DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON
STATE OF COLORADO
100 Jefferson County Parkway
Golden, Colorado 80401

DATE FILED: July 24, 2018

Plaintiff:

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

٧.

^FOR COURT USE ONLY^

Defendant:

ERIC ST. GEORGE

Case No. 2016CR2509 Division 1

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

The sentencing in the above-entitled matter commenced on April 4, 2018, before THE HONORABLE LILY OEFFLER, Judge of the District Court.

This is a full transcript of the proceedings had on this date in the aforementioned matter.

APPEARANCES

For the People:

MIKE FREEMAN, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY KATHARINE DECKER, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY District Attorney's Office First Judicial District 500 Jefferson County Parkway Golden, Colorado 80401

For the Defendant:

MR. ST. GEORGE, PRO SE

MR. MENGES, ADVISORY COUNSEL

1 PROCEEDINGS, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 2018, 1:30 P.M. 2 THE COURT: Okay. We are set for sentencing 3 this afternoon in People versus St. George, this is 4 2016CR2509. Can I have appearances, please? 5 MR. FREEMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mike 6 Freeman and Katharine Decker on behalf of the People. 7 Also with us is our advisory witness, Detective Larson. 8 MR. ST. GEORGE: Eric St. George on his own 9 behalf appearing with advisory counsel Peter Menges. 10 THE COURT: All right. Are both sides ready for 11 sentencing today? 12 MR. FREEMAN: People are ready. 13 MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll first talk 15 up the motion for judgment of acquittal that was filed. 16 Mr. St. George, do you want to add any additional argument 17 to what you have filed for the Court? 18 MR. MENGES: Judge, is it possible to take 19 Mr. St. George's handcuffs off so he can assist himself? 20 THE COURT: Yeah. We can take the handcuffs off 21 for purposes of sentencing. 22 MR. MENGES: Thank you. 23 MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, the motion for 24 judgment of acquittal is complete, and I stand with it as

25

it is.

THE COURT: Any response?

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, we didn't file a written response. The Court didn't require one, and to be honest I didn't think one was necessary. I would just say that while the defendant I think generally cited the correct legal standard for the Court to follow, he did spend numerous pages of his brief asking the Court to violate one or more of those principles by asking the Court to find alternative information to the evidence, to second-guess the credibility of the witnesses, to give specific weight to certain pieces of evidence -- most notably his own testimony. All of those things are not proper in a motion for acquittal.

There's certainly nothing about the testimony of any of the witnesses and especially the victims that was incredible as a matter of law that would allow the Court to discount their testimony, and the jury was entitled to reject most or all of the defendant's testimony, which they clearly did, and credit the testimony of the People's witnesses. And for those reasons, Judge, we would ask that the motion be denied.

THE COURT: All right. The Court has gone ahead and reviewed defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal. In his motion, he has asked the Court to review pieces of evidence and testimony that were brought forward. He has

argued that there was insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt both the counts that were found guilty by the jury, and also to disprove his theory of self-defense. The Court was asked to look at these issues previously during the course of the case. A defendant can bring a motion for judgment of acquittal at a variety of different occasions during the course of the trial and at the conclusion of the trial.

Again, the Court -- the jury found the defendant guilty of Counts 1 and 2 as Felony 3s, that is attempt to commit murder in the second degree; Counts 4 and 5, assault in the first-degree; menacing; illegal discharge of a firearm; and unlawful sexual contact. So, with that being said, the Court did go ahead and review the testimony and evidence presented.

The Court reviewed the information provided by the defendant. I look, again, at the standard, which is the standard in Colorado in People versus Bennett, 183 Co 125, and with that I look in passing upon a motion for a judgement of acquittal, "the trial Judge should not attempt to serve as a 13th juror or invade the province of the jury, but should prevent a case from being submitted to the jury when prosecution has failed to meet its burden of proof."

The Court has found in the course of the

proceedings that the prosecution did meet its burden of proof. I looked at, in this case, People versus Robb, 215 P.3d 1253, and there Robb tells me that when assessing the sufficiency of the evidence in support of a guilty verdict, a Court must determine whether any rational trier of fact might accept the evidence taken as a whole and in the light most favorable to the prosecution as sufficient to supporting a finding of the accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

After a thorough review, I find that that standard has been met, and I'll deny the motion for judgement of acquittal.

Let's proceed to sentencing, I'll hear from the People.

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, at the outset, I haven't received or we haven't received any motions for restitution. I know there was some damage done to obviously the defendant's unit or the one he was renting and outsides of other units. In an abundance of caution, I'd ask the Court to allow us to reserve that issue for 91 days in case anyone decides to submit a motion. We did

THE COURT: Hold on one second. I'll go ahead and reserve restitution for 91 days.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

We did reach out to Ms. Elliott to ask whether she wanted to be here today or not. She declined to join us, indicating that she didn't ever want to see the defendant again and didn't want to be in his presence, so she is not here today.

Agent Meyers -- formerly Agent Trimmer -- is here. She has decided not to make a statement to the Court. We did send her a copy of the defendant's handwritten PSI. She did indicate to me that she did get a chance to read it, found it very upsetting, and didn't feel like she would be able to make a statement today.

We also sent it to Sergeant Maines. He has declined to be here and make a statement today. However, on their behalf, we have Chief McCasky, chief of the Lakewood Police Department. He is here. He would like to make a statement on their behalf. And the Court may recall that during this case, the defendant filed a lawsuit against the Lakewood Police Department, and also against Detective Larson. I believe that's still pending. So at this time I would ask him to come up.

CHIEF MCCASKY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Dan McCasky, the chief of police of the Lakewood Police Department, and I'm here to speak on the behalf of all the men and women of the Lakewood Police Department and for the community that we serve as well.

Today's a day to put a difficult chapter behind the Lakewood Police Department, behind our community, and if ever possible, behind Agent Meyers and Sergeant Maines, along with the other police agents that responded that night to that dangerous situation. There's also another young woman who was victimized in this case that I'm sure she would also like to put this chapter of her life behind her as well.

Today I'm asking you to send a message, a loud and clear message, that the actions of this defendant will not be tolerated by the citizens of our community.

Today's about sending a message that law enforcement officers are here to serve the public and not be targets of violence because of some alcohol-fuelled frenzy or some precalculated plan to commit violence against these officers.

I realize, as all the men and women of the Lakewood Police Department do, that there are always inherent risks to this -- to put on this badge and this uniform every day. We understand that. But that doesn't excuse anybody the right to try and kill our police agents. That's not part of our job description. It's not why these men and women serve our community. They serve because they care. They serve with compassion. They serve with dignity. They serve with bravery. And on this

particular night, they served with incredible courage and bravery. And I'd ask that you send a message that honors that bravery of these officers in this deadly situation they encountered.

