

INTERVIEW WITH BRYAN DUBOIS

Date: December 12, 2005

Jay Milano, Bryan Dubois, Marty Keen, Hank Decansik (from the prosecutor's Office - Investigator) and myself, Dan Kasaris

Kasaris: Today was trial date for the Baumgartner/Dubois matter. In conversations with Mr. Milano. Normally when we have time what we do is put this in writing. We have a proffer letter that we put together. Its agreed upon that nothing you say in this room can be used against you. It encourages free flow discussion. You don't have to worry about any violations, criminal violations, or anything like that. We then take the proffer, consider it, and come up with a plea arrangement. It is not impossible, or is possible, that a pre-arrangement, we could end up agreeing to two misdemeanors. I am not saying that is impossible. But in order to come up with any type of plea arrangement in the matter, we need to do this. The position of our office is that the indictment is the plea offer and that if you want something other than the indictment, then you come in and ask us for something. What we are doing today is setting- -we are starting that process by taking a statement from you and you have voluntarily decided to give to us and we will consider what you tell up and then come back to you with some sort of plea offer. Is that okay, Bryan?

Fair enough, in my point of view, I have advised Jay Milano, I have advised Mr. Dubois, pretty much exactly what you have said, that nothing that he says here will be used against him either here or Ottawa County.

Milano: That is true. The Ottawa County matter as well. That is correct.

I have advised him that the only way that this is effective for him is that he tells you the absolute truth and that he tells you _____. I have also advised him that the decision on a potential plea is yours, as the State of Ohio, and the State of Ohio's alone, depending up the weight of what he give you. It is our specific request ultimately that this case be resolved by way of a misdemeanor in Cuyahoga County ____ Ottawa County. Beyond that, go ahead _____.

Bryan: I have one question? If I want to confer with him, you pause that?

Kasaris: Sure.

One thing that I should also indicate is nothing he says in this room will be used against him, or could be used against, in Erie County either. She's charged with fleeing and eluding in Erie County. She was living some place prior to the fleeing. I don't know if she was living with him or, I don't know that, because there is an obstruction offense that could be out there. I don't know the answer, I'm just advising you that that could be out there.

Bryan: Do you intend on calling me as a witness in Erie County.

Kasaris: I haven't made that decision yet.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Here is one of the ground rules, Bryan, because this can get real unruly, if you if you start asking questions direct.

Bryan: Okay.

Milano: So, why don't you ask me and I will follow through. Use me as an intermediary so it stays clean.

Go ahead.

Kasaris: State your name for the record.

Bryan: BRYAN DUBOIS.

Kasaris: And your wife is Mandy?

Bryan: Mandy.

Kasaris: And how long have you been married?

Bryan: 5 years.

Kasaris: I think I met your mother-in-law in Erie County in May. She was with your wife. Do you recall her name?

Bryan: Tina.

Kasaris: Tina, okay. Now Bryan, you work for the railroad?

Bryan: Yes, well.

Kasaris: You use to work for the railroad?

Bryan: Yes.

Kasaris: And when did you use to work for the railroad?

Bryan: January, 2000.

Kasaris: And how long did you work for the railroad?

Bryan: Um, until I was officially terminated in August, 2005. It's up on appeal.

Kasaris: Why did they - why were you terminated from the railroad?

Bryan: Because I marked off sick and I just stayed off to long, basically.

Kasaris: How did you meet or get involved with Elsebeth Baumgartner?

Bryan: Through the internet.

Kasaris: Was that before or after you started the Erie Voices?

Bryan: After.

Kasaris: After. So when you started the Erie Voices Website, what was your intent with the blog.

Bryan: Offer my opinion. I like to write.

Kasaris: Did somebody set you up with her, or did they, or did she just comment one day on an article?

Bryan: She sent me an email about something I had been writing about and from there, she offered information to me. Things she knew about. Case that she had first hand knowledge of in Erie County.

Kasaris: And that was, I think you had a question and answer session that you posted on the internet. Is that were that came from?

Bryan: Um.

Kasaris: Or where did that come from?

Bryan: That occurred because I thought the inform..... I thought the whole story was fascinating.

Kasaris: Okay. And at the time that you, she began to email you, where was she living at?

