N23N-CR080077420S : SUPERIOR COURT

STATE OF CONNECTICUT : NEW HAVEN JUDICIAL DISTRICT

VS.

: AT NEW HAVEN G.A. 23

STEPHEN PISERCHIA

: MAY 8, 2008

BEFORE THE HONORABLE: PHILIP SCARPELLINO, JUDGE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE STATE:

MICHAEL DENISON, ESQUIRE

ASSISTANT STATE'S ATTORNEY

FOR THE DEFENSE: JOHN CIRELLO, ESQUIRE

ATTORNEY AT LAW

JANET LASKEN COURT RECORDING MONITOR

1	MR. DENISON: Good morning, Judge. Michael
2	Denison for the state.
3	THE COURT: Good morning.
4	MR. DENISON: And on your A Docket, number
5	71, the matter of Stephen Piserchia.
6	MR. CIRELLO: Good morning, your Honor.
7	John Cirello for the defendant who's approaching.
8	I have notice of the A.R. application and the
9	green card from the victim.
10	MR. DENISON: I know that the victim is in
11	court today, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Britt Marie Horrer (sic),
13	H-A-W-R-E. Hawre.
14	MR. DENISON: Harwe.
15	THE COURT: I apologize if I mispronounced
16	it. Is that you, Miss? Come on up. How do you
17	pronounce it, ma'am?
18	MS. HARWE: Harwe, H-A-R-W-E. Harwe.
19	THE COURT: Harwe. The the W sounds like
20	a V? All right. Record should reflect that
21	Miss. Harwe's received notice and she is actually
22	present in court.
23	Now I'm sure the prosecutor, ma'am, has
24	informed you that, you know, this is an
25	application for a particular program. This
26	program, firstly, is available only to persons
27	with absolutely no prior criminal involvement.

It's a program you can use one time in your life. 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

26

27

It's a program where the Court can put -- put the defendant on a probation for up to two years with any conditions the Court thinks is appropriate.

And, you know, whenever -- before this program is granted there's a statute that says the victim must be notified so that the victim can come and give their views to the Court. I always try to tell the victims that there's really two things the Court would like to hear, other than, you know, what you want to say anyway, but what -- what the Court would like to know, you know, on the one hand if you're opposed to the program in the first place, and on the -- if you are, then a -- a second thing the Court would want to hear is, even though you're opposed, if the Court were to grant the accelerated rehabilitation, even over your opposition, what conditions would you like to see on it.

So -- so those are -- aside from any remarks you'd like to make besides that -- I'm not -- I'm not limiting your remarks to that but those are the two issues that -- that the Court would want to address or want you to address so that -- you know, as I said, even though, you know, a victim may come in, a victim may object, the Court may

1 grant it over the victim's objection, the Court may not grant it over the victim's objection. I 2 don't know what I'm going to do. 3 I had a conversation with counsel this morning. I did read some letters on behalf of 5 the defendant to save some time when I came out 6. in court. I did listen to both attorneys speak 7 to me. And I indicated that I would listen to 8 everybody and if I had some problem I would just 9 continue it for awhile to -- to decide what I 10 wanted to do. Or, if I could make a decision 11 today, obviously, I would do it today. So that's 12 13 where we stand. Now having said all that, are you ready at this point to address the Court? 14 15 MS. HARWE: Yes. THE COURT: Do you feel comfortable? Okay, 16 very good then. Go ahead, ma'am. 17 18 MS. HARWE: Okay. THE COURT: Just state your name for the 19 record. 20 MS. HARWE: My name is Britt Harwe. 21 want to let you know I have a paralyzed vocal 22 cord so I'm sometimes hard to understand. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Can you hear that okay 24 25 through the microphone? THE MONITOR: Yes. 26 THE COURT: All right. 27

 MS. HARWE: I'm the one that received Dr. Piserchia's harrassing phone calls. I'm here to say that I do not think Dr. Piserchia should be able to get accelerated rehabilitation and have the possibility of his record erased.

I do not believe for a minute that he will not harass again. He is a health care provider who has the priviledge of using the title doctor which makes his behavior all that more -- much more reprehensible.