I'm sure that you're going to hear people tell you today that the defendant's not some evil person, that he didn't mean these things. I'm sure there's a variety of reasons and excuses that will be given to you today for you to consider. The fact that he's shown no remorse, no regret, nothing but filing a lawsuit against the Lakewood Police Department for his actions that he created, this situation that night, just goes more to show that this man deserves a lengthy prison sentence, that he can't harm anyone else in our community and he can't put our police agents in danger, or any other law enforcement officers that serve with bravery and dignity.

Again, I would ask you to send this message particularly for Agent Meyers and Sergeant Maines and the other police agents that were there that night, the victim who was also there that night that was traumatized -- a victim of a sexual assault. I ask that you send a message for her as well. But please send this message that this community values our law enforcement officers, that you respect the work that we do, the bravery, the dignity, and the courage that we serve this community every day, and

that this defendant's action won't be tolerated.

So I would just ask that when you consider all the facts of this case, that a lengthy prison sentence will send a message that's appropriate to the men and women of the Lakewood Police Department that their service is valued and that to our community, that we believe in a safe community to live in.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FREEMAN: Judge, I think one of the questions that I know I asked myself when I got this file was why did this case happen? You look at the defendant's lack of criminal history, lack of violence in his background, his education, his employment, and you wonder how did we get here? And I think the case can be really boiled down to four factors.

One, on this particular night the defendant was very frustrated over the evening's events. He was very frustrated with his interaction with Ms. Elliott and that led him to be fairly angry.

The second factor is excessive amount of alcohol. As the Court recalls from the trial, his BAC at the time of the shooting was somewhere between a .27 and a .29, and the I think as the Court knows from its experience, that's an extremely high amount of alcohol in

his system that led to some very poor judgement, very poor decisions.

The other factor that I think led to this is access to a lot of firearms. And that, by itself, is certainly not a crime or anything that necessarily leads to a crime. But I think when you factor in the frustration and the anger and the alcohol and the access to firearms, it was a bad combination.

And lastly really is just the defendant's incredibly inflated sense of self, and almost to the level of narcissism, that you add those other factors in, the access to firearms, the alcohol, and the frustration that really led to him reacting the way he did.

Everything that the agents did that night, and I'm not just talking about Sergeant Maines and Agent Trimmer, but all of the agents that responded, everything they did was reasonably focused on having a safe interaction, hopefully, with the defendant, and also for themselves, which they were entitled to do. And the backdrop of this case was always officer safety.

It's a very, you know, sort of high-profile issue right now. We live in a country where already in the first three months of this year we've had 16 peace officers killed, including two in Colorado, just in the first three months of 2018. We had a peace officer killed

in Colorado during this trial on February 5th, and that was always the backdrop on this case.

In every instance the officers explained why they did or didn't do something in relation to their safety and the defendant's safety should they ever make contact with him. And yet time and again, the defendant rejected the notion that they have the right to do something to protect themselves. He would have them walk up to his front door on a weapons call, a shots-fired call. He would have them walk up to his front door and knock. How many officers have been shot through a front door or have knocked on a front door and had that door flung open and been shot? And yet he thinks that that's what they had to do, and that's the only reasonable thing that they should have done in this case.

There were so many things that the defendant did this night that were simply unreasonable and put other people in unreasonable danger, and not just the officers -- Ms. Elliott, his neighbors. The Court may recall when the defendant was testifying and I was asking him about whether he perceived any danger from shooting a firearm into the air in a relatively densely populated urban area and he rejected that notion. He talked about the velocity of bullets, no, it can't -- that can't possibly -- the bullets coming down can't possibly hurt

anybody.

I was curious about that, because I know in my experience that's simply not true. I went back and all I had to do was do a search in Wikipidia and just in a 7-year period in Los Angeles, California. One city in one state in one country in the world, in a 7-year period, 118 people were injured by falling bullets, randomly falling bullets from the sky. 38 of those died. And yet even on that simple point the defendant couldn't even agree with me that that was a dangerous act, that that was an unreasonable act. He wouldn't even agree with me on that.

He refused to call 911. When the police called him on the phone and said hey, we're outside, and we want to talk to you, and if you have any concern that we're not who we say we are, call 911. They will put you through to us. He rejected that. That was unreasonable. Rather than come out the front car unarmed as he was being asked to do, he went out the back door armed with a handgun in his shorts, as we know now that he always carries and always carried with him back then. That was simply unreasonable.

And then ultimately he arms himself with a shotgun, that handgun, extra rounds of ammunition, goes out his back door at night while intoxicated looking for an armed confrontation. And that was inherently

unreasonable and dangerous, and that is what the jury found in this case.

I look at the purposes. I know the Court is familiar with the purposes for sentencing under 18-1-102.5, to punish a defendant by assuring a sentence is deserved in relation to the seriousness of the offense, to ensure fair and consistent treatment of offenders, to prevent crime and promote respect for the law, to promote rehabilitation of a defendant, to address an offender's individual characteristics, and to promote acceptance of responsibilities.

Here we're talking about punishment, the first factor. He fired three separate handguns at ten times total at or near three victims that night. The jury determined that none of those shots were justified. He had justified -- unjustifiably endangered Ms. Elliott, Agent Trimmer, Sergeant Maines, and numerous neighbors. And his level of intoxication made him make numerous bad decisions that night. All of those things are strongly deserving of punishment.

In looking at fair and consistent treatment of offenders, other defendants who have shot at officers received lengthy and significant sentences, not only in this county but all over the United States. And again I think the backdrop of this is that so many officers have

been killed already this year, I think 16 in 2018, including two in our state, that a message should be sent that shooting at an officer, even if it doesn't cause harm, is an extremely grave and serious act that has to be punished.

The factor of preventing crime and promoting respect for the law is a really tough one for this defendant because he clearly has little or no respect for the law and little respect for law enforcement. And that was not only obvious by his testimony in the case, but the PSI that he wrote in the case shows that he has no respect for law enforcement and no respect for the rights of these officers to do things to insure their own safety. And really, the outrageous statements that he made in his PSI writing shows that he has no remorse for his actions. So how do you -- how do you promote respect for the law with somebody who doesn't have any? I think the only way to do that is to give them a significant sentence that sends that person a message that they will respect the law or they will be punished.

To promote rehab, I think this is a similar issue. I'm not sure how you rehabilitate somebody who doesn't think they did anything wrong. And it's clear from his PSI he doesn't think that he made one wrong step that night. So I'm not really sure how you promote

rehabilitation for somebody who doesn't think they need to be rehabilitated and don't think that they ever did anything wrong.