Bryan: In Florida.

Kasaris: In Florida. And do you know why it was she moved to Florida?

Bryan: Um, she said she wanted to go to Florida because it was nice and sunny, and

Kasaris: Did you know there was a warrant out for her at the time?

Bryan: Yes.

Kasaris: Okay. Further probation violation.

Bryan: I didn't know what it was for. I guess it was for a probation violation.

Kasaris: Did she talk to you about the warrant at all?

Bryan: She told me that it was a bad warrant because, as I understand it, a motion is filed with the court and attached to that motion is an affidavit filed by the complaining witness saying that so-and-so, in this case was Baumgartner violated her probation. She told me that the motion that was filed with Ottawa Municipal did not have an affidavit, wasn't sworn to, and just from my common knowledge, I mean, I also saw it

did not have an affidavit, so to me that meant that, sure, it wasn't a good warrant. I'm not a lawyer.

Kasaris: Do you know who she was living with in Florida?

Bryan: To my knowledge, she was living by herself. She told me that.

Kasaris: Did she ever live with her husband in Florida?

Bryan: Not that I know of.

Kasaris: Or any of her kids?

Bryan: Jessica lives down there, lived down there on and off. I don't think they ever lived together. I am not sure. I know it is in the same residence but I don't know.

Kasaris: There was a man in Florida that I think she was sending emails to, I think it was FOB?

Bryan: Yeah, that was Bob Farley.

Kasaris: Who is Bob Farley?

Bryan: In my opinion, he is a certifiable nut case.

_____ Well, it fits in this case _____

Bryan: It sure does.

Kasaris: What do you know about Bob Farley?

Bryan: Well, Bob is a, Bob Farley, understand I don't have any first hand knowledge, only what these people are telling me, Bob Farley used to live in Columbus. He was a, he's dead now. You knew that, right?

Kasaris: When did he die?

Bryan: He died two or three months ago.

Kasaris: Okay.

Bryan: He was a paving contractor and I guess he was worth a nice chunk of change. He was going through a divorce and he felt that he was unjustly treated by the system in Columbus, so he started his crazy website. Lashing out at every judge he ever came in contact with and he basically opened up his services to anybody else who was upset with the system. No critical thought analysis, just a bunch of, you know, I hate the system, that kind of jazz.

Kasaris: I noticed in one, I think, in one filing, he actually filed down in Florida, one of her lawsuits, a document saying I have nothing to do with her.

Bryan: Yeah, I'm a little familiar with that, but again that is just information from him, information from her, I never get to see, I don't know what actually happened.

Kasaris: When you first met her?

Bryan: That was over the address, right?

Kasaris: That was over the address. The home address. When you first met her, had she already filed her two Florida lawsuits?

Bryan: I can't remember. When did she file them?

Kasaris: She filed the first one on March 22nd or 23rd of 2004.

Bryan: Okay, so I met her after she filed.

Kasaris: Okay. The second was filed in June, on June, maybe June 11th.

Bryan: Okay. I met her after.

Kasaris: Okay, so you met her sometime after June?

Bryan: Yeah, I think it was the end of June.

Kasaris: So when she sent one of the emails to Judge Markus, one dated June 16 of 2004, had you known her?

Bryan: Well, I would have to look at when she sent it, I don't know.

Kasaris: You're not courtesy copied on that.

Bryan: Okay, then yeah, I don't know. Let me.

Kasaris: Go ahead and take a look at it.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: What do you know about that email?

Bryan: Well, I can explain what she probably meant by some of these things. Do you want me to.

Kasaris: Sure.

Bryan: Okay. _____ without a record. Okay. She is probably referring to something that happened in January where Markus held a pretrial without a court reporter and I think it was at that time she introduced Krista Harris to Markus. Okay, so that was that. Okay, she's say _____. She is saying, that is a generalization, and she is saying it about Markus because Markus did not react to the story that she told about Krista Harris. _____. What happens is when you, she believes,

that when you tell someone of authority about a crime that that person should act. If they don't act, boom, there _____.

_____ They are part of the crime?

Bryan: Well, I don't know about part of the crime but they're

Kasaris: They are just as guilty as the person committing it?

