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(Open court, defendant present)
MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor, one brief
housekeeping. Defense Exhibit 77 was a folder from Mr. DeGuerin's file that had Charles Kenneth Temple's written statement in it. The folder is marked Defense 77. I have marked the contents of it as Defense Exhibit 77-A, so it wouldn't be lost.

THE COURT: All right. You want 77-A
admitted as part of 77?
MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, Your Honor.
Defense Exhibit 37 are the reports given to -- the folder for Mr. DeGuerin's file regarding the investigation of Mr. Cain, Frank Cain, that was discussed on October 4th, 2007 in the record. And the contents of -- that's Defense Exhibit 37. I've marked the contents of the folder as $37-A$. I found it this morning floating around without a mark -- a sticker on it. So, the contents of 37 is $37-A$ and I'm offering that into evidence.
(Defense Exhibit No. 37-A and 77-A Offered)
THE COURT: All right. They will be included as exhibits.

Go ahead with your examination, please.
(Defense Exhibit No. 37-A and 77-A
Admitted)

MS. GOTRO: Yes, sir.

## KELLY SIEGLER,

having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

CONT'D BY MS. GOTRO:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. I think when we had left off yesterday, we were talking about some of the items that -- I guess the period of time from when David Temple was arrested until the moment you-all showed up for trial, that sort of pretrial discovery period.

Do you remember getting any particular requests for evidence in writing from Mr. DeGuerin?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you a series of documents and we can go through them. They're out of order, but $I$ would like you to take a chance and just thumb through them and tell me if you recognize them (indicating).
A. (Witness complies).

I recognize all of these.
Q. You do?
A. Yes.
Q. Are those the written requests that

Mr. DeGuerin had sent you prior to trial?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are there some of them in there that appear to be sent to you during trial?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And based on those written requests, is there a theme, in your opinion, for what it is that Mr. DeGuerin is looking for based on these documents?
A. Thoroughness.
Q. Thoroughness?

Okay. What's the -- specifically, is there
a theme for what he's looking for, any particular types of evidence that he's requesting from you?
A. No. I would say he was just being very thorough. Everything is in there.
Q. Okay. So, he was asking for scene photographs and scene videos, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you recall having telephone conversations with he and Matt Hennessy about these discovery requests?
A. And Barbara and Warren and Todd and Neal and Matt.
Q. Okay. Having dealt with Mr. DeGuerin before,
you know that he records those telephone conversations?
A. I did not know that.
Q. No?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. Not surprised I guess, but $I$ did not know that.
Q. When you say that, is that based on, I guess, what we've described as sort of a mutual distrust between the two of you?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MR. CHIN: Excuse me, Judge. If you could have the witness pull the microphone closer.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Yeah, that mutual distrust. Did you ever feel a need to record any of Mr. DeGuerin's conversations?
A. Not one time. So, Barbara and Warren record all of their conversations, too?
Q. I don't know about Barbara and Warren, but certainly there was some testimony -- or Mr. DeGuerin had some transcripts from some telephone conversations between the two of you where you're discussing, for instance, his filing that examining trial. I think you called it the motion to grant the speedy indictment. Does that sound right?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Sometime in February -- I guess David was indicted at the end of February. Is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Is that when you became aware of an inmate named Michael David?
A. I think it was a little after that, but I'm not sure. I know that $I$ first became aware of him on a Friday night when $I$ was sitting at home.
Q. Okay. And is that -- a detective had contacted you to let you know this letter had come in that was addressed to David Temple?
A. It was either Dean Holtke or Mark Schmidt.
Q. And if I'm correct, Mr. Michael David --
A. Yes.
Q. -- had mailed a letter to David Temple's former address saying that he knew who the real killer was?
A. Actually, he mailed a letter to Dick DeGuerin even before that. So, Dick knew about Michael David way before $I$ knew. He pretended like he didn't throughout that whole hearing, throughout my whole grievance, and throughout that whole box full of papers. Dick knew about Michael David before I did.
Q. But when you found out about Michael David that would have been in February?
A. I don't remember. I'd have to look in the stuff and see when that was.
Q. That's fair. No reason to disagree that it was in February?
A. No, there is. It could have been a month or so after that. I don't remember.
Q. Okay. Give me just one second. (Pause)
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) You mentioned the grievance that was filed against you.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the one filed by Sean Buckley?
A. Via Dick DeGuerin.
Q. But is that the one that was filed by Sean Buckley?
A. Via Dick DeGuerin, yes.
Q. And when you say "via Dick DeGuerin," you mean -- it's your belief that Dick put him up to it?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. I'm going to show you just a portion of the transcript. And you can start with Page 2 and flip through and see if you recognize that as your response to the grievance that was filed by Mr. Buckley (indicating).
A. Yeah, this is it.
Q. Okay. Can you thumb through there and tell me when it was that you received the letter or received notice, $I$ guess, of the letter from Michael David?
A. This says that Mark Schmidt called me at my house on that Friday night, February 11th, 2005 .
Q. Okay. And am $I$ correct in saying that the letter had been addressed to David Temple's former -- I guess former home?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And the residents had accidentally opened the letter?
A. I don't know if they opened it or knew right away what it should be and called the sheriff's department.
Q. Okay. And then forwarded that letter to the sheriff's department?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And after you read the letter, what was it that you decided to do?
A. Figure out who this Michael David person was and research his criminal history and try to find every single place that he had been within TDC and California, and $I$ think there were seven states where he had convictions, to track his criminal history, to try and verify this story that he said he heard from another
inmate, and figure out if it could be verified to see if it was true.
Q. Okay. And working in the division you worked in, it's true -- I'm correct in saying that you-all received a lot of letters from inmates claiming to have information about crimes?
A. You know, what's "a lot"? Maybe one a month. Not as many as people think.
Q. Johnny Bonds submitted an affidavit in your support.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Bonds had helped you sort of vet this letter from Michael David?
A. He did.
Q. Mr. Bonds said that the district attorney's office received several letters a month from Texas and federal inmates wanting to give us information. Does that sound about right?
A. Well, Johnny was the investigator for seven prosecutors. And if any of the letters were written with inmates trying to give information, that they should have been writing those seven prosecutors. If he got two or three a month that he knew about, it would be consistent with my one a month.
Q. Okay. So, again, fair to say that that's a --

Johnny Bonds at least was certainly familiar with getting these types of letters, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And based on that letter and Johnny's experience -- and you consulted with Craig Goodhart on this as well, didn't you?
A. I would think so. He was my partner.
Q. Okay. You-all knew that typically people in Mr. David's position are out for something, they're looking for something, right?
A. Heck yeah.
Q. Right.

And so, am $I$ correct in saying that your job, law enforcement's job is to do a thorough search, find out as much as you can about this person before you guys actually sat down with him?
A. True.
Q. Okay. And then in your -- in your response to this grievance, you would explain that it's best to do those types of interviews cold. Do you remember saying that?
A. You mean bringing Michael David in without him knowing what's up?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that important?
A. Well, because if you send him a letter going: Hey, dude, I want to talk to you about this letter that you wrote, can we meet next Tuesday, that's all he's going to be thinking about is trying to get his story straight in a way that might not be true.
Q. And he might start collecting information, additional information or trying to search out additional information?
A. Yeah. I don't know how he can do that if he's in prison, but $I$ guess that happens in the real world.
Q. Okay. Well, so it's important to do this interview cold, right? That's what you mean by that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then certainly Johnny Bonds in his affidavit talks about doing the interview on your own turf.
A. All cops believe in that, yes.
Q. What exactly does that mean?
A. You don't ever ideally want to do an interview sitting in the suspect's home.
Q. Okay. Why?
A. Because they feel comfortable there. They can kick you out during the interview. It's not going to end when and how you want it to.
Q. Okay. And if it's on your turf, then you have a little bit more control over the situation?
A. True.
Q. Okay. We had spoken earlier about Steven Clappart's investigation into Daniel Glasscock. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Were you at any point aware that Clappart was going to execute some municipal warrants that Cody Ellis had outstanding against him?
A. I don't think $I$ ever knew that.
Q. Okay. You had spoken, I guess yesterday, about your knowledge of a capital murder warrant.
A. That's the P.C. warrant against Glasscock.
Q. Okay. Did you know about any sort of capital murder warrant --
A. Not against Glasscock. Where Glasscock is the main witness. I said that wrong.
Q. Okay. But a capital murder warrant that Clappart was trying to put together for the arrest of Cody Ellis?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. But you didn't have any information about these municipal warrants that Clappart was going to execute in order to do an interview of Ellis?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Were you in -- you do know that Dean Holtke did conduct an interview with Cody Ellis?
A. I assume at some point he did. I don't know when that happened. I wasn't in the middle of all of that discussion.
Q. Okay. So, you had told us earlier that Dean Holtke was your primary source of information about the investigation into Mr. Glasscock.
A. Yeah. That was probably a total of two or three phone calls.
Q. So, what else would you have been talking about with Mr. Holtke during that period of time?
A. The whole thing that we talked about yesterday, Glasscock and Riley Joe Sanders and all of this going all over again.
Q. Okay. So, you know, it's no secret that your cell phone records have been obtained.
A. Right.
Q. All right. So, if we see ongoing phone conversations and text messages, regular phone calls and text conversations between you and Mr. Holtke, if you only spoke with him twice about the Glasscock investigation, my question is: What else are you talking to him about during that --
A. That's probably all we were talking about.
Q. Okay. And in all of that time, he never said to you that he was going to execute -- he was going to go out and talk to Cody Ellis?
A. He might have. I don't remember all of that because, honestly, the dilemma that we were all in then is that $I$ was the person who was vested the case, but I was also the person that everybody was afraid to communicate with about anything. Dean didn't want to call me. He didn't know who else to call. Whoever was in appellate that was handing the case was afraid to call me. Craig Goodhart, my partner, never picked up the phone to call me. They wanted to leave me out.

They didn't want me to be in the middle because they were afraid they'd get in trouble for putting me in the middle of it.
Q. So, when you say whoever was in appellate that was -- who do you mean? Do you mean a district attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. So, your assumption is that there was someone in the appellate section of the district attorney's office that was managing this investigation?
A. Well, somebody had to be. At that point, it was still on appeal.
Q. Okay. And so, did you not understand that to be Alan Curry?
A. I got calls from Alan Curry and Brian Rose periodically updating me on the case. So, it was both of them, I think.
Q. Okay. I want to go back to your knowledge of the interview. So, you are telling us that you had no idea that Dean Holtke was going to interview Cody Ellis?
A. He might have told me. He might have told me the highlights of what was happening. I don't remember because it wasn't -- there was nothing I could do about it. I was just kind of stuck in the middle of all of this going on and $I$ had nothing -- there was nothing I could do about it.
Q. Okay. And you told us that you were the one that knew the most about the case and that's why Dean Holtke was talking to you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. But fair to say you didn't know anything about -- well, let me scratch that.

What did you know about Daniel Glasscock?
A. That Dick claimed that he was a brand-new witness who could say that David Temple was innocent.
Q. Okay. But you also knew the substance of what his statement was?
A. Not until I saw that P.C.
Q. And when did you see the P.C.?
A. Sometime in the middle of all this time. I don't remember exactly when.
Q. Who showed you the P.C.?
A. I don't remember how I got that.
Q. Was it by text message, was it by e-mail? Did you see a hard copy of it?
A. It wouldn't have been a text message. I don't know if it was a hard copy or an e-mail. I think it was an e-mail.
Q. Okay. Well, if $I$ told you that Dean -- excuse me -- that Steve Clappart had been working or instructed to work with Alan Curry on that particular affidavit, does it sound right that you got that from Alan Curry?
A. Maybe.
Q. I guess Mr. Curry would be the best person to ask about that?
A. If he remembers, yeah. I think the records probably speak for themselves.
Q. Now, during this same period of time, you were working closely with Alan, though, weren't you?
A. No. There was nothing close about it. You don't understand. They were afraid to call me. No one wanted to tell Pat Lykos they were communicating with

Kelly Siegler about the David Temple case. I was a pariah. They didn't want to tell me anything. If you think there was some ongoing help or back-door happenings, there wasn't.
Q. So -- and just so that we're clear, the summer between -- the summer, June through September, you weren't working with Alan Curry to respond to the Brady claims that the defense had alleged?
A. We were working on my affidavit, yes.
Q. Okay. And when you were working on your affidavit, were you given access to your old files to do that?
A. Well, yeah, I had to.
Q. Okay. Where did you get access to the file?
A. I came down to the D.A.'s office and they sat me in a room for one day and $I$ looked it over and took notes for my affidavit.
Q. Okay. And then when you got to the D.A.'s office, $I$ guess you don't remember what day it was?
A. Oh, no.
Q. Okay. You don't remember what month it was?
A. No.
Q. All right. Whenever you got to the D.A.'s office, did you meet with a specific assistant district attorney before they left you in a room with the boxes?
A. Brian Rose.
Q. Okay. So, you meet with Brian Rose, he says: Go through these boxes. Did you see Daniel Glasscock's statement in there?
A. I don't think it was that day. It might have been. I don't remember. I mean, my focus that day was to try and figure out how to go through all those boxes and take enough notes to draft an affidavit. I was kind of overwhelmed.
Q. Were you able to take enough notes to draft an affidavit -- were you able to take enough notes in order to draft an affidavit?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. And what was the purpose of the affidavit that you were drafting?
A. To address each and every allegation that Dick made when he filed the motion. That's the same thing we're still talking about today.
Q. The out of time motion for new trial?
A. I don't remember what it was titled exactly. I just know that it was repetitious and the same thing I've been answering all this time.
Q. Okay.
A. The only thing new was Glasscock.
Q. So, if I told you that the out of time motion
for new trial was filed September $10 t h$, September 10th --
A. Of 2012?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Then?
Q. You would have been working on your -- you would have been working on your affidavit sometime after September 20 th?
A. Yes.
Q. Sometime after September 10th?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you are telling us that it was Brian Rose that gave you access to the file?
A. He walked me down the hall, escorted me down the hall, and put me in an office and shut the door, and left me there to look through the boxes.
Q. And I apologize, Ms. Siegler, I didn't have my pen with me. But just so that we're clear, did you have any -- did you do any work with Alan Curry in crafting your response to these particular Brady claims?
A. I took my notes and then I went home and typed the affidavit by myself and I e-mailed it to Alan Curry to look over. And I think he tweaked it a little bit and sent it back to me, and then $I$ looked to see what he tweaked, and then we were done with it.
Q. Okay. And then so you guys communicated by e-mail?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that at his Harris County District Attorney's e-mail or was it his Alan Curry gmail account?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Ms. Siegler, do you keep any separate notes yourself on the cases that you prosecuted during your time with the D.A.'s office?
A. They're all up in the files.
Q. Okay. So, your personal notes, whatever notes you made during your prosecutions, would be in the care, custody, and control of the district attorney's office?
A. All of them.
Q. All right. So, there is nothing in your personal possession?
A. No.
Q. Do you still have access to the e-mails you exchanged with the district attorney's office during that summer of 2012?
A. You mean like did $I$ print out a copy of every e-mail I sent?
Q. Well, no. I'm talking about your inbox.
A. No. I'm not very computer savvy, so I don't
really know what you're asking me. Do I save those things? No.
Q. Well, when you open up your e-mail and read an e-mail, once you've read it, doesn't it just sort of sit there in your box, the inbox, and it's not in bold indicating that it's just been read?
A. Anyone who knows me can tell you that I'm an OCD and $I$ delete everything the minute it's done. Because if I don't, I'm looking at it every day. The minute that $I$ take care of it, it's gone.
Q. So, you deleted all of your e-mails right after you read them?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Tell me again when you became -- how you became aware of the contents of Daniel Glasscock's statement.
A. The contents of the statement?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. When I saw that P.C. Because I remember not knowing what it was he had to say until I read the P.C. itself that Clappart drafted. And that was the first time I realized how lame it was.
Q. Do you remember which version of the affidavit you read?
A. I do not.
Q. And you don't remember who showed it to you?
A. I do not.
Q. Well, can we safely assume that if Alan Curry was the lawyer that Clappart was working with, that it was Alan who showed it to you?
A. I don't even know that for sure.
Q. Don't know what for sure?
A. That it was Alan Curry. I mean, I think it was, but he would know better than me.
Q. He would know better than you whether or not he was the one that showed you the affidavit?
A. Yes.
Q. Right.

Ms. Siegler, did I leave those discovery
requests up there, those letters from Mr. DeGuerin?
A. Yes.
Q. Fantastic. I hate to jump around on you, but it seems to make sense to go in that order.

Do you remember the date that the trial commenced in the State of Texas vs. David Temple?
A. Sometime around my birthday in October of 2007 .
Q. Okay. When is your birthday?
A. The 12th.
Q. Okay. Do you see a handful of written requests from Mr. DeGuerin in November of 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. Can we agree that you were in the middle of trial in November of 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.

MR. CHIN: Excuse me? What year?

THE WITNESS: 2012 .

MR. CHIN: Trial in 2012?

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) 2007 .

Am $I$ correct in saying that when you began trial, Mr. DeGuerin had not been given -- other than reading those offense reports, he had not been given any specific -- he had not been given copies of offense reports, right?
A. Snippets of the offense report, not the entire copy, no.
Q. When you say "snippets," those are the ones that you read to him?
A. Yes. And Matt and Todd and Neal and Ralph.
Q. And am $I$ correct in saying that there were offense reports in your possession that Dick never saw?
A. With his own eyes, correct.
Q. All right. That the defense counsel never saw?
A. There were parts of that they had never seen,
that's correct.
Q. Okay. Do you remember which parts those were?
A. No. No way.
Q. What was the criteria that you used to decide what parts the defense got to see and what parts they didn't?
A. They got to see everything they were entitled to see. Anything that was exculpatory and anything the law allows them to see, they got to see or they got to know about.
Q. Anything that was exculpatory and anything that the law allowed them to see?
A. Correct.
Q. You make a distinction between those two things and -- I don't want to quibble over words, but we can both agree the law allows them to see exculpatory evidence, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you referring to a second type of evidence when you say something that the law allows them to see?
A. Well, just the stuff that's more easily -- more easy to categorize.
Q. Like?
A. Photographs, defendant's statement, oral statements made by the defendant, the results of testing
done, things like that.
Q. Okay. So, am $I$ correct in assuming that the offense report that you had been working with during this pretrial period would be in the State's file?
A. I have no idea if it's still in the same format it was in back then. I mean, they might have taken it apart and put in different kinds of notebooks and divided it up the way they want it today. When $I$ was through with the file in '07, it was in the box the way I had worked on it for years.
Q. Okay.

MS. GOTRO: Your Honor, may I ask the witness to step down and see if she can put her hands on the offense report that she had been working with for years?

THE COURT: Yes.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Ms. Siegler, would you --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- mind maybe assisting Mr. Smith?
A. Ms. Gotro, this is completely different than it was when I had it. New stickies, new divisions, everything.
Q. Okay. Does that look like -- and when you say it's all different, what are we talking about? Can you describe for the record what kind of --
A. These stickies are not my writing. See all these (indicating)?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. The way it's in three folders, that's not me.
Q. Okay.
A. That's just not the way $I$ had it.
Q. Okay.
A. That's not the way $I$ had it.
Q. Fair enough. So, the appellate division came along and mucked up your organized files?

MR. CHIN: I object to that characterization being argumentative as well.

THE COURT: Overruled.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Have you looked through that just to see if you recognize the documents, that maybe your work product is on it, post-it notes, anything like that? If not -- yeah, take a minute just to do that for me.
A. It is the offense report, you know. Beyond that, $I$ don't know what to tell you.
Q. Okay. Could you take a second and go through those three red wells and see if you recognize any of your work product still attached to it? Because I know Mr. Curry is particular about not disturbing work product on trial counsel's file.
A. Well, there is no -- I never made a habit of writing on the offense report.
Q. Post-it notes?
A. Post-it notes.
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. These red stickers on the corner --
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. -- are from me.
Q. Would you mind pulling those items out? When did you put the red stickers on those offense reports?
A. I don't know. I don't think I put the date.
Q. Would that have been something you did back in '07 or would that have been something you had done during the appellate --
A. I didn't do anything during the appellate process.
Q. Okay. So, if there are red stickers on the offense report, those would have been from your trial preparation?
A. Yes.
Q. Perfect.

Can you pull those pages of the offense report out that have got your sticky on it?
A. I don't want to take them out of order. I'll just go with the first one and start like that.
Q. Yes, ma'am. Do you mind doing that?
A. This is the first sticky I see (indicating).
Q. What is the -- who wrote that offense report?
A. This would be Sam Gonsoulin.
Q. Sam Gonsoulin?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Wasn't he the first -- was he the first officer that appeared at the scene?
A. He is the first officer that arrived at the scene from Precinct 4 or 5. And he was the first witness $I$ planned on calling at the trial, but he passed away.
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. I'm getting my glasses on.
Q. How about $I$ just bring those up to you and you can flip through them on the stand?
A. Okay. There you go.
Q. And as far as your first red sticky, that's Officer Gonsoulin's offense report?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. May I see that document?

MR. CHIN: Judge, may I approach and come view?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. CHIN: Thank you, sir.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Am I correct in saying that he entered that offense report on January 11th, 1999?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that document is highlighted, Ms. Siegler. It that your highlighting?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. And then is all of that offense report tagged from you, red-flagged from you?
A. Say that again.
Q. Mr. Gonsoulin, that offense report that he generated --
A. His supplement, you mean?
Q. Yes, ma'am. His supplement to the offense report. Have you read-flagged each one of those pages?
A. Of his supplement?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Yes, because $I$ think there are only a few pages.
Q. Okay.

MS. GOTRO: Can $I$ have just one second,

Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
(Pause)

MS. GOTRO: Judge, I've never seen the items that Ms. Siegler -- that is in front of

Ms. Siegler right now. If we can have a moment for the defense to sort of go through those, I might be able to move this more quickly than having Ms. Siegler sit there and flip through every single page.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. GOTRO: May we do that?

THE COURT: You want a recess?

MS. GOTRO: Briefly, sir.

THE COURT: How long?

MS. GOTRO: Fifteen minutes, maybe; ten
minutes.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. GOTRO: I will go with 15 just to be safe, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll be in recess for 15 minutes.
(Recess)
(Open court, defendant present)

THE COURT: Thank you. Please have a seat. Ms. Gotro, go ahead, please.

