||seated.

Was there further evidence the State would like to present in this case, Ms. Timmins?

MS. SCHAEFER: Not at this time.

At this time, Your Honor, the State would rest.

THE COURT: That was a quick turnaround.

Ladies and gentlemen, the State is resting at this time. We need to take just a few matters, legal matters, up outside your presence. It should be just shortly, and we'll come back for the start of the defense case.

(In open court, outside the presence of the jury, in the presence of the Court, the Defendant, and counsel at 1:55 p.m.)

THE COURT: Please be seated everybody.

The record should reflect that we are outside the presence of the jury. The State has rested at this point.

Ms. Schaefer, is there record you

want to make?

MS. SCHAEFER: Yes, Your Honor.

At this time the defense would make a motion for judgment of acquittal and state at this time that the State has not presented sufficient evidence to support any of the three counts set forth in the Trial Information for submission to the jury.

With regard to Count I, specifically the only evidence that the State has offered to support the Sexual Abuse in the Third Degree are the statements of Kxxxxxx . There was no video evidence to support some of the allegations she made. There was no physical evidence to support any of the allegations she made. There was no witnesses to corroborate any of the allegations she made. These are just merely statements and are insufficient to support a verdict of guilty to Count I.

With regard to Count II, there has been no evidence specifically that the Defendant was in any way a therapist or

counselor to these students. He was merely the owner of the Midwest Academy and did engage in some staff representation of students, but there has been no evidence that he was a counselor or a therapist.

evidence that any of the activities, specifically the unsubstantiated claims of Ms.

as well as the evidence of taking the upper level students shopping to Victoria's Secret or the body imaging exercise or the sexual survey, there has been no evidence that any of those were done for the purpose of satisfying or arousing his sexual desires or those of anyone else.

With regard to Count III, there has been no evidence that the Defendant knowingly acted in any manner that created a substantial risk to the child, specifically to Bxxxxxx and Axxxxx

In fact, there's substantial testimony that he never placed anyone in OSS and was there on a periodic basis to

provide positive support for the students that were in OSS.

For all of those reasons, Your

Honor, we would ask for the Court to grant
the motion for judgment of acquittal on
all three counts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Response by the State?

MS. TIMMINS: Your Honor, considering the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, the State would ask that the Court overrule the Defendant's motion.

In regards to the arguments of

Count I, the statements of Kxxxxxx

are credible. They are also

corroborated by surrounding evidence that

has been provided to the jury.

In Count II, the statute

contemplates that the Defendant can

purport to be a counselor. He doesn't

have to be a licensed counselor to be

convicted under this statute, and evidence

has been presented that he acted in a

manner as a therapist would; that he

presented himself in that manner at times; 2 that he was Kxxxxxx's family 3 representative at the time that only counselors could be a family 5 representative. If the Court finds that the Defendant committed sex acts with 7 Kxxxxxx, which there is substantial 8 evidence to support that, it can easily be 9 inferred that that was done with the intent to arouse the sexual desire of 10 11 either party.

And in Count III with Child

Endangerment, we have an abundance of

evidence that these locked rooms were used

improperly, excessively, and done so to

the extent that it harmed the physical,

emotional, and mental well-being of

Bxxxxxx or Axxxxx

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For those reasons, we would ask the Court overrule the Defendant's motion.

THE COURT: In a motion for directed verdict, there must be presented such evidence as could convince a rational trier of fact that the Defendant is guilty of the crime charged beyond a reasonable

doubt in each of Counts I, II, or III.

The Court does examine the evidence in the light most favorable to the State and against the moving party. The Court does consider the entire record and all legitimate inferences from that record.

As to the Sexual Abuse in the Third
Degree charge in Count I, it was correctly
pointed out that there is an element of
believability as to the allegations. In
this particular case, the Court does find
that there is sufficient evidence that a
rational fact finder could find the
Defendant guilty of a sex act, and also
that it was against the force or will of
Ms. again, considering her
testimony. It's appropriately for the
jury to decide issues regarding
credibility and whether there is
sufficient other circumstances to validate
her statements.

As to Count II, Sexual Exploitation, the counselor or therapist, again, as we discussed a couple times the Edouard case out of Marion County. That

was the issue in the case, and that it involved a pastor. The facts and circumstances in this case would show that a rational trier of fact could find that the Defendant in this case was a counselor or therapist. Again, he was a family rep. He controlled the entire facility. The statements attributed to him would indicate the same. The scheme of conduct shown by the testimony of Ms.

would also support that contention. So the Court does find that a rational trier of fact could find the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt based upon those circumstances.

Finally, on the Child Endangerment, the OSS rooms, there was extensive testimony about what they are, the possible harms they could cause, and what the kids were doing in there and how they were affected by that. So the Defendant—again, there is evidence in the case that he controlled the entire facility. It would appear that nothing got done without his say—so, so a rational trier of fact

could find that to be the case, so the 1 2 Court will overrule the motion on that 3 ground, too. 4 Is there anything else by the 5 State? 6 MS. TIMMINS: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Schaefer? 7 8 MS. SCHAEFER: No, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Bring the jury back in. 10 (In open court, in the presence of 11 the jury, the Court, the Defendant, and 12 counsel at 2:03 p.m.) 13 THE COURT: Please be seated 14 everyone. The jury has now been seated. 15 Ladies and gentlemen, if you 16 recall, Ms. Schaefer reserved her opening 17 statement at the beginning of the trial. 18 Ms. Schaefer, do you wish to give 19 that opening statement at this time? 20 MS. SCHAEFER: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed. 22 MS. SCHAEFER: May it please the 23 Court. 24 THE COURT: Ms. Schaefer. 25 MS. SCHAEFER: Ms. Timmins.