1 MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, we're 2 prepared to go today. 3 THE COURT: All right. That will be denied. 5 Go ahead, Mr. Parrish. 6 MR. PARRISH: I'd like to call Ms. 7 Schaefer to the stand, please. 8 LISA SCHAEFER, 9 called as a witness by the Defendant, 10 being first duly sworn by the Court, was 11 examined and testified as follows: 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PARRISH: 14 Q. State your name, spell your first

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

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

record since you've now indicated that I can make an oral record myself--

THE COURT: There you go.

MR. PARRISH: --with regard to that, and I will do that. But this issue, so that the Court will be on the same page, will go to the prosecutorial delay in getting material to the defense.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) How long have you been practicing law?
- A. I graduated from law school in 2001. I clerked for a year with the Seventh Judicial District and began formally practicing law in the summer of 2002.
- Q. And prior to your testimony here today, did you talk with anyone about a subpoena that had been issued to you?
- A. I do believe I asked Ms. Timmins just what was being said. I was no longer on the EDMS service list, so I didn't know what the hearing was.
  - Q. When did you call Ms. Timmins?

- 1 I think it was right after I got 2 the subpoena to say, what hearing has been 3 set? Q. What did she tell you? 5 That there was a Motion for New Α. Trial. And then she directed me to EDMS 7 to get the information. 8 Q. Did you talk to anyone else before your testimony today? Did you call the 10 Court up? 11
  - Did I call who? Α.
    - Q. The Court.
    - Α.  $N \circ .$
    - You did not? Q .
  - $N \circ .$ Α.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- All right. Have you talked to Q. anyone else about your case or your testimony here today?
- No. I wasn't exactly sure what I would be testifying to.
- Q. All right. As a matter of fact, you had a hearing initially that conflicted with this, did you not?
- 24 It was--today was supposed to be the second day of a divorce trial that

- ultimately settled.
- Q. And your office told me you had gotten that worked out; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

- Q. All right. And I subpoenaed from you what were your billing records; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you brought your billing records with you?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And your billing records—you had filed a motion with the Court to bring in what—well, you had filed an application with the Court to pay for what's known as a hard drive; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And this hard drive, who had possession of it?
  - A. At what time?
  - Q. At any point in time before you got involved in the case?
    - A. Before I got involved in the case?
- 25 Q. Yes.

- A. The copy that I had?
- Q. No. The copy that you requested the Court--that you needed to prepare for your defense?
- A. Before I got in the case, I couldn't tell you. We purchased it afterwards.
- Q. But the hard drive you wanted to copy information onto it?
  - A. From one that Ms. Timmins had, yes.
- Q. Right, exactly. I was trying to cut to the chase. I thought we were on the same page.
  - A. I'm sorry. I was just confused.
- Q. That's all right. So when did you get the material that was on the hard drive?
- A. From Ms. Timmins?
- 19 | O. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- A. It was when depositions began. I know it was after the holidays. I believe it was—the first would have been the 28th that she delivered it to me, because we were doing depositions down there.
  - Q. The 28th of what?

A. November.

- Q. And what date was your trial going to start?
  - A. December 12th, I believe.
- Q. So you got the hard drive with the discovery on it on the 28th of November with your trial starting in December; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Tell the Court how much information that hard drive had on it?
- A. I believe it was over 5 terabytes of information.
- Q. And how many rooms of paper would that terabyte--1 terabyte fill up?
- A. That I could not tell you. My understanding was a U-Haul truckload of paper.
- Q. And between November 28th and December 11th, were you able to go through that material?
- A. Small pieces of it. It was

  voluminous. It covered all the students

  for the most part. So I attempted to. A

  lot of time was just spent trying to find

who I was looking for specifically.

- Q. When Ms. Timmins sent you that material on November 28th, would you tell the Court whether or not she gave an index or a searchable guide to it?
- A. No. I was just given the hard drive.
- Q. Did you request a searchable guide from the State of Iowa with regard to 5 terabytes of information?
  - A. I did not.

- Q. Did you tell the Court when you went in for the hearing--
- MR. PARRISH: And, Judge, again let me caution, I don't want to go into ineffective assistance of counsel information, so I won't be violating the Court's order on this.
- THE COURT: Well, just ask and they can object.
  - MR. PARRISH: Sure.
- THE COURT: So if it gets close, they can object.
- MR. PARRISH: Thank you.
  - Q. (By Mr. Parrish) Did you tell the

Court when the first day of trial started that you had just received 5 terabytes of information from the State of Iowa on the 28th of November?

- A. I don't know if I specifically told the Court that.
- Q. Is it on the record anywhere that you told the Court that?
  - A. It may be. I just don't recall.
- Q. Did you tell the Court that the State had provided you 5 terabytes of information which could, in your opinion--I think it's larger than that--but would be a U-Haul full of documents?
- A. I don't recall specifically telling the Court how much information. I do remember using the word "voluminous."
- Q. And did you tell the Court that they did not provide you a searchable format for this information?
  - A. I did not.

- Q. Did you tell the Court that you did not request a searchable format for this information?
  - A. I did not.

- Q. Now, who scheduled the depositions in this case, you or Ms. Timmins?
- A. It was a mutual scheduling. We both were busy with other issues, so it was just a mutual decision to do them when we did.
- Q. When were they scheduled? When did they start?
  - A. They started--
- MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to object. I don't understand the relevance of when our depositions were had. That's going into the ineffective issue.
- THE COURT: I don't know where it's going from here, but go ahead. Overruled.
- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) When did the depositions start? You have it in your time records, don't you?
- A. I'm just-- I need my reading glasses. I want to say it was November 27th or 28th. It was that Monday or Tuesday after Thanksgiving.
- Q. The same date you got the hard drive of 5 terabytes of information; is

1 that correct? 2 A. Yes. 3 THE COURT: I'm sorry. What date 4 was that again? 5 THE WITNESS: Pardon? 6 THE COURT: What date was that 7 again? 8 THE WITNESS: It appears from my 9 billing records that the depositions began 10 on the 28th of November. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. I'm sorry. 12 Go ahead. 13 MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge. 14 (By Mr. Parrish) The same day that Q . 15 you got the hard drive; is that correct? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Did you copy the hard drive that Q. 18 same day, or was it copied for you? 19 It was copied for me. Α. 20 And when you opened the hard drive Q. 21 on the copied one that you saw, when you 22 opened it up did it have an index that 23 showed you how to find various witnesses?

A. Yes. Well, sort of.

24

25

Yes or no?

- Q. Well, it either did or it didn't.
- A. It provided some indexes but I

  don't--it provided-- Truly, I don't

  remember. I just don't remember. I

  remember there being an index or two, but

  they still were not necessarily helpful in

  getting me to the information I was

  looking for.
  - Q. Prior to receiving this 5 terabytes of hard drive, had you ever defended a sex abuse case in the past?
    - A. Defended? No.
    - Q. Your first one?
    - A. Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Ms. Timmins, in fact, knew prior to the time that this trial started that you had never defended a sex abuse case prior to this; isn't that correct?
  - A. I don't know what she knew.
    - Q. Well, she knew you?
- A. This was the first time Ms. Timmins and I had ever worked together.
- Q. Well, I thought you were a-- Were
  you a prosecutor for twelve years before
  this?

A. Yes.

- Q. At Burlington?
- A. Yes, Des Moines County.
- Q. And she was with the AG's office that kind of circulates around the State; right, the area prosecutors?
  - A. I don't understand your question.
  - Q. She was with the area prosecutors--
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. --for a number of years; right?
- A. Yes. I just had never had the opportunity to work with her before.
- Q. So you don't know whether she had a habit of doing this, waiting to the last minute to deliver discovery?
- A. I don't know what her practices or habits were. I had never worked with her before.
- Q. So my question is, when you received 5 terabytes of information, did you make an inquiry and ask: Why would a prosecutor with experience deliver 5 terabytes of information to me twelve days before trial?
  - A. No, I did not ask her that.