MS. GOTRO: Yes, sir.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Excuse me, Your Honor.

Mr. Rose brought in e-mails that were recovered from the district attorney's files concerning the Temple case in 2007. We just got those now. I just wanted to let the

Court know.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Go ahead, please.

MS. GOTRO: Thank you.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Ms. Siegler, while we were on the break, we got a chance to go through what appears to be the offense report that you used during your preparation for the trial of David Temple; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if the record could reflect we're looking at -- what is that -- about 6 inches of -- 7 or 8 inches of paper on the right not on the red well.
A. This part (indicating)?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Five inches, yes.
Q. And then this second red well, is that also part of the offense report or -- yeah, offense report?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you remove from that from the red well so the Judge can see it?
A. (Witness complies).
Q. And then is there a third red well?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can we take that out so the Judge can
see it?
A. (Witness complies).
Q. And is that the extent of the offense report that you used to prepare for the prosecution of David Temple?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked and admitted as State's Exhibit 32, State's Exhibit 29 - -

MR. SCHNEIDER: Defense.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) I'm sorry. Defense Exhibit 32, Defense Exhibit 29, Defense Exhibit 33, and Defense Exhibit 31. And I'm going to ask you if you recognize these, Ms. Siegler (indicating)?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Would you place them on the counter in front of you?
A. (Witness complies).
Q. Now, those four exhibits that I've just shown you, do you recognize those exhibits as the offense report that you actually tendered to Dick DeGuerin during the course of the trial?
A. I do not remember that, no, but they appear to be the supplements of Shipley, Holtke, Leithner, and Schmidt.
Q. Okay. Do you remember at any point during the course of the trial actually tendering the physical offense reports and supplements to Dick DeGuerin?
A. I don't remember that, but it would be in the record.
Q. Okay. And so, if after Detective Leithner testified, the record indicates that Dick was able to look at Leithner's supplements and offense report --
A. I do remember that, yes.
Q. Okay. Am I correct in saying that he was only allowed to look at those offense reports while he was in the courtroom?
A. I think it depended on the time of day and the offense report. I think there were times when the Judge broke for the day or gave him the overnight or gave him time, but, again, the record will speak for itself.
Q. Okay. So, if it's in the record that he only reviewed those supplements and offense reports in the courtroom, then you are not going argue with that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So, if we compare this one stack of papers, Ms. Siegler, to the other three, can we agree that --
A. Well, first of all, these are repetitious and also included in here.
Q. Oh, yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So, can we agree that the four exhibits that I've just shown you are actually contained within these three stacks of papers?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And at some point we talked about the criteria that you used to decide what the defense could have access to, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you said that it was exculpatory evidence and evidence that the defense was entitled to have under the law?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. I'm going to take those state's \{sic\} exhibits back from you. That first pile of papers, Ms. Siegler, would you -- I'm going to work through that with you as best I can. We've ripped through it pretty quickly. I'll try to go through it more thoroughly on the lunch break.

You told us yesterday that this was a circumstantial evidence case, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And so that the truth was in the details?
A. Right.
Q. And you outlined some details that were pretty critical to your case. The first of them being the time. Your theory of the case was that Belinda Temple had arrived home at 3:45 and had been killed around 4:00 p.m. Does that sound right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, the day that Belinda Temple was killed, you'd agree with me that wasn't her -- she didn't follow her regular schedule that day, did she?
A. Correct.
Q. Right. She had gone over to -- she had a meeting after school and then had gone over to Mr. Temple's home?
A. Correct.
Q. At any point during the course of your investigation, in the course of that investigation that was at your disposal, were you able to determine what time Belinda Temple normally arrived home?
A. I don't remember that today.
Q. Ma'am?
A. I don't remember that today.
Q. All right. At the far end of the bar in front of you is the manila folder you were working from yesterday.
A. Right.
Q. Does that contain any of your work product?
A. That's mostly motions.
Q. Okay. Were you able to locate any of your work product in any of those boxes?
A. I don't think $I$ have a folder just flat out called work product. It's sort of in the middle of everything.
Q. Is there anything that you would need to review to help you with the testimony we're about to go through?
A. What are we about to go through?
Q. I guess the trial and your strategy.
A. Okay. Let's go.
Q. All right. So, you said $3: 45$ was the State's theory about when Belinda Temple had gotten home, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that was based on David Temple's statement, right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. That issue was highly contested at trial, no doubt, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Dick's theory of the case was that she had gotten home a little bit after 4:00?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. During Detective Schmidt's Grand Jury testimony -- and we talked about this just a little bit yesterday -- he was asked what time Belinda Temple had gotten home, and his response was either 3:45 or 4:00 to 4:10, depending on who you believed, or depending on the story. Right?
A. Depending on who you believed.
Q. Depending on the story. Because if we listen to David Temple's statement, she got home at 4:45.
A. Correct.
Q. And if we listen to Kenneth Temple's statement, she couldn't have gotten home at 4:45?
A. Correct.

MR. CHIN: I'm sorry. What was the time
again?

MS. GOTRO: Oh, 3:45. I apologize.
MR. CHIN: So, are the answers still the
same from Ms. Siegler concerning the corrected question or the original question?

THE COURT: Ask it again, please.
MR. CHIN: Thank you.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) According to David Temple's statement, Belinda Temple arrived home at $3: 45$, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. According to Kenneth Temple's statement,

Belinda Temple had not left his home until about 3:55, and thus wouldn't have arrived home until somewhere around 4:10, something like that, between 4:00 and 4:10?
A. Correct.
Q. Fantastic.

I'm going to work through this first pile of papers that you've got here. There's a divider called table of contents. Does that appear to be your handwriting (indicating)?
A. It is.
Q. What does it say?
A. "Do not move stickies."
Q. All right. And are you referring to the flags that litter this offense report?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Is that commonly how you would prepare for trial, Ms. Siegler, is to sticky the offense report?
A. I mean, I use sticky sometimes. I don't understand your question. That's not helping me prepare for trial.
Q. Well, you know, trial lawyers are weird creatures. They've all got their own manners and methods about how they get ready for a big trial. I'm just wondering if there was any particular organization
to what we see here with these red and green and yellow flags all over it.
A. A lot of these stickies are not mine.
Q. Okay. Does the fact that you use a red sticky in the top right-hand corner of these documents mean anything of significance?
A. The colors mean nothing. Just whatever I could find to stick.
Q. Fair enough.

Does the placement on the page mean anything?
A. It used to, but there are so many placings here I don't really know what it all means. The corners, I can say for sure these red stickies in the corner are mine.
Q. Okay. Would it be being placed -- that sticky being placed in the corner mean anything significant?
A. That it is significant. I don't remember now why it was significant. There's probably a bunch of reasons.
Q. Okay. I've flipped to what appears to be just the first page of the offense report. A case synopsis, is what it says?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm going to need my glasses as well.
A. No kidding. Yes.
Q. Does it indicate on this offense report the time -- and it's a case synopsis of when Belinda Temple was, perhaps, killed; is that right?
A. I think it's just a synopsis of everything, but I'm not going to disagree with what you said.
Q. Okay. Can you tell who wrote that synopsis?
A. Schmidt/Leithner.
Q. Okay. And the time of occurrence. What is the time of occurrence on that particular page?
A. Between 4:15 and 5:30 p.m.
Q. Do you know what the officers, Smith and Leithner, based that timeframe on?
A. I don't remember what time the 911 call was. Do you? 4:32?
Q. $4: 32,4: 38 ?$

MR. SCHNEIDER: 911? 5:36.

THE WITNESS: The 911 call?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
A. I'm not sure why they came up with $4: 15$ to $5: 30$ if they're talking about the window of the whole thing or what they're talking about.
Q. What would the window of the whole thing be?
A. The events of the afternoon that were significant. Much broader than the time the shots were
fired.
Q. Okay. What significant event would have occurred in that timeframe, between 4:15 and 5:30?
A. What time Belinda got home, what time David got home, whether they got home at different times, any arguments that might have occurred, what she did when she got home, who put Evan to bed, how he got to the garage, and all of those things.
Q. Okay. And so, just for the record -- or I would like the record to reflect the document we're working from is actually Bate's stamped No. 3 in the offense report that has since been submitted to us.
A. You mean the whole thing?
Q. We were provided a different copy. And just so we're clear, Ms. Siegler, Bate's 03, is that, in fact, the document we're talking about (indicating)?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Fantastic.

Do you have any specific recollection of talking with either Schmidt or Leithner about how they generated that timeframe, 4:15 to 5:30 p.m.?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you have any recollection of tendering that offense report or discussing the contents to defense counsel prior to trial?
A. This specific page?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. No, I don't.
Q. Can you agree with me that the timeframe that's reported in this document actually is contrary to what your theory was at trial?
A. I don't agree with that.
Q. Well, your theory at trial was that Belinda Temple was dead by 4:00 p.m.
A. By when?
Q. By 4:00 p.m.
A. Okay.
Q. And if this offense report indicates that the occurrence was between 4:15 and 5:30, about 15 minutes later than what your theory at trial was.
A. And they typed this synopsis on January 13th, 1999 before they had all of the information. They typed their supplements at the end of every day as best they could to keep up. And every day they learned new information. And it wasn't until they had all of the information they were able to come up with the true time of occurrence. So, the fact that this says one thing two days after the murder doesn't really mean that much.
Q. So, can we agree that this timeframe 4:15 to 5:30 does not comport what with your theory was at
trial?
A. We cannot. We're talking about a window of an afternoon. The window is what's important. The whole afternoon is what's important. It's not just the time the shots were fired.
Q. Did you introduce any of this testimony from either Schmidt or Leithner at trial?
A. About the time of everything?
Q. About the time of occurrence being between 4:15 and 5:30.
A. We talked about all of the events of the afternoon. Did $I$ ask them specifically if once upon a time two days after the murder they had a window of opportunity or time of occurrence as 4:15 to 5:30? I don't remember that. I do not think I asked them that.
Q. My question was: Did you ask -- oh. I don't know that $I$ heard the answer to it. I will just repeat the question.

```
                                    At trial, did you elicit any testimony from
```

either Schmidt or Leithner about this offense report
with the time of occurrence of Belinda Temple's death
was between 4:15 and 5:30 p.m.?
A. I don't remember if $I$ did or not. It would be in the record.
Q. Okay. If $I$ tell you you did not or it's not in
the record, you wouldn't disagree with it then?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember a witness named Justin Valdez?
A. $V-a-l-d-e-z$ ?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. No. Give me a hint.
Q. I'm going to have to work through my offense report, too. Just give me one second.
A. Was he the boyfriend of the lady that saw the car in the garage?
Q. I don't know. I don't know who his girlfriend was. But $I$ would say about an inch-and-a-half into your offense report there is a supplement, a Harris County supplement that is dated January 12 th of 1999 , and it appears to be of that initial canvass where the neighbors were interviewed.
A. Right.
Q. Can you flip through that portion of your offense report? It's about 80 pages in.
A. Do you know who wrote that supplement?
Q. Yes, ma'am. That appears to be Sergeant T. Herndon.
A. Do you want to just show me that page?
Q. Sure. And I'm happy to show you my document. I just know that yesterday you wanted to work from your
copy, and so -- but I'm happy to share this with you.
A. Let's start that way. And if I need to look in here, I can. Because the page is the page. It speaks for itself.
Q. Yes, ma'am. So, let's get to Page 85. Justin Valdez. Do you remember reading the offense report with Justin Valdez's testimony -- or his, I guess, statement to Herndon?
A. So, this goes with this pile, right?
Q. Ma'am?
A. I'm holding it like this.
Q. It's one supplement.
A. But it doesn't go with this, right (indicating)?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay. I read it.
Q. Okay. Does Mr. Valdez make any statements about - well, before $I$ get into that, one of your other details at trial was about Shaka, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Shaka was a dangerous or a scary dog and strangers or -- couldn't get into the back yard, right?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Does Mr. Valdez make a statement about Shaka, the dog?
A. Are you talking about Christopher Valdez or Justin Valdez?
Q. I'm talking about Justin Valdez.
A. He does talk about the dog.
Q. What does he say about the dog?
A. He says that he always rides his bike in the neighborhood. He had stopped and talk with Belinda in the past. The dog barks and growls at everyone that walks by the gate. All those dogs, a little familiar with him. He still barks sometimes when he'd stop by, but would calm down after a little bit. During the day, the dog is left out in the back yard with the door leading from the garage to the back yard open giving the dog access to the garage and the back yard.
Q. Okay. And so, just to recap Mr. Valdez's statement about Shaka, did you receive any information that he was actually familiar with the dog other than these occasional visits?
A. That's what this says in here, yes.
Q. Okay. So, that's it, that's the only information that you got about Mr. Valdez?
A. That $I$ can recall right now, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you have any recollection of turning either Mr. Valdez -- this offense report over to the defense?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Okay. Any recollection of either giving Mr. Valdez's name, telephone number, contact information to the defense?
A. I don't remember talking about the Valdezes, no.
Q. To Mr. DeGuerin or the defense team?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

And that was Justin Valdez, right, and that
was -- what did we say -- Page 85?
Do you remember -- do you remember who
questioned Quentin Harlan whenever he testified at trial?
A. You mean me or Craig?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. That would have been me.
Q. Okay. And in preparing for Quentin Harlan's testimony, do you remember what you reviewed before he testified?
A. We would have -- I would have let him read his Grand Jury testimony. If he gave a statement -- I can't remember if he did or not -- he would have looked that over. And we had talked about everything.
Q. You said you did not let him read his Grand

Jury?
A. No. I did.
Q. You did?

Okay. And we had some confusion about this yesterday. When you say "his statement," are you referring to his oral statement or his written statement?
A. Written statement.
Q. Okay. How many written statements do you recall him giving?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Would his written statements be in your file?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you locate them for us, please?
A. In all this?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Tell me how many you think there are? I'm not going to argue with you.
Q. I think there are at least two written statements.
A. That sounds right.
Q. But are they in your file?
A. They would be somewhere in all of this.
Q. Okay. Well, I thought we just went through offense reports.
A. Offense reports contain witness statements.
Q. Okay.
A. And they contain ATF forms and ballistics reports and autopsy report. This is not all just from the cops. This is everything.
Q. Well, Ms. Siegler, I'd like to ask you, since we have identified those documents as the one that you are working from --
A. Right.
Q. -- if you wouldn't mind terribly, I can tell the first stack, I went through them and I didn't see any written statements, but the next stack, do you mind terribly going through them and telling me if there are any written statements in there?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Just with the red tags,
there are no statements in there.
A. Okay. This pile right here seems to be written statements (indicating).
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Okay.
A. And what did you want me to do?
Q. Quentin Harlan.
A. If I just need Quentin's statement, I actually divided up statements in a different box alphabetically. Do you want me to get that?
Q. Wherever it is, $I$ just need to know what it was
that you reviewed with Quentin before he testified.
THE WITNESS: Can I go get it, Judge? THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) How many statements -- how many oral statements did -- how many oral statements did -I'm sorry -- written statements did Quentin Harlan give?
A. Well, I'm just looking at the two Grand Jury testimony days right now. I'm sorry. One Grand Jury testimony day. One is a copy.

THE WITNESS: You don't see his written statements, Andrew?
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) All right. How many written statements?
A. Two.
Q. Two written statements.

And did you go over -- I guess did you allow him to review both of those before he testified?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you tender both of those to Mr. DeGuerin after Quentin testified?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. To your knowledge, were there any oral statements made to law enforcement by Quentin Harlan?
A. I don't remember if there were or not.
Q. Okay. And, again, just so we're clear, you don't have any work product that would --
A. No.
Q. Okay. Give me just one second? (Pause)
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Turning to Page 27, Supplement No. 3 of Detective Schmidt. I'm going to pass that to you right there (indicating).
A. Okay.
Q. And if you will flip to Bate's 129.
A. Okay.
Q. I believe it's the last full paragraph at the bottom.
A. Right.
Q. Does that appear that Detective Schmidt took an oral statement from Quentin Harlan on the 13th of January about 2:10 p.m.?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. In that statement -- if you will take a minute to read over it.
A. (Witness complies).

Okay.
Q. Okay. Mr. Harlan states that he has no memory of David ever discussing hunting, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And he also states that the Temples' dog stays at his home with his children --
A. Correct.
Q. -- right?
A. And all of that was brought up at the trial.
Q. Okay. Does he say anything about being afraid of the dog?
A. And all of that was brought up at the trial.
Q. Okay. Does he say anything about being afraid of the dog?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And just so that we're clear, do you know if this offense report was one of the ones that was tendered to Dick DeGuerin?
A. It's all repetitious in the Grand Jury testimony. It was brought up at the trial. One sentence not being tendered to Dick when it was all brought up at trial, what difference does it make?
Q. Well, as a defense attorney, I say it makes a big difference whether he got it during trial or prior to trial.
A. He had it prior to trial. He knew that.
Q. When did he -- you gave him access to that statement prior to trial?
A. This particular paragraph right here, no.
Q. Okay. Did you give him access to Quentin Harlan's written statements prior to trial?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So, as a defense attorney, again, you asked me when does it matter, I'm saying it matters that a defense attorney have that information prior to trial.
A. All of this was brought up at trial. Dick questioned Quentin about the fact that the dog wasn't afraid of Quentin. The jury heard that. Shaka did not scare Quentin.
Q. But prior to trial, Dick didn't have the benefit of that information, did he?
A. I don't know what Dick knew or didn't know.
Q. Well, he hadn't gotten the information from you, right?
A. About that particular paragraph, no.
Q. About this paragraph, about Quentin's written statement, he had not gotten those, had he?
A. No.
Q. And he had not gotten Quentin's Grand Jury testimony, had he?
A. Not until after he testified.
Q. Right. And so, it's fair to say that prior to Quentin Harlan -- prior to the start of trial, Dick DeGuerin didn't know how many inconsistent statements

Quentin Harlan had given?
A. Well, the record will speak for itself as to the fact that Quentin very clearly was not afraid of Shaka.
Q. Ms. Siegler, for the purposes of my question I'm talking about what Dick was provided by you before the start of the trial. Okay?
A. I've answered that.
Q. No. What you've stated -- what I heard you say -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but what $I$ heard you say is that he was given this information right after Quentin Harlan testified.
A. Correct.
Q. If it's right after Quentin Harlan testified, then you'd have to agree trial was already commenced, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. When we talked about Brady evidence yesterday, Ms. Siegler, and your obligation to turn it over -- right -- a prosecutor's obligation to turn it over, I believe what you had said -- just answer the question again. I don't want to put words in your mouth.

What is your understanding of a prosecutor's obligation as far as when they are supposed
to turn Brady evidence over?
A. I think the case law says as soon as practicable. You tell me what that means.
Q. As soon as $I$ find it, as soon as $I$ put my hands on it.
A. I'm not going to argue with that.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us when you put your hands on Bate's stamp 003?
A. Mark Schmidt's paragraph that we're talking about right now?
Q. Yeah, 4:15 to 5:30.
A. The fact that Shaka did not scare Quentin Harlan is not necessarily Brady.
Q. Ms. Siegler, your case was a circumstantial case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you told that jury in opening and closing probably 30 times that the truth is in the details, did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. Then can you not agree with me that any piece of evidence that contradicts those little pieces of the puzzle that you stacked up to get a conviction of David Temple was Brady as far as the defense was concerned?
A. I do not agree with that. There are many
details that neutral, innocuous, unobjective details that speak for themselves that create a circumstantial case that has nothing to do with being exculpatory against David Temple.
Q. But, Ms. Siegler, if you were going to take those --
A. Buck -- like Buck Bindeman catching him driving down the road, that's a circumstantial piece of evidence that has nothing to do with exculpating David Temple.
Q. Right. But when you put Mr. Bindeman on the stand, what you argued to that jury and the impression that you left was that Buck Bindeman was actually present at the time that David Temple hid the murder weapon. That's the impression that you left with Mr. Bindeman's testimony, was it not?
A. No.
Q. No, that's not what you -- that's not what you argued in closing?
A. The impression $I$ left was that Buck Bindeman saw him immediately after he headed out to the Temple compound, which is where we believe he got rid of the shotgun.
Q. Right. So, the purpose of Buck Bindeman's testimony was to put this man, David Temple, in a place where he could destroy, hide, conceal the murder weapon,
right?
A. I just answered your question. My point was that Buck Bindeman could tell the jury that David Temple was coming from the opposite direction away from the Temple compound immediately after it all happened, which is where we believe he got rid of the shotgun.
Q. Okay. So, I guess that may be a long way of saying "yes" to my question. Because what I heard you say prior to that was that there are all of these little innocuous facts, right --
A. Yes.
Q. - that you don't believe contradictory evidence constitutes Brady, right?
A. In some cases it does. In some case it doesn't.
Q. Well, let's talk about this case.
A. We have been.
Q. Okay. And so, if you've got all of these little-bitty innocuous facts that you are going stack up to create enough evidence to put a man in prison for the rest of his life, is it not fair to say that the defense, under Brady versus Maryland, is entitled to any contradictory evidence that you've got in your possession for any one of those little-bitty facts?
A. It depends on the facts.
Q. These facts.
A. It depends on the specific fact.
Q. Anything controverting your timeline when Belinda Temple got home that day.
A. That is Brady that would go to the defense, yes.
Q. So, just so that I'm clear, if you have any evidence, any documentation, any witness statement in your possession that Belinda Temple arrived home at any other time other than 4:00 p.m. or could not have arrived home at 4:00 p.m., then that constitutes Brady?
A. That's a long question. I think the answer to that is yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going -- that was a long question. I'll ask it differently.

Your theory of the case was that Belinda Temple was killed at 4:00 p.m. At trial, your theory of the case was that she had arrived home at 3:45 p.m. Do you agree with both of those statements.
A. Well, $I$ would say that David Temple said that she got home at 3:45 p.m. and we believe that she was killed sometime right after 4:00. I can't remember if we were hard and fast on 4:05. I don't remember.
Q. Can we agree at trial that your theory of the case was that Belinda Temple had arrived home at 3:45?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can we agree at trial your theory of the case was that Belinda Temple was killed around 4:00 p.m.?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If you had evidence in your possession, the State's possession, that showed Belinda Temple could not have been home at $3: 45$, would that have been Brady evidence?
A. Probably, yes.
Q. What's the equivocation?
A. It depends on who it comes from. If it's some random person calling in that's a kook. It just depends. I can give you a blanket "yes" that's all-inclusive. It just depends.
Q. And so, if a random person or witness says: You know what, Belinda Temple wasn't home at $3: 45$, if you think that person is a kook, are you saying it's not Brady?
A. It depends.
Q. I'm just working with the answers you've given me, Ms. Siegler.
A. And I'm just trying to answer your questions.
Q. Okay. So, if you have evidence that shows Belinda Temple could not have been home before 4:00 - -
let's just throw that out there -- she couldn't have been home before 4:00, is that not Brady?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. It is Brady.