Bryan: Let's look at this way, I was in the Marine Corp. for 4 years and, as a corporal, if I witnessed one of my privates or one of my _____ corporals doing something wrong, and I didn't report them or I didn't hold them accountable, I am the one held responsible.

Kasaris: Okay.

Bryan: First rule of leadership, everything is your fault.

Kasaris: When she tells Markus at this pretrial that Judge Markus had, that she introduces Judge Markus to Krista Harris, and tells Krista, Judge Markus.

Bryan: From what she told me, yes.

Kasaris: That Krista Harris was Kevin Baxter's

Bryan: Was manipulated by Kevin Baxter.

Kasaris: _____ slave.

Bryan: _____

Kasaris: The whole deal. About perjury.

Bryan: Disagreeing with the characterization, the words that she uses.

Kasaris: Why do you disagree with that?

Bryan: Because it is kind of heavy. It's, you don't, I mean do you want to get into that?

Kasaris: Yeah.

Bryan: They are not the right words to describe what happened, in my opinion. Okay, I want to keep, I try to keep everything accurate, okay, and if there are words, if they have kind of certain connotations, certain meanings being them, loaded words. Okay.

Kasaris: Uh ha.

Bryan: Sexual slave. I mean that makes me think she had like a collar around her neck. You know what I am saying?

Kasaris: I know what you are saying.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: When Judge Markus, when she tells Judge Markus the story and Judge Markus doesn't indict Kevin Baxter, or doesn't proceed with Kevin Baxter, she then lumps Judge Markus in with Kevin Baxter.

Bryan: It appears so.

Kasaris: Did she ever have conversations with you about Judge Markus?

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: And what would she talk about?

Bryan: It's hard to, I mean, that's like saying, I have this thing with my wife, she always tries to say well what did you talk about. Well it is kind of hard to, it's kind of hard to, I mean I can tell you generalities what

Kasaris: In general, we will get to specifics when we get to the emails.

Bryan: Markus was approaching those cases with a predetermined outcome. They were already decided. It was just, the end result was there, we just have to get to that end result. Do what we can to get to the end result.

Kasaris: And did she tell you why she thought, why she thought that?

Bryan: The fact pattern. How everything happened. That Markus was hand picked by a lawyer. I went back and looked at newspaper articles where she is seeking a federal investigation on the lawyer. Everything fits together.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Now, that is not to say, I disagree with some of the words that she uses, but politically everything fits together.

Kasaris: Anything else about the email?

Bryan: Pause

Kasaris: Do you ever remember seeing the email before?

Bryan: I don't think I have ever seen that one.

Kasaris: You never talked to her about this email.

Bryan: I don't think I did.

Kasaris: She sent a second one out that day also. She sent more than one out. I will show you one on the same date, sent to George Kurbeck and Barbara Sutton. You are not courtesy copied on that either. Just take a look at it. Have you seen this email.

Bryan: I've seen this. This is in discovery.

Kasaris: Other than discovery, have you seen it?

Bryan: Oh, Oh, probably, I do think I have ever read this in detail.

Kasaris: Do you recall talking with her about the email?

Bryan: This is the same, I think, this is, no, I don't think we ever spoke about this. Other than the fact, I mean, no no, she's defended this to me by saying this was okay to

Kasaris: She admitted to sending the email.

Bryan: We of course, yeah, her email address is right there.

Kasaris: Okay. I know her email address is there but had she told you she has sent the email.

Bryan: Oh Yeah.

Kasaris: Okay. And what did she talk to you. What did she say to you about the email?

Bryan: Um. Gees Kasaris, I can't remember.

Kasaris: That's okay. That's okay.

Bryan: You would have to ask me specific questions about this.

Kasaris: She has

Bryan: She has acknowledged that

Kasaris: She has acknowledged that she sent the email to Judge Markus.

Bryan: Wait a minute, is he on there? Is he

Kasaris: Yeah Judge Markus ____.

Bryan: Yeah, she always copies who she is talking about. She doesn't want to look like she is back-stabbing she says.

Kasaris: She's talk, she sends this to, uh, did she ever talk to you about why she would send this to the Lutherans and to Barbara Sutton?

Bryan: Yeah because Markus is on that board with those two people.