This was not a one-time occurrence or lapse in judgment. Over a period of three days he called seven times. Each time leaving a message harrassing, singing songs, belching and making fun of stroke victims. He admitted he made these calls but only to voice his opinion. Yet not once in any of these seven messages he left did he express any opinion at all. He also sent me e-mails as far back as January 2006 poking fun and that he was going to adjust 45 necks that day.

I'm the co-founder of a group of victims called The Chiropractic Stroke Awareness Group. We consist of hundreds of members who have suffered a stroke as a result of a chiropractic adjustment. Our group is working alongside another group called VOCA which is Victims of

1 Chiropractic Abuse. It is working to getting
2 laws passed here in the state of Connecticut that
3 chiropractors would have to adhere to.

One of the bills is about giving informed consent to patients before a chiropractor does a minipular treatment on a patient he must first discuss the risks which include permanent disability, stroke and even death.

Dr. Piserchia as well as other chiropractors in the state do not want this bill to become law because they feel patients may not want to have manipulations done if they knew there were risks. All chiropractors seem to be concerned about is their bottom line instead of the health of their patients.

My group feels that since the risks may include such devastating injuries as permanent disability and death, people have the right to know so they can make their own informed decision about whether they should proceed with this health care treatment.

Chiropractors have long advertised that manipulations or adjustments, especially cervical adjustments, were safe. But this is not the case. I can personally attest to that. In 1993 I went to a chiropractor for a pinched nerve in my shoulder and the chiropractor crushed an

artery to my brain and I had a stroke immediately
on the table. Since the age of 26 I've had many
disabilities. I was told I'd never walk or
possibly talk again. I have a feeding tube
because I cannot swallow properly and have to

normally, in 15 years.

I am one of the fortunate ones. Many have become permanently paralyzed, have totally lost their ability to walk or talk and even have died. And I'm one of the survivors that want to warn people about the possible dangers. We know about the risks of so many things in medical procedures, risks of smoking, taking drugs, et cetera, so why shouldn't we know the risk of a chiropractic manipulation, especially since they're so severe and potentially life—threatening.

take all nutrition and I have not eaten properly,

I want to continue my work without fear of him calling or writing me, making fun of me or my fellow stroke survivors. I want to continue my work. Dr. Piserchia knows he's picking on people who now have severe physical and emotional problems. He is preying on them by making his phone calls so that they become too intimidated to take part in our awareness campaign, all in hopes that our message will simply go away.

Dr. Piserchia may not have continued the calls himself to other victims across the state but I strongly believe he's very instrumental in getting other chiropractors to do exactly as he did. Many messages left on other victims phone's answering machines were the same songs and basically making fun of stroke victims. I know that this is no coincidence. Dr. Piserchia -- it almost chokes me to use this title for him because it just seems unfathomable that any doctor who's supposed to live by the motto first do no harm would intentionally compound a person's injuries by making fun of them.

He has never, ever apologized or expressed any remourse that he made the calls. Obviously, he knows our e-mail address and easily could have written a nice note but he didn't. In fact, I know he did the opposite. He has been calling everyone he knows to try and further intimidate us.

We know he's even called the billboard companies that we advertise with and tried to get companies to take down our advertisements. He's used every connection he had in the New Haven Police Department to try to get me to go away ever since he made the calls back in June of 2007.

After he admitted to the police that he made the calls to me and after I put in a complaint to the New Haven Police Department, he called sergeants, lieutenants, patrolmen that he knew at this department, all in hopes of getting this to quietly go away. That is why it has taken over eight months to get to court. Every time Dr. Steve made a call to one of his friends the paperwork would mysteriously dissapear.

Between Janet, President of MOCA, and myself, we've spent hours upon hours and days upon days trying to get someone to do the right thing within the police department. In fact, the very first time we went to the New Haven Police Department we were told he was not known to them as Dr. Piserchia. He was known as Dr. Steve because Dr. Steve always came in and gave them adjustments.