And so, if you possess that kind of evidence, it's your testimony today you should have turned it over to the defense?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We got there.

There was a statement -- let's go back to the Grand Jury testimony for just a second. Detective Schmidt. When he was asked -- and you and I have gone over this today. When he was asked if law enforcement was able to find out what time Belinda had gotten home, Schmidt says: $3: 45,4: 10$, depends on who you listen to. Correct me if I'm wrong, but Schmidt goes on to opine that if Belinda Temple had arrived home at 4:10, it would have been -- makes it pretty impossible, if not impossible, pretty difficult, if not impossible for David Temple to have committed this crime. Do you remember something like that coming out of the Schmidt's mouth.
A. Something like that, yes.
Q. In your opinion, is a statement like that Brady?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, you had read all of the Grand Jury transcripts by the time you got to trial, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you will agree with me that Schmidt's statement was not turned over to Dick DeGuerin?
A. Dick DeGuerin knew what Mark Schmidt had to say about the time.
Q. Did Dick DeGuerin know what Mark Schmidt's statements were to the Grand Jury?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. Well, I don't know. I don't know if Ted and Donna had told him. No. They wouldn't have told him. He wasn't the lawyer back then.
Q. Did Dick DeGuerin ever -- let's face it. Dick DeGuerin couldn't have seen the transcripts, Ms. Siegler, because you had exclusive possession of them at that time, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you told us you didn't give him those Grand Jury transcripts?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, then we have to agree that Dick

DeGuerin did not see prior to trial Mark Schmidt's statement about the impossibility of David Temple committing this crime if Belinda Temple gets home at 4:10?
A. Well, he didn't use the word "impossible," but he did not see the Grand Jury testimony. I agree with that.
Q. What was the word that he used?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Me either. I will look it up. But it makes it very, very difficult, right?
A. Agreed.
Q. And the reason that it makes it very, very difficult is because David's on film at Brookshire Brothers at 3:32 -- 4:32, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So, that would have given him 10 minutes to murder his wife, get cleaned up, and get over to Brookshire Brothers?
A. It would have been real fast.
Q. It would have been real fast. Now, you have to -- you have to agree this could not have been a premeditated murder, right?
A. Well, what's your definition of "premeditated"? I think it was one of those murders where he had
thoughts about it prior to that day and he had thoughts about how to alibi himself prior to that day. Did he wake up that morning and say: Today is going to be the day? No. I think that the day just went crazy and he had enough and the New Year's Eve weekend had happened and he finally lost it, and that's when it happened. So, premeditated in the sense that he had thought about it before and how to alibi himself and what he's going to do with the shotgun, I do believe that part was premeditated. Did he wake up that morning planning to do it that day? No.
Q. Okay. Well, when I had asked you about the premeditation, the place that $I$ was going to go was that Belinda didn't stick to her regular schedule that day, did she?
A. She did not.
Q. Right? Because she didn't know that Evan was going to get sick at school, right?
A. True.
Q. And so, midway through his workday, David Temple sort of gets thrown a curve ball when Belinda Temple says: Hey, you've got to come home and watch the baby, he is sick?
A. That is true.
Q. So, when I had asked you whether or not this
was premeditated murder, typically wouldn't you expect someone to sort of plan in advance how they were going to commit this murder?
A. Not a spouse murder, no.
Q. No?
A. They think about parts of it and how to get away with it. I will agree on that with you.
Q. Okay.
A. But usually a spouse murder is in the middle of a fight and they just lose it and it happens.
Q. Right. In the middle of a fight. And it's toe-to-toe, isn't it?
A. No. He was mad that she made him come home early and he was mad that he didn't get his hookup with Heather. So, as he drove him that day, he was already pissed off.
Q. Right. How many statements --
A. And then when we --
Q. -- did you read, Ms. Siegler, where people described Belinda Temple as spunky?
A. A lot. She was.
Q. As a fighter, right?
A. $\quad$ Spunky" is different than "fighter."
Q. She stood up for herself?
A. Yes.
Q. She didn't take crap from anybody, certainly not at work anyway?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.

How many statements did you read where
she's described as a woman who loved her children?
A. A lot.
Q. Okay. A woman who sticks up for herself, who loves her children, do you think for a single second she's going to go down on her knees on the ground against a guy like that? Is that your experience with spousal fights, Ms. Siegler?
A. At the barrel of a shotgun, anybody would go down on their knees with their back turned toward the shotgun. That's exactly what happened and that's what I believe happened.
Q. Well, $I$ know -- we know that's what you believe happened. The first thing that you told us when you walked into this courtroom is that you were absolutely convinced of this man's guilt and there was close to nothing that would ever change your mind about that. Right?
A. Right.
Q. Right.

And it doesn't matter what kind of new
evidence comes forth because you sit here today convinced that he killed her?
A. Correct.
Q. And let's be honest. That's the world -that's the lens you are going to view this conviction through for the rest of your life, isn't it?
A. Seems like it.
Q. Right.

The truth of the matter is that most
domestic violence deaths occur in either the kitchen or the bedroom?
A. Where did you get that stat from?
Q. Well, I don't remember.
A. I don't --
Q. You know what, $I$ guess $I$ read it at some point preparing for this. I guess I read it at some point preparing for this.
A. Well, I've handled a lot of them and I've never read that stat.
Q. How many cases have you handled where the husband shoots his pregnant wife in the back of the head when she's fully dress on the ground in the closet?
A. Exactly like that? Only this one.
Q. Okay. Well, how about just on her knees --
A. Pregnant?
Q. Well, $I$ was going to go with on her knees in the closet.
A. Just this one.
Q. Okay. How about on her knees pregnant somewhere else in the house?
A. Or outside?
Q. Well, we having gotten there yet. My hypo. Somewhere else in the house.
A. Just this one.
Q. Okay. Well, you drug me there. Outside. Pregnant on her knees outside?
A. Yes.
Q. How many?
A. One.
Q. Okay. Where else do husbands kill their pregnant kneeling wives besides outside --
A. Anywhere they might not get caught.
Q. -- that you've handled?
A. Anywhere they might not get caught.
Q. That you've handled personally, Ms. Siegler.
A. All over the house, outside the house, down the road, outside bars. Lots of places.
Q. These are cases you've personally handled?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Where pregnant women are kneeling and shot in
the back of the head by their husbands?
A. They weren't all pregnant. They were spouses or girlfriends.
Q. On their knees shot in the back of their head by their partners?
A. No. We were talking about where. All the wheres.
Q. Right. Right. And don't those situations typically have a history of domestic violence?
A. Yes, or a bad temper in the mix.
Q. Well, now, Ms. Siegler, your office very often uses that cycle of violence, right, that sort of explosion, the honeymoon, the blah, blah, the explosion. You are familiar with that cycle of violence?
A. I don't think it's just my office that uses it. I think the whole world uses it because it's accurate.
Q. Well, no. Your office uses it, "yes" or "no"? Do you have personal knowledge of that?
A. Most D.A.'s offices use it, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you have any idea who developed that particular tool?
A. I don't know for sure.
Q. Okay. If I told that you that it's called the Duluth model, would you have any reason to disagree with that?
A. $\quad D-u-l-u-t-h$ ?
Q. Duluth.
A. I've seen that name, but $I$ don't know if that's it. I'm not going to argue with you.
Q. Okay. That particular -- and, again, tell me if you have any reason to disagree with what I'm about to say. You've used that power -- that cycle of violence before in your prosecutions?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, then you're familiar with those dynamics, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you also know that that particular exhibit was based on women who were in a shelter, that women had sought shelter from battered women's -- at a battered women's center; did you know that?
A. I did not know that.
Q. These were women that had been beaten severely over years of their lives. Did you know that?
A. I'm not even sure that $I$ know what the Duluth model is. So, no, I didn't know that.
Q. Okay. So, you have no idea where the information that that wheel came from, you just used it a lot in court?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And then you use it a lot in court in your cases where you've got people in intimate relationships hurting each other?
A. Well, what do you mean by "use it a lot"? I mean, you referred to the cycle of violence. Everybody knows what it is.
Q. Right.
A. Do I make it a cornerstone of my case, like an element of the offense? No.
Q. No, but, Ms. Siegler, you said some things about David Temple. You said he had an explosive temper, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Right?

Any evidence that he exploded at Belinda
before?
A. They had some pretty good arguments before.
Q. Did you find any evidence that he had exploded at Belinda before?
A. I think that Tammy Harlan testified about that and so did Brenda Lucas.
Q. So, other than Brenda Lucas and Tammy Harlan?
A. She might have told some of the girlfriends about some of their arguments. I can't remember anymore.
Q. Would these have been the girlfriends whose names you couldn't really get into at trial?
A. I think we got into the names. We didn't get into the contents of what Belinda told the girlfriends.
Q. Do you remember testifying at the motion -- the hearing on motion for new trial, Ms. Siegler?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you remember the defense's objections about you sort of alluding to statements that had never been made; do you remember that?
A. And $I$ remember my explanation for all of that, which was --
Q. Ms. Siegler.
A. -- what he was alluding to.
Q. Ms. Siegler, come on. I just asked you if you remember the defense --
A. I do remember.
Q. -- complaining about you alluding to testimony that had never been entered. Yes?
A. I remember his allusions.
Q. Okay. And you claimed on the stand that there were folks -- family members that actually said these things to you, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But they never came into the courtroom
and testified, did they?
A. They couldn't, so they didn't.
Q. Ms. Siegler, again, they never came into the courtroom and testified, did they?
A. They did not.
Q. No. But you asked questions in a certain way that left the impression that you had had these conversations anyway?
A. Are you going to get into why $I$ did all of that or are you going to stop your questions when $I$ answer that question?
Q. Well, I'll get where I'm going when you start answering the questions that I'm asking, Ms. Siegler.
A. The answer to that question is yes.
Q. Okay. So, you did ask questions in a manner that left the impression with that jury you had conversations with folks that hadn't even testified yet?
A. I also did it on voir dire. So, yes.
Q. Do you think there's anything improper about that?
A. Not for the reasons I did it.
Q. Do you think there is anything improper about that?
A. Not for the reasons I did it.
Q. This is a yes-or-no question. As a general
principle, do you think there is anything improper about trying to get in evidence that you know is not admissible and --
A. That's not what $I$ was trying to do.
Q. May I finish, please? Is that a yes?
A. I'm waiting for the question.
Q. Okay. You know under the rules of evidence, top prosecutor in the country, it is improper to try and get in evidence, to try and leave an impression with the jury about evidence that you know is not admissible or you know hasn't come in, but you're saying that if the reason is good enough it's okay?
A. That's a heck of a question.
Q. You just said if the reason is good enough, it's okay.
A. That's not what $I$ said.
Q. Well, what was your reason for doing that, Ms. Siegler?
A. The reason $I$ did it was to remind the jury that even though there are a lot of girlfriends out there who have information about what happened between Belinda and David, the law does not allow them to come into court and testify to it.
Q. Did you explain why the law doesn't allow them to come in and testify?
A. I sure did, on voir dire.
Q. But you managed to slip their testimony in anyway, didn't you?
A. No, I did not. I was just reminding the jury that there were girlfriends that have information, that Craig and I are not worthless, pathetic prosecutors that aren't going to call them; the law does not allow us to call them, and $I$ was reminding the jury of that. And that is what $I$ said at that hearing in January of 2008 .
Q. Okay. Did you not leave the impression with that jury during trial -- right -- that those conversations had actually happened, that people had actually said those things to you about David? Did you do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Because you thought you had good enough reason to do it?
A. No.
Q. Then why did you do it?
A. Because it's common sense to remind the jury that the girlfriends did hear all these things about their failing marriage, and that the law doesn't allow them to necessarily come into the courtroom and talk about all of those things.
Q. But it's okay for Kelly Siegler to bend the law
and get it in front of them anyway?
A. I didn't get it in front of them. I was just reminding them of why we didn't present it. I would have loved to have put it in front of them, but I couldn't.
Q. Do you think that reminding them $-\quad$ I don't even --

MS. GOTRO: Could $I$ have just a second, please?
(Pause)
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Ms. Siegler, do you remember speaking at South Texas College of Law to a bunch of law students about the issues we're talking about now?

MR. CHIN: I object, Judge. It's been --
number one, it's been addressed in the motion for new trial proceeding that was raised on direct appeal. And also it's irrelevant to any habeas allegation. THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead.
A. Do $I$ remember speaking to a class at south

Texas?
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Yes, ma'am.
A. Which time?
Q. Well, the time that Mr. Chin was talking about. Let's start with that one.
A. You mean the time that Dick had his intern who
worked for him go to South Texas and get a copy of my speech, that time?
Q. I actually thought it was a clerk that had been working for Stan Schneider, but I don't think that --
A. Well, it's a guy that took the bar four times and never passed it. What was his name, Stanley?
Q. A different one.
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Different student, Ms. Siegler.
A. Oh, well.
Q. But back to your talk --
A. That was the one that got the copy of the tape.
Q. In any case, do you remember what you talked about?
A. What I talked about?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. I talked about a lot. I have been to South Texas many times teaching advocacy classes.
Q. Right. And teaching those advocacy classes, do you remember teaching those law students that it's okay to ask a question that you know is objectionable.

Right? Did you --
A. No. What I said --
Q. Let me finish my question, Ms. Siegler, please. May I?
A. Sure.
Q. Okay. Do you remember telling those law students that it's okay to ask a question that you know is objectionable, that you know is improper, and you know an objection is coming just so you can get that information in front of the jury? Do you remember saying that?
A. That's not what $I$ said.
Q. Then tell me what it was you said.
A. I said that good trial lawyers often ask objectionable questions. A good defense lawyer is going to object, a judge is going to rule on it. You can't live your life as a trial lawyer being afraid to ask questions. Sometimes they're going to be objected to.
Q. Do you make a distinction between a prosecutor's obligation in trial, Ms. Siegler, and a defense attorney's obligation?
A. In what respect?
Q. In any respect.
A. Yeah. I think a prosecutor is a whole lot more restricted.
Q. Right. So, for instance, prosecutors don't talk about the defendant's right to remain silent, do they?
A. That's correct.
Q. You guys have a lot more restrictions on you as far as argument is concerned. Why do you think that is?
A. Because it's our job to seek justice and seek the truth.
Q. And maybe to protect the defendant's due process rights, those constitutional rights?
A. Correct.
Q. That's part of it, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And so, when you say this thing about trial advocacy -- and specifically at South Texas College of Law, you didn't make a distinction between defense attorneys and prosecutors, did you?
A. I think I was talking to a class as a prosecutor and everybody assumed that. We would at times talk about defense lawyers, too.
Q. But what you said to that group of folks is kind of what you did in this case, Ms. Siegler.
A. Whatever I said to that group of folks and whatever $I$ did in this case is the same that $I$ have always done.
Q. Which is bend the rules?
A. Ask an objectionable question? I've probably done that lots of times.
Q. Intentionally?
A. Objectionable questions are asked all the time. That's not bad. There is nothing wrong with that.
Q. Doesn't it depend on the question that you are asking?
A. Yes, sometimes.
Q. All right. And if the question that you are asking gets a fact in front of that jury that you know is not admissible, can you agree with me that that's improper?
A. It depends.
Q. On what?
A. On what the question is.
Q. If it gets a piece of information, a fact that you know is not admissible, that you know is improper, in front of that jury and you do it anyway.
A. What's your question?
Q. Is that okay to do, Ms. Siegler?
A. It depends.
Q. All right. On your definition?
A. On the question.
Q. On what it is you're trying to accomplish?
A. On the question.
Q. Because the reality is, is that if in your mind the end justifies the means, doesn't it?
A. No.
Q. And it doesn't matter how you get there, does it?
A. You need to be asking that Dick that question, not me.
Q. Ms. Siegler, I promise you Dick DeGuerin will be thoroughly cross-examined before this hearing is over with, but he is not here today. Okay?

So, to you I ask a specific question. It doesn't matter how you get to the end, does it, just so long as you get there?
A. That's not true.
Q. Did you read all of Justin -- I'm going to back that up for a second. The offense reports that are sitting in front of you, they look pretty well thumbed, Ms. Siegler.
A. They do.
Q. Right. Imagine those are your thumbprints on them.
A. Some.
Q. Some. Some Craig Goodhart's, right?
A. Some.
Q. All right. You are not going to tell anybody in this courtroom that you tried David Temple, this man, that you tried this man in a six-week trial and that
both prosecutors didn't pour over every page of that offense report; you are not going to say that, are you?
A. I knew this offense report very well.
Q. Right.

And so, in knowing that offense report very well, you knew exactly what evidence was getting turned over to the defense and what wasn't, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.

And so, all of those statements about Riley
Joe Sanders or all those statements from Riley Joe Sanders, those didn't get turned over to Dick DeGuerin because you didn't want them to get turn over to Dick DeGuerin.
A. Everything that $I$ know about Riley Joe Sanders was given and told to Dick DeGuerin. He knew all of that and it was presented to the jury.
Q. The offense report with the oral statements in them that didn't make their way to Dick DeGuerin, didn't make their way because you didn't want them to, did you?
A. I will say it again. All of the information about Riley Joe Sanders was turned over to Dick DeGuerin.
Q. I will take that as "yes" to my question. Yes?
A. You heard my answer.
Q. Is that a "yes" to my question?
A. I don't remember the question. I'm sorry.
Q. Who was the ultimate decisionmaker about which of these offense reports made their way into defense counsel's hands?
A. I was.
Q. Right. And so, from that statement, may we conclude that if you decided Dick didn't get the statement, then he didn't get the statement?
A. Dick DeGuerin got all of the information about Riley Joe Sanders. It was presented at trial.
Q. That you deemed him entitled to?
A. He got all of the information about Riley Joe Sanders. He got Riley Joe Sanders. He got to cross-examine Riley Joe Sanders at trial.
Q. How many of Riley Joe Sanders' statements had you given Dick before that cross-examination?
A. None.
Q. How many written statements did Riley Joe Sanders give?
A. I think we talked about that yesterday. What did we say? Three, two.
Q. Right. And so, prior to Riley Joe Sanders -excuse me. After Riley Joe Sanders' testimony, did you give Dick the written statements?
A. After he testified?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. But Dick had the information before Riley Joe Sanders testified.
Q. Why do you keep making that distinction?
A. Because you keep acting like he never heard about Riley Joe Sanders until the trial.
Q. No, ma'am. I do not. I'm talking about your prosecutorial obligation to turn over a witness' written statement or oral statement to defense counsel.
A. He got the information. He saw --
Q. Why do you keep making that distinction?
A. Because you keep making the distinction.
Q. So, as long as you transmit the information to him, then do the Rules of Criminal Procedure just forgive you for turning over the written statement?
A. The information was provided to Mr. DeGuerin. The actual statements themselves he saw when the law says he's entitled to see it, after direct examination.
Q. Ms. Siegler -- and $I$ just want to be sure $I$ understand you correctly -- if you give the information in the statement to defense counsel, do you believe that that is enough to comply with the Code of Criminal Procedure that requires you to turn over written statements?
A. If I --
Q. "Yes" or "no"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, in your mind, you don't have to turn over the written statement so long as you tell defense counsel the contents of it, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And is that what you did in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you recall for how many
witnesses you did that?
A. No.
Q. All right. Is Riley Joe Sanders one of them?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Quentin Harlan?
A. Again, give the information, but not the statement until after he testifies on direct?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, are we to assume that the -- no, no, no, no.

My question to you was: If you give the contents of the written statement or the contents of any statement, does that relieve you of your duty to tender those statements to defense counsel after a witness
testifies?
A. No.
Q. All right. And so, your testimony then is for every witness that testified, after that person was done testifying, you tendered written statements and oral statements made to law enforcement?
A. Written statements. Again, oral statements are documented in all of this (indicating).
Q. Right.

So, you don't believe you have an obligation to turn over the oral statements?
A. The oral statements were consumed in the written statements. They're all the same.
Q. Okay. So, then are you saying that you believe the oral statements that these witnesses made in offense reports are completely consistent with the written statement?
A. Yes, for the most part.
Q. Well, what are the exceptions?
A. Well, it depends on who you're talking about.