It even goes back to his interview with police that night. He consistently stated alcohol had nothing to do with the decisions that he made that night, and we know, based upon our experience, that alcohol had a huge factor in the decisions that he made and the poor judgment that he had. But he wouldn't even acknowledge that. So I think it's difficult even to say well, if he gets alcohol treatment, that's going to promote rehabilitation when he doesn't even acknowledge that alcohol had something to do with this offense.

You know, addressing his individual characteristics and reducing his potential to re-offend, again somebody who doesn't think they did anything wrong and has no remorse and his -- sort of his last filing is to attack the victims? I'm not sure now you address that. And certainly his lack of criminal history would otherwise be a significant factor and a strong indicator that he's not likely to re-offend.

But then you factor in his complete lack of remorse and his complete lack of responsibility -- acceptance of responsibility -- and all you're left with is someone who, if they were confronted with the same or

similar situation would act in the same or similar manner. And that's really what makes him dangerous, is he is basically saying by his PSI, if I ever get in a similar situation, I'm going to do the same thing. And that makes him dangerous.

To promote acceptance of responsibility, only a lengthy sentence is going to do that with this defendant. The PSI shows that he hasn't accepted any responsibility at all, blames and -- not only blames, but attacks the victims, calls Ms. Elliott a perjurer, calls Agent Meyers a coward, calls Sergeant Maines a lackluster leader, calls him -- essentially calls him selfish and a coward as well. The only way to promote acceptance of responsibility to this defendant is to force it on him by way of a significant sentence. He thinks he's the victim in this case, and he said as much in his PSI.

Judge, we're asking for a sentence that should reflect the harm that was done to each victim. I think each victim in some manner should be reflected in the Court's sentence. We did file -- we did file a sentencing brief in which we laid out what we thought the sentencing ranges were and the limitations on the Court's discretion. I do think that the minimum sentence is 20 years, and -- I think I wrote it in here -- I think the maximum sentence is 152 years.

Judge, we're not asking for anything near the maximum. We're not asking that the Court necessarily lock the defendant up for the rest of his natural life. I don't think that that would be appropriate. But we are asking for a significant sentence that not only reflects the conduct and the serious nature of the conduct, but his complete lack of remorse, his insulting and outrageous statements in the PSI, and his complete lack of acceptance of responsibility in this case.

And, Judge, based upon those feelings, those beliefs, we feel that a minimum sentence of 30 years would be appropriate, and nothing short of that, in our opinion, would address those factors, the seriousness of the offense, and his complete lack of remorse in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. St. George?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I have friends and family here in the gallery who are entitled to and want to speak on my behalf. They will also be representing those friends and family who weren't able to be here for one reason or another. And they will be reading letters that have been brought to them from those friends and family.

THE COURT: And just to let you know,

Mr. St. George, I have reviewed all the letters that

you've submitted to the Court. So I have read the letters

that were submitted over the past couple of days. So if

these are new letters, I will definitely hear them.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, in that case, while I think it would be beneficial for all of those in the gallery to note --

THE COURT: I'll hear from anyone that's here personally. I was just telling you that I have reviewed the letters that you submitted to me, and I think the district attorney's office has had the opportunity to review those also.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Okay. That being said, I'd like to call my uncle, John St. George --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ST. GEORGE: -- to speak.

THE COURT: Sure. Come on up.

MR. JOHN ST. GEORGE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm John St. George. I'm Eric's uncle, his father's brother.

The family is very sorrowful about this whole episode, and we don't condone what Eric did that night. Wasn't there. Can't offer any evidence or I would have been called at the trial.

But we would like to say that this is a valuable man, he's an entrepreneur, he's started several business, he employs people, he pays taxes. As the district attorney's pointed out, he has no history of criminal

violence or criminal activity. So in terms of rehabilitation, any sentence given would certainly suffice, I think.

He's 40 years old now. 30 years he'd be 70, 20 years he'd be 60. We would like -- his family -- to see him get past this thing and be free at some point so that he can return to society and contribute and, you know, be there for us, with us, and rejoin society and hopefully not repeat, you know, these mistakes.

THE COURT: Thank you so much.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I would next like to call some of my closest friends. This will be Troy and Casey Loftus to speak on my behalf.

THE COURT: And spell your last name?

MR. LOFTUS: Loftus, L-O-F-T-U-S.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. LOFTUS: Your Honor, my wife and I -- Casey -- are very good friends of Eric St. George. Actually personally, for me, I've known him for 20 plus years, and in the 20 plus years, he's probably been I would say one of my closest friendz. You know, you have people in your life come and go, he's been there for me or I've been there for him the whole 20 years basically. I've only been married for ten years, and that's when Casey met him.

But you know, basically he's had no violent

5

history the whole time I've ever known him for 20 plus years. You know, just as a little history on me, I've never had a detention. I grew up as a straight-A student. I've never been in trouble for with the law. I think I maybe have one speeding ticket. And, you know, I don't tolerate others around me that don't respect the law or that are violent and things that I -- that would put my wife or anybody I cared about in danger.

So I think that night's events were very circumstantial and, you know, in all honesty, when someone is innocent or is, you know, defending themselves, why would you show remorse for that? I wouldn't feel remorse if I was trying to defend myself against unknown danger.

You know, I've trusted this man with my life. We spent seven months in the Alaska wilderness, hiking around and staking gold claims for a big company, to where -- in Alaska, in the wilderness, it's life or death up there. And I trusted this man with my life for months on end. Any time I've ever called him when my vehicle's broke down, he's been to help me. I've driven 3000 miles with him to go pick up a vehicle that was disabled.

On the night in question, Your Honor,

Mr. St. George had in his possession probably \$10,000

worth of my most precious firearms and ammunition that he was temporarily storing for me while we were moving and

transitioning from an RV to a cabin. I would not trust someone that I felt was dangerous or unstable with that kind of fire power. I'm more responsible than that.

MS. LOFTUS: And I'd just like to add from my personal point of view, I've actually been friends with Eric for 13 years and he has become one of our best friends. You know, he's smart, he's intelligent. He's not an acquaintance, he's the guy you have deep conversations with, intellectual conversations. And we've been hiking on multiple day hikes, and throughout that time, you know, we've talked about life and what our plans were, and he's always said that he planned to get married and have kids. That's the life that he wanted and that's the life he deserves.

And so we're asking for leniency today and understanding, that this -- this is this man's life, and he is a good man.

THE COURT: Thank you so much.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, next I call one of my classmates from high school. I call Courtney Horning.

MS. HORNING: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is Courtney Horning, and I live in Castle Rock, Colorado.

I'm a single mother of three girls, ages 9, 8, and 5. I met Eric in high school and I've known him for 25 years.

I would not hesitate for one second to leave him with my

three girls.

