recollection of the testimony is not the same as yours, you must follow and rely on your own recollection.

The summations of the lawyers are merely that, summations. They are not evidence, nor should they be construed by you as evidence or instructions on the law. The summations are intended to help you in understanding the contentions of each side.

With that, ladies and gentlemen,
Ms. Timmins will proceed first followed by
Ms. Schaefer, and Ms. Timmins will get a
reply to the argument of the defense.

Ms. Timmins.

MS. TIMMINS: May it please the Court.

THE COURT: Ms. Timmins.

MS. TIMMINS: Counsel.

Ladies and gentlemen, I stated at the beginning of this case that the Defendant used his power, his control, the trust that he had been given to abuse, to exploit, and to endanger.

You have now seen and heard the

evidence for yourself, and it is now time for you to make a decision about that evidence. The power and the control is soon going to get turned over to you.

This is my time to walk through what we've seen, what we've heard, and what we haven't heard, and talk about how the facts and the law fit together, and how it is that the State would argue to you about the end result of this case.

A lot of people hear those instructions and see them for the first time and say, that's a lot, and that seems confusing. But it's really not once you start taking all the facts and you put them into the elements and break down each one.

The first one that is the most important in any criminal case is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt is the State's burden. We gladly take it on in every criminal case that we do.

This is the definition: "If, after a full and fair consideration of all the

evidence, you are firmly convinced of the defendant's guilt, then you have no reasonable doubt and you should find the defendant guilty."

Okay. That's the standard, firmly convinced. What it doesn't mean is beyond all doubt, beyond any doubt, beyond a shadow of a doubt. It's called reasonable doubt for a reason. Firmly convinced.

What it also doesn't mean is that if something's possible then that means there's reasonable doubt. Anything is possible. It's possible you're going to walk out of the courthouse and get hit by a car. Is that reasonable? It's possible that we all might not wake up tomorrow morning because the earth explodes. Is that reasonable?

So just because an alternative theory is given, just because someone says, I didn't do it and another says I did, that doesn't mean there's reasonable doubt.

Reasonable doubt is based on your common sense. It's based on the kind of

doubt that would make a reasonable person hesitate to act.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, don't confuse hesitation with deliberation, but it is your job as a jury to deliberate. You are supposed to go back to the jury room and to talk and to discuss, and some of you may argue. So deliberating and going through the facts and taking all of this through your mind and trying to make decisions about things. That's not hesitation. That's doing your job. When you look at that word hesitation, that comes to when you're ready; when you're ready to make that decision. So if you're talking about it, you're thinking about it, you're doing the right thing, and that doesn't mean that you have doubt about it.

A reasonable doubt is one also that naturally and fairly arises from the evidence or lack of evidence. It's based on reason and common sense, not on the mere possibility of innocence. That naturally and fairly arises, what it means is you don't go looking for it.

You will see in your jury instructions, it says it's your duty to seek the truth. That's what your duty is. It is not your duty to seek doubt. You are truth seekers, not doubt seekers. So let the evidence fall in front of you, talk about it, think about it, put in the puzzle pieces, look at the big picture, and then make a decision about where you're at, about what you believe, about who you believe.

Some of the other instructions that you have—there are three counts in this case, three charges. Each one has to be decided on its own, so you need to look at each one separately and not say, well, because he's guilty of this one, then we'll just say guilty on all three. You have to decide on each one.

The other thing is you don't have to agree as to which acts occurred. So when you are looking at a count, for example, Count I is a Sexual Abuse. Well, the State has put in front of you several acts of what we will argue to you is

sexual abuse, several different times that it happened to Kxxxxxx.

so when you go back to the jury room and you start talking about those, if six of you say, well, I think the seminar room happened but I'm not for sure about the sleeping room; and, then six of you say, well, I think the sleeping room happened, but I'm not for sure about up by the med room. It's all okay as long as you're all agreeing that a sex act occurred. So you don't have to agree on all of the facts. As long as you're getting to the same place and meeting the definitions and coming to a final agreement in the end, then that is all okay.

You also don't have to agree to how the acts occurred or when the acts occurred. Again, it's the same proposition. And that's with most everything that you're going to see in these counts. So you can have your own version of events in your head as to how this particular thing occurred or when

this particular thing occurred or didn't occur. But as long as you come to the same end result that the other jurors are, even when they have a different opinion on the facts, then you have the same verdict.

When you consider the evidence, you've been instructed that you're going to use your observations, your common sense, and your experience. You get to be you when you're looking at this case. We talked about that in jury selection. You don't leave your common sense at the door when you enter the courtroom. Of course you get to use your common sense. That's how we all make reasonable decisions.

You are also told that you try to reconcile any conflicts in the evidence, but if you cannot, then accept the evidence that you find more believable. So if he said something, and she said something completely polar opposite, what this instruction is telling you to do—and what it's telling you not to do is throw up your hands and say, well, don't know; can't make a decision.

If you can't reconcile the conflict—because in this case you can't reconcile the conflict. Kxxxxxx said it happened. He said it didn't. So if you can't reconcile that conflict, accept the evidence you find more believable. What do you find more believable? Who do you find more believable? Who do you find more credible? Who do you find more credible? Don't throw up your hands. Make a decision.

On the lesser included offenses, the Court read to you Count I and went through what the elements are. And then if you flip the page, and then he also said Count I, and went through some more elements but they were a little bit different. The second page, the third page, those are the lesser included offenses.

When you're looking at a charge, you start with the highest count. You start where it's charged at. If you go through that, for example the sex abuse charge, if you go through that and you

say, okay, I think the State has met its elements. Beyond a reasonable doubt the State has proved that a sex act occurred and it was by force or against the will, and everybody agrees, you're done. You don't have to go through the lesser included offenses. Because if you find that first count, the lessers don't matter. But that's why those second pages are there behind a couple of those counts. That's what those are.

So you start at the top, and you don't move down unless you have questions about the top.

Here is the first count, Sexual Abuse in the Third Degree.

During the timeframe January 2015 through and including December 2015, which is the timeframe that Kxxxxxx was at the school, the Defendant performed a sex act on Kxxxxxx

The Defendant performed the sex act by force or against the will of Kxxxxxx

That is the first charge.

So what do we have in this case then? The State has to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt the first element that a sex act occurred.

What's a sex act? Well, it's pretty much anything. I won't read through that one. You heard the Court say it. But it's pretty much any touching of one part of your body to another part of your body that includes some private parts somewhere. That is a sex act. It doesn't matter if it's over the clothing; it doesn't matter if it's under the clothing, as long as there's that touching.

It doesn't have to be actual sex.

It can be somebody putting or grabbing someone's hand and placing it on their crotch and feeling their erect penis.

That's a sex act.

So what do we have on the first one? Let's put this in context a little bit before we start talking about this too. We heard a lot of evidence about all of the rules and how strict the school was and all of those things. A lot of the

reason that you need to know about that, that you have to consider that is because you have to look at the circumstances surrounding the sex acts.

It is extremely important in this case that you consider what the power imbalance is between the Defendant and Kxxxxxx. You cannot ignore that. And all of those rules, all of the structure, all of that goes towards what position Kxxxxxx was in when she came to that school. What the position all of the students were in when they were at that school. What the position the staff was in.

You know, you heard testimony about the fact that staff lived in the condominiums. The staff had cars. The staff was very dependent on him as well, okay? And that's the environment of that place. Those children had absolutely no control over anything that they did. And that's where all of this starts.