Are we talking about Quentin Harlan?
Q. Let's talk about Riley Joe Sanders.
A. Okay.
Q. So, for the most part. What do you mean by "for the most part"?
A. Dick DeGuerin had all of the information about Riley Joe Sanders. And after he testified, Dick DeGuerin got the statement.
Q. We're not talking about Dick DeGuerin right now though. We're talking about the difference between Riley Joe Sanders' written statement and his oral statement to law enforcement. Okay?
A. We talked about the oral statements yesterday. If an oral statement was made, it's somewhere in all of this and in paragraphs. The oral statement and what they said are consumed inside the written statements.
Q. Okay. So, just so we're clear, are you saying that in this case all of Riley Joe Sanders' oral statements to law enforcement, those facts, details contained in those oral statements to law enforcement are represented in his written statements?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you reviewed those oral statements to make sure of that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And so, in tendering those two written statements to defense counsel, you turned over any -- you turned over everything you knew about what it is that Riley Joe Sanders had testified to -- or had -statements that he had made to law enforcement?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Just one second. Let me get my glasses.
(Pause)
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Will you -- if you could on the documents in front of you, will you find the first time that Riley Joe Sanders was interviewed by law enforcement? It would have been to Detective Shipley on January 11th, 1999.
A. Do you have it? Do you want to do it that way?
Q. It's tiny, and I'm looking for a larger version now.
A. You mean the print is tiny.
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. I've got my glasses -- that's okay -- I think.
Q. Well, it's work product, Ms. Siegler, and I don't want to misquote anything. Here you go. It's Bate's stamped 2193 and this is in Exhibit No. 32.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, if it's Exhibit 32, we know that Dick DeGuerin was at least given that offense report during trial, right?
A. Correct.
Q. On that first statement to Detective Shipley, when she testified at trial did she discuss that
statement at all?
A. Did you tell me a page?
Q. I did not.
A. Okay. So, are you waiting for me to answer your question?
Q. I was waiting for you to get -- did you find where it is Detective Shipley got -- interviewed him and got a statement from him?
A. Riley Joe?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. February the - no. This is titled "Tracy Shipley," correct?
Q. Well, he was interviewed by Tracy Shipley. I'm sure by this point you know that one detective might author it, but it typically will include -- at least in those offense reports, it will include --
A. But that's what's confusing. Because this is it Rogers Wedgeworth's supplement. It's not Tracy Shipley's supplement. So -- and this is Valerio's supplement. It's not Tracy Shipley's supplement. So, I'm not sure what this is. It's called "Shipley," but these are not all Tracy's.
Q. All right.
A. So, whoever put this together is incorrect.
Q. Well, those were just the documents that you
had tendered to Dick in the middle of the trial. So, you're saying you can't find Riley Joe's statement in there?
A. It was given to -- I don't know which one you're talking about. Show it to me.
Q. Well, I had it open to a page. Oh. That would be Page 2. 2193, No. 2. Bate's 2193. Detective Schmidt was assigned to -- I misspoke. I'm sorry. It says "Shipley," but this looks like it says "Schmidt."
A. Well, it's Schmidt and Wedgeworth and Valerio. So, that document is put together incorrectly.
Q. Why is it -- how is it put together incorrectly?
A. Well, it's a bunch of different detectives' supplements and $I$ thought it was all just Tracy's.
Q. Well, we've got Page 1 and Page 2.
A. I know, but look. Watch this. So, this is Shipley's, Tracy Shipley's. This is Tracy Shipley's. This is Tracy Shipley's. This is Tracy Shipley's. This is Tracy Shipley's. These are all Tracy's.
Q. So, what's confusing about how the documents are put together?
A. One of the supplements back here belongs to Roger Wedgeworth. And this is Bill Valerio's here. This is Bill Valerio's supplement. And this is Roger

Wedgeworth's supplement. And this is Roger's supplement. And this is Wichkoski's supplement. I don't know why they are all in with Tracy Shipley's. So, whoever told you this was incorrect.
Q. Told me what?
A. That this was all Tracy Shipley's.
Q. I didn't say it was all Tracy Shipley's. I'm just giving you the exhibit as it was marked and as it was provided to Dick DeGuerin during trial.
A. Well, somebody wrote in here "Shipley's O.R., Exhibit 32." Whoever wrote that, this is not Shipley's O.R. It's four different people's supplements to the offense report.
Q. Are Shipley's O.R.s in there?
A. Some of them are. I hope this is all of them.
Q. Okay. So, let's go to Page 2. What does

Bullet No. 2 say?
A. 22506 Round Valley, Riley Joe, his home phone number. I spoke with Mr. Sanders, his wife Connie, and his teenaged son, Joe, who is a student at Katy High School where the complainant taught. Mr. and Ms. Sanders stated that they did not see anything out of the ordinary today. Their son Joe stated he went to school today, and when he came he did not see anything either. Joe stated he knows Ms. Temple because she is one of his
teachers, but he can't remember seeing her in the hallway today.
Q. Okay. And when was that statement made? Can you look at these offense reports and tell me when the statement was made?
A. All on January 11th, 1999.
Q. Okay. So, January 11th, 1999 Riley Joe Sanders -- and when I say "Riley Joe Sanders," can we just agree I'm talking about the teenage kid that we've been talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, on January 11th, 1999, he states -Riley Joe Sanders states that he wasn't home that afternoon, right?
A. He went to school today and when he came, he did not see anything either.
Q. Okay.
A. So, he doesn't really say he wasn't home. He said he went to school today and when he came he did not see anything.
Q. Okay. Is he being questioned by a detective with the Harris County Sheriff's Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Homicide Division?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, is it fair to assume that that detective is asking him questions about the homicide that happened next door?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, when he responds: I was at school and didn't see anything, what does that mean to you, Ms. Siegler?
A. Well, just what it says.
Q. That $I$ went to school today, came home and didn't see anything?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what it means to you?
A. That he went to school. At some point, he came home. And during the time that you're asking him about, he doesn't think he saw anything.
Q. All right. Can you flip to the next page where you see a statement from Riley Joe Sanders?
A. On the very next page?
Q. I said just to the next page.
A. Okay. Is it going to be another Tracy Shipley supplement?
Q. I'm not sure.
A. Do you have a page number?
Q. Of the one -- next one chronologically?
A. Yeah.
Q. Hang on.
A. Or do you want to show it to me?
Q. The next statement that $I$ have him giving is on the 12 th.
A. Okay. Well, I'm to the 28 th with Tracy and I either missed or $I$ don't see it.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. I'm on the 28th -- now I'm on February 1st with Tracy Shipley's supplement. So, I either missed it Or - -
Q. Give me one second.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you have a statement from -- do you have a Shelly Gonzalez offense report up there?
A. Shelly Gonzalez?
Q. Shelly Gonzalez. Do you have an offense report from her up there?
A. Is it going to be in the same pile of stuff I'm looking at or something else?
Q. They're not really organized very well, are they?
A. Nope.
Q. How about this highlighted page, does that appear to be a statement from Joe Sanders?

MR. CHIN: Do you have a Bate's page?

MS. GOTRO: 78 .
MR. CHIN: 78. Thank you.
MS. GOTRO: You're welcome.
A. Yes, it does.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Okay. Then I'm going to -well, it starts with Wichkoski, but then we move to -who does that say?
A. Here's 4 and --
Q. But that's page. So, Wichkoski or page --
A. That's giving all of this. I need to see the front. Where is Page 3? You're going to the front of it. Where is Page 3? Page 3, 2, 1. So, it's Wichkoski.
Q. Where does Shelly Gonzalez come in?
A. I don't know. That's the canvass, which is going to be the violent youth offender guys.
Q. The who?
A. What we talked about yesterday.
Q. The violent youth offender guys?
A. $\quad \mathrm{h}-\mathrm{hu}$.
Q. Okay.
A. Page and Herndon with that unit.
Q. Was there any significance to the Violent Youth Offender Unit participating in this initial canvass of Belinda Temple's murder?
A. They just needed all men on deck to take care of all of the to-do lists.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry. So, the next statement was what?
A. This is a supplement by Steve Wichkoski when he interviewed Riley Joe Sanders.
Q. And that date would be what?
A. The interview was on January 14th, '99.
Q. Okay. You don't see a statement on the $12 t h$ of ' 99 ?
A. Of Riley Joe Sanders?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. By Steve Wichkoski?
Q. No, ma'am. That would have been by, I think, Shelly Gonzalez.
A. Well, I'm just looking at Wichkoski's right. Do you have Gonzalez's?
Q. No. I thought it was in the group of papers I gave you.
A. I think this is just Wichkoski.
Q. So, nothing in here about -- okay. When you turned these offense reports over to Dick in the middle of the trial, how were they organized?
A. By the detective who just testified.
Q. Okay. So, did Steve Wichkoski testify?
A. He had -- he was subpoenaed and he was out in the hallway. I did not call him. And I know Dick thought about calling him -- yeah, he did call him because of the Roberts' boys, I think.
Q. Okay. So, if Steve Wichkoski testified, the trial transcript will reflect that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What other detectives did Riley Joe Sanders give a statement to? What I'm asking you, Ms. Siegler, did all of the detectives that Riley Joe Sanders gave oral statements to, did you call them to the stand?
A. The detectives?
Q. Yeah.
A. No. Because I called Riley Joe to the stand.
Q. Okay. But that was a rebuttal witness. I'm talking about during your case-in-chief.
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Can you agree with me that if you don't call an investigator to the stand, a defense attorney never gets to see his offense report, does he?
A. Yeah, he does.
Q. How is he going to see an offense report for somebody that doesn't testify? Didn't you just say that you only turned over offense reports for folks that
testified?
A. Yeah, but Judge Shaver was pretty clear about letting him see copies of the statements of anyone who testified.
Q. Okay. But I'm just talking about offense reports, Ms. Siegler. I'm not talking about -- just help me, please. Help me and listen to the questions that I'm asking because this is exhausting.
A. Okay.
Q. This is exhausting.
A. Imagine being in trial with Dick for six weeks.
Q. I have read that transcript. No, thank you. Okay?

So, my question is: If you don't call a detective or an investigator and put him on the stand -right?
A. Right.
Q. -- then isn't it true that defense counsel - I mean, how is defense counsel supposed to know what detectives even participated in the investigation?
A. Well, their names are on the subpoena. And if you really want to know what they did, you call them to the stand yourself, but if $I$ don't call them to the stand myself as a witness, no, then $I$ don't hand over their supplement to the defense because $I$ never called
them.
Q. Okay. So, just so that I'm clear, if defense counsel wants to know who all investigated a particular offense, all of those detectives will be listed on your subpoena list?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you're saying that it is defense counsel's job to call up every one of those individuals and find out what, if any, role they participated in in this particular crime or this investigation?
A. I wouldn't say it's his job. I would say that if he wanted to, he could.
Q. Well, how else is he supposed to find out which members of law enforcement actually participated in the investigation?
A. Their names are on the subpoenas.
Q. Right. You're doing that circular thing. I think the question is real clear, Ms. Siegler.
A. Okay. Ask it again.
Q. All right. So, how is defense counsel supposed to know which members of law enforcement participated in an investigation? You tell me: Well, he can look at the subpoena list. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Well, if he looks at the subpoena list,
there is nothing on the subpoena list that says who investigated and who didn't, right?
A. Not from the subpoena, no.
Q. Right. Which means defense counsel is going to have to call every single person on that subpoena list and ask them what role, if any, they played in this investigation? Is that what you're saying?
A. If you want to know, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know how long your subpoena list was in this case?
A. I sure do.
Q. How long?
A. I don't know, but $I$ typed it up and it was even in alphabetical order.
Q. I appreciate your alphabetical order on things, I really do.

So, you will agree with me that it was a whole lot of folks?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. All right. On that subpoena list, did you include every single officer that put together an offense report?
A. I thought I got all of the important ones that I would ever possibly need to testify. If I left off a couple of them, I might have.
Q. Ms. Siegler, not all the important ones. My question to you was: Did you subpoena all of the members of law enforcement that participated in the investigation of this offense?
A. Every single one, no.
Q. Okay. What were the criteria that you used to decide who you would subpoena and who you would not subpoena?
A. Did they do anything significant.
Q. Like?
A. Oh, lots of things.
Q. Interview a witness?
A. Interview a witness that was important, collect any evidence that was important.
Q. And, again, this is important by your standards, right?
A. Do you know how many people with the sheriff's department were involved in this case?
Q. No, I don't.
A. A lot.
Q. I don't.
A. That didn't anything that amounted to anything. I wasn't going to shut down the sheriff's department and subpoena all of those people.
Q. How is defense counsel supposed to find out who
participated in the investigation, Ms. Siegler?
A. I guess ask the questions.
Q. Well, no, no, no. No, no. Don't do that. You and $I$ both know you don't call everybody on that subpoena list to the stand.
A. No, of course not.
Q. No, of course not. Those subpoena lists were baloney. I mean, you people would -- y'all would stick everybody and their mama on that list and you know you only call a tenth of them. Because that was how we got our notice of witnesses, right, check the subpoena list?
A. What's your question?
Q. Do you know what I'm talking about, the phenomenon $I$ just described?
A. You kind of went off on a tangent and lost me.
Q. No, I did not, Ms. Siegler. You put how many people on that witness list?
A. Count them. I really don't know. It was a lot.
Q. All right. And you called what, less than a tenth of them?
A. I called a lot of people. It was a six-week trial.
Q. Right.
A. I think there was 40-something witnesses.
Q. So, correct me at any point if I'm wrong. Depending on which cop talked to which witness and depending on whether or not you deemed that witness or that information important, that officer might make his name on a subpoena list, right?
A. If the witness -- I don't necessarily agree that you have to subpoena the cop that interviewed the witness in all cases. Like those canvasses of all the people on the street that didn't know anything, the guys from the Violent Youth Offenders Unit that talked to those neighbors that didn't know anything, I didn't put the neighbors on the subpoena, $I$ didn't put the Violent Youth Offenders on the subpoena.
Q. Well, you didn't stick Justin Valdez on that subpoena, did you?
A. No.
Q. Justin Valdez who said: You know what, the dog stays in the back yard, got access to the garage with a door that leads from the back yard to the garage. You didn't put him on that list, did you?
A. I did not.
Q. No, but you hammered David Temple on his cross-examination when you said: Nobody said anything to anybody about that dog being in that garage until 2007. Do you remember doing that?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Right.

You had that statement and you were the only person that had Justin Valdez's statement. Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. It's fair for you to argue one point when you were the sole possessor of anything in the world that could contradict it and you don't give it to defense counsel; that's fair?
A. I did not give defense counsel these statements made by Justin Valdez about one time seeing the dog in a garage. I did not do that.
Q. Right. But that one time, Ms. Siegler, makes it enough. That one time makes your questions of David Temple and your argument to that jury wrong. It makes it wrong because you knew -- and he wasn't the only one that said that dog was in that garage. There are other statements in there, Ms. Siegler. Do you remember seeing those?
A. Is that an argument or a question?
Q. No. I'm asking. Do you remember seeing the other witnesses talk about that dog being in that garage?
A. No, I do not. And I disagree with your
argument.
Q. All right. So, if it's just one witness that contradicts what you're arguing, it's okay to keep that in your file?
A. No. I didn't say that.
Q. Then I missed your answer, Ms. Siegler. Why was it that Justin Valdez's statement wasn't turned over to the defense?
A. The fact that Justin Valdez saw the dog go into the garage one day is not something significant enough to me to need to be turned over to the defense.
Q. One day in 1999, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.

But it's okay to argue to the jury and to beat him up with the statement that nobody said anything about that dog until -- being in the garage until 2007?
A. Well, he kind of did give his own statement about the dog, but he never happened to mention it until his trial started.
Q. Did he --
A. That's what $I$ beat him up about it.
Q. Did anybody ask him where the dog was in that statement, Ms. Siegler?
A. Of course they did.
Q. Where?
A. I don't remember.
Q. That's because it didn't happen.
A. It was all about Shaka.

MS. GOTRO: Your Honor, may we approach the bench, please?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
(At the Bench, outside the hearing of the audience)

THE COURT: You need a break?

MS. GOTRO: Can we have a restroom break?

THE COURT: For lunch or --

MS. GOTRO: Sure, is that your --

THE COURT: Half an hour?

MR. SMITH: Why don't we do 45 minutes, Judge, because Mr. Durfee is supposed to show up at 12: 30.

MS. GOTRO: If we can work our stuff out, we --

THE COURT: If we go to 12:30, does that sound okay with y'all?

MS. GOTRO: Yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Yes.
(Open court, defendant present)

THE COURT: Court will be in recess till

12:30.
(Lunch recess)
(Open court, defendant present)

THE COURT: All right.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Welcome back from lunch. Okay. I'm going to back up for just a second before we even get to Riley Joe Sanders, Ms. Siegler.
A. Okay.
Q. Before we broke for lunch and before we got into Riley Joe Sanders' statement, we had been talking about the timeframe behind the prosecution's theory at the time of Temple -- at the time of David Temple's trial. I'd like to back up to that spot for just a moment.

MS. GOTRO: What exhibit number are we on?

THE COURT: 89.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) I'm going to show you what's been marked just for demonstrative purposes as Defense No. 90, Ms. Siegler (indicating).
A. Okay.
Q. It's a file-stamped copy of the State's subpoena list -- oh, the next one is 89. I apologize.

Defense Exhibit 89 for demonstrative purposes, which is a file-stamped copy of the State's
subpoena list. I'm going to pass that to you now and ask you if you recognize it as that (indicating)?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
A. I'll give you room for a new pile.
Q. I will pile over here.
A. Okay.

THE COURT: Are you tendering that as
evidence?
MS. GOTRO: Judge, it's just for
demonstrative purposes.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. GOTRO: I believe it's already part of the clerk's record, Your Honor.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Do you remember reading the statement of Ms. Terri Schultz?
A. Not offhand, no.
Q. Okay. Just to facilitate things, I'm going to hand you what's Bate's stamped beginning -- perhaps Bate's stamped No. 90. Does that appear to be an offense report (indicating)?
A. A supplement to the offense report, yes.
Q. I apologize. A supplement to the offense report.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you see where Ms. Terri Schultz is being interviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. She's asked a question about the dog, the Temples' dog. Do you see the portion that is highlighted there (indicating)?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What does Ms. Schultz say about that dog?
A. Terri said she knew the Temples to own a black Chow dog that was very mean. She also advised that the dog stayed in the back yard and also had access to the garage.
Q. Okay. And then I'm going to show you and hand you back Defense Exhibit No. 89. And that was Terri Schultz that makes that statement about Shaka having access to the back yard?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Is Ms. Schultz on the witness list?
A. She is not.
Q. Okay. And could you read what the Bate's stamped was on that document that $I$ have just shown you?
A. Could I read it? I think it's 90 .
Q. 90 , yes, ma'am.

Now, to your recollection, was this offense
report or the information within it tendered to Mr. DeGuerin prior to trial?
A. It was not.
Q. And you did not see her name on your witness list either; is that right?
A. I did not see Schultz on the subpoena list, no.
Q. Okay. Do you remember an interview with

Roseanne Martinez?
A. I do recognize that name.
Q. Okay. Do you know her to, perhaps, as the -- I guess the wife or partner of a Joe Cadena \{sic\}?
A. Isn't she the blue car in the garage lady?
Q. I don't know who that is.
A. It might not be her.
Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you what's Bate's stamped 98 and -- or excuse me -- 99 of the offense report. You may need to refer back to 98 to see who's making that first statement, but $I$ will submit to you it is Ms. Martinez.
A. Okay.
Q. And in the highlighted portion, does she make any statements about Shaka, the dog?
A. She does. She said the dog sometimes stayed in the kitchen, but that Belinda told her she was going to start keeping the dog outside because of the new baby
coming.
Q. Okay. Does she say anything about the dog staying in the garage?
A. No. She says she knew the Temples to own a large black Chow dog that was protective, but she is the garage lady.
Q. When you say "the garage lady," what do you mean by that?
A. There was a witness that saw the car pulling into or out of the garage. And I specifically went and talked to her in person.
Q. Okay. When you say the car pulling into or out of the garage, what are you referring to?
A. I don't remember which it was now. I just know that during the time -- the time window that we have been talking about, she saw the car coming out of the garage. And $I$ can't remember if she saw Evan in the car, the car seat in the car, and all of that, but she was the car witness. That's how I referred to her in my head.
Q. Was that Angela Vielma?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. And if I'm correct, Angela Vielma was the woman that had come jogging down the street when she saw David Temple pull into the garage?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is -- but let's back up for a second.

So, Roseanne -- Roxanne Martinez --
A. Roseanne Martinez.
Q. Roseanne Martinez. Is she on the State's witness list?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know if she was ever called to testify?
A. Oh, I can't remember.
Q. But she didn't say anything about Shaka having access to the garage. She just said that she was aware that Belinda was going to start keeping Shaka outside, right?
A. That she typically kept Shaka in the kitchen and it was a very protective dog.
Q. Do you recall any other interviews with Terri Schultz where she talks about -- scratch that.

Do you recall any witnesses -- any witness interviews that discussed the time that Belinda Temple would typically arrive home from work?
A. I don't remember. You asked me that at the beginning of the day and $I$ can't remember what they said.
Q. Okay. At this very moment, the name -- I think
it was Terri Schultz, and $I$ will check on that, but do you remember Terri Schultz saying that Belinda typically got home from school at about 3:40 in the afternoon?
A. I really don't remember.
Q. Okay. But can you agree with me if Belinda typically got home at 3:40 on the afternoon on just a regular workday, it would be very difficult for her to leave school, go to Kenneth Temple's home, and make it home by 3:45?
A. If she typically got home at 3:40?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Ask me the question again.
Q. So, if Belinda Temple is at school and she decides to go straight home from the high school, from the school where she worked to her home, she would arrive at 3:40 p.m. under normal circumstances?
A. To her home?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. On this particular day, though, she decided to go -- there was a diversion, right? She went to Mr. Temple's home. Can you and I agree that if she typically gets home at 3:40 under normal circumstances, with the added trip to Kenneth Temple's home, it would have been virtually impossible for her to make it home
by 3:45?
A. Well, it was a flying trip to Mr. Kenneth Temple's house. And I don't remember what everybody else said was the typical time she got home. Terri Schultz didn't live in the house with her and wasn't one of her girlfriends.
Q. Okay. But did you talk to any of her girlfriends that did tell you what time she typically got home?
A. I did. They all knew what time she usually left for school and what her procedure was and all of that, but $I$ don't remember what time they said she would have left school usually or gotten home usually. I can't remember.
Q. But -- you don't remember what time the girlfriends said she usually got home, but you know it wasn't 3:40?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Give me just one second. I misplaced my notepad. I'm looking for a particular offense report that is Bate's stamped 17. It's an interview with -- Terri Schultz is interviewed during that initial canvass by law enforcement. She tells them that 3:40 is the time that Belinda Temple typically gets home. Do you have any reason to dispute that,

Ms. Siegler?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay.

MR. CHIN: That was 17 --

MS. GOTRO: Bate's 17. 17 .

I apologize. There is a lot of paper up here.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) And do you remember off the top of your head what kind of car Belinda Temple drove at the time of her murder?
A. I do not.
Q. If I said it was a red Isuzu, would have you any reason to disagree with that?
A. Is that a car or an SUV?
Q. Isuzu? I'm going to go with one of those crossover things.
A. That sounds right.
Q. Okay. Ms. Siegler, I have been writing down just some summaries of evidence we have discussed. I will put my hands on that B17, but for right now I'll put an asterisk by it as far as Ms. Schultz saying that Belinda Temple typically got home around 3:40 every day.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm going to pass you what's been previously admitted as exactly that Bate's 17. And there is a
highlighted portion on there. Can you tell me if that confirms what we have been talking about (indicating)?
A. It is.
Q. Thank you, ma'am. I'm going to scratch out that asterisk.