I wanted to give you a glimpse of the Eric I know outside of the incident on July 30, 2016. He is one of the most dedicated, loyal friends that I know. He has always been there for me and every one of the girls, as he likes to call us. He has travelled very far to be a part of the important events in our lives. He truly values his friends.

He is also one of the most intelligent people I know. He has successfully started and grown several businesses where he's always shown integrity. He has a large support group of friends and family who have been with him since the beginning and will continue to stand beside him, no matter of the outcome.

I understand the gravity of the crimes he has been convicted of. I believe in laws -- the law -- and we are responsible for our actions. Eric truly believed, as do I, that he was acting in self-defense. He stands firmly for his Second Amendment right and the responsibility that comes with that right. The Eric I know would never intentionally harm two peace officers.

Over the last 25 years, I've never seen Eric demonstrate any inappropriate sexual behavior. Honestly, through high school and college he had many opportunities to do so but always acted with good moral character.

Eric is a good man with integrity and it would be devastating to lose my friend. So I thank you very much for considering leniency for Eric James St. George.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, next I call another classmate, I call Kom Pak Koeut.

THE COURT: Could you help me with your last name spelling, please?

MS. KOEUT: Sure. K-O-E-U-T.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. KOEUT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

First and foremost I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to say a few words about my friend, Eric St. George. I'm from Jacksonville, Florida, and actually flew in about 2:00 your time when I left home to be here to support him. I've known him since high school, so like Courtney said, in numbers that's more than 25 years.

So I want to give you just a little bit of background. When I was in 8th grade, my guidance counselor told my dad that I should apply to this high school called Stanton College Preparatory. It's an academic magnet school in Jacksonville, located downtown, where everyone had to be bussed in or drove -- driven. I had never had to do that before -- apply to a public school -- but I did. I applied and I got in. It used to

be a 7th through 12th grade school, and our class, 1996, was the last of the 7th through 12th.

When I went to that school, that was the third school in three years that I had been to. But it was even worse for me because the people and the students, they had already been together for two years. So not only was I a new student from the wrong side of the tracks, but all the groups were already made, friends were already made.

Your Honor, I remember it like it was yesterday. I walked into class and I was frozen. I just, I had to have been like a deer in headlights. I couldn't move. I mean, I was nervous and I was scared. I was more scared of this than any other new school I had been to. And I think Eric sensed something. He looked up. I saw a bunch of people in the corner and they were talking and laughing. And through that crowd, he looked straight at me and he smiled the warmest smile. I don't think I've seen a warmer smile since.

And he was kind. I mean, you can tell he had a lot of friends, so I think when he made that gesture, and he was kind to me and he introduced himself and he was nice, everybody else just kind of followed suit. Because I wasn't scary anymore. I like to think of him -- I like to think of Eric as my high school ice breaker. I don't think he ever knew, back then, the impact that he had on

me in high school.

I know that I'm going to forever be grateful for how he helped me. But as I would learn, that would just be par for the course, because he's a good person. And I don't mean that in a nonchalant way. Eric is a good person to his core. He's smart, he's dedicated, he's loval. He loves life. He loves adventure.

I mean, this is a guy that once dressed up as Slenderman. He wore stilts. He was seven feet tall. He wore a very super hot outfit and he walked around a parade and he took pictures with everybody. People tried to give him money, he didn't take it. He probably took hundreds of pictures with people, and he did it because they were smiling, they were happy. He did it for the joy. He's not a bad person.

I mean, you've heard from several people that he has a very entrepreneurial spirit. That entrepreneurial spirit and his, just, know-how -- I mean, he was successful in not only growing and running a business, but he was also successful and excelled in our ridiculously hard academic routine at school.

There was once, I don't recall the year, maybe 2007, one of our mutual friends had basically hit rock bottom. And I won't mention names, but he was in trouble. He had nobody, he had no one, nowhere to go, no money, no

nothing. But Eric saw the good in him and he gave him a job. And not only did Eric give him a job, but Eric gave him a place to stay until he could get on his feet. He gave him a second chance, second chance at life, and that person now -- that person now is not only self-sufficient, he's financially stable, he's emotionally stable, he's in a loving relationship.

I don't know where he would have been if Eric didn't help him and reach out to him, say hey, man, why don't you come work for me. I got an extra room at the house, you can stay there. You don't have to pay me anything, it's okay. That's the kind of person that he is. That's who he is.

Just a couple more things. Eric is a go-getter, probably will be always. But the thing is, when he gets, he always gives back more than he gets. He gives back to his community, he gives back to his friends, his family. His door was always open. I remember at our 20th reunion -- it's hard, weird for me to say 20th high school reunion -- he offered everybody from our graduating class a free tint job. Yeah, come on over, I'll tint your windows for you. I'm not charging you anything. I was busy, though. I couldn't do it. His hand is always a giving hand, and always a helping hand.

Eric loves his family. He loves his friends.

He loves his communities that he's been a part of,

Jacksonville, Atlantic Beach, Colorado, Alaska. He loves

his life, and that's what I want to impress upon the

Court. He loves his life. He values it.

I flew here from Jacksonville today to beg the Court to show him mercy, give him a chance to do more good in the world. Because I promise you, Your Honor, he's not done. I would wager my own life on that. You show him mercy, you won't be disappointed. He's going to do good things.

We all want him to come home. We'd all like him really to come home so that we can all start to mend this brokenness that we feel. The experience has changed a lot of us, all of us. And obviously today we're a little down, but we're not out. We all have fight left in us, no one more than Eric. So I'm asking you to send him back to us so we can all begin to heal. And we love him and we need him in our lives.

You have most of the letters, but just some of the names of the people: Nicky, Cheryl, Peg, Ronny, Vanessa, Adam, Julian, Gina, Ashley, Crystal, Jeremy. All these people need him home.

Thank you.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Your Honor, I call my brother, Craig St. George.

MR. CRAIG ST. GEORGE: My name is Craig St.

George, Eric's brother. I've literally know him my entire

life. And I know the difference in him.

I know the difference in him between angry intent and sheer terror. And what I can tell you about what I've heard of that night is that was sheer terror. Some of the things that I listened to during the trial, I had to just listen to in disbelief in trying to picture some of those things he lived through and had to live through.

And any time I talk to someone about this and they kind of tell the story and I tell them about some of the things that were said over the phone, you know, "my friends are in your backyard, they're standing in the dark and looking through the window," that's just creepy.

That's creepy to me, and I don't know how I would react to that. I have a wife and a kid, and I'm very protective of them. I would probably do something to make sure they were safe no matter what I had to do.

My brother and I obviously grew up together.