Kasaris: So did she ever tell you what she expected to get out of sending this email to these two people that are on these boards.

Bryan: No, I mean to let them know what he was doing, other than that. I mean, do you

Kasaris: Go ahead.

Bryan: What do you think, I mean what do you think

Kasaris: I think, well, I think she sent the email, I think she sent these people the emails in an attempt to influence Markus. I see no other good reason to send this emails.

Bryan: To influence him?

Kasaris: Right

Bryan: No, I don't believe that. Probably to let everybody else know what he is doing. That is, I mean, look,

Kasaris: Go ahead

Bryan: If I were a judge and I was doing all of these things and I was aware of these things, and somebody sent an email to people that I work with,

Kasaris: Uh ha

Bryan: I would be very embarrassed about that, if these were true.

Kasaris: Assuming they are not true,

Bryan: Well, assuming they are not true, then she could be charged with crimes.

Kasaris: For example, Richard Markus has advanced and protected the rape of a mentally, of a male, mentally disadvantaged juvenile client of mine at the hand of Ohio Minority Leader Chris Redfern.

Bryan: Yeah, I know who that is.

Kasaris: Is she talking about Kasarisiel Kay?

Bryan: Yeah, did you know about that case?

Kasaris: I know, what I know about the case, is one of the reasons why she was disbarred, was her mentally _____ involved in the Kasarisiel Kay case.

Bryan: She was the attorney of record on the case.

Kasaris: There was a prior attorney of record, from reading, I am getting this from the Supreme Court material, and from the disciplinary counsel, uh, she enters an appearance in Juvenile Court without talking or without the approval of the juvenile's mother. Without anybody else knowing about it. Without the prior attorney knowing about it, which probably is not out of the ordinary, but the mother is clearly out of the ordinary, the mother should have known.

Bryan: That is not what she told me.

Kasaris: Well, she enters the appearance. They had a plea arrangement worked out where apparently he was charged with some felonies of the first degree. They had a plea arrangement worked out where we was supposed to plea out to some felonies of the fifth degree. She gets involved and starts wild accusations that she makes about people. She end up calling, I think, the Judge a drunk and the judge was a drug user, and other things about the judge. Typical stuff from her. Anyway, it ends up happening is they go to Juvenile trial, the guy gets convicted, he gets sent to the Department of Youth Services and the Kasarisiel Kay matter, she actually prepared some of the paperwork later on after she had been suspended that Kasarisiel Kay's mother filed. Kasarisiel Kay's mother said, you know what, Baumgartner prepared this stuff for me and that got her in hot water with the Supreme Court. One of the things that got her in hot water with the Supreme Court that she had been suspended and could not practice law but she was continuing to practice. What did she tell you about Kasarisiel Kay?

Bryan: Well, I met Kasarisiel Kay.

Kasaris: Un hah.

Bryan: So, I mean I feel really bad for the kid because I saw, uh, I actually met him at Ottawa County. He was in jail. He had been incarcerated there and his whole life _____ after that stuff happened to him when he was younger. So I mean, without _____ about my opinion, I mean, about what happened to him specifically, I mean, what do you want to know?

Kasaris: Did she talk to you about Kasarisiel Kay?

Bryan: Yeah, she told me his story.

Kasaris: Okay. She then talks about Mark Mulligan, a man _____ known to be drug dependent.

Bryan: Yeah, they went to, they were. Jill was, Jill Baumgartner was Mulligan's college roommate. So, those two know each other. There is a friendship there.

Kasaris: I know that.

Bryan: So, that was one of the things that bothered me about Mulligan just constantly going after her, its like a friendship going bad and it was like using his position to go after both of those two. Okay, so that's

Kasaris: Mr. Mulligan has protected a drug trafficker, child abuse ring in Ottawa County for many years?

Bryan: Okay, bits and pieces of that I am aware of.

Kasaris: And what are you aware of in regard to that?

Bryan: How Kasarisiel Kay, that family trying to get those allegations worked into _____ Mulligan is in charge of Ottawa County _____

Kasaris: He's the Ottawa County Prosecutor. Right.

