19 BY MR. HOYT: 20 21 Let's go with specific observations. What did you observe about the way she treated him? 22 23 She treated him --A. Did she borrow his car? 24 ο. 25 A. Oh, she totally, yeah, borrowed his car. She CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2019

2021 worked upstairs scanning documents, court documents. 1 2 Now, you talked to her personally? 3 Yes, I did. 4 Based upon your perception of her, did she have any interest in WaterOz? 5 MR. TAXAY: Objection. THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. HOYT: B Do you know -- did she move her belongings --9 10 strike that. Did she indicate to you that her intention was 11 to move to Grangeville and work at WaterOz permanently? 12 13 MR. TAXAY: Objection. Hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. 14 MR. HDYT: I think it goes to impeachment, and 15 it's an exception. 16 17 THE COURT: Let me see counsel at sidebar. (Phoroupon, the following sidebar discussion 18 was held outside the presence of the jury:) 19 20 THE COURT: Mr. Hoyt, I think I know what you are trying to do. It is the way that you are going 21 22 about it that is causing all of these objections which 23 are proper on the part of the Government. 24 What she is doing is she is, essentially, testifying to hearsay and to what her own impressions 25

were.

2 3

10

11 12

13 14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

1

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

16

17

18

19 20

22 23

24

21

BY MR. HOYT: 25

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

If Ms. Bates said something to her that is inconsistent with what Ms. Bates testified to, you can simply ask her about the impeaching statement; and that's it. You can't do much more with a witness like

MR. HOYT: In addition to that, Your Honor, there are some concrete facts. Ms. Bates did not move her belongings to Grangeville, even though she said she wanted to move there.

So I was trying to get into the area of the concrete facts of why she believed that Ms. Bates was not interested in WaterOz.

THE COURT: Why don't you just ask her, in a non-leading fashion, "Do you know whether or not she moved her belongings? At what period of time?" et cetera.

Instead, the way you are asking the question, you are, basically, just eliciting hearsay and her impressions. That is not proper impeachment.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court, in the presence of the jury:) BY MR. HOYT:

ο. Ms. Burke, did Arme Bates move her belongings to Grangeville?

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2022

BY MR. HOYT:

Q. You indicated that she worked one day in the bottling plant?

After she worked in the bottling plant, did she ever seek to be assigned to any other part of the health product manufacturing of WaterOz?

MR. TAXAY: Objection, Foundation,

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. HOYT:

ο. You said she was scanning documents; is that connect?

Did scarning documents involve anything related to the manufacturing of health products?

MR. TAYAY: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: I will allow that.

THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. HOYT:

And what were the circumstances under which Ms. Bates terminated her employment at WaterOz?

MR. TAXAY: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Are you personally familiar with the

circumstances? Did you observe the circumstances under which she terminated at WaterOz? 2

> A. Yes, I did.

And would you please advise the court and jury what the circumstances were?

It was supposedly her birthday March 13th or 14th, and we went to the bar after work and drank. And she was out all night long, till about 4:00 o'clock in the morning, and --

> MR. TAXAY: Objection. Non-responsive. THE COURT: I think that's all right.

Go ahead. Just ask another question, 12

Mr. Hoyt.

q

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. HOYT:

You said she was out till 4:00 o'clock in the morning. What happened the next day at work?

She never showed back up. She said she was A. hing over, and she never did come back to work.

She never did come back to work ever?

To work, right, yes. 20

> She was finished at WaterOz at that point? Q.

Yes.

MR. HDYT: No further questions. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hoyt. Cross-examination?

MR. TAXAY: Objection. Foundation.

THE COURT: Overruled. Why don't you lay a

foundation, counsel? Sustained.

No. she didn't.

BY MR. HOYT:

A.

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

21

22

23

24

25

You indicated that you socialized with Ms. Battes?

Yes, I did. A.

And did you get to know her well enough to know where her belongings were located?

They were located in Grangeville -- or Boise. Actually, they were in Boise; and whatever she carried on her was in Grangeville.

So she had a few personal items with her in Grangeville?

Right. A.

The question is: Did she manifest, by her 17 conduct, an interest in WaterOz? 18

MR. TAXAY: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained. 20

BY MR. HOYT:

What did you observe about her interest in WaterOz?

MR. TAXAY: Objection. Same question.

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Sustained.

2026 CROSS EXAMINATION 1 2 BY MR. TAXAY: 3 Ms. Burke, you weren't with Ms. Bates 24 hours a day; isn't that right? 5 Right. 6 You don't know what she was doing when she ο. 7 wasn't with you? Right, I don't know. 8 A. You testified that she horrowed Mr. Hinkson's 9 10 car? 11 A. Yes, she did, on one occasion. And "borrow" means Mr. Hinkson let her have 12 13 it; right? Usually, yes. 14 A. You said that she lived in his house? 15 O. 16 A. She did so with Mr. Hinkson's permission; 17 correct? 18 19 A. 20 o. You spoke about her drinking until 4:00 o'clock in the morning. I assume you were with her, and 21 that's how you know this? 22 Yes. 23 A. MR. TAXAY: One second, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Sure. 25

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2028 THE COURT: Certainly. 1 MR. HOYT: We have great air conditioning in 2 3 here today. THE COURT: At least it's cooler in here today 5 than it was yesterday. 6 MR. HOYT: Yes, indeed. 7 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. HOYT: 9 Good morning, Mr. Hinkson. 10 o. A. Good morning. 11 Mr. Hinkson, would you please tell the jury: 12 13 Do you have a criminal record? No, I have never had any problem with the law. 14 Have you ever been stopped by police? 15 o. 16 A. And what was that all about? 17 Q. I have had about four speeding tickets in my 18 A. 19 entire life. 20 Have you ever had a parking ticket? Q. 21 No. A. /22 0. Have you ever been stopped --MR. SULLIVAN: I object. I object to this. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 25

2027 BY MR. TAXAY: 1 2 ۵. This evening that you guys went out till 4:00 3 o'clock to the bar, is that the last time you saw Ms. Bates? 5 I saw her one other time when she came to get her stuff from WaterOz. 7 Since then, you haven't had any contact with 0. her? R 9 A. No. 10 MR. TAXAY: Nothing further. 11 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Hoyt? MR. HOYT: Nothing further, Your Honor. She 12 13 may be excused. THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Burke. You are 14 15 excused. I hope you catch your 11:00 o'clock flight. 16 Thank you. 17 Mr. Hinkson, would you resume the witness 18 stand, please? 19 20 DAVID ROLAND HINKSON, 21 having been called, previously sworn, testified as 22 23 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hinkson. I remind you, sir, that you are under oath. 24 MR. HOYT: Excuse me, Your Honor. 25

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

```
2029
     BY MR. HOYT:
 2
              Was there an incident near Teton. Idaho?
        ο.
 3
        A.
              Briefly, tell us what happened.
        Q.
              MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I object if this is
 5
 6
     scrething about being stopped for speeding.
 7
               THE COURT: If that's what it relates to, the
     objection is sustained.
              MR. HDYT: It doesn't relate to speeding, Your
10
     Honor.
11
              THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
     BY MR. HOYT:
12
              Mr. Hinkson --
13
              MR. SULLIVAN: I would ask for a question
14
15
     rather than an incident.
16
               THE COURT: Yes. Why don't we do it that way?
17
     BY MR. HOYT:
              After the Tetan Dann flood, did you work an
18
     the clean-up operation?
19
20
              Yes. I volunteered to clean up the Teton Dann
21
     mess.
              As a result of that, did you find some
22
        Q.
     snownobiles that had been carried away in a flood?
23
               THE COURT: Counsel, let me see -- I think I
24
25
     know where you are going. The Government is objecting.
```

3

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2032

Let me talk to you.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whereupon, the following midebar discussion was held outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: What do you seek to elicit? That he was investigated for the theft of a snowmobile? I mean, it's not impeaching. I don't know how it's relevant.

MR. HOYT: It shows the contact that he's had with police in the past, the level of his cooperation. it goes to general character. I think we are entitled to show the jury some background. Especially since the Government says that he is a law violator, I think that his history is relevant to the subject.

THE COURT: If they tried to impeach him on the subject, I wouldn't allow them do it because it's not proper impeachment.

MR. HOYT: It will be mentioned by Dr. Doke.

It's in his report. He asked him if he had ever had any contact with police, and he mentions this incident.

If he doesn't have a chance to -- I don't want to have it come cut later, not having given him the opportunity -- it's, like, two more questions just to get it cut.

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, it has nothing to do with the case. He's trying to put on good character

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. NCIAN: All I am saying is that I can understand his follow-up question because we don't want to appear as if Mr. Hinkson is lying when Dr. Doke gets on the stand and says something about this incident. That was my thought.

THE COURT: Let me do this: If Mr. Hoyt
thinks it's this important -- I question the relevancy
of it, but I think we probably spend more time arguing
about whether it's admissible or not than if we just let
it in.

But I'm going to let it in only because you say that Dr. Doke is relying on it in forming whatever his opinions are.

MR. SULLIVAN: I have another matter that is related but separate. I seek permission of the court to make my very first question to Mr. Hinkson on cross-examination, "Isn't it true you are a convicted felon?"

THE COURT: With his answer, I think that's a fair question on cross-examination. I'm going to allow you to ask that question.

MR. NCLAN: Isn't there an issue about whether or not sentencing is required before you are, in fact, convicted?

THE COURT: I had my Law Clerk research that;

testimony that he -- I don't know exactly what he did. If he was investigated, so what? I mean, it means, I guess, no charges so, therefore, there was nothing, so that's good character evidence.

THE COURT: Is that it? I mean, is that what he is going to say?

MR. HOYT: He has talked about those snowmobiles, and he had receipts for them. He had purchased them, and so that ended the investigation right there.

THE COURT: Then what is the relevancy? The fact that somebody was investigated for a crime and is either not charged or acquitted is not admissible.

MR. NCLAN: The only problem I had when I heard the question was Mr. Hirkson said, "I have never been," and I remembered that Dr. Doke had referred to that, that he had been investigated about this.

THE COURT: I'm going to decide over the weekend whether and how much of Dr. Doke's testimony is coming in. I don't know until I hear from Dr. Doke what the relevancy is, in terms of establishing a psychological opinion.

The fact that somebody has been investigated but never charged with a crime -- I just don't see what that has to do with anything.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2033

and the answer is it comes in as a conviction, although you can establish on redirect that the matter has not yet been appealed and, therefore, is not final yet.

MR. NOLAN: That goes back and forth, depending upon the purpose. I have been reading stuff.

THE COURT: I thought about it. I have had some research done, and that's what I understand the Ninth Circuit law to be on that subject. You know, that's as much as I need to say now.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court, in the presence of the juny:)

MR. HOYT: May I have the last question read back by the court reporter?

(Whereupon, the last question and answer were read back by the court reporter.)
BY MR. HOYT:

- Q. Mr. Hirkson, can you briefly tell us what happened?
  - A. Yes, I was arrested for looting.
- Q. Related to the snowmobiles?
- A. Yes. I found them.
- Q. And were you able to provide some documentation as to those?
- A. Well, I called up the owners and tried to return them; and the owners didn't want them back

2034 because they were going to get new ones for free. And so I got a bill of sale signed for each one and I --2 MR. SULLIVAN: I object. Unresponsive. 3 THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. HOYT: 5 6 Were you able to present a bill of sale for 7 those items to the police? 8 A. Did that end the investigation? ο. 9 10 A. Yes. Mr. Hinkson, have you been convicted by a jury 11 o. of the tax charges as have been discussed here in this 12 case, specifically, on May 5th of 2004? 13 Well, the Government thinks --14 15 THE COURT: Just "yes" or "no." THE WITNESS: -- I was convicted. 16 THE COURT: "Yes" or "no," were you convicted? 17 MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I didn't hear the 18 19 answer. 20 THE COURT: The court reporter will re-read 21 the question and the answer. (Whereupon, the previous question and answer 22 were read back by the court reporter.) 23 BY MR. HOYT: 24 Is the answer "yes" or "no"? "Yes" or "no"? 25

## QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

2036 of March 27, 2003, when you had the conversation with 2 Mr. Harding, that he was recording you? 3 No. I had no idea. After the raid of November 21, 2002, were 4 Q. records concerning your credit with credit companies 5 removed? Did you discover they were removed? 6 Yes. The files were taken from the factory. 7 MR. SULLIVAN: I object. Relevance. 8 THE COURT: Sustained. 10 BY MR. HOYT: 11 After the raid, was your credit shut down? 0. 12 Yes. A. 13 MR. SULLIVAN: I object. THE COURT: Sustained. Irrelevant. 14 15 BY MR. HOYT: Mr. Swisher contended in his testimony that, 16 at one point in time, you had asked him to murder your 17 18 former wife, Marie Hinkson, now Towerton. Do you recall that? 19 20 Yes. Do you have any reason or motivation to want 21 her killed? /22 A. 23 MR. SULLIVAN: Asked and answered. 24 25 THE COURT: It is camulative, counsel. You

2035 Okay. I will say "yes" then. A. 2 Q. Have you been sentenced on those charges yet? 3 A. No. Has the case been appealed yet? ٥. 5 A. No. Now, Mr. Hinkson, you were arrested on April 6 Q. 7 4, 2003, related to these alleged threats, as testified by Agent Long; isn't that correct? Yea. I was And how long was it before the Government 10 indicted you on this offense? 11 12 Eighteen months. A. In Mr. Harding's discussion about the body 13 wire, Mr. Harding said that there was a long pause and 14 that you stared at his chest and that, from that, he 15 16 presumed that you were aware he was recording. 17 MR. SULLIVAN: I object to the summarization of the testimony. 18 19 MR. HOYT: I am laying a foundation. 20 THE COURT: Overruled. I think it's a fair foundational question. 21 22 BY MR. HOYT: Do you recall that general testimony, sir? 23 ο. 24 A. Yes, I do. 25 And, Mr. Hirkson, were you aware, on the night

### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2037 asked him that yesterday. Sustained. 2 BY MR. HOYT: In the tape-recorded radio interview that was played for the jury, you are talking to a radio amouncer: is that correct? Yes, that's correct. A. 7 And what was the name of that program? Do you ο. recall? a 9 A. I don't remember. 10 Would the term "The Agitator Hour" refresh your recollection? 11 12 A. Yes. 13 Now, is this a regular program that goes on, ο. to your knowledge? 14 I don't know because it was the first time I A. 15 was ever on it, I think. 16 17 Now, you had -- you had been a radio talk show host, yourself? 18 19 A. Yes. 1,000 shows I've done. And do you recall, at the beginning of the 20 21 tape recording, what the approach of the armouncer was? Was it -- was it a spoof? Was it very serious? What 22 23 was going on? What type of a program was it? MR. SULLIVAN: I object, Your Honor. It calls 24 for a characterization.

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1

Sustained. The jury will have to draw its own conclusions.

5

7

10 11 12

13 14 15

16

17 18

19 20

22

24

2 3

1

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19 20

21 22

23 24 25

evidence, Your Honor. It's probably best to take it up at the bench.

THE COURT: On this same subject? MR. HDYT: We can do it at another time. It

authenticate the balance of the tape. authenticate whatever it is you want him to

authenticate. Go ahead. We will see where we go. BY MR. HOYT:

٥.

A.

ο.

January 8, 2003?

21

23

25

here for the jury?

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Yes, I do.

Was that the full tape?

THE COURT: The tame is in evidence.

MR. HDYT: The full tape is not in evidence.

THE COURT: Well, your question is improper.

MR. NOLAN: We would move offer a piece of

doesn't have to be done now; but our purpose would be to

be offering it through this witness, i.e., to have him

THE COURT: Why don't you have him

Mr. Hinkson, do you remember the broadcast of

And there was a portion of it that was played

MR. HOYT: One moment, please.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Hoyt, I have it here.

MR. HOYT: Exhibit H?

MR. NCLAN: It's page 36 of the transcript.

MR. HDYT: Page 36, ckay. It's missing from this book.

THE COURT: It should be -- isn't that 4-A, Exhibit 4-A, the transcript of the --

MR. HOYT: It is also Exhibit 4-A.

MR. NOLAN: I have the transcript page here.

MR. HOYT: All right. May I put it on the

Elmo, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, Go right ahead.

BY MR. HOYT:

Mr. Hinkson, do you recall that you made this statement starting at the top of the page: "The feds are good for something, sport."

And Mr. Harding said to you: "Good for sport. Did you bring the sporting feds today, Wilson? Yes, I did."

And then you respond to him: "I got two IRS (insadible) we are going to hant them. Got the hound dogs ready? Yeah. (Inaudible) this one, white one. Yeah."

And then Mr. Harding says to you: "Do you think there are good guys in the system, though, that A. No.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, we would tender -- and I'm sure you want to take that up with us as a legal matter later. We would tender the balance of the tape that wasn't played for the jury and ask that we can do that at a later point in time.

THE COURT: Let me take a look at it at the necess.

MR. NOLAN: We want to have a foundational -whatever you think is necessary.

THE COURT: You have done that. If I rule it admissible, you can play it. If I don't, then you wm't.

RY MR. HOYT:

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

7

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24 25

2040

Hinkson, as a matter of speech, do you use ο. metaphors?

A. Yes, constantly.

In the recording by Mr. Harding of March 27th, you make the following statement at page 36, starting at line 1.

My question is -- I want to read you -- let's see. Let's see if we can put that before the witness. The easiest way might be with the exhibit book.

> Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: Sime.

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2041

just don't know?"

Mr. Hinkson: "They quit."

My question to you is: Were you speaking literally or metaphorically when you said, "We are going to hint them??

Just metaphorically. A.

Why would you use that metaphor? ٥.

There was a movie on TV about this where they had done this and we were -- I was kind of joking about this movie.

Is that the kind of humor that you follow?

Not usually. I mean, I -- I was just BS'ing with Mr. J. C.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, subject to same follow-up questions that would relate to the tape recording of the radio interview and the portions that were not played previously, at this time, no more questions of Mr. Hinkson.

THE COURT: Very well. Thank you, Mr. Hoyt. I will allow you to re-open if I admit that portion that you want to play.

MR. HOYT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Cross-examination?

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

/22

23

24

25

Mr. Hinkson, let's start with last things first. This passage that Mr. Hoyt just read to you that started out on page 36, "The feds are good for scrething, sport, " you think that's furmy, don't you?

CROSS EXAMINATION

Well, they hamt me. Yeah, it's furmy.

So you are hunting them? Q.

No.

Isn't it correct that the -- you didn't get this from a movie, did you?

No. There was a movie where they took these two agents and they took them out in the outback and they hunted them.

You found that amising?

It was a good movie.

You found that amusing?

A.

Q. The passage starts at page 135.

THE COURT: 35 or 135?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. 35.

MR. HDYT: What line, counsel?

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Let's start at line 12. J. C. starts out saying: "No, the feds, how are they staying healthy?"

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

doesn't it?

I think there are some federal agents that are very had, and I think there are some good ones that are trying to do their job and honor the Constitution.

You further say: "I got two IRS (inaudible) we are going to hunt them. Got the hound dogs ready? Yeah. (Inaudible) this one, white one. Yeah."

When you say, "I got two IRS," what are you referring to? The two IRS agents you are going to hunt?

I wasn't referring to anybody.

You weren't referring to Jerold Vernon, the revenue agent; and Steve Hines, the criminal investigator?

A. No. I was just kind of BS'ing.

Mr. Hoyt asked you if you used metaphors, just a few moments ago; connect?

Yes, he did. A.

Let me ask you this question, if this was a metaphor, from page 25 of the radio interview on "The Agitator Hour."

MR. HOYT: One moment, please, counsel.

THE COURT: Counsel, you are going to have to enlarge that.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Could we have the exhibit from the book? Page

2044

25 of Government's Exhibit SA, starting at 740. At 740, "DH," which is David Hinkson, do you see that on the monitor?

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

A. Yes, Ido.

It reads: "About a week ago, but we sent her another letter and she's in default as of Friday this week again. That will be the fifth time."

You are talking about Nancy Cook?

Yes, I was, actually.

You follow then with: "We're trying to give her every opportunity to cough it up. We want that stuff."

"Well, yeah."

And you follow with: "We got a fifty-million-dollar lawsuit and that's the evidence we need to finish her off. We need it."

Was it literal or a metaphor when you said you needed it or wanted it to finish her off?

Well, I'm asking for my discovery here. To "finish her off" would mean that she's going to lose in

Q. It doesn't mean that you were going to finish her off, in the metaphorical sense, that you were going to kill her?

A. No. It reads the way it's supposed to read.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Mr. Hinkson: "Nobody is opposing them."

Hinkson: "You go to jail, nobody cares."

Mr. Hinkson: "That was a true story where

Hinkson: "But they kichapped two IRS agents.

I think the movie was based on that, yes, I

starts killing, go, okay. This is enough. They're not

they are hinting those people, turn them loose, hint

They turned them loose and lamted them. True story."

You thought that was a true story,

And you thought that true story was

It was just a movie. It was a plot.

You followed up that conversation with what

You say: "The feds are good for something, sport." And that expresses what you think of the feds,

Hollywood did, I think.

appears at page, 36 and you join in the fun.

Did you? You did, didn't you?

Informant. "Yeah. Yeah."

Informant: "You think somewhere somebody just

Informant: "Why?"

railroading me anymore."

them like animals."

Mr. Hinkson?

entertaining?

A.

0.

A.

Q.

A.

It says "finish her off." It's the lawsuit. We are talking about a lawsuit here.

- Q. Those are your choice of words here; correct?
- A. That's what it says.
- Q. "Finish her off."

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

A.

Let me ask you if this was also literal or metaphorical when you said, at page 48 of the radio interview, starting at 1454: "Well, I have to file a motion to put her in contempt." You were, again, referring to Ms. Cook?

- A. Yes, I was.
- Q. It says: "Well, no. She's -- she's denying --"

You say: "Somehody has to. Somehody has to say I motion to put her in contempt."

Amnumcer: "Well, no. Wait a minute. No. Wait a minute. The judge -- this was the judge's order. If somebody's not obeying the judge's order --"

And you say: "It's great. It's great because she has to dismiss everything. If she doesn't have it turned over, it's over for her."

Was that metaphorical or literal?

A. It's absolutely metaphorical. What I'm saying here is she won't give me my discovery. If she won't give me my discovery, she has to dismiss the phony

#### QNA COURT REPORTENT (208) 484-6309

2048

2046

Is that metaphorical or literal?

- That means that she's going to go to jail.
- Q. By the way, she never went to jail, did she?
- A. No. She kidnapped me.
- Q. You went to jail?
- A. Right. I was kichapped.
- Q. So when you say, "She's toast," you weren't referring to killing her; right?
- A. No. I think she just should be in jail where she belongs.
- 11 Q. That was your choice of words, though, to say,
  12 "She's toast"?
  - A. It sure was.
  - Q. You say you were kidnapped, Mr. Hinkson?
  - A. Yes, Ido.
  - Q. You know there was a court order for your arrest; correct?
  - A. I don't believe so.
- Q. You were brought before Magistrate Judge
   Williams on --
- 21 A. There was no attached oath and affirmation; 22 therefore, it was an invalid arrest warrant.
  - Q. So you must have moved to have the charges dismissed on that basis; correct?
    - A. It depends upon which case we are talking
      ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

accusations against me.

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

By the way, I never got my discovery.

Q. Did I ask you that question, sir?

THE COURT: The jury will disregard what Mr. Hinkson just volunteered. It's not responsive to the question. It's stricken.

MR. HOYT: Discovery has been mentioned many times and  $\mathbf{I'm} \mathrel{--}$ 

THE COURT: Counsel, I have ruled.

MR. HDYT: I'm not arguing about that. I wonder if we could have a definition of the term "discovery" in a lawsuit so the jury might understand.

THE COURT: I will allow -- you can handle that on redirect. I think the jury knows what discovery is

Go ahead.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. You didn't mean, again, "kill her," just in some other metaphorical sense, but that things would go hadly for her in the lawsuit?
  - A. Yes
- Q. But you continued in that statement. After you say, "It's over for her," you say, "And if she turns it over knowing that she forged that Indictment, she's toast."

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2049

about now.

Q. Which case are you talking about?

A. You are asking the questions. Why don't you rephrase it so I know what case you are talking about?

Q. I will. You said you were kidnapped. Which case were you kidnapped in?

- A. I would say, both of them.
- Q. Okay. It doesn't matter which one I'm asking about; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Your first kidnapping would have been 11/21/02?
- 13 A. Yes
  - Q. And you know there was an arrest warrant issued by a Federal Judge for your arrest on that date?
    - A. No Federal Judge signed that arrest warrant.
  - Q. So you must have moved to have the case disminsed on that basis; right?
  - A. No, I dich't. You said "Federal Judge." It was a Magistrate.
    - Q. He is a Federal Judge, sir.
    - A. I didn't know Magistrates were Federal Judges.
  - Q. So the answer to my other question was, no, you didn't move to dismiss on the basis that there was no signed arrest warrant; right?

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2052

A.

o.

A.

o.

Q.

A.

A.

o.

A.

1

11 12 13

15 16

18

20 21

22 23

be on Monday or Tuesday of next week, not today. time preparing to testify; is that it? testimony. 10 that was a kidnapping? 14 the cause. kidnapped the plaintiff"? 17 19 your civil suit; " right? signed by a Federal Judge? 1

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309 later. You had a hearing before a Federal Judge, didn't you? I never had a --A. Let me finish the question. You had a hearing before a Federal Judge on the revocation of bond, too, didn't you? I have never had a bond or bail hearing in 22 A. months. You had one on April 9, 2003? ο. That was not a bond and bail hearing. A. And it was before --O. It was not a de novo hearing. THE COURT: Wait for the question,

I don't remember if I did or not.

You spent a lot of time preparing for your

So your testimony is you haven't spent any

I have not spent any time preparing for this

After you were arrested 11/21, you contend

And you told Judge Williams that; correct?

And you told him, "The defendants have

I think he said that, yes.

I told him I didn't understand the nature and

And he didn't -- excuse me. He said, "That's

Your second kidnapping was April 4, 2003?

And that, again, was based upon a warrant

Absolutely.

Yes, I did.

Yes.

I've spent zero time because I was supposed to

Mr. Hinkson. BY MR. SULLIVAN: That was before Judge Mikel Williams who had set your bond, wasn't it? I have never been on bond, that I know of. THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, did you have a hearing before Judge Mikel Williams on April 9, 2003? "Yeo" or "no"? THE WITNESS: Yeah, there was a hearing. BY MR. SULLIVAN: All right. And you were seeking to be Q.

A.	Without	an	cath	and	affirmation.

And you were detained on that arrest warrant. 0. werren't you?

2651

2053

I was put on hold. A.

You were put on hold?

That's what you call it when you put somebody in jail with no bond or bail for 22 months. You call it a hold.

Didn't the judge who signed the warrant call it a revocation of bond for violation of the terms of vour bord?

A. I think he said something about I violated my release -- my release -- I'm not sure if I worded quite exactly right, but I don't have it in front of me so --

You know that the reason for your arrest on April 4th was because there was an arrest warrant issued for your violation of bond?

There was an arrest warrant issued for making A. threats.

Q. Which violated your band?

But there were no threats.

You know you were -- you had your bond ο. violated -- that is, revoked -- because of threats?

There were no threats. There was no evidence of a threat ever entered into the court until 22 months

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

released on bond again; correct?

I had no chance to prepare for that hearing so I don't know what -- you said I'm seeking something?

You were represented by Brit Groom; correct?

He showed up, yes.

Is there a difference between showing up and being represented, Mr. Hinkson?

When there is no time to prepare, I don't think it's such good representation.

And after the Judge ordered you held on the revocation of your bond, you appealed that to a District Court Judge, also; right?

We appealed the improper detention, yes.

Right. And the District Court Judge affirmed the ruling of the Magistrate?

With no detail, yes. A.

So you have had at least two hearings on the revocation of bond; correct?

They were not bond and bail hearings. They were not de novo hearings. So the answer is "no." I have never had a bond or bailing hearing de novo. No, I have not.

When the District Court Judge upheld the ٥. Magistrate Judge, you took an appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals about the revocation of your

band; true?

5

7

10 11

12 13 14

15 16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

> 2 3

S 7

10

11 12

13 14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21 22

23 24 25

A. Yes. I did.

So you had another review, a third review: ٥. correct:?

A. Yes. I did.

And you were still held in jail because you were found to have violated the terms of your bond and to be a flight risk?

There has never been any evidence presented to this court to show that I had ever made a threat at that time.

Agent Long testified at the first hearing on 0. April 9th; correct?

He committed five counts of perjury on that. It's proven on the record.