- Q. Did you call her supervisor and ask her supervisor, why would she do something like that in a case like this?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. You indicated that the depositions were set according to a mutual agreement. Who subpoenaed the witnesses? Did you subpoena the witnesses or did Ms. Timmins subpoena the witnesses for the depositions?
- A. Ms. Timmins, I believe, subpoenaed the State's witnesses, and the defense witnesses, I actually had most of them come in voluntarily.
  - Q. I'm talking about the depositions.
- A. We deposed both State and defense witnesses over that two-week period.
- Q. So Ms. Timmins arranged for all of the State's witnesses to appear for the depositions; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So it was Ms. Timmins' idea to call K.T. (sic) the same day that the jury selection was going to start?
  - A. I would assume it was her decision

when to call her witnesses.

Q. And if she knew that K.T. (sic) was going to called, which was the main witness in the case--

THE COURT: Could counsel approach once?

(A side-bar conference was held off the record.)

MR. PARRISH: I think I was one letter off. It should be K

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) So it was Ms.

  Timmins' idea to subpoena K. on the day the trial started and not you; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, she would have.
- Q. And she knew, did she not, that with regard to K. that if you had to file a motion with regard to Rule 5.412, you would have to file it on the same day or the day after her deposition was taken; isn't that true?
  - A. I don't know what she knew.
- Q. Well, she's the one who came in and made the record to the Court that you were late. That was her motion--that was her

- resistance to your Motion to Judge Kruse, that it was late; isn't that true?
- A. Yes. She did argue that the Motion was untimely.
- Q. She's the one who set the depositions, isn't she?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Did you know she had a habit of setting depositions of the key witnesses within a period of time that would not allow defense lawyers to file a 5.412 motion? Did you know that?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Did you check to find out if she had done that before?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Did she in your presence off the record have a conversation with Judge
  Kruse to say--to tell the Judge that she set the deposition schedule?
- A. I don't recall the specifics of the off-record conversations.
- Q. Did you hear the Judge ask her: Well, how did this debacle happen?
- 25 A. I know there was discussion about

- it. I don't remember exactly who said what.
- Q. Well, was the discussion on the record or was it off the record?
  - A. Both.

- Q. So you had a discussion with Judge Kruse off the record and with Denise Timmins off the record about why K. 's deposition was not taken until right before jury selection started?
- A. I remember there being a general conversation of why this was being--I think Judge Kruse's question was: Why are we doing this now?
  - Q. Well, that's a pretty legitimate--
- A. I don't remember any specifics other than Judge Kruse's statement.
- Q. That's a pretty legitimate question coming from the Judge, isn't it? He's thinking to himself: Why in the world are we having the main witness here with her deposition being taken right before the trial starts?
- Isn't that a legitimate question coming from the Judge?

- A. I believe any question that comes from the Judge is legitimate.
  - Q. Well, okay.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: Sometimes it is; sometimes it isn't.

MR. PARRISH: I would defer to the Judge's last answer on that.

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) So my question is, if the Judge had some concerns, why didn't you tell him what Denise Timmins had done?
- A. We discussed in general when they were scheduled.
- Q. No. Why didn't you tell the Judge at that point: Look, Judge, Denise

  Timmins didn't even give me the discovery until the 28th. She scheduled the deposition. She didn't even schedule K. until the trial started.
- A. I believe there were discussions about what had occurred as far as the timing of everything but, no, I didn't specifically say she was the one responsible, no.
  - Q. It's not in the record. It's not

in the transcripts.

- A. I don't remember having that specific discussion, other than a general discussion of, why are we dealing with this right now. But I don't remember, other than Judge Kruse's question, what was specifically said.
- Q. So why didn't go on the record knowing what you know now--or what you knew then, why didn't you go on the record and explain to the Judge what the Attorney General--Assistant Attorney General had done to your client?
- A. I believe there was some discussion about the depositions that were scheduled right before trial. I don't think we discussed anything about specifically who scheduled them.
- Q. Well, isn't Ms. Timmins the one who actually filed the motion that indicated it was untimely?
- A. She filed the Resistance to my Motion, yes.
- Q. And the main reason of the Court's ruling was that the Judge said he won't

waive speedy. He also said in his ruling, he is--that the Motion is untimely, didn't he?

A. He did.

- Q. Didn't you tell the Judge it was not untimely because you had, in fact, been slow-played by the State of Iowa in the discovery?
- A. I think what I explained to him was that the deposition of K. had been taken the day before her testimony, and I had filed it at the earliest possible moment that I could file it.
- Q. And that good cause existed because, in fact, it was delayed and you were getting the discovery, 5 terabytes of it. You had found this information. You had made the call. You had found that this information could come in as an exception to Rule 412 exclusion, and you then didn't make a record, did you not, nor did Ms. Timmins make the record, that she participated in this type of process? She never made a record. Did you see her do that?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Now, you were in the trial--

MR. PARRISH: And again, Judge, I'm going to make clear that I am not making a record with regard to ineffective assistance because I've been excluded from doing that with this witness. But I will make the record on the offer of proof.

She was subpoenaed for the purposes of making an extensive record with regard to her work on this case, but I will abide by the Court's ruling. But I want to go into a separate area that I think does not go to ineffective assistance of counsel in full respect, but it does deal with a separate issue on this case that we have filed in our Motion. And if you look on the EDMS we supplemented it last night with our last Motion.

THE COURT: It's the same thing, just go ahead. If there's some reason to believe--the State believes it violates that, they can go ahead and object.

I just want to make one other point on the ineffective assistance of counsel--

and I was looking at State v. Clark, which is a 2013 unpublished opinion by the Court of Appeals, but it cites a number of other cases, that the ineffective assistance of counsel—the next to the last paragraph goes into various discussions regarding that, including that post—conviction hearings in ineffective assistance of counsel allow an adequate record claimed to be developed, and that the attorney charged with providing ineffective assistance may have an opportunity to respond to such claims.

Again, Ms. Schaefer is here not even knowing why she is here, the purpose of the hearing, or anything else, and is at a huge disadvantage.

So go ahead on that.

MR. PARRISH: All right. And I think also, Judge, in response to those issues, I would refer the Court back--and you indicated you read the *Tjernagel* case which was just decided in 2018. But also we would say, Judge, that if the record under the Iowa Constitution and the United

States Constitution is supported and it can be reviewed *de novo* by the appellate court, they can decide on direct appeal that that issue is there.

And I would agree that perhaps if there are other issues that need further explanation, the appellate court can, in fact, look at it. And I don't dispute the Court's analysis on that point.

THE COURT: Well, I'm just saying that Ms. Schaefer has already had a hard time remembering what was said. She didn't have access to the file and probably not the transcript. So I assume she's going off memory totally.

MR. PARRISH: She has her billing records, Judge, that she can refer to.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.

Q. (By Mr. Parrish) During the course of the trial, you would agree that two things came up with regard to an expert that was produced by Ms. Timmins.

Do you recall her experts being

called? And I'm not going to ask you did
you order any experts or anything like
that. We'll have your billing, and I'll
make my offer of proof later. But do you
recall testimony coming up with regard to
Larry Nassar, who was the doctor who was
treating the young ladies from the
gymnastics program?

- A. I don't specifically recall that.
- Q. Do you recall an expert from

  Harvard testifying about an issue

  regarding the bombings taking place in the

  Boston Marathon?
  - A. Which expert?
- Q. Being brought up by her sex abuse expert.
  - A. Dr. Salter?
  - Q. Yes.

- A. Vaguely I remember when she was explaining something with regard to trauma and offering that as an example.
- Q. All right. When the information came up with regard to the Boston

  Marathon, and the information came up with regard to--you don't recall regarding

Larry Nassar, but it's in the transcript
about the Michigan State issue and the
treatment of gymnastics. Do you know,
based upon your recollection of what was
taking place in the courtroom, had Ms.
Timmins told you that she was going to
present that information in advance?

- A. With specific regard to Dr. Nassar and the Boston bombing?
  - Q. Right.

- A. No.
- Q. Now, are you able to recall what was going on with regard to Dr. Nassar at that point with regard to the investigation into the gymnastics?
  - A. No.
  - Q. You don't remember even--
- A. I don't even know that I knew his name at the time.
- Q. So that just caught you totally off guard?
- A. It did not register to me. It was not something that I followed.
- Q. And the expert didn't tell you in advance that she was going to testify

about that, did she?