Bryan: The information that I am getting is when, Jesus, I mean how would you feel if you're molested and you couldn't get anybody to do anything about it. I mean, that is what is so bothersome about Mulligan for me.

Kasaris: Were the, were the allegations, they were, were they ever investigated by anybody as far as you know?

Bryan: I don't know.

Kasaris: So with her case, when she filed, what ever she filed, let say when she filed an accusation against somebody in 2000, there actually was some sort of investigation done, the charges, for instance, against the School Board Members. She filed

Bryan: Oh sure, it was done by a 17 year old kid who worked for the prosecutor as like a political favor.

Kasaris: Uh hah. Who was the kid?

Bryan: Uh, (Michael) Bassett.

Kasaris: And that is what she told you?

Bryan: Well, yeah that is what she told me.

Kasaris: So anyway, Richard Markus is abusing his office to insure that government insiders are fee to steal public resources, sexually and/or physically abuse women and children, engage in drug abuse, and/or trafficking, and/or to fix outcomes in criminal cases for profit. Where did she get that from? That Judge Markus was uh

Bryan: I don't know how she can. Okay, let me read this. Where are you getting this?

Kasaris: Third paragraph. _____

Kasaris: I'm sorry, second paragraph.

Bryan: Attorney Markus is impersonating a judge in Ottawa County Pleas Court. . .that is because her, as an attorney, she, in her opinion, is that Markus is not legally. _____ know that whole thing.

Kasaris: He's 70 years old. He is retired. He can't sit as a judge. That is one of her positions that she takes?

Bryan: Right. Uh, yeah.

Kasaris: Just one of them.

Bryan: _____ Okay. She is probably saying that because Markus was a lawyer of the allegations against Kevin Baxter. Kevin Baxter, as you probably know from reading stuff that I have written, after investigating it myself, and believe me if anything I am saying is false, somebody please tell me, so that I can take it down, but from my reading of the source documentation,

Kasaris: Uh hah

Bryan: Kevin Baxter is in violation of 2921.42. That is seeking public contract. Having an unlawful interest in a public contract. But, I am not an attorney so I can't really

Kasaris: Your talking about the boat?

Bryan: Yeah, the boat. The whole thing with the boat. Okay, there is a lot of upset people about that. Nobody comes right out and says it because they know

Kasaris: Yeah

Bryan: What will happen. Everybody is afraid politically of the County Prosecutor. Okay. So, she saying that because Markus was aware of that, he is roped in, as I have said before, this is how it happens, okay.

Kasaris: Because she makes Markus aware of something and Markus doesn't do anything

Bryan: Do anything about it

Kasaris: She lumps Markus in with whomever it may be.

Bryan: My opinion is, you can't do that because you have to condition it. You can't make statements like that because you have to condition it. Conditional statements telling people, explain exactly what you mean, because it opens you up to a civil deformation suit because you can go in and file a deformation suit and say you, ya know,

Kasaris: You're defaming me.

Bryan: You're defaming me. Right.

Kasaris: Do you know if she had any, uh

Bryan: Then she would have to go in and prove that what she was saying was true, if she didn't want what happened to her in Ottawa County to happen to her in Cuyahoga County.

Kasaris: Did she ever talk to you about how Richard Markus, how Judge Markus was abusing his office so the insiders are free to sexually and/or physically abuse women and children?

Bryan: That is probably a reference to Krista Harris

Kasaris: Or Kasarisiel Kay.

----- break? -----

Kasaris: That was sent in June. We get into August of 04 and I think by now you email address was bryan44870@peoplepc.com.

Bryan: yeah, I changed that address probably in February or something like that.

Kasaris: Hers is consistently been xxxxxxx and her husband's, I think, is xxxxxxxx and fobb5555 is Bob Farley?

Bryan: Bob Farley.

Kasaris: Who is mellfx?

Bryan: That is Dave Palmer.

Kasaris: Okay, right here

Bryan: He lives in California.

Kasaris: California

Kasaris: Who is J. Craig from the Columbus Dispatch.

Bryan: John Craig. He doesn't work for the Dispatch. He works at the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Kasaris: I know who R. Bright is from the Plain Dealer. It is Virginia Bright.

Kasaris: Who is J. Province from the Toledo Blade?

Bryan: I don't know him.