We were assured by the sergeant at the time that although they knew Dr. Steve it would not affect the fact that he was going to be arrested for the harassment, and this was back in August of 2007. Dr. Steve has proceeded in calling everyone else on the force to make this go away. He had the audacity to keep denying that he even made the calls at all, even though he already admitted it to some police officers, and it was

1 clearly his voice on the tapes and the caller ID clearly identified his office as the New Haven 2 Medical Sports and Occupational Health.

> And then when VOCA was making great strides in bringing one of our bills to light in the legislature this past March, we were accused publically of using Dr. Steve as a scapegoat because they said we deliberately waited to get him arrested in March so we could use the publicity against him and make an example of chiropractic behavior.

In fact, the whole tactic of trying to stonewall this and delay his arrest has nothing to do with us at all. We have tried hard to get this done seven, eight months ago and yet they accuse us in Hartford of unscrupulously using Dr. The whole thing was so covered up and didn't proceed after the paperwork mysteriously dissapeared.

We showed an article to Mr. Denison that was written up on Dr. Steven on the internet, of which I have a copy here if you'd like to see. He clearly states Dr. Piserchia made contacts at the New Haven Police Department by lecturing at the Police Academy and it even shows a picture of him working with a police officer in uniform.

Dr. Piserchia is a licensed healthcare

23

24

25

26

27

3

5

pr
 of
 He
 ye

provider. He made harassing calls from his office in between appointments during the day. He wrote e-mails also during the workday about a year-and-a-half before we could prove he was making these calls.

Steve Piserchia will not stop his harassment of me or other stroke victims. Accelerated rehabilitation will not stop him from harassing, frightening and emotionally hurting these people, these stroke victims. We have all, obviously, suffered enough and I would rather not have his record erased. He is a healthcare provider. People need to know that this is on his record and this is the way he has behaved toward victims; knowingly calling them.

And I have transcripts of what he said. Not once did he left any kind of opinion whatsoever. And he was complaining he was upset about our advertising. All we did was advertise, injured by a chiropractic adjustment, 'cause we wanted to find others and we have found hundreds. That's all we've done. It's called stroke awareness. You hear about stroke being caused by so many other things, it is caused by chiropractic manipulation.

THE COURT: But --

MS. HARWE: They've said it in all their

1 literature. 2 THE COURT: But you're not asking me to punish him for all the people that were injured 3 by chiropractors? 4 MS. HARWE: No, I -- I'm --5 THE COURT: I mean --6 MS. HARWE: -- asking you to --7 THE COURT: -- some of your presentation 8 was, you know, was directed at -- at all the 9 people who suffer. And certainly, you know, this 10 Court and I think any -- well, I won't speak for 11 12 anybody else -- this Court has, you know, empathy for folks who, you know, go in for what we all go 13 in for sometimes and come out in a -- in a bad 14 situation. 15 But -- but you're not asking me to deny it 16 because there are people who suffer --17 No. Absolutely not. MS. HARWE: 18 THE COURT: 19 Okay. I am asking you deny the 20 MS. HARWE: Accelerated Rehabilitation because this should 21 not be wiped off his record. There have been 22 23 hundreds of people in the group, there have been others that have gotten the same type of phone 24 calls. We can't prove that it's him but others 25 have been affected. The group has been affected. 26

I can't get others to come with me today because

1	of the harassment.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. HARWE: And what is a medical procedure
4	and yes, medical procedures can go wrong, but in
5	many cases chiropractors don't tell the people,
6	go to the hospital and get treatment. They say
7	nothing and let the person suffer.
8	In my case the chiropractor called 911 yet
9	said nothing. Did not tell him he did a neck
10	adjustment, did not tell him I couldn't sit up,
11	that I couldn't speak
12	THE COURT: Yeah, but I can't
13	MR. CIRELLO: Your Honor
14	THE COURT: I mean, the
15	MS. HARWE: They had no idea
16	THE COURT: You know, I can't you know
17	MS. HARWE: But this is what he's making fun
18	of these people.
19	THE COURT: I understand that but but,
20	you know, the it the sympathy of the Court
21	cannot be a factor in whether or not to grant
22	this Accelerated Rehabilitation. I mean, there's
23	certainly a sympathetic and empathetic feeling of
24	the Court but but I can't use that to to
25	deny or grant. Now
26	MS. HARWE: I want you to understand what he
27	did. It is not just a matter of one person

