

<https://jeffreyweinhaus.wordpress.com/>



[Demand Justice for Jeffrey Weinhaus](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Blog](#)

## Home

**REPORTER**

**WHISTLE BLOWER**

**CANDIDATE**

**NOW**

**....CHRISTIAN POLITICAL PRISONER**

**WRONGFULLY convicted of shooting a State Trooper.....**

**With a twist.....**

**HE was the one shot.**

**And he needs YOUR help.**

September 11, 2012, Jeffrey Weinhaus makes a trip to a remote gas station to an arranged meeting with law enforcement to have his printing press and equipment returned to him.

13 seconds after Weinhaus steps out of the car he is shot four times in the head and the chest. He had a weapon holstered on his left side, but he never drew it.

Weinhaus is now wrongly serving a 30 year prison sentence for assault on a law enforcement officer. The officer who shot him, Sgt Henry James Folsom, of the Missouri State Highway Patrol testified in trial that Weinhaus pulled his gun, therefore he had to shoot him. There was overwhelming evidence at the time of the trial to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Weinhaus was innocent. His attorney, as well as the prosecutor, did not enter that evidence into trial. **The entire thing was even captured on a secret spy watch video.** [Click to watch spy watch video](#)

He was denied due process and adequate council, and was falsely convicted. His crime was exposing government corruption.

We need to help Jeffrey Weinhaus find justice.

## **THERE IS SOMETHING YOU CAN DO TO HELP**

On this page we will explore that evidence, and you can decide for yourself. Buckle up because I am about to take you on a wild ride....

### **The Whole Story**

For a decade before he was shot Weinhaus was an active member in his community with a strong voice in local political corruption and advocated standing up for constitutional rights.

He produced a political newsletter and videos under the name of Bulletinman challenging corruption and trying to build a better community. Many local businesses showed their support for him by running ads in his newsletter and stocking copies to distribute to patrons.

Summer 2012, Mr Weinhaus ran an ad in the local paper asking for information on corrupt officials and activities. He got about 200 responses. They were all stored on his computers, which along with the other equipment he used to produce his literature, were essentially his printing press.

During this time he was running for County Coroner in an attempt to open up two old cases that he had reason to believe carried some dark implications. The County Coroner has the power to arrest and even to replace the County Sheriff if necessary when illegal activities are uncovered.

On August 16, 2012, Weinhaus released a video urging corrupt local officials to change their ways or step down.

His outspoken views did not sit well with some.

August 22, 2012, Two Missouri State Highway Patrol officers, Sgt Henry Folsom and Cpr Scott Mertens, were sent to find Weinhaus and feel out his intentions in the video as well as his level of threat to himself or others.

They spoke with Weinhaus outside of his home about the video. He explained his political platform and intentions in making it. He was pushing for reform to broken systems and corruption, not advocating violence. Sgt Folsom asked if Weinhaus would surrender his printing press and equipment so they could look them over.

With his equipment being his livelihood as a journalist, and because his platform was pushing for the enforcement of constitutional laws and rights, he knew that it was against the law for them to take it without a subpoena.

The **Privacy Protection Act** was established in 1980 to protect people like Mr Weinhaus. It makes it unlawful for a government officer “to search for or seize” materials when:

- (a) the materials are “work product materials” prepared, produced, authored, or created “in anticipation of communicating such materials to the public,” 42 U.S.C. § 2000aa-7(b)(1);*
- (b) the materials include the “mental impressions, conclusions, or theories” of their creator, 42 U.S.C. § 2000aa-7(b)(3); and*
- (c) the materials are possessed for the purpose of communicating the material to the public by a person “reasonably believed to have a purpose to disseminate to the public” some form of “public communication,” 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000aa-7(b)(3), 2000aa(a); or*
- (a) the materials are “documentary materials” that contain “information,” 42 U.S.C. § 2000aa-7(a); and*
- (b) the materials are possessed by a person “in connection with a purpose to disseminate to the public” some form of “public communication.” 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000aa(b), 2000aa-7(a).*

**In these situations, the government is required to use a subpoena or other compulsory process rather than use a search warrant.**

It was also a violation of his **Fourth Amendment** Constitutional right:

*The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.*

He knew that they were not complying with the law so he refused.