Kasaris: Rneil, somebody at Fremont Gazette?

Bryan: Oh, no, no, no, that is Rick Neil. Let me see. When was that sent?

Kasaris: August of 2004.

Bryan: Okay that is probably when they guy still worked for, the uh, News Herald.

Kasaris: Is it the Fremont News?

Bryan: They use the same server.

Kasaris: Port Clinton News Herald?

Bryan: He worked for the News Herald.

Kasaris: All right. Did she ever talk to you about filing a writ of prohibition sometime around August of 2004.

Bryan: I am aware of it. We didn't talk about it or anything.

Kasaris: Do you know that she never filed it?

Bryan: She never filed it?

Kasaris: She never filed a Writ of Prohibition in August of 2004. You did now that.

Bryan: No, I didn't know that.

Kasaris: She filed one in 2005.

Bryan: Okay, was it just a typo or was this a specific

Kasaris: This is a specific email in August of 2004. She filed the one in 2005 that our office represented the Judges on with John Oakar, _____

Bryan: 223. Okay, I don't know anything about that case. CVC223.

Kasaris: That is one of the Ottawa County cases. I think that is the

Bryan: There is a bunch of related

_____ That is the Baumgartner v. Drunken Miller that Charles Burns counter sued on.

Bryan: Okay, I don't know anything about this.

Kasaris: Have you ever talked to her about that email?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: Have you ever seen that before other than discovery?

Bryan: Well it got copied to me but I don't remember reading this.

Kasaris: All right.

Bryan: A lot of times she sent me stuff and I wouldn't even read it.

Kasaris: Yeah, I see, even the court stuff she was

Bryan: She copies me on a lot of stuff.

Kasaris: Judge Markus, uh, fixing cases to steal money and property from the State of Ohio and its people as well as to protect drug trafficking, pedophilia and other outrageous crimes in . . .Where is she getting that from? Did she ever talk to you about Judge Markus protecting pedophiles so that they can commit crimes?

Bryan: I mean, that's an embellishment to, to be honest.

Kasaris: Okay. Why do you say its an embellishment?

Bryan: Well because like I said, sex slave, that brings to mind pictures of a young black female that they collar around the neck. It is not what happened. That is not even what alleged to have happened. I mean,

Kasaris: She's living in Florida at this time, August of

Bryan: It would be

Kasaris: August of 04. And then, uh,

Bryan: Sue her, fricken sue her. I mean, sue the pants off of her. Do it. She can't last forever. I mean, if they have claims, fricken sue her. That's my opinion.

Kasaris: I understand.

Bryan: Okay. I mean this, you have to understand that not everything she says is false or an embellishment. And when I am looking at the stuff, if it's true, I am going to look at it and say, I am going to make the decision as to whether or not it is true. All right! You know? So that's

Kasaris: In here at 8-18 or August 18th, 04, email, where she courtesy copied you, its a reminder, I call it a reminder email, she emails Barbara Sutton, again, at the University of Notre Dame, I have obtained clear evidence that Moore, Markus and Dennis O'Toole fixed my case in Ottawa County to create sham judgment award of \$100,000.00 to another lawyer and to protect sex crimes, including pedophiles. What she's saying there is that Judge Markus has awarded, I think that's Burns \$100,000.00 to protect the sex crimes in Ohio. What sex crimes was Burns involved with? Supposedly?

Bryan: Let me look at it. Burns?

Kasaris: Charles Burns.

Bryan: Okay, Burns was the BCS Official who called, this is just from the information I getting.

Kasaris: From her.

Bryan: One ho called to let the Supreme Court know that she was operating under her law license when she was sus, what inter, when the remedial suspension, okay. So, that is his connection in there. Now this all goes back to _____

_____ She never alleged that Burns was involved in any sex crimes.

Bryan: Okay, does it say. . . . Clear evidence that _____ Okay, where is Charles Burns?

_____ Well the \$100,000.00 suit she is talking about has to be Charles Burns because that is what the trial

Bryan: ___to protect sex crimes . . . That is the connection she made in her mind, in her opinion, that is what happened.

Kasaris: Did she ever talk to you about that?

Bryan: I mean I know the facts, where she is getting it, no, but she never took me

Kasaris: Where is she getting that at?