The Judge believed his testimony; correct?

Third-party hearsay is not evidence.

The Judge didn't reject his testimony? He accepted his testimony as accurate and truthful, didn't he?

A. What he said was the perjury didn't matter or scrething like that.

Everyone perjures themselves against you; is that correct, Mr. Hinkson?

It's proveable perjury. It's on the record.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2056

you?

I think he did. He had a handpun in his hand. A.

You had absolutely no proof of such a thing ο. that he was trying to mirder you?

Well, we are all entitled to our opinion. I didn't wave a gun in your face.

You accuse Nancy Cook of being a member with Mr. Hines to murder you on 11/21; correct?

A. No. I don't think Nancy Cook was there.

ο. She wasn't there, but you later accused her of being a part of the plot to murder you?

No. She's not part of a plot to murder anybody. She is just the prosecutor.

MR. NOLAN: Could I approach briefly, Your Honor? I don't mean to interrupt.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Whereupon, the following sidebar discussion was held outside the presence of the jury:)

MR. NOIAN: I would ask the court to admonish the jury that any finding by a previous court or judge regarding any threats or anything is not relevant to whether or not he is guilty of those charges today, in light of the cross-examination.

THE COURT: I think that's proper. Unless the Government objects, I will give that limiting

THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, answer Mr. Sullivan's

question.

6

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

The court reporter will read back the question.

(Whereupon, the previous question and answer were read back by the court reporter.)

THE WITNESS: Everybody you have brought to

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

court.

So I am also a part of those who bring perjury 10 ο. against you, Mr. Hinkson? 11

> I have no evidence that you personally did it. A.

But you believe it? 13 o.

I know that you know I'm innocent, and you are 14 A. prosecuting a person that you know is innocent. 15

And you made that allegation against Dennis Albers, too, didn't you?

I sure did. A.

And you made that allegation against Nancy O. Cook, didn't you?

Yes, I did. A.

You made -- you make allegations without proof against lots of people, don't you, Mr. Hinkson?

No, not lots of people.

You accused Steve Hines of trying to murder ο.

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2057

2055

instruction now.

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, he claims there were no -- there was no evidence produced, that everyone perjured himself. For the court to tell the jury now that they shouldn't consider, you know, what happened in those hearings --

THE COURT: No. I think Mr. Nolan's request is more limited. He just wants me to tell the jury that they are not to consider, in deciding whether or not Mr. Hirkson is guilty of the counts in the Indictment, any decisions by a Federal Judge in connection with holding him without bail.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court, in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I need to give you another limiting instruction.

You just heard some testimony in response to Mr. Sullivan's questions about decisions by other Federal Judges and Courts of Appeal concerning the reasons for holding Mr. Hinkson without bail.

You are not to consider the fact that other judges have ruled upon some of the evidence in making that determination, in evaluating the evidence that you are hearing here in court, in deciding whether or not Mr. Hinkson is guilty of the offenses charged in the

Indictment. Do you understand that?

Okay. I see everybody modding their head "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Nolan.

Go ahead, Mr. Sullivan.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

1

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

/22

23

24

25

Q. Mr. Hinkson, you just now said you don't believe you ever said that Nancy Cook was part of the plot to murder you with Steve Hines?

A. She didn't show up on the property. She plotted to bring these phony, false indictments against me.

Q. Could I have a "yes" or "no" answer? Did you accuse her of plotting to mirder you?

A. I don't know. I don't think so.

Q. Didn't you put out on a website something relating to your arrest, something called "David Hinkson's Day of Terror at the Hands of Satan's Foot Soldiers"?

A. I didn't put that on the Internet.

Q. So where it says, "I, David Hinkson," wasn't you?

A. I wrote the article; but a bunch of other people kind of massaged it, also. So, you know, it's --

Q. It's not quite your work? It's someone else's

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

hear anyone talk about, "Let's go murder Dave Hinkson"?

A. A SWAT team and machine guns aimed at my house and ear plums in is no proof?

Q. You made it up as you were preparing this, just to try to influence the public, didn't you?

A. No. I think that -- I think what you did was very victous, surrounding my house.

Q. You prepared this document, "David Hinkson's Day of Terror at the Hands of Satan's Foot Soldiers," to influence the public when they read it; right?

A. Well, yes. I think that was to influence the public, yes.

Q. And it was the same purpose in going on "The Agitator Hour," to influence the public; correct?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Because you were facing trial on the tax case?

A. And the FDA charges.

Q. With the FDA charges and the structuring of money charges; right?

A. Yes

Q. And you hoped, by putting your message out in this fashion, you could influence the public in your favor?

A. Ch, I would think so, yeah.

Q. That could help you with any jury that heard

work?

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. It would be a combination of different people that were active in writing that story, yes.

Q. But you started it, and it's your version of what happened on 11/21/02?

A. I think the rough story is my version, yes.

Q. Didn't you say the following in that rough story: "After thinking about the whole situation, I believe that the defendants, Nancy Cook and Steve Hines, crohestrated the raid on WaterOz and my home for the sole purpose of murdering me and ending the lawsuit that was filed against them by me in the amount of fifty million dollars." You wrote that, didn't you?

A. In the rough draft, yes, I wrote that.

Q. So you just forgot that you accused a Federal Prosecutor of trying to murder you?

A. I said "orchestrated," didn't I? I don't have it in front of me so --

Q. It says: Nancy Cook and Steve Hines,
together, orchestrated the raid for the sole purpose of
murdering me.

A. I think that was their purpose, yes.

Q. Of course, you had no proof of such a thing?

24 A. No proof?

Q. Yes. You had no proof. You were not there to

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2061

your tax case?

A. I don't know if very many people saw the letter. I don't know if that would help with my jury.

Q. You hoped it would when you put it out on the website and did the radio show?

A. I don't think it had anything to do with the jury. I think it was just me exposing my perception of what is being done to me.

Q. And in order to expose this corruption, you made up a lot of lies about Nancy Cook and Steve Hines?

A. I don't think those are lies. I think they orchestrated to get me any way they could.

Q. You claimed Steve Hines came through the door with a silver handom --

A. Yes, I did.

Q. -- on 11/21? And you claim that he -- they were -- they, the agents present, were going to kill you and put that gum in your dead fingers? I think you used that expression; correct?

A. Somewhere I think I said that, yes.

Q. Right?

A, I'm not sure where.

Q. Of course, that didn't happen, did it?

A. No, because I said, "It's on the headboard," and I don't think they expected me to answer that way.

ONE COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2059

1

12

13

16

17

20

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I really believe that they were holding the silver handpun to plant it in my hands. That is my belief mystem.

- Q. That's your belief system so that, therefore, makes it true?
- A. It's my belief system. And when I wrote that, I expressed it as my belief of what happened.
  - Q. Now, you had a handgun there; right?
  - A. Yes. Two of them, actually.
- Q. When you refer to "on the headboard," you are
   referring to a gun of your own?
  - A. Yes, it was.
    - Q. Was it registered to you?
- 14 A. Idon't know.
- 15 Q. Where did you get it?
  - A. Years ago. I don't know. Las Vegas somewhere.
- 18 Q. But you have had it -- do other people know 19 it's yours?
  - I don't understand what you mean.
- 21 Q. Did you show it to anybody? Did you take it
  22 out with some of the people to go shooting?
- 23 A. No, I don't think it's ever been shot but one 24 time.
  - Q. But you have shot it; right?

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

- Q. The fact that nothing happened at all doesn't influence your belief system, does it?
  - A. Nothing happened at all?
- Q. Right. No one shot you? No one planted a gun on you?
- A. They were planning to shoot if I would have looked out the window, I believe.
  - Q. And that didn't happen either, did it?
  - A. That's because I didn't go to the window.
- Q. They could have pushed you to the window, couldn't they?
  - No. Then they would get shot, maybe.
- Q. You said there was -- when you came back from the bond hearing, you found urine in the bathbub?
  - A. I did, and ear plugs all around the house.
- Q. And because you are skilled in chemistry, you must have taken a sample of the urine in the tub to prove your allegation?
  - A. No. I just had somebody clean it up.
- Q. Because you are sure that they were planning to kill you, you must have taken photos of the urine in the tub?
  - A. We took photos of everything.
  - Q. You took photos of what, sir?
  - A. Footprints, the muddy footprints, the doors

THE COURT: Counsel, the record is a little confused here. I believe the witness testified that he had two guns, and you are asking him about one.

BY MR. SHILLIVAN:

 I'm talking about the one you said was on the headboard.

A. Yeah. It was a .45.

One time, yes.

- Q. You had a .45 on the headboard?
- A. Uh-huh.

1

2

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

- Q. Was there anything that stopped the agents from taking that gun and putting it in your dead fingers if they wanted to?
- A. I think they didn't know who was all storming into the room. They were surprised, I think, to see me laying there. They all had ski masks on.
- Q. Yes.
- A. I think they hesitated in their plan. That's my belief.
- 20 Q. And that, therefore, makes it true?
  - In my mind, yes.
  - Q. So Nancy Cook and Steve Hines didn't orchestrate it that well; is that correct?
  - A. I don't think it went according to the plan they hoped.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

that got battering-runned, the urine in the bathtub -we took a video of everything that was done.

- Q. Ch, you didn't mention that on direct, did you?
- A. Nobody anked me about a video on direct.

  MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I would like to
- have the document that I was reading from marked as the next exhibit.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. HOYT: Is that in? Is that already in?

THE COURT: I think it's previously been marked as Exhibit 7: is that correct. Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Do you want it 7-A or do you want it 13? We could do 7-A or 13.

THE COURT: Do we have another 7?

THE COURTROOM CLERK: We have a 7.

THE COURT: It's already marked as 7.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: He just wanted this

partian.

THE COURT: Do you want the whole thing or just the portion?

MR. SULLIVAN: The whole thing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The whole thing. All right.

7 8

11 12 13

19 20 21

22 23 24

25

3 5

6 7 8

g 10 11

12 13 14

15 16 17

18 19 20

21 /22 23

24

25

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Longstreet? THE COURTROOM CLERK: Did you admit it, Your Honor? THE COURT: I haven't admitted it yet, Mr. Sullivan. Let's have him authenticate. MR. SULLIVAN: What is the number, please, your Honor? THE COURT: 7, counsel. 10 BY MR. SULLIVAN: I am showing you Government's Exhibit 7, a printcut of the document I was just reading from, "David Hinkson's Day of Terror." Do you recognize it? 14 Yeah. I have seen it before. ٥. Who were the other people who you say helped you draft it? Well, it kind of went everywhere. I know that Rod Remlin pitched in and helped write it. Just a variety of different people. I didn't even come up with the title. Who did? I'm not sure. MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I move the admission of Government's Exhibit 7. CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309 A. All you have to do is come and knock on the 1 2 door. How did you make yourself accessible to

Would you like it shown to the witness?

- Mr. Hines and Ms. Cook?
  - I was never in hiding.
- How did you make yourself accessible to the 0. cont?
- I guess you just serve papers like you A. normally would anybody else.
- Isn't it true, sir, that you were invited to meet with Special Agent Hines during his investigation and you declined?
  - I think he cancelled.
- Didn't he invite you to have a meeting, and you didn't show up?
  - A.
- Isn't it true you were invited to appear before the Grand Jury to testify?
  - A. I do remember that, yes.
- And did you make yourself accessible to the 0. Grand Jury by doing that?
- Yes. I was going to come, but there was stipulations in there as to what I had to say; and, therefore, I decided, under direction of counsel, not to go.

MR. HOYT: No objection.

THE COURT: Government's Exhibit 7 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Government's Exhibit No. 7 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. SUILLIVAN:

2

3

5

6

B

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

2068

I am showing you Government's Exhibit 7 to the jury, the document entitled "David Hinkmon's Day of Terror at the Hands of Satan's Foot Soldiers," by David Hinkson.

THE COURT: Can you focus that, Mr. Sullivan? BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- The passage I read to you is from page two, the yellow underlining, the yellow highlighting. Do you see that, Mr. Hinkson?
  - Yes. I do.
- At the bottom of the page -- let me ask you this: Is it your contention, sir -- let me show you the second page of the document. Do you see where it says, "In light of the fact that I have always made myself available and accessible to the court and defendant Hines and Cook . . . . Do you see that?
  - Yes. I see that, yeah. A.
- How did you make yourself accessible to the courts and Mr. Hines and Mr. Cook?

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2069

2067

That invitation appears in Government's Exhibit 1, your civil lawsuit; correct?

I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Counsel, would this be a good time, while you are looking at that, to take our morning recess?

MR. SULLIVAN: I have it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MR. SULLIVAN: All right. We need the break, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we will take our fifteen-minute recess at this time.

(Recess.)

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: I know you have stuff to take up with me, but let me dispose of the letter that was tendered to me this morning for in-camera review.

For the record, it has got two dates on it, the most recent of which is a January 10, 2005, letter from the Department of Navy Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, to Mr. Ben Keeley, K-e-e-1-e-y, of the Idaho Division of Veterans Services, from Lieutenant Colonel K. G. Dowling, D-o-w-l-i-n-g, who is the Assistant Head for the Military Awards Branch.

2070

Having reviewed it, I assume the Government has no objection if it's disclosed to the defense. I believe it to be Giglio material.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Longstreet, would you provide copies to defense counsel?

THE COURTROOM CLERK: All three of them to the defense?

THE COURT: I think the Government has a copy. We will keep one for the court record. She does have -ch, give the third one to the Government.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sorry.

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: That's all I had. What have you got? Somebody wanted to see me? No? That was it?

THE COURTROOM CLERK: You don't want this marked or anything?

MR. NOLAN: I would ask that it be a court exhibit.

THE COURT: Let's do that. Let's give it a court exhibit number and make it a part of the record that way.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Court's Exhibit No. 1 is marked.

THE COURT: Very well.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: And sealed, Your Honor?

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: It appears to be -- am I correct, Mr. Hoyt, it appears to be attached to a portion of Exhibit 1 that begins at Bates 044, captioned "Memorandum in Support of Objection to Certification"?

MR. HDYT: Yes, Your Honor. I believe that was an August 27, 2002, filing.

THE COURT: With that clarification, Mr. Sullivan, you may proceed.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

That was part of your lawsuit; correct? MR. HOYT: Objection, Your Honor. I don't mean to be hypertechnical, but it may have been raised

as a part of a motion that came up in the lawsuit. It doesn't necessarily mean that it was, quote, "part of the lawsuit."

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

> Why don't -- Mr. Sullivan, perhaps you can just ask the question directly without showing the letter. That might be the better way to do it. BY MR. SULLIVAN:

ο. Isn't it true, sir, you were invited to appear before the Grand Jury?

In reading that letter, we asked -- my lawyer asked, first, that I see the Grand Jury -- and then that letter was in response to our -- so the answer is "yes"

Mr. Hinkson, why don't you resume the witness As soon as you do that, we will bring in the

THE COURT: Yes.

jury.

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

19

20

21

22

23

2

7

11

12

20

21

2072

(Whereupon, thus following proceedings were held in the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Mr. Sullivan, I believe there was a questic operating that you can restate or I can have the court reporter read it back, if you would like, however y a want to do it.

FR. SULLIVAN: If we could have it read back, the last question?

13 (Whereupon, the previous question was read back by to court reporter.) 14 BY MR. SUI LIVAN: 15

16 Mr. Hir kson, showing you Bates number 65 from Government Phili it 1, your civil lawsuit, do you 17 18 recognize this letter?

so, I don't recognize it.

Dichra you attach it to your civil lawsuit? MR. FOYT: Your Honor, just for clarification, objection. I hink it was attached to a Memorandum in Support. The lemanit was filed on April 16th, and it would be a physical impossibility to have attached the May 22nd let ter; so that's my objection.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Q.	You were invited to appear and testify before
the Grand	Jury?

4 Yeah. After my lawyer requested it, yes. A.

5 o. And after he requested it, you were invited to do so?

A.

Q. And you were given a date that you could 9 appear?

10 A. Connect.

> O. But you didn't? You declined that invitation?

It was declined --A.

13 THE COURT: "Yes" or "no," Mr. Hinkson? Did you decline it? 14

THE WITNESS: Well, we didn't show up. 15 16 BY MR. SULLIVAN:

17 Now, isn't it true that one of your complaints 0. 18 about 🔧 : Grand Jury was that Ms. Cook only put people

befc. It as witnesses who were unfriendly to you? 19

> A. That's very true.

Did you consider Jeri Gray to be unfriendly to 22 vou?

23 No. In fact, she's adopted me as her son. 24 MR. SULLIVAN: I move to strike, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: If you wish.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Hour" that you have a photographic memory? 1 2 I have a pretty good memory. A. 3 You don't remember the date that you appeared on "The Agitator Hour"? It didn't seem important enough to remember 5 the date. 7 But you recall that it was after your ٥. Indictment; correct? 8 Yeah, I would agree with that. 9 10 And you knew that those three people, Jeri Gray, Bruce Walton and -- excuse me -- Grant Walton and 11 Bruce Meinen all appeared before the Grand Jury before 12 13 your Indictment? That's true. 14 They all appeared in 2002? 15 Q. 16 Cloay. A. Was it a -- referring to Government's Exhibit 17 ٥. Exhibit 5-A, the radio transcript -- let me put it on 18 the monitor. 19 Page seventeen, line 494, was it a ٥. 20 misstatement at this point when the amouncer asked: 21 "Who were the people that -- who were the people that they called into this Grand Jury that were saying all 24 this?" 25 And you answered: "Anybody that I ever fired

2075 of a Grand Jury. Do you admit, when you said on "The Agitator 2 Q. 3 Hour" that Ma. Cook only put unfriendly people before the Grand Jury, that that was a false statement because you knew at least three friends of yours had been put before the Grand Jury? MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I think that is 8 argumentative. THE COURT: I think it's a fair question. 9 10 "Yes" or "no"? 11 THE WITNESS: I -- it's probably a 12 misstatement. 13 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 14 A misstatement? 15 Unless, of course, of the time line. It depends upon when they were in front of the Grand Jury, 16 17 and it would depend when I made the statement. 18 You appeared on "The Agitator Hour" after your 19 Indictment; correct? I believe so. 20 21 Didn't you appear on "The Agitator Hour" on ο. 22 January 8, 2003? 23 A. I don't have a recollection; but if you say so, it's okay. 24

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

By the way, didn't you say on "The Agitator

25

1	cr dich't like me."	2077
2	And you answered: "They found them all."	
3	A. It's true.	
4	Q. That's what you said; right?	
5	A. Yes.	
6	Q. You knew that was false when you said it?	
7	MR. HOYT: Objection, Your Honor. It	
8	mischaracterizes the whole transaction. He didn't	
9	say he was asked previously: Did you say	
10	THE COURT: Counsel, you can bring it up on	
11	redirect. Your objection is overruled. It's a fair	
12	question on cross-examination.	
13	BY MR. SULLIVAN:	
14	Q. Was that a misstatement when you made that	
15	statement that I just read?	
16	A. Well, I didn't exclude the people that were	
17	friends; so I would say, yes, it's probably a	
18	misstatement.	
19	Q. Because you knew that Mr. Walton, Mr. Meinen,	
20	and Miss Gray had all appeared before the Grand Jury in	
21	2002; right?	
22	A. Yes.	
23	Q. Another one of your friends, a fourth friend,	
24	appeared before the Grand Jury in 2002. You knew that	
25	was Mr. Swisher; right?	

Yes. I was aware he was in front of the Grand 1 A. 2 Jury, yes. 3 And he was your friend in 2002, wasn't he? ٥. He was a tester, an acquaintance. I wouldn't 4 A. call him my friend. 5 And you accused -- strike that. 6 7 And you also accused Nancy Cook of putting В people before the Grand Jury who lied about you; right? Absolutely. 9 And you took that very personally, didn't you? 10 11 A. Yes. I would take it personal, yes. You took it so personal that you decided to do 12 ο. something about it? 13 14 Yeah. I sued her. 15 You did more than that, didn't you, 16 Mr. Hinkson? 17 I can't think of anything else. A. 18 Same page, seventeen, starting at 491: "God, 0. everything is a lie that they said. They sat there day 19 20 after day hearing orchestrated lies against me." 21 A. 22 "I do take that kind of personal." 23 Yeah. You would take it personal if somebody

### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

I am going to show you again Government's

is lying against you in front of the Grand Jury.

24

25

1	highl ight	æd.	2080
2	A.	Yes.	
3	Q.	So at that point in time, you had been	
4	indicted	and arrested and you made your appearance	
5	before Ju	adge Mikel Williams; correct?	
6	A.	Yes.	
7	Q.	And he had released you on hond; correct?	
8	A.	No.	
9	Q.	He didn't release you on bond?	
10	A.	No. He just released me on he called it	
11	O.R., 1 k	pelieve.	
12	Q.	Right.	
13	A.	On my own recognizance because he said I never	r
14	had a cri	iminal record and I was not a threat.	
15	Q.	And you had to sign a document that was an	
16	O.R. bond	<del>1</del> 7	
17	A.	Well, I didn't know it was a bond. There was	
18	no money	attached, but I did not sign it.	
19	Q.	You were ordered to sign it; correct?	
20	A.	Yes, I was ordered to sign it.	
21	Q.	And then you did?	
22	A.	No, I didn't.	
23	Q.	You didn't sign it?	
24	A.	No.	
25	o.	Showing you Government's Exhibit 5-A, the	

```
Exhibit 7, a document entitled "Hinkson's Day of
1
    Terror." Referring to the second page, you made the
2
     statement at the very bottom, yellow highlighted, "I was
 3
    not, and am not, planning on going anywhere;" correct?
 5
              That's what it says on the paper.
              What is the date that you made that statement
 6
 7
     on this paper?
              I don't know. What's it dated?
 8
        Δ.
              Do you see the date that I'm pointing to at
 9
     the top of Exhibit 7?
10
11
              Yes.
        A.
               It says published November 29, '02?
12
              THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. I think there
13
     is a "12" there. I think it's December.
14
              MR. SULLIVAN: It's 11/29/02.
15
               THE COURT: Where are you looking? I'm
16
     looking at something that says "published."
17
              MR. HDYT: Published 12/10/02.
18
               THE COURT: Are you looking at a different
19
    piece of paper than I am?
20
21
              MR. HDYT: Do you want to borrow my copy? Go
22
     ahead.
     BY MR. SULLIVAN:
23
               I'm sorry. Your Honor is correct.
24
     "12/10/02," do you see that at the top? It's yellow
```

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2081 transcript of the radio interview, you talked about appearing before Judge Williams on the radio interview, 2 didn't you? 3 I don't recall. But if this is what it says, I will go with it. MR. HOYT: Is there a page? 6 7 BY MR. SULLIVAN: В Page 40, starting at 1216. Excuse me. Start at 1208. Starting at 1208, you said -- on "The Agitator Hour, " you are referring to your appearance before Judge 10 Williams at this point, are you not? 11 12 Yes. I am. A. You said: "I'm confused. I don't know the 13 nature and the cause. He says . . . " That's the judge; 14 15 correct? 16 A. I would believe so. 17 ". . . Well, what's nature? I said, well, I 18 think it means you don't have legislative, concurrent, or subject matter jurisdiction to hear this case, sir. 19 "He says, 'Well, well, well, uh, uh, I'll 20 plead for you.' He can't do that." Quote, unquote, 21 "'Not guilty.' Boom. 'You're going home, son. I'm 22 23 going to CR you today. You get to go home." That was you saying the judge was going to 24

release you on your own recognizance; right?

25

#### ONE COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

"I agree to have a probationary officer and

Can you read it now?

Yes. Go ahead.

23

24

25

25

Q.

o.

A.

О.

```
2084
               Correct:..
 1
         A.
              Didn't you just tell us a few minutes ago you
 2
     didn't sign the O.R. band?
 3
 4
               I never signed it.
               It continues. It says: " . . . unless I sign
 5
     this piece of paper under threat; right?
 6
 7
               "He says, 'Yeah, yeah, yeah.'
               "I says, 'I was hoping you'd say that.' And I
 В
     picked up the pen; and I said, 'Let this be my
 9
     handwriting,' which makes it not my signature."
10
               And you signed the O.R. bond?
11
12
               No.
         A.
               Did you put a pen in your hand and write
13
     "David R. Hinkson"?
14
               Yes, I did that. That's not my signature.
15
         A.
               Because you said some magic words?
16
         ο.
               No. It's a carmon of law. It's not your
17
         A.
     signature unless there is free agency. It's one of the
18
     basic concepts of the Constitution and Civil Rights.
19
               By saying, "Let this be my signature"?
20
               No. I said, "Let it be my handwriting."
21
               You made your signature invalid; is that
22
23
     correct?
               No. It was my handwriting.
24
```

```
not leave . . . * You said that?
 2
         A.
              I think that's what I said, yes.
 3
              And you understood that you had to make all
     appearances before the court; right?
              Yes, I understood that.
        A.
              And that's what you meant by saying "not
         o.
    leave"?
              Yeah. I was told I can't leave.
 8
         A.
 9
        Q.
              That was a condition of bond; right?
10
        A.
               It goes down -- you state: "I said, let me
11
     get this straight. You kidnap me and you're my captors,
12
13
     and this whole thing is a fraud and, basically, the
     kidnappers are not going to let me go unless I sign this
14
     piece of paper under threat . . . "
15
16
               You were referring to signing the O.R. band,
17
     weren't you?
18
               MR. HOYT: " . . . under threat; right?"
               THE WITNESS: Yes.
19
20
               THE COURT: Counsel?
               THE WITNESS: " . . . under threat; right,"
21
22
    yes.
23
    BY MR. SULLIVAN:
              And you were referring to signing the O.R.
24
        0.
25
    hand?
```

2083

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

```
2085
     bond invalid?
               MR. HDYT: Objection, Your Honor. I think --
     I think, first of all, I feel comsel has been arguing
     with the witness, number one. And number two --
               THE COURT: There is some arguing going on
    here, coursel; and I think it's over what constitutes a
     signature. I think the jury understands Mr. Hinkson's
 8
     position.
 9
               Mr. Sullivan, I think you have made your
     point. Move on to another subject.
10
     BY MR. SULLIVAN:
11
12
        Q.
               Isn't it true, sir, when you signed the bond
     or whatever you did, you had no intention of couplying
13
     with the band?
14
              Well, I was planning on complying with it
15
         A.
16
     because I agreed to.
               Right. You said you wouldn't leave; right?
17
               I said I wouldn't leave; but I also asked the
18
     judge if I could go to California to give the speaking
19
     engagement that I was already scheduled to speak at, the
20
21
     forum.
               Your intention was to flee before trial, was
22
         O.
23
     it not?
               I have never planned on fleeing before trial.
24
         A.
               Isn't it correct that you tried to obtain a
25
         0.
```

Is it correct that you thought you made the

passport after this bond hearing?

1

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I didn't try. I did obtain one.

And wasn't one of the conditions of the bond that Judge Williams told you about was not to obtain a passport?

He demanded that I turn over my passport is A. what he demanded.

ο. And didn't he say, "And don't obtain another passport"?

I don't remember him saying that but I'm -- I believe he probably did.

Do you recall Judge Mikel Williams saying, at that hearing, page 11 of the transcript:

"THE COURT: All right. So it's O.R. release, pretrial supervision, surrender passport, not obtain a new passport, reside in his residence and travel restricted to the Continental United States."

Do you recall Judge Williams advising you of that?

A. Yes, I do.

So you knew, at that point in time, at that initial appearance on 11/21/02, that you were to nurrender your passport; correct?

Yes, I did. A.

And not obtain a new passport?

### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Yes. So there was a further hearing when it became known that you had tried to obtain a second passport; correct? There was a second hearing, yes.

And this time, the judge put you on \$100,000 appearance bond?

A. Yes, he did.

O. But the terms stayed the same, otherwise; connect?

A. Correct.

You still had to make all court appearances; correct?

13 A.

> ο. You couldn't leave the Continental United States?

A. That's true.

Yet you planned to flee before trial to the Island of Antigua?

A. That is not true.

ο. Because you didn't intend to stand trial; correct?

A. That is not correct.

And if you hadn't been arrested on April 4, 2003, you would have fled to Antigua?

That is not true.

That is correct. A.

Correct? 0.

Veg A.

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

13

14

24

2

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

24

25

2086

And you agreed to that? Q.

A. I agreed to that.

But that was a false statement when you told Judge Williams that, wasn't it?

I don't believe it was a false statement. A.

Because you went out and obtained a new ٥. passport?

I applied for a new one so that I could submit 11 A. 12 it.

And you violated the term of that bond, didn't Q. you?