When Weinhaus refused to hand over his equipment, Sgt Folsom claimed that he smelled marijuana. His partner, Cpr Mertens, testified that he did **NOT** smell anything. This is an important detail to pay attention to. Weinhaus's defense lawyer at his trial did not challenge this claim. If a drug dog expert had been called as a witness, they could have testified that not even a trained dog could have smelled marijuana from that distance, let alone a human. This would have proven that it was an invented claim to gain access to the equipment.

Folsom informed Weinhaus that he was going to leave and get a drug search warrant. Four hours later he returned with the warrant. During that time Weinhaus was handcuffed and detained in the front yard. When Folsom returned, he served the warrant alone. To serve a search warrant Folsom was required to notify the local sheriff and have them present. He testified that he had not been able to contact the local Sheriff. His story later changed to claiming that he did not have cell phone service to contact them. There are procedures to be followed in that instance, but they were not:

***Missouri Revised Statute, section 43.200, subsection 3, which clearly and unquestionably states the following:***

***The members of the highway patrol may request that the prosecuting or circuit \attorney apply for, and members of the highway patrol may serve, search warrants anywhere within the state of Missouri, provided the sheriff of the county in which the warrant is to be served, or his designee, shall be notified upon application by the applicant of the search warrant except for offenses pertaining to driving while intoxicated. The sheriff or his or her designee shall participate in serving the search warrant except for offenses pertaining to driving while intoxicated and the investigation of motor vehicle traffic accidents. Any designee of the sheriff shall be a deputy sheriff or other person certified as a peace officer under chapter 590. The sheriff shall always have a designee available.***

The law does not make an exception. Weinhaus's lawyer did not challenge in court as to why Folsom went ahead and served the warrant illegally.

During the search they found a miniscule amount of marijuana and a prescription pill in the basement. No matter what your bias is, the marijuana and pill found were inconsequential and irrelevant.

If a drug dog expert had been called to testify, it would have proven that Folsom had invented the claim to gain entry.

Without the basis for a legitimate search warrant, entering his home became an illegal act – compounded by the fact that it was served illegally without a representative from the local sheriff department.

While they were there, can you guess what they took?

**That's right. His printing press and equipment.**

They did not have a subpoena which is required by law. They only had a fraudulently obtained and illegally served warrant.

Another important thing to remember right now is that Sgt Folsom claimed that the reason for the visit was to gauge if Mr Weinhaus posed a threat. Both of the state troopers testified that they did not feel he was threatening. This is backed up by the fact that several firearms were found in the home during the search and were not removed. It is further backed up by the fact that at the upcoming meeting where Weinhaus would be shot, none of the officers were wearing bulletproof vests. This goes to prove that they did not see Mr Weinhaus as a threat.

September 11, 2012, Sgt Folsom calls Weinhaus to let him know that he could have his equipment back. Folsom arranged a meeting at a local gas station. When you get your property back after a seizure it is standard procedure to go to a police station and sign a receipt for your merchandise. **This meeting was held at a gas station in a rural location in St. Clair, Missouri that was open for business and populated with citizens.**

Several officers testified in trial, including the shooting officer, that this was a ruse to arrest Weinhaus for a warrant that they had obtained for the marijuana and the pill. They had also obtained a warrant for tampering with a judicial official stemming from the video. (*which had already been cleared as free speech at this point by federal review*) The reason for the initial visit to Weinhaus's home was to gauge if he was a threat. If they still had any reservations about him becoming dangerous, planning an elaborate ruse to arresting him in a public uncontrolled gas station with citizens and workers points to negligence and deviation from procedure that **DID IN FACT** put the public at great risk. It also left one man in critical condition with four bullet holes.

Neither the FBI Agents, nor the Missouri State Highway Patrol who were to be present at the upcoming meeting were wearing bulletproof vests. That should have been standard procedure for someone they thought was capable of violence especially knowing that he usually carried a gun, as did a lot of others in town.