1	harassing another person or a group. This is a
2	healthcare provider, licensed by the state of
3	Connecticut, using the title doctor, knowingly
4	calling a stroke awareness group and making light
5	and making fun of stroke victims. Hah, hah. My
6	mother had a stroke, she can't talk.
7	THE COURT: That is
8	MS. HARWE: This is
9	THE COURT: difficult to understand.
10	MS. HARWE: That's what I want you to
11	understand and that's why I gave you
12	THE COURT: Well, I do
13	MS. HARWE: all that
14	THE COURT: understand that.
15	MS. HARWE: background information.
16	THE COURT: I do understand.
17	MS. HARWE: Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
19	MS. HARWE: No. Thank you for letting me
20	speak.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. DENISON: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: The state?
24	MR. DENISON: Judge, this is one of those
25	cases where we're faced with a misdemeanon (sic),
26	which is arguably what the Accelerated
27	Rehabilitation Program is designed for.

As the Court knows, you've got to make a decision based on whether or not the defendant is likely to re-offend and whether or not this matter is one of serious proportion that would preclude somebody from benefitting from a period of probation.

I think Miss. Harwe has kind of summed everything up here. He's a doctor. Uses the name doctor, the title doctor, uses the title physician. While "do no harm" is the first tenet of medicine, I don't know about chiropractic, but it is the first tenet of medicine, she's a hundred percent correct. He picked somebody who he doesn't know, calls them repeatedly over a period of several days leaving just horrendous telephone calls mocking the fact that these people have been hurt.

Now the Court has heard what Miss. Harwe's injuries were. She suffered a stroke. She has on-going life -- life problems including the fact that she's no longer able to eat without assistance from a tube. I don't know if the defendant knew that at the time he made the calls but he does know that these people were injured. And what he did was exacerbate these injuries, literally by mocking them and by simply saying, I'm a doctor, I can do this. This is

1	arrogance
2	MR. CIRELLO: Your Honor, my
3	MR. DENISON: arrogance.
4	MR. CIRELLO: That's not a quote from my
5	client. I want the record to be clear. He says
6	my client said this and, as far as I know, my
7	client has never spoken to Mr. Denison.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. DENISON: If if I may make my
10	remarks?
11	MR. CIRELLO: Sure.
12	MR. DENISON: This is just plain arrogance
13	on the part of this defendant. On the one hand
14	he wants to be doctor, physician, Dr. Steve to
15	all the all the police departments and other
16	folk.
17	And on the other hand he wants to be able to
18	engage in the practice of chiropractic with
19	impunity. And any one who takes an opposite
20	opinion of the practice of chiropractic or
21	anybody who speaks ill of it, well, they're just
22	fair game. This is horrendous behavior and
23	there's no doubt about it.
24	If the Court is inclined to grant
25	Accelerated Rehabilitation, it should be for the
26	full term of two years and the Court should, as a
27	condition, mandate through the Department of

1	Probation psychological evaluation and such
2	treatment as is necessary to ensure that this guy
3	doesn't re-offend and that he's made to
4	understand that one who is entitled to use the
5	term doctor, on the one hand, has great
6	responsibility to society in general and to those
7	who he treats on the other hand. Thank you,
8	Judge.
9	THE COURT: Okay. I read
10	MR. CIRELLO: Your Honor
11	THE COURT: I read the the packet of
12	letters that you gave me. I'm not going to go
13	through the entire list but counsel, on leaving
14	this morning, gave me a packet
15	MR. CIRELLO: There are about a dozen
16	letters, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Yeah, and, as I said, I did read
18	through all of them. And I'm going to hand them
19	back. And I had written made some notes on
20	there so I wouldn't mispronounce his name so
21	MR. CIRELLO: Anything further, your Honor?
22	THE COURT: No, go ahead.
23	MR. CIRELLO: Okay. Your Honor, the accused
24	is standing next to me. This is a person who's
25	accused of certain crimes. There's been no proof
26	that he has committed these crimes to date. And
27	I think that I didn't want to interrupt the

alleged victim with her comments or the state with their comments but not only did they portray a lot of the accusations made in the affidavit, the police affidavit, as fact but also added additional allegations that I have never been made aware of and that my client -- and others that my client absolutely denies.