I don't believe I did because there was 15 A. reasons why this happened the way it did. 16

You understood that the bond was a promise 17 from you to the court to be released? You would abide 18 19 by the terms of the band?

20 Right. And because of that, he made me sign 21 another band for \$100,000 because I --

Your promise to the court was not one you 22 Q. 23 intended to keep; correct?

Ch, I intended to keep it. So in answer to your question, I intended to keep it.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. SULLIVAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. I need a moment.

THE COURT: Do you need the lights, Mr. Sullivan? Would you like the lights, counsel, to help you see?

MR. SULLIVAN: No. I will find it. THE COURT: That won't help? BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Page 11 of the tape transcript between J. C. 10 Harding and Mr. Hinkson -- excuse me. It's not 11.

On page 150, didn't you tell Mr. Harding that you were headed for Antigua?

A. I don't know. I would have to read the statement.

Okay. Showing you page 150.

THE COURT: Counsel, you have got two pages superimposed there.

BY MR. SULLIVAN: 18

Starting at line 1, the informant says: 19 Q. "Right." 20

You say: " -- and I am orchestrated to go to prison and I end up in Antigua or wherever I end up, never allowed to come back to my country, yeah. Or if I was sitting in a jail cell for the next 400 years, I'd pay for that. But right now I think God is going to

2090 1 take care of them. " 2 So you referred to going to Antigua, didn't you? 3 A. Q. That's because you were planning on going to Antigua? 7 No, that's not the reason I mentioned Antigua. A. Antigua is an island in the Carribean? Q. Yes. It's a very nice island. A. 10 You have been there before? 0. 11 I have not. A. How do you know it's a nice island? 12 ο. I have seen pictures. 13 A. Dich't you tell J. C. Harding that you saw 14 yourself as a future Antiguan? 15 16 Yes, I made that statement. Wasn't that in context to how you were going 17 ٥. to leave the country so you wouldn't have to stand 18 19 trial? 20 A. No. Showing you page 141 of the transcript between 21 you and Mr. Harding on tape -- let me ask this: Ism't 22 it true that, to facilitate your fleeing the country, 23 you tried to liquidate assets by getting big loans on 24 25 your property?

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2092 1 A. Yes. Not that you sought him out? 2 Q. Margie brought him because she was a mortgage broker and she was trying to earn a commission, and she brought him because she knew we needed to refinance 5 because we had a balloon on the property. So your testimony is that you sought a loan, 7 but you weren't trying to entumber your property so that you could leave? 9 I sought the loan for two years, before I was 10 indicted, from Dan Vaughn. Marjorie is a friend of Dan 11 Vaughn's. 12 13 Dan Vaughn testified here? Yes. He was here yesterday, yes. So she 14 15 brought him over because it was an excellent loan and an excellent interest rate, and he wanted me to agree to 16 the terms. 17 18 Q. My question was: You were seeking a loan, a legitimate loan, and you were not trying to encumber 19 your property with liens or mortgages so you would have 20 21 enough money to flee? I was not. I rejected his loan. I didn't 22 want to reject it, but I decided not to borrow any 23 24 money.

2091 It's not true. You did try to get loans on your property, didn't you? A. It's not true. n. You spoke to a mun, namely -- excuse me -- Lee Stemburg, to borrow \$600,000? Yes. He came to my factory and proposed that I borrow \$600,000 at six-percent interest. That's a good loan rate, isn't it? 0. It was excellent. A. And he, of course, wanted some sort of security or collateral for that loan; correct? He just needed my signature. A. This time, you would actually sign? I always keep my word, yes. A. And when did this happen? A. I think it was maybe about a week before Harding showed up. o. And it's your testimony that Mr. Lee Sternberg proposed this loan arrangement to you? Yeah. He came with another woman. Her name was Margie Anderson, I believe. My question was --A.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

the tape recording between you and Mr. Harding, starting at line 3. Didn't you say: "They moved the trial all the way to the end of the year." Harding. "Oh, they moved it past September 5 11CW?" Hinkson: "Yeah, sometime. I don't know exactly when." Harding: "(Inaudible) enjoy yourself." Hinkson: "I got the next -- I got the next 10 Jume, July, August. I got at last five months before I 11 12 even got to worry about the trial starting." The informant: "Well --" 13 Mr. Hinkson: "I've arranged to put loans on 14 everything. The feds didn't lien anything." 15 The informant: "Put loans on -- I don't 16 17 understand. You just started borrowing money against 18 all your shit?" 19 Hinkson: "Everything." Informant: "Smart." 20 21 Hirkson: "I'll have a million dollars worth of debt, and it will all be in an offshore bank. Give 22 me two weeks." 23 And you follow with: "See, that's brilliant. 24 That's smart." 25

25

0.

Let me show you page 141 of the transcript of

10

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Stemberg proposed it to you? ο.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

21

22

24

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

2096

4

5

6

ß

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

like that."

Hinkson: "Future Antiguan."

You said those words, did you not?

A. I did.

Q. When you were talking with Mr. Hinkson (sic.) that particular day of the tape recording --

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I know counsel didn't mean to say this; but he said, "When you were talking with Mr. Hinkson."

MR. SULLIVAN: It happened before.

THE COURT: Yes. We all do it. Just start your question again.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. I'm sorry. Mr. Hinkson, when you were talking to Mr. Harding on March 27, 2003, the day of the taping, didn't you believe that he might be a fed or an informert?

A. No, sir

Q. Dich't you tell Special Agent Long, when he interviewed you on April 4, 2003, that you had believed that he had been an informant?

A. No. sir.

Q. You didn't tell Agent Long that?

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

-	 	

A. I did not tell Chad Croner that, no.

Q. On the tape between you and Mr. Harding, isn't it true that you were very careful in what you said?

A. Careful? I think I was talking really stupid.

Q. All right. But you never once said, "I hope these people die;" right?

A. No. I said, "I want God to smite them." I think I said that.

Q. Right.

A. Yes.

Q. But you didn't say it on the -- you didn't say, "I hope someone dies," on the tape, did you?

A. I don't think so.

Q. It's because you were being very careful?

A. No, I wasn't being careful or I wouldn't have talked so stupid for four hours.

Q. What was so stupid about what you were saying, Mr. Hinkson?

A. The conversation, prior to this end, was totally stupid.

Q. Who was stupid? You or Mr. Harding?

A. Ma. I was very stupid.

Q. Because you said things that made it sound like you had discussed with Mr. Harding hiring him as a

A. I didn't tell Agent Long anything.

Q. You didn't tell him anything?

A. No, I didn't, not with regards to this matter.

Q. I see. But you did hear him testify about things regarding this matter; right?

6 A. I heard -- I heard his lies, yes.

Q. I see. And do I understand that you're telling the jury that what he testified to was not true?

A. Totally lies. Totally untrue.

Q. Another perjurer against you?

A. He is really good at it.

Q. I see.

A. Uh-hih.

14 Q. But you deny that you knew Mr. Hinkson (sic.)
15 was an informant; right?

A. Yes.

17 THE COURT: You said "Mr. Hinkson" again.
18 THE WITNESS: Please do.

19 BY MR. SULLIVAN:

20 Q. You deny knowing Mr. Harding was an informant?

A. Yes, I deny that.

Q. You deny saying it to Agent Long?

23 A. I deny that, yes.

Q. Dich't you tell -- dich't you even tell Chad

Croner in the Ada County Jail that you knew he was an

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2097

hit man; right?

A. No. We were talking about stupid things, about girls and stuff like that.

Q. We didn't even play that part of the tape.

A. I know. Thank you for that.

Q. Yes. We played the parts where Mr. Harding says, "You shouldn't say stuff like that or someone will take you up on it;" right?

A. What's the question?

Q. I said that we played the parts where Harding says to you, "You shouldn't say stuff like that or someone will take you up on it"?

A. You played that part, yes.

Q. We did. Those were his words to you; right?

A. I believe so.

Q. And you knew what he meant?

A. No. I don't know what the word "it" meant, and I really warn't even listening to what he was

and I really wasn't even listening to what
 saying. I was just talking at him.

Q. You don't know the meaning of "it"?

A. I don't. He's not a conversationalist.

Q. J. C. Harding is not a conversationalist?

A. I don't think it's possible to have a conversation with this man.

Q. You knew he was a stand-up comedian, did you

#### Do you deny that you used to criticize Judge Q. Lodge?

No, I don't deny that. A.

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you used to say very insulting things Q.

### CNR COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

He puts innocent people in prison every single Q. 1 2 day? Yes, I think he does. And I think you do, MR. SULLIVAN: Move to strike. THE COURT: The jury will disregard the last 7 answer. BY MR. SULLIVAN: Then you say: "What have I got to lose?" 9 Q. Right? 11 A. Yeah, I guess. Because he hates your guts? 12 Q. I don't think he likes me. 13 A. He hates your cuts? 14 ο. That's what I said. A. 15 16 o. He's going to rule against you every chance he gets? 17 18 A. Yea. And when you said that about Judge Lodge -- he 19 20 was the judge assigned to handle your tax case, wasn't 21 he? Do you have to think about it? **′22** Yeah. He had never made a ruling in my case at that point. It was just, basically, Williams. I 23 know, eventually, he was going to be involved, I 24 believe: but at that point, he had never done anything 25

2099 about him? 2 A. I'm not sure how to answer that question. O. Didn't you say that Judge Lodge was worse than Adolf Hitler? 5 A. I said that in my kitchen. I remember reading that on the wire. 7 Right. At page 170 of the conversation with Mr. Harding, you said: "All I'm saying is these people are so wicked and evil that they deserve to be smitten by God today. These are bad people. I got on the radio 10 and I said that Judge Lodge was worse than Adolf 11 Hitler." 12 13 If that's what the transcript says, I must 14 have said it. And it continues: "This man sits there and 15 16 throws innocent people in prison every simple day. That's his job description. And he's wicked. What have 17 18 I got to lose? He already hates my guts. He already is 19 going to rule against me every chance he has. I might 20 as well tell the world he's a demon bastard from hell. What the hell." 21 That's what you said about Judge Lodge? 22 23 Yeah, in my kitchen.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

١	to me.		210
۱ ۽	Q.	My question was: He was the Judge of your	
,	criminal	tax case; right?	
۱,	A.	Yeah. After yeah, I think so.	
,	Q.	And you just now said, at that point, he had	
,	never-dar	e anything to you?	
,	A.	He hadn't.	
,	Q.	Is that your testimony?	
,	A.	Yeah.	
,	Q.	All right. Hadn't he thrown out your civil	
١	lawsuit?		
2	A.	I didn't know it was thrown out. I'm not sure	
,	what day	it was thrown out.	
	Q.	Wasm't it thrown cut in February, a month	
5	before yo	n said these words?	
5	A.	Is that the date that it shows? I don't know.	
,	Q.	You don't remember?	
3	A.	I don't remember.	
,	Q.	I am showing you Government's Exhibit 1, all	
۱ و	of the pl	leadings from your civil lawsuit. You are	
1	familiar	with it; correct?	
2	A.	A little bit, yeah.	
3	Q.	You wrote it, didn't you?	
4		No. Dich Bellon umbe it	

- You believe Judge Lodge is wicked? 0.
- T do. Δ.

24

25

25

01

Oh, Rich Bellon wrote it?

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

7

q

11

13

14

16

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

must have gotten it.

a month before that.

Q.

A.

BY MR. SULLIVAN: 1 2 You didn't have any problem with Mr. Bellon having been convicted of assaulting an IRS agent, did you? 4 5 MR. HOYT: Objection. Vague. 6 THE COURT: Overruled. 7 MR. HDYT: The problem --THE COURT: Overruled. Sit down, Mr. Hoyt. THE WITNESS: Ask the question again, please. 10 BY MR. SUILLIVAN: 11 12 13 convicted of assaulting an IRS officer? I never had even thought about it. 15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

25

of 2002, maybe.

For the third or fourth time, you didn't have

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2105

any problem with the fact that Mr. Bellon had been

So when did he start preparing all of your pleadings in the civil suit?

I told you it would have been about a month before the lawsuit was filed because it took him a month to write it.

All right. And you consulted with him that Q. whole time?

Yes. On a daily basis, we were in comunication.

Because he didn't know the facts as you alleged them to be independently of asking you; correct?

And you knew he had legal training; right? He claimed he was a lawyer in California, I

Dich't you file the lawsuit on April 16, 2002?

Okay. So then he would have been hired about

knew he wasn't supposedly, at that time, licensed in Idaho. He claimed he wrote a book, which I found out he did not write.

You also found out he was convicted of assaulting an IRS officer, too?

Yeah. I found out that when he was barred from coming into the courtroom.

You approved of that, didn't you; that he had assaulted an IRS officer?

I didn't know anything about it.

ο. You found out about it later, as you just told us?

Well, I found out he had manhandled a female IRS agent is what I found out.

And you didn't have any problem with Mr. Bellon being convicted of assaulting an IRS officer, did you?

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I think we are going way far afield right here.

THE COURT: Overruled.

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309 and not a lawyer's. Is that what "pro se" means, Mr. Hinkson? ٥. Well, I believe that when you file it in your own name and you don't have a lawyer, it's called "pro 86. It means you did it yourself, that you ο. represented yourself, doesn't it? Well, maybe that's your definition; but it A. wasn't mine. Isn't it true you just made it up in this 10 courtroom that Richard Bellon did the civil pleadings? 11 Well, I have probably ten witnesses that will 12 testify to it; but you wouldn't let them speak about 13 this. 14 I wouldn't? 15 ο. No. You cut them off every time Wes tried to A. 16 let this information come in. 17 You blame Richard Bellon for a lot of your 18 Q. 19 problems, dan't you, Mr. Hinkson? No. He wasn't a problem, initially. 20 21 So you blame him for a lot of your problems 22 later? It would depend on the time. 23 A. Let me ask you this: In your direct 24 Q. examination yesterday, did you claim that you went to 25

2107 Starting at 528, line 528, you say: "That kind of messes up the investigative power of the Grand Jury, don't you think?" The amouncer said: "It's manipulation is what it is." And you say: "Well, yeah. Well, that's why I sued her for the fifty million for prosecutorial misconduct and Grand Jury tampering. And I did it pro se, which means no lawver." 10 That's correct. "It's a war of a titan." Excuse me. There is 11 sixty -- strike that. 12 13 "There's sixty motions back and forth in that thing. It a war of a titan." 14 15 That's what you said on "The Agitator Hour;" correct? 16 17 Yes. "Titans." I think, with an "s." A. 18 ٥. Yeah. And you took credit by saying you handled this matter pro se, without a lawyer? 19 Well, I dich't mention that Bellon wrote it at 20 that point; but I didn't take credit necessarily for it 21 22 either. You said you did it pro se? 23 ο. That means that the person who signed it is 24 A. not a lawyer. I signed it because it was my name on it

#### OND COURT DEDCEMBER (200) 404-6200

	Mat court transfer (200), 401-0203
,	2109 Coeur d'Alene to find out what date the Grand Jury had
2	been sitting and whether or not it had disbanded? Did
3	you do that?
4	A. No, I didn't.
5	Q. Did you say you did that?
6	A. It was in Boise that we checked. It was the
7	Boise Grand Jury that we checked.
В	Q. Okay. Tell me about that. What was it did
9	you do it, or did Mr. Bellon do it?
0	A. Well, I checked in the courthcuse and there
1	was no there was no record showing that the Grand
2	Jury had been extended.
3	Q. How did you do that? How did you check that?
4	A. You go to the Clerk's Office.
5	Q. Did you know what Grand Jury, particularly, to
6	ask about?
7	A. Well, we did at the time. I mean, Rich Bellon
8	had kind of laid it cut for me.
9	Q. I see. Rich Bellon supplied you with the
٥	information?
1	A. Correct.
2	Q. Okay. What is it that he told you?
3	A. He said that the Grand Jury had ceased to
4	exist, and we wanted to get a certified copy of that.
5	Q. Okay. And so you did that?

25

2112

1 I remember -- that's my recollection. A. 2 Q. So where is that certified copy? 3 I don't have a clue. I have been deprived of all of my legal papers. 4 5 You, of course, couldn't have had one of your 6 lawyers go get you another certified copy of the 7 document; right? That was impossible? Well. I made the accusation that there was no В file stamps. Later on, some paperwork appeared to show 9 10 that the Grand Jury had been extended. And it's my 11 belief that they just created this paperwork, because some of it is not file stamped. 12 13 I see. It's your belief system, again, that 14 there was some phonying up of paperwork? 15 Yes. That's why I wanted the certified copy to prove it. 16 17 MR. SULLIVAN: I would like a new document 18 marked as Government's Edhibit 13. 19 THE COURT: Exhibit 13? Very well. 20 MR. SULLLIVAN: Your Honor, I would like to 21 have marked a two-page document as Government's Exhibit 22 13. It is a certified court document from the Clerk of 23 the District Court for District of Idaho. THE COURT: Does the document have a title, 24 25 comsel?

## QNA COURT REPORTENCE (208) 484-6309

MR. HOYT: It's published.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. "Comes now United States Attorney for the
District of Idaho and hereby moves the court for an
order extending the Northern 2001 Grand Jury through the
31st of July 2002. The reason for such extension is
that the panel is involved in several investigations
which are complex." Do you see that?

A. Uh-huh. I see it.

Q. And the second page of this certified court

Q. And the second page of this certified court document is an order, which no one can read: I will read it.

"Order.

1

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12 13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

"The United States Attorney has moved the court for an order to extend the term of the Northern 2001 Grand Jury to and including July 31, 2002.

"Upon good cause shown, it is hereby ordered that the Northern 2001 Grand Jury is hereby extended to and including July 31, 2002.

"Signed April 29, 2002.

"Honorable Larry M. Boyle, Chief U.S. Magistrate Judge."

When you made the accusation against Nancy Cook that the Grand Jury had disbanded in May 2002, you knew that was a false accusation, didn't you?

2111 MR. SUILIVAN: Yes, Your Honor. "Motion and 1 Order to Extend Term of Northern 2001 Grand Jury." 2 THE COURT: Very well. You are offering it at 3 4 this time? MR. SULLIVAN: I offer it at this time. THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Hoyt? 7 MR. HDYT: No objection. THE COURT: Government's Exhibit 13 is 8 admitted. 9 (Whereupon, Government's Exhibit No. 13 was 10 11 received in evidence.) 12 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 13 Q. Let me show you Government Exhibit 13, Mr. Hinkson. Do you see this document that is signed at 14 the bottom by Thomas E. Moss, United States Attorney? 15 I do. 16 A. 17 And it's dated the 26th day of April 2002? Q. 18 Yes. I see it. And it's entitled "Motion and Order to Extend 19 Term of Northern 2001 Grand Jury; " correct? 20 21 A. I see it. MR. SULLIVAN: May I publish to the jury, Your 22 23 Honor? 24 THE COURT: You may. 25 THE WITNESS: I cam't see the top of it.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

	But court innounting land, sost sost
1	MR. HDYT: Your Honor, I will object. It
2	assumes facts not in evidence. I think he said
3	THE COURT: The fact has now been in evidence.
4	MR. HOYT: I think he said that the Grand Jury
5	had been disbanded in April, before he filed his
6	lawwiit.
7	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to allow the
В	question. Your objection is overruled based upon
9	Government's Exhibit 13. Counsel certainly has a
10	good-faith basis to ask the question.
11	MR. SULLIVAN: May I have my question read
12	back?
13	(Whereupon, the pending question was read back
14	by the court reporter.)
15	BY MR. SULLIVAN:
16	Q. Can you answer that question?
17	A. Well, when I checked the record in Boise, I
18	dich't find those papers. Is that on file in Boise?
19	Q. I ask the questions, sir. So are you telling
20	the jury that your accusation against Ms. Cook was based
21	on some misunderstanding?
22	A. No, no. I didn't find these papers when I
23	checked; therefore, I would say that there is no proof

.

24

25

You also accused her of forging the

as to what day this paperwork was created.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- ٥. Based upon the fact, as you believed it, the Grand Jury had disbanded in May of 2002; right?
  - That's true. A.
- So you believed that, if there had been no Indictment returned in May of 2002, then any other Indictment afterwards must have been forged; right?
- In discovery, she refused to give us the Minutes. There were no Minutes. There has to be Minutes, but there aren't any Minutes.
- You were represented in the tax case by lawyers; correct?
  - Not initially. I was pro se initially.
- You were represented by a Mr. Mahathy initially?
  - Initially. A.
- You were represented by Mr. Groom in April of ο. 20027
  - Yes, that's true. A.
- And after November of 2002, when you were arrested, you were -- excuse me. That's when you retained Mr. Mahathy, after November 21, 2002; right?
  - A. I believe so.
  - And you retained Mr. Groom sometime in early ٥.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2116 Yes. 1 A. 2 Which means demanding various kinds of Q. documents from the Government to assist you in your 3 defense: right? 5 We are talking about the first case now only? A. 6 Q. We are talking about the tax case. The tax case? ٥. Right. A. Yes. Right. And you never alleged, at any time, in 10 any motion regarding the Grand Jury, that Ms. Cook 11 12 forged the Indictment, did you? I don't think so. I don't have it in front of 13 me. I haven't read it for years so I don't --14 15 You think you would forget whether or not you moved to dismiss the Indictment because the AIRA, the 16 prosecutor in the case, forged the Indictment? You 17 18 would forget such a thing? Well. I'm not sure if I remember. I do 19 20 remember there was a referral. THE COURT: Just a minute, Mr. Hinkson. Wait 21 for the next question. 22

2003? 2 Well, Rich Bellon suggested that we needed a lawyer of record; so Rich Bellon worked with Mr. Groom full time at that point on the case. Okay. Okay. And based on Mr. Bellon's suggestion, 6 you are claiming you retained Mr. Groom? 7 Yes. Mr. Bellon felt that, even though he was doing the work --8 THE COURT: No, no. Mr. Hinkson, we don't 9 care what Mr. Bellon felt. The question was whether or 10 11 not, based upon his suggestion, you retained Mr. Groom. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MR. SULLIVAN: 13 14 Actually, you had a series of lawyers even 15 after Mr. Groom; right? 16 Correct. A. 17 ο. You were always represented through 2003, 18 weren't you? 19 A. I believe so. 20 Q. All the way through 2004? 21 Yes, I believe so. A. 22 ٥. Right through trial? 23 A. 24 ٥. And your lawyers, whoever they were at the

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

various times, filed motions for discovery; right?

25

2117 lawsuits you have been involved with; correct? 1 2 I'm pretty good at writing affidavits, yes. 3 You never prepared an affidavit and attached Q. it to any kind of motion to dismiss the tax case 5 alleging that Nancy Cook forged the Indictment, did you? 6 I don't recall one. I don't remember. 7 All right. Because that would be a really significant kind of allegation to make, wouldn't it? Well, I don't think we -- it would be a significant allegation, yes. 10 And you know that no such motion to dismiss, 11 12 based on that allegation, was ever made in your tax case: correct? Well, she wouldn't give discovery; so I would 14 A. 15 say "correct." And you didn't file anything that had your 16 affidavit saying Ms. Cook forged the Indictment, did 17 18 vou? Not that I remember. 19 A. You only say that over the public radios; 20 Q. right? 21 22 A. Ch, I said it on the radio, yes. 23 Q. That's right. Because you don't have to 24 provide proof over the public radio; right? That's true. 25

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

preparing affidavits and submitting them in various

Well, you have never been adverse from

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

24

25

A. That's true.

Q. Proof means facts?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. You don't worry about facts, do you,

Mr. Hinkson?

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

B

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. I try to gather them every chance I get.

Q. You make allegations without knowing any facts to back them up?

A. I don't think that's a safe statement.

Q. Didn't you, in this courtroom, yesterday, make an accusation against Detective Mealer with no facts to back up such an accusation?

A. I did?

Q. Yeah.

A. I don't remember an accusation.

THE COURT: Counsel, would this be a good place to stop? I will let you pick the time, but we are right up against the noon hour.

MR. SULLIVAN: May I have one minute, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. When you went -- you were arrested on April 4,

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Q. You blurted out that Sergeant Mealer was having an affair with that person; correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. And you did it because you resent the fact that he set you up for the arrest?

A. No.

 $\label{eq:main_main} \mbox{MR. SULLIVAN:} \quad \mbox{This would be a good time to} \\ \mbox{stop.}$ 

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as may have been clear from that last exchange, you may disregard my instruction to you yesterday with respect to striking the statement that Mr. Hinkson said about Detective Mealer having an affair, since Mr. Sullivan now wants to inquire about it.

With that, we will be in recess until 1:15 this afternoon.

Don't talk about the case. Keep an open mind.

Don't let anybody talk to you about it. Don't do any
research. We will see you back here at 1:15.

(Lunch recess.)

MR. SULLIVAN: May I proceed, Your Honor? THE COURT: You may.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Mr. Hinkson, did you try to hack into Judge Lodge's files by computer?

2003, at the Kooskia Substation; right?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

7 B

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

2120

pocket?

Q. And you had gone there to report a burglary or a theft to Detective Scott Mealer?

A. Yes

Q. And it was at that place that you got arrested by Special Agent Long?

A. Yes

Q. And you resent the fact that Sergeant Mealer set you up for that arrest?

A. Well, it wasn't a nice thing to do.

Q. Plus, you didn't trust Sergeant Mealer?

A. That's true.

14 Q. That's why you had the tape recorder in your

A. That's true.

Q. And, yesterday, you blurted out in front of the jury that the person you were accusing of stealing your money --

20 THE COURT: Counsel, before you go here, I
21 thought I struck that question and the answer. Do you
22 want to go there again?

MR. SULLIVAN: I do.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Go ahead. BY MR. SULLIVAN:

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

A. No, I did not.

Q. Did somebody else?

A. No.

Q. Are you a hacker?

A. I'm not computer literate.

Q. May I ask you if you didn't say in the taped conversation between you and Mr. Harding, page 163 -- lights -- top of the page: " . . . that the NSA attacked me last week, accused me of --"

Informant: "The NSA? You mean the National Security Agency?"

And you say: "And the FBI."

Mr. Hinkson: "They accused me of hacking."

I am going to skip down to line 16.

"They shut off my computer."

"Did they tell you?"

"What:?"

Mr. Hinkson: "No. They said I was hacking. I'm a hacker. All I did is download the Judge's files to prove that he rules wrong every time for the last eighteen years."

Did you say that to J. C. Harding?