- A. No. I don't remember ever hearing that name prior.
- Q. Nor did the expert tell you-- And you had taken her deposition; is that correct?
  - A. I had.
- Q. All right. And in her deposition, she didn't tell you she was going to talk about the Boston Marathon bombing, did she?
- A. No. My understanding of her testimony was that she would be presented hypotheticals and that would be what she would testify to, her opinion based on those hypotheticals.
- Q. And you at that point were comfortable with the fact that she would only testify about hypotheticals, and you would agree that Ms. Timmins didn't give the Judge any notice that she was going to bring Larry Nassar into it, and didn't give you any notice she was going to bring the Boston bombing into the trial?
  - A. No. I did not know that.

- A. If I remember correctly, Ms.

  Timmins had indicated it was going to be tenuous whether he would be able to. She was still hopeful all the way up to trial, but she had made it clear she wasn't sure.
- Q. So did she tell you categorically--did Ms. Timmins tell you categorically that A. was not going to testify at trial?
- A. I don't think she was definitive either way. I think she was still hopeful.
- THE COURT: Would counsel approach again.
- (A side-bar conference was held off the record.)
- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) Now, as I understand it, you and Ms. Timmins had some type of understanding with regard to witnesses for trial; is that correct?
  - A. What do you mean by an

understanding?

- Q. Well, did she indicate she was going to bring the State's witnesses?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you were going to bring the defense witnesses?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. So you had an understanding; is that correct?
- A. I don't know that it was something we specifically discussed. I just think it was something that we mutually--or individually understood that's how you do things.
- Q. And I take it you didn't have it in writing, and you never told the Court that was the rule?
- A. No. That was just for both of us, I think, standard operating procedure.
- Q. Did the Court make an inquiry and say, well, look, we have this trial coming up, big trial, and who is going to be responsible for getting the witnesses here?
  - A. I don't recall such an inquiry

being made.

- Q. All right. And so A., up until the day that the trial started and you started selecting the jury, Ms. Timmins had indicated to you that A... would be present?
- A. She had indicated to me more likely than not he would not be present, but she wasn't sure.
- Q. Do you have that in writing anywhere?
- A. It was a conversation that the two of us had.
- Q. Do you have it in an e-mail anywhere?
- A. I think it was a conversation we had after one of the days of depositions, because I'd asked specifically about a couple of people. We were deciding who was going to come in when. I asked about A. That one I remember because she had said on numerous occasions she didn't know if he would be able, psychologically it was my understanding, to handle the trial. She was still hopeful. And that if he

did, we would depose him as soon as we could prior to his testimony.

- Q. And did you depose him?
- A. No.

- Q. As a matter of fact, Ms. Timmins had explained to you that she actually knew the rules, that if a person is not going to testify and they're going to refer to that person, that there are certain rules she had to follow to be able to talk about that person; right?
  - A. I don't understand the question.
- Q. Well, did Ms. Timmins tell you she knew the rules how to get that evidence in without the person testifying in court?
  - A. I don't recall such a discussion.
  - Q. She never told you that?
- A. I don't recall such a discussion, no.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall her filing any particular motion to get A. . 's testimony in by any source under the Iowa Rules of Criminal Procedure?
- A. Without looking at the case file, I couldn't tell you.

- Q. Well, off the top of your head?
- A. I don't recall off the top of my head. But there are, I'm sure, a lot of things about the case that I wouldn't recall right off the top of my head.
- Q. Well, did she, to your best recollection, file any motion that you resisted to bring A. 's testimony into the courtroom in front of the jury?
  - A. I do not recall such a motion.
- Q. All right. And had such a motion been filed, you would agree that you would have resisted it?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. But yet would you agree that she presented testimony from A. . during the course of the trial?
- A. He wasn't here. How did she present his testimony?
  - Q. Through other people.
  - A. I know his mother testified.
- Q. Right. And some medical records came in from him; is that correct?
  - A. I don't specifically recall.
  - Q. But you know evidence came in

sufficient for Mr. Trane to be convicted,

even though Ms. Timmins never filed a

prior motion to let the Court know or let

you know that this evidence was coming in;

you would agree?

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, at this

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to object. There's absolutely no requirement in the rules that I would have to file anything like that.

THE COURT: Is there a rule you can cite, Mr. Parrish?

MR. PARRISH: I was asking her a question, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I don't recall the question.

- A. And I believe I told you I don't recall any such motion being filed.
  - Q. You would agree that the State

filed a draft motion for instructions; is that correct, for jury instructions?

- A. I do believe so, yes.
- Q. You did not?
- A. I did not.
- Q. And I looked pretty vociferously through the transcript to try to find the conferences, et cetera on the jury instructions. Did you participate in those at all?
  - A. Yes.

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

22

- Q. And did you make any objections?
- A. I don't specifically recall whether

  I--I know there was a lot of conversation

  about various instructions.
  - Q. Would the record speak for itself?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. And so whatever the record would reflect, you would agree that that would be what your entire discussions would have been on this matter; is that correct?
  - A. With regard to the jury instructions?
- Q. With regard to the jury
  instructions.

- A. I know there was also some off-the-record conversations.
- A. As far as the record is concerned, the transcript is what it is.
- Q. Now, with regard to the jury instructions, did you get a copy of Ms. Timmins draft jury instructions?
- A. I believe so. They were filed on EDMS.
  - Q. And did you review them?
  - A. I did a cursory review.
- Q. Do you know whether her jury instructions that she drafted and prepared to the Court and gave to the Court were erroneous?
  - A. In what way?
- Q. Well, erroneous in designating who the alleged victims were; designating which one the jury could convict on? Did you have a chance to review that to make that determination?
- MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to object. In the

Defendant's brief, this all goes towards the ineffective assistance of counsel argument.

MR. PARRISH: Judge, this goes to

Ms. Timmins'-- I told the Court in

chambers part of this hearing is directed

to Ms. Timmins and part of the reason--and

she asked for the conference. I came out

and asked the Clerk, does the Judge prefer

a conference or not? Some judges prefer a

conference; some judges don't.

Ms. Timmins came in and indicated with regard to meeting with the Court. It was not my request, Judge, contrary to what the Court indicated. And when we went back in there, I specifically told the Court that it was my position that we should be able to cover these issues because these issues go to Ms. Timmins' conduct as a prosecutor in this case and what she did with regard to matters. And that's why she did not want a hearing on an offer of proof.

THE COURT: Well, this isn't the offer of proof. I thought you were on

other issues other than ineffective assistance of counsel right now.

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PARRISH: You're absolutely right.

THE COURT: And she's saying that goes to ineffective assistance of counsel.

Just address that.

MR. PARRISH: This issue goes to the instructions that were prepared. They were prepared erroneously. If she made the draft instructions and this Court relied on that -- and we're not getting into the issue of what she did because that goes to ineffective assistance of counsel. But if Ms. Timmins prepared instructions that were deliberately misleading or erroneously or accidentally misleading or reckless, then she needs to know who else participated. If she participated in it, that's one thing. If only Ms. Timmins participated in it, it goes to how she was able to present that to the Court and whether or not the Court adopted those instructions so she's aware as to what happened on that issue. And if there were other conferences, we don't know.

THE COURT: I don't even remember the last question. Ask it again and we'll go from there.

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) Did you participate in any way with giving Judge Kruse copies of the instructions?
  - A. No.

- Q. So he relied on Ms. Timmins' instructions in order to prepare the final set of instructions to give to the jury; is that correct?
- A. You would have to ask Judge Kruse whose instructions he used. It's common practice in Des Moines County, and having worked with Judge Kruse, that the Judge prepares their own instructions.
- Q. Well, judges want lawyers--in every case I've ever been involved in, wants lawyers to assist them, too, right, to do their job; would you agree? That's the way I practice.
- A. That may be. I know the common

  practice in Des Moines County where I have

  worked with Judge Kruse before and all the

other judges is those judges prepare their own jury instructions. If you have something specific or unique, you can offer that to the Court. But the general instructions themselves are prepared by the Court.

Q. I've done a lot of practice down here over the years. As a matter of fact, my practice used to be busier down here than it was in Des Moines.