Gas Station workers, patrons, and neighbors were all put at risk in this backwoods ruse to serve a warrant. This entire situation would have been avoided if procedure had been followed, and had his equipment been returned at the police station.

Cpr Mertens, who was Sgt Folsom's partner, as well as the FBI Agents present all state that they did not know the reason for the location. Folsom had chosen and arranged it.

Jeff did not trust the situation and tried to get a pastor to go with him as a witness. He was unable to and went alone. He was wearing a spy watch which was recording everything and sending it to his children's mother.

He can be heard in the [video](#) praying for protection on the ride to the meeting. [Click to listen to the prayer](#)

On September 11, 2012, Weinhaus gets out of his car and has a gun holstered, as he always does, strapped backwards on his left hip. His seat belt made that the only position he could wear his holster in. Cpr Mertens has the trunk popped to support the ruse that they were returning the equipment.

Sgt Folsom asks him why he has a gun. Weinhaus remarks that he is allowed to carry one.

The **Second Amendment**, Article 1 section 23 states that the right of citizens to bear arms **shall not be questioned**:

*Section 23. That the right of every citizen to keep and bear arms, ammunition, and accessories typical to the normal function of such arms, in defense of his home, person, family and property, or when lawfully summoned in aid of the civil power, shall not be questioned. The rights guaranteed by this section shall be unalienable. Any restriction on these rights shall be subject to strict scrutiny and the state of Missouri shall be obligated to uphold these rights and shall under no circumstances decline to protect against their infringement. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the general assembly from enacting general laws which limit the rights of convicted violent felons or those adjudicated by a court to be a danger to self or others as result of a mental disorder or mental infirmity.*

*Source: Const. of 1875, Art. II, § 17.*

Sgt Folsom and Cpr Mertens would both later testify that at this point Weinhaus unstrapped his holster, and began to draw his gun. They claim he was then instructed by Sgt Folsom to remove his hand from his gun. That was before they knew about the existence of the spy watch video where you can clearly hear the conversation. Any mention of Weinhaus touching or even motioning for a weapon is blatantly missing. The video, witness testimonies, and two FBI present during the incident can all confirm that Weinhaus never even touched his holster. Sgt Folsom later changed his story to say that he did not have time to tell him to remove his hand.

[Click to listen to video](#) There is never one order to Weinhaus other than to get on the ground.

Sgt Folsom then orders Weinhaus to the ground followed by shooting Weinhaus once in the head, twice in the chest, and then again in the head. In trial, Folsom claimed that Weinhaus had pulled his gun and said, **“Your gonna have to shoot me, man”**. If you listen to the video you can clearly hear Weinhaus say:

***” You don’t gotta shoot me, man.”***

Folsom claimed in court that Weinhaus said:

***“Your gonna have to shoot me, man.”***

A vocal analyst can confirm that Weinhaus did in fact say: ***“You don’t gotta shoot me, man.”*** No expert was called in trial to challenge what was said. One even went to Weinhaus’s

lawyer Mr Eastwood's office the day before the trial. He insisted on being summoned to testify as an audio video expert. He was refused.

[Click to watch the shooting](#) and listen for yourself. \*Warning Graphic\*

Folsom also claims that the gun was holstered on Weinhaus's right hip and that he unlatched the holster and drew his weapon. He claimed he had no choice but to fire his weapon.

***"When he said "You're going to have to shoot me man" and started to exit that gun from the holster and remove it, and in that posture, I had no choice but to fire."***

***"I pushed him over onto the left side, where I could see the holster on his right side and the gun, i'm standing directly above him."***

Cpr Mertens also testifies to the fact that Mr Weinhaus was wearing his holster on his right hip:

*"Ok, so where was the holster on Jeff?"*

***"It was on his – It wasn't on his hip. It was on the front side on the right."***

**BOTH OF THESE TESTIMONIES HAVE BEEN PROVEN TO BE A LIE**

A [Still Shot](#) that had been isolated at the time of the trial clearly shows a reflection of Mr Weinhaus walking past the car with his holster on his LEFT hip. This shot as well as the FBI statements are very clear proof that Sgt Folsom and Crp Mertens lied about which side Weinhaus wore his holster on. This still shot was not entered into the trial.