Was -- and, again, Ms. Schultz isn't on the
State's witness list?
A. She is not.
Q. Okay. So, in an instance -- if a witness is not on the State's witness list, I guess I'm trying to figure out how it is that you know when Brady kicks in.
A. Well, a neighbor saying what time they think it took her to get home compared to the girlfriends and the teachers she worked with and her husband said what time she typically gets home, who knows best? That's the kind of the question.
Q. Okay. But Ms. Schultz living across the -Ms. Schultz living across the street from the Temples, can we assume that -- well, what time does she typically get home is the question she's asked by law enforcement. Can we assume that that's based on what her observations are on a daily basis of Belinda Temple arriving home?
A. Observations, not daily necessarily, yes.
Q. Okay. And so, did girlfriends -- the girlfriends -- did you give any names about who these
girlfriends were?
A. Well, the teachers that she worked with.
Q. Okay.
A. Who were also -- some of them were her girlfriends.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what those -- what those girlfriends -- what their names were specifically?
A. Yes. Debbie Berger, Margaret Christian.
Q. Okay. And did either of those two women tell you what time Belinda typically arrived home from work?
A. They would have told me about her routine typically. I don't remember what the times were.
Q. Okay. If I represented to you that as far as the time that Belinda typically arrived home from work that neither statement from either one of those women reveals what time Belinda Temple typically gets home from work, do you have any reason to dispute that?
A. No.
Q. And I'm sure if I'm wrong, Mr. Chin will clear that up on his cross. Was Debra Berger on the State's witness list?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember who cross-examined her?
A. Dick cross-examined everybody.
Q. I apologize. Do you remember who direct -- who
did the direct examination?
A. Me.
Q. All right. Do you remember what she -- what was used to refresh her memory before she testified, if anything?
A. If she gave a statement, she would have looked over her statement, but $I$ don't remember if she gave one or not.
Q. Ms. Berger?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Do you know how many times Ms. Berger was interviewed by law enforcement?
A. I do not.
Q. Did any one of the flags on those offense reports that you are looking at now, do those flags signify a witness' oral statement to law enforcement?
A. They might.
Q. Could you have a look at those flags and see if you see a pattern as far as when and where oral statements were made? I mean, I'm happy to show you what we've got, but if you've got them in your own work product, I think that's ideal.
A. I don't really have any work product. This is just the offense report with stickies on it. I didn't write anything on here that $I$ would call work product.

It's just on the same page.
Q. I think if you go through that offense report carefully, Ms. Siegler, you will probably find some offense reports and some handwritten notes on them with your handwriting specifically.
A. On the sticky pages?
Q. And on the offense report itself.
A. That's my writing?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay. Now, what's your question?
Q. Well, I had asked you about Debra Berger and who had examined her and whether or not you saw any oral statements up there. And specifically those flags, do you see any pattern or method to where those flags are placed? Do they reveal an oral statement made to law enforcement?
A. Sometimes, but not necessarily.
Q. I'm sorry. I didn't hear what you said.
A. Sometimes, but not necessarily.
(Pause)
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Okay. Could you --
A. Keep going?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay.
Q. Anything?
A. As far as?
Q. Your flags indicating where an oral statement from a witness might be made to a member of law enforcement.
A. I know that the flags indicate oral statements made by David Temple to law enforcement.
Q. Okay. Anybody other than David Temple?
A. I don't think so.
Q. All right. I'm going to hand you what's been marked as Bate's stamped 332 (indicating).
A. Okay.
Q. What is that exactly?
A. This is Mark Schmidt's supplement regarding Debbie Berger.
Q. Okay. And that supplement, when is it dated?
A. January 26 th, 2000 .
Q. In that supplement, is there a statement in there where Ms. Berger says she's got Joe Sanders in one of her classes?
A. Yes.
Q. And that he appeared to be genuinely upset over Belinda Temple's death?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was that information, the fact Ms. Berger saw Joe Sanders in that period of time,
whenever it was, that he appeared to be genuinely upset, was that information tendered to defense counsel?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Okay. Is there anything you can do or review that would make you clearer in your answers? Like any - - know that you had a manila folder file up here at one point that you were looking at. Is there anything that you can look at within the possession of the state that you could tell us determinately whether or not certain information was tendered to the defense?
A. Roll back time.
Q. Okay. We don't have that one with us.
A. No.
Q. So, this is just Bate's stamped 332?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was by Debbie Berger?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. All right. I'm going to hand you Bate's stamped 789 and 7 -- 1 can't really read these numbers and $I$ apologize. Beginning at 789 , it appears to be a voluntary statement of Ms. Debra Berger. Will you look at it and confirm for me (indicating)?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. If $I$ could ask you to flip to that last page of her statement.
A. Okay.
Q. Is it Detective Shipley that's questioning her?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. She's asked a question about Belinda ever complaining about her feet being swollen.
A. Yes.
Q. And what was Ms. Berger's response?
A. Belinda had complained about being tired a lot and had mentioned to me that she had not been eating that much for supper over the past few weeks. On either Friday or Monday, Belinda had mentioned that her hands were swollen because her rings were tight.
Q. Okay. Is there any statement in there about Belinda's feet being swollen?
A. About her feet being swollen?
Q. Yes, ma'am. And feel free to read the whole statement.
A. Not that $I$ see, no.
Q. Can $I$ have that Bate's stamped that begins that offense report?
A. 789.
Q. She said that Belinda had been complaining about being tired and what else?
A. Her fingers swelling and not eating much.
Q. Do you know -- and Debra Berger testified at
trial, right?
A. She did.
Q. Okay. And was that written statement tendered to Dick DeGuerin before -- or after Ms. Berger testified?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you remember any -- just right now sitting here, do you have any independent recollection of Ms. Berger's testimony at trial?
A. Just sitting here right now?
Q. Yeah.
A. No.
Q. Okay. If I told you that she testified about Belinda's feet being pretty swollen and having to prop her feet up in the office at trial, does that ring a bell at all?
A. Somebody said that. I don't remember which lady it was.
Q. Okay. And Ms. Berger's name is on the witness list, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Did I leave that offense report with you?
A. That's hers (indicating).
Q. Thank you, ma'am. And that was Detective Shipley that had
taken Ms. Berger's statement?
A. It seems to me like Tracy Shipley asked her some of these questions, but she's saying it past tense and now she's putting down in writing from what might be Detective Lampson because he is the one that signs it.
Q. Okay. Was it common for these investigators to work in tandem and then just one of them write a supplement?
A. Or as a team and only one write the supplement, or as a squad or a group, whatever you want to call it.
Q. Okay. And that's not -- that's common practice, fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, beginning at Bate's 789 when $I$ showed you that written statement, are you aware of any other written statement or recorded statement that Debra Berger gave?
A. Not that $I$ can think of right now.
Q. Do you have any specific recollection after Ms. Berger testified of written documents that you gave to the defense other than this one written statement?
A. No, but it would be in the record if I did.
Q. Okay. Yeah, I was just checking.
A. I don't think so.
Q. You remember the Ruggerios, don't you?
A. Yes.
Q. How would you pronounce their last name?
A. You said it right.
Q. Ruggerios?

Do you remember either one of the Ruggerios
describing when Belinda Temple would pull into the driveway, coming home from work, open the garage door, she'd have to toot the horn to get shaka to get out of the way?
A. Somebody said that. I don't remember if it was the Ruggerios or different neighbor or somebody else, but somebody did say that.
Q. Okay. So, when you were cross-examining Mr. Temple in the Temple trial, you said to him pretty harshly and repeatedly that nobody said anything about Shaka being in the garage until 2007 .
A. And $I$ was referring to this specific day and instance. Not generally speaking or habitually.
Q. Okay. The statement that $I--$ at least that we put up on the paper as far as who said Shaka did, in fact, have access to the garage, those statements weren't turned over to Dick DeGuerin?
A. Well, having access to the garage generally speaking is not the same thing as on this very day, during the most important time we can talk about, Shaka
being in the garage. I never knew that he was going to say that. How would I know that was exculpatory or inconsistent or anything or even important? I had never heard that before until David Temple took the witness stand. I can't see the future to know what to produce to the defense.
Q. When David took the witness stand, was he guessing at where the dog was or did he say definitively Shaka had -- what did he say? Do you remember?
A. He was lying about where the dog was. The dog was in the garage.
Q. That wasn't my question. My question was: Do you remember what he said?
A. Word-for-word, no, I don't.
Q. Okay. But am $I$ correct in saying that it doesn't matter, I mean you just assumed every word that came out his mouth was a lie anyway, right?
A. Actually, I did not. I thought he did a very good job testifying, much better than his family did.
Q. But you thought he was lying about where the dog was?
A. I thought he was lying about only three or four things, but they were very significant.
Q. Did you think he was lying about where the dog was?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Yes. Okay. Why?
A. Because he had to explain the fact that Shaka didn't bark. And if it was a random burglar or a random robber or a murderer who want Belinda Temple dead, how come that ferocious dog never barked a peep?
Q. Well, $I$ want to direct your attention back to Justin Valdez's statement where he says that, you know, once the dog got used to him, Shaka kind of settled down.
A. Right.
Q. Okay. I believe -- did we introduce an offense report about the special ed teacher with you, Ms. Siegler?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Okay.
A. Sosa.
Q. Sosa.

Can you find in your offense report the one that I showed you? It's going to be Bate's stamped 300 . And I know you're going to have to dig for it, but there is a note in what $I$ believe --
A. I saw it.
Q. Okay. What did it say?
A. That Mark Schmidt checked that out and there
was nothing to it. And it was on the page that you showed me earlier having to do with Sosa.

Do you have the page that $I$ wrote on or do you want me to keep looking for it?
Q. No, ma'am. I would like for you to keep working on it. Because you used some sort of shorthand that $I$ didn't quite understand.
A. I did.

THE WITNESS: Andrew, if y'all know the page that we're talking about, jump in here.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) I don't know that the Bate's page would even help you, Ms. Siegler, because yours don't coincide. It was right around 340 , but your copy of the offense report isn't Bate's stamped.
A. Does it look like I'm going in the right direction?
Q. Yes, ma'am. I would go deeper into it.
A. I'm going back to the front. Here. No, that's not it. I saw what you're talking about.

MR. CHIN: May I approach the witness and help her locate it? THE COURT: Yes, sir. (Pause)
A. I know what you're talking about if you want to do it from memory.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Well, it was in shorthand, Ms. Siegler.
A. Yes. And it said: Addressed by Mark Schmidt. And it had two lines drawn with an arrow. And it had a nothing sign. And that's what $I$ write down when $I$ mean "nothing."
Q. But there was another word. It was a word that I couldn't make out.
A. Okay. Let me see if $I$ can find it then. Wasn't it: Addressed by Mark Schmidt? No?
Q. We guessed it alone or about?
A. Tell me the whole context.
Q. It said: Mark Schmidt act alone about, above maybe .
A. I think it was Mark Schmidt addressed.
Q. Okay.
A. Do you know what we could do? We could -- do y'all know what we're talking about? It's a page -like it's typed and then it has my writing here that she's talking about, but $I$ don't know where in the pile it is.
Q. We can come back to that if you'd like to have the State help you look for it, Ms. Siegler.
A. Yeah.
Q. It sounds to me when it says: Mark Schmidt
above, does it sound like Mark was the person that followed up with that -- with Mr. Sosa?
A. Exactly. Yes. Exactly.
Q. Okay. And just so we can recap, Mr. Sosa basically contacted law enforcement and reported two things, right?
A. Say that again.
Q. Mr. Sosa, he contacted law enforcement and he reported two things. One was that the statement by Michael Grantom: If you put a pillow over the end of a shotgun it would muffle the sound.
A. Correct.
Q. And the other one was Cody Towner -- Cody Towner's admission that he had been at Riley Joe Sanders' the night of the homicide.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that shorthand symbol that you used, that would leave me to believe that Schmidt had been the one to follow up with Mr. Sosa.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you remember what the date of the report was?
A. Of the report or of the note that I made?
Q. Oh, of the report that you wrote on.
A. No. It's going to be on that page itself.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any other offense report where Schmidt documented his follow-up of --
A. Sosa?
Q. Yes.
A. I wouldn't remember that.
Q. Would you expect, if your handwritten note is that he followed up and there is nothing, that an offense report would exist, though; a supplement would exist?
A. If they had the time to write the supplement. We were doing a lot of things then. I don't know how much time they had to supplement everything.
Q. Would you expect to see some sort of supplement documenting Schmidt's contact with either Grantom or Towner to confirm or debunk this idea that either Grantom said that -- bad question.

Would you expect some sort of supplement documenting schmidt's efforts to corroborate those statements?
A. Not really. Because the way I read it, Mark Schmidt went to talk to Sosa and there was nothing to it. I don't remember why there was nothing to it. So, there wasn't any need to follow up any more.
Q. Okay. So, a teacher -- well, scratch that. We know from the evidence that Cody Towner
and Michael Grantom were near Belinda's home at the time she was killed.
A. Right.
Q. We also know from the evidence and the multiple statements --
A. Around the time she was killed because we don't -- you know, the whole window of when they got home. Remember, we talked about that yesterday?
Q. Right. So, around the time. That's fair enough. She was -- they were there around the time that she was killed?
A. Yes.
Q. We know from the evidence that one of the boy's parents drives a white four-door -- off-white, four-door car, right?
A. Oh, I don't remember that.
Q. You don't remember that? Mr. Ruggiero talking about being on a walk with Peggy Ruggiero and seeing this --
A. I remember him seeing a car. I don't remember who it belonged to.
Q. Well, I don't think you-all were able to determine who it belonged to.
A. I don't think we were either.
Q. But the physical description given by

Mr. Ruggerios was that it was two late teen, early 20 boys.
A. Something like that, yeah.
Q. With a cream colored or off-white colored four-door sedan?
A. Something like that, yeah.
Q. With some bondo on the back of it.
A. Yes.
Q. But law enforcement was never able to determine who that was?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Ruggiero reported seeing that car speed away right around 4:30 p.m. Does that sound right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you agree with me that it was the defensive theory that Belinda Temple was killed somewhere around 4:30 p.m.?
A. I don't remember exactly what time the theory was. I just know that we were in disagreement over the time.
Q. Okay. Do you remember the Roberts boys?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. The Roberts boys, just to refresh, were the three young boys that lived behind the Temple home and had heard what they believed to be a shotgun, yes?
A. One of them did.
Q. Right.

Well, they heard -- everyone heard a noise.

I think one of them characterized it -- one or two of them characterized it as a shotgun.
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And that would have been around 4:30 in the afternoon.
A. Well, that was also up in the air. No one could say for sure.
Q. What was the state -- what was your opinion on what time they heard what they say they heard?
A. We have no idea because they were ages -- what was it -- six, seven, and eight; four, six and eight. The only way to try to figure out the time was to estimate that those little boys knew exactly what time the school bus dropped them off, if they had a snack, if they did their homework, when they put in the Dr. Doolittle movie, and where it was in the movie they heard the pop watching the movie. And there was just no way of knowing.
Q. But can you and I agree that it was the defensive theory that that pop was, in fact, the shot that killed Belinda Temple?
A. That was one of the theories, yes.
Q. Okay. One of the theories.

And if we employ that defensive theory, it certainly fits with the defensive theory that Michael Grantom and Cody Towner are the two boys that are speeding away from the Temple home?
A. If the times work, yes.
Q. Okay. If the times work.

So, you've got Mr. Sosa reporting that Cody Towner and Michael Grantom are -- don't you think it's a pretty inflammatory statement, that piece about putting a pillow over the end of a shotgun.
A. There is no evidence that a pillow was used when the shotgun was fired at Belinda Temple's head. I don't know why all of a sudden the pillow is important. We didn't have a pillow in our case.
Q. That wasn't my question.
A. Well, that was my answer. I don't think it's important.
Q. My question is: Don't you think it's -- don't you think it's odd that this kid is making this statement at the time he is making the statement, given the fact that Belinda Temple has just been shot in the back of the head with a shotgun?
A. Everybody in Katy was talking about the case. And most of the people in Katy had bad information. The
fact that one more kid that went to the high school where she thought said something about how he heard it happened, $I$ do not think is important, no.
Q. I don't believe Michael Grantom said that's how he heard it happened. I believe what Mr. Sosa reported to law enforcement was -- and, again, we haven't seen the offense report, so $I$ don't know what the follow-up was, but $I$ believe what Mr. Sosa reported is he's got these two boys in his class, one of them says: I was at Riley Joe's house the night Belinda Temple was murdered. And the other one says: If you put a pillow over the end of a shotgun, it will muffle the sound of the shot.
A. That makes it even less important.
Q. To you that type of statement is less important?
A. Yes.
Q. Why?
A. Did you say "wow" or "why"?
Q. I said: Why?
A. Why?
Q. Yes. That's my Cajun. I'm sorry.
A. No.
Q. Why?
A. Because everybody in Katy was talking about this case and most of the information they all had was
incorrect. And the fact that yet another teenage boy makes some statement about how a shotgun sound, gets transmitted or not in the days that follow has nothing to do with the facts of the case.
Q. Yeah, but all of these people that were talking about this murder, they actually weren't anywhere near the scene of the crime at the time it happened, though, were they?
A. I guarantee the whole town of Katy knew she was killed with a shotgun.
Q. That wasn't my question, Ms. Siegler.
A. That was my answer.
Q. Come on. Come on. The whole town of Katy wasn't there, but the truth of matter is, Ms. Siegler -come on --
A. The whole town of Katy knows everything about this murder.
Q. Ms. Siegler, you know you have evidence, you have independent evidence out of those boys' mouth that put him -- put both of them right there in the house next to where Belinda Temple was murdered. You had that evidence.
A. On the day it happened. Not necessarily at the very time it happened.
Q. Okay. What's your --

MS. GOTRO: Thank you, Andrew.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) What's your understanding of -no. You told us that your theory was that it happened at 4:00 p.m., right?
A. Say it again. I'm sorry.
Q. Your theory was that Belinda Temple was murdered at 4:00 p.m., right?
A. Around 4:00 p.m.
Q. Around 4:00 p.m.

Okay. Do you not have statements from the Katy boys putting each of them in that neighborhood near that house with opportunity to commit that murder?
A. They were in the neighborhood that afternoon. Whether they were at the store or at that friend's house where they tried to buy more marijuana or where they were at the exact time she was murdered, we could never establish that.
Q. And that's because you couldn't get a straight story out of them, could you?
A. No. Because teenaged boys don't know exactly where they are at any given time and they sure don't how to compare it to what was happening inside the Temple house next door, if they were even next door. It's impossible to figure that out definitively. We tried.
Q. Okay. So that I'm clear, you're telling us that teenaged boys don't know where they're at when they're there? Is that what you just said?
A. Well, that's kind of general, but I'm not going to argue with you.
Q. No. I'm not arguing with you. I just want to make sure $I$ understand your statement. Because what I said was that law enforcement wasn't able to get a consistent story between these kids, right?
A. It was pretty consistent. They just didn't know what time they were doing everything. They didn't watch a clock. They weren't documenting it. But where they all went and who they were with and what they did was pretty darn consistent.
Q. So, it's okay for these teenaged boys not to watch a clock, but you expect David Temple to have his eyeballs on a clock every minute of the day, don't you?
A. Heck, yeah, because he's trying to alibi himself. He knew exactly what he was doing.
Q. And you decided that, right, because he's trying to alibi himself and those Katy boys are just Katy boys, right, don't know where they're at, just getting high, yeah?
A. That's not what $I$ said, but I'm not going to argue with you.
Q. So, you say there is no significant difference between the Katy boys' statements, right?
A. Between what each of them had to say that afternoon about what they did?
Q. Yeah.
A. Not really, no.
Q. Okay. Well, the little differences that there were, what were they?
A. Maybe one remembered Riley Joe eating chilli and the other one didn't. Maybe one said the guy that they went to buy dope from didn't have change and the other one said: I'm not going to sell it to you because you don't have enough money. Who rode shotgun when they left the house. How they drove the route home to get back to Riley Joe's house, when he fell asleep and when they left. Those little things like that might be inconsistencies.
Q. Well, now isn't the truth in the details, Ms. Siegler?
A. Sure is.
Q. And isn't that where you typically trip suspects up, is those little-bitty details?
A. Yeah, suspects that know the details. Teenaged boys that happened to be next door that have nothing to do with what's going on aren't going to remember the
details.
Q. That's why you separate co-defendants, right?

And that's why law enforcement separates co-defendants?
A. When they interview them?
Q. Right.
A. Yes.
Q. Because they can't get those little-bitty details, right, unless they're sitting in front of each other, can they?
A. Well, it would depend, but generally speaking I agree with you.
Q. They can't get the details straight because that's where the truth is, isn't it?
A. So, you think the Katy boys are smart enough to conspire and try and figure all of this out themselves?
Q. I make no opinion about their enlightenment, Ms. Siegler.
A. Just their guilt.
Q. I make no opinion about that either, but $I$ have some opinions about your investigation of those Katy boys.
A. I can't figure that out.
Q. Did you ever see more than one interview of Randall Hess?
A. I don't remember if there was more than one.
Q. Okay. Did you ever see -- there wasn't. Did you ever see more than one interview of Cody Ellis' father?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did you ever see more than one interview of Cody Ellis?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times was he interviewed?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Did he ever give a straight story?
A. Their stories were pretty consistent.
Q. No. Cody Ellis. The two different stories that he told, were those two stories consistent?
A. I don't remember enough to tell you.
Q. Okay. Then nine different statements that Riley Joe Sanders made out of his own mouth, were those consistent?
A. In my opinion, they were pretty darn consistent. You can pick them apart all you want to. It's still my opinion they were pretty consistent.
Q. So, the first person that he tells -- the first statement that Mr. Sanders gives is that he was in school and he didn't see anything. Do you remember that?
A. Say that again now.
Q. The first statement that Mr. Sanders gives is that he was in school and that he didn't see anything.
A. No. He said he was in school part of the day. Let's not make the whole day. That's what you just tried to do with your question. And at the time that he thinks it might have happen, he didn't see or hear anything.
Q. Please find that offense report for me where Riley Joe Sanders says what you just said, Ms. Siegler.
A. You have it easier than I do.
Q. No, actually I don't. I've never seen those words come out that kid's mouth. And so, if you've got an offense report that $I$ don't --
A. That's how I remember reading it.
Q. Ma'am?
A. That's how I remember reading it. But isn't
the relevant question here that Riley Joe Sanders testified at trial?
Q. That's not my question.
A. It ought to be.
Q. We're still pretrial, Ms. Siegler. We're still pretrial. We'll get to trial, I promise.
A. Here's the page you were looking for.
Q. Which one?
A. The Mark Schmidt page.
Q. What's the Mark Schmidt page? I'm sorry.
A. The one $I$ was looking for with my handwritten note on it earlier.
Q. Oh, yes, yes. May I see that, please?
A. Yes.