I think that we need to take into consideration what the charges are and the facts that are outlined in the police report with regard to whether Accelerated Rehabilitation should be granted.

Between June 5th and June 7th of 2007 the victim allegedly received seven harassing phone calls from the defendant, okay? There is no mention of e-mails, there's no mention of him getting other people to call, there's no mention of anything about it at all.

On June 27th the victim called the Wethersfield Police Department to report the incident. On June 28th, 2007 an officer from the Wethersfield Police Department, which has no relation to my client, my client doesn't know and my client doesn't do any business with the Wethersfield Police Department, called my client and told him not to call the hotline any longer.

Since that time my client has not called the

hotline. The -- at that point the victim was dissatisfied with the Wetherfield Police

Department that my client wasn't arrested. So or August 9th she contacted the New Haven Police

Department. And I don't know how she knows conversations that she wasn't privy to with regard to my client and the New Haven Police

Department or vice versa but they did what they were supposed to do. They presented the case to State's Attorney Dave Strollo and they said that they were ceasing the investigation.

And then on January 15th brother counsel presented the case to the police department. My client — there was a warrant out for his arrest. He was notified of that and he turned himself in. She makes some comments about — with regard to the seven phone calls, they were, other than the one comment about the — getting someone on the phone who had a stroke, they were "Prince Albert in the can" type comments. Phone calls, there were seven phone calls. The total duration of those phone calls was 100 seconds. It's a minute and a half.

What were the adverse consequences to date for the accused? As a result of the victim's efforts to make this prosecution a media spectacle, my client's name and sometimes picture

wa
 Fo
 na
 th

was depicted in the Hartford Courant, CBS News, Fox 61, NBC Channel 30, News Channel 8 and national -- and national cable news. Many of these things were available on-line 24 hours a day.

News Channel 8 was probably the most egregious with a camera in the courtroom. Not only did the show air that night but a slow motion special effect shot of my client walking out of this courtroom was depicted on the news for two weeks during every one of their news broadcasts promoting the news.

As a result of this -- Dr. Piserchia owns a small business in town and it's affected his business. Cameras were appearing in front of his place of business. When the Knights of Columbus, who was a major client of his, found out about it, they dropped him as a provider just because of the allegations that were set forth in the news stories.

Additionally, just recently, he received letters from two insurance carriers saying they have suspended his ability to treat their patients because of a news story that appeared in March 6th of 2008.

Why all of this media attention? As the victim stated, she's the sole member and owner of

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

a company called the Chiropractic Stroke Awareness Group, LLC. The group's mission is to attack the profession of chiropractic care which -- which is commonly used by millions of Americans. The group promotes their -- the group, meaning the Chiropractic Stroke Awareness Group, promotes their agenda through aggressive advertising campaign which includes a website, newspaper advertisements, television commercials, bus advertising, an entire bus with her phone number on it, a half-page Yellow Pages advertisement, again with the victim's phone number on it, public service announcements with the victim's phone number listed; most notably, a billboard on Route 95 in Bridgeport which is seen by millions of commuters with her phone number on it.

We're not trying to silence her from standing on a mountaintop and shouting whatever she wants through a megaphone. But if somebody shouts back, I think that's -- that should be expected to some degree. So one hundred seconds of poor judgment by -- on my client's behalf results in a firestorm of media attention to promote the victim's cause.

Through A.R. my client's charges might be dismissed but the damage to his reputation and

his business will not. Despite the relentless media attack, he still is respected and trusted by his patients, other businessmen, and other healthcare providers as the 12 letters that you've read indicate. And I don't want to read them on the record for -- I don't wish to waste the Court's time.