A **Parachute Retention Holster**, which is the holster that Weinhaus used, is not designed to be a quick draw weapon. It would have made it extremely difficult if not impossible for Weinhaus to unholster his gun and draw it in the short amount of time he would have had to do so. Adding to that the fact that the holster was backwards on his LEFT hip and that Mr Weinhaus is RIGHT handed.

The FBI agents present swore in their deposition that Weinhaus did **NOT** attempt to draw his gun, and the holster was **NOT** on his right side as claimed by Sgt folsom as his reason for shooting Weinhaus. They were, however, not called to trial to testify on Weinhaus's behalf.

FBI Agent Maruschak stated in his deposition:

*"So you saw a little more of his right side?"*

***"Yes, his right hip."***

*"Did you see a holster?"*

***"No"***

*“Did you see a gun?”*

***“No”***

FBI Agent Cunningham who was asked by Folsom to help serve the warrant, stated in his deposition that he never saw a gun:

***“I just remember him standing with his hands in front, and there’s a conversation going on between Sgt Folsom and Jeffrey Weinhaus, and then seconds later I see Sgt Folsom, he puts up his right hand, and then steps back, and then there’s shots fired.”***

*“You say sergeant, seconds later, was that seconds after Jeff stopped?”*

***“A time frame, I couldn’t — It happened really quick. I couldn’t tell you how many seconds. When he stops there is a conversation taking place, Jeffrey Weinhaus has his hands in front. Again, the conversation takes place”***

*“Sure”*

***“And that’s when Sgt folsom raises his right hand, draws his weapon, steps back and then to the left, and then shots fired.”***

*“And what happened to Jeff after the shots were fired?”*

***“He fell to the ground.”***

Fbi Agent Maruschak also verifies that Jeff did not pull his gun:

*“Did you ever see a gun before he — before shots rang out?”*

***“No, I did not”***

*“Before shots rang out did you ever see a holster?”*

***“No***

*“Did you ever see any movements by the hands up or down?”*

***“I did not. I remember seeing the hands in front.”***

Not only does Folsom claim that Weinhaus drew his weapon and that it was on the right side, which have both been proven a lie, but he also fully admits to executing purposeful kill shots instead of simply trying to incapacitate him if in fact he had posed a threat:

***“At that point when i fired my weapon, you know, the totality of the circumstances hit me at the point that when i actually saw that he has showed up armed and was actually drawing a***



*gun out of the holster, I don't know if those other people were involved, and to be honest, I was already looking past him and trying to scan and see if there were any more people back there that were threats. And when I First pulled my gun out, I fired two in the chest, and I saw both of them hit. He had a lime, like a lime green shirt, i saw both those rounds hit, and on the way up i fired one to his head and saw it hit his head."*

*"Let me stop you there, sir. where were you aiming?"*

*"Just his chest and head. I fired, purposely fired two into the chest and one into the head"*

Folsom has claimed here that Weinhaus pulled a gun and he was forced to shoot. He also acknowledges that there are citizens around in an uncontrolled atmosphere, with two Highway Patrol Troopers firing their weapon in public. Sgt. Mertens, Folsom's partner fired off a couple shots as well. None hit Weinhaus, but two hit the building with two cashiers and customers inside.

This all could have been avoided if protocol had been followed by having Weinhaus go to the police station.

Folsom and Merten's claim that Weinhaus pulled a gun is proven false by video evidence, FBI, and witness testimony that were not made available to the jury in trial. Their claim that Weinhaus's gun was holstered on his right side has also been proven wrong by the video, still shot, and FBI Agents statements.

Folsom claimed that he holstered Jeff's gun when he pulled it out from under him:

*"And I rolled him over, I see that gun there, I just reach down and grabbing the gun and shove it in that holster that was right there."*

If Folsom had admitted that the gun was in the holster when he removed it from Weinhaus, it would have proved that it was **not possible** for him to have drawn his gun. He would have had to return the gun to the holster as he was falling to the ground while being shot four times.