So Kxxxxxx has been there for a while. Kxxxxxx adjusts pretty well. She comes into the school. She can handle the

rules. She's one of those people that can sit back and think about her actions, and she does fairly well. She moves up fairly quickly. She gets to go on services projects. All of those things are occurring.

You heard testimony that the

Defendant has started to pay some more

attention to her; that some of the girls

were getting jealous of that; that she was

getting treated like a princess.

All of that leads up to when

Kxxxxxx has to go to a Child Protection

Center. And she's taken to that Child

Protection Center by the Defendant's wife,

and it has to do with issues that came out

of her past.

And don't forget why these kids are here. These kids were all here for a reason, right? These kids were all vulnerable. Kxxxxxxx, just like the rest of them, was also vulnerable.

So she's taken to the CPC. She did a couple of interviews there. They wanted some follow-up. They wanted to have some

photos, have her checked to see if there were any marks or scars or birthmarks, anything like that. That's where we have the first physical contact.

Exxxxxx testified that the Defendant came to her, explained to her what was needed, asked her if she wanted to go to the CPC. She didn't want to go back to the CPC. Kxxxxxx didn't like that kind of stuff, and you saw that throughout her testimony. She didn't like social workers. She wasn't all that trusting of police. And the Defendant offered, let me help you with that, then you don't have to go.

And he takes the opportunity to go up to the upstairs seminar room. And, yes, there's another girl there. She's downstairs doing the cleaning or whatever it is she was supposed to do, and they go upstairs so he can look at the birthmarks.

Now, the State is not arguing to you that a sex act occurred there, because it didn't. You know, she didn't even take off her clothes. All he did was maybe

touch her a little bit on the hip to pull down her pants some, and had her pull up her shirt so he could look and see if there was anything there.

But once you look back, step back and look at the big picture, you see what's going on in this situation. And remember what Dr. Salter testified about, about the desensitizing, getting kids used to being touched and things like that.

This is where he first tried it out to see how she would react, to see if this was all going to be okay. And it was okay. He just did what he said he was going to do, and they left, and there was no issues; right?

She was also in a very vulnerable situation at this time. She had just been to the CPC. The Defendant knew that. He knew the emotional state she was in, because already by this time he had started talking to her about things, about her emotions, about her past, about how she was feeling.

So then we move on to the first

sexual act. It happened a short time after the birthmarks. It's not right away, but sometime after the birthmarks. Kxxxxxx knows it was summer because the air-conditioner broke, and the girls had moved upstairs. It was a box air-conditioner. That's how she was able to give you the timeframes on that.

It was maybe an hour after lights out, but she knew it was lights out.

Everybody was in bed. Everybody was facing the wall like they were supposed to. Do you remember what a big consequence it was to not face the wall? That you lost a lot of points if you weren't facing the wall when you went to sleep?

She was a bunk leader at that time, so she's on the bottom bunk. She said she had been upset earlier in the day; that she had been talking to the Defendant.

And it was that night that he came into her room.

Now, I'm going to guess when everybody first heard that you go, whoa,

wait a minute. He walked into a room with a bunch of girls in there and did this?
But again, step back and look at the big picture.

You knew he had the power to walk around where he wants to. Cheyenne told you they don't mark down when staff is coming off the floor. Cheyenne said that he did come up there sometimes after hours to pull the girls out or talk to the girls. The Defendant says he would come up there after hours sometimes and pull girls out to talk to the girls. So it's not crazy that he was on that floor.

And after seeing this entire case and knowing the type of power and control that he had, that adults had there, how conditioned those kids were to do as they're told, it's not shocking that he walked into that room and did what he did. Actually, it makes sense when you look at this case and after watching the Defendant testify.

So he comes in the room. She heard his voice. She knew he was out there.

And then he comes up to her bed. And she says he's talking to her. She's not for sure what he says. And he puts his hand under the covers, under her shorts, and inside of her. He inserts his finger in her vagina. She felt it. It hurt. She said it felt like it scratched, his fingernail scratched her. And she said it was seconds. And then he left.

Put that act into the context of what that just told Kxxxxxx. He walked into a room full of girls with staff outside, and he put his finger inside of her. And then the next day, everything is normal. The next day everybody walked around like nothing happened. The next day nobody knew except Kxxxxxx and the Defendant. At that point, if he wasn't all-powerful before that happened, he sure was now.

How many times did you hear that in this case? The Defendant was like God there. He was worshiped there. He had all the power. He could do whatever he wanted. Him doing that in that room full

of girls just set the stage for everything else to happen.

The second time a sex act happened, again, we're on the floor. Again, it's not abnormal for him to come on the floor after hours. This time she's watching the dorm because she's a dorm leader. So before she was a bunk leader, and now she's moved up to a dorm leader, so she sits at the door at bedtime. The kids talked about that.

He took her in--he wanted to talk. They were talking quite a bit now. She goes down the hallway. They go around the corner to where the sitting area is by the med room and they talk. She said they were talking about something that was emotional for her. It was upsetting, things about her past.

And when they get up to leave, he hugs her and he holds his arm around her back so she can't back up. And then he grabs her hand and he puts it on his crotch and he holds it there. And he's not erect at first, but after a bit he is.

And she said she tried to back up but she couldn't because the hand was there. And she also knew, what was she supposed to do?

You know, I asked her that. You didn't say no. Why didn't you yell? You all know why she didn't. We don't have to spend a lot of time talking about that.

Because of who she was and where she came from and where she was at the time, and who the person was that was offending on her. And he let her go. Seconds. Just another stolen touch.

And that's what all these things have to be because of the environment they're in. You know, they really couldn't go spend an hour in the seminar room doing these types of things. That would get noticed. So it's just seconds. Stolen moments here and there when it works out.

The next day, she didn't tell anyone. Everybody acted like nothing happened.

The third time, this time it was

the Defendant's house. This time not only is he the owner, the all-powerful, the man that could come in the room and put his finger inside of you when people are all around, but now, now he's her family rep.

Now he controls even more of her day-to-day life. Now he gets even more access to her to pull her out of class, to take her places, to talk, to counsel.

They're at the Defendant's house.

Mxxxx is the other girl, the only other girl, those two, on his caseload. They're outside there at the picnic table. They're talking. They're setting goals. And for some reason they go into the house because something is said about cinnamon rolls.

Now, here's where you get the big diversion; right? So the Defendant says he has a really foggy memory of this, not for sure. But he does remember cinnamon rolls. He does remember Layani being there. And, you know, he told agents he could not remember if Kxxxxxxx was in the house. But now he's saying he has a foggy

memory that that happened.

Layani testified that she remembers the day out of all those days of being at the academy and with all the kids there, she remembers that particular day that Mxxxx and Kxxxxxx came over for cinnamon rolls.

This is where you have to start deciding credibility, not just of the Defendant but other people who are testifying for him.

But what Kxxxxxx tells you is that they went in the house. She hadn't been the house before. She'd never been in the house. So she's wandering around. She's looking at the pictures. And think about what a treat this is, too. They're outside. She's now in the Defendant's house, an environment she hasn't been in for how long because she has been inside the academy with the concrete walls. And she's looking around at the pictures.

And at some point she goes down to the basement, and the Defendant comes down to the basement. And in the basement

there's that back empty room. You've seen the photographs. You'll have them to look at. But there's the back empty room--or not empty. I'm sorry--unfinished room. And it's in that room that we have another sex act.

It's in that room that the

Defendant came in; that he unbuttoned

Kxxxxxx's pants; that he again put his

finger inside of her vagina. She said it

didn't hurt this time. And keep in mind a

lot of those details, too, because those

are things that show the credibility of

it. You know, this time it hurt because

it felt like it scratched; but this time,

it didn't hurt. You know, the senses that

she has during the experiences. But this

time it didn't hurt.

