substantial risk of safety. They lost weight. Nor could she prove or did she prove that the Defendant actually knew what was going on in the OSS.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you when you go back and you deliberate, not hesitate but deliberate, think about those questions. Am I truly, firmly convinced that the events occurred the way the State has presented?

And when you deliberate and you look at all the evidence, put all assumptions aside and look only at the facts you heard, you will find there are just too many doubts. There are just too many doubts. And you will find the Defendant not guilty of all charges.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Timmins, you may proceed.

MS. TIMMINS: It must be nice to be at the top of the food chain and not have to be responsible. Is that what happens when Exxon Mobile spills oil in the ocean and kills animals? Does the president get

to step back and say, not my fault? It's my workers' problem. Does Sam Walton get to do that at Walmart? When something really bad goes on in his stores, does he stand back and say, not my fault?

It is his fault. It is his responsibility. He's not Sam Walton.

He's not Exxon Mobile. He was the owner of the facility that he lived at that he worked at that he was in every single day and that he had complete control of. He knew exactly what was going on there.

Just because something is possible, it doesn't make it reasonable. Just because an alternate theory is thrown out, that doesn't mean that there's reasonable doubt. Just because the Defendant has a different version of events than everybody else, that doesn't mean you then throw up your hands and say, well, he said it didn't happen; guess we're done.

You have been spoken to like there's no evidence in this case, like all there is a Kxxxxxx and that's it. You know that to not be true. You know all of

the other surrounding circumstances that corroborated what she had to say.

And you also know, and you know it from the instructions that you're getting, what Kxxxxxx says alone can be proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

You know you heard that phrase "he said, she said" many times. Do you know why? Because when people in our society--we hear that a lot in the news and the media--it's a he said, she said. That makes people go, oh, must not be anything there. Right? And that's what she wants you to do.

This is so much more than he said, she said. And there is so much more that supports what Kxxxxxx had to say. If you cannot reconcile the differences, then you accept what you find more believable.

What does the evidence tell you is more believable? Who did you find more believable sitting on this stand?

Is it reasonable to believe that Kxxxxxx made this up? We went through this before, but her disclosure itself

tells you that she wasn't out to get
anybody. They talked about the
rollercoaster ride. And you hear that and
it's like, well, yeah, that can make
sense. I get that. But this has been a
long rollercoaster ride.

If all she wanted was to get him in trouble; if all she wanted was to get out of the school; she got it. What incentive does she have to still be here? Why wouldn't she have just walked away and said, see ya'; I'm going to Vegas; I'm done; not dealing with this?

She works two jobs to get by, and she had to come here this week--I shouldn't say had--she came because we asked, and gave up that money from her jobs and be here and go through this situation. She didn't have to do it. If she made it up, she would have walked away. If she got what she wanted, there was no reason for her to be here.

And what is the motive? Has that ever made sense to you? Did that ever play out with Kxxxxxx, that she was angry

and so upset and just enraged about this whole thing? The Defendant said that.

They brought in Kxxxxx to say, well, she was upset during this time. She was angrier than she normally is.

But what you also know from all of the other facts in this case is actually what Kxxxxx said is fairly consistent with where she was at at that moment, that she was having these suicidal thoughts. She was in a bad place during that time. So is it because she was mad at Ben and she wanted to get back at him? Or was it the pressure cooker?

Do you really believe that she has the ability, that she is that conniving and manipulative, and has the forethought to think about what she was going to say, and had the forethought to see how it would all play out later on, to make up this story?

Because, you know what? It's not that good of a story, is it? If somebody actually sat down and said, I am mad at him; I'm going to make this up; I'm going

to say that he did those things.

the first sex act she tells you about, there are 8 other girls in the room. Who would make that up? Because most people would say, that doesn't sound right; that doesn't make sense. That's a hard one to swallow, isn't it? If she was going to make it up, wouldn't she say, I said no; I fought; nobody was around, whatever it might be? He took me by myself somewhere in the car; it happened in the car.

Think about what she told you. If she made it up, it would have been so much better. And she has to be the actress of the century to have sat up there on that stand and went through her testimony like she did in such a genuine and true way if that was all made up.