A. I said I was not a hacker.

Q. Did I read it wrong? Line eighteen?

A. You are misinterpreting it.

	i	79
1	Ω.	Did I read it wrong at line eighteen when I
2	read?	•
3		Mr. Hinkson: "No. They said I was hacking.
4	I'm a had	ker.*
5	A.	Yeah. There is the word "not" missing there.
6	But read	either way, it still means I'm saying I'm not a
7	hacker.	You are misinterpreting it, the way you're
8	reading i	ŧ.
9	Q.	Did you download Judge Lodge's files to prove
10	that he r	lles wrong every time for the last eighteen
11	years?	
12	A.	Rich Bellon went on the public access for the
13	Federal O	ourt System, and he downloaded a whole bunch of
14	Judge Lod	ge's cases.
15	Q.	Where does it say Richard Bellon downloaded
16	the Judge	's files?
17	A.	It does not.
18	Q.	It says, " I did "? It says, "All I
19	did is do	ralcad the Judge's files." That means you did?
20	A.	Well
21	Q.	Correct?
22	A.	It was metaphorically speaking. Rich Bellon
23	is the one	e that downloaded them.
24	Q.	It's Rich Bellon who is responsible; is that
25	your test:	imony?
١		

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1	Α.	It wasn't a big deal.	2124	
_	A.	-		
2	Q.	Then why did you call him at page 162 of		
3	the Hardi	ng-Hinkson tape, why did you call him		
4	" more evil than Adolf Hitler and a slut "			
5	A.	Well, I don't believe that just dismissing one	!	
6	civil case would cause enough hostility from me to have			
7	made those statements.			
8	Q.	Well, were you so hostile that you also said,		
9	"And I ripped him an ass so big you could drive the			
10	Grand Canyon through it"? That's pretty hostile, isn't			
11	it?			
12	A.	It wasn't about him dismissing my case.		
13	Q.	So you are hostile toward him for some other		
14	reason?			
15	A.	Yes, Iam.		
16	Q.	But you admit you were hostile?		
17	A.	It wasn't personal. It's just I know he's a		
18	very bad person.			
19	Q.	When did you stop filing income tax returns,		
20	Mr. Hinkson?			
21	A.	1994, I believe.		
22	Q.	You testified in your own tax case prosecution	ı	
23	last Apri	il or May; correct?		
24	A.	Yes, I did.		
25	Q.	You took the stand there, like you're doing		

			2123			
1	A.	It's not a matter of being responsible. It's	2.22			
2	not a crime to look at public domain.					
3	Q. Well, it's a crime to lie though, isn't it,					
4	under out	under cath?				
5	A.	I wasn't under testimony.				
6	Q.	Well, you are now?				
7	A.	Yeah. I am now, yes.				
8	Q.	And you said it was Bellon?				
9	A.	It was.				
LO	Q. And you are under cath?					
11	A. Yes, Iam.					
12	Q. At that previous time, you said it was you?					
13	A. I wasn't giving testimony when I was talking					
14	to Mr. Harding.					
15	Q. So you could lie to Mr. Harding?					
6		MR. HDYT: Your Honor, he is badgering the				
7	witness.	He said he spoke metaphorically.				
8		THE COURT: Sustained. The jury will decide.				
9	BY MR. SULLIVAN:					
20	Q.	And the reason well, the reason that there				
1	wan any downloading of Judge Lodge's files is because					
2	you were unhappy with his ruling dismissing your					
3	lawsuit; right?					
4	A.	No. Wrong.				
5	Q.	Weren't you unhappy with him about that?				
ı	CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309					
		#				

	<b>2</b> 000	a 142 012210 (200) 101-0009		
.		1	2125	
1	nov?	•		
2	A. Yes, Idi			
3	Q. And you v	were under oath then, as you are now?		
4	A. Yes.			
5	Q. Starting	at line 6, page 1157, did you testify		
6	at your own tax structuring trial to the following:			
7	"And had	you been an income tax filer up until		
8	that point in time?"			
9	Answer:	"Yes, we were."		
10	Question:	: "And then, as you were working at		
11	the Tropicana through this period, did you stop filing			
12	tax returns?"			
13	Answer:	"Well, I stopped filing I believe		
14	it was 1989. I dox	n't have the record in front of me."		
15	Is that t	the testimony you gave under oath at		
16	your own previous trial?			
17	A. I really	don't remember when I quit filing. I		
18	believe, at that to	ime, I was being going with my		
19	understanding that	during the trial, I think,		
20	evidence was presen	ated that '94 was my last one; but I'm	ı	
21	not sure.			
22	Q. So you're	e not sure whether it was '94 or five		
23	years earlier than	that, 1989?		
24	A. I'm not i	really positive.		
25	Q. And I th	ink you told us you stopped filing		
	1			

2 3

7 8 q

10 11 12

13 14

15 16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

> 1 2 3

10 11

12 13 14

15 16

17 18 19

> 20 21

22 23 24

25

because you read the entire Internal Revenue Code and Supreme Court decisions: correct?

- Yes. I have, yes.
- All right. So that was just some principal position you took that you were not entitled -- excuse me -- you weren't required to file tax returns?
- It is my belief at this point that it's voluntary and nobody is required to file under the current law as written.
- Isn't it true your principal position that you took that you didn't have to file also saved you a lot of money?
- A. No. I never had any profit or income, pursuant to the law, because every permy I made went back either into expansion or tax-deductible things; and I knew I did not have a tax liability.

In the raid, they stole all of my tax-deductible receipts; so I was not allowed to make a defense.

I see.

MR. HDYF: I object to going into this area. Are we going to relitigate the tax case?

THE COURT: I realize that you are laying a foundation here. If you could get to the point, I would appreciate it, Mr. Sullivan, because I have the same

### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

-	4	•	d
-	4	~	ı

question, no. And you provided her with information about

your finances so she could do that; right?

- I provided her with some figures, yes.
- All right. And you had her prepare your tax returns?
  - A. No, not correct.
- 0. And you consider them not your tax returns because you didn't sign them?
  - That and the figures were not correct on them.
  - Well, the figures came from you, didn't they?
  - Not entirely, no.
- But you used those tax returns for a purpose that benefited you?

MR. HDYT: Your Honor, I don't know where we are going. It could just drag on.

THE COURT: I assume you are getting to Eighteen USC 1001?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's get to it.

MR. SULLIVAN: There is another purpose, as well, Your Honor,

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. BY MR. SULLIVAN:

You had those tax returns prepared, and you

concern Mr. Hoyt does.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

1

2

3

4

5

В

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Well, at your tax trial, when you testified last year, you were shown tax returns that you had prepared; correct?

No. I did not prepare them.

I said, "that you had prepared." Someone prepared them for you?

They weren't tax returns. They were just statements of income.

They were 1040s, were they not? Q.

They were on 1040 forms.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I think this was an issue in the tax case.

THE COURT: He is laying a foundation. I think he's entitled to lay it for impeachment. Go ahead. Overruled.

18 BY MR. SULLIVAN:

You had a lady named Peggy Newman, an 20 accountant in Las Vegas, prepare Form 1040 income tax returns for you in the late 1990s and even into the early 2000s, didn't you?

She printed them out.

"Yes" or "no"?

She printed them out. The way you asked the

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

used the	m for a	a vurrocce	that was	beneficial	to w	ານ?

They weren't tax returns that were prepared as A. tax returns.

What term would you like me to use? Q.

They were, basically, a profit and loss A. statement.

o. On a Form 1040; right?

That's correct. A.

And you used those Form 1040 profit and loss statements to secure loans from financial institutions; correct?

A. It was private money on those, I think. It was not -- it was not institutions, like you say.

You secured a loan from something called CLS Mortgage Company, didn't you?

Right. That was a private lender, like forty or fifty different investors.

Does it matter if they are a private or a public corporation, to you, Mr. Hinkson? You submitted those -- whatever you want to call them -- financial information forms on the 1040s; right?

MR. HDYT: Your Honor, objection. We went into this in depth.

MR. SULLIVAN: No, we haven't, Your Honor.

MR. HOYT: We went into this in depth in the

You may go ahead with your attempt to impeach him. MR. SULLIVAN: Could my last question be read

Your objection is overruled, Mr. Sullivan.

(Whereupon, the pending question was read back by the court reporter.)

BY MR. SITLIVAN:

back, please?

1

2

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

2

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

/22

23

24

25

- You did that; right?
- I submitted it to CLS, yes. A.
- And that was to secure a loan? ٥.
- A. Yes.
- Q. And other institutions required you to sign those returns, didn't they?
  - A. Nobody has ever required me to sign them.
- Are you testifying that you never signed one ٥. to secure a loan?
  - I have never signed one to secure a loan.

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Answer: "Well, they said they had to have tax returns; and I told them that I had not signed them, nor had I filed them, and they said, 'Well, we don't care about all of that, but we want you to sign this form because it has to go in our file so that we can verify with the IRS that you signed them.

"And I told them I dich't sign them, and so I put 'Forced to Sign as a Condition of Funding' above my signature after I told them this."

Was that your testimony?

- A.
- So when you needed a loan, you would sign documents, wouldn't you?
  - Just the loan documents. A.
- Right. Now, sir, you said the tax returns that you had the lady in Las Vegas prepare for you showed that you owed substantial amounts of income tax, didn't they?
- They weren't accurate because they were just financial statements.
- Did they show that you owed substantial ٥. amounts of income tax?
  - I don't believe so.
- All of those income tax returns you didn't sign were moved into evidence in your trial, weren't

2131 Absolutely, 2 Q. Are you quibbling about signing? 3 No, I'm not. A. 4 Such as you said, "Let this be my 5 handwriting, " or something? Not even my handwriting. A. Sir, did you give this testimony at your tax trial last year, under oath, starting at 1250, page 21. 9 Question by the prosecutor -- Mr. Bradley, was 10 it? 11 I don't know. Why don't you put it on the 12 screen? 13 ٥. Question: "Mr. Hinkson, finally, I would like to show you Government Exhibit 76 which is in evidence, 14 15 which is the W-9 form. Do you remember that coming in 16 through the CLS Mortgage people?" 17 Answer: "Yes, I do." Question: "Can you see your signature there?" 18 Answer: "Yes, I do." 19 Question. "It says, 'Signature, Forced to 20 21 Sign as a Condition of Funding, ' quote, unquote. Did 22 you write that there?" 23 Answer: "I did." Question: "Why did you write that there, 24

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2133

they?

mir?"

25

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. I would assume so.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, may we approach at sidebar?

THE COURT: I think that might be a good idea. (Whereupon, the following sidebar discussion was held outside the presence of the jury:)

MR. HDYT: Your Honor, Mr. Hinkson has admitted that he was convicted of the tax counts. And what I see counsel trying to do here is to go back through and relitigate. This is more like a 404(b) sort of argument of, you know, prior bad acts or something.

You know, the man has been convicted. He can't say anything more than that. It just doesn't seem proper to go through all of the individual items of evidence that were used at the tax case against him. He's had wide latitude, and we haven't really gotten anywhere.

MR. SULLIVAN: Counsel, on his direct, tried to paint a picture of Mr. Hinkson to the jury that he's a hymnitarian that wants to cure the world of every disease known to man, that all he does is work hard at his plant in order to do this, that he is curing tuberculosis, et cetera, et cetera.

This is a completely different view of the man

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

B 

 doing all of these humantarian acts and standing on principal, he is not filing tax returns and he is benefiting, quite substantially, financially.

THE COURT: The court has the same concern

that is being presented to the jury that, while he is

THE COURT: The court has the same concern that Mr. Hoyt has articulated. I think the way to get there, counsel, is to just confront him directly with the fact that, as a result of the fact that he engaged in this conduct, he has received substantial amounts of money that he paid no income taxes on, hundreds of thousands of dollars -- I think that the only thing you can do with a witness like this so to simply confront him with that. Let him answer any way he wants.

The problem -- and I agree with Mr. Hoyt -the problem is, if you ask him the kind of open-ended
questions you are asking him, you are just inviting him
to go back in and testify again to all of the things
that the tax court jury heard and rejected.

And he's been convicted of that, and I do think that you can get to the point more directly without going into this much detail.

MR. SULLIVAN: I am going to go right to it.

I think I have laid sufficient foundation to confront
him and impeach him in testimony where he admitted that
these tax returns show tax due and owing.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

refresh	his	recollection.	Otherwise,	the question and
answer w	rill	stand.		

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Do you see it on the screen where I am pointing?

THE COURT: You can show it to the jury, since you have already read it. You are going to need to enlarge it, counsel.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. Did you give that testimony?
- A. That's what it says on the screen. I don't recall but --
- Q. Do you recall being shown your 1998 1040 prepared by Peggy Newman and being asked about your tax due and owing in?
  - A. I do not remember.

MR. HDYT: Your Honor, objection. Counsel, I thought, was going to get right to it, ask the one question, and move on.

THE COURT: I think this is a different year.

MR. SULLIVAN: It is a different year.

THE COURT: I will permit him to ask on the different year.

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I am just wondering if I have to bring in a bunch of witness to counter this On this particular one, I would ask: "You hadn't paid that \$35,000, had you?"

"No."

THE COURT: If you can get right to it, I will allow you to go that far. Otherwise, I think we have heard enough on the tax case.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were held in open court, in the presence of the jury:)
BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Page 1212, line 2. Did you give this testimony under cath at your tax trial?

Question by Mr. Bradley: "Then it says, quote, 'Estimated Tax Payments and Amount Applied on line 53, \$35,000. Do you know where she got that number from?"

Answer: "I really don't. I mean, I can speculate."

18 Question: "You hadn't paid that \$35,000, had

19 you?"

Answer: "No."

Is that the testimony you gave last year,

April or May?

A. I didn't read it on the screen, so I'm not sure.

THE COURT: If you want to, show it to him to

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

testimeny.

THE COURT: I ruled at sidebar that he could get to the question of money otherwise due and owing. That's what he is doing. Overruled.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Were you shown by Mr. Bradley your 1980 -- excuse me -- 1998 1040 prepared by Peggy Newman? Do you recall that?

A. I don't.

Q. And do you recall that that tax return showed you owing \$58,000?

12 A. I don't recall, but I'm sure it's not a tax
13 return if it's not signed.

Q. Did you give this testimony to these questions?

1215, counsel.

Question: "Exhibit 42 is your 1998 1040 prepared by Peggy Newman. Do you recognize her signature, six?"

Answer: "Yeah, I recognize her signature."

Question: "On this return, the total amount
of tax that year was \$58,000 on line 56. Is that what
it says?"

Answer: "That's what it says."

Question: "And your total payments were

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

g

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

6

23

25

15 16

19 20 21

9.

7 9 10

18

\$57,000 that year?" Answer: "That's what it says." Question. "You didn't pay that \$57,000?" Answer: "No, I didn't pay that." Was that your testimony at that time, sir? I haven't seen it on the screen. MR. SULLIVAN: May I show it to the --

THE COURT: Move it up just a little bit, Mr. Sullivan. There you go.

MR. SULLIVAN: Page 1215, starting with line

THE WITNESS: Well, it says I testified to it: so I believe it. I don't recall it. RY MD STILLTUNG

- The truth of the matter is, Mr. Hinkson, that you are a successful businessman because you never paid your taxes?
  - A. I don't think that's true, no.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

- Do you claim that you are a successful businessman because you had a superior product that sold well?
  - No. I don't think that's correct either. A.
- Well, you didn't have the same overhead that O. other businessmen do, did you?

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

You said: "Now, the next part of the crime -notice she's the criminal -- is on the 21st of November. She created a search warrant to search my factory. She signed the judge's name to it and never file stamped it in."

Does that refresh your memory?

- Yes. A.
- On page 27, line 804, you said in the radio interview: "So she never took that to court. She just created that, signed the name on it, and never bothered to take it to court."

You are referring to the search warrant for the plant; right?

- I'm not sure. I would have to read more of that. Was it the search warrant, or was it the Indictment?
- Are you telling me -- all right. You accused her of forging the Indictment, too, didn't you?
  - Yes, I did.
- And you don't recall whether you accused her of forging the search warrant, also?
- Well, there was no affidavit attached to it; and I don't think it was proper.
- Well, my question was: Are you forgetting whether or not you accused her of forging a search

A. I had more overhead than other businessmen. 2139

2141

o. You didn't have the overhead of having to pay taxes; correct?

- I paid a lot of taxes during those years. A.
- ο. You didn't pay your income taxes?
- A. I paid any tax that I legally owed.
- As a matter of fact, you didn't pay any Idaho State tax either, did you?

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, how deep are we going to go into this?

THE COURT: I will sustain the objection.

12 I think that's enough on the tax case, 13 Mr. Sillivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

- Mr. Hinkson, you also accused Nancy Ocok of having forged the search warrant that was used to search the plant on 11/21/02?
- Yes, I did. I believe I did. Do you have a transcript to show me or something?
  - Government Exhibit 1 -- excuse me. It's not
  - 1. It's the transcript of the radio interview.

THE COURT: 5-A.

MR. SULLIVAN: 5-A, Your Honor.

Page 26, line 782. Does this refresh your ο. memory?

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

warrant?

- If that's what I said, then I would agree that's probably what I said. And it's my belief that it is a frand, yes.
- Okay. And at this point in time, on January 8, 2003, when you gave this radio interview, you still had your lawsuit against Nancy Cook and Steve Hines in court; right?
  - A. What day?
- Your lawsuit hadn't been thrown out of court or dismissed yet on January 8, 2003; right?
  - Okay. I agree with that.
- Okay. And did you ever, at any time in that lawsuit, complain that your civil rights had been violated by Nancy Cook for forging an Indictment or forging a search warrant?
- She wouldn't give the discovery, so I had no way of absolutely proving it because she refused to cocoerate.

THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, that's not responsive to the question. The question is: At any time in the lawsuit, did you complain that she had violated your civil rights by forging an Indictment or forging a search warrant? Just answer that question.

THE WITNESS: I don't remember. I would have

to read it at this point.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Did you attempt to amend the complaint by alleging that she violated your civil rights by forging the Indictment, forging the search warrant, and plotting to mirder vou?
- A. No. I don't recognize that testimony or that statement.
- Those would be pretty significant civil rights violations if somebody had committed them; is that correct?
  - A. I think that would be serious, yes.
- But you didn't file anything or seek relief in court for those alleged violations?
- I don't know. I haven't read the civil suit in three and a half years -- or three years.
- Your testimony is you don't know whether you included in your complaints that she forged the Indictment, et cetera, forged everything against you? You don't remember that?
  - I don't remember that, no.
- ο. Sir, in 2003, were you the legal owner of WaterOz?
  - In 2003?
  - Q. Yes.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- 0. Your criminal trial was last year?
- Yeah. I remember there was a trial.
- Right. And that was in 2004; right?
- I quess so. A.
- In that where you say it was established -they established that you were the owner of WaterOz?

MR. NOLAN: Can we approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

(Whereupon, the following sidebar discussion was held outside the presence of the jury:)

MR. NCLAN: I know the least about this of everybody here, but it seems to me that he may have made representations that he didn't own the place on a number of occasions.

He may have even testified that way. There may be all sorts of things about who owned what. The jury made a determination or the court made a determination.

The fact that he took a position back then that may or may not have turned out to be true I don't think is something that is appropriate to get into.

MR. SULLIVAN: I am not trying to establish that this was a proven fact at his criminal trial in

I think they established that at the trial. A. They said I was a legal owner of the business.

Who established?

This court did. A.

But you had been claiming earlier -- you had 5 claimed before your trial -- your trial was in 2004; right? Correct? 7

> I really don't remember the exact time. A.

You don't remember having your trial last ٥.

vear?

1

2

3

4

я

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

24

25

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2144

MR. HDYT: Which trial, counsel? Objection. Date.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

You don't remember this trial? 14 THE COURT: Let's see if we can help 15 Mr. Hinkson remember what trial we are talking about. BY MR. SULLIVAN: 17

0. Before this trial, you only had one other trial; correct?

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, there are other cases 20 21 that have been talked about.

THE COURT: That's what Mr. Hoyt's concern is. 22 Can you help him out?

MR. SULLIVAN: The criminal trial is what I meant.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2004. I am trying to establish that he has tried to hide assets for a number of years, and he's done it by claiming he is not the legal owner of WaterOz. I think that goes to deceitful conduct.

THE COURT: It is true that that was a portion of the proof that the court heard at the last trial but it's going to -- it will take so much time to establish all of that. Unless you are trying to lay the foundation so that you can set him up for impeadment,

Otherwise, you are reopening the entire tax case; and I don't think that's going to help any of us. And it certainly --

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I will avoid doing that. I have specific transcript pages to ask him those questions which I think show his inconsistency in these areas.

THE COURT: Well, let's --

MR. SULLIVAN: If he would answer the question --

THE COURT: You have to deal with the witness as he is, and he is a very evasive witness who doesn't respond directory to questions.

I mean, I had the same problem with him when Mr. Hoyt was examining him. He is just a tough witness.

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2148 with Mr. Harding on March 27, 2003, didn't you say the 2 following? MR. HOYT: Page? 3 MR. SULLIVAN: 76. 4 5 MR. HDYT: It was excluded, counsel. MR. SULLIVAN: Page 76. 6 MR. NOLAN: I'm not sure this is in evidence. 7 THE COURT: I don't think it is but I assume that you are going to -- well, go ahead and ask your question. Let me hear it and see if there is an 10 objection. 11 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 12 In the conversation, the taped conversation 13 with Mr. Harding, do you recall having a conversation --14 15 one topic of your conversations was about firing or 16 hiring an employee? Yes. That was the girl that robbed my house. 17 18 Right. And Harding says: "Bizarre. You're not going to hire her back? Please say, 'No.'" 19 20 MR. HOYT: Your Honor --THE COURT: I am going to sustain the 21 objection. This is not a permissible area, /22 Mr. Sullivan. Move on to something else. 23 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 24 25 Sir, with regard to your WaterOz products,

2147 WaterOz? Absolutely not. 2 A. o. Wasn't he part of your management team of WaterOz? 5 A. Yes. Once we had a problem, we wanted him to help solve the problem; and we had some management meetings with my father, Jeri Gray, me, Charlie. Was the answer, "yes," he was a part of your management team them? 10 I believe he was, for a brief period of time. It would have been in January of '03. 11 12 ο. That what? 13 That he was meeting with us and trying to help us resolve some problems. They were, like, manager 14 15 meetings. 16 The question is: Was he a member of your 17 management team, not whether he was trying to help you? These are just words. They are semantics. 18 19 THE COURT: Counsel, now you are quarreling 20 with the witness. THE WITNESS: He was, basically, asked to help 21 22 negotiate some serious problems we were having with Mr. Swisher. 23 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 24 25 o. Sir, in the taped convernation that you had

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1

11

have you -- you have claimed they can cure tuberculosis; is that right? God cures the tuberculosis. A. o. You don't think you are God, do you? A. But you say you can cure tuberculosis, don't 6 Q. 7 you? I just don't like the way you used the word. R A. I'm sorry. Do you think you can cure 10 tuberculosis? I think silver kills all viruses known to man; and if you breathe silver vapor, tuberculosis will die. 12 My question is, sir: Any of these products 13 that you sell and have been selling for a number of 14 years, have you ever patented them with the U.S. Patent 15 Office? 16 17 MR. HDYT: Your Honor, I will object. I 18 think, if we are going to go into this area, we really do need to approach at sidebar. There is a whole litary 19 of issues here, now that counsel has brought it up, that 20 21 we would be happy to address. THE COURT: Let's not do it in this fashion. 22 23 Are you trying to lay a foundation for impeachment here, 24 Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not. I think I know the

answer and I think that will --

THE COURT: So do I. If that's the case, then I sustain the objection. Move on to another area. BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. Sir, you know who Kay Walsingham is; correct?
- A. Yes.

,

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. She was the secretary of your previous attorney, Brit Groom?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. You have known her for a while; correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
  - Q. You used to go into Mr. Groom's law office and speak with her?
    - A. Yes, I have spoke to her.
  - Q. And you used to say things in front of her that you hoped Dennis Albers would die; correct?
    - A. No
  - Q. You never said that in front of Kay
    Walsingham?
    - A. No
  - Q. Did you ever say in front of -- didn't you say in front of Kay Walsingham that you hoped Dennis Albers' wife and children would die?
  - A. Demnis Alberra doesn't have children. And the answer is "no."

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

- A. No. I'm not the aggressor.
- Q. In the litigation between you and Mr. Bellon, it's correct that he swed you; right?
  - A. Yes. He stied me, yes.
- Q. And then you filed a counterclaim against him?
  6 Yes?
  - A. Yes, I did, even though I didn't participate in it. I was in jail.
  - Q. And then you filed a claim -- that is, you sued Mr. Swisher and made him a third-party respondent; connect?
  - A. Yes, because he seized the factory.

    THE COURT: The answer is "yes" or "no," not why you did it.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: The jury will disregard why.

THE WITNESS: It is my understanding that, yes, we did.

19 BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. And when was that that you did that, approximately?
- A. I'm not sure. I would just be able to guess. I don't have a calendar in jail. Just every day is the same.
  - THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, this is not a place

Q. I thought he had a daughter, sir. Didn't you tell us yesterday that he had a daughter?

A. Yes, an older daughter who is a lawyer and a very nice lady. The word "children" refers to younger people.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Hinkson, I think the jury understands what the word "children" means.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. Dich't you say in front of Kay Walsingham that
   you hoped -- or you wanted Mrs. Albers and her children
   to be tortured in front of Mr. Albers?
- 12 A. No. absolutely not.
  - Q. You do like Mrs. Walsingham, though, don't

14 you?

5

6

7

я

13

16

17

19

24

25

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2152

2150

- 15 A. Yes, I have always liked her.
  - Q. She's not one of your enemies, is she?
  - A. No
- 18 Q. You have never sued her, have you?
  - A. She's never sued me is a better way of saying

20 it.

- 21 Q. Okay. She's never sued you; right?
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 Q. And you've never sued her?
  - A. Right.
    - Q. Now, you do sue people regularly, of course?

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2153

1 from which we make speeches. We answer questions.
2 BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Now, the litigation between you and

Mr. Bellon, wasn't that because he claimed to be your

partner?

- A. He claimed it, yes, verbally.
- Q. Well, you had a written agreement with him,didn't you?
  - A. No, sir.
  - Q. Didn't you dictate an agreement to Brit Groom for him to prepare for you?

MR. HDYT: Your Honor, objection. There is a court order that finds that there is no basis for a written agreement.

MR. SULLIVAN: I object to counsel's speeches.

THE COURT: So do I. Counsel, the objection is overruled. You brought this up yesterday on direct, and I think Mr. Sullivan is entitled to explore it on cross.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. Mr. Hinkson, didn't you dictate to Mr. Groom, Brit Groom, your attorney, a document that encompassed a partnership between you and Mr. Bellon?

A. It was a future partnership that was being proposed, yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

24

25

MR. SULLIVAN: Let me show you a document. The next exhibit number? THE COURT: Fourteen, I think, counsel. MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. Fourteen? Thank you. THE COURTROOM CLERK: Plaintiff's Exhibit No. Franteen is marked. BY MR. SITTITUM: If you will, look at the screen in front of you at Government's Exhibit fourteen for identification. Do you recognize this particular document? I don't think I have ever read it. Do you see the back, the second page? Yes, I see there is a second page. Do you recognize Mr. Groom's signature? A. I don't really know what Mr. Groom's signature locks like, so I can't say I recognize it. Mr. Groom used to file motions on your behalf in the criminal case, the tax case; correct? A. As my lawyer, yes. And he would sign those pleadings, wouldn't O. he? A. As a lawyer, yes. Ckay. And you would review those pleadings, Q. wouldn't you?

#### ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. SULLIVAN: To both, Your Honor. MR. HOYT: Can we approach? THE COURT: Yes. I want to hear where we're 5 coing on this. 6 (Whereupon, the following sidebar discussion 7 was held outside the presence of the jury:) MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, they presented and 8 their defense includes a version of this litigation that they like to call "The Bellon Take-Over." 10 I want to show the jury that there was a legal 11 12 basis. There was a legitimate, legal dispute, based upon the document that this witness has identified he 13

MR. HOYT: Your Honor?

a partnership. MR. HOYT: Your Honor, we already have a legal determination in this issue between Mr. Bellon and Mr. Hinkson. Mr. Groom even testified about it in the court up in Idaho County.

dictated, this document to Brit Groom; and it represents

The court ruled, on December 12, 2003. For the purposes of the temporary restraining order, he found that this document didn't have any validity and it wasn't a legal agreement. I don't understand why we are trying to relitigate all of these cases.

THE COURT: Let me just say this: As I

A.	Yes.	Before	I	filed	him,	yes.

You would see his signature on the back page. ο. the last page of those pleadings?

Δ.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2156

This is the signature of Mr. Groom on the 0. screen in front of you, isn't it?

I don't know for sure, but I believe it is.

You know what this is, don't you, Mr. Hinkson?

A. Yeah. It was read to me on the phone.

Because you were in jail, and you dictated 0. this partnership agreement to Mr. Brit Grocm; correct?

MR. NOLAN: Can we object on the basis that it calls -- he is making a legal conclusion?

THE COURT: I will overrule the objection. The document does contain that word, and I think it's appropriate.

The jury, however, will be instructed that they are not to draw any conclusion as to whether it is or is not a legal partnership agreement; but the document does contain the words "partnership agreement."

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

Mr. Hinkson, isn't it correct that this ο. document was created by Mr. Groom as you dictated it to him over the telephone?

THE COURT: To him or to Mrs. Walsingham?

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

understand the purpose of Mr. Sullivan's line of inquiry, which you, Mr. Hoyt, opened the door to yesterday on direct examination of Mr. Hinkson, the Government is now attempting to impeach Mr. Hinkson with the document that he admits he dictated to Mr. Groom's law office.

And you have suggested, in your examination of Mr. Hinkson, that there was a conspiracy by Mr. Bellon and Mr. Swisher and others to takeover the company and to take it away from Mr. Hinkson and that's why they are all testifying against him.

Mr. Sullivan is entitled to show that Mr. Hinkson was discussing, at least at this point in time, engaging in some kind of a joint venture with Mr. Bellon. That is impeaching. Your objection is overruled.

MR. NOLAN: Can I just, first of all, say --THE COURT: Let me just say that I have been very generous about allowing both lawyers; but I want one lawyer to state the position for each side, and it will be the lawyer handling the witness. You can whisper in Mr. Hoyt's ear, and he can be your mouthpiece. I want to do this one at a time.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2 3

9 10

11 12

13 14 15

16 17 18

19 20 21

22

23 24

25

3 4 5

1

2

6 7

8 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

THE COURT: Proceed, Mr. Sullivan. The objection is overruled.

held in open court, in the presence of the jury:)

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I move the admission of Exhibit fourteen.

THE COURT: I will admit it for the purposes of impeaciment. It's not coming in yet as substantive

(Whereupon, Government's Edublit No. 14 was received in evidence for the purposes of impeachment.)