The claim that the gun was out of the holster when Weinhaus was shot was proven wrong by FBI Agent Maruschak who stated this when asked when the first time he saw the gun or holster:

*"Sgt Folsom was in the process of removing it from underneath Weinhaus's body. When I made the approach I had **no idea a weapon was involved**. At that point gun, gun, i've got to get it removed, get it removed. He tries to get his hand out underneath weinhaus body. At that point **I see an olive drab holster, an a weapon in it.**"*

Once Again, Folsom's version of the story has been proven untrue, but the jury did not hear that testimony of those FBI agents

If the gun was still in the holster when it was pulled from under Weinhaus's body, he could not have drawn it. Its as simple as that. He is in prison because two men, the man who shot him and

his partner, maintained their lies throughout the entire trial. The testimony of the two Missouri State Troopers, Sgt Folsom and Crp Merten, is backed up only by their word alone which contradicts every other single person present's version of the events, as well as video and audio evidence.

There was no investigation into the actions of Sgt Folsom and Crp Merten in the shooting by the Sheriffs Department, the FBI, or any other agency. It was all done in house. They were investigated by their peers.

A chilling dispatch call was recorded catching the head of the Highway Patrol and the dispatcher saying "Yeah, theres supposed to be a Jeffrey Weinhaus guy?, Are you familiar with that name?"..."Oh, no... They're messing with him, AGAIN?!"..... "Maybe he learned his lesson this time."

That was not played in trial either. [Click to listen.](#)

There were men working on the gas stations gutters at the time. [One witness states \(click to listen\)](#) very clearly and emphatically that Weinhaus did not have a gun in his hands when he was shot, and that he believes it was a setup and murder. He states there was no attempt to help Weinhaus on the scene, and within 30 seconds the parking lot was swarming with officers. The shooter had his hands taped up and immediately left and did not return. Another witness verified that Jeff did not have a gun in his hands at anytime. Both of these two witnesses and the two FBI agents verified that Weinhaus had not pulled his gun.

FBI Agents that were present during the shooting were in courtroom ready, willing, and able to testify, but they were not called. After hearing their depositions Robert Parks, the prosecuting attorney in the case, removed them from the witness list. Weinhaus lawyer did not call them to the stand.

One of the bullets entered Weinhaus's temple and came out his forehead. This is believed to be the last shot that struck him, leaving a bullet in the ground next to where his head fell. [Click to see photo of the bullet](#) No crime scene team was brought in to investigate the shooting, and no expert was brought to trial to show that that bullet was fired into his head when he was on his way to the ground after already being disabled by three previous kill shots. It can still be proven easily after the fact by watching the [Video](#). You can see the Sgt's hand positioning as he shoots. The angle of his gun to his body and the angle of the guns path through Weinhaus's skull proves it was a kill shot while he was already twisting on the way down from the three previous purposeful shots to the chest and head. [Photo](#) \*Warning graphic\*

Sgt Folsom stated in his deposition:

***"I fired two into his chest and one into his head, and I immediately started scanning left. I knew that i had to eliminate him as a threat. I saw his eyes roll up in his head, and it was just the whites of his eyes were showing."***

*“When the first two rounds hit him, he was just kinda standing there almost like he was in amazement, and I saw his eyes roll up in his head.”*

*“I could still see Jeffs got his hand on the gun and i heard that shot go off, and he started to rotate, **I JUST CHOSE MY SIGHT, WENT BACK ON HIS HEAD...I SQUEEZED THE TRIGGER AGAIN, AND HE WAS ALREADY STARTING TO ROTATE AND FALL. He fell, and i mean he fell, i mean he fell violently. I mean, he collapsed on his face and just piled up.**”*

Sgt Folsom admitted that he fired that last shot **AFTER** he acknowledges that three previous kill shots had **ALREADY** taken Weinhaus down and he was even able to “*see the whites of his eyes*“. *He made the choice at that point to aim again to Mr Weinhaus’s head, and make a shot that rips through his temple and out his forehead as he is pivoting towards the ground. This is full admittance that the last shot fired from Sgt Folsom’s gun was INTENDED to kill.*

Even if he had pulled his gun, which it has been prove he did not – **TO INCAPACITATE AND TO MURDER ARE NOT THE SAME THING.** Admitted shots to the head and chest when there is no provocation is murder on BOTH sides of the badge.