Oh, and with Kxxxxx, why did they put her on? Now, they say they put her on to talk about Kxxxxxx, that she was upset. But isn't it interesting, they called witnesses just like we called witnesses, and the comment was that the

only people we called were kids that hated MWA, disgruntled employees. The one kid, prior student, that they put on was Kxxxxx whose father was Devon Dade, the director of the academy, the friend of the Defendant, the girl who never once went into OSS, and had just a great experience there and has always supported the Defendant, always. That's the one kid that they put up for you.

Is it reasonable to believe that

Kxxxxxx made it up? You would know that

he had the ability to steal those few

moments, those touches. He could go

wherever he wanted; nobody questioned him;

the records were not kept of the staff; he

was the family rep; he could take her

whenever he wanted; nobody questioned

that.

And the movie nights in the seminar room, and what does he have on his phone (indicating). We know like Kxxxxxx said that it was easy to go away on a movie night. Look at all those girls facing that screen, watching that show. He had

several of those pictures on his phone.

Kxxxxxx had nothing to gain from this. She had nothing to gain from this. The Defendant has everything to lose. He's the one that has the motive. He's the one that has the incentive to deceive. He has everything to lose. So who do you find more credible?

I said this earlier, he wants to walk in here and say what he wants and expect you to just take it as is, believe everything and be done. Don't listen to the other evidence. Ignore everything else that's in front of you. He says it, so it's true. Don't do that.

On the second count, is it reasonable to believe that he just made these bad choices, when we're looking at this pattern, practice, scheme of conduct, when we're talking about the sexual questionnaires, the Victoria's Secret. You know, he sat up here and said, oh, I know it looks really bad, you know, and I made some bad choices.

We know what happened to kids at

Midwest Academy when they made bad choices. He makes bad choices and he just wants to give you an explanation and have you all say, oh, no problem, okay.

He told you it was annoying to take the girls to Victoria's Secret; that he didn't want to. It was disturbing to read the sexual questionnaires. He said it was the girls who asked for the mirror therapy or classes.

He said he wouldn't be around females anymore on December 4, 2015. He said that. But what do his actions say? That's what he said to you. But what were his actions, what did he do?

He built this school that was based on discipline, punishment, deprivation of wants. Food is a privilege; mattresses are a privilege; a mirror is a privilege; parting your hair is a privilege.

Everything was controlled there. He and staff are in charge at all times.

And then he sits up on the stand and he says, well, I just took them there because they wanted to. It was their

choice. And he kind of acted like he just--there was nothing he can do about that. Do you find that credible? Do you find that reasonable?

He said the school is financially strapped, but then you hear that he's buying bras and underwear for teenage girls at Victoria's Secret. All he had to do was say no, not going to Victoria's Secret. I'll take you over to Walmart, and you can buy the cheap cotton bras and underwear; right?

So once again he's sitting there not taking responsibility, placing it on the kids. It was the girls that wanted it; their choice, not mine, and wanting you to blame somebody else for his behavior.

He said it was disturbing to read the questionnaires yet they're still sitting in his office. Because when Mike Davis talked to him on the phone after all of this happened, and Mike Davis was like, what is this sexual questionnaire stuff? And the Defendant gives him the

explanation and, oh, I shredded them when I was done with them. But they were in his office. They weren't shredded. And then by the end of his testimony yesterday, it was just something about the staff found them in the garbage or something. And then today it turned into some conspiracy theory where somebody planted it a day before the search. Do you find that reasonable? Do you find that credible? Or do you find it to be someone who is filling in the blanks, who is displacing the responsibility and pointing the finger at others?

He said the data was used in those questionnaires to teach the kids about how unplanned pregnancies affect the generations in the family. What do questions about how many times do you masturbate have to do with that? Read the questionnaires.

He said he gave the survey to staff to hand out. The kids all dispute that.

And guess what staff doesn't know about them? You know, he said he talked about

he wanted to help the kids. He was doing this to help the families. He just wanted to collect it for data. Well, nobody compiled the data, and he never once told the counselors about it. Mike Davis, Jane Riter, Gary Lachapelle, they had no clue about this. Do you find it credible that this survey was to help the kids?

When it came to the uniform room, again, he had this story he told of a girl crying in the hall and he just wanted to help her and they were being mean, and he wanted to make her better. So he printed off these papers, and the next thing you knew all the girls wanted it. What was he supposed to do?

taken the girls to Victoria's Secret if it was so important to go there? Could another female staff take care of those sexual surveys with the girls if that was so important? Could another female staff take care of this body image where you're having girls go into a room and undress and look at themselves? He says things to

you, but his actions don't play out. His actions show what his intentions are.