She doesn't resist. She doesn't say no. She doesn't yell upstairs to

Mxxxx

This was when--and I know you all remember this--this is when Kxxxxxx was on the stand, and I asked her, why didn't you say no? That's when she got so quiet, and she looked down, and she

said, I don't know why. And I asked her, did you think you could say no to Mr. Ben?

She is not the only person you heard in this case that would say that.

Rxxxxx testified, you didn't say no there. When she was being asked about whether or not the--going to do the mirror class, well, that was voluntary, wasn't it? Well, he said it was, but you don't say no there. Okay? Nothing is voluntary there.

And she didn't think she could say no to Mr. Ben. And Mr. Ben knew that she wouldn't say no to him. She didn't tell. Life went on like nothing happened.

We're in the fall now, and this is when things increased. And again, go back to Dr. Salter's testimony where she talked about how that's common in these types of situations with offenders; that they start out with the small touch, and then it keeps moving up until you're into the full-blown sex.

The rest of the sexual acts from

here on out happened in the seminar building. It happened in the building that is the farthest away from anywhere else in that campus. It is a long walk back to the seminar building. You have to go through a lot of doors to get into the seminar building. The seminar building has no cameras.

She talked about the different times she would either be cleaning, maybe watching a movie, or talking. He would bring them there like when he talked about with her and another girl to set goals.

The acts, her masturbating him, meaning she put her hands on his penis, touch. She said that his hands were over hers when that happened. Force.

Her performing oral sex, her mouth was on his penis. She talked about that where she was the one moving in that situation.

Him rubbing on her. Both clothed.

You know, she didn't say that, you know,
he always made me take my clothes off and
then he'd do this or that. She said there

was a time when she was on the floor and he got on top of her and he was rubbing her, on top of her.

And sex. Now, the last time was really explicit. The last time is the one that she remembers the clearest, which makes sense when you look at the timeline of things, because things happened pretty quickly after that.

So what do we know from Kxxxxxx?

The Defendant took her and two other students to the seminar room to clean.

And I think he was going to do goals with one of them as well. All right. So they're in the seminar room. We know that happens. Nobody has disputed it. The Defendant agrees, yeah, we take kids to the seminar room to clean.

He told her to go upstairs. She knew why. She had been through the routine before. She goes. This time it's a little different when she goes up the stairs. When she got up there, this time she saw the camera on the table. She saw rags and spray sitting by the camera.

She said when she got up there she saw that and started to go back down, but he was already on his way up, so back into the room she went. He told her it would be really fast. It would be okay. It was always really fast. It had to be. You had to have the stolen moment.

He had her lay down with the camera facing the mirror. He unbuttoned and unzipped her pants. He pulled them down. And what did Kxxxxxx do? She laid on the floor and she closed her eyes. And the phrase that she used is, she didn't want to pay attention.

She heard him spit, and she could feel the wet when he touched her vaginal area with his hand. Again, those little details, that's important.

She's not for sure if she tried to flip over and move away, or if he's the one that flipped her over, but at some point she's flipped over. And now she's on her knees, and he's having sex with her from behind, vaginal sex. She felt his penis go inside of her.

She made a noise. He told her to be quiet. He told her to look in the mirror, but she said she kept her eyes closed. It only took a few minutes, and this time he ejaculated inside of her.

And she talked about when he was done, he told her to push it out; that he had her push out his semen into his hand where he went and wiped it off on a rag. And then he handed her cleaning supplies and had her clean the floor.

Now, if there's not more of a power imbalance in this situation. Just picture that in your head. He just had sex with Kxxxxxx, and now he's standing, watching her while she's cleaning up his semen off the floor. And she didn't tell, and it went on like nothing happened.

Ladies and gentlemen, Kxxxxxx's testimony alone by itself establishes that a sex act occurred. There is not a third party witness to any of this. There's no video footage of any of this.

Do you remember the camera that he used? They found it. So there was a

camera. But it has a little SD card, so there's no footage. They took the SD cards that were sitting around. It's not there. But keep in mind, too, when did Kxxxxxx report? December 1st is when it all came out. The Defendant knew it. In fact, he knew it was coming the week before that because little stuff started to come out.

When did they go in to do a search?

January 28th. He had two months to take care of what he needed to. So they found the camera, but they didn't find any footage. That doesn't mean it didn't happen.

We don't have that third party
witness. We don't have that video
footage. We don't have DNA. We normally
don't in sex abuse cases like this. But
what you do have is the eyewitness to the
crime. Don't hold her to a different
standard than you would hold somebody who
had their purse stolen. She gave you the
details of that as good as she could, as
well as she could, sitting up in a room

full of strangers in front of the Defendant, in front of people that she knew in the back, and having to tell that.

Her testimony is believable, and it is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Her testimony alone, if you believe it and you find it to be consistent with what else you know, her testimony alone is beyond a reasonable doubt. Because you do have to decide who to believe.

week. It has been a long couple of weeks. And I want you to go back to the days that Kxxxxxx was here and that she was sitting in this chair in front of you. And I want you to remember what you thought when you listened to her. And I want you to remember what you saw when she testified.

She was on the stand a long time.

Did you find anything inconsistent when
she was up there? Did you find that she
suddenly changed her story from here to
there?

Joe Lestina testified that her story had always been consistent with him;

that she gave a description of the Defendant's house and his basement, and it was completely consistent with what he saw when he did the search there.

Go back to when she was on the stand. And when she was done with her testimony, did you believe her? That's beyond a reasonable doubt.

But there is more. Okay? There's not, like I said, the eyewitness, the camera, but there's more to corroborate and to show the credibility of Kxxxxxx.

The circumstances of her disclosure alone are credible. They want you to believe that she was mad; that she made all of this up because she didn't get to go home to see her sister—or she didn't get to go off campus to see her sister. That's what they want you to believe; that's their motive for Kxxxxxxx not being honest. Does that fit with what you know in this case? Because what you know is her disclosure was not so much her doing it.

All right. We know that last sex

act happened mid-November, and it was shortly after that, after this had been going on for months, after you heard from some of the girls that they saw a change in Kxxxxxx's behavior; that she didn't want to be around the Defendant anymore; that it wasn't cool to have him as a family rep; that she wasn't happy when he came in the room.

And what you also know is that

Kxxxxxx started having some suicidal

expressions. And with that she had made

the comment to a girl, a couple of girls,

I'm not comfortable, I'm uncomfortable

around Mr. Ben. That's all that was said.

The girls tell. They did what they're supposed to. They went and told what was going on; that Kxxxxxx was saying suicidal things; that Kxxxxxx said Mr. Ben makes her uncomfortable.

And what happens to Kxxxxxx? She is written up. She is given a life buddy. She's put out in the hallway and she's lost her level. So Kxxxxxx found out really quick what happens when you tell.

You know, she tested the waters and she got probably what she expected from it, punishment.

What's important about this, too, is that it's at this point that the Defendant knows this has been said. Now, he told you he's busy with Thanksgiving and, you know, he knew about it at some point. He admitted he knew about it before December 1st. So he knows at this point.

Miss Cindy, Miss Jane, on the 24th, Miss Jane talks to her. Kxxxxxx doesn't tell. She doesn't say anything. Nothing at all. She takes her consequence and goes back to having her life buddy and sitting out in the hallway. Is that what someone does who is making this up, who's trying to hurt somebody, who's trying to get back at somebody? Not at all.