When Dr. Steve called me and told me that he was charged with these crimes, I agreed to represent him pro bono. I'm not taking a fee for this case, your Honor. That's how much I respect this man. Also, I'm a client. And I've treated with him in the past and had the same neck manipulation that the victim has had. And if I was in pain again I would have him do it again.

The relief we're seeeking is that the Program of Accelerated Pre-trial Rehabilitation be granted. It's appropriate in this case. My client has no previous criminal record. The charges are misdemeanor. The accused is unlikely to offend in the future. And — and that is evidenced by the fact that the last time he made a phone call, allegedly, was June 7th and since that time my client has told me that he has not made any phone calls or contacted the victim in any way.

Additionally, the accused has suffered

damage to his reputation and his business standing in the community, especially with the insurance companies preventing him from earning income for treating their patients. The insurance companies are asking how this case resolves in order to see if he may be reinstated. If there's a two year period of probation we won't know how this case resolves for two years. And as a result, he may lose these — these providers forever. For the foregoing reasons, the accused asks the Court to grant the Accelerated Rehabilitation Program and dismiss the charges today.

About the state's request that a mental health evaluation be ordered of my client, I don't see that anywhere in the Accelerated Rehabilitation statute. There is a section that says you can have a mental health screening if the crime involves cruelty to animals. So, therefore, the legislature contemplated in what cases do we need a mental health evaluation and they decided that in the case of cruelty to animals, yes, that would be appropriate but it's silent to a Harassment in the 2nd Degree charge.

The victim claims that my client's more concerned about the bottom line and not the care of -- of patients. I think the letters

contradict that statement. And with regard to him not apologizing to her, the Court's well aware that any statements that my client makes after he's been charged with a crime can be used against him and, therefore, he has the right to remain silent.

THE COURT: Certainly -- certainly, the fact that he's not apologized has absolutely no bearing on the Court, whatever decision the Court makes.

MR. CIRELLO: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor --

THE COURT: As a matter of fact, this Court doesn't order letters of apology. This Court feels that if people want to apologize, they should do it on their own, not because they're ordered to apologize. You know, I find that rather ridiculous, to be honest with you.

MR. CIRILLIO: Thank you, your Honor. I have nothing further to say, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. PISERCHIA: Your Honor, I am truly sorry. I never did this for fortune, fame or greed. It was a silly act but I have suffered dearly as a result of it. And I was never given the ability to apologize because I was told by the Wethersfield Police that cease and desist

means no further contact.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not -- I'm not concerned about the apology. I understand the reasons, the legal reasons for that.

Well, you know, firstly, there's a -there's a couple of things that should be noted
and you know, we did have some pre-trial
discussions and the discussions out here do not
reflect the pre-trial discussions that we had.
The -- you know, the representations that were
made in chambers are different than what occurred
in this courtroom this morning. And,
nevertheless, what occurred, occurred, and so,
obviously, the Court has to deal with that.

You know, regarding the remarks of the victim in this case, you know, I think that many of the remarks were extremely poignant and extremely important. I think some of them, you know, regarding the number of people that have been injured by chiropractors, I really don't think that has anything to do with this particular case.

I think what we're looking at here is a professional chiropractor who made phone calls to a group. I mean, I think he has a right to resist the group. I think he has a right to lobby against the group just as the group has a

right to lobby for what it wants. I mean, that's -- that's what this is all about.

So -- so the real issue here is -- you know, the statute says the Court has to, one, find that it's not of such a serious nature, the crime itself. And, secondly, that he's not likely to offend again in the -- in the future.

You know, whatever the Court does, you know, this is not a win/lose situation. This is not, you know, the defendant wins or the victim wins and the defendant loses and, you know, the -- the Court has to look at the conduct. Now it was also mentioned -- so so that addresses the victim's, you know, view of the situation.

I -- I think that the -- you know, there are rights to resist. There's nothing wrong with that but the question is, is what he did too much for the Accelerated Rehabilitation.