MR. SULLIVAN: May I display it on the projector?

THE COURT: Why don't you, first -- yes. All right. You may do that. I will give a limiting instruction.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I mean by this is that, where a party is using either a document or a prior statement of the witness to try and impeach or discredit the witness, you may not consider the content of the statement or the document for its truth.

But you may consider it to the extent that you find that, depending upon how the witness responds to it, it is not consistent with prior testimony that the witness has given.

With that understanding, you may display it to

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2160

also signed it, to witness it; correct?

I don't know what her signature looks like, but I believe you.

- And it bears a handwritten inscription at the bottom with the name Richard Allen Bellon; correct?
  - That's what it says on the screen.
  - You didn't see him write that?
  - I was in jail.
- You didn't see Ms. Walsingham or Mr. Groom sign it either?
  - A. No. I did not.
- But you did see this document later, during the litigation: correct?
  - I'm not sure if I have ever seen it.
- Q. Mr. Hoyt represented you in that litigation; correct?
  - Yes. I'm sure he saw it.
- At the very bottom of page one, does it not read: "Mr. Bellon shall have management authority over the operation of the WaterOz facility with consultation with Mr. Hinkson."

MR. HOYT: Your Honor, I object to the form of the question. Counsel is well aware of the court decree that finds that this --

THE COURT: Counsel, no more speaking

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

the jury.

٦

10

11

12

19

22

24

25

5

6

7

В

12

13

14 15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Mr. Hinkson, on the screen before you is a document that is headed, or titled at the top, "Partnership Agreement;" is that correct?

And it's dated Thursday, July 24, 2003? 0.

A.

And then it is followed by the words, "Mr. David Hinkson and Richard Bellon agree, as follows;" correct?

Correct.

THE COURT: Could you enlarge that a little 13 bit, comsel? It's hard to read. 14 BY MR. SULLIVAN: 15

And this purported to be some kind of a 16 O. partnership agreement between you and Mr. Bellon; 17 correct? 18

> A. Correct.

And you were in jail at the time you dictated 20 it to Mr. Brit Groom; right? 21

A.

And he prepared it and he signed it; correct? 23 o.

> I don't know if that's his signature but --A.

And then Cathryn Walsingham, his secretary, Q.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

objections. The objection is overruled.

Mr. Hinkson, did you dictate those words or 2 not?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. I don't have a copy of the tape.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Are you alleging that Mr. Grocm didn't take it down correctly when you dictated it?
- I wouldn't know. They have recorded every 9 convergation I ever made to Mr. Bellon. I believe there 10 are, like, 300 tapes. 11

THE COURT: No. Mr. Hinkson, that's not responsive to what Mr. Sullivan asked you.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. I mean, I don't remember.

BY MR. SULLIVAN: 16

> When is the first time -- do you recall ever seeing this document before? "Yes" or "no"?

No, I have never seen it.

You have never seen it? Q.

A.

You were being sued on the basis of this o. document, and you are telling the jury you never saw it?

A.

That particular litigation between you and Q.

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1	A.	Yest.	2164
2	Q.	It has a return address for Mr. Hines, doesn't	
3	it?		
4	A.	Yes. On this paper, it does.	
5	Q.	Does that refresh your memory that you did	
6	know that	he had a return address?	
7	A.	I already said I knew he had a return address.	
8	Q.	You said you didn't know if he had a return	
9	address,	didn't you?	
10	A.	That's not what I said. I thought I said that	
11	I had an	address that was on his paperwork for a return	
12	address.		
13	Q.	And you said you didn't know where he worked?	
14	A.	I don't know where he works. That's just his	
15	mailing a	address.	
16	Q.	So you think that doesn't necessarily mean	
17	that's wi	nere he works; right?	
18	A.	I don't know where he works.	
19	Q.	Did you tell Chad Croner that you had a mob	
20	lawyer?		
21		MR. HOYT: Your Honor, where is this going?	
22		THE COURT: Well, I think there was testimony	
23	to that	effect by Mr. Croner. Overruled.	
24	BY MR. ST	JLIVAN:	
25	Ω.	Did you tell him that?	
	I		

```
2163
     that was on his correspondence. I believe.
 2
     BY MR. SULLIVAN:
               That's the address for this building, isn't
 3
     162
 5
         A.
               I wouldn't know.
 6
               You couldn't find a street address in Boise if
    you wanted to?
               I didn't try.
         A.
              But you did know where he worked? "Yes" or
10
     "no"?
11
              No. I didn't know where he worked.
12
               You did know the address, the return address,
13
     for his letters, though, didn't you?
14
        A.
              If they were on his return address, yes.
15
              And you knew that Nancy Cook was in the U.S.
         o.
    Attorney's Office in Coeur d'Alene, too?
16
17
              No, I did not know that.
              You didn't know that?
18
        o.
19
        A.
20
              Mr. Hoyt moved into evidence, after you
21
     identified this exhibit, Defendant's Exhibit F-7. Do
    you recall this exhibit, sir? Defendant's F-7?
22
23
        A.
              Yes, I do, actually.
              You remember that? It was only yesterday.
24
        Q.
25
    Yes?
               ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309
```

```
A.
              No.
2
              MR. HOYT: My objection is to relevance, Your
    Honor.
              THE COURT: I'm allowing it for impeachment,
    Mr. Hoyt. Overruled.
5
    BY MR. SULLIVAN:
              Did you tell Chad Croner in jail that you had
        Q.
    a mob lawyer?
        A.
              No, I did not use those words.
 9
10
              In Las Vegas, when you were a paralegal, did
11
    you have a mob lawyer?
12
              Well, he's an Italian lawyer; but, you know
    he's not a mob lawyer.
13
              Haven't you called him a mob lawyer?
14
              There's been times when I referred to him as
15
        A.
     that, yes.
16
17
              You referred to him that way to Mr. Croner,
        0.
    too, didn't you?
18
              Not that I remember, no.
        A.
19
              If you would, look at page 156 of the
20
    transcript with J. C. Harding. Didn't you say, at line
21
22
     16 -- start at 15.
               "And I got it. I got a Harvard law professor
23
     using my account, my dad, Rich Bellon, in Vegas a mob
24
     lawyer. I was trained in Vegas by a mob lawyer. I was
25
```

trained by a mob attorney."

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

В

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

You said that to Mr. Hinkson (sic.); right?
THE COURT: Mr. Harding?

 $\mbox{MR. SULLIVAN:} \quad \mbox{I'm sorry.} \quad \mbox{Mr. Harding.} \quad \mbox{I} \\ \mbox{keep doing that.} \\$ 

THE COURT: MR. SULLIVAN, would you write on a piece of paper and just put the name "Harding" on it and stick is under his nose?

MR. SULLIVAN: Or put it on my forehead.

THE COURT: I'm not sure you would see it on your forehead.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Q. You said that to Mr. Harding, didn't you?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. You said it to Chad Croner, didn't you?
- A. No I didn't.
- Q. How else would be know you had a mob lawyer in Las Vegao, sir?
  - A. I'm sure you prompted him.
- Q. In that another one of your accusations that you make against federal officials, based upon no fact, Mr. Hinkson?

MR. HOYT: I object.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer that, Mr. Hinkson.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

That is correct; that was never mailed out.

- Q. Is it your testimony you sent it to the Idaho Supreme Court and the other persons listed at the very top?
  - That would be my testimony, yes.
- Q. In this letter, you accuse Mr. Albers of having orchestrated -- do you follow my finger -- having orchestrated a lawsuit against you based upon perjury; correct?
  - A. Absolutely.
- Q. And you allege, "Dennis Albers has further met with federal agents while acting as a prosecutor, City of Grangeville, in an attempt to destroy me and my family for the purposes of taking property he is not entitled to," correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. At the very bottom of this letter, the last sentence, did you write to the addressees at the top, the following:

"After fifteen days, if I do not hear from you, I will consider that you granted Dennis an implied immunity and are, thus, sanctioning Dennis Albers' activities by silence."

- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Was that supposed to mean that, if they didn't

THE WITNESS: I think he got information off my legal paperwork stolen from my jail cell.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

1

10

11

12

13

17

18

24

25

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2168

Q. Your testimony has now charged? I must have prompted him? Someone stole your information? Is that your new testimony?

- A. I'm not going to give any testimony on that.
- Q. Why not?
- A. Could you restate the question?
  - Q. Never mind.

Counsel also moved into evidence Defendant's Edubit F-4. Do you recall this document?

- A. Yes. I saw it yesterday, yes.
- Q. This is the document that -- you did a mass mailing when Dennis Albers was running for District

  Attorney; is that correct?
  - A. I don't believe that's correct.
  - Q. All right. Tell us what F-4 is.
- A. I think it's a letter to the Idaho Supreme
  Court. Go back to the top. It will tell you what it
  is. It says it was addressed to the Idaho Supreme
  Court. State Bar Association, and the Mayor, and
- 22 Court, State Bar Association, and the Mayor, and 23 Grangeville City Council.
  - Q. Are you testifying that you didn't include this in your mass mailing to the voters in Idaho County?

## . ONE COURT REPORTENZ (208) 484-6309

go along with you, you were accusing them of some impropriety?

A. I think that's what it says. I think it states that I will state that they will be in agreement that this activity of his is okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. I have lost another document.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Take your time, counsel.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

Q. sir, during the conversation with Mr. Harding on March 27th, did Mr. Harding tell you, at page 136, line 10 -- line 1 -- Mr. Harding said at the top: "So when does that happen, though? Do you get close to losing and you go, okay, I've got to whack these guys?" And you say: "I am only one guy."

Dich't you understand Mr. Harding to be saying "whack these guys" -- that he was talking about murdering them?

- A. I think he was speaking metaphorically.
- Q. Like you do?
  - A. I did, at that time, yes.
- Q. And you said say, "I'm only one guy." Is that metaphorical, too?
  - A. Yeah. I feel overwhelmed.

24

25

A.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Meaning you were only one guy, and you couldn't whack three guys by yourself; right? No. I can't fight the whole world by myself.
  - And then at page -- excuse me -- same page,
- line 12, where it says --
  - It's talking about people in Grangeville. A.
- But Harding says: ". . . made the joke in front of that guy the other day about killing those three feds . . . " What joke had you made the other day about killing three feds?
- I do not know of any joke, and I do not know if I even was listening to him.
  - You don't know if you were listening to him?
- No. He just sort of talked, and I really didn't may much attention to what he was saying.
- Because you didn't say to him, in response, "What joke?" or, "Killing what fede?" did you?
- I really -- I wasn't really having a conversation with him. It was more like he was just kind of doing what he does, yacking away; and I wasn't really listening to most of it.
- Were you listening when he said, ". . . killing those three feds . . . " or were you listening when he said, " . . . if you keep doing that in front of people, somebody is going to fuck with you

#### ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE WITNESS: I was talking about the girl that robbed my house, so it was non-responsive. I really wasn't listening to him. BY MR. SULLIVAN:

- Right. You were trying to avoid engaging in a conversation because you knew he was wired?
- No. I was very depressed that day because this woman had robbed my house.
- At page 137, line 3, don't you indicate that you are listening to him when he asked the question at line 3:

"My point being, if you're going to do it, count to it comewhere. If you're not going to do it, shut the fuck up. That's serious. That's from a friend. Are you listening to me at all?"

And you say: "Yeah. No, the only thing I can do is if it's going to get that ugly is I need to leave the country and never come back and (inaudible) like the American people."

He says: "I would rather you do that than hart schebody."

You were listening then, weren't you?

I don't understand the word "it" or "that," and I really wasn't really listening to what he was saying; and that's why I respond and the way I did, I

2171 or somebody is going to whack one of them mother 2 fuckers -- no, you think that's furmy." 3 You were laughing at that point, weren't you, Mr. Hinkson? 5 A. 6 Why did he say, "No, you think that's furmy"? 7 Everything he said --A. B Do you think that's furmy? 9 A. Everything he said here was staged for you 10 guvs that were listening. 11 So you are saying you weren't laughing when he talked about whacking people? 12 13 A. I wouldn't laugh about that. 14 Were you listening when he said, "But somebody Q. 15 is going to whack one of them mother fuckers and they 16 are going to go, 'Well, that's furmy, because Dave is always saying that he will pay you money to do it'"? 17 18 Did you hear him what he he said that? I didn't remembering hearing him. What was my 19 A. 20 response? 21 Your response was: "(Inaudible) comes out of 22 here. She's got everything else."

#### ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: You have to move it up, counsel.

I can't see.

MR. SULLIVAN: SOUTY.

2173 believe. My response is non-responsive. That's because you suspected he was wearing a 2 ٥. 3 wire; right? No. I didn't have any idea he was wearing a wire. Harding is not somebody you would take serious. THE COURT: Wait for the next question, Mr. Hinkson. The jury will disregard that last statement. BY MR. SULLIVAN: 9 Were you listening to Mr. Harding when he 10 11 said, at page 149, line 3: "I want to know scrething for sure. This is dead serious what I'm anking you 12 this. You talked to me about this on a couple of occasions. Do you want to do it? Do you not want to do 15 it?" 16 You say: "What?" 17 He says: "You know what I'm talking about. I can handle it." 18 You say: "What?" 19 He says: "Your problem with the three 20 21 wisenen." And your response is: "I'm just suing them." 22 23 You knew who he meant by "the three wisemen," didn't vou? 24 25 No. I did not. A.

CAR COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Let's get it, Ms. Longstreet.

THE WITNESS: This goes to F. Do you have a

THE COURTROOM CLERK: I just go to I, counsel.

20

21

22

23 24

25

A.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Did you say, at line 12: "I don't know what

you're talking about, J. C." You didn't say that, did

That's what it says there.

you weren't suing anybody, were you, because your

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. HOYT: Yes, Your Honor.

Redirect, Mr. Hoyt?

Isn't that true?

I don't think so.

You said, "I'm just suing them;" right?

So you knew he was talking about the three

And, in fact, on this date, March 27, 2003,

MR. HDYT: Objection. It calls for a legal

Your lawsuit had been thrown out, so you

MR. SULLIVAN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

wanted the three wisemen and the wise lady murdered?

1

3 vou?

4

5 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

Q.

A.

ο.

conclusion.

ο.

Δ.

BY MR. SULLIVAN:

feds; right?

No.

lawsuit had been thrown out?

1	THE WITNESS: This is just F.
2	THE COURT: It should look something like
3	this.
4	THE COURTROOM CLERK: Let me see if I have it
5	over here.
6	THE COURT: Shall I give him my copy,
7	Mr. Hoyt?
В	MR. HDYT: That would be fine.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson, I am handing you
10	Echibit J.
11	BY MR. HDYT:
12	Q. Mr. Hinkson, can you identify Exhibit J?
13	A. A transcript, yes.
14	Q. Okay. What is it?
15	A. It says it's a transcript of a temporary
16	restraining order hearing on the 11th and 12th of
17	December of 2003 at 9:16 a.m.
16	Q. Ckay. And can you turn over to what is marked
19	as page 355, at Bates number 380?
20	A. Uh-huh.
21	Q. Do you see the portion where it begins, on
22	line eighteen, "The Court"?
23	MR. SULLIVAN: Judge, I object.
24	THE WITNESS: Yes.
25	THE COURT: Sustained. This exhibit is not in

```
CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309
                                                              2177
     evidence yet, is it, comsel?
              MR. HOYT: I'm just asking him --
 2
              THE COURT: You can't ask him about the
3
    contents of it until it's admitted into evidence. We
    are doing this by the rules, Mr. Hoyt.
    BY MR. HOVT:
              Mr. Hinkson, can you identify this exhibit
        0.
     that says the transcript -- my question is: Can you
     identify the portion of the transcript that is depicted
     in Exhibit J?
10
              Do I recognize it?
11
        A.
              Yes.
12
        ٥.
              I wasn't there; but I recognize that it's a
13
        A.
     transcript of the hearing, yes.
14
              Is it a transcript of the court's findings and
15
     determinations as a result of the temporary restraining
16
    order dispute?
17
18
        A.
              THE COURT: The jury will disregard the
19
20
     answer.
21
              Mr. Sullivan, what is your objection?
              MR. SULLIVAN: He, obviously, can't establish
22
    a foundation of personal knowledge. This is hearsay.
23
              THE CLIET: Sustained.
24
              MR. HDYT: We move the admission of Edhibit J.
25
```

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

#### CNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

25

MR. HOYT: Mr. Hinkson was on the phone during

have helped you in your lawsuit against Nancy Cook? It would have proven a misconduct. 2 Who had possession and control of the Grand Jury Minutes? The court. THE COURT: Just a minute. MR. SULLIVAN: Unless he can show personal 7 knowledge, speculation. THE COURT: Sustained. The court -- the jury 10 will disregard the last answer. MR. HOYT: Your Honor, not at this moment but 11 I would like to make an offer of proof on this subject. 12 THE COURT: I understand, counsel. I think I 13 know an awful lot about Grand Jury proceedings, and that 14 was a proper objection. Move on to the next question, 15 BY MR. HOYT: 16 17 Now, Mr. Hinkson, did you disagree with the 18 Internal Revenue Service as to how your income and 19 expenses should be calculated? 20 Yes. And when you were submitting information in 21 loan packages to lenders, did you include 1040 forms that had been prepared by an accountant? 23 A. 24 Did the lenders obtain that information from 25 o.

2179 this hearing from the jail. 2 THE COURT: I see. Very well. With that representation, you may proceed. BY MR. HOYT: Mr. Hinkson, are you aware of what happened in this proceeding? Yes. A. Q. And what happened? THE COURT: Well, no, counsel. That's too broad. Let's do it with a leading question. 10 11 BY MR. HOYT: 12 All right. Mr. Hinkson, as a result of the claims for temporary restraining order of WaterOz, are 13 you aware of the Judge's finding? 14 Yeah. He, basically, removed the people that 15 16 had seized the factory. He ordered them out. MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I move to strike 17 the characterization of "seized the factory." 18 THE COURT: Overruled. 19 BY MR. HOYT: 20 21 Now, Mr. Hinkson, you talked about the Grand 22 Jury Minutes that you wanted to get in discovery from Namey Cook. Do you recall that testimony? 23 24 A.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

25

o.

How would obtaining those Grand Jury Minutes

		Col CONT. KERCHTING (200) 464-6303	
			2181
1	your acc		
2	A.	I did not have an accountant at that time.	
3	Q.	What were you doing the night that Mr. Harding	ſ
4	came to	your house and ultimately tape recorded the	
5	conversal	tion March 27th?	
6	A.	It had been a long week; and I was just,	
7	basicall	y, taking it easy for the day.	
8	Q.	Were your children there that evening?	
9	A.	Yes, they were.	
ιo	Q.	Were you preparing dinner for them?	
11	A.	Yes, I was.	
12	Q.	Were you occupied in various kitchen	
13	activiti	es?	
14	A.	Yes, I was. I was making dinner.	
L5	Q.	You were making dinner while Mr. Harding was	
16	talking	to you?	
١7	A.	I was.	
18		THE COURT: Counsel, you are leading.	
19	BY MR. H	DYT:	
20	Q.	Did your children ever come up and speak to	
21	you duri	ng the time that you were talking to	
22	Mr. Hard	ling?	
23	A.	I think they interrupted a few times there.	
24	You coul	d hear them in the background.	
25	Q.	Now, counsel for the Government attempted to	

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2182 suggest that you were intending to flee with a passport; 1 is that correct? 2 3 That's incorrect. They intimated that that's --4 ο. 5 Yes, that's correct. A. 6 Mr. Hinkson, where was your passport at the 7 time that you were arrested? I believe it was at the Ukrainian Embaosy. 8 A. 9 Why was it at the Ukrainian Embassy? 10 I had sent it in to get travel permission. They stamp it authorizing you to come to that country. 11 12 And why were you planning on going to the 13 Ukrainian Embassy as of November 21, 2002? I was planning to go to the Ukraine to pick up 14 15 my fiancee; and we were going to go to Bangkok, Thailand, for a week and then we were flying to Africa. 16 17 And were you going to meet with anyone in the 18 Ukraine when you went there? 19 Well, I always met with Roman and his 20 doctor --21 THE COURT: Didn't we go through this in some detail when you had him on direct yesterday? 22 BY MR. HOYT: 23 24 Were you -- were you able to get your passport 25 back from the Ukrainian Embassy?

#### QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Just what did you do, Mr. Hinkson? 1 2 Don't characterize it. 3 THE WITNESS: I wanted to turn one over to 4 him. 5 THE COURT: No. Mr. Hinkson, not what you 6 wanted. What did you do? 7 THE WITNESS: Oh, I applied for another one for the purpose of surrendering it to him. And I 9 believe the court was going --10 THE COURT: Mr. Hinkson --THE WITNESS: -- to allow me --11 12 THE COURT: Just stop with you applied for 13 another one. Wait for the next question. 14 THE WITNESS: Cleav. 15 BY MR. HOYT: 16 ο. When you declined to show up or for the Grand 17 Jury, Mr. Hinkson, had you asked to be able to speak freely to the Grand Jury? 18 19 Yes, I did. 20 And what were you told? 21 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Time? 23 THE COURT: I am going to allow it since you 24 tried to impeach him. 25 MR. SULLIVAN: Some foundation?

No. They said they couldn't find it. A. 1 Was there a government agent named Gayler who 2 o. was pressing you to turn in your passport? 3 He said, if I didn't turn it in, he was going 4 to immediately have me arrested. 5 And in response to that statement by Mr. Gayler, what did you do? 7 That's when I applied for another one. But it R A. wasn't a secret. 9 What do you mean, "It wasn't a secret"? 10 ٥. MR. SUILIVAN: I object to the --11 THE COURT: The jury will disregard 12 Mr. Hinkson's comments as to whether or not it was a 13 14 15 THE WITNESS: Cleay. 16 BY MR. HOYT: Did you make the information available to 17 Mr. Gayler that you had applied for a back-up passport 18 19 since your passport was lost? Well, yes. I explained to him that I didn't 20 have it, but he didn't believe me. He kept getting more 21 and more vocal about it. He said I had to turn it over. 22 And so what did you do to comply with his 23 o. demands? 24 It was a double-edged -- I wanted to --25 Α. ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

218: THE COURT: If you could, establish a time 1 frame and who gave him whatever instruction he was told. 2 BY MR. HOYT: 3 4 Was the time frame the same as the time frame for the letter that was written that has now been discussed in your prior testimony? 6 7 A. 8 And during that time frame, who did you talk O. to about the possibility of Grand Jury testimony? 9 10 A. Mr. Baxley. 11 What did you learn about your ability to speak freely to the Grand Jury? 12 13 I was told I could not speak freely to them. What were you -- what restrictions were to be 14 15 placed upon your testimony? I think they are in the letter. 16 17 MR. SULLIVAN: Object. 18 THE COURT: You are not going to testify what the letter said. What did you understand the restrictions to be? 21 THE WITNESS: I understood the restrictions 22 were -- basically, I was there to just be reasted; and I was not going to be allowed to defend myself. 23 BY MR. HOYT: 24 Now, Mr. Sullivan made quite a -- strike that.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

QUA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

25

Q.

9, 2002, four days after your arrest, Mr. Hinkson -THE COURT: 2002 or 2003?
MR. HOYT: I'm sorry. The court is correct;
it's 2003.

At the original detention hearing dated April

Q. On April 9, 2003, Mr. Hinkson, were there -was there any live testimony given by Mr. Harding?

A. No

Q.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q. Was there live testimony given by Ms. Bates?

A. No

## QNA COURT REPORTENTS (208) 484-6309

MR. SULLIVAN: Just a few minutes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's see if we can finish up with

Mr. Hinkson.

# RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. SHLIVAN:

Q. Isn't it true, Mr. Hinkson, at the April 9, 2003, hearing on the revocation of your bond, the tape between you and Mr. Harding had not yet been transcribed?

A. That's not true.

Q. It's your testimony that --

A. You are right; it wasn't transcribed. The actual disc was put into evidence.

Q. So the transcript at that point didn't exist; right?

A. Correct.

Q. So nobody was reading transcripts, as we have done here; right?

A. Correct.

Q. Your testimenty is you declined to testify before the Grand Jury because you thought you would be roasted?

A. Yeah. Another metaphor.

Q. You choose those kind of metaphors all the

2187 Did you or your lawyer have the opportunity to 2 cross-examine either Ms. Bates or Mr. Harding? 3 A. 4 Q. How was their information presented to Judge Williams? 5 Agent Long presented it, and I put the 6 A. 7 transcript in. What transcript did you put in? The body wire was not wanted to be used by 9 10 Mr. Agent Long. He didn't want it in. MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. 11 THE COURT: Sustained. 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Move to strike. 13 THE COURT: The jury will disregard the last 14 15 question and answer. BY MR. HOYT: 16 17 Did you offer as an exhibit the body wire recording at the April 9, 2003, hearing? 18 Brit Groom did, at my request. 19 How was the information from Harding and Bates 20 Q. 21 presented at --THE COURT: Counsel, that's not relevant. 22 MR. HOYT: No further questions. 23

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Sullivan, let me

2189

1 time, don't you?
2 A. Yes, I do.

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SULLIVAN: I have nothing else, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

just ask you how long you --

MR. HDYT: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Hinkson, you may stand down.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we are, case again, at a weekend break. I want to remind you, as I have told you many times, until the trial is over, you are not to discuss this case with anyone, including your fellow jurors, members of your family, people involved in the trial, or anyone else, nor are you allowed to permit others to discuss the case with you.

If anyone approaches you or tries to talk to you about the case, please let me know immediately.

Do not read or listen to any news reports of the trial. Do not do any cutside research, and that includes Internet searches or Dum & Bradstreet searches, related to the people or entities discussed during the trial.

Finally, you are reminded to keep an open mind until all of the evidence has been received and you have heard the arguments of coursel, the instructions of the

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

23 24 25

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

7

B

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

It looks like the records have been declassified, but I

want to satisfy myself of that.

I wish you all a pleasant weekend. Be back

court, and the views of your fellow jurors.

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here at 9:00 a.m.

Please stay healthy. I do not want to lose any more of you. We will see you back here at 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning.

(Whereupon, the jury was escused from the courtroom; and the following proceedings were held outside the presence of the jury:)

THE COURT: Counsel, we will be in recess for about ten minutes and take up that other matter.

#### (Recess.)

THE COURT: Counsel, a couple things before we get started with our two psychologists.

I have received, just within the last few minutes, the response from the National Personnel Records Center. It is about a half-inch-thick stack of materials which I will review this weekend.

I can tell you that a quick review of the file indicates that Mr. Swisher was, in fact, involved in top secret activities; and it appears that he was awarded the medals that he claims that he was awarded.

What I plan to do is go through the file carefully over the weekend, make sure that there is nothing in there that I am not permitted to disclose.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

review; but based upon what I saw, I don't think you are going to want to bring him back for that reason.

MR. NOLAN: I thought that the letter we just got today from the prosecutor seemed to say that some of the things are impossible. I'm sure the court will figure it out.

THE COURT: I want to do it carefully. I will review everything. I wanted to, at least, give you the preliminary indications so you have some idea over the weekend where that is going.

The other thing is you should have received copies of the court's draft of final jury instructions. I want you to have a chance to review them over the weekend, and we will have an instruction conference next week as soon as we see where the evidence is going.

At this point, is the defense still thinking that you may rest on Monday?

MR. NOLAN: I believe so.

Isn't that the case?

THE COURT: Mr. Hoyt?

MR. HOYT: I think so.

THE COURT: And then does the Government have any idea how long their rebuttal case might take?

MR. SULLIVAN: We are planning a rebuttal case, Your Honor; but it would be very short.

And what I would propose to do would be to have you come in early on Monday morning and let you take a look at the entire file in chambers, and then I will seal them or return them to the National Personnel Records Center. They do not appear to be impeaching, based upon my quick review.

2191

2193

MR. NCLAN: What is interesting is the letter that was given to us today.

THE COURT: It is all in there. It looks like they have copies of the correspondence with Mr. Hoyt. And as I say, it is about a half-inch thick. I did not have time to go through all of it in fifteen minutes, but it does not look like it is impeaching.

MR. NOIAN: May I also indicate that he is under the court's -- I mean, he hasn't been excused.

THE COURT: I understand, yes.

MR. NOLAN: I don't want the defense to contact him. I don't want any of us to contact him. I would appreciate it if the court would allow us to have the Marshal contact him.

THE COURT: We can tell the Marshal to have him come back but I don't want to -- I'm thinking of a word here. I don't want to pre-judge my preliminary

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: We might be to the jury by mid week, after closing arguments?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let's proceed. Mr. Nolan?

