

Mr. Timothy Zeiger of Shackelford Questioned

"Why were you afraid of Mr. Robert Thomas Rogers? You mentioned you were."

"His mind is messed up."

"What do you mean by that?"

"He's got very, very concerning art."

"Did he show you his art?"

"No."

"Then how are you speaking about it?"

"I looked at his website."

"Were you forced to look at his website?"

"No."

All pay closer attention.

He adds, "The Harpers were concerned."

"Did he show them his website?"

"I can't speak for them. My understanding is they saw it on their own. He painted the back fence one time. Wrote things on it."

"Did he write curse words or dangerous things on the back fence?"

"I don't know. The Harpers didn't say. They said it was bizarre, very disturbing. Some reference to Ephesians about the Armor of God and white oil paint said 'Quickness of Spirit'. Honk on Demand."

"Are you talking about the fence next to the alley which is on the 2401 Hillview Road 78703 property?"

"I'm talking about the fence next to the alley."

"Yes. We're talking about the same one. You mean the one that's in the backyard of the home that was owned by Robert Thomas Rogers Trust. That fence is not in the alley. It's next to it in his yard."

"Ok. Yes. That's the one."

"Do you think it's a crime for someone to paint one's fence? Some think that's American as apple pie."

A lawyer for Zeiger says, "Your honor..."

Judge: "Stick to questions and facts."

"Sticking to the question, do you think it's a crime for someone to paint one's fence?"

Zeiger is silent for a few moments. "If it's bizarre it should be."

Lawyer looks around the room and repeats Zeiger: "Should be." The lawyer continues: "Back to why you were afraid, which I'll assume you meant given you said so. If you were lying all this would be nonsense, but I'm going with your word. Based on what's said, you were afraid of him because you say his mind was messed up and you've mentioned his art as proof of that?"

"Yes."

"Are you a practicing mental health professional?"

"No, but I know danger when I see it."

"I thought you've never met."

"I meant, I can tell by his photograph that I saw he's dangerous. He wasn't seeing a psychiatrist at the time."

"Did Mr. Robert T. Rogers tell you that?"

"No."

"Interesting. How would you know about his personal health care?"

Hyper attention in the room.

"The Harpers said that."

"Did Rogers tell the Harpers that he hadn't made a psychiatrist appointment?"

"I can't speak for them."

"We can ask them. Do you think Mr. Robert T. Rogers would talk with them about his private health matters?"

"I don't know."

"Do you think all who see or don't see psychiatrists for mental health are dangerous?"

Silence.

Mr. Zeiger represented the Harpers of Bowman Street. He claimed that I needed to pay the Harpers, Austin Police Department, and him money.

Austin Police Department Questioned About the Towing

"Austin Police Department, did you take the vehicle of Mr. Robert T. Rogers on May 4, 2019, from 2401 Hillview Road 78703?"

"We had a towing company take his father's vehicle."

"Why do you think it was his father's?"

"His father's company owned it."

"Did you take it from 2401 Hillview Road 78703, Robert T. Rogers' residence?"

"We took it from his neighbors' driveway."

"By neighbors are you referring to the Harpers who live at 2807 Bowman Street, Austin, TX 78703?"

"Yes."

"Are you saying you took the vehicle from their driveway on 2807 Bowman Street?"

"No. We took it from an alley on Hillview Road."

"Do you acknowledge the alley was not their driveway?"

"It belonged to them."

"Interesting. It's a fact the alley was 50 percent owned by Robert Thomas Rogers Trust, which owned 2401 Hillview Road, and 50 percent owned by the Harpers. Let's say you did think it was owned by the Harpers and the vehicle was not Mr. Robert T. Rogers'. Did you think Robert T. Rogers stole the vehicle?"

Silence.

Continued: "If you thought it wasn't his vehicle and the property from which you took it didn't belong to him, why would you involve him in any of it?"

"We didn't. He hurried out of his house and talked to a woman officer in his yard."

"By 'his house' and 'his yard' are you saying you think it was his property?"

Silence.

Continued: "What was the interaction like? Was he aggressive?"

"Robert T. Rogers was upset. He asked in strong tone if he could move the car."

"Did you grant his request? To move the vehicle and end the civil matter?"

"No."

"So you were on Robert T. Rogers' property, based on the location of the interaction he had with the woman officer [had you thought he was on someone else's property you could have arrested him for trespassing], and you took a vehicle belonging to his father's company, which you recognized Robert T. Rogers used, and APD took it from an alley owned 50 percent by his trust, the 2401 Hillview Road property, Hillview being the street on which Rogers lived and not the Harpers, whose driveway is on a different street?"

Silence.

"Was there a bill for the towing service?"

"Yes."

"Who received the bill?"

"Robert T. Rogers."