Same parents, no divorce, had a good life. We weren't affluent by any means, but we had everything that we needed. Always had everything we needed, guidance, love, support, and we had a dad that, he worked really hard and we learned from him. We both learned from him. And what

 he did is he worked three jobs his entire life. You know, he had good jobs, but he just kept working other jobs to make sure we were taken care of.

When my dad was in school -- he was going to school for a radiographer -- he would get off -- that's a 40-hour-a-week position, for anyone who knows medical imaging. I did it too. He would work that 40 hours per week and he would get off and be an orderly for the hospital and he would work until the late hours of the night and then he would drive a cab and he would do that until the early hours of the morning to make sure that we had extra money so that my mom could stay home and take care of us.

He did that all through high school until we graduated. Not the cab part, but he was a stenographer manager, so he worked 40 plus hours. Managers have to work 40 plus hours in medical imaging. And he took calls at two different hospitals. And if anybody in here's been on call, which I think a lot of you have, it's terrible. You know, you go home, you're trying to go to sleep, and get called in. I myself have worked 24 plus hours straight. It's awful.

He did that, and my mom worked as well. My brother and I learned at a very young age how to take care of ourselves for the most part. My parents were busy

people but they wanted to provide for us, wanted to make sure we had a good life. You know, we learned very early on how to cook for ourselves, clean for ourselves. We were doing our own laundry an about my son's age -- he's 7 -- and that's about when we started to do those things for ourselves. It sounds dangerous but it was a different time back then. Things are different now.

But we both learned -- the point is we both learned from my parents and we wanted to do more with our own lives. Eric, I would say, probably got the picture a little earlier than I did. He had his own lawn company when he was, like, 12. And he worked all the time. He'd go to school, he'd get off, and he would go cut people's yards, and they would pay him for it. He did a good job. They respected his work, a 12-year-old's work. And they would hire him and they would tell their neighbors, hire this guy, hire this little kid, he does a great job.

And that stemmed on into high school. He started his own business in my parents' garage and he was tinting windows and the neighbors started to complain about it because there was so much word of mouth that the product was good, he was doing a good job, that the traffic got to be too much for the neighborhood and they were upset and they essentially kicked him out of the garage -- the neighbors did, not my parents.

So he bought his own shop. He worked at his own shop for many years. He built that company up like from nothing and he made really great money, then he employed people and gave people chances. He did all that before a lot of us, obviously. So when he finally did graduate high school, he was already a businessman, in business for himself, doing well.

He is a giving person as you already heard. He gave jobs to people. There was one kid who would have never gotten an opportunity like the one my brother gave him. He did not finish high school. He finally received a GED from my brother's guidance and he would have gone into the world and he would have wound up working at low-paying jobs for the rest of his life, but Eric gave him a chance. He gave him a really good salary and he taught him about business, taught him how to work for himself and do things for himself. And I've talked to that person, you know, in the last couple years and he is doing very well. He is self-sufficient, he is a businessman of his own. He's doing great. He learned those things from my brother, from that give-back.

I definitely looked up to my big brother. When I needed something, he was always there. He could always provide it. If I ever needed money, he would give it to me. He sold me my first car for \$500. He gave me a loan

of \$500 for, I think, like, 24 months, which equates to about \$6 a month or something like that. And I, you know, I could barely pay it. And he never came asking for money, he just -- I essentially paid him off, but he never bothered to ask. He just wanted to give me a car because he knew I needed it. He was just that kind of person. He wanted to make sure his little brother was taken care of.

If I ever need a place to stay, he was there.

He let me move in with him, didn't charge me any rent. It was better than living with my parents and he didn't want me to sleep in my car so he let me move in with him rent free. I always appreciated that.

If I ever got myself into a situation where I was stranded -- and it happened a couple of times, I would be an hour and a half, two and a half hours away from home, midnight, 1:00 a.m., 2:00 a.m. -- I'd call Eric and explain my situation to him, tell him how I got there and how stupid I thought I was. And he wouldn't even think about it, he would just ask where are you, I'll be there as soon as I can. 1:00 in the morning and he's willing to drive two and a half hours to pick me up just to drive me two and a half hours back home.

If I ever needed to just clear my head, if I just needed to talk to somebody, I always valued him as a very intelligent person. I still do. He's one of the

smartest people I know.

Even through this experience he wanted to educate some of his fellow inmates and read to them. And it turns out that they're Spanish-speaking and they can't read the books themselves. He learned Spanish again so he could read to them because they couldn't read it on their own. And they're bored and needed something to do. And he would sit there and he would spend these hours with these folks that he doesn't even know and read to them in a language he learned back in high school and has rekindled himself. It's incredible. So why wouldn't you want to talk to that person? Why wouldn't you want that person in your life to talk to you, to explain things, to teach you? He was always a great educator.

He was always there to tell he how stupid I was being sometimes, and I eventually -- I took the hint and I did go back to school, and I'm doing quite well, and it was because I always looked up to him and I also wanted nice things like he had. And while I was in school, my wife and kid and I had to take a lot of time away from family.

Eric never took time away from family. Nothing was more important than that. He was always at big events, weddings, anniversaries, birthdays. No matter what it was, no matter where it was, he was on a plane, in

his car -- mostly in his car. He's what I would refer to as a road dog, kind of a St. George thing. We like to drive across country. I don't know why, but we like it.

But he was there and I wasn't. And everyone knows I'm the jerk in the family. So they got to know him a lot better than me. These are family members in Minnesota. These are people we don't see very often. He saw them often. They know him, they love him, they love having him around. He's fun. He's fun to be around.

There was a picture of my brother as a child in a little red suit. It's a ghastly outfit and my grandmother just loves that suit. She's 90 now. And --she's 92 now. On her 90th birthday, while I was too busy with my studies to make is it, Eric showed up. He bought a custom suit. Custom suit runs about \$150 to \$200, and he just wanted to see that old woman smile at his new red suit.

He's fun. He does these things. He remembers things in people, things that they love and appreciate. He goes out of his way to make people smile. It's all he wants to do. He loves to smile. I love to smile. So he loves to make people smile.

He's made every holiday gathering for a long time. He's filled it with a lot of joy and laughter. He has one of the biggest hearts of anyone when it comes to

family and friends, and he puts the needs of others before his own. He obviously has a great deal of friends. He's gotten letters, you've heard from some of them today, they're inspired by him, they appreciate him, they respect him, they love him. They're lifted by his personality. I'm lifted by his personality.

My son is lifted by his personality. He's a young child and he asks about his uncle all the time. Last couple Christmases have been difficult because I haven't been able to tell him what's going on. I don't have the words yet, but I'm going to have to at some point explain what's going on with his uncle, and he's just going to keep asking for him to be there because he just loves being around the guy. He just takes really good care of his nephew, makes sure that each day that he's around him is filled with fun and laughter.