MR. NOLAN: Yes. I would like to call Dr. Doke, please.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, would you step forward and be sworn, please?

MR. SULLIVAN: As a preliminary matter, would it be okay if the Government's psychologist sat at counsel table?

THE COURT: That's fine. There is no jury here. I would like the two psychologists to hear one another. That's perfectly appropriate.

JERRY D. DOKE, Ph.D.,

having opinion called, sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: First of all, Mr. Nolan, before you proceed, let me thank both doctors for making themselves available on such short notice to the court.

I know you are very busy, and I appreciate your accommodating us.

Go ahead, Mr. Nolan.

24 THE COURTROOM CLERK: If you would, state your name and spell your last name please for the record. 25

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

A.

٥.

A.

ο.

A.

Go ahead and mark it.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. NOLAN: Was it attached somewhere?

THE COURT: Counsel, I think I have seen that.

THE COURT: I have a copy of Dr. Doke's C.V.

MR. NOLAN: I didn't know it was attached.

2196 It's actually nationally approved by the National Education Association, which is a little 2 better. It's not accredited by any national Q. associations; is that correct? It's approved. A. That's not my question. ο. I don't believe the "accreditation" word was A. used, no. 9 So to your knowledge, it's not accredited? 10 Q. 11 A. Yes. 12 And have you heard of the American Q. 13 Psychological Association? 14 A. Yes. I have. 15 That's the national body that standardizes Q. academic training; isn't that right? 16 Partly, yes. 17 A. And they, also, standardize internships and ο. 18 things like that? 19 Yes, they do. 20 And that's the group that -- well, when we 21 talk of accreditation, that's the group I'm talking /22 about. The California Coast University is not 23 accredited by the APA? 24 25 That's correct.

All right. Fine. THE COURT: I assume the Government stipulates to his credentials and that he is a qualified psychologist to enter an opinion. MR. TAXAY: The Government would like to voir dire on that subject. THE COURT: You would? All right. Go ahead, Mr. Taxay. I guess we are going to have to do it the old-fashioned way. Let's do it quickly. I do want to 10 get Mr. Nolan to the airport. MR. NOLAN: Thank you. 11 12 THE COURT: Let's do this. I have the C.V. I have read it. Why don't we let Mr. Taxay ask whatever 13 questions he wants to ask him? 14 15 16 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. TAXAY: Dr. Doke, good afternoon. 18 Q. 19 A. Hello. 20 Q. Your Ph.D. -- you got it from California Coast University? 21 22 A. That's not an accredited -- that's not an 23 accredited -- it doesn't have an accredited Ph.D. 24 program, is that right? 25

2195

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2197 Now, there is another sort of accreditation. The distance learning -- I'm sorry -- the Distance Education and Training Council, have you heard of that? A. I think so, yes. Now, California Coast University is not -- its Ph.D. program is also not accredited by the Distance Education and Training Council; ion't that right? I'm not sure. MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, I have here an Internet printout from the Distance Education and Training Council's website detailing accredited universities -- accredited programs, programs that have been accredited by them; and California Coast is not on that list. I would tender that to the court. THE COURT: Very well. Why don't we mark that? I guess it would be Exhibit 15. THE COURTROOM CLERK: Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 15 is marked. BY MR. TAXAY: Now, California Coast University, that's a school that allows -- let's see. I'm reading from the website. Basically, that an individual's multiple learning experiences can be measured and assessed for academic comparability and equivalency. Is that your

understanding of California Coast?

A. I think that was part of the statements made in the catalogs.

Q. Well, let me ask you this: Did you get some credit for prior experiences?

A. Yes

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. How many classes did you actually take at California Coast University?

A. I don't have my transcript here; but it was enough to qualify me to sit on the licensing boards, the national licensing boards; and I was approved by California to be able to sit on those licenses boards.

Q. How many classes did you take, sir?

A. I don't remember.

Q. Morre than five?

A. Yes.

Q. More than ten?

A. I don't remember exactly.

Q. When you say the school has been approved, specifically approved by whom?

A. My understanding -- I don't have the information here; but my understanding, at that time, it was the National Education Association.

A. And I was approved in California, again, because of the full dissertation and the requirements

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: I would prefer the highlighted

THE COURT: I would prefer the highlighted one, since it's just me.

MR. NCLAN: Do you have a copy for me?
THE COURT: Yes, provide a copy for the defense.

THE COUNTROOM CLERK: Plaintiff's Exhibit 16 is marked.

THE COURT: Both exhibits are admitted.

MR. TAXAY: Counsel, do you have an extra copy of his resume handy?

MR. NCLAN: Yes.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. I don't have one in this package. I found it. Sorry. Thank you.

Now, you were talking about national registries a moment earlier. Were you talking about the American Poychotherapy Association as a national registry?

A. No

Q. Let's talk about that first. That's listed on your professional affiliations, the American Psychotherapy Association; and it says you have a diplomat?

A. Yes,

THE COURT: Counsel, if you have an extra

met, to sit on the licensing board in California.

Q. Did you know that -- have you ever heard of the United States General Accounting Office?

Q. GAO?

1

2

3

4

5

ĸ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

ĸ

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2200

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know that the GAO was recently had an investigation into federal employees? This is what -it has what the report is called. Federal employees have obtained degrees from diploma mills and other unaccredited schools, some at government expense?

A. I don't know about that, no.

Q. Did you know that California Coast University is highlighted amongst a small handful of schools that are unaccredited?

A. I don't know about that.

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, the Government would tender this GAO report.

THE CCURT: Very well. We will mark it as Edubit 16, and both Edubits 15 and 16 will be admitted for purposes of this hearing only at this point.

(Whereupon, Government's Edubit Nos. 15 and 16 were received in evidence for this hearing only.)

MR. TAYAY: Your Honor, I have highlighted certain sections of it. I could give you the unhighlighted copy.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

copy, I don't have mine. I sent my law clerk to go get it for me.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Maybe we should mark this as an exhibit, just so we have a clear record. Let's give this one number 17.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Plaintiff's Exhibit No.
17 is marked.

9 THE COURT: And it will be admitted for 10 purposes of this hearing.

(Whereupon, Government's Exhibit No. 17 was received in evidence for this hearing only.)
BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. Now, this American -- undermeath your professional affiliations, it says you are a member of the American Psychotherapy Association and you are a diplomat. You don't -- to become a member of that organization, you don't need a Ph.D.; isn't that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. A Master's Degree in psychology would be sufficient?

A. To be a member, I believe so, yes.

Q. Now, the international -- I'm sorry. Your professional affiliations also include the International

5

7

R

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2204

2205

College of Prescribing Psychologists Fellow Diplomat. You are not licensed to prescribe medications in the State of Idaho; isn't that right?

- A. Correct. No psychologist is.
- Q. Basically, if you pay a fee, you can join these two organizations?
  - A. No.

7

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. You have to have a Master's in psychology?
- A. That's not correct.
- Q. Ckay. Tell me what the requirements are for these organizations. First, the American Psychotherapy Association?
- A. You have to apply with your history and a letter and your credentials, and they take those to a board and they either approve you for membership status or various other statuses.

I think there might be an affiliate and, also, a diplomat. And with the college of prescribing psychologists, international college, that was a 150 hour classroom hour, face-to-face with professors over a period of two or three years to earn the diplomat.

Q. Let's get to the American Psychotherapy
Association. To achieve diplomat status, you don't need
a psychologist -- a Ph.D.; correct? A Master's would do

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

A. Yes.

Q. That's different than the American Psychological Association; is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. The American Psychological Association is the entity that accredits programs at a national level; ion't that right?

A. They do some, yes.

Q. It's the leading organization; isn't that right?

A. You know, for psychologists, I suppose it still is. It's changing some. It has over the years.

Q. You are not a member of the APA, the American Psychological Association?

A. I'm an ex-member of the APA. I used to be a member.

Q. Well, your school is not accredited by the APA, the American Psychological Association; is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. So you are not eligible to be a member of the American Psychological Association; isn't that right?

A. That's not right.

Q. So is it your testimony that you don't need -to become a member of the American Psychological

A. You know, I think so. I think certain people with certain credentials and experience and contributions to the field may be able to achieve diplomat status. I don't have any of that information in front of me, but I believe you might be correct on that.

Q. I actually have a printout from the American Psychotherapy Association, and I will read it to you. What it says is that diplomat status is only available to applicants who have achieved a minimum of a Master's Degree from a regionally-accredited institution and a psychotherapy-related field. All applicants must have a minimum of four years professional psychotherapy experience.

THE COURT: Mr. Taxay, slow down just a little bit for the court reporter.

 $\label{eq:main_main_solution} \textbf{MR. SULLIVAN}: \quad \textbf{I apologize}. \quad \textbf{Thank you, Your} \\ \textbf{Honor.}$ 

Q. Is that consistent with your understanding of what it means to be a diplomat with the American Psychotherapy Association?

A. I don't have that in front of me but if that's
 what you read, then I suppose that's --

Q. Now, the American Psychotherapy Association goes by the initials APA?

#### QNA COURT REPORTENZ (208) 484-6309

Association, you do not need to come from an accredited APA program?

A. I had a Master's Degree accredited. And at one time, I was a member of the American Psychological Association.

MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, at this time the Government would tender a printout from the American Psychotherapy Association that describes the requirements to become a diplomat.

THE COURT: Very well. We will mark it as Exhibit 18 and admit it for purposes of this hearing.

(Whereupon, Government's Edubit No. 18 was received in evidence for this hearing only.)

MR. TAXAY: Counsel, I will get you copies of this.

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 18 is marked.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. With respect to your membership in the American Psychological Association, your membership was at the Master's level and not at the Ph.D. level?

A. That's been a while ago, yes.

Q. You have never been a member of the American Psychological Association at the Ph.D. level; right?

It shows not to be, that's true.

13 14 15

16 17 16

19 20

21 22

23 24 25

5

2

Q 10

11

В

12 13

14 15

16

17 18 19

20 21

Q.	Isn't it	true	that	Acr	are	not	eligible	for	1
pecause	you didn't	came	fram	an A	mer.	ican	Psycholog	rical	L
Associat	ion's acon	edite	d ins	titut	ian	?			

- I am eligible, if I want to apply, to become a member of the American Psychological Association.
- Not to quarrel with you, Dr. Doke, but they won't accept you at the Ph.D. level, is that right, because you don't come from an American Psychological Association accredited Ph.D. program?
- There are different levels of membership, and at that also changes over the years. I haven't checked lately, but I can certainly become an associate member. Again, there are different levels of membership in the American Psychological Association.
- So you are not eligible, though, for their highest level of membership; is that correct?
- A. If that's the way you want to put it, that's correct.
- The American Psychotherapy Association doesn't o. require an entrance exam; right? You don't need to take a test?
  - A. Exactly.
- Q. One question I forgot to ask about California Coast University --
  - THE COURT: Mr. Taxay, I don't want to

#### ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

220

- That's correct.
- You don't qualify to be in this book because you didn't come from an accredited program; isn't that right?
- I'm not sure if that's correct or not. A.
- You can't get in this book because you don't have the qualifications; is that right?
  - A. I'm not same.

MR. TAXAY: That's all right now.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nolan, you don't need to redirect on this. For purposes of this hearing, I am going to allow Dr. Doke to testify. Let's get to the meat of it.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you.

## FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. NOLAN:

- Were you retained to do an evaluation of ο. Mr. Hinkson?
  - A. Yes, I was.
- And he is the person seated here in the courtroom; is that correct?
- Yes. He is in the blue sweater with the white shirt underneath.
  - THE COURT: For the record, the Dr. Doke has

2207 interrupt your deposition here; but I want to really get to the heart of the matter.

Unless there is samething else that I need to know about Dr. Doke's background, I would really like to get into the substance of his proposed testimony recording Mr. Hinkson.

MR. TAXAY: Just one more item then, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

10 BY MR. TAXAY:

2

11

12

13

17

22

5

7

A

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Dr. Doke, have you ever heard of the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology?
- A.
- That's a register that psychologists who ο. 14 qualify can be -- are included in this book, the 15 16 Register, right here?
  - Yes. A.
- Now, what do you understand this Register is? Q. 18
- You know, I haven't looked at that for a long 19 time. I really don't need to do that in order to do my 20 21 work.
  - Pair. You are not in this book? ο.
- Right. 23 A.
- You are not in the National Register of Health 24 Q. 25 Service Providers in Psychology?

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2209

identified Mr. Hinkson.

2 BY MR. NOLAN:

- And you were hired to do a psychological assessment; is that correct?
- Yest. A.
- ٥. At the time you saw him, he was in custody; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Your proposed testimony may relate to 2000, 2001, 2002, and his personality characteristics or psychological make-up at that time.

Do you believe that you can offer an opinion in regards to that time period, in light of the fact that you saw him while he was in custody and were asked to evaluate his present condition?

- Yes, I can.
- All right. Are there two types of sort of Q. diagnoses? You used the words yesterday with me, and I can't remember. One never changes, and the other is situational?
- I think we were talking about personality traits and personality states.
- Personality traits and personality Q. straights -- I'm sorry -- and personality states?

THE COURT: You lost me on that one, counsel.

MR. NCIAN: I lost myself. Personality traits 1 2 and personality states. THE COURT: S-t-a-t-e-s? 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. NOLAN: 6 Q. The states vary, depending upon the 7 circumstances? A A. Yes. And the traits remain the same? 9 Q. 10 A. Pretty much. 11 Pretty much the same? 12 A. Yeah. So in your testimony, your proposed testimony, 13 you would be talking about personality traits; correct? 14 Morre -- yes, more than the states. 15 A. 16 And you would be comfortable being able to be cross-examined as to whether or not, for example, how --17 how you diagnose him, whether that diagnosis is 18 19 effective for the years 2000, 2001, 2002? I believe so, yes. A. 20 All right. In regards to the methodology in 21 determining whether or not someone has certain 22 23 personality traits, is there a methodology that is 24 accepted in the psychological comunity? 25

#### QNA COURT REPORTENS (208) 484-6309

1	the patie	nt?	2212			
2	A.	If they are available, yes.				
3	Q.	In regards to Mr. Hinkson, did you see him on				
4	at least did you see him, personally, on three					
5	cocasions	?				
6	A. I saw him perconally on 10/25/04, 10/28/04,					
7	and 11/28,	/04, yes.				
8	Q.	And I don't mean to lead you too much, but you				
9	have your	notes there. You saw him for two hours on				
10	each of t	nose times; is that correct?				
11	A.	Yes.				
12	Q.	And that was a person-to-person encounter in				
13	the jail;	cogrect?				
14	A.	Yes.				
15	۵.	You also had a conversation with him, did you				
16	not, on ti	he telephone?				
17	A.	Yes.				
18	Q.	And that lasted approximately how long?				
19	A.	On 10/29/04, one hour.				
20	Q.	And did you administer psychological tests?				
21	A.	Yes.				
/22	Q.	To Mr. Hinkson?				
23	A.	Yes.				
24	Q.	And those were traditional, not unusual				
25	psycholog	ical tests; correct?				

```
2211
               All right. And does that methodology include
         Q.
 2
     taking a history from the patient?
 3
         A.
               Yes.
 4
         Q.
               And does that include a family history?
 5
         A.
 6
               Does that include a vocational history?
         0.
 7
               Yes.
         A.
 R
               An education history?
         Q.
 9
         A.
               Yes.
10
               A medical history?
         Q.
11
         A.
12
               And a legal history?
         Q.
13
         A.
               Does it also involve observations of the
14
         ο.
15
     patient and their behavior?
16
         A.
17
               Does it involve trying to, under certain
     circumstances, confirm information from sources other
18
19
     than the patient itself?
20
         A.
               Yes.
21
               Does that include administration of standard
         o.
     psychological tests?
22
              Scretimes.
23
         A.
24
               All right. And does that also include
25
    reviewing other doctors' reports who may have examined
```

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

```
They were -- for the situation in the jail and
    the exam I was asked to do, they were acceptable and
    traditional, yes.
              What were those tests?
              The mental status checklist by
    psychological -- well, they call it PAR. It's a testing
    manufacturing company that is widely used by
    psychologists.
              The mental status checklist also used by them,
    both generated from -- both generated by the examiner
10
11
    and the patient and then --
              THE COURT: I'm sorry, Dr. Doke. It sounds to
12
13
    me like you are talking about the same checklist. Are
    we still on the mental status checklist, or are there
14
    two different checklists?
15
              THE WITNESS: Two different.
16
              THE COURT: Could you clarify that, Mr. Nolan?
17
    BY MR. NOLAN:
18
              Yes. If you could, just briefly give us the
19
    generic name of the tests that you performed.
20
              The mental status checklist was one, and then
21
22
     the quick view was another one.
              THE COURT: Quick view?
23
24
    BY MR. NOLAN:
25
        ο.
              Quick view?
```

Beck Depression Inventory.

A. Beck, B-e-c-k, Depression Inventory II, which is the second edition.

Q. How many years of experience have you had in doing evaluations?

A. 39.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. And do you believe that these tests are reliable that you used?

A. Absolutely.

Q. And the results of these tests, do you believe that they are reliable?

A. Yes.

Q. And are there ways in which these tests are designed so that you can make that determination?

A. Yes

Q. And do you believe that you interviewed
Mr. Hinkson for a sufficient number of hours to offer an opinion as to his psychological traits and make a diagnosis?

A. Yes.

Q. And did you talk to his lawyer and get certain facts from his lawyer, Mr. Hoyt?

A. Yes.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

BY MR. NOLAN:

Q. Let me ask you whether or not these are questions you feel you can answer as a psychologist and an expert to assist the trier of fact.

As a hypothetical, based upon your psychological evaluation of David Hinkson, do you have an opinion as to whether David Hinkson would be more or less likely than a person without his psychological make-up to truly threaten someone or actually intend to solicit the murder of someone? That's one way of asking the question.

Is that something that you feel you can answer, based upon your experience?

A. Would you repeat the question, please?

Q. All right. Let me try it -- let me try a different question because I'm trying to find the right one.

Are there aspects of Mr. Hinkson's character that have been determined by you through your psychological evaluation and assessment that might be considered by a jury as making him more likely to truly solicit the nurder of someone?

A. No

Q. I mean, is that a question that you think you can assist the jury in determining? Q. Were there any experimental techniques used in your evaluations?

A. No

5

10

11 12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

2

5

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

first?

2216

Q. Did you deviate from any normal practices that you would use?

A. No.

Q. Based upon your evaluation and your assessment and your work, were you able to make a diagnosis?

A. Yes

Q. Do you have confidence in the diagnosis that you made?

A. Ye

Q. Are those diagnoses as to personality traits that you believe exist as to Mr. Hinkson?

A. Yes

MR. NOLAN: Now, in regards to your -- I want to give the court some idea of the question that I might try to ask.

THE COURT: I would appreciate that.

MR. NCIAN: All right. Again, I'm taking into account that the Government objected to the general nature of the previous questions; and I don't disagree with them, so I have tried to formulate them.

THE COURT: Chay.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2217

A. Yes

Q. If so, what are those? And what are your reasons? That would be one of the questions.

Another possible question is --

THE COURT: Let's not do it in a compound fashion. Let's him explain the basis.

MR. NOLAN: I was --

THE COURT: You want to lay out the questions

MR. NCLAN: I'm trying to lay cut two or three questions so that, if we all agree that someone has a better one, we will see what he says on it.

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, do it any way you want.

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, the Government --

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Taxay.

MR. TAXAY: The Government objects to the procedure. It almost suggests that we have this rolling set of theories as to what he might be able to testify to. I mean, Dr. Doke has an opinion or he doesn't have an opinion. That's what we are here to hear.

THE COURT: Maybe we should do it the more traditional way, Mr. Nolan.

Doctor, do you have an opinion? What is that opinion? And let me hear what he has to say because you are leading him an awful lot. I will not let you do

that in front of the jury.

1

2

3

7

A

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. NOLAN: Okay. What I'm --

THE COURT: I realize you are asking him hypothetically.

MR. NCLAN: What I'm trying to do is to formulate the kind of question that would be relevant based upon what he would say and so we will ask --

THE COURT: Let me hear what his diagnosis or cpinion is.

MR. NOLAN: That's fine.

THE COURT: Let's go from there.

BY MR. NOLAN:

If you can, tell the judge what your diagnosis ٥. is and how that diagnosis and your opinion is relevant to the issues in this case.

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, I mean, the relevance to the issues in this case is not something for this witness to determine.

THE COURT: Well, as I understand Mr. Nolan's question, he would like Dr. Doke to give us his opinion with regard to Mr. Hinkson's personality traits.

MR. TAXAY: Right. We would love to hear that.

THE COURT: As they relate to Mr. Hinkson's ability to form the intent to solicit the murder of

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

In addition, I did put in my report a very descriptive, you know, accounting of that, where it came from, and I quoted Millon who is a nationally- and internationally-recognized expert.

THE COURT: It would help the court if you could explain what it is that causes you to conclude that he has a paranoid personality disorder.

THE WITNESS: Okay. The testing and my mental status interview, all of the records I reviewed, and all of the other standard elements that I used end up with my psychological evaluation.

THE COURT: All right. BY MR. NOLAN:

What does that mean, Doctor? ٥. THE COURT: That's kind of general. BY MR. NOLAN:

Doctor, if you might do me a favor, pretend you are just talking to the Judge. Tell the Judge, without going through all of the detail -- tell him what this means, as far as your assessment of David Hinkson.

Okay. One of the things we evaluate, Your Honor, is their overall belief system, their thoughts, how they perceive the world, and whether those things are more or less longstanding, pervasive traits or those sameane?

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NOLAN: That's right.

THE COURT: I would like to know what he's going to say. There is no jury here. You are not being hurt yet.

2219

I haven't ruled on whether or not he is going to be allowed to do this. I would like to know what he's going to say. I mean, that's the whole purpose of this hearing.

MR. TAXAY: Agreed.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, with that clarification, can you help the court?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

On Axis I, I put: Rule out delusional disorder. And that was based upon not only my interview but the history and all of the records I read and the testing. I also put, under Axis I, post-traumatic stress order, base.

THE COURT: Doctor, I read your report. If you were asked in front of the jury, "Do you have an opinion as to his personality traits and, if so, what would that opinion be?" --

THE WITNESS: My opinion on his personality traits is that he is in that spectrum of paramoid personality disorder. That's the closest, probably most

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

are situational types of things, whether or not they are consistent in the personality structure over a long period of time and whether or not they meet some of the criteria in the literature and so on.

So I was impressed with the nature of his belief system, the way he perceived reality, the way he perceived things that were going on.

Based upon a standard, for example, when most people believe that way -- in order to have a personality diagnosis -- you do have to deviate some from the norm.

THE COURT: In the tests that you administered, is there some kind of a test score that would help you conclude that he deviates from the norm?

THE WITNESS: There is -- we didn't use the MMPI-II or the Millon. Because of the nature of the interview and so on. I didn't necessarily feel that that was necessary.

Those tests are adjuncts and those are helpful as collateral information. Most of the research shows that clinicians, licensed psychologists, people that diagnose on a regular basis are better, overall, at diagnosising than the personality inventory.

They are not diagnostic tools. They are helpful in clarifying certain deviations within the

2220

reliable.

1

2

8 10

11 12 13

14

15 16 17

18

24

person on certain personality traits.

THE COURT: So you are relying more upon your -- what was it -- 39 years of experience in evaluating individuals who possess paramoid personality characteristics?

THE WITNESS: I relied more on that and my interview and the records than I did any psychometric -THE COURT: Any objective test score?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, go ahead.
BY MR. NOLAN:

Q. Thank you. In regards to someone with that type of personality characteristic, how is that relevant -- if it is, how is that relevant to whether or not they may be more likely or less likely to carry out verbal threats?

A. I don't see it that way when I interview someone.

THE COURT: See what that way?

THE WITNESS: I don't see their personality trait or that diagnosis as necessarily relevant to whether or not they would have done something. I see it more, as a clinician, as a diagnostic category with which we can treat someone.

We can understand someone better; and if there

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: But that doesn't really help me with the question about whether or not a person diagnosed in that fashion would or would not be inclined to solicit harm from the objects of these beliefs or harm to the -- can you help us with that?

THE WITNESS: I think it would be less likely that they would, in my opinion. I base it, also, on what Millon says because, if they do disintegrate more, it would be the eccentric type.

His demeanor over the years, his behavior -lack of aggression, lack of assault, battery, things
like that -- as far as we know, has been vocal. They
lave been verbal. They have been protests, murches,
radio shows, very outspoken, very verbal-type things.

That fits into this type. I just used this Millon to bolster that up, and I do think it would be less likely for him to do anything but be litigious.

THE COURT: Less likely for him to do it himself? Do you understand he is not charged in this case with actually doing it himself? He is charged with soliciting or inducing or offering money or other things of value to someone else to do it for him.

Is that -- does that make a difference, in your opinion?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. I think he

are other questions related to that personality, we would certainly consider that personality.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, I think, if I understood

Mr. Nolan's question and your answer -- I'm a little

confused by your answer. What we are trying to get at,

I think, is propensity.

Would an individual with Mr. Hinkson's diagnosis of paramoid personality disorder be the type of a person who would be prone to solicit acts of violence from other people, or would be prone to carry out acts of violence? Can you help us there?

THE WITNESS: I can do that. On page eight, I believe, I quoted Millon. And at the bottom of the page, we talk about the stages of this personality diagnosis quoted out of Millon. And if I may, on page nine --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Quote, "During the second stage, all personality functions disintegrate. According to Schneider's theory, they can split into either the combative type or the eccentric type.

The combative can be actively quarrelsome about their fallacious beliefs, complaining bitterly about injustices done to them, often seeking retribution and are frequently litigious.\*

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

would be more litigious. I think he would use the law. I think he would use it, like he did in Nevada when he had the protests against the commissioners and got one fired because of some injuntices.

THE COURT: Because of the fact that you would expect, based upon this disorder, that he would not do such a thing, you would not expect him to ask someone else to do it for him? Is that what you are saying?

THE WINTESS: Right. If he asked anybody to do anything, it would be through legal issues, based on, again, my -- based on my opinion as a psychologist, on his history, on the nature of all of my evaluations and him responses, I believe he would use legal means to do that, in my opinion.

THE COURT: Ckey. All right. Go ahead, Mr. Nolan.

MR. NOLAN: That's, basically, it. I would like -- I would like to just form the question so we don't violate any of the rules.

THE COURT: Please, do.

21 BY MR. NOLAN:

Q. But that's basically -- I take it, you feel that -- let me ask you this: Do you feel that this kind of diagnosis of paranola and --

THE COURT: Paramoid personality?

em comm. Promotel normanality

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2

3

5

ĸ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. NOLAN:

Q. -- paramoid personality and the second axiswas -- I can't remember.

A. That was Axis II.

Q. Axis I was paranoia?

A. Post-traumatic stress disorder, rule out delusional disorder.

O. Delusional disorder?

A. Yes.

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q. That a jury may be more likely to believe that he would be inclined to use unlawful means and misuse the personality characteristics that they might see, not knowing that the psychological community actually might draw a different conclusion?

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, do you want him to -do you want him to testify as to how an average juror
would misperceive somebody who suffers from paranoid
personality disorder?

MR. NOLAN: No. What I think I want to do is establish the need for the psychologist because of the fear of the jury misinterpreting the behavior and drawing a conclusion that would be contrary to the psychological community's conclusion.

THE COURT: Well, I mean the jury choicesly -- I don't think you quarrel with this under Rule 704(b).

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2228

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. NCLAN: I wasn't going to necessarily ask it in front of the jury.

THE COURT: That one -- I will give you a written ruling on all of this. That one is more troublesome to me, as I understand the case law.

MR. NCIAN: Because you are, basically, telling the jury they don't know what they are talking about?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. NCLAN: I'm saying that I think one of the criteria for admission has to be: Does the jury need some assistance, you know, or can the jury determine it on their own?

THE COURT: Let me ask Dr. Doke: When you say, on Axis I, that you are ruling out delusional disorder, can you tell me what you mean by that? Are you saying he is not delusional, in your opinion?

THE WITNESS: We are ruling out a specific diagnosis of delusional disorder. We are pretty sure, and there is a strong reason to rule that out. We want to be more sure.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. NCLAN: May I follow up?
THE COURT: Absolutely.

The jury has to make the ultimate determination as to whether Mr. Hinkson did, with intent, make solicitations and engage in true threats.

MR. NOLAN: Right.

THE COURT: So I'm not sure what question you are asking him here that wouldn't violate 704(b) on this issue.

MR. NCLAN: I don't think I want to ask him that in front of the jury. I am asking him that because it's kind of like if no one knows about Tourette syndrome.