As far as, you know, counsel's remarks regarding these charges not being proved, well, I mean Accelerated Rehabilitation obviously contemplates the Court looking at the facts that were presented and making a decision on the facts that were presented. Now these facts may turn out, I mean, who knows? It may turn out that a nurse from his office made these phone calls. The question is, I have to decide whether if he

made these phone calls whether that's too serious an offense or whether or not he's likely to offend again. So I have to assume that these things occurred the way that -- that they are said to have occurred. This is not an innocent -- a guilty type situation.

You know, regarding what the news has done, I'm sure that that does reflect, you know, some punishment that he's received then. But, you know, in todays day and age, you know, the -- the media can -- can hurt someone and can be judgmental and -- I didn't read the articles pertaining to this case. I don't know anything about this case except for what I've heard in the chambers and what I've read in the police report. I obviously made it a point not to look at anything that had to do anything with this case.

Yet the Court -- you know, there's something that's wrong here. There's something that just doesn't sit right. Why would a doctor pick up a telephone over a three day period, make seven phone calls to somebody and -- and -- and -- and some of them were mocking. Some of them were degrading. And it's hard to get -- it's hard to get past that.

And this is truly one of those cases, you know, it's again, you know, one of these cases

that's -- that's on the fence and -- and , you know, difficult to decide. I think that some of the things that the victim said are, as I said, reflect what the Court feels. A number of phone calls over a period of time but I don't want to get sidetracked by the poor victims of -- of some -- of anybody, any profession; doctors, chiropractors. People get hurt, people get injured. You know, I -- I don't want to punish the doctor for those reasons either.

But, you know, for -- for a physician, for a doctor to pick up a telephone and -- and over three days make these calls to a specific group that has suffered as a result of these injuries, is something that the Court is unsure as to whether or not it can address through the Accelerated Rehabilitation Program.

And finally, you know, this has nothing to do with whether I'm going to do this or not do this but, regarding any psychological counseling, you know, I think this Court has the authority to demand psychological counseling if that's what it thinks is appropriate in this particular case.

So, having said those things, obviously as I said to you when we had these in-court, in-chamber discussions, the -- the presentation changed somewhat when we came out here. And so

1	the Court has digested the remarks that have been
2	made and can I see the content of the the
3	transcript of of the call of the calls?
4	Can I see that?
5	MR. DENISON: We don't have a transcript, I
6	don't believe, at this point.
7	MR. CIRELLO: I I have a transcript.
8	MR. DENISON: You have the transcript? Oh,
9	yes, I do.
10	THE COURT: Yeah, you have it. We talked
11	about it this morning.
12	MR. CIRELLO: Let the record reflect that
13	Crystal Haynes from News Channel 8 is in the
14	courtroom.
15	THE COURT: Why does that matter?
16	MR. CIRELLO: I think that media has a lot
17	to do with this case. It was a large part of my
18	argument.
19	THE COURT: Okay. All right, we'll pass
20	this for a few minutes and we'll get back to it
21	in a little bit.
22	(THE MATTER IS PASSED AND LATER RECALLED.)
23	MR. DENISON: Is the Court prepared to take
24	up
25	THE COURT: Yeah.
26	MR. DENISON: Piserchia matter?
27	Recalling number 71, the matter of Stephen

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

27

Piserchia.

MR. CIRELLO: John Cirello, once again for the defendant, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. All right, the record should note that the victim is still in the courtroom and the Court has taken about an hour or so after hearing the arguments.

As I said earlier, you know, there -- there was a -- an initial indication this -- this might have been an agreed to situation, however, that changed and that's -- the Court has no problem with that. It just wanted to digest everything and all its reasons that it -- that it had on its mind regarding this particular offense.

You know, I start the day every day by saying that there are numerous programs available that have the effect of dismissing the particular charge against you if you qualify and if you do as you're directed to do with these programs.

And, you know, there's -- there's a program, you know, for drunk driving where it ends up in a dismissal of the charges. There -- there's possessions of narcotics that carry seven years and \$50,000 that end up in dismissals. You know, there's family violence offenses that are violent that sometimes -- and those end up in dismissals.