He's not a narcissist, not a narcissist at all.

And maybe he was frustrated that night, rightfully so.

Everything was out of control completely and nobody was doing anything to bring it back in. Nobody was reigning it in. He would never intentionally hurt anyone. I know that. I know that. He doesn't hurt people. As I mentioned before, he has a big heart.

And I also mentioned that when I was working on my degree I didn't spend a whole lot of time with family,

and that meant him. I didn't get a lot of time to be around him, and he would ask and I wouldn't be able to make it to things, and I was really hoping that when I moved to New Mexico, that we would be close again. He did start coming down a lot when he could, and I never made it up here to visit him. And I wish I would have on so many more occasions.

I wish I would have taken the time, and I want that time back. I want to go hiking with my brother and want to help him put the pieces back together. I want to reconnect with him, and I want to do things that brothers do.

He's intelligent, he's capable, and he has the ability to learn anything. He needs the chance to demonstrate his best intentions. 20 years might not be a life sentence to him, but it's a life sentence to a lot of people in our family. He's already missed one grandmother's funeral, and I don't know who's going to be next. There's lots of elderly uncles and aunts, older cousins, another grandmother -- the one that loves the suit.

My parents. My parents were here for the trial. They sat and listened to the whole thing. It was hard to watch them go through this. Heart trouble runs in my family. My dad's been in to the cardiologist since this,

just recently. It's hard. He's already had a heart attack and this is hard for him to handle and he looks older than I've ever seen him look, and it's because he doesn't understand what's going on with his son and why he's being treated like this.

When my -- when we finished the trial, we went back to my uncle's house and we talked a little bit, but my parents walked off because they needed some time to kind of process this on their own, which I can understand. I wasn't allowed to process it yet, at least I told myself that, that I was going to make sure I stayed strong for them, to let them have their time with each other, the time that they needed to be with each other.

And I overheard something that my mom said to my dad. And if you understand my dad, he lost his brother recently, his older brother as well, to a heart attack -- go figure. And he was just a stone. He's just a hard man, you know? These things don't affect him like they affect most people. They don't bring tears to his eyes. He's able to accept them and move on as life.

He recently lost his mother, that was in December. That's the grandmother that Eric was not able to be at the funeral. Same thing, I sat next to him the whole time, choking back my tears and wondering where his were. This was his mother. But he's just a stone. Then

I overhear my mom after the trial walk to the back room and say Fran, we just lost a son. That was the straw. It's the first time I'd ever seen tears.

We don't get to close this chapter. We don't get to move on, high fives all around. This chapter doesn't end for us. So there is no moving on past this. And I don't want to be at another funeral without my brother putting a flower on a casket on his behalf. He shouldn't have to miss those things. I don't want him to miss those things. So I'm asking you to please show leniency towards this good man, toward my brother.

People mistake us for a lot of things because of the way we are. St. Georges are goofy people. They mistake our confidence for arrogance. They mistake our wise cracks for snarkiness. They mistake our silliness for a lack of respect or responsibility. That's just not true. They are mistakes.

We like to have a good time, but I can tell you one thing, we handle our business and we get things done. We learn that from each other and we care about each other and we take care of each other.

So please, again, I ask you to show a little bit of leniency for my brother. Regardless of what other people in the room might say, he is a good man and he has done good things and he's been good to a lot of people.

And he had one really bad experience. One really bad experience. That was out of his-control and it landed him here.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. ST. GEORGE: July 31, 2016, I was shot and killed. My life was taken from me that night. Instead of actually expiring that night, though, I've had the misfortune of living. Because had I actually passed that night, from my wounds, from being shot and killed, my family would have had the opportunity to begin the healing by now. But instead, I've continued to be painful to them. They haven't had the chance to heal. Instead they get to watch me slowly expiring again.

Following the trial, articles were placed in the news.

"Man who fired gun at exotic dancer, Lakewood police is convicted of felonies. Gunman was hit by officer fire in July 2016 incident, no officers were injured. Man who fired shots at Lakewood police has been convicted of multiple felonies including two counts of attempted murder.

Eric James St. George, 40, was found guilty this month by a Jefferson County jury after a 7-day trial according to the district attorney's office.

On July 31, 2016, a woman called 911 saying that she had just left St. George's house in the 8100 block of West Eastman Place. He followed her outside and fired a gun at her. The woman and exotic dancer said St. George paid her to dance for him at his home, but during the session he started groping her.

The jury deliberated for two hours before returning their verdict. Officers told the jury in the case that when the pair arrived, they talked to Mr. St. George, but the 40-year-old refused to answer six calls from them. Lakewood police then began to set up a perimeter around the home. The DA's office said that St. George went out the back door and kept walking until he had a clear line of sight on an officer behind a vehicle. St. George reportedly raised his shotgun and fired at the officer three times."

Even after winning at trial, it wasn't good enough. The district attorney continued to pitch this false narrative, the false narrative that they brought to trial, false narrative that they're still trying to sell.

They've approached this case without so much as the smallest amount of professional integrity. They've brought shame into your court. They've allowed their career ambitions to come before seeking truth or justice or morality. They've suborn witnesses to perjury.

They've committed crimes of their own, perjuring themselves.

We all heard it at the trial. We heard even the police department's detective in an "aw, shucks" testimony where he said, "you know what, I think we blew it on this one. Mr. St. George never fired at that girl." Because that was -- that's true. I never fired at that girl. That didn't stop the DA from putting that into the public and libelling me.

They said that I walked out the back door trying to flank officers. I came out the back door because I was told there were people in the backyard looking through my windows. I went out there unarmed. There was no gun on me. We have witnesses that said that very thing.

There were no police at my house that night.

There were just shadows. Had I known -- had I known that there were police out there -- this would have never happened. I wouldn't have been shot and killed. I wouldn't have put people at harm, in harm's way. I would never have shot at someone had I not been open fired upon.

It was suggested that, even today, the DA still hasn't relented, said I came out looking for a confrontation. We know that's not true. I was defending myself. We still can't seem to get the facts correct, even after trial.

It was suggested that I have no respect for law or law enforcement. Nothing could be farther from the truth. When I tried to say at trial that I have friends and family, I have clients who are law enforcement, it was objected to. I was stopped before I was allowed to say that, because we couldn't let the jury hear that I respect law enforcement, because we're trying to sell a narrative that I'm a bad dude who's out to kill cops. A fiction and a lie. Nothing could be farther.

It's been said that alcohol -- it's just because he was so drunk. Had the scenario been played out exactly as it occurred that night and I had been stone sober, I still would have fought to defend myself. If someone fires upon me, I have no option but to fight back for my life. Alcohol played no part in this. Don't blame alcohol. I won't tolerate that. And we won't blame guns. My guns would never harm somebody. But if someone tries to murder me, I promise you I will defend myself. And if I have to use a gun, I'll use it. I never denied that. I never claimed otherwise. I said from the beginning I was fighting for my life.