MR. CHIN: May I approach to view, Judge?

THE COURT: Certainly.
MR. CHIN: Thank, you, sir.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Okay. And so, the offense report that we're referring to with Ms. Siegler's handwritten note, it's on February 4th, 1999, 8:00 p.m., Mr. Sosa, the special ed teacher, Detective Schmidt phones him back. Cody Towner told Mr. Sosa he was in Sanders' home the night of the homicide. Excuse me. Cody Towner told Mr. Sosa he was in Sanders' home the night of the homicide along with Michael Grantom?
A. Okay. It doesn't mean when the murder happened. It could have been before, it could have been after. They were over there that day. That's not in dispute.
Q. I suppose we could quibble over those semantics, but --
A. That's the way I read it.
Q. At least one interpretation would be that they were inside Riley Joe's house the night that Belinda was
murdered.
A. I read it that they were over at the house the night the murder happened because it was a big event in their life. Belinda Temple gets murdered and that's the same day they were right next door. The same day they were right next door.
Q. I'm sorry. Tell me that again. You believe that means what, that they were just next door?
A. They were in Riley Joe's house next door to Belinda Temple that day, that same day at some point. It could have been during, it could have been before, it could have been afterwards.
Q. I guess that is an interpretation of it. And, again, we don't have a follow-up report to this, do we?
A. No. It kind of speaks for itself.
Q. Well, that's your opinion, right, this speaks for itself?
A. Is there a supplements that Mark Schmidt made to that? No.
Q. Okay. And you know that for a fact?
A. No, I don't.
Q. All right. But this document right here speaks for itself in your opinion?
A. I think so.
Q. Two boys in the same neighborhood near the
house where Belinda Temple is shot fitting the description of the car that's speeding away at the time the defense is saying Belinda Temple was murdered. And there is absolutely no follow-up or at least documented follow-up from the sheriff's department, and that's okay with you?
A. How did you make the jump to it was the car?
Q. I said fit the description.
A. And how did you make that jump?
Q. It wasn't a jump, Ms. Siegler.
A. Who says that?
Q. Read your offense reports.
A. Mr. Ruggiero remembers seeing a car speeding away. He --
Q. He described that car -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry. THE COURT: One at a time, please.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) If you'd go through your offense report, if you review Steve Clappart's investigation as he was attempting to verify Glasscock's statement, it -well --
A. So, it's Clappart that says the car was consistent. Well...
Q. Right. And Clappart is worthless, too, isn't he?
A. In this investigation, pretty much.
Q. Right. Clappart's worthless. You said Denholm was worthless.
A. I did not say that. I said the questions he asked that day we tried to do a mock cross-examination were questions that no lawyer would ever ask. And he was supposed to be playing Dick DeGuerin. So, that turned out to be a joke.
Q. You know that Mr . Denholm has given his opinion that David Temple is innocent?
A. I have heard that.
Q. Okay.
A. He never said that to me.
Q. So, do you know if Detective Schmidt ever spoke with Mr. Grantom or Mr. Towner about these two -- about these statements made to this special ed teacher?
A. I don't know for sure. I don't think he did.
Q. But it's not something you would have encouraged him to do, right?
A. Not really.
Q. Because it's insignificant, in your mind any way, right?
A. I don't think that one teenaged boy talking about a shotgun being muffled by a pillow, when our case has nothing do with a pillow, or another teenaged boy talking about being over at the house on the same day it
happened next door is significant, no.
Q. Is that because you had already decided that David Temple was guilty?
A. It's because of all of the information and all of the evidence and all the witnesses had to say.
Q. Right.

MS. GOTRO: Your Honor, may I request that
the State copy this so that we can make it part of the record? I don't want to take the original from you, but would I like a copy to be made part of the record.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. GOTRO: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Andrew, does this go back like this (indicating)?

MR. SMITH: Yeah.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) All right. I'd like to back up for just a second. You told us that you thought that the statements that Riley Joe Sanders had given, both his oral and written statements, were basically the same?
A. Basically consistent.
Q. Okay. You didn't see any glaring differences between his statements?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I have organized some documents for us,

Ms. Siegler. And just so that we're clear, you did call Riley Joe Sanders to the stand as a rebuttal witness, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you remember receiving a letter from Dick DeGuerin on the 13 th of November requesting Riley Joe's previous statements and Grand Jury testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I apologize. I'm -- I apologize for not remembering this. Did you give him those things after Riley Joe testified?
A. Yes.
Q. Including the Grand Jury testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. The reports that $I$ give you are going to be Bate's stamped, Ms. Siegler. And if you could start off by letting me know what the Bate's stamp is.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Here you go (indicating).

What's the Bate's stamp on that
supplement offense report?
A. 379 and 380 .
Q. 379 to 380?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And who authored that supplement?
A. Mark Schmidt.
Q. And what's the date?
A. April 13th, '99.
Q. Do you know offhand the date that Riley Joe Sanders testified before the Grand Jury?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Will you take a minute to look through that statement?
A. (Witness complies).

Okay.
Q. Does Riley Joe Sanders give a statement in that document?
A. Well, he talks to Heather Mesker, who is the one being interviewed in this supplement.
Q. Okay. And what does Heather -- what information do we learn about Riley Joe Sanders in that report?
A. The supplement by Mark Schmidt documents that he spoke to Heather Mesker, who tells Mark Schmidt that she was an ag teacher at Katy High School. She knew Belinda because they went through orientation together. She grew up in Katy. She knew Kevin and Rebecca Temple. She had socialized with Belinda. Belinda and Becky both came to her baby shower.
Q. Ms. Siegler --
A. She had Joe Sanders --
Q. Okay. Yeah. I was going to say we can skip right to Riley Joe.
A. She had Joe Sanders during the fall in one class and now she has him in two classes, ag and study hall. She described Joe as, in quotes: Not a terrible kid. I think he just craves attention. She says Belinda has never spoken badly of her in-laws or her husband, but that does not surprise her. That's how she knew Belinda. Belinda had never said anything derogatory about Joe Sanders. She only knew that Joe was her neighbor because she said in class one day she had to send Ms. Temple a note and she asked the class who knew where her class was and Joe said he did, she is his neighbor. She said that Joe told her about the incident one day while he was in study hall. He had asked to use the phone. She overheard him saying he did not want to go. After he got off the phone, she asked him what the call was about. He told her he had taken two polygraphs and they were wanting him to take a third. He told her he was not at home. He had skipped seventh period with a buddy and they had left to go get cigarettes. He had told her he was gone at the time this happened.
Q. Okay. So, this Ms. Mesker, I guess that Riley

Joe is speaking with her sometime between the second and third polygraph exam?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that about right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you to just hold on to that document.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm going to hand you Bate's 51. Is the date of that offense report -- that supplemental offense report January 11th?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. And who authored the offense report?
A. Tracy Shipley.
Q. Give me the Bate's again. I'm sorry.
A. The first page is 51. And 52. And then do you think this is -- is that supposed to be 53 right behind it?
Q. The numbers are sort of squiggly. It starts a new document. I think that looks like 80. Just go with the first two pages.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay.
A. So, this is Tracy Shipley's offense report.
Q. Okay. Do you see where Tracy Shipley speaks
with Riley Joe Sanders in that report?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what does Riley Joe Sanders tell

Tracy Shipley on the first of -- on the 11th of January?
A. Their son Joe stated he went to school today.

And when he came, he did not see anything either.
Q. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. Say it again.
A. Their son Joe stated he went to school today.

And when he came, he did not see anything either.
Q. Typo? Is that what that sounds like, a typo?
A. No. It sounds like exactly what $I$ said he said awhile ago.
Q. That when he came, he didn't see what?
A. He didn't see anything either.
Q. When he came where?
A. Home.
Q. Okay. But "home" is not written in the offense report, right?
A. It is not.
Q. Okay. So, I was just observing that it might have been a typo by the officer writing it.
A. Okay.
Q. Yes?

Okay. So, give us your interpretation of that statement, Ms. Siegler.
A. That Joe Sanders says on this particular day he did go to school. And when he got home that day, he didn't see anything.
Q. Do you take that to mean that he had gone to school all day?
A. I do not.
Q. What do you take that to mean?
A. Just what I said, he went to school that day at some point. It doesn't mean he went to school all day. That's your interpretation.
Q. Okay. So, it doesn't mean he went to school on time, does it?
A. He simply said he went to school that day.
Q. I'm asking you your interpretation of that statement.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay? Does that statement to you mean that he went to school at his usual time?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. Okay. That he got off at the usual time?
A. Same answer.
Q. Not necessarily?
A. Correct.
Q. So, the only thing that statement tells you is that at some point he was at that school and at point he
saw nothing?
A. When he got home, he saw nothing.
Q. Okay. So, school at some point, home at some point, and he saw nothing?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you recall from the offense report Riley Joe Sanders making a statement to the cameras that were outside after the Belinda had been shot?
A. I don't think it was in the offense report. I think I saw the interview somehow, somewhere.
Q. Okay. So, you saw the actual interview?
A. I think so.
Q. Do you remember what it said?
A. Yeah. He said he was at school all day, he said something about school, when he wasn't really there all day, and that's what lead to him getting into the middle of all this.
Q. Okay. I will trade you.
A. You want both of these?
Q. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Bate's stamped 74, January 12 th. Who wrote
that offense report?
A. Steve Wichkoski.
Q. Wichkoski?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Now, real quick, was Tracy Shipley -did she testify?
A. She did.
Q. Okay. And Wichkoski, did he testify?
A. He was out here a lot of days in the hall waiting. I think he did.
Q. All right. Now, with respect to Riley Joe's whereabouts on the day that Belinda Temple was murdered, what does Detective Wichkoski document?
A. Which part do you want me to read, or just say it to you?
Q. You can tell us what -- where was Riley Joe that day? What statement did he give to Wichkoski?
A. Wichkoski's paragraph about Joe Sanders says: This investigator got in the back seat of the Chevy Lumina with Joe. I told him that the reason that I wanted to speak with him is because he was on television saying he was in school on the day of the murder, when, in fact, he was skipping. I then asked Joe if he could tell me anything about what happened on Monday, January 11th. Joe advised me that the reason he said he was in school is because he didn't want his father to know he was skipping school. I asked Joe if he was home all day, and if so if he remembered anything out of the ordinary that may have happened next door. Joe told me
that he was not home all day and that nothing out of the ordinary happened. After telling me this, I told Joe that I needed to call his parents. I advised Joe that I wanted to tell them that $I$ spoke with you. And then he and Paige leave.
Q. Okay. So, it's Wichkoski and Paige that are interviewing him?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And just so that I'm clear, Riley Joe Sanders says: I wasn't at school all day -- say that piece again.
A. I asked Joe if he was home all day, and if so if he remembered anything out of the ordinary that may have happened next door. Joe told me that he was not home all day and that nothing out of the ordinary happened.
Q. And how do you interpret that statement, Ms. Siegler? What does that mean to you?
A. Consistently with what he said earlier, he went to school and he was also at home part of the day. And when he got home, nothing out of the ordinary happened.
Q. Well, now let me ask you something. At the beginning of that report, the detective says he's in the back seat of the cop car with him because he said: You lied, you skipped school yesterday, and we heard you on
camera saying you had been at school all day. Do you know the cops found out he lied?
A. They saw the news and somebody else told him that wasn't at school that day.
Q. How about does it sounds familiar if $I$ tell you that Lampson and Shipley and Hernandez and a lot of the folks working for the sheriff's department went up to the school, and the first thing they did was to see who was missing that day, who hadn't been in school on that particular day?
A. Right. But they did that because somebody else saw Riley Joe on the news saying he was at school and they knew he wasn't. So, some other little piece of the story happened before they went looking for who was missing at school.
Q. Okay. I'm going to ask if during the break you find that for me in an offense report because I don't remember seeing that. Can you agree to do that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. They came up with three names of folks that were missing from school at the time Belinda Temple was killed. Do you know who that was?
A. What time are we talking about? When was seventh period?
Q. It would have been the time that this officer
right here requested the information from the campus.
A. Well, but $I$ don't know that we're in agreement that the time that they skipped school is the same time we think the murder happened. I don't remember when seventh period was.
Q. Can we make -- can you and I agree that when the officers went up to the school, they asked who missed school at a particular time?
A. Yeah, but your question said they skipped school when -- the time the murder happened. That was your question.
Q. I have a different question. I have a different question.
A. Okay.
Q. Can you and I agree that the cops -- that the officers of the sheriff's department that were investigating this maybe knew what they were doing?
A. Yeah.
Q. You think so?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And so, if they request records to find out when student were absent, do you think they've got a pretty good reason for asking for that?
A. Yeah. And if they missed school, it might have amounted to something, but just because you miss seventh
period doesn't mean it's the time the period happened.
Q. Fair enough. But you and I can agree the timeframe that these cops would have asked for was at least relevant in their minds?
A. Sure. They wanted to see who was skipping school that day.
Q. Okay. And they came up with three names, right?
A. I don't remember the three names. I know Riley Joe Sanders was skipping school that day.
Q. And so was Cody Ellis?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And so, what that tells the police is that Riley Joe Sanders had lied on B 51, on the first statement?
A. And to the newsman.
Q. Right. And that's actually what Wichkoski says in the report you just read?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. That you lied and so I'm back, what happened.
A. Correct.
Q. But you perceive these two statements to be the same?
A. I think they're consistent.
Q. All right. Who else was at the house that day when the cops showed up? Can you tell us from that offense report?
A. Joe Sanders, Travis Millner, Cody Towner, Andres Aguilar, Michael Touring.
Q. Okay. Is there any indication that Cody Towner was interviewed, on that day anyway?
A. It doesn't look like on that day, no.
Q. Okay. And if $I$ can back up for a second. Ms. Siegler, if I told you that neither Wichkoski or Paige testified, do you have any reason to disagree with that?
A. I know for sure Paige didn't testify, but $I$ sure thought Wichkoski did because I thought that Dick put him on the stand.
Q. You thought Dick put him on the stand?
A. Yeah. It was about the Roberts' boys. I know he was down here because Dick wanted him down here. I didn't put him on the stand.
Q. I may not have the right record, but according to mine Wichkoski did not testify.
A. Well, that's I mean. Dick had him on standby out in the hall, but he might not have put him on the stand. I know I didn't.
Q. Okay. So, then we're in agreement, neither one
of those two officers testified?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. I'm going to move to January 25 th, 1999, Page 214 Bate's stamped.
A. Okay.

MR. CHIN: You said 214, ma'am?

MS. GOTRO: Yes.

MR. CHIN: Thank you.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Who authored that
supplemental report?
A. Ramon Hernandez.
Q. If you could look over that report and I'm going to ask you some questions about a statement, an oral statement Riley Joe Sanders gives to Ramon Hernandez.
A. Okay. I'm looking at that paragraph.
Q. All right. How did Riley Joe come to be interviewed by Mr. Hernandez, by Ramon Hernandez?
A. At his house, at Riley Joe's house.
Q. All right.
A. On January 25th.
Q. Okay. And what did Riley Joe tell

Mr. Hernandez -- or Officer Hernandez?
A. Sanders advised me -- that's going to be Hernandez -- that after school he drove Cody Ellis home
at about 3:20 and then he drove home to his house where he made himself something to eat. Michael Grantom arrived at his residence shortly after about 3:30 hours. Michael Grantom had asked him for some marijuana, but he did not have any. Riley then told Michael Grantom to take Joe to Randy Hess' house down the street to get some marijuana. Michael Grantom told Riley Joe he did not have any money. So then they went to Randy Hess' house in Michael Grantom's car along with Cody Towner where Randy told them he did not have any marijuana. Riley Joe, Michael Grantom, and Cody Towner then left Randy Hess' house. Cody Towner had gotten into Michael Grantom's car in the front passenger side and called out "shotgun," which means he had the right to the front passenger seat. Riley Sanders said he did not want to sit in the back seat and walked back to his house instead. Michael Grantom drove his car back to Riley Joe's residence and sat on the back trunk of his car as it was parked directly in front of Joe's house on the street. At about 4:30 to 4:40 Michael Grantom, Riley Joe, and Cody Towner drove to a convenience store to buy cigarettes, and Michael Grantom then drove Riley Sanders back to his residence and dropped him off. Riley Sanders then stated he went into his residence and fell asleep on the couch until about 5:30 when his dad came
home and woke him up. This is when his dad told him about the commotion going on next door at Belinda Temple's house.
Q. Okay. And then so from that statement, what happened between 4:30 and 4:40?
A. At about 4:30 to 4:40 Michael Grantom, Riley Joe, and Cody Towner drove to a convenience store to buy cigarettes, and Michael Grantom then drove Riley back to his residence and dropped him off.
Q. Okay. And then can we conclude -- is that all the statement says?
A. And then it ends with: Riley Joe stated he went into his residence and fell asleep on the couch until about 5:30 when his dad came home and woke him up. And that's when they hear about the commotion next door.
Q. Okay. We know that 911 wasn't called until like 5:38?
A. Yes.
Q. So, Dad might have been home for a couple of minutes before he came out and got him, before the commotion started, I guess?
A. Before he -- okay.
Q. Is that right?
A. Before he went in and got him?
Q. No. I'm sorry. Dad might have been home a few
minutes before the commotion started next door?
A. Got you. Yes.
Q. Is there any discussion in that offense report about whose car Michael Grantom was driving?
A. Michael Grantom's car.
Q. Is there any description of the car?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you Bate's -- I don't know -- it looks like 8 -- 089 . Does that look like a Bate's 089 (indicating) ?
A. Or 88, yes.
Q. Who authored that offense report?
A. Shelly Gonzalez.
Q. And what's the date?
A. January 12th. She says '98, but it's probably ' 99.
Q. January the -- I'm sorry. What?
A. The 12 th.
Q. January $12 t h . \quad A n d$ I'm sorry, who wrote it?
A. Shelly Gonzalez.
Q. Okay. Is there an oral statement there from Riley Joe Sanders?
A. Yes.

MR. CHIN: You said 889, Kelly?

THE WITNESS: Well, she says in the body

January 12th of '98, but up here it says '99.
MR. CHIN: You said --

THE WITNESS: Oh, the Bate's stamp. I'm sorry.

MR. CHIN: Thank you.
A. I do see it.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Is Gonzalez on your witness
list?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. Okay. And then what does Riley Joe Sanders tell Gonzalez?
A. Joe said his neighbor across the street told him -- that's Joe -- that he heard a backfire. Joe also stated that his lunch period begins at 11:13 a.m. He went home for lunch and claims to have seen what he thought to be a utility person in the neighborhood. He said the person was a black male holding a pole shaped like a "T" like the ones used to open the water meter box. Joe has knowledge of the Chow dog at the victim's residence.
Q. Okay. Was Joe asked anything else about the Chow dog at the victim's residence?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. Does he make any statement about how mean and vicious the Chow dog is?
A. Not in this statement.
Q. Okay. What does that mean to you, Joe has knowledge about the Chow dog?
A. He knows about the dog, but they didn't ask him any follow-up questions or they didn't bother putting his answers here.
Q. Any idea why law enforcement would do that?
A. Well, Shelly Gonzalez was a deputy in the Youth Violent Offender Unit, so she didn't have a lot of experience.
Q. Okay. But can we agree that normal practice might be to get some details about what kind of knowledge you have about the dog?
A. She's not a detective. She's not an investigator.
Q. My question is: Isn't the better practice to document details?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Joe has knowledge about the dog. So --
A. Joe has knowledge of a Chow dog at the victim's residence.
Q. Anything else that -- anything else that Gonzalez reports?
A. No.
Q. So, is this the first time we find out that he's skipped school in the offense report that we've just read?
A. Well, he doesn't really say he skipped school here. He says that his lunch period begins at 11:13, he went home for lunch, and then he goes on to say he saw the utility guy, the meter reader, who we did find.
Q. Were you allowed to leave lunch for school?
A. Yeah. A lot of high schools let you leave for lunch. My daughter did.
Q. Did they find out if Riley Joe Sanders was allowed to leave school for lunch?
A. I just assumed that he was. I don't know for sure.
Q. Okay. You just assumed he was okay to leave at lunch.

Does he tell us where he goes for lunch?
A. He went home for lunch.
Q. All right. Did he -- does he see anybody?
A. The utilities person.
Q. Who takes him home?
A. It doesn't say.
Q. It doesn't say who took him home?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And that would have been on the $12 t h$,

1999, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Are there any other statements from Riley Joe Sanders in that offense report?
A. Not this one, no.
Q. Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

I'm going to hand you what is Bate's -- I
think you did that one already.
A. Y'all need to get a better Bate's machine.
Q. It's the State's.
A. Y'all need to get a better Bate's machine.
Q. That sounds like it's got donation written on it, Ms. Siegler.
A. Yeah.
Q. Give me just one second, please.

Now, you have told us that you are familiar
with some written statements that Riley Joe Sanders provided.
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Were there any other oral statements given to law enforcement other than the ones that you see up here?
A. No, ma'am.

MS. GOTRO: May we approach, Judge?