But at some point it starts rolling out. At some point it's too much. Like Dr. Salter said, that pressure cooker in these kids that don't tell, and then they have all these outside influences of

everybody acting like it's normal and nobody knowing what's going on, and all of this builds up, and a lot of times it comes out when there's anger or suicidal thoughts.

She finally tells. She tells
Cheyenne, just a little. So again, if
she's trying to get to the Defendant, if
she's trying to hurt him, trying to get
him in trouble, is this how she would
tell? No. She tells just a little.
Again, testing the waters.

They talk over a few nights. She tells Cheyenne about the birthmarks, that that part happened. And Cheyenne asked if he did anything else. And Kxxxxxx confirms it, that there's more but she won't say what. Cheyenne, the first time that's brought up to her, do you remember that testimony from Cheyenne? The first time that's brought up to her, she tells Cindy Crew. So they knew about it.

Cheyenne said that Kxxxxxx begged her not to say anything. Cheyenne said that Kxxxxxx didn't want to leave; that

when she was talking about this she was shaking, she was crying. But Cheyenne did do the right thing, despite what the Defendant wants you to believe. She did the right thing and she went and she told. She told Cindy Crew that night.

And then after a couple of days when she figures out nothing is going to happen, nobody is doing anything, and now I'm getting called into the office, into management? And she calls DHS. Cheyenne is one of few adults at that place that did the right thing, and she called DHS.

But we still see with this disclosure, why this disclosure makes her testimony credible, is because she still doesn't want to tell. So Davis and Riter talk to Kxxxxxx. She doesn't say anything. She doesn't want to leave. She told you that.

And maybe that surprised you a little bit when you heard that. Because I know when I heard that, I'm like, man, I would be running out of that place as fast as I could. But she didn't want to leave.

She had friends there. It was a home.

Regardless of the type of home it was, it

was one that she had because she didn't

have one to go to.

She refuses to say anything.

Cheyenne is called for the meeting. She called DHS. She tells them at the meeting, I've called DHS. Cheyenne is fired two days later. And I hope you do not buy that testimony that it wasn't the Defendant's decision or that he wouldn't have been part of that decision that Cheyenne was fired.

Isn't it interesting that he had no problem taking credit for every good thing that happened at that school, but everything that wasn't, that was somebody else fault, somebody else's responsibility.

Kxxxxxxx is removed from the facility. It took some time but she finally told. She disclosed. It came out. It took a few days, but she got it out.

The places that he chose makes her

story credible. So not only disclosure, but his choice of location. He picked the building that's the farthest away from anything else on that campus for the sex act. He picked a room in the basement where they were around a corner, back in the back, for a sex act, for a few seconds' worth of a sex act.

He picked the upstairs of the seminar room. They weren't in the downstairs area, the big place where just anybody—or if somebody did walk in they'd see them right away. They were in the upstairs. He chose the location. He chose the times.

The significance of that first sexual act, and don't think he didn't know what he was doing when he did that.

Kxxxxxx knew from the very beginning who had all of the power. Every one of you knew before Kxxxxxx even got on the stand who had all the power. You had heard enough about that school. He was all-powerful from that point on after being in the room with those girls.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You also have to consider the Defendant's actions with Kxxxxxx. It's not just Kxxxxxx saying that he paid more attention to her, all right? You also know that he knows that she's vulnerable. She's there for a reason. Kids like Kxxxxxx are the perfect kids to pick for this kind of stuff. Unfortunately, they get picked a lot for this kind of stuff. Why? Because they're the easiest ones to later on say, they're liars; they steal; they're runaways; they do bad things; you can't believe these kids. And the kids know it. They know who they are and where they come from, and you know what their self-esteem is, and you know what the issues are. They don't think anyone is going to believe them either, so they don't tell. He knew her vulnerabilities. He starts paying more attention to her, taking her on the service projects, choosing her for a second. You heard that

her, taking her on the service projects, choosing her for a second. You heard that from multiple students at the academy. It wasn't just Kxxxxxx saying that.

And everyone wanted to be around

Mr. Ben, right? So to the outside world, she's so lucky. She gets treated like a princess. But what did Kxxxxxx say to Mxxxxxx

They wouldn't want him for a rep if they knew.

go back to her testimony. It's been a while back as well. He gave her more attention than the other students. He picked her more often for trips and for seconds. There was time when Lxxxxx was with them, and he let Lxxxxx go to the bathroom while he stayed alone with Kxxxxxx. Now, to all of us that may seem like, what's the big deal? But you know in that school that was a huge deal for the Defendant to say, yeah, I'm fine sitting here by myself for her to go to the bathroom. That didn't happen.

He gave Kxxxxxx extra points.

Lxxxxx saw him pull her out class a lot.

Other girls were jealous. All the other girls there were jealous. It didn't help Kxxxxxx when he was giving her this attention, because they were getting mad

about it and jealous.

And what did Lxxxxx say? He was the owner. He could do whatever he wanted. Everybody at the school knew Mr. Ben could do whatever he wanted.

Defendant pull Kxxxxxx out of gym class.

She saw her pull her out of class multiple times. He'd always be talking to Kxxxxxx away from the other kids. Now, she didn't say, you know, I saw him in the hallway alone walking up to the stairs or whatever, but she said it was normal in gym class or whatever class to have the Defendant pulling her aside in the same room and just talking to Kxxxxxxx.

He'd buy the brand products for

Kxxxxxx, not the cheap stuff. And again,

to us, well, maybe not such a big deal,

but to those kids, huge. They were

getting the Dollar General shampoo and

Kxxxxxx the brand name. Big deal. Staff

rules of being alone did not apply to Mr.

Ben. That's what Fxxxxxxx told you.

Cheyenne Jerred. Cheyenne was--I

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

put that down wrong. She was not her family rep. Cheyenne was the night staff. Cheyenne would see the Defendant come in and talk to the girls at night. Now, Cheyenne -- they're going to say Cheyenne is a disgruntled employee. Did Cheyenne seem like she was trying to add things to the story, to make things up? Because if she wanted to tell a really good story, if she really wanted to stick it to the Defendant, wouldn't she have come in and said, yeah, I saw him come in one time and I saw him walk down the hall with Kxxxxxx, and they didn't come back for, like, fifteen minutes? But Cheyenne didn't do that, which is what makes her credible. She said, I can't say that I saw him with Kxxxxxx, but he did come on the floor. So you know that happens. It was usually between 9:00 and 11:00 at night, and that they didn't -- the staff didn't keep track of staff who came on the floor. And Cheyenne also knows Mr. Ben could go wherever he wanted.

Mxxxxxx The only staff

you could hug was Mr. Ben. So again, it's that kind of all-powerful position that he had. All the kids wanted to be with him. He was the only staff that you could hug. He had all these special things that he would do for everyone. Mxxxxxx said it was usually Kxxxxxx that he would take on errands. It was usually Kxxxxxx that he would take as a second.

Mxxxxxx herself went with the

Defendant and Kxxxxxx to get graduation

robes out of the seminar room. So you

know it's not ridiculous for Kxxxxxx to

say that there were times she went with

the Defendant with one or two other people

to the seminar room. Mxxxxxx confirms

that.

Mxxxxxx said Kxxxxxx at first was excited to see Mr. Ben. She thought——I mean, everybody thought it was cool that Mr. Ben was the family rep. Over time, she didn't want to go with him. She made excuses why she wouldn't or couldn't go with Mr. Ben.