Officer Meyer --

THE COURT: You need to speak with me, Mr. St. George.

MR. ST. GEORGE: That person has stolen my life

from me. Every minute that person spends with her wife and child is a minute that was stolen from me. Whether it was fear, whether it was -- whatever. I don't know what -- I'm not going to be like others, and I'm not going to speculate as to what was going through someone else's mind. What I do know is something became between that person and their professional, legal obligation as peace officer to do what needed to be done that night.

Never once did I see a squad car or a uniform, did I hear a warning. That person laid in wait, hiding, and when I came around the back of that truck, they opened fire on me, wounding me. Could have killed me. Then, for fear of the consequences, couldn't honestly report what had occurred in that incident. Instead, made me out to be the aggressor, which is flatly not true.

I was not the aggressor that night. That person lied to her fraternity of fellow officers, dragging them into a perjury. Said, "he shot at me three times, and then I fired back." Physical evidence wasn't there. We saw that at trial. There were no shotgun shells behind that truck. I got shot and immediately retreated.

Your Honor, I do not envy your position. I gave you a motion for judgment of acquittal. I don't ask you for a favor. I don't ask you for special consideration.

I don't ask you for sympathy nor pity. I'm not asking you

to make a moral decision based on your own subjective feelings. I ask you to make a legal judgment.

That motion should have been granted. I gave everything that you needed in order to do that. And I understood -- I believed -- that you could find the strength to make a politically difficult and unpopular decision and grant that motion. And I really hoped you would do it.

You now have to come and pass judgment on me.

You have to determine what happens to me next. I warned you of these potential hazards. If this conviction is allowed to stand, we forever eliminate the obligation of peace officers to identify themselves in dangerous situations. We forever strip men of their right to self-defense. We set a legal precedent today, which effectively revokes the statute which allows self-defense, Colorado statute 18-1-704. We effectively eliminate the obligation by police to mitigate the risks to those that they serve. I'm very afraid for that.

I never would have harmed peace officers. I know enough peace officers that I know how challenging their job is. That job requires placing themselves into dangerous, potentially lethal situations. They also have an obligation to eliminate those dangers where possible.

Your Honor, I know that my message sounds much

of being sad just yet. I have to be hard, because I have to fight. I'm not sad, I'm angry. I've been cheated. My life has been stolen from me. You heard a couple of my friends -- you heard Casey talk about my aspirations towards marriage and family. That has been stolen from me. I won't have that. I have a right to that. It belongs to me.

different than that of my friends and my family, because

while they're sad, I have not afforded myself the luxury

And it's true, I have been a good person my whole life. I don't have the arrogance to get up here and told you all about it, despite what you may have heard from others. Because I'm not an arrogant man. In fact, I'm quite the contrary. You won't find someone who's quite so self-deprecating as me.

Since the time I've been housed in this facility, I have met all the peace officers who work here. Many of them come to me and they ask me, how do I have the strength and the confidence to do what I've done? How is it possible for me to defend myself, not to be represented by counsel, to get up and speak on my own behalf? In fact, I explained to them, I didn't have a choice. My back was against the wall. Didn't have an option, not unlike that night.

I had an incident with a woman of ill repute

earlier in that evening. When my friends and my family tell you about the mistakes that I made, that's where it ends. That was the mistake that I made. I made a choice to invite the devil into my own home.

She lied to police. She told them that I tried to kill her. That never happened. We know it's not true. She told us it wasn't true, basically, in her own words, in her recorded statement. All the neighbors knew it wasn't true. They only heard one sound. She used innocent people as tools. That wasn't fair to them, wasn't fair to me to have those innocent people used against me.

It's been said that I'm not taking responsibility. I've been told by many people the best thing to do is to go fall on your sword in court, beg for mercy, take responsibility. Except how can I do that? How can I take responsibility for trying to defend myself, to protect my own life? I have -- you've watched me fight in this courtroom for my life. It hasn't ended yet for me.

I was shot in an attempt on my life and then I entered the legal system, which is nothing more than another attempt on my life. Shameful people with career aspirations, I suppose, or perhaps it's an obligation to their constituency, have had no problems telling

falsehoods about me, misrepresenting the evidence, lying. There's no better words for it, it's just lying. And it cheapens this court, spitting on the dignity of this Court. And it's morally wrong, legally wrong.

Again, Your Honor, I'm asking you to make a good legal decision here. I genuinely had hoped that my motion for judgment of acquittal would be heard. There was no evidence presented at trial that I was not defending myself. There was none. And now I have to take up this fight in an appellate court, I presume. My family gets to watch me slowly lose myself. The man that they all spoke of, I don't know if I can continue to be that man as I'm robbed of my life.

I don't smile as much any more. I have nothing to give anyone anymore. Everything I had's been taken from me. I don't know what I'm going to do. But I will keep one promise. I will fight. I've told my family that I will fight. I will fight until this thing can't be fought anymore.

When you make this decision, Your Honor, make sure that you know an innocent man, an innocent man at least in these charges -- I'm not guilty of attempting to murder anybody. I'm not guilty of assaulting anybody. I've fought for my life. Those people outside my home did not tell me that they were police. So as far as I could

tell, it was the payback from Ms. Elliott. Well, she's got her payback. I've already lost nearly two years of my life, and today you're going to decide how many more I lose. But I'm not guilty of these charges.

I hope everyone -- I hope everyone who has used me as their personal little scratching post knows what they have done. I hope they lose sleep. I hope that they one day will be recognized for the shame, for the elicit behavior, for the poor conduct, for the lack of integrity that their actions deserve. They deserve to be seen as unfit people.

Your Honor, I wish you the best of luck in making this decision.

THE COURT: All right. Have you concluded your remarks?

MR. ST. GEORGE: I think you're done hearing them.

THE COURT: No. I'm asking you if you've concluded. Yes?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Perhaps I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll assume that means yes.

All right. So we're here today to look at convicted charges from the jury, Counts 1 and 2, attempt to commit murder in the second degree; Counts 4 and 5, assault in the first degree; Counts 6, 7, and 8, menacing;

Count 9, illegal discharge of a firearm; and Count 10, unlawful sexual contact.

So when I take a look at this, I understand, Mr. St. George, that you disagree with the finding of the jury. It is your position that you are not guilty of these charges, and it's been your position throughout the course of this trial.