So my question--and I'm pretty familiar with how the judges do it. Are you telling me judges don't accept proposed jury instructions down here?

- A. It has been my experience in my eleven-plus to twelve years as a prosecutor the judge--in a criminal case the judge is the one who prepares the jury instructions.
- Q. So that is why you didn't prepare any jury instructions?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Then why did Ms. Timmins prepare jury instructions if that was the rule down here in Keokuk County? Why would she

send a draft to the Judge?

A. You would have to ask--

THE COURT: This is Lee County.

MR. PARRISH: What county am I in?

(Laughter)

THE COURT: City of Keokuk, Lee

7 || County.

MR. PARRISH: South Lee County to be exact.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. PARRISH: I'm in South Lee County, all right.

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) But anyway, let me just tell you, so are telling me-- Well, you explained the reason why you didn't prepare your draft, and we can't get into that issue right now. But Denise Timmins is the only one who prepared a draft to the Court for the Court to rely on with regard to the various counts; would you agree?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And did you review her counts?
  - A. I said I gave her draft a cursory

review.

- Q. Right. And if you looked at her draft, would her draft with regard to the counts mirror Judge Kruse's?
- A. I didn't do a page-by-page comparison.
- Q. Did you ever take a look to see--Well, we're only bringing up 31 and 33, Instructions 31 and 33.

The question is, in looking at

Instructions 31 and 33, did that mirror

Judge Kruse's instructions? Or have you

gone back to check?

- A. I didn't check then, and I haven't checked since.
- Q. But what you can tell us, quite frankly, is that you never presented any. The only instructions that you're aware of came from Denise Timmins, and you would agree that you didn't check to see whether or not any error in her instructions were encompassed in the Judge's instructions; would that be fair?
  - A. That would be fair.
  - Q. Did they ever have any instruction

conference where you didn't participate, to your best knowledge?

- A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. So every one that the Judge had, he invited you in to talk, as a judge would do, invited you to make comment, invited you to make any corrections; you would agree?

A. Yes.

MR. PARRISH: Judge, we have filed, as the Court can tell, we filed

Defendant's Exhibit A, which should be on

EDMS at this point. It may take a while

for it to pop up, Judge.

And Exhibit A, Judge, will be the billing records of Ms. Schaefer. And while Ms. Schaefer is on the stand, Judge, I will ask if the State wants to ask questions beforehand and—— Go ahead.

THE COURT: Let me just interrupt.

Regarding Exhibit A, the practice in the Eighth is that, by rule of the Chief Judge, is that those be paper exhibits.

So if you filed one electronically, it will probably get rejected. So if you

have that record and you wish to admit it, you'll have to do it in paper. That's just to put you on notice, because it probably won't pop up here. It's not there now.

MR. PARRISH: We'll have a paper one, Judge. She brought one in with her today. I think we have it marked as Exhibit A.

- Q. (By Mr. Parrish) I'm going to have you take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit A, Ms. Schaefer. I issued a subpoena duces tecum to you, did I not?
  - A. You did.
- Q. And I asked you to bring your billing records to the Court with you?
  - A. Yes.

MR. PARRISH: And I would at this time, Judge, offer Defendant's Exhibit A, understanding I'm not allowed to ask any questions on it, but I will make an offer of proof at the appropriate time since the Court now has—— I do need, Judge, time to call my office and let them know that you did indicate I could make an offer of

proof orally, as opposed to through a 2 witness, so they can correct that 3 interlocutory appeal. (Defendant's Exhibit 5 A was offered in 6 evidence.) 7 THE COURT: All right. Ms. 8 Timmins, do you have any objection to Defendant's A? 10 MS. TIMMINS: No. 11 THE COURT: Defendant's A will be 12 admitted without objection. 13 (Defendant's Exhibit 14 A was received in 15 evidence.) 16 MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge. 17 Judge, at this time those are all 18 the questions I would have. I would ask 19 the Court to reconsider its motion--its 20 ruling on the issue of if I'm allowed to 21 go into ineffective assistance of counsel 22 at this time, based upon the record that 23 has been made, Your Honor. We believe it's denial of the Constitution of the 24

United States for us to not be able to

```
1
  explore these issues at this point. We
2
  believe it's a denial of the rights of Mr.
3
  Trane with regard to his Iowa
  constitutional rights to pursue his claim
5
  at this point.
6
          We would also point out two
7
  additional matters, Judge.
8
          THE COURT: Well, can we maybe just
9
  let them question, and then make that same
10
  motion, and then we'll go back to that,
11
  okay?
12
          MR. PARRISH: All right. That's
13
  okay.
14
          THE COURT: That way it keeps--
15
          MR. PARRISH: That's fine.
16
          THE COURT: It's easier to keep it
17
  straight.
18
          MR. PARRISH: Sure.
19
          THE COURT: Ms. Timmins, regarding
20
  those issues, do you have any questions of
21
  Ms. Schaefer?
22
         MS. TIMMINS: Just a few.
23
          (Continued on the next page.)
24
```

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MS. TIMMINS:

- Q. Ms. Schaefer, your client in this case demanded a speedy trial; correct?
  - A. He did.
- Q. What was the process of getting the hard drive?
- A. Grueling. I think our initial conversation was as early as the bond review hearing in early October. And you had indicated there was a hard drive, but I think you had told me that your understanding was it was all financial stuff, that it had nothing to do with the charges against Mr. Trane. And I believe I had told you if that's all it is, then it doesn't have any bearing on what I'm doing and it wouldn't need to be copied.
  - MR. PARRISH: May I give her this, Judge, in case she needs to refresh her recollection.
  - THE WITNESS: That's all right.

    I've got my own copy.
- MR. PARRISH: Oh, okay. Thanks.
- A. Then you had contacted me, and I

don't remember if it was just a conversation we had in the courthouse or if it was via e-mail or by phone. I don't remember specifically. But you did indicate to me that it had come to your attention there was other information on that hard drive, and that I would probably want to see it.

Then we had a several-week period of time where we were trying to figure out how to do it efficiently. I think at first Mr. Trane had actually provided me a 2 terabyte hard drive, if I remember correctly, that he just happened to have, and I provided that to you at one of our hearings, or I might have even provided it to Agent Lestina. I don't remember.

And then you contacted me within a few days to say that there were two problems: No. 1, it wasn't big enough; and, No. 2, that the DCI would not hook up a hard drive to their system that was not brand new manufacturer sealed.

So we knew at that point we had to figure out something else. I think at

first it was just not big enough, and Mr.

Trane had indicated to me that he had some others, if we could put it on, like, separate hard drives. And then you advised me that aside from that, it had to be manufacturer sealed.

So we were trying to figure out how to get that done. I did the order to the Court. You had indicated that the State was not going to pay for that through your office. The DCI wasn't going to do it. I think we even tried to maybe see if we could avoid having to copy the whole thing, if we could part and parcel out what was relevant to this case versus what wasn't. I believe you indicated that that just--it couldn't be done in an efficient manner.

So once we decided that we needed to just get a brand new hard drive that was when I petitioned to the Court for an extraordinary expense for the Public Defender to reimburse. Then I had my secretary order a hard drive.

I think it came in two or three

- days later. Then I provided that to you and from there it was copied. My understanding was it took several days to copy as well.
- Q. Will you take a look at your billing statement, which I believe is Defendant's Exhibit A?
  - A. Okay.

- Q. On there, on the first or second page, when was the first time that you received discovery from the State?
  - A. November 1st.
- Q. And that was the Division of Criminal Investigation disk; correct?
  - A. Plural, but yes.
- Q. So there were several?
- A. There were several.
  - Q. And the DCI disk is what contained the main information regarding this case; correct?
  - A. It contained all of the investigative reports from, I think, local law enforcement, the DCI, the FBI. I think there were some videos on there.

    They kind of were supplemented

consistently throughout. But yes, that was the main crux of the written information, yes.