THE COURT: Sure. (At the Bench, outside the hearing of the audience)

MS. GOTRO: May we take a break, Judge?
THE COURT: How long? Ten minutes?
MS. GOTRO: Ten minutes.
(Open court, defendant present)
THE COURT: Court will be in recess for 15 minutes.
(Recess)
(Open court, defendant present)
THE COURT: You may proceed.
MS. GOTRO: Thank, you, sir.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Ms. Siegler, I want to back up to the January 25 th offense report. That's Bate's 215, Deputy Hernandez's contact with Riley Joe Sanders. When he went to Sanders' home on the 25 th, it's true that Michael Grantom and Cody Ellis were also there, right?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Okay. Detective Lampson had participated, I guess, in part of this interview process with Detective Hernandez. Does that sound about right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, in that same offense report they speak -- I don't know which detective, but some detective speaks with Michael Grantom, does he not?
A. Correct.
Q. And what does Michael Grantom tell us? What does he -- how did he spend his day?
A. What, Michael Grantom?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Michael Grantom told us that he had gone over to Riley Joe Sanders' home about 3:30 and stayed there until about 4:30. He does not recall hearing any noises on the day that Belinda Temple was killed.
Q. Okay. And then just for -- to be clear, this is listed in military and you translated it to --
A. Yes, because $I$ hate military time. Sorry.
Q. Me, too.

$$
\text { So, on 1-25 from -- was it } 3: 30 \text { to } 4: 30 ?
$$

A. Correct.
Q. He states he goes over to Riley Joe Sanders'
house --
A. Yes.
Q. -- stays there --
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad-\quad$ leaves and hears nothing?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you read to us what Riley Joe Sanders had said. Does Riley Joe Sanders report essentially the same thing in your opinion?
A. As?
Q. As what Mr. Grantom did, that from 3:30 to 4:30 he goes over to Riley Joe Sanders, he hangs out, he hears nothing, he leaves.
A. Well, Riley Joe Sanders mentions going to some other places. I'm trying to see if Grantom went. And, yeah, and Grantom went with him, but Grantom doesn't talk about going to those places probably because they were going to buy dope.
Q. The drive to the convenience store Michael Grantom doesn't mention, does he?
A. He does not.
Q. Okay. Cody Ellis is also there, isn't he?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us what time Cody -- does Cody Ellis talk to any police officers?
A. There is one sentence that says: Cody Ellis stated that he was at home when Belinda was killed. Riley dropped him off at home after school was out about 3:22.
Q. Okay. So, 3:22 Cody Ellis is at home having been dropped off by Riley Joe Sanders.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Does Mr. Grantom explain how he got over to Riley Joe's house?
A. Over to Riley's house? Let's see. He doesn't say exactly, but we do know that we have Michael Grantom's car there. Is that what you asked me?
Q. Oh, is there a description of Michael Grantom's car?
A. No, no, no. We just know his car is in the mix.
Q. Okay. But there is no description of the car?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to backtrack. I had forgotten that those kids were there. Thank you.

Oh, Detective Leithner. On February 1st, are you aware of an interview that Detective Leithner did with Riley Joe Sanders?
A. I don't remember the date. Were you looking -you set these aside to go through next.
Q. Ma'am?
A. You set those aside to go through next.
Q. Let me make sure this is -- so it Bate's stamped 1939. Bate's stamped 1939. Who authored that offense report?
A. Chuck Leithner.
Q. And the date is 2-1-99?
A. Correct.
Q. And we know Leithner testified, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, he goes, at some point, to speak with Riley Joe Sanders. Why is he going to re-interview Riley Joe Sanders, can you tell?
A. I don't want to get these out of order here. Can you come and make sure I didn't get these out order? The little clippy fell off.
Q. I'm sorry. I --
A. This was the front page, right?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. We turned to this (indicating)?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. That's what I needed. Okay.
Q. That works?
A. So, you asked me what again?
Q. So, Leithner goes to interview Riley Joe Sanders at some point. What was the -- why was he going to re-interview him?
A. Well, I see that he summarizes Schmidt's interview of Riley Joe and then he summarizes Wichkoski interviewing Riley Joe. I'm trying to see where Leithner interviewed Riley Joe. Okay. Here it is.

Now, what did you ask me?
Q. Okay. Is there a particular reason? Because
if we look up at the notes that $I$ have been taking on all of these interviews, this is going to make for the -- one, two, three -- fourth time, fifth time he's going to be interviewed, fifth time he's being interviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was there a particular reason? Was Leitner or Schmidt or anyone instructed by anyone else to go and re-interview these kids?
A. I don't know. I wasn't handling the case back then.
Q. No. I meant documented in the offense report, Ms. Siegler.
A. That somebody told them to go do it? It's not in here, no.
Q. Okay. Are you able to determine who spoke with Riley Joe?
A. This says that right after wichkoski got through interviewing Riley Joe, Leithner says he wants to talk to Riley Joe, and then he does.
Q. Okay. So, then we have two statements coming out of that particular day; is that right?
A. Well, plus Mark Schmidt's summary makes three, but that's just a summary of somebody else's interview.
Q. Do you know who Schmidt -- do you know who

Schmidt is summarizing?
A. No. Leithner summarizing Schmidt.
Q. Okay. So, first interview, who conducted it?
A. In this document, the first thing that we have is Chuck Leithner summarizing an interview that Mark Schmidt did of Riley Joe Sanders. And then we have him going into the fact that Wichkoski was interviewing Riley Sanders. And now we're to Chuck Leithner himself wanting to interview Riley Joe Sanders.
Q. Does Chuck Leithner actually interview Riley Joe Sanders?
A. He does.
Q. All right. Now, can you give us a reason why -- why is Leitner summarizing an interview that Schmidt did?
A. Because that's how Leithner always wrote his reports. They're always long.
Q. Did Schmidt write his own report about the interview?
A. I don't know. I don't remember.
Q. Would that be a customary practice?
A. As long as one person is writing down what happened, that was pretty much routine.
Q. Okay. So, let's go through the first interview with Riley Joe Sanders on there. Tell us who did it.
A. The one that Leithner did?
Q. Or I guess -- sure, yeah. What does Leitner say?
A. Leithner says: A short time later Wichkoski advised that he had completed his interview with Joe Sanders. At that time, I advised that I would talk to him. At approximately 11:00 a.m. I met with Joe Sanders, III in Interview Room No. 1. During the interview, Sanders advised that one -- that on the day of the offense report he had gone to school early in the morning. He advised that although he has a truck, his parents took driving privileges from him and his mother takes him to school.

During school, however, he talked a friend into taking him home during the lunch break where he picked up his truck and drove back to school. Later during the afternoon hours, he met with a friend identified as Cody Ellis and asked him to ditch the last class with him. According to Sanders, he and Ellis cut class and they drove to his house. He advised when he arrived home, he noticed the front door was slight -was opened slightly. He checked the house and noticed that nothing appeared to be missing. So, he and Cody got back in his truck and they drove off over off the Grand Parkway where they shared a joint.

He advised after they finished the marijuana cigarette, he drove Cody home. He stayed at Cody's approximately 20 minutes and then drove home. When he arrived home, he fixed himself something to eat and then called a friend of his named Michael Grantom. Sanders advised that Grantom and another friend named Cody Towner arrived at his house at approximately 3:30. He advised he had a partial joint lit and they finished it off.

At approximately 3:45, they all decided to go over to a friend's house named Randy Hess. He advised that Randy lives just down the street from him and that they would sometimes score some weed from him. Sanders advised that they arrived at Randy's house a few minutes later and stayed there approximately 15 minutes or so. He stated Randy did not have any weed. While departing the Hess residence, he fought over rights to riding shotgun in Michael Grantom's car with Cody Towner. He advised that Towner got the position, so he told them to drive on and he would walk.

Sanders advised the walk was approximately five minutes to his house. Sanders advised that as he rounded the corner to his street, he could see both Mike and Cody waiting in front of his house. As he continued to walk towards his house, he saw his neighbor David

Temple's truck passing by heading northbound on Hidden Canyon. He identified the vehicle by stating it was a blue-colored Chevy pickup truck with tinted windows and chrome wheels. When he arrived where Mike and Cody were waiting, they told him they wanted to go to the store to buy some cigarettes. According to Sanders, it was approximately 4:30 p.m. as they got in Mike's car and drove to the store.

He advised they were at the store a short time and then Mike drove him home, as Mike had to pick his mother up from work by 5:00. Sanders advised it was approximately 4:45 when he got back home and he went inside and turned on the television and laid down on the couch where he fell asleep. He advised his father woke him up when he arrived home from work.
Q. All right. Are any other boys interviewed on that day in that offense report?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And Riley Joe mentions that he was getting high with Cody Ellis, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Says that, you know, these boys came over at 3:30, according to Michael Grantom and to Cody Towner, and he mentions the trip to Randy Hess' house, right?
A. Correct.
Q. He also says that he sees David Temple's truck?
A. Correct.
Q. What time do you approximate he thinks he sees David Temple's truck?
A. It's hard to say because it says: According to Sanders it was approximately 4:30 p.m. as they got in Mike's car and drove to the store. Two sentences before that, he says he identified David's truck, then he arrived where Mike and Cody were waiting for him. They told him they wanted to go to the store and buy cigarettes, and that's when he mentions a time. So, we don't know if the $4: 30$ refers to when he sees the truck or when they leave to go to the store to buy the cigarettes.
Q. Okay. Well, let's back up. He says that after he stays at Cody Ellis' house for 20 minutes, then he goes over to -- then he comes home. And then by 3:30 Michael Grantom and Cody Towner were there. Is that accurate?
A. I'm looking for the 20 minutes. What did you say about 20 minutes?
Q. Well, when he drops Cody Ellis off, he says he stays at Cody Ellis for about 20 minutes, Riley Joe.
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. All right. And then he goes home. And at
about 3:30, Michael Grantom and Cody Towner come over.
A. Yes.
Q. And then he says at $3: 45$ they head over to Randall Hess' house?
A. They decided to go over there, he lives down the street, and then they go. So, close to 3:45.
Q. Okay. And they stayed there for about 15 minutes?
A. A few minutes later and stayed there approximately 15 minutes, yes.
Q. Okay. And then he says he's got a five-minute walk home.
A. Yes.
Q. So, give or take, does that put Riley Joe Sanders seeing David Temple's truck leaving David Temple's home at around 4:15, 4:10?
A. I don't know because the only reference in here is 4:30 in the paragraph that has to do with the truck. And it's hard to know.
Q. Well, I guess I'm working forward from the 3:30 time.
A. I know, but there is the 4:30 time in here that you have to deal with.
Q. Well, let's start with 3:30. Can we agree that comes before 4:30?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So, at 3:30 he says that Michael Grantom and Cody Towner come over to his house, right?
A. College.
Q. And then they decide to go to Randall Hess' house.
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Does he say that they do anything after they get there immediately?
A. At Randall Hess' house?
Q. No, no. At Riley Joe Sanders' home. When those two boys come over, what's the first thing that Riley Joe, Cody, and Michael Grantom do?
A. They finish off a joint.
Q. Okay. How long do you think it takes to smoke a joint?
A. I really don't know.
Q. Okay. That was a loaded question.
A. I know, but I've never smoked one so I can't tell you.
Q. Fair enough. He said it was half a joint?
A. Partial joint lit, but it's spelled l-e-t. So I think that means lit.
Q. Four minutes, five minutes?
A. I guess.
Q. Okay. Five minutes.

And then they decide to go over to Randall

Hess' house.
A. At 3:45.
Q. At 3:45. So, 3:45 they had to Randall's house. And he says they're for about 15 minutes?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So that makes it now 4:00.
A. Well, they arrived at his house a few minutes later. So, the earliest would be 4:00, yes.
Q. Okay. So 4:00 to 4:05.
A. Or 4:10.
Q. Or 4:10.

Okay. And then they go there and he states that they try to buy weed, Hess says: I'm not giving it away, you need money, and then the boys are out of luck. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And then Mr. -- what's his name?
A. Grantom?
Q. Yeah. Then he's got a five-minute walk home.
A. After they argued about who gets to ride
shotgun.
Q. Right. Got a five-minute walk home.
A. Correct.
Q. So, what --
A. So, once again, we have some kids in the area that we care about during the time that we care about, but it sounds like they left the house right when everything happened.
Q. So, can we agree, though, that based on this timeline, what you've described, is that they see David Temple leaving his home anywhere as early as 4:10 and as late as 4:20?
A. Well, no, because we have 4:30 in here to deal with.
Q. What's the $4: 30$ say?
A. According to sanders, it was approximately 4:30 as they got in my car and drove to the store.
Q. Okay. Can we agree that 4:20 is approximately 4:30? I mean, it's 10 minutes. Right?
A. Yeah. That makes a lot of difference in this scenario, though.
Q. It does make a huge difference, doesn't it, those few minutes?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. It makes a huge difference.
A. And they're teenaged boys and a 10 -minute difference to them back then smoking dope is hard to rely on.
Q. Ms. Siegler, I suggest to you that 10 minutes is a big difference to a whole lot of people.
A. Especially to Belinda.
Q. So, you've told us earlier that all of these oral statements were included in Riley Joe Sanders' written statements. Do you remember saying that?
A. Yes. And the Grand Jury testimony was all consumed in those.
Q. Now, I haven't gotten to the Grand Jury testimony. What $I$ was talking to you about were the defendant's statements and specifically the state's obligation to turn over written statements.
A. Okay.
Q. And your statement was that all of these oral statements that had been previously made had basically been collected into the written statements of Riley Joe Sanders. Do you remember saying that?
A. If you say I did, I did.
Q. No, that's not my question. My question is: Do you remember --
A. I thought I said and Grand Jury testimony, but I don't want to argue with you about something like that. So, if you think I said, then I will admit to you that $I$ said it.
Q. Can you and $I$ both agree that you don't -- that

Grand Jury testimony is treated differently than a written statement?
A. As far as what you turn over after somebody testifies, not necessarily.
Q. Okay. Can you and I agree that Grand Jury testimony is treated differently than a written statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, within the confines of a statement, I understood you to say earlier -- and thank God we've got the court reporter, but $I$ understood you to say earlier that in the case of Riley Joe Sanders with all these oral statements that he made to law enforcement, all of those oral statements had been collected into the two written statements. Is that your testimony or not?
A. I don't remember saying that exactly. If you think I did, then $I$ will agree with you. I think what $I$ said was all of Riley Joe's oral statements eventually got consumed into the written and the Grand Jury and it all got told to Dick and it was all brought up at trial and the jury heard all of it. That's what I remember making a point of.
Q. Okay. Well, we don't even have to get to the part of trial yet. Remember, we're still -- we're not to trial yet, Ms. Siegler. And so, all of those oral
statements of law enforcement, those facts are
documented in the offense -- excuse me -- in the written
statement and the Grand Jury testimony; is that what
you're saying now?
A. One or the other.
Q. One or the other.

And you believe that's what you said
earlier, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. The offense report that $I$ had given you, do either Cody Towner, Cody Ellis, any of the other Katy boys, give any statements in that offense report?
A. The supplement that we just got through talking about?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Okay. May I have that?
A. (Witness complies).
Q. Thank you, ma'am.

I'm going to pass you two documents. One is Bate's stamped 831 , which is a written statement of Riley Joe Sanders on 1-28-99 (indicating).
A. Okay.
Q. Do you remember seeing that document before today, Ms. Siegler?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Give me just a second.

Who -- where is Riley Joe Sanders when he is giving that written statement?
A. I can't tell from this.
Q. Okay. Well, give me the Bate's stamp again, please?
A. 831.
Q. And the date of the statement?
A. 1-28-99.
Q. Can you tell us who notarized the statement?
A. Pete Lampson.
Q. Okay. And what time was the statement given?
A. It's sworn to and subscribed at 2:56 p.m.
Q. All right. Will you please read that statement?
A. My full name is Riley Joe Sanders and I'm a white male, 16 years of age. My date of birth is 3-1-82. My social is, my driver's license is unknown. I reside at 22506 Round Valley, Katy, and live with my parents. My home telephone number is. I'm a student at Katy High School in the tenth grande. It gives the perjury paragraph.

On Monday, January 11th, '99, my mother drove me to school at about 6:50 a.m. I was in class
from the time $I$ arrived at school until about 11:20 a.m. when I left school with Mike Langford. Mike drove me home and dropped me there. I got in my car and drove to school. I was about five to ten minutes late returning to school. I entered my next class, algebra, fifth period, about 11:55. My teacher, Mr. Elliott, asked me why I was late, but did not send me to the office or take any other action about my lateness that $I$ saw.

I attended my fifth and sixth period classes, but $I$ skipped my seventh period English class. When sixth period ended, I walked to my locker and put up my books, then $I$ walked my girlfriend, Nikki Biondo, to her drill team practice in the drill team room. I met up with my friend, Cody Ellis, and we went to my car which was parked in the field by the ag barn and drove to my house. I stopped at the Mobil station at Fort Bend Road at I-10 and bought some gas. Cody paid cash for the gas. It took me about 10 to 15 minutes to get home. So, we arrived at my home at about 2:00 p.m.

I parked in my driveway and walked to my front door. My front door is usually left unlocked during the day even when no one is home, except at night and when we go out of town. I do not have a key to my house and haven't had one for about a year. I get into my house each day when $I$ return from school just by
opening the unlocked front door.

This day, Monday, January 11th, '99, I opened the exterior glass door. And as I reached for the inner door handle, I noticed that the inner door was not fully shut. It was cracked open about an inch. Cody was right beside me at this time. I remarked that my door was open. Cody and $I$ entered my house and my three dogs, two small dogs and a large dog, ran up to us in an unusually aggressive as if something was amiss in the house. Cody and I split up and looked around the house to see if anything was missing. We did not find anything missing or amiss.

I went into my room and got some marijuana.
Then cody got in my car and I drove Cody to his house on Heights Street in Katy. As we drove, we smoked a little marijuana. I dropped Cody at his house and I talk to Cody's dad for about 10 to 15 minutes. I then drove straight back to my house. I arrived home about 3:30.

I entered the front door as usual and went through the kitchen into the garage, opening the garage door, and pulling my truck into the garage. I started heating some food and called Michael Grantom and asked him to come over. He said he would be over shortly. I started eating my food. Mike and Cody Towner arrived at my house about $3: 45$ to $3: 50$ p.m. Mike asked if I had
any marijuana and $I$ told him no. I said that we could go to Randy Hess' to see if he had any marijuana.

We got in Mike's car and drove to Randy's house, which was on Round Valley, a block or so around the corner from my house. We rang the doorbell and Randy's sister Bonnie let us in. We asked Randy if he had any weed and he said: No, but $I$ can get y'all some. We didn't have any money, so we didn't take Randy up on his offer to find some weed for us. We talked with Randy for about 10 to 15 minutes and then we went outside to leave. Mike asked me to buy him some cigarettes because the clerk at the Quick Mart would not sell them to him. I refused because Mike would not let me ride shotgun in his car to the store.

I began walking towards my house and Mike and Cody drove down the street beside me trying to get me to stop, but $I$ wouldn't stop because they wouldn't let me ride shotgun. Mike at one point drove over the curb in front of me up into a house's front yard and yelled at me to get in his car. I refused and Mike pulled away and went to my house and parked in the street in front of my house. When I reached my house, it was about 4:20 to 4:30 p.m. I got in Mike's car and he drove us to Quick Mart where I bought a pack of Marlboros for Mike. Mike then drove me home and dropped
me there. It was about $4: 35$ to $4: 40$ p.m. when Mike dropped me at my house. Mike and Cody then drove away.

I went into my house and grabbed a blanket and laid down on the couch in the living room, which is in the front of the house near the front door. I went to sleep and slept until my dad came home. It was beginning to get dark when Dad got home, so $I$ think it was 6:00 p.m. when Dad got home. Dad woke me up and told me there were some cops outside and told me to come outside. The cops were beginning to put out yellow tape around the Temples' house next door. Dad asked me if I knew what was going on and $I$ told him $I$ had no idea.
Q. Is that it for Mr. Sanders' statement?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. I did not see Belinda or David Temple that day, not even in school. I have never been inside the Temple's house while they lived there. I did go into the Temple's house in the past when the previous residents lived there. I have never had any problems of any kind with Belinda Temple. I was tutored some by Ms. Temple at Katy High School, never at home. I know that Ms. Temple once came to my house and told my parents that $I$ had 131 unexcused absences from class. I didn't really appreciate Ms. Temple telling my parents
about my absences, but $I$ was not angry about it, nor did I hold a grudge against her. I have no knowledge of anyone who would want to hurt Ms. Temple, nor have I ever heard anyone talk bad about her. Ms. Temple was liked by everyone, including me.

About the end of December '98, my friend Cody Ellis told me that he, Casey Goosby, and Carlos Gutierrez had broken into Casey Goosby's mother's boyfriend's house over the Christmas holidays and had stolen two shotguns. About two weeks after Cody told me about the break-in, $I$ went with Jonathan Pena, Carlos Gutierrez, and Cody Ellis to the woods behind Carlos' house on FM 529 and we fired the shotguns. I brought one of the three shotguns that my dad owns. After we fired the guns, I left the one I brought with Cody Ellis because I didn't want my dad to discover I had used one of his shotguns.

The shotgun $I$ brought belongs to my dad was a 12-gauge Remington single-shot shotgun. We also fired a . 22 pistol brought by Jonathan Pena and a 12-gauge pump shotgun taken in the above break-in. A few days after Ms. Temple was murdered, I was told by Casey Goosby that Carlos Gutierrez had another shotgun taken in the break-in at his home. This shotgun was supposed to be a double-barrel shotgun, but $I$ never saw it.

Casey also told me that one of Carlos Gutierrez's female friends had a thrown a double-barrel in the street gutter behind the VFW hall in Katy. End of statement of Riley Joe Sanders.
Q. Okay. In the statement that Riley Joe gives, he doesn't say anything about seeing David Temple's truck, does he?
A. He does not.
Q. Okay. Can you and I agree a witness that shows David Temple leaving approximately at the time you and I talked about, approximately 4:00 -- what did I say, 4:10 to 4:20?
A. And I said there was a $4: 30$ in there, too.
Q. Well, there was the $4: 30$ in that statement about when he was approximating, correct?
A. In that one --
Q. Okay.
A. -- in the other statement? But he also says 4:30 in this statement.
Q. Okay. Well, much like and you are going to argue over what that time means, fair to say you and Dick DeGuerin were probably going to argue over what the time means, how it should be interpreted, yeah? Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was the statement about having seen David Temple's car at that time turned over to Dick DeGuerin prior to trial?
A. It is not in this statement, so no.
Q. Was the statement from Riley Joe Sanders wherein he states that he saw David testimony's truck leaving David Temple's home between 4:10 and 4:30 --
A. No, I'm not agreeing to 4:30. He could have seen the truck leaving at the exact same time we always believed the truck left the house. What Riley Joe Sanders said about seeing the truck leave could be completely consistent with the evidence presented at trial.
Q. It could also be completely consistent with the evidence that Dick DeGuerin was trying to present.
A. Only if you buy your definition of what 4:30 means. Nobody does.
Q. Where in this statement -- do you still have the statement we're talking about?
A. I have the one I just read.
Q. Okay. So, you don't have the statement that we were just talking about. So, you're saying --
A. I'm saying you're making 4:30 the time you want the truck to be --
Q. No, Ms. Siegler. No.

