IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR LEE COUNTY AT KEOKUK 2 STATE OF IOWA,) Cause No. FECR009152 3 VS.) Transcript of Hearing BENJAMIN G. TRANE,) on Motion for New Trial 5 and Sentencing Defendant. 6 7 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the Honorable Mark Kruse commencing at 9:45 a.m. on May 10, 2018, in the district courtroom of the South Lee County Courthouse, Keokuk, Iowa. 10 APPEARANCES 11 DENISE A. TIMMINS, Assistant Attorney General, Area Prosecutions Division, Hoover 12 State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319, counsel for the State. 1.3 ZACHARY MILLER, Assistant Attorney 14 General, Area Prosecutions Division, Hoover State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319, 15 counsel for the State. 16 ALFREDO PARRISH, Attorney at Law, 2910 17 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50312, counsel for the Defendant. 18 19 20 21 22 Scott A. Landon Certified Shorthand Reporter 23 Des Moines County Courthouse 24 Burlington, Iowa 52601

25

1		<u>I N</u>	DEX				
2	WITNESSES:	Direct	Direct Cross Redirect Recross				
3	For the Defendant: LISA SCHAEFER	15 58		67	67		
4	BENJAMIN G. TRANE	142					
5							
6		E X H	I B I T	S			
7	Defendant's Exhibits: A-Ms. Schaefer's billing records			-	Offered 56	Received 56	
8	Defendant's Offer of B-deposition of Mega	Proof	Exhibit	<u>s</u> :	140	140	
9	C-deposition of Kath	nerine M	ay Grenn Axxxx	1	140	140	
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

1

2

3

_

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

1617

18

1920

21

22

24

25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(In open court, in the presence of the Court, the Defendant, and counsel at 9:45 a.m.)

THE COURT: The case is State of Iowa vs. Benjamin G. Trane, under FECR009152. The record should reflect that on December 22 following a jury verdict, the Defendant was convicted of the lesser included offense in Count I of Assault With Intent to Commit Sexual Abuse, an aggravated misdemeanor, in violation of Iowa Code Section 709.11; Count II, Pattern, Practice, or Scheme to Engage in Sexual Exploitation By a Counselor or Therapist, a class D felony, in violation of Iowa Code Sections 709.15(1), 709.15(2)(a), and 709.15(4)(a); in Count III, Child Endangerment, an aggravated misdemeanor, in violation of Iowa Code Sections 726.6(1)(a) and 726.6(7) of the Code of Iowa.

Today was set for sentencing. The Defendant also filed a Motion for New Trial, I believe, on March 27 of this

year.

Appearing today for the hearings are Ms. Denise Timmins, Assistant Attorney General, and Mr. Zachary Miller, Assistant Attorney General. The Defendant, Mr. Trane, appears here today with his attorney, Mr. Alfredo Parrish.

We spoke in chambers briefly.

There were countering briefs, or an objection by the State in their brief, regarding the extent of the Motion for New Trial regarding ineffective assistance of counsel issues in this case.

I believe the State pointed out that most, if not all, the grounds refer to that—well, most do.

Mr. Parrish, is there record you want to make on that issue?

MR. PARRISH: Well, Judge, I think the State needs to state on the record what their record was off the record with the Court.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, we requested with the Court that the

ineffective assistance of counsel argument not be heard. It's not appropriate for a motion for new trial. It's something that can be dealt with on appeal or in a PCR issue. And we would rely on the case law in our brief to support that.

THE COURT: Mr. Parrish.

MR. PARRISH: Judge, for the record, I want to outline what happened in chambers. And the State will quickly correct me in regard to this matter, if necessary.

We went into chambers with the Court. The Court indicated, after the State made an objection, that the Court could not hear any issues with regard to a Motion for New Trial that pertained to ineffective assistance of counsel; that it read our cases on this point; it read the State's cases on this point; and saw that in one of our cases, I think Tjernagel, and perhaps another case that was presented to the district court; and, we argued to the Court off the record that any other grounds that the Court could

consider in this matter could be considered in a Motion for New Trial.

We also indicated to the Court that the rule that we quoted on the ground for the Motion for New Trial, which is 2.24(2)(b), indicated that the Court could, in fact, hear those issues related to the Motion for New Trial, which would include what we believe would be other grounds.

We also indicated to the Court that 822 was not the exclusive remedy for ineffective assistance of counsel and the Court does have the power to consider that. I believe the Court indicated that it had already ruled on those points in trial and made reference—at least had a piece of paper in its hand—with regard to that matter.

We then told the Court if, in fact, we would--if the Court was not going to listen to our evidence on the issue of ineffective assistance of counsel that we would ask the Court, then, to consider an offer of proof on ineffective assistance

of counsel. I believe the Court responded: Then I don't have to listen.

And that was the response that the Court gave to me in chambers with counsel present at that time.

And I said--I told the Court, I said, I did have a right under Parrish v.

Denato, to make an offer of proof with regards to this matter if the Court was not going to listen to the evidence. Then the Court responded: Then I'm not going to let you make an offer of proof.

I then indicated to the Court, if you're not going to let me make an offer of proof with regard to these matters--

THE COURT: Whoa, whoa. I believe it was more in the nature of that you can make a verbal offer of proof if you wish, not testimony. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: I guess I didn't hear that part, where there was not testimony, but that I can make a verbal offer of proof.

Is that what the Court is telling me I can do now?

THE COURT: Well, I think that's what I said in there.

MR. PARRISH: Maybe I didn't hear you. Because my response, Judge, is if you were not going to let me make an offer of proof, I referred you to the case of Parrish v. Denato, and then I indicated that I thought that case was on point, and there were several cases that came after that that are directly on point.