- Q. This hard drive that we've been talking about, that contained information of documents that had been seized from the school; correct?
- A. Other than the Cellebrite report-for those that don't know is the forensic
  analysis of, I believe, his phone and some
  other things. Other than that, I think
  the rest of it had to do with just basic
  school records.
- Q. Of all children who went to Midwest Academy?
- A. Of all of the children that went to Midwest Academy.
- Q. And within that disk there was some categories where you could pick which areas to look into; correct?
  - A. Correct.

- Q. And I think all of the children's materials were grouped together by their name; correct?
  - A. I truly don't remember at this

point.

- Q. But there was some organization to the disk?
- A. There was. It was just the information—there was just so much information.
- Q. Now, in regards to depositions, when was it that you were made aware that we were actually going to speedy trial?
- A. That would have been, I believe,
  November 17. I believe it was at the
  pretrial conference. Prior to that time,
  there had been discussion about waiving
  speedy trial. But I think it was at that
  time that the Defendant had persisted in
  his demand.
- Q. So it was at that point that plans started to be made for depositions and getting ready for trial and things like that; correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. In regards to obtaining the presence of an out-of-state witness, how do you do that?
  - A. You have to petition the local

court to issue an order saying that the witness's testimony is necessary. That then has to go to whichever state the witness is in. And then a separate order has to be issued in that state because that state has jurisdiction over that actual witness. And so then they have to actually issue the subpoena. It takes a few weeks to get that done.

- Q. It's a long process; correct?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And, in fact, the State agreed to get you all of the out-of-state witnesses here, but the agreement was that we have to do it during trial or before trial so no one was paying for extra plane tickets; correct?
- A. There was discussion about that, yes.
- Q. And was there any witness that you were not provided access to that testified at trial?
  - A. That testified at trial? No.
- Q. How many sex abuses cases have you prosecuted?

- A. Have I prosecuted?
- Q. Yes.

- A. Oh, heavens, a lot. I couldn't tell you a number.
- Q. You're not unfamiliar with sex abuse cases?
- A. No. When I was with the County Attorney's Office in Des Moines County, that was my principal caseload.
- MS. TIMMINS: I don't have any further questions. Thank you.
- THE COURT: Mr. Parrish.
- MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Your Honor.
- I believe, Judge, the State has opened the door, and I should be allowed now to ask those questions, and I'll tell you specifically. But I think the State opened the door with regard to this matter.
- She questioned her about the process of getting the hard drive, what steps she made with regard to the getting the hard drive. She indicated that she relied on Ms. Timmins' professional

representation with regard to whether or not she should get it in a timely fashion and review that material. She's only relying on what Ms. Timmins said. So I'm allowed to go into that area with regard to it.

She talked about the provisions provided in the 2 terabytes of information that was provided to her. I think that opens the door to the inquiry as to whether or not I'm allowed to ask her the questions about what she did as a result of that.

Also, she asked the question about the investigative reports. I would like and make an inquiry with regard to those matters.

She made mention of the Cellebrite reports. I think that's significant because it goes to the issue that I've raised in my pretrial motion on this matter.

She opened the door with regard-THE COURT: I don't--

MR. PARRISH: --to witnesses-- I'm

sorry. Go ahead.

THE COURT: I don't know what your questions are. So if you ask those, and maybe they can object and then we'll do it in that fashion.

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PARRISH:

- Q. In your experience of trying, prosecuting sex abuse cases, could you tell us whether or not you had utilized the services of an expert in prosecuting those cases?
- A. In a sex abuse case? I don't believe in any of my sex abuse cases.
- Q. And you said you couldn't remember how many. Could you give the Court some idea as to how you many you've tried--you've prosecuted?
  - A. Prosecuted?
  - Q. Yes.
  - A. I couldn't even begin to count.
- Q. 100?
  - A. At least.
- 25 Q. 150?

- A. Possibly. Of course, those didn't all go to trial.
  - Q. Well, how many went to trial?
  - A. Maybe a dozen or so.
- Q. Okay. And out of those dozen or so, did you use a single expert?
  - A. No.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, as a defense lawyer you said you only tried one in your opening part of the statement?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, my question is, you knew the State was getting an expert; is that correct? Dr. Salter?
- A. She was listed in the Minutes of Testimony.
  - Q. Did you consult an expert?
- A. Did I consult an expert? I wasn't sure what Ms. Salter was going to be testifying to specifically.
  - Q. You took her deposition?
  - A. Just a week or two before the trial.
    - Q. Did you consult an expert?
  - A. I was looking to see if there would

be one who would be able to offer evidence that would contradict Ms. Salter's testimony.

- Q. Did you consult an expert?
- Α. I did not consult one, no.
- Did you make a request to the Court to get an expert?
  - Α.  $N \circ .$

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

18

21

22

23

24

- Did you consult an expert in questioning Ms. Salter about -- to help you prepare your questions for Ms. Salter?
  - Α. Did I consult an expert?
- 13 Q . Yes.
  - Α.  $N \circ .$
- 15 So then would you agree with me Q. 16 that in your career as a prosecutor and in your career also as a defense lawyer, you've never once consulted an expert in a 19 sex abuse case, nor did you consult one in 20 this case; is that true?
  - Have I ever consulted an expert in a sex abuse case? Yes. I've never actually utilized one at trial.
  - Now, you indicated Ms. Timmins made a representation to you about what was on

the data--on the 5 terabytes of data; is that correct?

A. Early on, yes.

- Q. When did she make that representation to you?
- A. I believe it was one of our very initial discussions. I want to say it was the bond review hearing, I believe. But I can't be certain.
- Q. Did she also tell you that you could not share that information with Mr. Trane?
  - A. Not at that time, no.
- Q. Well, when did she tell you that you couldn't share it with Mr. Trane?
- A. We had some discussions about—and I don't remember if it was specifically about the hard drive information, but there was some concern that he was, for lack of a better word, sharing some of the information that he had already received that would have only come out through discovery with members of the public, and she was very concerned about that.
  - Q. Did you understand my question?

- When did she tell you? I didn't ask you about the background.
- A. I don't recall specifically when she told me.
- Q. Did you tell Mr. Trane that he could not look at the material on the hard drive?
- A. Prior to the case--or prior to trial or after trial?
- Q. Before you went to trial, did you tell Mr. Trane he could not look at the material on the hard drive?
- A. I told him I could not provide him a copy--provide him the hard drive, that's correct.
  - Q. You told him that; right?
- 17 A. Yes.

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

- Q. And you told him that because Denise Timmins had told you that you couldn't; is that correct?
- A. I remember her voicing concerns. I

  don't recall exactly what her verbiage

  was.
- Q. Did you ever tell Judge Kruse that
  the State told you that they made

representations about what was on the hard drive, and your client couldn't even look at it?

- A. I don't think she said he couldn't look at it. She didn't want him to have a copy of it.
- Q. Well, did you make arrangements a single time throughout the trial for him to come in and look at the hard drive?
- A. Throughout the trial? There was not time.
  - Q. All right. So you would agree as you sit here today that Mr. Trane never once looked at the hard drive; is that correct?
    - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Did you ever tell the Court that when you came in and you did your 412 hearing?
    - A. No.

- Q. Did you think that was important for the Judge to know?
- A. I didn't even know what was on the hard drive. I hadn't had the opportunity to review it all.

Q. Well, let me ask you this. If they
told you that they are charging Mr. Trane
with misconduct with regard to the
students, and they gave you a 5 terabyte
hard drive that contained information
about the students, wouldn't you think
that the first thing you would look at is
see what information was on the hard drive
with regard to the students?

MS. TIMMINS: Objection. Your Honor, I think at this point he has gone into the ineffective assistance.

THE COURT: Well, she already answered it before, but I'll sustain the objection. Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: Judge, she opened the door to it when she talked about the terabytes and the hard drive when she asked the specific question about when she got it and what was on it. I'm only asking to cross-examine her on that point.

THE COURT: As to that question, the objection is sustained. Go on.

MR. PARRISH: Could we make an offer of proof, Judge? Could I make an

oral one?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.

The offer of proof that we would make in response to the question is that the witness did not review the hard drive.

Ms. Timmins made a representation to her as to what was on the hard drive. She relied on that representation with regard to the hard drive.