"If it wasn't his car and it was taken from property not belonging to him, why would Rogers receive a bill?"

"It was his car. He drove it. His father's company is in another state."

"Interesting. Earlier you said it wasn't his car; it was his father's company car. Now you say it was his car, and thinking it was his car at the time, the tow company sent Mr. Robert T. Rogers the bill. Is that correct?"

Silence.

"Were there any witnesses besides Austin Police Department and Mr. Robert T. Rogers to the towing?"

"Yes. The Harpers watched."

"Where were they standing?"

"In the alley."

"You mean the alley that is not their driveway?"

Silence.

"Are you aware the bill Mr. Rogers received listed 2401 Hillview Road as the address from which it was towed?"

Without a court order, APD seized a PUCC [personal use company car] parked on private property [the employee's address on the tow bill and the property owned by a trust in his name]. As for the Harpers, did they knowingly make a false statement to police [saying they solely owned the alley] or was it just a mistake? To not know an alley is shared after years by it?



My front porch in Austin, TX. Timothy Zeiger, representing the Harpers, said it had “chicken wire and junk” on it. Why did the porch look concern the Harpers? Perspective: in criticizing my porch, Zeiger was trying to get me to take unnecessary action (change it). APD knocked over the fence a few times. My dog liked the space when the door was open. As if: “We didn’t know his American landscape architecture had purpose. We thought it was agrarian aesthetic.”

Austin Police Department Questioned About the Door

"Austin Police Department, did you go to Mr. Robert T. Rogers' home at the time, 2401 Hillview Road, Austin, TX 78703 in 2019?"

"Which time are you talking about?"

"Here, it regards his front door."

"APD went to Rogers' home because the front door was open."

"To be clear, you understood Mr. Rogers lived at that property?"

"Yes."

"Did you think it was private property?"

"Yes."

"What happened?"

"An officer showed up and talked to Robert T. Rogers about it."

"So he was home. Had Mr. Rogers called the police for help?"

"No."

"His door was open. Did that concern the police?"

Silence

Continued: "Where did this 'talk', as you call it, take place?"

"The officer didn't enter the home. The officer stood near the front door."

"Were you worried about the safety of Robert T. Rogers?"

Silence

Continued: "Was Rogers in the house?"

"Yes."

"How do you know?"

"The officer reported that he was in his living room, visible from the open front door."

"Was Robert T. Rogers able to hear the officer from the living room for this 'talk'?"

"Yes."

"Did the officer speak or only Rogers?"

"The officer said he was there because his door was open."

"So Rogers could hear the officer from his living room. Would you say that required the officer to shout?"

"I don't know if he shouted. He spoke loud enough for Rogers to hear him."

"Did Rogers say anything?"

"He said to the officer, 'Sir, you need to leave. This is private property.'"

"Did the officer at once leave?"

"He did after a while."

"After a while. What took place between saying loudly to Rogers that his door was open and the time he left?"

Silence

"According to Mr. Robert T. Rogers the officer acted like a child throwing a tantrum and repeatedly said, 'I can't hear you!' with his hands by his ears in response to Rogers saying he needed to leave the property."

Silence

Continued: "So you weren't concerned about his safety. What were you concerned about?"

"The door was open."

"Do you think it's a crime if someone in Austin, TX, has their front door open? Enough to go on private property to loudly talk to a citizen about it?"

"APD didn't know if he was in danger or not."

"Oh, so you're saying it was courtesy? You were being nice to Mr. Rogers by checking on his well being, crossing the border of his private property, raising your voice at him without Rogers having called Austin Police Department for help? In your view, you were doing good community policing because a front door open when one is sitting in one's private living room is troublesome?"

Austin Police Department Questioned About Detainment

"Austin Police Department, did you ever detain Robert Thomas Rogers?"

"Yes."

"Was this in the same years that you took his car beside his home from an alley his trust owned 50 percent, showed up at his home due to his door being open, parked next to his home and told him you'd park on the private property every single night, and watched him walk his dog around his Austin neighborhood?"

Silence

The lawyer continues: "The question is based on incidents. There are years for them. It would be easier if you just say 'yes it took place during that time' or 'no.'"

Officer: "Yes."

"Did you detain him at his home?"

"Yes."

"What time of day?"

"Morning."

Attorney: "Were there parents nearby taking their kids to school? Rogers remembers."

"Yes."

"Why were you on his property? Had he called the police?"

"Rogers did not call the police. It was a welfare check."

"So, according to you, APD was checking on his well being. Does this procedure always include detaining the person?"

"No."

"So, you arrive at his property one morning while parents nearby are taking their kids to school. Rogers had not called the police for help, and you detained him?"

Silence

"Is there something missing? How did this happen? Was his door open or did he answer it?"

"His door was shut. Robert T. Rogers opened it."