And one time Mxxxxxx and Kxxxxxx

were talking about the other girls'
jealousy, and Mxxxxxx was bringing up what
some of the other girls were saying and
how they were so jealous. And Kxxxxxx
says, yeah, well, they don't even want Mr.
Ben as a rep if they knew.

All right. That was before any disclosures came out, before she started doing even the Mr. Ben makes me uncomfortable. That shows the credibility of what she's telling you. It's a prior consistent statement of hers.

He chose to be Kxxxxxxx's family representative. This choice was not made by some committee. This choice was made by him. Mike Davis testified that he told the Defendant that he shouldn't be Kxxxxxx's family rep. He told him that Kxxxxxx was better suited with a female family rep, as was Mxxxx

And those are the two people the Defendant chose to have on his caseload.

Jane Riter says she was not involved in that decision. Now, Ben and his wife Layani, it was a whole big group

committee, and everybody thought it was a great idea. Everybody agreed to it. And the Defendant, well, he'd just reluctantly take that on; he was trying to help the other people out, too busy of a caseload.

Did you notice he was able to always have an explanation, an innocent explanation for things? But his explanation is not consistent with the evidence. It's not consistent with what the people on this administrative committee are telling you.

The other thing that was interesting to me is when the Defendant testified he said, well, nobody wanted Kxxxxxx. That's why he took Kxxxxxx on his caseload. Did you find that odd? Because you've never heard anything bad about Kxxxxxx. She moved up. She did well. But he wanted to make it, like, nobody else wanted her because she was awful or whatever it may be, and he was just being the good guy, the good administrator taking one for the team and took Kxxxxxx on. You decide what you find

credible in that.

Also, go back to Dr. Salter when you are looking at the facts of this case and deciding what you believe. You know, sometimes things that Kxxxxxx did may seem counterintuitive to what we believe people would do had they been sexually assaulted, right? Because what we want people to do is jump and yell and say stop, no, and go tell somebody right away.

But what you know from Dr. Salter from the science and the research is people don't do that, especially kids, especially kids who are in a situation like she was in that controlled environment, completely secluded from the outside world. Delayed disclosure is normal, afraid of punishment, won't be believed, shame. You saw all of those things in this case.

Pressure cooker. Kids don't tell.

They internalize their feelings.

Everything around them remains the same,
and the Defendant just walks around like

nothing happened. Think of how crazy

making that is, and what Kxxxxxx was going through with her emotions and living that every day. At some point that pressure cooker has to blow. Then it comes out. And we saw it come out when she was on suicide watch and she was sitting there with Cheyenne Jerred, and it comes out.

Dr. Salter also talked about implicit coercion. There's no violence. You don't have to have violence to coerce, to have something against somebody's will. Kxxxxxx knew her existence depended on this man. She knew her life could be really good or really bad depending on what he chose to do.

We saw the grooming behaviors: the special attention, the gifts, the privileges, the points, the moving her up a level. We saw the desensitizing with the birthmarks. We saw the progression of abuse. We saw the trauma bonds. Because all of this was going on, but you still heard out of Kxxxxxxx's mouth, I didn't want to leave. All of this was going on, but you still know that Kxxxxxx was

talking to the Defendant about prior issues, past issues, emotional things.

So even though she wanted the sex acts to stop, there was still those things that kept her bonded there. And like Dr. Salter said, with kids like that you don't cut the bond, you twist it, and it's pretty ugly looking but it's there. And she was completely isolated from the outside world. That increases that trauma bond. Kxxxxxx had nowhere to go.

The carrot and the stick. How much did we see a carrot and a stick in this case? Over and over and over again. I can give you something; I can take it away. I can care for you; I can hurt you. It was a big stick in this case. Kxxxxxx had no control over anything.

And the risky situations, when we talked about the Defendant going into that room. Dr. Salter told you in her training, her experience, her education what we see in the research, what she sees through talking to offenders. This is normal. A lot of people think, well that

can't happen. How can you molest a kid in the backseat of a car when the mom is up in the front driving? That can't happen.

Yes, it can, and it does. Why? It's a thrill. It's powerful. And because they can. It makes the child feel not safe anywhere. It makes it more likely the child won't tell.

The Defendant committed sex acts against Kxxxxxx. They were not accidental. They were nothing but sexual. They were done in the context and the circumstances of sexual gratification, his sexual gratification.

Element 1 is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Sex acts occurred.

Element 2, by force or against the will. We don't have to spend a lot of time on this, because we've talked about most of it already when talking about how those sex acts occurred.

We do not have to prove to you that she physically resisted. Now, you can see it in a couple places. And even when she talks about it. You know, he put the hand

behind her back and she tried to back up when he hugged her. That's some physical resistance. Or she talked about--she wasn't for sure, but maybe she tried to flip over to move away, or maybe he did it. But if she was trying to flip over, there's some physical resistance.

But what this case is really about is about the power imbalance. The act can be against the will if there is a psychological force or inability to consent based on the relationship and circumstances of the participants.

Who had all the power and control?

Kxxxxxx didn't think she could say no to

Mr. Ben. You all know in that environment

none of those kids could say no to Mr.

Ben.

This is how old Kxxxxxx was when she came in (indicating). She's 16. When she came into this facility, she was a kid. Her first encounter with Mr. Ben is in the OSS room. Did you hear that from pretty much almost every kid that testified? Do you think that's by chance

that they pick the OSS room for all kids to be checked in with they arrive there?

in that OSS room and her stuff is being gone through and there's kids in these cells and she doesn't even know what this place is, and Mr. Ben comes in and walks in and says, hey, how are you doing? Can I help? Are you okay? From that day on, he controlled every aspect of her life, everything. Now, he wants to step back from that. It's Devon Dade; it's Mike Davis; it's these other people. You all know that's not true. You all know that he had total control of that facility.

How could any sexual contact in a relationship with such a power imbalance ever be consensual? It cannot. Kxxxxxx's entire existence was dependent on the Defendant. The act was against the will.

How did Kxxxxxx describe it? I didn't think you could say no to Mr. Ben. How many times did you hear it, over and over? The Defendant had the final say. He did as he pleased. He was her family

rep. He had absolute control over her, and he knew it. He knew the power that he 3 held and he used it to gratify himself. He used it to coerce Kxxxxxx for sex 5 against her will. He abused his power. He abused his position. He abused his 7 trust, over and over and over with her. 8 So did he commit Sexual Abuse in 9 the Third Degree? He committed sex acts with Kxxxxxx 10 They were by force 11 or against the will of Kxxxxxx 12 He's guilty of Sexual Abuse in the Third 13 Degree. That is Count I. 14 Count II is the Sexual Exploitation. During the timeframe, and 15 16 you've got a broad timeframe on this one, 17 because we're talking about pattern, 18 practice, or scheme of conduct. We're 19 looking again at the big picture, okay? 20 When you focus it down, the focus 21 is Kxxxxxx, but you get to look at his pattern, practice, and scheme of conduct, 22 23 okay? 24 So you've got this September 18, 25 2014, through January 31, 2016. The

Defendant engaged in sexual conduct with Kxxxxxx.

No. 2, he engaged in the conduct as part of a pattern, practice or scheme of conduct.

No. 3, he did so with the specific intent to arouse or satisfy the sexual desires of the Defendant or Kxxxxxx.

No. 4, he was then a counselor or therapist.

Some of you may have heard that when we did the instructions and you went, what does that mean, because everybody is saying he's not a counselor? We'll get to that.

No. 5, Kxxxxxx was a was then a client, or a patient, or an emotionally dependent patient or client.