We believe that information was critical to his defense. And the reason it was critical to his defense, Your Honor, is because they were making allegations of conduct that occurred within the school. They were making allegations of conduct that was occurring within the school, and it was imperative that an individual who had knowledge of it could go through all of the records with regard to where the students were, where they were placed, to records that were kept with regards to each student to see whether or not that was consistent with the information that had been provided to

the State of Iowa to see whether or not 2 their representations that had been made 3 to this Court with regard to discovery that had been complied with, not only under the rules, but when the Court made the ruling on--I believe the Court 7 indicated that a court made a ruling that no further motions can be made--and I think the Court said that off the record 10 this morning. I did not include that in 11 my record.

THE COURT: That was at the pretrial conference.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PARRISH: Right.

THE COURT: And I believe Judge Linn was there.

MR. PARRISH: Judge Linn, right.

THE COURT: He said--he was going over typical pretrial stuff, and then he said, "the court will not entertain motions the morning of trial." That's a quote.

MR. PARRISH: Right. Thank you, Judge.

And Judge Kruse, off the record,

made the record that Judge Linn had made
the record that no further record could be
made or motions could be made with regard
to this matter, that the pretrial
discovery is significant because
representations had been made to the Court
with regard to this matter that were
inaccurate.

That's my offer of proof, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you. Just one
other thing. When I quote anything from
the pretrial conference, this is not a
certified document. The court reporter
prepared it very quickly yesterday, so
it's not certified. There might be
changes in it. So I just want to make the
parties aware of that.

MR. PARRISH: I appreciate that, Judge, thank you.

THE COURT: It's initially what she believes was said.

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

(Continued on the next page.)

BY MR. PARRISH:

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Resumed)

- Q. I was unclear as to what your answer to Ms. Timmins was with regard to when she was leading you on the issue of the DCI information as opposed to the terabytes of information? What was she trying to get you to say?
- A. I think she was trying to get me to differentiate between the information that was provided in the initial discovery versus what was actually on the terabyte-- or the external hard drive.
- Q. So you would agree that your actions at that time were based upon what Ms. Timmins told you when she was making a professional representation to you?
  - A. At what time?
- Q. When she told you what was on the 5 terabytes?
- A. I guess I don't understand the timeline of your question.
- Q. Well, let's go back step by step then. At one point you received 2

terabytes of information; is that correct?

A. No.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Q. You never did?
- A. No.
- Q. All right. You only received one hard drive with 5 terabytes of information?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And that's the one I talked to you about on the 28th?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So what is Ms. Timmins talking about with the 2 terabytes of information?
- 14 A. I don't think I ever heard Ms.
- Timmins refer to 2 terabytes of
- 16 information. That would have been me,
- 17 | because originally I think we thought that
- | 18 | | 2 terabytes would be enough, and Mr. Trane
- $^{19}$  | had a 2 terabyte hard drive that we
- 20 thought we would use without having to go
- 21 | through the whole process of getting
- 22 | court-ordered funding.
  - Q. I think that--
- A. That's where the 2 terabytes came
  in.

Q. That clears it up. So to go back then to the 2 terabytes, the 2 terabytes was a request for a hard drive that perhaps you had made to see if that would completely get all the discovery that she was trying to give you?

A. I think everyone--or I think Ms.

Timmins--again, I'm just speaking to what

I believe was her thought process--was

that there were only a couple of terabytes

of information and that a 2 terabyte hard

drive would be sufficient to copy that.

When I was discussing that issue with Mr. Trane, he said: I have several of them; I will bring you one. You can provide that to them; they can copy it.

She provided it to the DCI, and then it was a few days later where she indicated to me initially, that's not big enough; there's significantly more information on there; we will need a bigger hard drive.

Q. Gotcha. So Mr. Trane never provided you with any discovery that contained records or what you would call

inculpatory or exculpatory information on a hard drive at any point in time?

- A. Mr. Trane?
- Q. Yes.

- A. No.
- Q. All right. So the only information you got was the information back on the 28th that we referred to in my initial questions?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And at some point you indicated that you made an agreement with her not to share it, if I recall, to share it with Mr. Trane, but I believe you indicated—and correct me if I'm wrong—you said you didn't share it in your office; is that correct?
- A. She didn't indicate that he couldn't see it. She did not want him to have his own independent copy of it.
- Q. And my question is, did you make an arrangement for him to come in to your office since he couldn't take it with him to review it?
  - A. Unfortunately, we were limited on

time. We didn't receive the hard drive
until the first day of depositions. And
as you can tell from my billing records,
most of those days were pretty full, in
addition to the hour and a half drive I
have between South Lee and my office.
There simply was not a time for him to be
able to.

- Q. So the answer is no?
- A. No.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. And you would agree that contained in that information, as you know now, because you've actually given me the hard drive, it contains student records that possibly could have assisted him in preparing for trial?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Did you ever relate that to the Court during the process?
  - A. No.
- Q. Is there a reason why you didn't tell the Court: Well, Judge Kruse, I got 5 terabytes of information. The State has 24 2 to 3 students here that they're going to make allegations out of 1,900 that have

been into my system. Now, Judge Kruse, I've got a problem here. I need to look at this material.

Did you bring it up to Judge Kruse or Judge Linn or Judge Schilling?

- A. No. But I did bring it up with Mr. Trane several times that I needed additional time.
- Q. But you didn't bring it up with the judges?
  - A. No.

- Q. Did you ever bring it up in writing to Mr. Trane?
  - A. In writing?
- Q. Yes.
- A. Usually it was at our meetings, or we would meet after depositions for a few minutes to go over things. And I would-especially once I saw just how much information was on the hard drive, we had a meeting in my office where I was asking him to waive speedy trial to give me more time.
- Q. Well, my question was, did you ever bring it up in writing? That was my

simple question.

- A. No, not in writing.
- Q. Did you outline to him what issues he would be facing, such as a late 412 motion, a motion to suppress, motion in limine? Did you bring that up to him in writing at any point in time?
- A. No. I think most of our conversations were verbal.
- Q. Did you ever make a record with the Court where you told the Court on the record with regard to Mr. Trane and the interactions with Ms. Timmins being present, or someone from her office being present, the issues you were having with going through discovery?
- A. I think I made a general reference to it at the pretrial conference. I can't be sure exactly what I said. But I think I did make a general reference that I had advised him that it was probably in his best interest to waive speedy trial to give us time, but he has chosen not to do that. It was very similar to the conversations I had with Mr. Trane.

- Q. So is it your testimony that you
  brought this up in front of a judge on the
  record?

  A. I think it was very much an inpassing--it wasn't specifically discovery.
  - I just had made it clear that I had made a recommendation that he might want to waive.

Q. Could you go to the date of the pretrial conference, please, in your time slips?

THE COURT: Counsel, I've got a rough transcript of that--again, it's not certified--if you want to look at it.

MR. PARRISH: Oh. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Ms. Timmins, you can approach.

(A side-bar conference was held off the record.)

Q. (By Mr. Parrish) Ms. Schaefer, I'm going to show you what is an incomplete—and you heard Judge Kruse's comments on this matter from the bench, where he indicates this is not a full and complete

record with regard to the pretrial conference.

First of all, let's go back and get the date of it from your billing records, please.

- A. The pretrial conference was on November 27th.
- Q. All right. And we know now the next day you get the hard drive?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. But see if--read through this and see if this refreshes your recollection.

  As the Judge as indicated, this is not a full record, and I think we all appreciate that, and it might be just portions of it.

  Read through it and see if it refreshes your recollection, and then I'll ask you my question.
  - A. It does.
- Q. All right. Thank you. Now, my question is—and it might not be on there, as the Court has pointed out—but do you tell the court that you hadn't even gotten the discovery yet?
  - A. No.

- Q. All right.
- A. I believe I had mentioned it was a passing reference to waiving speedy trial.
- Q. But you talked about a change of venue, too; right?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And is there any reason why you didn't tell the Court that the State of Iowa hadn't even complied with the production requirements at that point when you're talking about waiving speedy trial?
  - A. Did I do that?
  - Q. Yes.
    - A. No.
- Q. But you knew at that time there was going to be more than 2 terabytes of information, didn't you?
  - A. At that time, yes.
- Q. All right. Why didn't you mention that to the Court?
- A. I thought I made it clear that by
  encouraging him to waive speedy trial, I
  was going to need additional time. I had
  the discovery, so it wasn't a question of
  Ms. Timmins not providing it. I just had

not had the opportunity to go through it yet.