So again, he's blaming the kids.

He's blaming the girls. They wanted to do

it. I couldn't say no; which, again, goes

against everything you know about that

school. He said he only did it a few

times over a two-month period. So he

tried to really restrict it down, didn't

he? He tried to make it seem like it was

minimal. You know that's not true.

Rxxxxx came there in December of 2013. That's what she testified to.

She said that that class happened shortly after she got there. She was pretty new.

Then look when the rest came. Fxxxxxxx was June 2014; Lxxxxx and Mxxxxxx, October 2014; Kxxxxxx, January 2015. They all did it. That is way longer than a two-month period, all right. So he wasn't honest with you, and he was trying to minimize what he was doing and make excuses for it.

And wasn't it interesting--when we're talking about pattern, practice, scheme of conduct, wasn't it interesting

that most of those girls said, yeah, I did it close to the time that I came. Do you think there's a purpose to that when the new girls come in?

Again, he said the girls asked if they could undress, completely against all the testimony that all the girls gave.

All of them that did it on different times and different classes, the Defendant was the one who said, you can take off your clothes; get down to your bra and underwear; take it all off.

When the girls came out, he'd talk to them about their body type. Well, you're a pear shape; you know, you have bigger breasts. But he wants to make it seem like it's all innocent. It's just because that's what the girls wanted. You know that's not true.

Is it reasonable that the Defendant just made bad choices when he went to Victoria's Secret? All right, he had to admit the Victoria's Secret. We had it on the phone. Everybody said it. Okay. So now it's just, you know, they wanted to.

He told Beth Webster he was done with the girls, wouldn't interact with them, on December 4th. On December 22nd, he was seen in the Iowa City mall, not the ones that are close here, in the Iowa City mall with girls from the academy. And then today all of a sudden he was thinking about it, and maybe it wasn't even girls from the academy. It was another group of teenage girls that he was with, because that's why he had that photograph. He says things; his actions are different. Do you find him credible?

Mike Davis confronted him about
Victoria's Secret, you know, while the
academy was still open—this was in the
fall of 2015—and said, hey, Ben, I heard
that you did this. Not a really smart
idea. And what does the Defendant say to
him? No big deal, and I can do what I
want. That's probably what a lot of this
December 22nd was, because he wasn't going
to have Beth Webster telling him where he
could go and who he could be with and how
he was going to run the academy. He could

do what he wanted.

He said he didn't have sexual conversations with Kxxxxxxx. Kxxxxxx said he did. You know those occurred. Rxxxxx said he did too. The trip to St.

Louis, coming back from the airport when he had the conversations with the two girls in the front of the van.

Mxxxxxx said he talked to the girls about masturbating. Now, you can put it in context of what it was, that maybe it was this general conversation.

But again, is there not female staff to take care of that? Or is that all still part of that pattern, practice, scheme of conduct of having this contact with the girls in the way that he is for Count II.

All of these things go to Count II, okay? He grooms, he tests. Isn't that some of it, the testing? Come on,

Kxxxxxx, let's go, come do this body exercise. Does she go in the room willingly? Does she question him? When she comes out, what does she say? How does she respond when I ask her about her

body? He sees what reactions he gets.

Are they quiet? Do they feel

uncomfortable? Do they seem like someone
who's going to say something?

He desensitizes to the sexual contact. He's always talking—he's talking about it to them, like this is normal, this is okay. He makes it seem normal. Again, every girl said they were fairly new with that mirror exercise. Was that the grooming? Was that the testing? Is that part of the pattern, practice, scheme of conduct? These actions were not bad choices, they were purposeful, they were done for a reason.

Is it reasonable, ladies and gentlemen, to believe that the kids are to blame for all of this? He wants you to believe that a 12-year-old boy made the rational choice to remain in a cell for half a year. He wants you to believe that he didn't notice any problems with Dxxx or Bxxxxxx.

You know, that too far up the food chain is ridiculous. I mean, he himself

testified he's in OSS, according to him, all the time. He admitted he was in there with Bxxxxxx and Dxxx. It was right in front of his face. He had his clinical staff saying, take care of this problem; they don't belong here. And they just kept putting them in the room.