Sexual conduct includes this long list of things (indicating) or a sex act. We have already discussed a sex act. If you find element 1 in Count I, that a sex act occurred, then we have met this element that sexual conduct occurred. It's that simple. So that's that element.

Pattern, practice, or scheme of conduct. You just have to look at the big picture. What it means is it can't be just a one-time thing that he acted like a therapist. It can't be just a one-time touch. You've got to look at this whole picture. What his motivations are, what the similarities are in his actions and his behavior, the methods of the commission, the interrelated circumstances and factual characteristics. Step back and look at the puzzle.

And it's not just the sexual conduct or the sex acts when we're talking about what acts occurred. Again, we're talking about it all. We're talking about the body image. We're talking about the sex acts. We're talking about the Victoria's Secret. We're talking about all of that. Look at the whole picture.

Specific intent. That is fairly simple in this case. We have to show specific intent to arouse or satisfy sexual desires of another person. Again, if there's a sex act, of course that's

what it's for. There was no other intent for having sex with Kxxxxxx and ejaculating. So specific intent is there. And the same thing when you start looking at all of the other behavior that occurred that he has innocent explanations for, but when put all together, not so innocent; correct?

Counselor or therapist. This is
the one where some of you may have paused
for a moment and said, what are they
talking about? What we have to show is a
professional counselor, family therapist,
or any other person, whether or not
licensed by the State, who provides or
purports to provide mental health
services.

Now, it makes total sense why our law wants to keep psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, people providing mental health services, why our law wants to prevent those kinds of people from taking advantage of their vulnerable clients; right? Okay. But the law also wants to keep those people who pretend

like they are therapists or counselors or who hold themselves out to be. They want to keep those people from taking advantage of the vulnerable clients or patients, the people who believe that they're going to this person for counseling, even though they're not really a counselor.

So a perfect example. I went this weekend to the toy store with my son. I was exhausted. I promised myself I was spending Saturday not working with my kids, whatever they wanted to do. He loves Hobby Haven. We went there. It's just a family-owned, ma and pop shop. And it's all the remote control cars and airplanes and all those things. So we went there. He needed to fix a thing on his car. We're looking around. He's telling me—he's all excited. He's 9—well, he's 10, just 10. He's telling me about this particular plane that he really, really wants.

And this guy comes up and he starts talking to us and says--he says, well, that one might be a little old for you.

Why don't you look at this one? And he pulls this other one out. And my son says, oh, I have that one. That's the one I started out on. So they start talking about what are some good levels for him to move up to in a remote control airplane.

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And this guy is walking around the store. You know, I'm staying with him all the time to make sure things are fine. But by the time we're done, he's got us up at the counter and he's showing us this particular item that -- I don't remember what it's called, but it flies like a helicopter and you can fly it in the house. It's all safe. There's things it can do. And he' showing this to us and somebody from behind the counter comes up. And they say, oh, are interested in getting that? We're having a sale on it. And I said, well, we're looking at it, but this person is helping me. True story. And the guy says, oh, I don't work here. He says, I just come here and hang out all the time. He goes, I should work here because I'm here all the time.

He had no intent to mislead me.

But because of his actions and because of his words, I thought he was a salesperson.

I thought he worked at the store. He just was a guy that loved remote control stuff and had fun talking to kids about it. He was being helpful.

Now, it's all fine because there was no harm done. But what happens if that guy, that same guy, had taken me up to the counter and nobody else was around and he said, look—and it's a ma and pop store—and he said, look, we're trying to get rid of our products so for after Christmas we can get all our new stuff in after the year. We've got a big sale coming up. I'm going to give you the deep discount price now if you want to buy this. You know, just 60 bucks cash and we're done.

And I pull out my purse and hand him \$60 cash and I walk out with something, and he has \$60 in his pocket. Is there harm now? Yeah, because now he deceived. Now, he used that position and

he tricked me to get something for himself.

So that's what we're talking about here. Did the Defendant hold himself out to Kxxxxxx as a counselor? Did Kxxxxxx go to him and act like a patient, like a client? Was she in that position to him?

So you're looking at how did he portray himself? What role did he take on in this situation? What words and actions did he use to purport to provide mental health services to Kxxxxxx?

So Kxxxxxx was 16. She comes in this school. She's told it's a therapeutic boarding school. This is the owner and director, Ben Trane. He holds himself out to her and everybody else as very knowledgeable on this topic. You got a taste of that when he testified; right?

How many times did you hear from him, well, as Dr. Grassian said, and then he started to give you a lecture on whatever psychological concept he was telling you about? He holds himself out like he knows a whole lot about that

profession.

He's the owner of a therapeutic boarding school, and he becomes her family rep when the switch is made that all of the other counselors are made family reps. You heard that from numerous people, that that's what happened, and the kids knew that's what happened.

So when you're supposed to be a counselor as a family rep, the Defendant stays a family rep. Is it unreasonable for Kxxxxxxx to think that he's a counselor, that he's a therapist, that he's the one that she's supposed to be talking to? It's not unreasonable at all. That's what he holds himself out to be.

What does he do? He pulls her out. He talks to her a lot. All the other kids confirmed that. Kxxxxxxx tells you that. Now, she tells you it started out once every few weeks, you know, when she first came there throughout the summer. But when he became her family rep, it was a lot more.

They'd talk about past issues. He

wasn't just pulling her out and talking to her about what college do you want to go to, how can we get your high school degree, where are you going to live at?

He is talking to her about her past issues with sexual abuse.

Kxxxxxx said it was hard sometimes to talk because she would get emotional in some of the things that they discussed. She talked about one time he gave her a--something to do, like to go back to work on to help her dealing with her emotions better, an exercise to do for that.

experience with sexual trauma than any other counselor there. You heard him testify. Was that surprising that he said that? He told her it would be better for her to talk to him instead of her other counselor, instead of Miss Jane, about the sexual trauma issues. And he is redirecting her from a real counselor, a real therapist, to get her to come talk to him because he's better at it.

Is he purporting to be a counselor?

Is he purporting to be a therapist? He gave her suggestions on how to deal with her emotions. She believed he was a counselor. She confided in him. She trusted him with her emotions. And what did he do with that? Just like he did with the sex abuse, he abused his power. He abused his position.

Now, there's a lot of definitions in this count that you have to look at.

One of those is mental health services.

Did he purport to be a counselor or therapist who provides mental health services? There's the definition up on the top (indicating).

So he's purporting to provide treatment. I can help you. Come to me. I can talk about it. I can make you feel better. Did you see that? He's providing assessment. Here are some things you need to work on. Let's take a look at this.

He's providing counseling. Talk to me; I know about sexual trauma. I know it better than anybody else here. Kxxxxxx had issues. He offered to help.

Intrapersonal issues, those are the issues inside of your head. Interpersonal issues, those are the issues she's having with her family. He dealt with all of that with her.

Her emotional condition or the nature of the treatment provided was such that the Defendant knew or had reason to know that she was significantly impaired in the ability to withhold consent to the sexual conduct. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this. All of this fits in with what we've already talked about and why this is against the will. So think about the argument made for that and tie it into this.

But here's the thing to keep in mind. That big paragraph up there (indicating), that's the definition for emotionally dependent patient. You can also choose patient or client. So when you get to Count I (sic) on Sexual Exploitation, you have these three options, which goes back to you don't have to agree on which one, just pick one,

okay?

So if you don't want to deal with the big paragraph definition, just go to the patient or client. That's the easiest one. It's a person who received mental health services from the counselor or therapist.