I mean, a lot of people would interpret the swearing as being the person swearing; and you'd need an expert to come in and say, "No, it's a disease."

All I am saying is that, when you are dealing with somebody that is vocal and you are pushing this issue, they are more likely -- a jury may be more likely to assume that they are more likely to commit the crime because of that characteristic.

Therefore, the need for the jury to be informed that there are personality characteristics and diagnoses that they should be aware of, that there are certain characteristics they may not be aware of about those people. That was the only reason I was asking that question.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2229

2227

BY MR. NOLAN:

Q. This is something the medical -- it's like every time I've talked to them. They didn't understand our concern from a legal point of view.

If I understand it correctly, it means you are pretty sure he is delusional; and what has to happen is you have to rule it out by all sorts of further tests and ecominations and things like that.

Like, you are not going to diagnose it yet but, boy, it's awfully close? Am I fair in that assessment of what it is?

A. Yes, yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Nolan. That was very helpful. Then the other question, Dr. Doke, is: Under the Axis I diagnostic impression, you indicate post-traumatic stress disorder.

Were you able to identify, in your taking of the history of the patient, what would have precipitated -- what cause would have precipitated the PISD?

THE WITNESS: Ckey. As we know it in his case, it was the being taken away from his work, some saboutage. My understanding is there were some things that happened at his business by coworkers that had betrayed him and that he was uprooted.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1

report; correct?

PTSD, generally, is a situation that most people don't experience. In addition, it has an extreme effect on that person. It may not affect all persons

Just like War veterans, Vietnam Veterans, there is a certain percent that experience the exact same situations that have severe PISD and a percent that don't.

THE COURT: So the transatic event here with this patient would be the upheaval in his business life when he perceived that others were attempting to dispossess him of everything that he had built?

THE WITNESS: I think there were other factors, Your Honor. That was one. The other one was his description of his arrest and some of the things that happened that he considered to be very abusive.

Again, it's his perception, also, that they were so far cut of the norm and so unlike anything he had experienced before that I do believe the symptoms that I saw not only with my own evaluation but with the testing were that he was suffering.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nolan, anything further?

BY MR. NOLAN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

One last question. You reviewed Dr. Engle's

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

CROSS EXAMINATION

2232

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. Dr. Doke, in your 39 years of experience, have you made other diagnoses of people with PFD?

Yes, I have.

And have you tracked their later history to see if they became violent or were non-violent?

Some I worked with over a long period of time.

Did you track fifty percent of the people?

Probably not.

So you don't -- you just don't know the long-term history of these people after your diagnosis with PPD: correct?

On my particular diagnosis of the people that I experienced? Was that your question?

Q.

Actually, no. I didn't track all of them over a long period of time. I worked in the prison for quite a while. I worked at the county jail for fourteen years. I worked in the forensics unit. I ran the forensics unit.

I understand. My very specific question -you have answered it. Thanks. In large measure, your conclusion that people with PFD are more violent or have a tendency to be less violent, there is some speculation

Yes. A. And did he also come to a diagnosis? 3 A. And was that similar to yours, as far as the 5 O. 6 Axes? 7 Yes, yes. A. MR. NOLAN: That's all I have. Thank you. 8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Taxay? 9 MR. TAXAY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 10 MR. NCLAN: By the way, Judge, I think I have 11 plenty of time. The plane doesn't leave until 6:30 but, 12 you know, it was just --13 THE COURT: I know you have got a lot going 14 15 MR. NOLAN: I wanted you to know that, looking 16 at the clock, I have plenty of time. 17 THE COURT: Good. I know you are concerned 18 about your mother, and you have my empathy. I hope it 19 all works out for your family. 20 MR. NOLAN: I appreciate it. 21 22 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Taxay. 23 24 25

## ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2233

in there; isn't that right? 1

2

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes. There always is. A.

I mean, a substantial amount -- because the basis for your opinion is your own patient population? You have testified that you didn't track, down the line, at least fifty percent of your patients; is that right? MR. NOLAN: I object to that question, in that

it's compound.

THE COURT: It is compound. Why don't you break it up, comsel? Sustained.

BY MR. TAXAY: 11

> The first question -- the first question is: Your conclusion that people with PFD are less likely to be violent involves some speculation on your part; right?

A.

And, indeed, the reason why it's speculative is that you haven't tracked the history of your own patients who have had PFD, isn't that right?

A.

Well, you don't know whether or not they were violent; isn't that right? The fifty percent that you didn't track?

A.

And because of that phenomenon that most ο.

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2236

Well, it has to do with legal matters, testifying in court, litigation, court proceedings, psychological work that is related to the justice

And that's, on some level, a subspecialty of psychology; right?

It can be, yes. A.

Chrrect.

Yes. sir.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Δ.

0.

A.

And the big issue, isn't it, is reliability? When you are testifying in court on these important subjects, forensic psychologists want to employ the most

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Q. You didn't use it? 2 A. No. There is another one called the -- another tool, similar tool, called the Violence Risk Appraisal 5 Guide. You have heard of that? 6 A. th-huh. 7 THE COURT: You have to say "yes" or "no," Dr. Doke. B 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. BY MR. TAXAY: 10 11 That, too, is another test, inventory, that forensic psychologists use to assess the risk of 12 13 violence in patients; isn't that right? 14 A. Yes. And you didn't run that test either, did you? 15 o.

A. In fact, you didn't use any of these tools to assess risk of violence; ign't that right? A. That's correct. Q. I mean, you are basing this on two things, as I understand it -- correct me if I'm wrong -- your subjective evaluation of Mr. Hinkson, that's one; correct? A.

And, two, your understanding of his background Q.

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1 and history; correct? 2 A. Partly, yes. 3

Okay. Are there other factors that play a major role in your opinion that Mr. Hinkson is less likely to be violent?

Other than those I testified to, the training that we have often is when you are asked a question of violence and a prediction, on a somewhat informal level, the best predicter is past history; and you get the best history you can, police records if you can, and so on.

very specific question here.

Your opinion that Mr. Hinkson is less likely to be violent is based on, as I understand it, two things: Your subjective evaluation of Mr. Hinkson, not having done any of these specific tests, and his past history; correct?

A. Yes.

Did anything else form the basis of that ο. opinion?

My experience. A.

Q. So your subjective evaluation, your experience, and your past history.

Now, you testified earlier that you didn't track the history of at least half of your patients. So

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

CNR COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2235

For example, you have heard of the HCR-20, Assessing Risk for Violence?

forensic psychologists use to assess the risk of

I don't use that one. A.

There are some.

violence: isn't that correct?

But you have heard of it? 0.

A.

A.

0.

This is one of those tools that forensic ο. psychologists use to assess the risk of violence in patients; isn't that right?

A. Some do, yes.

2237

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, I am just asking a

is there other experience that you are referring to here?

2238

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

2240

A. Well, over the years, many, many, many -having worked with many violent patients, we did a study
at the Corrections Department. When I worked at the
prison, we had almost 600 and some inmates and their
histories of violence.

I came up with a partial checklist to try to predict whether or not they might re-offend and some things like that. I just pulled from lots of experience working with people of different diagnoses and some without a diagnosis.

- Q. In terms of this survey that you did, was that a research survey?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Did you publish a paper?
- 17 A. Excuse me?
- 18 Q. Did you publish a paper?
- 19 A. N

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

B

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 20 Q. Was it peer reviewed?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. By whom?
- 23 A. The people I worked with and --
- Q. The other people involved in this study?
  - A. Yes, some of the people involved with the

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

me ask a few questions.

Dr. Doke, was this a study that was done while you worked for the Idaho Department of Connections?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Was it done at the Idaho State Penitentiary?

THE WITNESS: Yes, yes.

THE COURT: What year was the study done?

THE WITNESS: I think it was '86, '87.

THE COURT: Were you a staff paychologist at the prison at that time?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: The people that you said reviewed this were other psychologists working for the Department of Corrections?

THE WITNESS: Yes. And then, after that, after giving a presentation to other licensed psychologists in the community, they were using it.

THE COURT: Here in Boise?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Mostly, yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead, counsel.

BY MR. TAXAY:

- Q. This study is not published; correct?
- A. Right.
- Q. What was the error rate?

study and some psychologists that asked for it after I gave a presentation that were using it.

I got a little feedback that it was helpful. It wasn't specifically to measure recidivism for violence. It was different things, but that was one of the issues.

- Q. Now I'm confused. This survey on which you are relying -- what was the purpose of it?
- A. The purpose of the survey was to assess whether or not we would be able to get a risk scale or a probability scale for repeat sex offenders.
  - Q. So this concerns sex offenders?
- A. Yes. Part of that was a propensity to be violent. We did a lot of research on histories on how they measure violence and whether or not that was a part of the scale.
- Q. So just so I understand this survey, it was of 600 immtes to determine the propensity for violence by sex offenders?
- A. That was part of the rating scale. It was an issue as to whether or not they might be violent, act out in a violent way.
- Q. What was the -- I spologize. I'm having trouble understanding this survey. Could you just --

THE COURT: The court is confused, too. Let

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

A. We didn't do a lot of statistical -- we didn't follow up with it a lot over the years. It was just done as a survey to see if -- back in those days, to see if we could come up with measures that were a little more comprehensive than those that were in the literature.

- Q. You don't have any idea what the error rate is? Is that fair to say?
  - A. We didn't do an error rate.
  - Q. Is it utilized currently, this study?
- A. What?
  - Q. Is this study utilized currently by anybody?
- A. I'm not sure. I would imagine the scale is used by some people. I know one lady from Texas, back in the '80s, wrote to me and said she had been using it and found it to be very helpful.

It wasn't -- it's not a scientific measure, necessarily. It's a tool to narrow some of the factors that might be involved in not only treating these people but trying to reduce the rates of recidivism, plus trying to focus on what past record may contribute to their risk.

- Q. Would you explain error rate for the court?
- A. You know, I have been out of the actual experimental psychology for a while but it's -- one of

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

the ways of looking at it is, over time, what error you might have, like a probability, or --How about this --

2242

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

/ 22

23

24

25

- -- how likely it is that a person with a certain score would have the same score or the probability that a person with a score on a test might have characteristics of other people that have that score. That's, basically, what we do.
- Is it fair to call error rate, basically, the extent -- the percent -- the extent to which -- the extent to -- the extent of --

THE COURT: Why don't you start over, counsel? BY MR. TAXAY:

- Let me start over. Is it fair to say that error rate would be the percentage of incorrect predictions?
- Not always. It could be false positives and false negatives, both, and a percent with which -- there are statistical reliability measures.

There are statistical measures that are scientific and very esoteric that they use to determine, if you will, error rate, over time what might happen, the probability that you might be making an error.

They did it with -- pharmaceutical companies do it, well and not well; and psychologists try to do

ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: All right. And of the 600, how many of them tested for a propensity for violence in connection with their section --

THE WITNESS: Very few. Excuse me, Your Honor. I guess it's considered a violent crime.

THE COURT: Sex offender?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: In the federal system, it is.

BY MR. TAXAY:

- Dr. Doke, this checklist that you are mentioning, you didn't use it? You didn't apply it to Mr. Hinkson's case; right?
  - No.
  - You didn't utilize it here? Q.
  - No.
- So you said earlier -- I'm trying to track the bases for your opinion. You said your subjective evaluation of Mr. Hinkson's past history, your experience -- and when you explained your experience, you described this checklist?

You didn't use this check list to evaluate whether or not Mr. Hinkson is more or less likely to tend toward a violent solution?

I didn't use that specific checklist. I used my experience in developing it, which is the question

it, trying to be a science as much as possible, so that some of the measures they use, they believe, over time, are not only valid and measure what they say they are going to but are reliable over time. There is lots of different kinds of reliability.

- These measures determine reliability of the survey and the checklist and its usefulness; correct?
- Kind of what you can predict. You are talking about error rate. I think that's probably what you are talking about more than anything.
- None of those, as you described them, scientific statistical measures have been applied to determine the reliability of your survey and your checklist; right?
- On the sex offender checklist, we did some measures, some statistical measures; but it wasn't reviewed over time or replicated, no. It wasn't followed over a period of time to see if -- right.
  - We will move on.

THE COURT: Let me ask one follow-up question.

Dr. Doke, with regard to the 600 some sex offenders, how many of those 600 would have been diagnosed with paranoid personality disorder?

THE WITNESS: Very few. Most of them were not clinically diagnosed.

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

you asked me, what experience I drew upon, and how do I arrive at that decision.

Mr. Hinkson's past history, let's talk about that. The total sum of your knowledge of his past history is based upon Mr. Hinkson's representations and coursel's representations; isn't that right?

Partly. A.

You did an independent factual investigation? Q.

No. A.

THE COURT: So what else do you have besides what the patient and his lawyer told you?

THE WITNESS: I relied -- I saw some letters that had been written by family members. I was assured, as I said in my psychological, that he did not have a criminal history or a battery history or that he'd ever been arrested for a crime or accused of one.

BY MR. TAXAY:

- Q. These are the things that Mr. Hinkson's lawyer and Mr. Hinkson told you?
- Those, plus the documents I had that were given to me by the attorney, yes.
- o. You don't know whether any of those things are true, whether those statements are true or not true; right?
  - I just relied on the expertise and the A.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

professionalism of the attorneys.

6

1

7

9 10 11

12 13 14

19 20

25

3

10 11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20 21

22 23

24 25

Because you don't know whether it is true or not true, isn't it the case that the standard in forensic psychology is not to engage in fact-finding?

I wouldn't say that's really true. If I can Δ. answer that question based upon my opinion --

Isn't it the standard in forensic psychology, also, not to rely on facts as stated by defense counsel?

You do -- you use whatever you have and you come up with an opinion based upon your best judgment within the scope of your practice and within the scope of what you're asked to do.

I'm asking about the standard.

THE COURT: Let me ask: Dr. Doke, if you are concerned, with regard to your Axis diagnosis, that the patient may suffer from a delusional disorder, would that influence how much you rely upon the veracity of what the patient tells you?

THE WITNESS: It would help me question the veracity, and I think I mentioned that in my report.

THE COURT: So you would question the veracity of patients that you might expect to be delusional?

THE WITNESS: I always question the veracity of a patient.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Mr. Taxay, go ahead.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Actually, Dr. Engle did a personality inventory. He used the Millon Inventory. He was not asked to assess risk of violence, so he didn't use an inventory there.

I am not aware that he used the Millon. I do not have a copy of it. To this minute, I was not aware he conducted a Millon.

I apologize. I misspoke. Dr. Engle did not Q. use the Millon test because he was not evaluating Mr. Hinkson's personality. He was looking at one very specific question, competency; and it was in that area that he applied a test.

And I was looking in a much more general and clinical overview of this person.

You chose not to run any tests?

A. I did run tests.

Not any tests on personality?

Deactly. And I explained that earlier. A.

And no tests on risk of violence, risk assessment?

That's right. Correct. That's correct. THE COURT: Thank you, Dr. Doke. MR. NCLAN: May I just interrupt? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NCIAN: I discovered yesterday that there

BY MR. TAXAY:

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2248

In terms of the standard that forensic psychologists employ, that's the specific question that I'm asking right here.

Do you disagree that the standard that forensic psychologists employ is not to accept as fact statements by counsel and the defendant regarding the defendant's conduct?

I didn't -- I wouldn't agree with that 100 percent. If I may --

Do you agree with it somewhat? 0.

If it's a standard, you know, that you got A. from a normal on forensic psychologists, like a subset of forensic psychologists that call themselves "forensic psychologists and what qualifies them to be forensic psychologists, they do have -- there is a division, I believe, with the APA, of forensic psychologists; and I believe that they have outlined and documented certain standards.

Some of those are used, but professional judgment is the most important thing. Both Dr. Engle and myself chose not to use scales that would predict violence, personality inventories, or other standardized tests for the purposes of the evaluations we were asked to do.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

could be tests that would be helpful; but, because of the lateness, however we would submit that -- if counsel wanted to have those tests administered over the weekend, we would be happy to make that available. In

THE COURT: That was the court's concern. If you recall, the court was a little perturbed at the beginning of the trial.

MR. NOLAN: For good reason.

other words, my concern was notice requirements.

THE COURT: I'm not haranging anybody. I'm saying the problem that late notice of this nature creates is this problem; and that is that, as I understand it, our two doctors were asked to evaluate Mr. Hinkson with regard to a different issue.

And now you want them to testify to something different, and there are other tests that they might have done had they understood that that's what you wanted them to do.

MR. NOLAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: The question is whether there is enough time to do it between now and when we would need them to testify next week. I will certainly hear from counsel.

> I appreciate your offer, Mr. Nolan. MR. NCLAN: I'm saying I am offering it. I

concern on the first day of the trial -- or on Friday, I guess it was, the 7th of January, when we addressed this issue at some length.

Go ahead, Mr. Taxay.

MR. TAXAY: The Government's position is it's too late.

THE COURT: You have made that abundantly clear. I have that in mind.

Go ahead.

MR. HOYT: I would be happy to talk further on that subject.

THE COURT: No, you don't need to argue further on that matter.

BY MR. TAXAY:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q. Moving to a slightly different subject now, Dr. Doke, looking at your report on page ten, you say that -- from page ten to eleven: "There is no evidence that local persons who aggressively pursue their beliefs, such as on talk shows, could resort to violence."

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

is nothing you can cite? No article? No study?

There are some studies. Obviously, there are thousands, hundreds of thousands of them out there. When I wrote that statement, I knew of no reason to believe that we could say that people that make these statements, who are very verbal and so on, are going to resort to violence just because they --

MR. TAXAY: The Government objects to this. It's non-responsive. I'm trying to get the --

THE COURT: You have got the court reporter confused. She is trying to get one of you to complete a sentence.

MR. TAXAY: I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's back it up.

THE WITNESS: Why don't --

THE COURT: I will read the question.

"Other than your own personal experience, there is nothing you can cite? No article? No study?"

And Dr. Doke started to answer, "There are some studies. Obviously, there are thousands, hundreds of thousands of them out there. When I wrote that statement, I knew of no reason to believe that we could say that people that make those statements, who are very verbal and so on, are going to resort to violence just because they -- "

There are no studies that support that statement: correct?

And I qualified that, such as people that are on talk shows that make very inflammatory statements, like the Jay Leno Show and even the presidential debate.

There are no studies that support that statement in your report; correct?

That was my statement.

I'm saying --٥.

No evidence of mine, no evidence that I felt we had or I had in my report to suggest that. I didn't say there was never -- there was no studies or no -- I had no evidence to suggest, and I did not know of any evidence that would suggest that vocal persons who aggressively pursue their beliefs, such as on talk shows, could resort to violence. That's what I meant.

This is just your personal opinion; right, that there is no evidence? It's just your personal coinion?

I didn't know of any when I wrote that A. statement.

ο. Okay. There is nothing you can cite that would support that statement?

A. Just --

Other than your own personal experience, there Q.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Dr. Doke, you didn't finish your statement. Just because they what?

THE WITNESS: Just because they are very vocal and aggressively pursue their beliefs, such as people on talk shows or, you know, Jay Leno or the debates where people say a lot of things and are very aggressive about it, very verbal, it doesn't mean they are going to resort to violence. That's what I meant.

BY MR. TAXAY:

I would like to restate the same question. I think it's pretty much a "yes" or "no" answer. There is no study, no scientific study, no article that you can cite in support of that statement in your report; isn't this right? Yes or no?

T don't know.

THE COURT: You know of none? THE WITNESS: I don't know.

THE COURT: You can't name one?

THE WITNESS: I can't name one that I would name my -- just, again, this was based on my belief of my interview and my experience and what I have been taught and, probably, imperical evidence.

I guess we would have to have a study of everybody on a talk show and everybody on the Tonight Show and so on and everybody in a debate.

2250

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2252

23

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

2

3

5

ĸ

7

В

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2256

2

3 4 5

9

10 11

12 13 14

15 16

17 18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

1

6 7 R

11 12

13 14 15

17

19

22 23

Especially in politics, and attorneys, they make a lot of statements that are very aggressive that don't necessarily -- what I said was: Because somebody is verbal and aggressively pursues their beliefs does not mean they are going to resort to violence. And I think probably most psychologists would back that up.

MR. TAXAY: I will move on.

THE COURT: I think we have got as much as we are going to get out of Dr. Doke on that question. BY MR. TAXAY:

"There is no evidence that vocal persons who aggressively purpue their beliefs could resort to violence?"

What about people who bomb abortions clinics? Isn't that inconsistent with this statement?

- What's the question?
- In this statement here, you said, "There is no evidence that vocal persons who appressively pursue their beliefs could resort to violence."

What about people who bomb abortion clinics? That is well-known in the public record.

- What's the question, though?
- Is that inconsistent with your statement? You say there is no evidence. Would you consider people who bomb abortion clinics to be people who vocally express

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

My statement was that literature on personality characteristics -- and I probably should have put, "See page such and such, Millon" -- and dynamics support what I say.

All I was saying is that I have literature to support my impression, my opinion, about his patterns of behavior to be litigious.

So the Millon literature, in addition to my clinical findings, his past history, as well as I knew it and had -- the information I had, you know -- I can testify under oath that I didn't have -- those things support that he would probably be litigious.

- Okay. So that I'm clear, the Millon -- the portion in your report that cites Millon, that doesn't include the reference to people with PFD being less likely to be violent; correct?
  - What was that statement, again? Excuse me.
- What I'm trying to figure out is where in Millon does it say that people with this personality disorder are less likely to be violent?

You say that -- you quote a portion of Millon in your report, but nowhere in that quote do I see any reference to propensity for violence.

I will quote it again from page nine. "According to Schmeider's theory, they can split into their point of view and then resort to violence?

When I made that statement, it was a general statement. There is always -- I suppose there may be exceptions.

Just like when you were talking about error rate, there is always a probability that there is an error of prediction, just like with pharmaceutical companies who put medicine out in the public and there are people that die.

- When you say there is no evidence, that's a mistake in your report?
- It depends on what evidence -- I had no evidence. I thought I clarified that.
- Ckay. The next sentence is: "The literature on personality characteristics and dynamics support Mr. Hirkson's patterns of behavior to be litigious rather than violent."

You don't cite anything, no literature here. What literature are you talking about?

- I did cite the literature on Millon, as I testified to earlier today; and I quoted that literature.
- Where in that literature that you just quoted does it say that people with PFD are less likely to be violent?

#### ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2257

either the combative type or the eccentric type. The contative can be actively quarrelsome about their fallacious beliefs, complaining bitterly about injustices done to

them, often seeking retribution and are frequently litigious."

I believe that supported my statement that Mr. Hinkson, in my opinion as a psychologist, with my interview and all of the information I had, would probably be litigious. That's all I said.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, I think the question he is asking you -- and the court is having the same problem.

I read what you wrote on page nine, quoting Schneider; but it doesn't show any link between people who have a litigious behavior and violence. There isn't anything about violence there.

THE WITNESS: Exactly. That's my point. There is no support that -- why mention violence if there is nothing to indicate violence?

THE COURT: Let me ask the question a different way. Are you suggesting that, because Schneider doesn't link litigiousness to violence, that, therefore, Schneider concludes that there is no such link?

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- But there is literature out there that links paramoid personalities with increased risk for violence; ign't that right?
- I reviewed some literature -- I believe it was on adolescents -- if that's the literature you are referring to. There is a great deal of literature. There are --
- And that literature says, if you have paranoid o. personality, you are more likely to be violent; correct?
- I don't know of any literature that is accepted to be entirely 100 percent reliable or valid. It applies to --
- I'm asking what the literature -- the literature that you are aware of, what does it say with respect to the link?
- Well. I would have to review the literature. MR. NOLAN: I would ask that the court instruct the parties --

THE COURT: Mr. Taxay, you have to slow down and let the witness answer the question. You are talking over one another, and you are not allowing Dr. Doke to finish his answer before you are asking him

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

I do. I'm happy to show it to Dr. Doke in a moment. Right now, I'm interested in the literature

I'm not citing any literature. There was some literature faxed to me yesterday on some studies -- I think they were on adolescents -- and there were some statements made.

We don't necessarily accept that as absolutely true, that it 100 percent applies to everybody, is reliably generalized to the whole population and everybody with a paramoid personality. There is a great deal of error of measurement.

I would be glad to review that and give you an interpretation. We could go to other literature that has other studies that have probably replicated those studies. There are thousands of them out there.

If you take one study -- some were done on adolescents -- and try to apply it to this case, you know, we are in a wide margin of error there.

MR. NCLAN: May I assist? May I try to assist counsel and the court?

THE COURT: That would help us all.

MR. NOLAN: There was an article that was attached to a pleading by the Government that we gave to another question.

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TAXAY: I appreciate that, Your Honor; and I apologize. I'm trying to move this along because we are getting a lot of non-responses.

THE COURT: I agree. But your job is to ask him questions to try and clarify it. I will do my best to hold him to the question.

MR. TAXAY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The problem Mr. Nolan is talking about is a different problem. Do you understand the problem, Mr. Taxay?

MR. TAXAY: No, I don't. Maybe I missed it. THE COURT: You are not allowing the witness the time to finish his answer before you start your question. All right. So just take a deep breath, let Dr. Doke finish, and you can ask your next question.

MR. TAXAY: I was trying to make -- that's dkay.

THE COURT: We are not that rushed.

MR. TAXAY: All right.

THE WITNESS: May I ask if he has an exhibit? I'm trying to find mine. It might speed things up if I can see what literature he is referring to.

THE COURT: Do you have something that --

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2261

2259

the doctor which we believe was the basis of -everybody is drawing conclusions.

If we could just establish, Doctor, did you get an article? Did you see -- is it title such and such?

THE COURT: Is that the article?

MR. TAXAY: No, I'm not there yet. I'm happy to get there in a minute.

MR. NOLAN: If that's not the article -that's what the Doctor thought, and that's the problem.

THE COURT: Let's help out Dr. Doke here. BY MR. TAXAY:

The first thing is -- I guess I would like to follow up right now on something that Dr. Doke just said.

Dr. Doke, you said there are a number of studies out there regarding risk of violence and that it would be very cumbersome to take a look at those and make a judgment as to how that body of scientific literature might apply to Mr. Hinkson; correct?

That was not my evaluation. I'm just, more or less, here to testify on what I did, what I believe on my evaluation.

You can question me about all of the literature in the world; and I can't, under cath, tell

that Dr. Doke was citing.

2

3

- 14 15 16 17
- 18 19 20 21

2262 you, with the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, that that literature definitely is going to apply to what I was asked to do and testify to today. I don't think that's even appropriate.

Maybe I shouldn't say that.

THE COURT: I will decide whether it's appropriate or not.

Go ahead, Mr. Taxay.

BY MR. TAXAY:

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

You understand that there is literature out there on this subject; correct?

I saw some yesterday on this particular subject of personality types and prediction of violence.

Prior to offering your opinion, you made no effort whatsoever to see what the scientific literature said about the propensity for violence in those people that had PPD; correct?

I, again, will testify that the basis of my report and my evaluation was what I have testified to earlier.

THE COURT: Doctor, the question is very simple. He is just asking you whether or not you reviewed any scientific literature about propensity for violence in people with PFD at the time you wrote the report. Did you look at such literature or not?

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2264

- Do you know who Paul Nestor is? 0.
- He wrote for the American Journal of Α. Psychiatry, a Ph.D.
  - Do you know of him by reputation?
- I will turn you to the second page of this article. It's page number is 1974. I would like to you focus in on the section that begins with the header "Personality Disorders."
  - A. Okay.
- The first sentence says: "Longitudinal studies have provided strong evidence of personality disorders representing a significant clinical risk for violence."

What do you understand that to mean?

- That some studies have shown strong evidence of personality disorders representing a significant clinical risk for violence.
- 19 Okay. Is that inconsistent with your opinion that you have offered in this case? 20
  - This study -- is that a yes or no question?
  - Yes. Is this statement inconsistent with the opinion that you have offered in this case?

    - Q. People with PPD are less likely to be violent?

THE WITNESS: No. I used the Millon mostly, yes. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 MR. TAXAY: I'm happy to turn to this article that was attached to the Government's pleading. I have 5 a copy of it here for you that I can give you.

THE COURT: Let's establish whether Dr. Doke has seen it. If so, ask your question. 10

May I approach, Your Honor?

BY MR. TAXAY:

11

12

15

16

17

22

24

25

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

Have you seen the Nestor article of 2002, ο. Dr. Doke?

I don't recall the name of the article. I'm 13 A. 14 trying to find it here.

I have a copy readily available. THE COURT: That might be the quickest way to do it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes, I have seen it. 18 BY MR. TAXAY: 19

When did you first see this? 20 Q.