Because of a video made calling out corruption, certain people took offense. An illegal search and seizure lead to a dangerous situation to everyone involved, innocent citizens included. It was all just to serve a warrant to someone who would have willingly walked into the police station and turned himself in if needed. This then lead to Weinhaus being flown to a hospital barely alive with four kill shots in his body.

The evidence has proven that Weinhaus is innocent. His crime was exposing government corruption. His house was raided. His computers were stolen. He was shot when he went to retrieve them. He was brought up on tampering charges for the video along with the assault charges that landed him in prison, but they were dropped as unfounded.

**THE ENTIRE REASON THEY STARTED THIS PROCESS DIDN’T EVEN HOLD UP IN COURT..**

....but the assault charge stuck..... and he **NEVER TOUCHED HIS GUN.** He is in PRISON for another 30 years for *armed criminal action and assaulting Sgt Folsom by shooting him*, and he **NEVER TOUCHED HIS GUN**

The ONLY evidence against this man is the words of the man who shot him and his partner. **OVERWHELMING** evidence proves he is innocent.

Sgt Folsom did not even try to hide the fact that he was shooting to kill **NOT** incapacitate. Witnesses were terrified. They were screaming. They saw a plain clothed man shoot another man in front of them. Bullets were hitting the building. **NOBODY** that was there other than the shooter and his partner claimed that Weinhaus pulled his gun. They refuted it. They were convinced, as you heard in the recorded witness testimony, that they witnessed an execution. None of this was necessary.

Witnesses also report that there was no effort made to help Weinhaus at the scene to stop the bleeding. It took the ambulance 8 minutes to get there. He was eventually flown in critical condition to the hospital and is alive today only by the miracle working power of God.

At trial Weinhaus was forced to wear 80,000 volt shock cuffs even though the court did not have authority to use them in this situation. A judge in Maryland was just convicted for doing this.

From prison Jeffrey was telling his story which was being recorded by a friend and posted online. He was barred from having his voice recorded and distributed, and was even served a restraining order with a video camera installed to film him in his cell.

Mr Weinhaus was shot in an attempt to silence his voice. It didn't work. He lived. They silenced him in court with shock cuffs. They silenced him in prison, but the facts do speak. You just have to listen. They speak of an innocent man gunned down after being subjected to unlawful procedure by the police through the entire encounter.

In an article ran in the Washington Missourian on October 12, 2013, Folsom talks about how the shooting ruined his life. He claims post traumatic stress, and not feeling as though his department stood behind him after the shooting. He was not fired but took a voluntary extended sick leave. He made no mention of concern or regret for what happened that day, or for the three decades that were stolen from Jeffrey Weinhaus his children. He actually placed all of the blame squarely on Weinhaus's shoulders:

***"I lost the ability to feed my children because one man decided he was going to start a revolution."***

That revolution Sgt Folsom spoke of was Weinhaus's life work. He DID want to lead a revolution. He wanted to inform and educate people – to inspire a resurrection of the republic and the constitution.

Weinhaus was the only victim that day. He will serve another two decades behind bars if we don't stand up and do something.

Make a stand for Jeffrey Weinhaus Today

**Call Missouri Governor Mike Parson and ask for a pardon for Jeffrey Weinhaus.**

Office of Governor Michael L. Parson  
P.O. Box 720  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
Phone: (573) 751-3222

**Below are links to videos where Mr Weinhaus explains in his own words, from prison, what happened. Please watch them and consider making a stand for Jeffrey Weinhaus. It just takes one phone call.**

[Jeff's Own Words #1](#)

[Jeffs Own Words #2](#)

[Jeff's Own Words #3](#)

[Jeff's Own Words #4](#)

[Jeff's Own Words #5](#)

**Click the link below to visit Jeffrey Weinhaus's facebook page to find out other ways you can help**

[Jeffrey Weinhaus fb page](#)

**Please feel free to share this article and spread the word. Every voice matters.**