- Q. I thought you told me you didn't get the discovery until the 28th?
- A. I had the initial discovery. So I had already gone through all of that. I was not anticipating the difficulty in going through one student's whole set of records. That in and of itself took a tremendous amount of time. And I wasn't able to get through it for all of them.
  - Q. All right. I'm a little confused.
- A. I might not have explained myself well.
- Q. Right. Let's try it again. Either you had the discovery before the 27th when you had the pretrial conference, or you didn't have all the discovery on the 27th before you had the pretrial conference.
  - A. I had the original DCI disks.
  - Q. All right.

- A. I did not receive the 5 terabyte hard drive until the next day.
- Q. Yes. Which you already testified to contained the student information that

you said you needed?

- A. Student records, yes.
- Q. Right. And my question is simply this: Is there a reason why you didn't tell the Judge that when you were talking about this speedy trial issue?
- A. I think we were dealing with so many issues that day it just--there was a lot going on in that pretrial conference.
- Q. You represented to the Court that—at least in answer to Ms. Timmins'
  question—that you knew the process of
  getting out—of—state witnesses, and you
  and the State made an agreement as to how
  the witnesses would be brought into the
  courtroom and who would be responsible.
  You made that agreement; right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And Ms. Timmins kind of led you and said, look, I agree to get the State's witnesses in so we can cut down the cost; right? Isn't that what she said when she was asking these questions?
  - A. I think that was her concern, yes.
  - Q. She was concerned about the cost to

you?

- A. I don't know.
- Q. Well, that would be your concern because your budget doesn't come from the same place as her budget, does it?
  - A. That is true.
- Q. All right. So you have a responsibility as a defense lawyer that is actually inconsistent with what her concerns are with regard to the budget, don't you?
  - A. I suppose.
- Q. And so let me ask about these witnesses. At some point did she release witnesses?
- A. I know there were witnesses that were here that were not called. I know that.
- Q. Yes. And tell the Judge who those witnesses were.
- A. I couldn't tell you specifically at this time.
  - Q. Do you recall a Mxxxx Bxxxxx Gxxxx?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Do you recall a Kxxxx Mxxxxxxx

## $M \times \times \times \times$ ?

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Α. Yes.
- Q. You heard Ms. Timmins tell you in her leading question that she would get the witnesses who she indicated she would call and have them available. That was her leading question to you, and you all said you had an agreement to that effect; isn't that true?
- A. Yes. She would secure them both for depositions as well as trial.
  - Q. Did she have Mxxxx Bxxxxx Gxxxx here for trial?
  - A. I do recall seeing her in the hallway at some point, but I don't remember when exactly.
  - Q. Did she have Kxxxx Mxxxxxxx Mxxxx here for trial?
    - Α. I don't recall seeing Ms. Mxxxx.
    - But she told you she would be here? Q.
    - That was my understanding. Α.
- 22 All right. And with those two Q . people here, she released them without 24 letting you know, didn't she?
- 25 A. I don't remember a specific

- conversation. I don't know what she did.

  I just know they weren't here, and they

  did not testify.
  - Q. Right. I read the transcript, and I didn't see either one of them in the transcript.
  - A. I did not see either one of them in this seat so--
  - Q. Right. And you didn't cross-examine them?
    - A. No.

- Q. Did she talk to you before she released these two witnesses?
- A. I don't recall any specific conversations about it, no. I guess I only saw Ms.--I think it was the Bxxxxx girl just in passing. I just happened to recognize her. I think I was in to talk to Mr. Trane or going up to the ladies room.
  - Q. And you had actually--
- A. I don't know what conversations Ms. Timmins had with them.
  - Q. Had you taken her deposition?
  - A. Yes, a day or two before.

- Q. A day or two before?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And in taking her deposition, you determined that she was going to be helpful; isn't that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. You knew that Bxxxxx Gxxxx was going to be helpful; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you knew that Kxxxx Mxxxxxxx Mxxxxxxx Mxxxxx was going to be helpful; isn't that correct?
- A. I felt her testimony would be more helpful than harmful, yes.
- Q. Now, when Ms. Timmins just told you in her direct examination questions that she would have these witnesses available, by her leading question and her professional way of asking this question to you, did you ever bring it up to the Court that Ms. Timmins had released these witnesses without talking to you and you knew that these witnesses were favorable to you?
  - A. No.

1 Q. Well, when Ms. Timmins just asked 2 you that question at this hearing on her 3 own without me asking this question earlier, why did you then continue to agree with her that all the witnesses who she said would be available would be here 7 if you knew two of them had been released without talking with you? Why did you answer the question, yes, that's right, 10 Ms. Timmins? Why did you just tell the 11 Judge that?

- A. I think my answer to Ms. Timmins was that it was the understanding that she would have them here and available.
- Q. Well, if they were gone you would agree they were no longer available; is that correct?
- A. I didn't know they were gone until they were gone.
- Q. Well, that's the only time anybody knows people are gone; right? When they're gone? They don't know any earlier, until they disappear; right?
  - A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. All right. So you knew they were

- gone. My question is, why didn't you go
  tell Judge Kruse that Ms. Timmins had
  violated the agreement that she made? Do
  you think he would have gotten upset with
  you?
  - A. I guess my practice as a prosecutor was you can choose to not call whoever you choose to.
  - Q. Well, but you knew they were favorable?
    - A. I did.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

- Q. And you had taken their deposition. We have a copy of the depositions right here, don't we?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you knew she told you she would keep them there; isn't that true?
- A. I don't think we had any specific
  discussions about keeping them here. The
  assumption was made that they would be
  here because I did see Ms. Bxxxxx Gxxxx,
  or whatever her name was.
  - Q. Well, you knew Mr. Trane wanted to call them, didn't you?
    - A. I knew what?

- Q. Mr. Trane wanted to call them?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And you've already acknowledged you knew they were favorable. But my question at this point is that Ms. Timmins just asked the question on her cross-examination: Didn't I agree to have all these witnesses here? Why didn't you respond; well, you said you would have them all there, but you then, in fact, released two witnesses that Mr. Trane wanted to call and their information was favorable, and you didn't tell me they were going to be gone, Ms. Timmins?

  Why didn't you tell Judge Kruse
- Why didn't you tell Judge Kruse that?
- A. In the heat of the battle, I just was too-- I didn't think about it. And by the time I knew they were gone, they were both--if I remember correctly, they were both out of state, and there was little to be done.
- Q. Well, that's how she prefaced her
  question here today. Because she said, do
  you know how to get out-of-state witnesses

in? Didn't she say that?
A. Yes.

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, at this point I'm going to object. My questions related to depositions. This has been twisted around into something that it is not. He's arguing about things that he hasn't even filed in his Motion for New Trial, and there's no relevance to this.

THE COURT: Response?

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.

First of all, Ms. Timmins in her questions, in an effort to show that she did not participate in some representations to the Court, this is what she asked, Your Honor. She asked her about out-of-state witnesses. She said they made an agreement they would bring out-of-state witnesses in because of the difficulty in getting the witnesses in. She said the State would agree, in her response to the questions, to get out-of-state witnesses available. And they also talked about the economy of it. And these witnesses would be available for

depositions, and she agreed also to have them available for trial.

The follow-up to this question,

Judge--and, first of all, it is in our

Motion, but it doesn't have to be in there

to have a Motion for New Trial.

THE COURT: Where is it, though? I know in your brief, you have six things here. It's none of those.

MR. PARRISH: If you look at paragraph 12 of our Motion, I think it's included in that. If you go to paragraph 19, it's directly included in that.

So I don't know where Ms. Timmins is getting the representation that it's not in there.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know if everything is in there, but I'm looking at the brief, too, which kind of focuses it, and that's definitely not there.

MR. PARRISH: Well, if you look at paragraph 19, Judge, if you go down. "The state failed to timely notify the defendant that they were not calling the witnesses and failed to disclose to the

defendant or the court that the reason the witnesses were not going to be called is because--

THE COURT: I see it now. Go ahead.