So just to go through a bit of this, when I looked at the register of actions, you did choose to represent yourself, so we appointed advisory counsel. We assigned an investigator in order to pursue your case. You also asked for an investigator, a special expert, who would analyze your crime scene information in order to provide you with substantiation of your version of the ballistics and what occurred. So you did have those opportunities.

So then we went before a jury and they heard the testimony and the evidence. The Court is not the finder of fact within the context of a jury trial. But certainly I listened and need to listen for purposes of any motions and, of course, the evidentiary rulings throughout. What I found was there was more than ample evidence to prove each and every element of each offense you were found guilty with, beyond a reasonable doubt.

An individual can craft a motion to the Court,

emphasizing certain pieces of evidence and certain not pieces of evidence: versions of the events, things that are missing like the fact that an individual contacted a friend to try to give themself some sort of alibi for that night because they knew that they had shot up in the air or at Ms. Elliott and knew they were in trouble. People try to formulate an alibi because they know the police are coming. Because they have a consciousness of guilt.

Certain factors such as that have -- also have to be considered when you look at the entirety of it. I listened to each and every witness in the case. The jury listened to each and every witness in the case. They heard your self-defense defense. And they found it to be lacking.

I understand that it is difficult for you to accept your behavior that night and what occurred that night. You have asked the Court to disregard the fact that you were very intoxicated. You indicated that intoxication played no part in. Now, the jury found that intoxication played a significant part of it, and they took a far more serious charge and reduced it because of your intoxication. So certainly the jury found intoxication to be relevant. I found intoxication to be relevant, otherwise my sentencing range would be much higher.

I need to find some sort of explanation. It is not appropriate to blame those people that you endangered that night, beginning with Ms. Elliott. You ran after Ms. Elliott when she left the home. You ran after her with a loaded gun. You shot it up in the air, or wherever, while Ms. Elliott was right there in front of you going to her car. How terrified would she have been? You shot a loaded handgun in the midst of a crowded apartment complex. That was certainly out-of-control behavior. No one can condone that. No one.

She called the police to say that somebody ran after her with a loaded handgun and started shooting in a busy apartment complex. Of course she called the police. What could be more dangerous?

You left and went to a bar. You indicated you needed to get out of there, you could be in some kind of trouble. You began drinking. You contacted a friends to provide you with an alibi. You knew the police were going to come. You don't have an alibi because scary people from an escort service are going to come over to your house. You have an alibi for fear that you are going to get in trouble for shooting a gun into a parking lot of a busy apartment complex on a nice afternoon.

Then you went home. You didn't know who was there? Your expectation was that after you just shot at a

would come up to your house and knock on your door? No.

They called you. You answered the phone. You didn't

believe them. I'm hopeful that it was intoxication.

They said, call the dispatch operator. The

young woman racing to her car, you thought that police

They said, call the dispatch operator. The dispatch operator will confirm that these are police officers out there, because they will connect you to their phone. You chose to disregard that. You caused this. Your behavior caused this. These are just a few of the small pieces of evidence that were brought out during the course of that trial which disproves your case.

Your theory was not accepted by the jury. A judge found probable cause for the charges initially, and I found more than ample evidence to support each and every one of the elements of the crime. I found ample evidence to disprove your theories of defense of property, because you were defending that \$200 when you ran after

Ms. Elliott. And defense of self -- self-defense against her -- I found each and every element that the prosecution had proved that was not correct beyond a reasonable doubt.

There was no self-defense.

I'm hopeful that it was because of intoxication.

I'm hopeful that you weren't thinking clearly, because if
you were, I should put you in prison forever because you
are a terrible danger to the community. There was no

self-defense. You created this environment. You were the dangerous situation.

There were two police officers that could have been killed that night. It is terrifying. The testimony from those police officers was chilling, as they moved around the car, as they were looking for shadows, as they were looking for cover, because who knew what you were going to do. Walking out a door and racking a shotgun, as you said, is the universal sign of go away? No, no. That is an incredibly scary sign of aggression. People don't brandish deadly weapons unless they intend to use them.

So I don't really understand what your thoughts are with reference to this self-defense. I understand that people filter their own experiences through their own life, but I'm having difficulty with this one. No, judges do not make decisions because they are politically expedient. Judges make decisions based on the evidence, the facts, and the law. And applying the evidence, the facts, and the law in this case, there is no motion for judgement of acquittal. There are jury verdicts. And the Court will sentence you on those jury verdicts.

So, this is what we're going to look at.

Okay. The attempt to commit murder in the second degree against the two police officers, two counts, I'm finding 15 years in the Department of Corrections for

each count to run consecutive. I require them to be run consecutive for a variety of different reasons. These are violent crimes arising out of the same set of circumstances with two different victims. However, I'm going to note for the record that if this wasn't mandated by statute, the Court would still find the consecutive sentencing to be appropriate in this case within the facts and circumstances of the case.

With reference to 4 and 5, assault in the first degree, I note that there are different elements in these crimes. However, the behavior is the same as that that supports the attempt to commit murder in the second degree. And thus I'm going to merge Counts 4 and 5 into Counts 1 and 2.

Counts 6, 7, and 8 are menacing. And in this case, Counts 6 and 7 are two years to run concurrently with Counts 1 and 2.

Count 8 is two years to run consecutively. That is Ms. Elliott. Ms. Elliott is a victim in this case. I don't protect victims because I like their occupation or dislike their occupation. I protect victims and sentence violent behavior against them because they deserve to be protected just as everyone else. And to disparage a victim because of the particular employment is inappropriate. The Court protects everybody. Everybody

comes before the Court in the same set of circumstances.

Count 9, illegal discharge of a firearm, that is two years to run concurrent. Count 10, unlawful sexual contact, two years in the county jail to run concurrent to the other counts. It is to be served in the Department of Corrections.

How many days do we have?

THE CLERK: 610, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm granting credit for 610 days.

So you do have a right to appeal this sentence, Mr. St. George. You have 45 days to appeal it. I would gladly appoint counsel to appeal both the sentence and the trial itself. The public defender's office has an appellate section and they certainly would provide excellent legal help. I would gladly appoint the office of the public defender to represent you to take this appeal.

MR. ST. GEORGE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And you want me to do that?

MR. ST. GEORGE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And with that, then, I will go ahead and grant the production of the transcription. They'll ask me for all of that. So we've appointed the office of the public defender, the appellate section, to go ahead and prepare the appeals. Thanks very

```
much, everyone.
 1
                  (End of proceedings.)
2
3
4
5
6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

The above and foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes taken in my capacity as the Court Reporter for the First Judicial District Court, County of Jefferson, State of Colorado.

Dated this 24th day of July, 2018, at Golden,

7
8 Colorado.

*This is an electronically signed copy of the transcript.

_Stephanie D. Swihart____ STEPHANIE D. SWIHART Registered Professional Reporter