THE COURT: One at a time, please.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) That statement from Riley Joe Sanders said approximately 4:30, did it not?
A. In reference to when they left to go to the store to get the cigarettes.
Q. Correct. No, no, no. Approximately 4:30 is the time you and $I$ are quibbling over, is it not?
A. Show me the statement.
Q. If I can find it.
A. Is it in Leithner right there with the clippy?
Q. From 3:45-- right, that's when they went over to Randall Hess' house, correct?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. This is from the 2-1-99 statement that Leithner is giving the summary of what Schmidt interviewed.
A. It's right there.
Q. Perfect. But it's at 3:45 that they headed other to Randall Hess' house. Do you agree with me on that?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Okay. And they stayed there for about 15 minutes. Can we agree on that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, does that make it 4:00?
A. Yes. They did something for 20 minutes. I
forgot what that was.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. They did something somewhere for 20 minutes.
Q. Oh, that would be Riley Joe Sanders staying at Cody Ellis' house for 20 minutes. Does that sound familiar?
A. Yeah. I need to look at the statement because I've got them all backwards.
Q. We'll get to that, but does it sound familiar?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, they stayed there for 20 minutes. MR. CHIN: I'll object, Judge, at this point. The witness already asked to review the statement to refresh her memory.

THE COURT: Is there some reason, you can't let her see the statement?

MS. GOTRO: I'm looking for it, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Let's find it and
then go to the question.
MR. CHIN: Thank you, Judge.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) 3:45, they all decide to go -is that the one with half a joint?
A. It looks like a long paragraph.
Q. Is that it?
A. Yes. Okay.
Q. Do you want to refresh your memory?
A. I got it.
Q. Okay. So, 3:45 what happened?
A. At 3:45, they all decided to go over to a friend's house named Randy Hess.
Q. Right. And they stayed there for what, 15 minutes?
A. Approximately 15 minutes or so.
Q. How long do you think it takes them to get to Randy Hess' house?
A. Sanders advised they arrive at Randy's house a few minutes later.
Q. Ms. Siegler, how long do you think it took them to get to Randy Hess' house?
A. I have no idea. I'm reading --
Q. Did law enforcement ever try and collect that information?
A. It says right here he told them they arrived at Randy's house a few minutes later.
Q. My question is: Did law enforcement ever measured the distance from Randy Hess' house to Riley Joe Sanders' house?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Okay. So, you are just relying on what Riley Joe Sanders is saying?
A. From this document, yes.
Q. Okay. I just want to be clear about that. So, at 3:45, they decide to go to Randy Hess' house. What happens next? They stayed for 15 minutes?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What time would you say it is when they leave?
A. Anywhere from 4:00 to 4:05, 3:55 to 4:10, somewhere in there. They stayed approximately 15 minutes. We don't know how long it took them to get there. We don't know how long they stayed before they left. So, we're right around the 4:00 time area here.
Q. Well, if we work with just what it is Mr. Sanders has said, stays for 15 minutes, takes him five minutes to walk home, give him five minutes to sort of goof around, does that sounds about right?
A. Say it again.
Q. I said: If it takes him 15 minutes -- if he stays at Randy's house for 15 minutes, right, the five-minute walk home, and we just through an extra five minutes on for goofing off.
A. We also have to get there.
Q. Okay. Want to put that in the goofing off category or what?
A. I just think it -- the time that we care about is up in the air because of the few minutes here and few minutes there.
Q. Okay.
A. And the approximately 15 minutes that he says they stayed there. And keeping in mind, they're all high.
Q. Okay. So, if he is high, does that mean he can't tell time?
A. Well, a 16-year-old boy who is high is not paying attention to the clock.
Q. You know, Ms. Siegler, I guess I hold 16-year-old boys to a higher standard than what you've described because $I$ still expect them to know where it is they are in the day as it passes. And so, if this 16-year-old boy is high or not tells you that at 3:30 he walks over to his friend Randy's house, do you believe that it took him 15 minutes -- that he hung out for 15 minutes there?
A. Well, they went over there at 3:45.
Q. Okay. So, let's just say five minutes there, right?
A. Okay. That gets you to 3:50.
Q. Okay. Hangs out for 15 minutes.
A. That gets you to 4:05.
Q. All right. Five minutes back.
A. You mean five more minutes?
Q. Five minutes back to his house, yes.
A. That gets you to 4:10.
Q. Okay. And then what happens?
A. That's the time he gets back to his house, to Riley Joe Sanders' house.
Q. At 4:10?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that's the time that he reports seeing David Temple driving away from his home, is it not?
A. That's confusing. It's not cleared up in this paragraph.
Q. Well, let's read the paragraph again.
A. Sanders advises as he rounded the corner to his street, he could see both Mike and Cody waiting in front of his house. As he continued to walk towards his house, he saw his neighbor David Temple's truck passing by heading northbound on Hidden Canyon. He identified the vehicle by stating it was a blue-colored Chevy pickup with tinted windows and chrome wheels. When he arrived where Mike and Cody were waiting, they told him they wanted to go to the store to buy some cigarettes. According to sanders it was approximately 4:30 p.m. as
they got in Mike's car and drove to the store.
Q. Well, we've heard one other statement after this one. Can you and I agree that they are not consistent to the extent that Mr . Sanders is reporting seeing David Temple's car leave David Temple's home in one statement, and in the second statement he doesn't say anything about David Temple's car?
A. We can agree on that.
Q. Okay. Now, can we also agree that at trial where David Temple was and when he was there was a highly contested issue?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And given the amount of time that you and $I$ have spent arguing about what it is Riley Joe Sanders meant by his ten minutes here and five minutes there, isn't it fair to say that Dick DeGuerin needed to have the evidence prior to the start of the trial?
A. He had all of the information he needed about Riley Joe Sanders to present to the jury.
Q. Point me to a place in the record that demonstrates anywhere, in any paper in this courtroom, that demonstrates you gave Dick DeGuerin a copy of Riley Joe's statement -- of Riley Joe Sanders' statement where he puts David Temple leaving his home between -- that he puts David Temple leaving his home.
A. David Temple admits he left his home. If Riley Joe Sanders saw David Temple leaving his home in that blue truck, that is not exculpatory. It is consistent with David Temple's own words.
Q. Ms. Siegler, we have talked about this all day and you admitted earlier today that if David Temple left that -- if he leaves his home at 4:15, 4:20, there simply is no way he could have committed this murder if the timeline that Charles Temple has given us is true?
A. No one is basing anything on Charles Temple's timeline. You are.
Q. The defense was.
A. Yes, you are.
Q. Right. Because that's the defense's job, isn't it?
A. And even if you buy Charles Temple's timeline, the very, very latest David Temple could have left would have been 4:20.
Q. Ms. Siegler, can you and I both agree as a prosecutor you don't have to buy the defense's timeline? Can we both agree to that?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Because the only people that have got to buy the defense's timeline is the jury. Right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So, irrespective of whether or not the prosecution buys the defense's theory, if you have evidence that is favorable to that defensive theory, you have to agree with me that you have to turn it over?
A. Agreed.
Q. That is Brady evidence, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you've got a statement from Riley Joe Sanders that puts David Temple in the place that helps the defense's theory, that is favorable to the defense's theory, you've got to give to him, Ms. Siegler. You've got to give it to the defense and you've got to do it before trial.
A. I'm not disagreeing with your statement. My point is that you are trying to make the time into something that this statement doesn't say it is, which means it's not inconsistent and it's not exculpatory.
Q. Can we agree that that statement that Riley Joe Sanders gave is not precise?
A. That's a big word, "precise." What do you mean?
Q. Well, the timeframe that he has given us, give or take five -- you and $I$ were doing it. Give or take five --
A. Yeah. It's not a timelined statement, no.
Q. Right. And so, it's subject to interpretation, is it not?
A. Yes.
Q. And in a circumstantial evidence case when you've got all of these other pieces of fact that you are going to stack up in order to prove your case, being able to interpret a timeline is a pretty big deal?
A. Yes.
Q. To both sides?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you point me anywhere in this record, anywhere in any paper in this building that says that Dick DeGuerin got a copy of that statement before he gave his opening statements, before he picked the jury?
A. He didn't. He had all of the information about Riley Joe Sanders and he got these particular statements after direct examination. And everything that he needed to know about Riley Joe Sanders was provided to him for presentation to the jury.
Q. Isn't opening statement a presentation to the jury?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Well, if he didn't get this statement until after Riley Joe Sanders testified, then he didn't have that statement for presentation to the jury and he
didn't have it for voir dire.
A. And the fact that Riley Joe Sanders saw the blue truck leaving David Temple's house is not exculpatory necessarily. You want to make it exculpatory because you want to make the time be what you want it to be.
Q. Who gets to decide what's exculpatory, Ms. Siegler?
A. We already did that yesterday.
Q. Well, humor me. Who gets to decide what's exculpatory?
A. Usually the prosecutor.
Q. Can't you rely on the Judge to help you with that?
A. And we did in this case. And Judge Doug Shaver read every bit of the Grand Jury testimony and found nothing exculpatory.
Q. I'm not asking about the Grand Jury testimony, Ms. Siegler. I'm asking you about this oral statement to law enforcement made by what was effectively the defense's alternative suspect, but this statement by Riley Joe Sanders, this oral statement by Riley Joe Sanders corroborating the defensive theory, did you give that statement to Judge Shaver and ask him to make a decision about whether or not it was Brady?
A. Number one, I don't agree that it corroborates the defense's theory. And, number two, no, I did not.
Q. Can we agree it could be favorable to the defense's theory?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And if it could be favorable to the defense's theory, then it could be Brady, right?
A. Possibly, yes.
Q. Okay. So, how did you double-check your
homework? You didn't give it to Doug Shaver, did you?
A. This particular statement?
Q. That statement with the blue truck. Riley Joe Sanders putting that man leaving his home at a timeframe that makes it virtually impossible for him to commit this murder.
A. Did I give that to Judge Shaver? No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Did you consult with any other lawyer in this building about what you should do with this potentially exculpatory evidence?
A. No.
Q. All right. When you are in trial and you see very clearly what Dick DeGuerin's trying to accomplish as he puts on his evidence, did it ever occur to you, you know what, $I$ need to turn this evidence over now?
A. No.
Q. Did you just forget about it?
A. I really think I've answered your question.
Q. Did you just forget about that statement? Because Riley Joe Sanders gave like ten of them.
A. The fact that Riley Joe Sanders saw David Temple driving away in the blue truck that afternoon was not exculpatory.
Q. Ms. Siegler, you've already agreed it was favorable to the defense.
A. He couldn't --

MR. CHIN: Objection. That's a
mischaracterization of --

THE COURT: Overruled. You don't need to shout.
A. He couldn't say for sure when he saw the truck drive away. We still don't know.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) We have been through this statement several times and we've already agreed that there is about 15 unaccounted minutes here in this statement. In the statement that Riley Joe Sanders gives to Detective Leithner there's about 15 unaccounted minutes, 15 to 20 unaccounted minutes. Yes, do you agree with that statement?
A. I don't know what you mean by "unaccounted
minutes." I mean, I'm not even paying attention to your
chart up there because your chart is not really
evidence. This is.
Q. Well, then read from that and tell me --
A. I am.
Q. -- how many unaccounted minutes are there.
A. What do you mean by "unaccounted minutes"?
Q. Well, when you and $I$ were talking about how long it would take Riley Joe Sanders to get from his house over to Randall Hess' house, you said: Well, you know, we need to factor in some time for him to get there.
A. That's true.
Q. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what $I$ mean by an unaccounted period of time.
A. Okay. Fifteen sounds fair.
Q. Okay. And so, if we've got 15 kind of wiggle room unaccounted minutes, what does that do to the timeframe that he sees David Temple leaving his home?
A. Nothing. Because we don't know what the minutes are.
Q. You could move them up or you could move them back?
A. They don't help or hurt us one way or the other.
Q. Well, I don't know what "us" you're referring to.
A. You or me. "Us" means you or me, the state or the defense.
Q. No.
A. Help or hurt either side, because we don't know.
Q. No, Ms. Siegler. There is no way you can say that the defense and the prosecution were on the same page when it came to where that man was on the day his wife was murdered. You can't say that.
A. That's not what $I$ was saying.
Q. Okay. Well, then let's focus on the timeline. Because that written statement in front of you -- and I appreciate that I'm looking forward, but I'm looking forward for a reason. Okay?

The written statement -- excuse me. The oral statement that Riley Joe Sanders gave on the 1 st of February is the first time that we hear him say he sees David Temple's truck, right? Is that right?
A. We've established that, yes.
Q. Okay. And he says about what, $4: 30$ is when he needs to go and get cigarettes with his buddies, 4:30;
is that right? Ms. Siegler, is that right?
A. Which statement are you talking about?
Q. Oh, the one -- the B 1937, Bate's 1937, given on February 1st, 1999.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. So, what time do you think that statement means he saw David Temple?
A. Are we talking about the 4:30 issue?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. I have no idea.
Q. Now, you have no idea?
A. It doesn't say and I'm not going to guess. It doesn't say.
Q. May I see that statement?
A. (Witness complies).
Q. According to Sanders, it was approximately 4:30 p.m. as they got in Mike's car and drove to the store. Does that sound about right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And a couple of sentences before that, Sanders says -- Sanders advised that he rounded --
A. He rounded the corner and sees the truck and then there's interactions between him and the boys. And the interactions between him and the boys is where we don't know how long it took.
Q. Right. We don't know how long it takes, but we know that at 4:30 he's leaving to go to the store and he's already seen David, right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So, as of $4: 30$ he's already seen David and we've got about 15 minutes of unaccounted time. That means anywhere between what $4: 15,4: 10,4: 30$ he could have seen David Temple leaving his home, right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Right.

And based on Detective Schmidt's opinion and the Grand Jury, there is no way that man could have killed his wife on that timeline?
A. That's not true. That is not what Mark Schmidt ever said.
Q. That's favorable to your theory, Ms. Siegler, that timeframe, that particular statement that Riley Joe Sanders gave?
A. Riley Joe Sanders' statement speaks for itself. And the $4: 30$ is vague and not cleared up in this statement. What 4:30 refers to, we know for sure is, they leave to go get cigarettes. It doesn't mean necessarily that that's when he saw the blue trunk.
Q. No. What it means is that he saw the blue truck before 4:30, doesn't it?
A. It does. We just don't know how much before 4:30. We don't know. And when you don't know --
Q. For David Temple to have been on a videotape at Brookshire Brothers grocery store at 4:32, you and $I$ both know he would have had to have left his home -- he would have to have left his home, the house where Belinda Temple got shot in the back of the head, no later than 4:20. And I mean driving no later - -
A. Agreed.
Q. Okay. Kenneth Temple -- and you've already given your opinion about Kenneth Temple's statement, but we're talking about the defensive theory. And Kenneth Temple gave a written statement and testified before the Grand Jury that Belinda left his home at --
A. $3: 45$.
Q. No. At five minutes until.
A. You're right.
Q. Which would have put her home anywhere between 4:05 and 4:10. If Belinda Temple is home between 4:05 and 4:10 and he's got to leave at 4:20, there is no way, it is virtually impossible, or at the very least it is arguable to twelve citizens to get to hear the full sides of both stories that he can't blow his wife's -what did you say -- face off -- is that how they said it? He can't blow his wife's face off, clean himself
up, get his kid in the car, stage a burglary, and book it down to Brookshire Brothers, or it certainly makes it a lot more difficult. Can we at least agree to that, that it would make it a lot more difficult, that small window of time?
A. And everything you just said is exactly what Dick DeGuerin said to the jury. You have not said one thing new this entire day that Dick didn't argue wonderfully to the jury.
Q. You know what he didn't get to do? He didn't get to say any of that during opening, he didn't get to talk about any of that during voir dire --
A. You want to talk about what he said on opening and the reason he lost this case?
Q. No, Ms. Siegler. No, Ms. Siegler. I have some pretty clear ideas about why he lost this case. And I'll be happy to visit with you about that after this trial. When Dick DeGuerin stood up and gave his opening, it was based on about a third of the story.
A. No. It was based on the fact that he listened to and believed what the Temple family, all of them had to say about the relationship and that day and the circumstances. And they lied to Dick and they set him up to fail.
Q. You have no --
A. He put him on the stand --
Q. You have no --

THE COURT: One at time, please. She's answering. You be quiet.
Q. (By Ms. Gotro) Well, how do you know they lied?
A. Because $I$ cross-examined them and it was pretty apparent.
Q. Right, that what, they got nervous when the great Kelly Siegler was crossing them?
A. No. They lied. It was unbelievable how they lied. It was apparent in the record. The Judge can read it for himself. They lied like I've never seen a family lie before. And everybody in this courtroom that heard it knew that.
Q. I think you actually said that the whole mess of them have told more lies than this whole building has seen in their entire life. I think that was your testimony, right?
A. That's a pretty accurate summary.
Q. But this kid, this kid right here, this one, good Katy boy, isn't he, Riley Joe Sanders?
A. I think I've said more than anyone how much he WAS smoking dope.
Q. But he's a good Katy boy, isn't he?
A. He sure as heck didn't commit a murder and his
statements are very consistent.
Q. Very consistent. All right. We'll keep
working through them. We'll keep working through them. And this is the kid that you ultimately helped get Chip Lewis to represent, right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Right. Because it's your job as a prosecutor not only to prosecute citizens, but to get defense counsel for the ones you believe are innocent, right?
A. When someone is going to be come after the way Riley Joe Sanders was again by Dick DeGuerin, he needed to have somebody advise him in the process and $I$ could no longer do that.
Q. Well, Ms. Siegler, it wasn't Dick DeGuerin that was about to interview Riley Joe Sanders. It was Steve Clappart with the Harris County District Attorney's Office.
A. At the insistence of Dick DeGuerin.
Q. Where do you even get that information? Who told you that?
A. A lot of people.
Q. Who? I would like to know who because they're now witnesses, Ms. Siegler. You're saying things to which there's been no factual basis of, none. Who is telling you this information?
A. A lot of people.
Q. May I have the names, please?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Because I'm not going to tell who told me information.
Q. Then maybe no one told you that, Ms. Siegler. Maybe you're making it up.
A. Okay. Go ahead and say that.
Q. Or give me a name.
A. I'm not going to do that.
Q. Why? Because you're afraid they're going to get fired?
A. Because their friends of Dick's. Not prosecutors.
Q. Oh, you see the last time you told this story, I thought you said they were --
A. Those were about the boxes in Jim Leitner's office.
Q. So, you've got a different group of people that are friends of Dick's that are telling you about what now? What's this group of people telling you about?
A. Dick's strategy and what's going on behind the scenes.
Q. At trial or during the investigation?
A. Oh, no, not at trial.
Q. Okay. The investigation of Daniel Glasscock's statement?
A. Yes.
Q. And so, you are -- so, you are assuming that Dick DeGuerin was involved in the D.A.'s office investigation of Daniel Glasscock?
A. Oh, yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And when $I$ say involved with it, tell me what you mean. What do you mean by involved with that investigation?
A. He was in the middle of it trying to direct its progress.
Q. And who was he directing?
A. Whoever he could.
Q. Like? Was he directing Clappart.
A. Through Brad Beers, yes. Through Jim Leitner, yes.
Q. You have used the word "kooky" a couple of times today, Ms. Siegler. And I've got to tell you, that is one of the kookiest things $I$ have heard today, that Dick DeGuerin is directing the special prosecutor. Have you met Brad Beers?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. He doesn't talk to anybody. You honestly
believe that he's taking his marching orders from Dick DeGuerin? That's your belief?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. All right. All right. That statement on 2-1-99 you had in your possession since the day it was written. And in your discretion, you kept it from the defense, Ms. Siegler, didn't you?
A. Are we still talking about seeing the blue car?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. We have been over that. Yes, I did not tell Dick about that.
Q. Because in your opinion it wasn't important?
A. Because in my opinion it was consistent with everything else that was in evidence. It's not exculpatory.
Q. Tell me from your memory, if you can, what other witness testified? What other alibi did David Temple have that put him leaving his home? Was there any other witness that saw David Temple leaving his home at any particular time?
A. Angela Vielma.
Q. I believe Ms. Vielma saw him arriving.
A. Okay. Then, no.
Q. No. So, we've got one witness that makes one statement that's in your possession, but you decide
defense isn't entitled to it. Is it because you didn't think it was Brady or because you didn't think it was important?
A. Both.

MS. GOTRO: I need a minute.
THE COURT: What?
MS. GOTRO: I need a minute.
THE COURT: A minute?
MS. GOTRO: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: You need a break. Okay. We're in recess for ten minutes.
(Recess)
MS. GOTRO: Your Honor, Ms. Siegler has tendered a copy of an offense report with her handwritten note on it regarding Mark Schmidt's interview of Mr. Sosa, the special ed teacher. The State's copied it and we've marked it Defendant's Exhibit 90 .
(Defense Exhibit No. 90 Offered)
MR. SMITH: The State has no objection, but just a point of clarity. I believe it's the last page it says Detective Schmidt, but I think it came out of a supplement of Deputy Valerio. So, that way whenever they're looking through -- whoever is higher up that's looking at it, it comes from Deputy Valerio's
supplement.

THE COURT: All right. No. 90 is admitted with that caveat.
(Defense Exhibit No. 90 Admitted)
MS. GOTRO: Thank, you, sir.

And speaking of the date, I'm not quite near done with the examination, but $I$ would be very comfortable with breaking at this point, Your Honor, and resuming at -- whatever date.

THE COURT: The 6th?

MS. GOTRO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: It is of acceptable to you?
MR. SMITH: Since we're not at a breaking point and probably not -- Ms. Gotro has indicated we're not going to be at a breaking point even if we went --

MR. CHIN: I'm sorry. Remember, you also have DeGuerin.

MR. SCHNEIDER: We've already subpoenaed Mr. DeGuerin for the 13 th and 14 th.

MR. CHIN: I'm sorry. Then $I$ have nothing useful to say, Judge.

THE COURT: Could we start this -- I talked to Mr. Schneider about this. Would 10:00 Tuesday be acceptable as the start time rather than 9:00?

MR. SMITH: That would be fine with the

State, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Is that okay with everybody? MS. GOTRO: No objections, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Well, then with everybody's consent, we sill stand adjourned until 10:00 on Tuesday, the 6th of January.

MS. GOTRO: Thank you, Judge.
(Proceedings recessed)
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