MR. PARRISH: I don't know how anything could be clearer, Judge.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

Q. (By Mr. Parrish) Let's go back to my question, Ms. Schaefer. I know you said in the heat of battle during the trial you forgot to bring this up to the Court. My question is, Ms. Timmins just led you through something trying to explain her position and acknowledge--and you acknowledge that that was your agreement.

My question is, when you answered the question here just a few minutes ago, why didn't you tell Ms. Timmins that, you know, Ms. Timmins, you let those witnesses go and you didn't tell me, and in the heat of battle I forgot to tell the Judge?

- A. What was the -- Are you --
- Q. Why didn't you answer the question

that way?

- A. Why did I not do it?
- Q. Yes.
  - A. I don't recall.
- Q. Okay. Now, in your experience as a prosecutor, have you ever done that to a defense lawyer before? Made an agreement that you were going to have witnesses here from out of state, and then you would let the witnesses go without telling opposing counsel, or tell the judge that you were going to do this?
  - A. When I was a prosecutor?
- Q. Yes.
  - A. My practice was if there was someone I was not going to call, I would let them know to give them the opportunity to subpoena them if they wanted to.
- Q. Well, when Ms. Timmins did this to you, how did you feel?
  - A. How did I feel?
  - Q. Right. Defense lawyers--
- A. I don't remember feeling anything

  specifically, other than there was another

  witness that we had to examine by the time

I realized they were gone.

- Q. Did you know that at that point, if that witness was unavailable and as she indicated they were out of state, that you perhaps could have made a motion to include that favorable evidence into court with regard to offering her deposition because she was unavailable?
- A. I didn't know that she was
  unavailable. I didn't know where she was.
  I just knew she wasn't here.
  - Q. Well, you could have just gone to the Court and said: Hey, Judge, I've got these two witnesses. Ms. Timmins let them go. I think she violated our agreement.

    And I want to put their depositions into evidence.

Why didn't you do that if Mr. Trane wanted to put the witnesses in there?

- A. I don't know.
- Q. Did you just forget?
- A. I think I was busy trying to deal with the other 20-some-odd witnesses and just didn't deal with those two particularly. There were a tremendous

amount of witnesses.

MR. PARRISH: Your Honor, we will get those depositions for the Court. But we would like to offer the deposition of those witnesses for the Court to review.

And I will have those available, Judge. I have copies of them.

response to a question asked by Ms.

Timmins that one of the disks contained what was called Cellebrite reports; is that correct?

Q. (By Mr. Parrish) You indicated in

- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Did you review the Cellebrite reports? Ms. Timmins asked you this question.
- A. If I remember correctly, the Cellebrite report, it was about 1,500 pages.
  - Q. I just--
- A. So yes, I reviewed it. And when I say I reviewed it, it was a very cursory review because it was, I believe, 1,500 pages long.
  - Q. Did you review the Cellebrite of

- K. s phone, the Cellebrite report?
- A. The 1,500 pages that I reviewed were of his phone, Mr. Trane's.
- Q. Did you review a Cellebrite report of K 's phone?
- A. I don't recall ever seeing one. I don't recall.
  - Q. Did you ask for it?
  - A. No, I did not.

- Q. Did you think that was significant?
- A. I wasn't aware there was one of Ms.--K. 's phone.
  - Q. You didn't even ask?
- A. I didn't remember seeing anything in a report. And again, this is recollections from several months ago. I don't remember seeing anything that she had a phone that was seized or that there was one. The only Cellebrite report I saw was the one from Mr. Trane's phone that was 1,500 pages long.
- Q. You've heard the Court referring, and you've heard my record with regard to the speedy trial issue, and you brought that up to this court at the pretrial

conference, and you heard Judge Kruse refer to Judge Linn's ruling; is that correct, about no motions--

- A. I heard him talking but I couldn't really hear him very well.
- Q. From that partial transcript he was reading, no motions can be filed after the start of the trial?
  - A. Correct.

Q. All right. Did you challenge Judge Kruse on that issue and tell him that he ought to reconsider Judge Linn's ruling because you didn't get the information until the 28th of November, and that Ms. Timmins did not get you the material in a timely fashion, and that the depositions were not taken until the night before, and it was her agreement to furnish those witnesses for you?

Did you make any representations to the Court with regard to those issues after the Court indicated that no new motions can be filed?

A. Did I make an argument to the Court regarding which motions? You have a whole

lot going on in that question.

- Q. The 412 Motion mainly, but also any motions. I think it can cover any motions that would be available to you after you received the 5 terabytes of information.
  - A. Did I ask Judge Kruse?
  - Q. Yes.

- A. No, I did not.
- Q. What was your reason for not doing that? Did you think the Judge would get upset with you for protecting your client's interest?
  - A. No.
- Q. Well, why wouldn't you bring that to the Court's attention? If he's new on the case, he just shows up to try the case, and he's not that familiar with it, why didn't you educate the Judge about what was going on in this case?
- A. The Judge, I think, was aware of the voluminous -- I mean, we'd had discussions during the 412 Motion hearing about the information.
- Q. Well, I looked at the transcript.

  25 | I didn't see any point where anyone tried

to educate the Judge as to the background of the discovery problems that existed in this case. So did you do it off the record?

- A. Yes, probably.
- Q. Why?

- A. I can't explain that. I don't know.
- Q. Well, if you went off the record and you had this discussion with the Judge, and you're protecting your client's interest, and you know you've got issues with Ms. Timmins on her discovery and you've got an issue with your client saying these folks ought to be here, why didn't you put that on the record so an appellate court could take a look at it to see were you adequately protecting your client's interest?
- A. You're talking about two situations. I think that's where I'm getting confused.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. With the 412 Motion, the Judge entertained it. I think his-- If I

remember the ruling correctly, it was untimeliness based on the rule, not anything from Judge Linn. It was a civil procedure rule that was his--if I remember the ruling correctly.

- Q. Well, the appellate court says don't rely on the civil rules; right?

  They say you've got to go to the criminal rules when you balance these things out, don't you? Doesn't almost every Supreme Court decision and Court of Appeals decision tell the judges don't do that?
- A. I don't pay attention usually to what they tell the judges to do. I would always pay attention to what they told the lawyers to do.
  - Q. Right.

A. But I did make the Motion. And my recollection on the ruling--and again, I don't have--I gave the case file all to you, so I don't remember the ruling specifically. But the untimeliness issue on the 412 was that it was not within the fourteen days of trial where that 412 requires it be filed fourteen days

beforehand.

Q. Well, it was actually Denise who brought that—Denise Timmins who brought that up; right?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, my question is, what about all the other motions? Did you try to educate the Judge and say, look, Judge we may have problems throughout this case because we agreed—she agreed to have the witness here; I'm relying on her; these are the rules we've agreed to; this is what's going to happen.

Did you think about educating the Judge on that issue and bringing him up to date?

- A. Probably not in a formal exchange.

  My concern at that time had been primarily

  Mr. Trane had made it clear he wanted this

  done as quickly as possible, and so I was

  trying not to slow up the process, because

  he had made it clear he was going to be

  home by Christmas
- Q. Did you file a trial brief in this case?

```
1
      Α.
         N \circ .
2
          The answer is no?
      Q.
3
          That was the answer. No.
      Α.
          MR. PARRISH: Nothing further at
5
  this time with regard to the questions
  that Ms. Timmins opened the door to,
7
  Judge.
8
          THE COURT: Ms. Timmins?
9
          MS. TIMMINS: No questions.
10
          THE COURT: You may step down.
11
  Thank you.
12
          THE WITNESS: Am I excused?
13
          THE COURT: You are excused, yes.
14
          Mr. Parrish.
15
          MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.
16
          Would you like me to make my offer
17
  of proof at this time, Your Honor?
18
          THE COURT: Well, let's take a
19
  brief ten-minute recess, and we'll try and
  get this in before we break for noon.
20
21
          MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Judge.
22
          (A recess was taken at 11:45 a.m.)
23
          (In open court, in the presence of
24
  the Court, the Defendant, and counsel at
```

11:55 a.m.)