21 Yesterday.

> Have you had a chance to read it? Q.

23 A. Excuse me?

> Have you had a chance to read it? Q.

I dich't read every line of this, no. A.

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2265

A.

0. And on what basis do you reject those other studies?

Well, this study -- as I said earlier, it was 4 my opinion, based upon my interview, my clinical judgment, the testing I used, the history I had in my interview.

And, also, this study, number two, has to do with an old study, 1978. It was a long time ago. There has been lots of time since then to replicate the studies to show whether they are true or not or, in fact, accepted.

Number three, this is done on adolescents in early adulthood. Mr. Hinkson is not an early adult or an adolescent. It doesn't apply to him.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, doesn't that last sentence that Mr. Taxay referred you to cite to footnotes 7 and 26 of the article?

THE WITNESS: Yes

THE COURT: That's what those numbers in parentheses mean?

THE WITNESS: Those are references to other articles, yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

25 BY MR. TAXAY:

7

8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bacarro in 1998.

Q. And, Dr. Doke, those footnotes -- I'm not sure where you are getting this 1978 stuff.

THE COURT: That's why I asked the question. That's not how I read the footnotes.

BY MR. TAXAY.

Q. If you look at the footnotes -- they are numbers 7 and 26 -- to me, they look like they refer to studies in the year 2000 and --

A. You are right. I made a mistake. This was done at the American Journal of Psychology in 2002 or --

THE COURT: 2000?

THE WITNESS: 2002.

THE COURT: 2002?

MR. TAXAY: The article is 2002. The footnotes reflect the earlier dates. Two thousand -THE CLIET: And 1998?

MR. TAXAY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In that right, Dr. Doke?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, the article, by
Johnson, was 2000, American Journal of Psychiatry, that
was footnote 7; and footnote 26 was Berman and Fallon,

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I erred on that.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

greater likelihood of violence in the community during adolescence and early adulthood."

Ign't it true that paramoid personality disorder is a cluster A disorder?

A. He is both of these, yes. Yes. But --

Q. Just -- PRD is a cluster A?

A. I believe it's a cluster B.

Q. In any event, you read this to say that people with PFD are more likely to be violent?

A. No. That's not a conclusive statement.

Q. Dr. Doke, I think, to clear up a preliminary matter, I have here the DSM-IV; and it shows paramoid personality disorder to be a cluster A personality disorder.

A. Ckay. It says cluster A or cluster B here. I was trying to answer your question.

Q. Would you like to see this DSM-IV?

A. No. That's all right.

THE COURT: So have we resolved that it is cluster A. Doctor?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. So doesn't this say that people with cluster A diagnoses like PFD are -- have a greater likelihood of BY MR. TAXAY:

2

3

5

6

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2268

Q. I would like to focus you in on some language a little bit deeper in that same paragraph. The sentence, second to the last sentence, begins with the words, "In fact . . . " Do you see that sentence, sir?

A. Yes.

Q. I will read it to you, Dr. Doke. "In fact, increased symptoms of DSM-IV cluster A or cluster B personality disorder corresponded to a greater likelihood of violence in the community charing adolescents and adulthood."

PFD, paramoid personality disorder, that's a cluster B personality disorder -- I'm sorry -- a cluster A personality disorder, isn't it?

A. Yes

Q. That's inside -- I mixed up that question.

THE CCURT: You also lost the court. What page are you on, counsel?

MR. TAXAY: I apologize, Your Honor. Page 1974, the section that reads "Personality Disorders," the first paragraph, second-to-the-last sentence.

THE COURT: I'm with you.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. "In fact, increased symptoms of DSM-IV cluster
A or cluster B personality disorder corresponded to a

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

violence in the community during adolescence and early adulthcod?

A. That's what the article says, yes.

Q. Your conclusion is inconsistent with that, as well?

 A. Well, actually, this would support my conclusion.

Q. Would you explain that, please?

A. Because he had no -- as far as I know, in my testimony here today under cath, he had no adolescent or early adulthood violence.

So if he had pervasive cluster A paramoid personality disorder most of his life, he had it in childhood and he had it in adolescence and early adulthood. He wasn't violent, so he is an exception.

So, again, this article does not apply to him. I would never use this, as a clinician, to believe a patient that I had or the many, many, many patients I have had with paranoid personality disorder were going to be violent.

Q. So it boils down to your gut instinct versus a bunch of scientific --

A. It's my experience. It's probably what most psychologists would testify to, if they were honest.

So we are clear, this is about your gut

2267

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

instinct?

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

A. It's more than gut instinct. It's professional opinion. And I believe that would be correborated by most psychologists.

They would not use this article unless they used it to say, gee, you know, I have a paranoid personality here that was never violent; and this article says they should have been violent in adolescence and early adulthood. Gee, that doesn't apply.

That's nothing new in our business. These studies do not always apply to our patients, just because they have a label.

Okav.

A. And I believe -- I'm not sure but I believe even Dr. Engle, in his report, if I may --

THE COURT: We are rurning a little short on time.

MR. TAXAY: I have just a couple more questions.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

BY MR. TAXAY:

You testified this week in another case, isn't that right, Dr. Doke?

Excuse me?

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

And this patient had a history of violence; isn't that right?

He had a history of some misdemeanor altercations, yes.

And, in fact, he was charged with aggravated assault; correct?

That's correct.

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, that's all for now.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Nolan?

MR. NOLAN: No. Your Honor.

THE COURT: Dr. Doke, thank you. You may step down. You are excused for the time being. We may need to recall you next week.

THE WITNESS: Cleay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Taxay, does the Government intend to call Dr. Engle or shall the court hear argument?

MR. TAXAY: We will call Dr. Engle.

THE COURT: Dr. Engle, would you step forward and be sworn?

Thank you, Dr. Doke.

DR. DOKE: You are welcome, Your Honor. Thank

23 you.

MR. NCLAN: May Dr. Doke remain?

THE COURT: Have a nice weekend,

You testified this week in another case; 0. right?

A.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

2

3

7

a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2272

2270

And in that case, your patient, the defendant, o. you diagnosed him with PPD; correct?

You know, I don't know whether --THE COURT: Did you testify in open court about it?

THE WITNESS: It was in a county hearing. THE COURT: So it was in a public hearing in a courthouse?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: You are not violating any patient confidences if you have already disclosed it publicly. BY MR. TAXAY:

You diagnosed this patient with a paranoid personality disorder this week?

I don't have the records here. I see many, 18 many, many people a week. I believe his diagnosis was 19 schizo-effective, and that's what we addressed in the 20 court. He had -- I believe he did have Axis II paranoid 21 personality. 22

Did you diagnose this patient with paranoid 23 o. perponality disorder? 24

I believe so, yes.

#### CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: Yes. I would like him to hear, if he has time.

ROBERT CRAIG ENGLE, Ph.D.,

having been called, sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURTROOM CLERK: Thank you. Please take the stand. You can adjust that mic however it works best for you.

If you would, state your name and spell your last name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Robert Craig Engle, E-n-g-l-e. THE COURTROOM CLERK: Thank you.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. Dr. Engle, what is your profession?

I'm a licensed psychologist in Idaho. I have a private practice here in Boise.

Where do you -- you have a Ph.D.?

University of Nevada, Reno, 1985.

How long have you been a practicing ٥. psychologist?

MR. NCLAN: I stipulate that he is qualified. THE COURT: I have read Dr. Engle's C.V. With that stipulation, go forward.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2276

1

2

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

/22

23

24

25

Q. Thank you. The National Registry of -- let me cite it correctly -- the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology --

THE COURT: Counsel, I don't think I need to hear what amounts to impeachment. I would really like to get to the heart here with regard to Dr. Engle's testimony with regard to Mr. Hinkson. BY MR. TAXAY:

Would you explain what forensic psychology is? THE COURT: Counsel, I know what forensic psychology is. Let's move on. BY MR. TAXAY:

Q. In forensic psychology, would you explain whether forensic psychologists use tests?

THE COURT: Counsel, let's get to Mr. Hinkson. You can assume the court is with you up to this point.

MR. TAXAY: Very well, Your Honor. We are not offering Dr. Engle for the purpose of providing an apinion on Mr. Hinkson.

THE COURT: The reason I suggested to you that you might want to call Dr. Engle is that the Finley decision gave the Government the option to do that at the Daubert hearing.

If you don't intend, at this point, to have

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

report. I will excuse you from any obligation to do that.

Although, counsel, you will have to provide an oral summary of Dr. Engle's opinion to defense counsel prior to his testimony.

MR. TAXAY: Your Honor, would it be useful to hear from Dr. Engle on the accepted methodologies that are employed by forensic psychologists?

THE COURT: That might be helpful in helping the court formulate its ruling over the weekend. Thank vau.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Dr. Engle, would you -- sort of getting to the meat of it here, would you please explain how forensic psychologists go about formulating their opinions so that they can testify in court?

> MR. NOLAN: Could I suggest a question? THE COURT: Sure.

MR. NCLAN: That is, based upon what the pricr testimony was, is there anything that he left out or that you disagree with, in terms of the forensic -- the methodology?

THE COURT: Will you accept -- I hesitate to call it a friendly amendment -- Mr. Nolan's amendment to your question, Mr. Taxay?

him testify with regard to Mr. Hinkson until after Dr. Doke testifies, that's fine.

I will hear argument with regard to whether or not Dr. Doke's testimony will be admittible which is, basically, the purpose of the hearing.

MR. TAXAY: Well, we can -- cur thought is that we haven't formulated a psychological opinion on Mr. Hinkson's propensity for violence.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Because Mr. Nolan has offered it, let's ask Dr. Engle while we

Dr. Engle, if you do need to testify next week with regard to countering Dr. Doke or discussing Mr. Hinkson's propensity for violence based on a diagnosis of paranoid personality disorder, do you need to conduct any further tests or evaluation of him prior to formulating such an opinion?

THE WITNESS: Judge, it would certainly be useful. It goes to the certainly with which an opinion could be expressed.

THE COURT: Could you do that over this weekend? Would you have time to do that? We may be getting to this testimony as early, I think, as maybe Monday afternoon.

You are not going to have to prepare a written

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. TAXAY: I think it's important to hear from Dr. Engle, as a forensic psychologist, how it is they go about their job.

THE COURT: I will let you conduct that examination. If Mr. Nolan wants to ask questions, I will let him do it.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Dr. Engle, please explain.

The customary methodology used in establishing diagnostics in a forensic context requires a much higher standard than the criteria used in clinical practice.

As Dr. Doke testified, the gathering of history from the patient, the observation of the patient is certainly relevant and important.

The collaboration of third-party information, the verification of the third-party information is absolutely critical in forensic reports, since defendants have a vested interest, almost always, in how they present themselves in the evaluation.

Psychological testing is also critical in forensic evaluations since it adds a layer or an element of objectivity to what is, essentially, a subjective evaluation of how the defendant comes across to the psychologist.

Thirdly, the evaluation needs to be specific

5

10

11 12

13

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

> 1 2

> > 3 4 5

> > 6 7 8

10

11 12

> 13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

to the issues that are relevant. If we are trying to predict violence or a solicitation for violence, there are, as you indicated in your examination of Dr. Doke, specific tests which can help and which most probably would help in bringing an objective basis to an expression of that prediction.

Now, having heard Dr. Doke's testimony with respect to how he went about arriving at his diagnosis, do you have a professional opinion as to whether or not he followed the standards that are accepted amongst forensic psychologists?

I would say that Dr. Doke's evaluation is typical of a clinical psychologist and not what is done in a forensic psychologist's evaluation.

> MR. NOLAN: Object. Non-responsive. THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. TAXAY:

- Do you have any specific objections -- can you 0. identify specifically how you view his approach to be inconsistent with the standard in forensic psychologist?
- Utilization of psychological testing, a survey of the scientific literature specifically pertinent to the questions he is being asked. And I was unclear from Dr. Doke's report what third-party information he had exactly and to what extent that had been verified or

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2280

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NOLAN:

- I take it, you have never relied upon a police report in forming your opinions for forensic purposes?
  - Certainly.
- Have you ever relied upon a police report in forming your opinion?
  - I just said yes.
    - THE COURT: He said, "Certainly."

BY MR. NOLAN:

- I'm sorry. I take it, they are more reliable O. than defense lawyers?
  - I don't know. A.
- What about prosecutors? Do you rely upon what they tell you?
- Q. And the police are part of the other party, are they not?
  - A. I don't know their source of information.
- Isn't the defense lawer a source of ٥. information?
  - A. With a prejudicial bias, I think.
- The police don't have a prejudicial bias; is that right?
  - A. Hopefully not.

So the failure to do those things is what you 2 Q. 3 are focused on?

> I would add them, yes. A.

Is it consistent with the standard amongst forensic psychologists to rely on defense counsel's denials?

A.

not.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

ĸ

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Is it inconsistent with the standard of --Q.

MR. NOLAN: Did I --THE COURT: The answer was "no."

MR. NOLAN: "No." Thank you.

BY MR. TAXAY:

Is it inconsistent with the standard among forensic psychologists to rely on defense counsel's denials?

It's highly inconsistent to rely on assertions 17 A. by either side. 18

Are there any other points that you think are significant with respect to deficiencies in Dr. Doke's methodology?

A.

MR. TAXAY: No further questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan?

## ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2281

THE COURT: Nothing further?

MR. NOLAN: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Dr. Engle. I'm not sure I over allowed you to answer my question. Would you be able to conduct any further evaluations of Mr. Hinkson over this weekend?

THE WITNESS: Judge, I have been thinking about that, as I have been answering. I cannot imagine that I could administer and score and interpret the necessary tests by Monday.

THE COURT: All right. Ckay. Anything further with regard to evidence before I hear argument? MR. TAXAY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Engle, you may step down. Thank you very much.

I appreciate both of you coming.

Let's see. I think the Government has the laboring our since the defense has endorsed Dr. Doke and you have moved in limine to preclude Dr. Doke's testimony.

Let me assure you both I have read your memoranda. I have read the supporting -- the key supporting cases.

So let's get Mr. Nolan to his airplane and keep your argument to the point.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

24

25

2

3

18 19

20 21

MR. TAXAY: Okay, Your Honor. Your Honor, I'm no going to rehash all of the points made in our --THE COURT: I have them in mind.

MR. TAXAY: -- response. I would like to highlight a few things.

Dr. Doke's proposed testimony is crystal ball testimony. Is it more or less likely that the defendant would have done it?

That's not the kind of testimony that is permissible for psychologists. The case law is clear that the very limited band of permissible testimony relates to things that go to whether or not the defendant could form the requisite state of mind.

That's what is not -- that is not in play here. Dr. Doke would testify not about the defendant's state of mind or a condition that would affect it but, rather, whether or not he was more likely to have committed the act with which he has been charged.

That is rank propensity evidence. It is inadmissible under Rule 40(a). We did not cite that in our brief. I apologize for that.

The Government posits that this crystal ball evidence has no role in a federal trial. It is the role of the jury to make a jump as to whether or not this happened.

#### CAR COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

He has admitted that he has not followed the patient history, his patients' history, at least half of them. When he has a gut instinct, it's really not based on even good data within his own practice.

There is substantial data that is available outside of his practice that Dr. Doke knowingly and intentionally decided not to look at to make a judgment.

THE COURT: I don't want to -- I'm going to be fair to Dr. Doke. He wasn't asked originally to do this kind of an evaluation, although defense counsel is, obviously, now asking him to do something that he didn't completely test for. I think that's the problem.

MR. TAXAY: That's a fair point, and I apologize.

THE COURT: I don't want to impugn the integrity of either of our two professionals here. They did what they were asked to do. Now they are being asked to do something different, as I understand the problem.

MR. TAXAY: I don't meet to impugn Dr. Doke's integrity.

You raised another very good point which is that -- this is item two in our motion, our brief -that they prepared -- the defense prepared an expert report sometime ago. Most of the issues about which

Turning my attention, briefly, to this Finley case, Your Honor, again, the Finley case focuses in on that very issue: What sort of psychological testimony would be permissible?

It's not the central issue in the case but it's definitely in play there. When you read the text of that opinion, there is much discussion about ability to form intent.

That's the kind of psychological evidence that is in play. Scrething that I think is worth noting here is that, in the Finley case, the court talks about the methodology that was employed by the psychologist and, essentially, it proves this Millon Clinical Multi-Axis Inventory to arrive at conclusions.

This is the very MCMI test that the Government says should have been done here if the defense wanted to put on a witness to testify about personality characteristics. It wasn't done.

That's on page 1006, I believe, Your Honor of the opinion, reference to this -- yes, 1006 -- reference to the MCMI.

Another item that the Government would highlight is that Dr. Doke's opinion is hardly scientific. It's gut instinct based upon his own personal experience.

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2285

they want to have Dr. Doke testify really weren't the subject of that report.

The Government identifies those items that weren't really mentioned in the report. But to the extent there is any aspect of propensity for violence in the report, it wasn't the focus of the report; and, as a consequence, Dr. Doke's opinion is not completely formulated on that subject. And so it would be unreliable testimony and confusing to the jury and certainly not helpful.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Nolan? MR. NOLAN: Yes. Thank you very much, Your Honor.

Pirst of all, Dr. Doke did not not do -- his purpose in doing the evaluation was not focused on this kind of testimony.

THE COURT: I understand that. So let's go right to the heart of it, which is, if that's the case, then why should the court permit him to testify when, by his own testimony, he hasn't done the types of things that one would do, from a professional psychologist's standpoint, in order to render a credible opinion on the subject?

> MR. NOLAN: I was going to be very brief. THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Nolan. Go ahead.

MR. NCIAN: What I'm trying to say is: I looked at the report. I then filed a supplemental memorandum which said, based upon what he did, I want to offer him.

yet.

The court saw that, indicated to the Government it had an opportunity to do additional tests.

We are before the court without the kind of tests that would make his testimony grade "A" testimony. We are borderline on the tests that he performed; I'm conceding that.

What I'm trying to say is, if we did have an opportunity to do the kinds of tests, we could not because it was too late for us to submit it; and we understand that.

And so, you know, we are at a place where I think the issue is not the issue of whether it should be admitted or not, based upon, you know -- that's been decided by Finley.

The question is: Does it meet the criteria?

THE COURT: I don't think so, Mr. Nolan.

Finley doesn't say that I can't exclude it. It says, if I do exclude it, I'd better articulate the reasons why and I'd better make findings under Daubert as to why the testimony is not admissible.

And one of the grounds, I think, if I

#### QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

MR. NOLAN: I'm not conceding it.

THE COURT: I understand that. I'm not ruling

MR. NOLAN: Exactly.

THE COURT: I am posing the question. I want you to help me. The laboring car, I think, is yours because, as I understand the evidentiary record, everything that could have been done in order to formulate what you call a class "A" opinion havn't been done.

And as I understand Dr. Engle's testimony, there is not enough time between today, Friday, and the next trial day, Monday, in order do it.

MR. NCIAN: All I would say about that is the Government had the opportunity. What I am saying is we can go in -- the Government had the opportunity to do the class "A" for plenty of time, from the day that this trial started.

In other words, it's kind of like the court is saying, you know, to the Government, "You had the opportunity to prepare for that in case I let it in," and they just barely made it, that kind of thing.

Now, for example, we could do the report over the weekend; but the court wouldn't allow that, I don't think. understand Daubert correctly, is essentially whether or not the methodology that the expert employed in this case would be recognized by his peers as sufficient to render the opinion that you want him to render.

That's what the court is having a problem with right now.

MR. NCIAN: I agree. What I meant was that, as to the issue of admissibility, the Daubert methodology is where we are failing.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. NOIAN: When I say "failing," I think -- I think we have met it; but I am conceding it's weak because we don't have the tests on the violence issue and that connection. I'm suggesting that I barely made it.

But I think that's where it focuses. It doesn't focus on, under proper circumstances, this wouldn't otherwise be admissible testimony.

THE COURT: I agree with you, Mr. Nolan. I think that, if both of the psychologists had been tasked with the job of assessing Mr. Hinkson in order to render this opinion and there was adequate time to do it and they conducted the kind of tests that they needed to conduct in order to do it, then it would be admissible under Finley.

## QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

THE COURT: It isn't a question of generating a report, as I understand it. It's a question of conducting --

MR. NOLAN: The examination?

THE COURT: Yes. As Dr. Engle testified, scoring the tests, interpreting them -- I'm not a psychologist, so I don't know how much work is involved. I heard Dr. Engle say that it takes a significant amount of time to do that.

MR. NCIAN: I believe doctor -- I would submit, for the purpose of an offer of proof, that we could do those tests this weekend, get them scored, and be prepared on Monday if we were allowed to do so. You know, so I am making that representation as an offer of proof.

THE COURT: Let me ask you another question. I'm looking at the defendant's supplemental memorandum of authorities regarding experts which the court received late on January 6, 2005.

It outlines three areas that Dr. Doke will not be asked to render an opinion on. "B" is whether he has an opinion that Mr. Hinkson had the intent necessary to commit the offense.

Now, when you were posing questions to Dr. Doke, that's what I was hearing. Did I  $-\!\!\!-$ 

MR. NOLAN: Whether or not the personality characteristics and the diagnosis make it more or less likely that he would have the intent. In other words --

2

3

7

B

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

THE COURT: You are citing Finley for the proposition that -- I must say I have a difficult time following my colleague's opinion in Finley.

MR. NOLAN: I have that feeling.

THE COURT: But it's a subtle distinction that may elude me. The distinction, as I understand it, is that the expert can offer, I guess, by way of explanation, background information to aid lay jurors in understanding how paramoid personality disorder would affect Mr. Hinkson's ability to form the intent to solicit the murder of federal officials; but that the jury still has to make the ultimate finding as to whether he, in fact, did.

MR. NOLAN: Absolutely. The way the examination is done in California -- when diminished capacity was eliminated but you still have the due process intent issue, you get into the way you formulate the questions.

It's not did he have the intent, but is there comething about it which the jury should understand in deciding whether there exists the intent?

THE COURT: Are you, essentially, pursuing now

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

behavior may not be interpreted in the same way.

It's a matter of helping them interpret his behavior. I mean, that's the way I see it. Again, Finley -- well, it actually -- if you look at Finley, Pinley goes a lot further than we are going. First of all, they didn't diagnose --

THE COURT: The reason we are having the hearing is because of Finley. The court is not going to make the same mistake the trial judge made in Finley.

MR. NCLAN: I am hoping, if I don't win, it's not going to be published.

that, in this case.

things. I'm not --

District Court level but not the Federal Court level.

Court's permission, we will do the tests and try to score them.

But, yes, the court has, really, to decide whether or not, in this instance, I think, we have sufficiently done the tests to meet the burden -- hurdle over the right tests to make that conclusion.

THE COURT: This might -- well, let me --

a diminished capacity?

MR. NOLAN: No. I was using it as a metaphor. THE COURT: Because there was no 12.2 notice

of it.

2

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NOLAN: No. I'm suggesting that there is a shift away from taking anything away from the jury, and the idea that someone would say he did not have the intent is improper.

But there is something to say that, because of this, he might not have had the intent, not that he did or didn't; but there is something you should be aware of and that you should consider in deciding whether he had the intent.

THE COURT: Whether or not he had the ability to form the intent?

MR. NOLAN: That would be an undiminished capacity, whether he had the ability.

THE COURT: Ion't that, essentially, what you are trying to get before the jury, that you want them to consider this psychological evaluation and Dr. Doke's testimony in order to help them decide whether or not he had the intent on the dates in question?

MR. NOLAN: That's right, because he has a diagnosed -- a disorder which affects him in a way different than other people so that his behavior -- his

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

2293

2291

Mr. Taxay, would you like to respond?

MR. TAXAY: Just a few points, Your Honor. Your Honor, I think an important point to keep in mind here is the defendant denies he made any of these statements. The defendant's position is that he didn't make these solicitations.

THE COURT: I understand that. I assume Dr. Doke would say that's an aspect of potential delusion.

MR. HDYT: I haven't heard that expert opinion yet.

THE COURT: I'm not rendering one. Let me just hear your argument.

MR. TAXAY: The defendant denies that he made the statements; and so Dr. Doke's opinion is whether or not he was likely to do it, not what did he mean when he said this, because the defense doesn't concede that he went to J. C. Harding and said, "Look, I will pay you \$10,000 to kill these people."

They don't admit that. And so this evidence really is designed to get before the jury a reason to think he didn't make those statements.

It's not -- it's not really designed to inform the jury as to his intent when he made them because the defendant denies that he made them.

2292

- MR. NOLAN: I thought you could publish
- THE COURT: I can publish things at the
- MR. NCLAN: In any event, I think, with the

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

1

7

ß

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

7

В

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2296

MR. TAXAY: -- I didn't mean it.

1

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Nolan, how do you respond to that point?

MR. NOLAN: They offered the tape. If they are going to argue that there is nothing in that tape that the jury may use to infer he is guilty of the crimes, then --

THE COURT: I don't hear them making that offer.

MR. NOLAN: I don't either. Part of it has to do with the jury understanding those statements in the

THE COURT: Go ahead. Mr. Taxay, anything further?

MR. TAXAY: It's way too late.

THE COURT: All right. I'm scrry. I don't mean to cut you off.

Anything else, Mr. Nolan?

MR. NOLAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Here is what I am going to do: I do need to think about this, but you also need a quick answer to the question.

## ONA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

at least, preliminarily may I will allow you to, at least, call Dr. Doke to offer testimony with regard to what a paranoid personality type is.

I think enough of an evaluation has been conducted to do that. Whether I am going to allow him to go the next step and offer the opinion that was elicited here is the question I am wrestling with under Finley and under Rule 704(b). That one I don't want to decide on the fly.

MR. NOLAN: So the generic, "What is a paranoid personality and what are their characteristics?" without getting into whether there is a connection to violence?

THE COURT: I might let you go further than that. The Government might decide whether they want to call Dr. Engle to testify in rebuttal to that.

I think, in light of that question that we got from the juror earlier, mid trial, about concerns with regards to whether Mr. Swisher had ever conducted any kind of an evaluation, at least one juror has a question about his mental condition.

And, frankly, I want to thank both doctors because the reports that you did and your testimony here today has been helpful to the court in better understanding a little bit more about Mr. Hinkson.

If you will, supply me with e-mail addresses. And did those fax numbers that I used last weekend work? Everybody got copies? I faxed my rulings -- maybe it was two weeks ago, I guess, at the start of the trial on Sunday, afternoon -- to both sides. Did you get them? MR. TAXAY: We did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hoyt, you got yours?

MR. HOYT: Yes, Your Honor, we got ours.

THE COURT: I don't know if I have an e-mail address for the Government.

MR. TAXAY: I can supply that.

THE COURT: Would you do that? I will try to get you a ruling just as quickly as I can. I hope to have it out by tomorrow afternoon.

I don't know if that will be enough time, Mr. Nolan, but that's the best I can do because, frankly, the late filing of the motion has jammed the court, as well.

I will do my best to get you an intelligent ruling in written form. I will get it as early this weekend as I can finish it.

MR. HOYT: Is the court in a position where it can make a decision on the lateness issue, as to the testing?

THE COURT: Let me say this: I think I can,

## CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

So I am going to deny the motion in limine to preclude Dr. Doke from testifying.

What I will issue this weekend is a ruling as to how far his testimony will go, what the scope of that testimony will be.

MR. NOLAN: And, again, we will be conducting -- we will start conducting some tests. Whether the court allows them not necessarily for the --

THE COURT: I don't think you need my permission. In light of that ruling, the Government can decide, you know, whether there is adequate time or what, if anything, they want Dr. Engle to do.

MR. NCLAN: Great.

THE COURT: That's as much as I feel confortable doing at 5:10.

Safe travels. I hope your mother recovers quickly.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: And we will see everybody -- why don't you plan on being here at 8:30 on Monday morning so that you can review with me in chambers the Swisher personnel file.

And then, Mr. Taxay, I do need, as I indicated the other day, the redacted form of the Indictment and a proposed form of verdict. I'd better have those by

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

CNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

Monday, as well. MR. TAXAY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Anything further? MR. NOLAN: No. Thank you very much, Your Honor. THE COURT: We will be in recess. Thank you all for your help on this difficult issue. (Whereupon, the court stood in recess.) 

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309

# CERTIFICATE I, LORI A. PULSIFER, certify that I made a shorthand record of the matter contained herein, and that the foregoing typewritten pages contain a full, true, and accurate transcript of said shorthand record, done to the best of my skill and ability. DATED this 8th day of April 2005. IORI A. FULSIFER, CSR, RMR, CRR Certified Shorthand Reporter Idaho Certificate 354

QNA COURT REPORTING (208) 484-6309