I then told the Court that if you're not going to let me make an offer of proof, then we're going to file an emergency appeal to the Iowa Supreme Court. You waived your hand--put both hands up in the air (indicating) and demonstrated in this fashion. And I said: Do I have time to do that? And you said: Yes, you have five minutes; that you can go out and call, which I did. I called my office. I explained to them that you were going to deny me a right to make an offer of proof.

I also told the office to begin preparing an emergency appeal to the Iowa

Supreme Court based on the fact that you were not going to consider an ineffective assistance of counsel claim in a motion for new trial, and also that you were denying me to file a--to make an offer of proof. I also told them that they should work on that immediately.

I also had asked the Court could I have additional time in which you would delay this matter in order for me to take the matter up to the appellate court, and you said, no.

THE COURT: Well, let me explain that a little bit first. The verdict in this case was issued--or rendered by the jury on December 22 of last year. We're now in May of 2018 still hearing this.

The Motion for New Trial was way late under the rules, filed on March 27, I believe. To delay this matter any further is ridiculous.

MR. PARRISH: I understand. We filed a proper motion to continue the Motion for New Trial, if the Court would review the record. We asked for an

```
extension of time in which to file. We
2
  also requested time to order the
3
  transcript, if the Court would look at the
  Motion. Our Motion was not late. Our
  Motion was timely under the rules.
  followed every single rule that we were
7
  required to follow to file a proper
8
  motion.
9
          We got a continuance. We ordered
10
  the transcript at State expense.
11
  transcript was provided. I filed a timely
12
  Motion for New Trial. We filed a brief
13
  with regard to the Motion for New Trial in
14
  a timely fashion.
15
          So any assertion by this Court that
16
  we filed it late is incorrect.
17
          THE COURT: Where is your motion to
18
  extend the time?
19
          MR. PARRISH: I'm sorry?
20
          THE COURT: Where is your motion to
21
  extend the time--
22
          MR. PARRISH: Judge, we filed--
23
          THE COURT: --to file-- You've got
24
  to let me finish.
```

MR. PARRISH: Oh, sure.

25

THE COURT: Where is your motion to extend the time to file for new trial?

MR. PARRISH: I don't have it sitting right in front of me, Judge. But if you go into the record, you will find it. That's the only way we could extend the time is to get the transcript so we could work on the transcript since we were not the lawyers who tried the case.

And we made a request for the transcript, which was approved. We did a proposed order and sent that down to the Court. I don't know whether you were the judge for it or there was another judge for it.

We also made a request, a couple other motions that were pending on this case, to file matters under seal that were related to sentencing issues, to travel issues, and all of those were filed in accordance with the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure.

We also, Judge, not only did that, we had a conference. We had a conference with the Court Administrator. And I

believe if you would follow--and I didn't
bring my trail of e-mails--Ms. Timmins

participated in the hearing. We asked for
two days to conduct this hearing. The

last conference I had was about two weeks
ago. When we had this conference, we

asked the Court Administrator: Could we
have a second day, if necessary?

Ms. Timmins and I have exchanged several e-mails on this issue, which I'm happy to present to this Court, indicating that she was also in agreement with this date. As a matter of fact, the first date that was set for sentencing, she could not meet. She had a conflict, I think a murder trial that she was in for approximately two weeks.

But we did everything in compliance with the rules. So if the Court is asserting that somehow we're not getting what we're entitled to get because we did not comply with the rules, I would ask the Court to point out where we did not comply with the rules.

THE COURT: It's not there. Go

ahead. Unless I'm missing it, I don't see it. All right. Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: Well, Judge, which issue would you like us to take up first? There are issues that you're saying don't go--that you're not going to allow us to present a single issue related to the ineffective assistance of counsel. So if that's what you're telling us, we have other issues that don't relate to ineffective assistance of counsel that we would like to present to the Court.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: And then after that,

I would like to make our offer of proof

with regard to the ineffective assistance

of counsel.

I would then ask the Court, on the record, for a continuance to allow us to take this matter to the appellate court, because I think the ruling by the Court was made before you could listen to the arguments in this case, and also that you came into court with your mind made up with regard to the decision.

1 So we believe, Judge, that you 2 should have at least given us an opportunity to listen to our argument prior to your ruling in chambers on this matter. And we would ask, Judge, if you would consider whether or not you can be 7 fair under these circumstances in light of what has just taken place. Can you be fair to Mr. Trane? 10 THE COURT: Don't question me, Mr. 11 Parrish. 12 All right. Let me make a couple 13 points here. You're the one who asked for 14 the conference. I have researched all the 15 documents, all the briefs, everything. 16 The ruling is based on the arguments made 17 here today, the briefs, a review of the 18 cases. I've looked up other cases. 19 That's why I ruled the way I did. 20 Ms. Timmins, is there a record you 21 want to make on the motion to continue? 22 MS. TIMMINS: On the motion to 23 continue?

THE COURT: They're asking to continue this hearing.

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, we're prepared to go today. THE COURT: All right. That will be denied. Go ahead, Mr. Parrish. MR. PARRISH: I'd like to call Ms. Schaefer to the stand, please. LISA SCHAEFER, called as a witness by the Defendant, being first duly sworn by the Court, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. PARRISH:

Q. State your name, spell your first and last name for the record, please.

A. Lisa Schaefer, L-i-s-a, S-c-h-a-e-f-e-r.

MR. PARRISH: And, Judge, I want to point out clearly that since you have indicated that I cannot bring up any issue related to ineffective assistance of counsel with regard to this matter, I want to specifically point out that I will not ask any questions on ineffective assistance of counsel, but I will make my