So the -- so the question is, is there some

way to address concerns and -- and go along with the statutory criteria that have been set out by the legislature. So the first thing is, is the Doctor likely to offend again in the future. You know, that's -- that's a question that -- that, you know, you almost have to guess at but he comes before the Court, let's say, over 40 years old, and have no -- without -- without any kind of criminal record. So, obviously, any one who applies for this program has to be in that position.

You know these -- these phone calls, when you -- when you read them and look at them they -- they almost look like they were made by a child. And I think that that's part of the reason, you know, why the Court has wanted to make sure it thought this out totally, hearing from the victim and seeing the nature of the offense and -- and the type of situation.

You know, it's hard to sit up here and say that any offense is not serious because every offense is serious as it -- as it relates to a particular individual. You know, someone that committed a Larceny 6 and stole someone's property, you know, in the total scheme of things is it that serious? Well, no, but it's certainly serious to -- to the person to whom that -- you

1 k
2 i
3 t
4 t
5 c

know, who the victim was. I mean, it might have involved a minor -- a minor keepsake that's -- that's worth ten bucks but just -- just the -- the value of it to somebody, you know, could -- could be something that's extremely serious to them.

So, you know, the question really becomes is the nature of the offense so serious that it would -- it -- it shouldn't -- you know, that this program shouldn't be used. And, as I said, we know, we give programs for -- for drunk driving incidents and -- and incidents more serious than this.

Obviously, there's a little different light on this because, you know, I think someone who is a professional is held to a -- a standard that -- that we don't expect this. I mean, if you read these phone calls and said who made these phone calls, I -- I'm guessing everyone would say someone under the age of 18 years old. And, you know, for that reason I think it's what brings the attention to -- to this situation.

You know, as I said, I think the -- the victim has her right to demand that doctors do certain things based on her experience. I think the doctor has a right to resist it legally. Not in this manner, however, obviously.

So the question is can the Court address the concerns and is this program appropriate. I'm going to find that -- that he's not likely to offend again in the future and that, you know, although it's -- I can't find the right word.

I -- I want to say extremely immature, accomplishing no purpose, stupid, should be ashamed of what you did, ashamed of it. Let alone apoogize. I don't order apologies because I don't think that that's appropriate but you should genuinely be ashamed.

I am, however, going to find that the offense is not so serious that it shouldn't be given A.R. I'm going to give the A.R. period for a period of two years. I'm going to order that you make a \$2,500 charitable contribution. I'm going to order that you do 250 hours of community service. And I'm going to order that you get any psychological evaluation that's deemed necessary by probation. You pay the fees in the clerk's office on the second floor. You see probation on the second floor. Once you do that, then you're free to leave. And, obviously, you must cooperate with this program.

I would note for the record that the charge with which he's charged is a misdemeanor that carries 90 days in prison and a \$500 fine. It is

the least serious type of misdemeanor that one could commit. And the Court, as I said, took so much time not -- not because of the nature of the charge, we grant A.R. on harassment charges every single day, but it's your position and the people that you called and the way that you acted that had the Court on the verge of not granting it.

However, in thinking it all over, you know, I don't want to -- I think you should be punished for the act that you did. I think that what I'm giving you as a punishment is sufficient punishment for what you did and, obviously, the collateral consequences is your problem. You created it in the first place by making the phone call and this Court has no sympathy for that. As I said, you should be ashamed, you should be looked upon as you -- as you're looked upon for doing this act but I do think that the program is not inappropriate, the Accelerated -- with -- with the severe conditions that the Court has put on. Okay. Go see probation. Go pay the fees.

MR. DENISON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

N23N-CR080077420S

: SUPERIOR COURT

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

: NEW HAVEN JUDICIAL DISTRICT

VS.

: AT NEW HAVEN G.A. 23

STEPHEN PISERCHIA

: MAY 8, 2008

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the following is a true and accurate transcript of the above-entitled case as heard and recorded in the Superior Court, Geographical Area 23 of New Haven, New Haven, Connecticut before the Honorable Judge Philip Scarpellino.

This certificate does not apply to photocopies which do not contain my original signature.

Signed and dated this 24th day of June, 2008.

Janet Lasken

Court Recording Monitor