Attorney: "Did Rogers stand inside his home or did he walk outside?"

APD: "He opened the door and stood inside his home."

"That's interesting. So he was in his home. Could you see his hands?"

"Yes."

"Was there anything in them?"

"No."

"Ok. One morning without Rogers calling APD the police showed up at his home. He answered and had his hands visible without anything in them. Was anything said?"

Silence

"What happened next?"

Silence

Lawyer: "According to Rogers' sworn account, the next thing he knew, the two male officers seized him from inside his home and bound his hands behind his back and ordered him to stand in front of the police car parked on the street while parents took their kids to school, and in Rogers' view the incident was humiliating because it made it seem like he was doing something wrong when all he had done was wake up and eat breakfast in the privacy of his home, and he made the mistake of thinking it was safe to open the door."

Silence

Lawyer: "How did the matter conclude? It's clear Rogers didn't go to jail. Why was he released from detainment?"

APD: "He demonstrated orientation awareness and answered correctly the name of the American President."

"Does that conclude your account?"

APD: "We were nice. APD asked Robert T. Rogers if he wanted pictures of the bruises. He declined."

"According to Rogers, bruises didn't show yet. They did later."

Vetted conspiracy says APD was concerned about my iPhone voice memos. I used to talk about many things. That doesn't explain their aggression. On my part regarding memos, I didn't need to explain what I was talking about or make clear when content was creative. I learned to express mostly in writing.

Mr. Harper Questioned About the Adopted Dog

“Mr. Harper of Bowman Street in the Tarrytown neighborhood in Austin, TX, did you ever have a conversation with Mr. Robert T. Rogers about his dog?”

Harper: “I don’t recall.”

The attorney says, “According to Robert T. Rogers you discussed with him wall blocks he was placing on his upstairs deck. Do you remember that?”

“Yes. That I recall.”

Attorney: “According to Rogers’ sworn account, it was a nice afternoon, and he had gone to Lowe’s Home Improvement on Shoal Creek Boulevard in Austin, TX. Rogers bought wall blocks to place on the wall of the deck outside his upstairs bedroom. He said you were in your backyard and from his deck you could see each other and were not far away, the fence separating the yards. Does that sound accurate?”

Harper: “That is correct. I remember this.”

Attorney: “Rogers says he said ‘Hello’ given the nearness, and he explained that the wall blocks were to raise the height of the deck wall so his adopted dog would not be able to jump over it. Is this true to your recollection?”

Harper: “Yes.”

Attorney: “A short conversation took place after ‘Hello’ and his explanation for his rational behavior. Do you recall?”

“This part I don’t.”

Attorney: “Rogers says you mentioned that your wife had seen the wall blocks, in effect saying you were already aware of them. And you gave advice. You told Robert that he might want to buy a screen. Do you remember?”

“Yes. It’s just been several years. I remember.”

Attorney: “Did you see a screen on the deck sometime after the conversation?”

Harper: “Later there was a screen. It looked like bamboo. I’m not sure the material.”

Attorney: “Now, in the Timothy Zeiger papers, Zeiger being your attorney, it suggests Rogers was abusive to his dog. It has already pleased the court to know that Austin Pets Alive, Brykerwood Vet, Taurus Academy on South Lamar and Petco on Bee Caves Road say that was not so. His dog was healthy. Hard drive visual evidence shows a well cared for dog. Even Austin Police Department, who watched Rogers walk his dog around Tarrytown, says he did walk the dog. The question: from your first-hand experience witnessing Rogers make efforts to care for his dog’s safety, do you stand by the Zeiger papers saying he mistreated his dog?”

Silence.

Attorney: “Also in the Timothy Zeiger of Shackelford papers, Zeiger claimed that your family was terrified of Rogers. Zeiger even said that he was so frightened of Rogers, who he’s never met, that he began carrying a handgun at all times for protection. Question: when you were talking to Rogers on that nice afternoon, did you have anxiety? Or given terror was portrayed in Zeiger’s papers, extreme anxiety?”

Silence

Attorney: “Because it seems like if you were actually afraid for your safety, you would not have continued to have a conversation, much less prolonged it by giving neighborly advice. It seems like you would have ignored his ‘Hello’ and perhaps distanced yourself. Do you think your behavior was consistent with the feelings toward Rogers described by Timothy Zeiger in the legal papers in 2019?”

Silence

“May it please all with ears to hear and in sign language for others, Mr. Harper of Bowman Street in Austin, TX, did indeed have a conversation with Rogers about the care of his dog, and care is what Rogers did, confirmed by experts in pet care in the capital of Texas. And Mr. Harper’s behavior suggests he was not afraid to be near Mr. Robert T. Rogers where they had a conversation, which Mr. Harper participated in, willfully prolonging the interaction.”