He wants you to believe that OSS helped them. Did you see that at the end here where he tried to take credit for Bxxxxxx and Dxxx doing well, that it was him, his academy? That's why they're doing well now?

talk about what those kids were like when they came home, curled up on the floor crying, behaviors they hadn't seen before. You heard the therapy that they got into when they went home, and the new programs that they got them into at home and were wonderful for them. Yet he wants to take full credit for the fact that they're doing well.

He wants you to believe that the kids love peanut butter and jelly. That's

okay to give them PB and J. They loved it. It's okay we left them in the rooms. They wanted to be there.

He wants you to believe he didn't know. He wants you to believe that what he did is okay. You know, he convinced the boys' parents of that, because they try to blame the parents too, right? We called a Plan B.

s testimony and remember what she said. Now, she agreed that she was called in November and that the mention of Plan B was made. But she was also told, come to the December workshop. So she thinks things are fine. She wasn't told--it wasn't until March that she knew exactly what was going on.

She wasn't told about the extent of the OSS rooms. Do you remember her testifying to that? Well, we saw them and the Defendant said that they're rarely in there. The doors are always open. She testified a long time ago, but go back to

what she said. She also said that the Defendant told her that he'd help her look for a place for Bxxxxxx; that he was going to look at other facilities.

Now, the bottom line on all of that is-- You know, that's fine. If you want to be upset with the parents for not realizing what was going on or maybe not doing something themselves sooner, that's fine. But the bottom line is he didn't change anything, okay?

all of the time, checking on the kids.

heard that from and about how the Defendant would tell them things, and it's going to be okay, and this is going to work. These are people who were desperate for a place to get their children help. Those parents sometimes are almost as vulnerable as those kids. Because as a parent, you'll do anything to help your kid. And if somebody comes along and says, we can help; we'll give therapy; it will all be okay. No, it's okay he's in the OSS room; he's in there a lot, but it's okay. This is working.

He took advantage of the parents as much as he took advantage of the kids, and he had no problem taking their checks either.

Here's the other thing. This is not the time and place to turn this into a debate about what's appropriate or not appropriate discipline for a child. What we're talking about in this case is excessiveness. So whether you agree or

not that it's okay to have those rooms-And you know what? Facilities have them.
The State is not charging the Defendant
because they have the rooms. He's being
charged because of how he used the rooms.

Your debate should be about what's reasonable. Is it reasonable to confine a child to make them conform? Because it wasn't just, I'm throwing a temper tantrum, I'm hitting somebody. It's, you know what, you got too many consequences today, in the room.

This wasn't just, as Dr. Grassian said, an appropriate use of the room to get them calmed down and to make it safe for them to be around others. This was, okay, once you're calmed down, then you're going to sit in here for twenty-four hours in structure. Can you imagine how they had to sit for the length of time that they did? And they want to say, well, people check in, it's okay. They got their peanut butter and jelly sandwich, it's okay. It's their choice to be in there. Had they just followed the rules,

this wouldn't have happened.

1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Can you imagine sitting in structure for twenty-four hours, whether it's on a concrete floor or three hours later it's in a chair, can you imagine? It's the difference between a spank and a punch in the face, okay? People can debate all they want whether it's okay to spank your child. But, you know what? Under the law it's okay to spank your child. Now, do you want to punch your child in the face? Do you want to leave a bruise? Do you want to beat your child? Not okay. It's about what's reasonable, and it's about excessiveness. His actions are not reasonable; they are excessive; they are criminal.

Who do you find credible? All right, our witnesses aren't perfect.

They're troubled young adults that came as troubled kids from troubled backgrounds, but that's why he picked them. That's why they were available to him. And that's what makes them so credible.

There's no explanation for motive

for these kids. There are too many consistencies in their accounts of kids at different places, different times. Did you watch some of them when they recited those rules? It was almost weird when you would watch a kid go into, oh, that's a Rule 355 and a 108. They still know those. Those are engrained in their head.

There are too many consistencies in these kids' stories. To believe the Defendant means that you're going to look at all this other testimony and say, that all is not true. What do you find reasonable in that situation? Who do you find credible?