If you find that the Defendant was talking to her about these issues; if you find that he was pulling her out and acting as a counselor or therapist and talking to her about past sexual abuse, issues with her family, with her emotions, then she's a patient or client. I mean, it looks as easy as this (indicating). Patient or client equals student plus conduct.

She's a student there. She's in a position where it is so easy to say that she is a client. She goes to that facility. They paid for her to go to that facility. She's going to him for services, for counseling. So she's a student, plus his conduct, means that she's a patient or client.

The last one, Child Endangerment.

Again, we have the same timeframe, big

broad timeframe. We're talking about

Bxxxxxx and

Dxxx ere under the age of 14 years. I'm

sorry. Element 1 is the custody or

control. The Defendant had custody or

control of them.

The boys were under 14 years of age.

The Defendant knowingly acted in a manner which created a substantial risk to the physical, mental, or emotional health or safety of Bxxxxxx or Dxxx.

I can tell you guys are ready to get up. You're tired. I won't spend a lot of time on this because it is so absolutely clear.

There is a definition for a person having control. The Defendant is the owner of the school. The position itself means he has custody and control of all of those children that go there. He was the director of the school. The position itself means he has that custody and

control.

He himself on the stand
reluctantly, reluctantly, admitted that he
has control of the kids there. Again, who
wants to accept all of the good things
that happen at the school. But he knew
why I asked that question. Did you have
custody and control of the children?
Well, the school did, the school. He knew
why I asked the question. He didn't want
to admit to it.

The parents turned the care of their children over to him. He is Midwest Academy. He had custody and control of those children.

What else do we know about his control? He has total control of the school. That's from Mike Davis. Anything that happened there he had to approve.

Mike Davis was the clinical director with the degree, and he was in an advisory capacity. So he could make suggestions.

He could advise what should be happening with the clinical program, but the Defendant got the final say.

And the compartmentalized culture, you saw a lot of that, the lack of communication, not just with the kids but with the staff too. When the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing, the person at the top gets to control all of it.

He was the top of the pyramid. He was my boss. That was Gary Lachapelle.

Jane Riter; he was my boss. He was the person who had control of everything. The Defendant himself described himself as a control freak. That doesn't change.

Bxxxxxx was 12 years old when he entered that school. His birthday is Xxxxxxxx xx, xxxx. He's 12 years old.

Dxxx, his birthday is Xxxxx x, xxxx. He's 12 years old. That's element 2. They had to be under the age of 14. That's met, no question.

Now, the State does have to show in element 3 that the Defendant knowingly acted in a manner that created a substantial risk. Do you know what knowingly acted means? It means he had a

conscious awareness. He was aware that things were going on that could be a substantial risk to these children.

He doesn't have to be the one shutting the door. He doesn't have to be the one dragging them in there. He doesn't have to be the one that said, oh, you moved your leg; structure starts over. You've been in here three days, now it's going to be four. But he has a conscious awareness of it.

He wrote the rules. He wrote the policies. It's his rules that kept them in there. He may not have shut the door, but it's his rules that kept them in there.

You heard a lot of the talk about the strict behaviorist, and it's behavior, it's not mental health. All these kids are making a choice. They choose to stay in there. They choose not to do as they're told. It's their fault is what they want you to believe.

He told agents he made the rules, policies, and procedures. He said that in

the interview. You heard that from Tom

Pearson. He made the rules, the policies,

the procedures. Everybody followed the

rules at Midwest Academy. You don't want

to step out of line there. His rules.

He made all the final decisions.

His clinical directors had an advisory capacity. His clinical directors were telling him, we need to change the OSS room a little bit. This probably isn't the healthiest thing. This isn't working. He didn't do it. When did he do it?

After DHS came in. After the FBI came in. After he said, oh, maybe we might make a few changes now.

He said, I will decide who comes and goes. He told agents that. He told Mike Davis that. Remember he said that there was a short period of time he gave Mike Davis the power to decide who's appropriate to come in and who's not. Do you remember what Mike Davis said when Mike Davis started turning away some kids because they had too many mental health problems that they wouldn't be a good fit?

The Defendant got mad, and he took that authority away from Mike Davis, and he said, I will decide who comes and goes.

Mike Davis also told you he'd refute what clinical staff would say because he knew better. Did you pick that up a little bit on the stand too, that the Defendant thinks he knows better than a lot of people?

Me took the attitude that he knew more about therapy than the therapists.

He believed that you must interrupt behavior and correct it with immediate consequences. And despite the staff recommendations, he would not change the rules of the room. He wouldn't change them. Even when he did change them, you heard that too, that when he did change them after DHS that he took the locks off of the doors, after a while they put it back on.

He wouldn't follow clinical advice that a child needed to go to a hospital or didn't belong there or needed to get out of the room. You heard that from Jane

Riter. Now, she said usually, you know, it would happen, the kid would get to the hospital, but not when she recommended it. Sometimes she said, oh, maybe a few days later. Is that okay for a few days later for a kid to go to a hospital when a licensed therapist is saying he needs it right now? He got to decide that.

He refused to give staff mandatory child abuse training. Everybody agreed to that. There was no dispute about that.

Why? Because he told Mike Davis they might make reports that we don't want them to. You knew from the staff that you went up through the chain. You didn't go outside. You stayed within MWA on that stuff.

He put in his friend as the director, Devon Dade, but he still ran the show. He still had control. He did not step away from this. This was his baby. This was his business. There was no way that he stepped away from this.

And he didn't require front line staff to have any sort of background or

training with children. That is no criticism on having a high school diploma. But these people are working with these troubled kids. They were restraining. They were the person that was having that direct interaction that if they didn't maybe do it right, it was going to get the kid in the OSS room. And there was no requirement for any type of education for the dorm people, for the night staff, for the family reps for a very long time.

that was shown through the evidence, you combine that with what he knew was going on with Bxxxxxx and Dxxx. Bxxxxxx spent a minimum--because the records weren't complete--minimum 133 days in OSS out of 210 days at Midwest Academy, 63 percent of his time. He was 12 and 13 years old, and he spent 63 percent of his time in an 8 by 8 room. And I don't care if the door was open or if the door was shut. That was not good for him.

Dxxx spent a minimum 163 days in OSS out of 323 days, 50 percent of

his time. He was 12 and 13 years old.

The Defendant knew that. He was in OSS.

He had been warned of the problems with

Bxxxxxx and Dxxx, and he knew it and he

did nothing.

His attitude is, it's just
behavior; it's not mental health. They go
to the OSS room so they can screw around.

It's their choice to be there. If you
lock down on them tight enough, we can fix
anything. He said that to Mike Davis.

They're not psychotic, they're just faking
it. That's the attitude he's taking into
this situation.

Lachapelle too. And, again, it's not a criticism of him. It's just a little bit of maybe he drank the Kool-Aid and maybe wasn't able to step back and look at what was really going on there. But he had a little bit of that attitude too, that it's the kids' fault.

You know from the weight charts the drastic weight loss that occurred. Now, you could be like Gary Lachapelle for Dxxx

and just say, well, he was fat when he got there. Was that a healthy way to lose weight? Does that make it okay, because he needed to lose weight that he lost weight in that extreme manner and that fast?

Bxxxxxx did not need to lose
weight. You saw his picture. The
Defendant wanted to tell you he was
overweight. Yet another excuse for his
behavior. He weighed 89 pounds when he
left there. He went into the hospital a
day after he got home for malnutrition.

The Defendant saw him. You look at those two pictures (indicating). Do you believe anybody who says that they didn't see a problem with Bxxxxxx, that Bxxxxxx was healthy and fine and no issues? He looked like he came out of a concentration camp when you look at these end photographs.

