

HERE ARE THE FACTS

[American Political Prisoners, Jeffrey Weinhaus](#)

## **JEFFREY WEINHAUS**

To: Rudy Davis

Rudy, Please post this on my page, it is...

15 Feb 26

---

Rudy, Please post this on my page, it is something I'm asking my AI to work on! Here are the facts. I have been convicted of "assaulted Sgt. Folsom by shooting him" There is no evidence to sustain this conviction. The Missouri Court of Appeals (ED 100807) ignored that fact and seven others points and denied the appeal in 2015. The only one shot was myself, twice in the head and twice in the chest. My lawfully carried, legally owned firearm never cleared the retention holster according to the trooper's who assaulted me. One of them alleged that the gun was within an inch of clearing the holster. The other trooper only saw me attempting to undo the flap. Both of them claim my holster was on my right side. A still shot taken from my wrist watch camera captures a reflection of the holster on my left hip. The holster was on my left side in order to fasten the seatbelt. There are three eyewitnesses who saw me falling face first, hands empty as the shooting was taking place. Two FBI agents on the scene to "back up" the troopers never mention, in deposition, any attempt to draw. Neither one of them even saw a holster, they had a clear view of my right side. The only ones alleging that I attempted to draw, were the troopers who shot me. The prosecution withheld the following from the defense before, during and after trial. Sgt. Folsom who was the first to fire, had tested positive for Ambien and Prozac ( the only time the Missouri Highway Patrol test for drugs is after a shooting) he used to treat his PTSD. The Missouri Highway Patrol failed to "drug test" Folsom for over eleven years, despite the fact he was the head of Troop I division of drug and crime control. This position put him in the presence of drugs on a daily basis, due diligence of the Patrol would have subjected Folsom to regular drug testing. Had the MHP required urine analysis they would have realized that Folsom was being treated for PTSD since he shot and killed another subject in October of 2000. Folsom would have failed fitness for duty evaluations, as he did three times in the 13 months leading up to my trial in October of 2013. At the time

of September, 11, 2012, shooting Folsom was under investigation by the Patrol for "departing from the truth" and bullying his subordinates. The prosecution knew Folsom lied in his report of the 911 shooting. He claimed that he told Weinhaus (me) that "he had papers for me to sign" in support of the ruse (another lie) that the purpose of the meeting was to return my printing and video equipment which Folsom "illegally" seized with a search warrant that was served in violation of RSMO 043.200. Folsom further claimed that before he fired he "commanded" Weinhaus to remove my hand off the holster. The prosecution had a copy of the audio that my ex wife recorded of the shooting and the five minutes before, that depicted me singing, praying and praising the Lord proving that I had no criminal intentions and also proving that GOD almighty answers prayer! I believed that I had achieved my goal of getting my printing equipment returned. Which I had petition the Court for with a writ of replevin on September 7, 2012. Folsom told me when he called the morning of 911 that he had been ordered by the court to return what he had "stolen" with his illegal warrant. I had no idea that the court dismissed my writ for lack of payment ( so much for justice shall not be for sale: Article 2, Section 10, MO Constitution) the morning of 911. Another Folsom lie, the prosecution knew of at least three lies before the charge of attempted murder was filed against me on November 1, 2012. An ethical prosecutor would have charged Folsom and his partner with attempted murder not me. There is no evidence that I committed any crime against Folsom, only his discredit testimony alleges that I'm the aggressor. I was acquitted of assaulting his partner by the jury! I was also acquitted of resisting arrest and tampering with a judicial official ( what started this injustice ) by the Judge! By the time of my trial, the prosecution knew that Folsom was a pathological liar. Folsom lied in the presence of the prosecution during a deposition on June 6, 2013, when ask what drugs was he on, he lied when he said none. The STATE OF MISSOURI was so hell bent on getting a conviction that it didn't matter if there star witness was "departing from the truth" repeatedly. When asked at trial what his employment status was Folsom lied again claiming he was on medical leave, the prosecution knew he had been relieved of duty. The STATE painted a portrait that Folsom was creditable. The Truth came to light in 2019 when the Missouri Western District Court of Appeals denied Folsom appeal that the Highway Patrol discriminated against for firing him for having PTSD. It was at this time the court cited material that had been kept under seal by the Attorney General Josh Hawley and Eric Schmitt during Weinhaus Appeal, 29:15 and Federal Habeas these Brady violations resulted in the most manifest injustice in the history of American jurisprudence. The deliberate indifference of the Court system that denied equal justice to a Citizen Journalist, candidate for office and father of six justice continued unabated through a local State Habeas based on numerous Brady violations in

October of 2020 denied without hearing or opinion. The Appeals Court denied the Habeas as well in December 2020 without hearing or opinion. For the Court of last resort, the Missouri Supreme Court. God provided the most successful lawyer in exonerations in America, Professor Sean O'Brien' who after four years prepared a petition that highlighted the Brady violations. It too was denied without an evidentiary hearing or opinion. Thus denying due process (Art 2 Sec 30, MO Constitution) To the only injured party in State v Weinhaus 15AB CC 00117. "But let judgement run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream" Amos 5:24 KJV.