The Defendant had an answer for everything, all right. That was so scripted and well played out, and he's very charismatic, and he's a good speaker. My witnesses not so much. Who do you find more credible?

The truth is simple and you heard it from these kids. He sexually abused Kxxxxxx; he sexually exploited Kxxxxxx through his pattern, practice, scheme of

conduct; and, he endangered the health and well-being of Bxxxxxx and Dxxx. That's it. He stole a piece of those kids' lives that they will never get back.

Bxxxxxx Spent his first day,
first day at the academy in that room
(indicating). He was 12. What did the
sheet say? He was brought in yelling and
screaming, it's 4:06. At 5 o'clock, he's
finally laying down. So he's calming down
by 5 o'clock. But he's still in there.
At 7:35 he's still in there. It's 5:10 in
the morning and he's still in there.

It's now September 4th, we're on another day, and he's woke up at 7:24. At 7:30, sitting in structure. So he got up and he's sitting in structure. He's ready to go. And then Mr. Mike D, Mike Davis, comes in to talk to him, and Bxxxxxx refuses to talk to him. And then at 7:58, Mike D tells Bxxxxxx structure starts over. What happens? He had to be restrained. He peed in the corner of his room.

That morning he got pickles and PB,

peanut butter, for breakfast. At 12:55 that afternoon, he's asking for a book and a stuffed animal. He's 12 and he's still sitting in that room, and all he wants is a stuffed animal. He's lucky he gets a mattress.

For lunch he gets a PB and J sandwich and raisins. Back to breakfast on the next day, PBJ and an apple.

September 5th, for lunch this time he gets a meat sandwich. What was it, three slices of deli meat on some bread, and an orange? At 6:15 he gets dinner. At 7:16 he's returned to his family, September 5, 2014. Those are his first days there.

Oh, guess what? September 6th, he's back in. It's 6:30 in the morning, Bxxxxxx brought to OSS, very angry, takes off socks. This is where he gets all of his clothes taken and he's sitting in that room with a camera on him naked. This is his third day there.

How many days did he spend there?

That's what his life was. Do you know what Bxxxxxx wanted (projecting photo)?

All he wanted -- he wanted something to eat.

Remember he went to the Chinese buffet for his birthday because he could eat as much as he wanted there? That's what Bxxxxxx wanted.

What about Dxxx (projecting photo)?
We don't know what Dxxx wanted. Dxxx
couldn't come here. Dxxx can't talk about
being there. So we don't know what Dxxx
wanted.

Kxxxxxx (projecting photo), she
just wanted a safe place to live. She
didn't want to leave.

Lxxxxx (projecting photo), she just wanted some therapy. That's all she wanted when she was there.

Fxxxxxxx (projecting photo), she just wanted a safe and secure place.

Mxxxxxx (projecting photo), she just wanted to call her mom. Remember that? She was crying. She just wanted to call her mom. She ended up in OSS for how long?

And Rxxxxx (projecting photo), she just wanted to feel human. Rxxxxx was

very compelling when she testified. She was one of those kids that did okay, that had the logical thoughts when she arrived of, okay, I'm going to conform because I don't want to be in that room. Remember she had to sleep in the room the first night she got there? And she didn't want to go back, so she did as she was told. She followed the rules. She could clean the blood up off the floor.

She said it was so awe some to go out for your birthday because that was the one time that you could feel human.

Because being there, you had no control; you couldn't talk to people. And despite the fact that she is around all these people at this academy, what was her response to what it was like there, how it felt? It was lonely. And she just wanted to feel human.

He had all of the power over those kids. He abused that power. He is not all powerful here. His word is assessed just like anybody else's. You get to make that decision as to whether or not you

believe him.

He is not God here. He was God at Midwest Academy. He wasn't questioned at Midwest Academy. Everybody took what he said no matter what.

You now have the power and the control. Use it to seek the truth, use it to do justice and find him guilty, guilty on each and every count.

Thank you.

(The Court read the remaining jury instructions to the jury.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I don't believe you have the verdict form attached to your copies. However, it's pretty straightforward. Count I is the Sexual Abuse offense. On the second page is the Pattern, Practice, or Scheme, and on the third page is the Child Endangerment. On each of those counts, you have to have—that's where you need to enter your verdict, okay? So they're separated by page and each goes by Count I, Count II, Count III. It's pretty straightforward once you get a chance to