And they want to tell you, well, that's Bxxxxxx's problem. Bxxxxxx chose not to eat. Those are his choices.

Who are the adults here? Who is

entrusted with keeping that child safe?

And whether he's following your rules or not, if he's not eating, if your peanut and jelly sandwich isn't enough to keep weight on him, then it's time to put the rules aside and do what's right and take care of the child. It didn't happen here.

And Dxxx, you can look at his before and after too (indicating). That's pretty extreme. The other thing that happened with Dxxx under the Defendant's care is he was put in that Pride group

So he got moved into the family with a group of boys who were struggling. They call it struggling. A group of boys who were a problem is the group he got put into. They got segregated in a different room. And the Defendant knowingly put another juvenile who was a sex offender in there.

There was kids from 12 to 17 in this group. This is why DHS had to come in that second time, because of the report of the sex acts that had gone on in that group. What did the Defendant say when

Agent Pearson was asking about it?
Supervision isn't their problem.

Dxxx finally got out in April after came back and went straight to DHS and realized what DHS was telling her is not what she was being told by the Defendant. Do you remember her saying that? Those stories were not consistent. And then she went and she took her boy home because she was done with there.

He knew exactly what was going on.

Nothing happened in that place without his say-so. He was not going to change the rules for anyone, not for Bxxxxxx, nor for Dxxx, not for anybody. His ego was not going to let anyone tell him any different. And his creation of the environment was an action. He created that place. He created those rules. And his failure to change the situation was a choice. He knowingly acted.

Now, we want to talk about substantial risk. We really don't have to talk too much. Bxxxxxx alone, he was malnutritioned. Okay. That right there

can just meet beyond a reasonable doubt this element.

But also look at what Dr. Grassian said. And I won't go through it all. But what Dr. Grassian was here for was to give you that foundation you needed to show that possibility of substantial risk when you keep a child in a cell like that.

They're less capable of processing their emotions. When they go in if they're not too upset, if they're a kid that doesn't have that good thought process, doesn't have some mental health issues, they're the ones that are going to escalate when they're in there.

How many times did you hear those kids would be in there just yelling and screaming for days? Was that because they chose to or because of their mental health and being in that room made them that way?

Dr. Grassian said they start somewhat in control, it's normal to get out of control. It's that maxing out. This is research. This is studies. This is for adults. It's worse in children.

Their brains are developing.

Higher rates of self-harm. You saw it over and over and over with those kids. I can't remember if it was Mxxxxxx or Lxxxxx, you know--and they're not under 14, so they don't fit in this count. But their accounts of the rooms can help you decide what kind of environment that was. And one of them said that they were in that room and just lost hope. They were done.

Mxxxxxx was the one in the room

trying to harm herself. Lxxxxx as well.

It has—it can have a physical effect on

the brain. It can change the formation of
a child's brain from being in there. That
is proven through the research, through
the studies, through the MRIs. It is not
a good thing to do.

Ask yourself this: If you heard that a parent locked their child in an 8 by 8 closet for a period of time and the amount of time that Bxxxxxx was, and that the parent fed them peanut butter and jelly at every meal with nothing else, and

that the parent (sic) was kept in the conditions that Bxxxxxx and Dxxx were there, would you find that okay? Or would you find that criminal?

Even a parent doesn't have the authority to keep those kids like they did. It was wrong. It was damaging. It caused harm. There was that substantial risk of harm, but this caused the harm. You didn't need a doctor to tell you that. You knew that before Dr. Grassian testified. Your common sense told you that to be true.

We don't have to prove the actual harm, we only have to prove substantial risk. They were in there too long. They were not nourished enough. They were not kept safe. They were at substantial risk of harm to their physical, mental, or emotional health, and the Defendant had a conscious awareness of that. That is Count III.

So truly at the end of this case, you're going to have to decide who you believe, because that's really what it

comes down to. Because the Defendant is telling you a whole lot of different things than what you're hearing from other people.

So you could tell that he admitted what he had to. You know, there was too many kids that said Victoria's Secret.

There were pictures on his phone at Victoria's Secret. So he had to admit that. But he gave you a good reason for it.

We found the sexual surveys in his office, so he had to admit that. But he gave you a good reason for doing it. Oh, then all of a sudden we found out they were planted somehow before the search. He doesn't have any idea how they got there. Do you find that credible?

So you've got to look at who you believe, and what did the Defendant say. And he wants to take all the credit for all the good and go on and on and talk to you at length about the psychology and the therapy and how great he is and how great the school is. But not the bad. The bad

was everybody else's fault. When bad things happened, he's not responsible.

How many names were dropped to you while he sat up here and testified? Do you remember when he sat here and he said, well, I picked Keokuk because I was looking for a community of good people, right as he's looking at you?

And how many names of the good people of Keokuk did he drop when he was talking about his testimony of Jane Babcock and started listing off all these people that he knew. Don't think that that wasn't contrived, and don't think that that wasn't an attempt to manipulate you.

Do you find him credible? What reason would the kids have to make this up? All these kids from all over the United States, what reason do they have? How are their stories so consistent if this is all made up? You heard the same thing over and over. Everybody had their own version, their own effect from being there, but it's still the same.

He wants you to disregard

everything that everybody else has said, and he wants you to believe him. He wants you to take his word for it, because he's used to having people just take his word for it, because he was the owner and director of MWA, because nobody questioned Mr. Ben, because nobody said no to Mr. Ben, because everybody did what Mr. Ben told them to do.

He just wants to walk in here and be able to say, didn't do it; this is what happened; all done. Disregard, ignore all of those troubled children who you shouldn't be believing; disregard and ignore those prior employees; disregard and ignore DHS, because they're just out to get him; disregard and ignore law enforcement, because they just—they don't understand. They're just taking this all the wrong way.

Do you find that reasonable? It's not. Ladies and gentlemen, the Defendant committed sex abuse. We've met every element. The Defendant committed sexual exploitation. We've met every element.

The Defendant committed child endangerment. We have met every element beyond a reasonable doubt.

The power and the control is yours now, and I ask that you use it to do justice, to seek the truth, and to find the Defendant guilty.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time we will take a break. I think your meals just arrived here a few minutes ago, so it's timed pretty well. They should be hot yet.

One of the things, remember what I told you several times was don't begin. Your deliberations begin when all the arguments of counsel have been made. So we're not done yet. So you can talk in there about Christmas, bowl games, football, whatever you want to talk about, except do not deliberate the case. Do not talk about the case or deliberate it in any fashion. That comes after all the arguments are made, and I have a couple of short instructions to read yet. So that's

1 when you start to deliberate. 2 (A recess was taken at 1:20 p.m.) 3 (In open court, outside the presence of the jury, in the presence of the Court, the Defendant, and counsel at 5 6 2:15 p.m.) 7 THE COURT: The record shall 8 reflect that all counsel are present and the Defendant. The break for noon and for 10 the jury to eat is over. You may bring in 11 the jury. 12 (In open court, in the presence of 13 the jury, the Court, the Defendant, and 14 counsel at 2:16 p.m.) 15 THE COURT: Please be seated 16 everyone. Everyone has now been seated. 17 Ms. Schaefer, you may proceed with 18 your argument. 19 MS. SCHAEFER: May it please the 20 Court. 21 THE COURT: Ms. Schaefer. 22 MS. SCHAEFER: Counsel. 23 Good afternoon. I trust the pizza was good, and probably well needed. I 24 25 will not take two hours, just to let you