Bryan: No, that is because Charles Burns was the one, I mean, Charles Burns got the \$100,000.00 judgment and he was also the one who called the Supreme Court to let them know she was operating while she was suspended.

Kasaris: Uh hum.

Bryan: That is where she is getting it.

Kasaris: Did you ever talk to her about this email.

Bryan: I don't believe so.

Kasaris: But she never said either Charles, but, she never said that either Charles Burns was involved with sex crimes or anything like that.

Bryan: Pedophilia.

Kasaris: Right. The pedophilia goes to Kasarisiel Kay and the sex crimes go to Kevin Baxter.

Bryan: It doesn't say that but, yeah, that is what I'm

Kasaris: From knowing her

Bryan: Right

Kasaris: When she talks about sex crimes, its

Bryan: Right

Kasaris: It's Kevin Baxter

Bryan: Right

Kasaris: Pedophilia is Kasaris

Bryan: She's telling me, she interrogated Krista Harris for 8 hours, make sure this woman, she couldn't find any indication that the woman was lying, so that is where she is getting it. She believes that is what happened.

Kasaris: Did she ever talk to you about why she was sending any of the emails, uh, these non court related emails to Judge Markus?

Bryan: No, other than the fact, do you mean to him specifically?

Kasaris: Yes

Bryan: To put him on notice, to let him know that, that, which to me is, I mean, common courtesy, why would you, I mean, I would view it as back stabbing if you didn't. I mean, that, to me that is more defamatory than not sending, I mean, how would you, do you know what I am saying?

Kasaris: When she sends the email to, go back to the 6-16 email, she sends it to Lutherans and to Barbara Sutton at Notre Dame University, and she courtesy copies Markus and all Supreme Court judges, and several newspapers.

Bryan: Okay, the purpose of that, what I believe her purpose is to let those justices know that she believes Markus is doing all of these things.

Kasaris: Then we go to a November 13th email, of 2004.

Bryan: Okay, this is her taking, can we just pause.

Kasaris: Sure.

Kasaris: Okay, I think we are back on. Yeah we're back on. Okay, I handed you the November 13, 2004 email.

Bryan: I chewed her out for this stuff. I don't want to be associated with that. Okay, this is not the only time she did this.

Kasaris: Did what?

Bryan: Sending out this, kind of, rambling, silly sounding, you know, ridiculous

Kasaris: What would you tell her when you chewed her out?

Bryan: I don't want to be associated with this. Knock it off.

Kasaris: And why did you not want to be associated with it?

Bryan: Because it is not how an attorney should behave.

Kasaris: Judge Markus on the verge of infamy for protecting pedophiles. That is an embellishment?

Bryan: First of all, what does infamy mean?

Kasaris: Something bad.

Bryan: Doesn't even fit inside what she is trying to say. Okay.

Kasaris: Not proper English.

Bryan: Right. Did you see her last filing? She is losing it.

Kasaris: I don't disagree with you that she is losing it. I saw her come out here on the record on the 17th crying, sobbing,

_____ Sobbing, when initially she was here, you weren't here, initially when she was first in jail here, I pictured her like this commercial Robert Conrad in the 70's, where he put the battery on his shoulders and said "go ahead, I dare you to knock it off." She was very brazen. She was very bold.

Bryan: She believed she was right.

Kasaris: But when she came out here on the 17th, after the judge remanded her, it was a completely different person. Whether she was acting, or whatever it was, or whatever

Bryan: I don't think that was an act.

Kasaris: she looked broken.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: She was in tears.

Bryan: 3 days in jail.

Kasaris: Most of the time she was talking. But previously, she had been in jail before for, before, and she, even, it seemed like when she was in jail in the summertime, that empowered her.

Bryan: Uh ha

Kasaris: This time when she was in jail, it had the opposite effect for whatever reason, uh

Bryan: Probably because she, because, after you go through it so many times, it wears you down.

Kasaris: You said earlier that she was embellishing and I think, I take it you disagreed with her embellishments?

Bryan: I disagree with the way she phrased what she said.

Kasaris: And why, what would be wrong with the way she phrased certain things?

Bryan: First, Okay, was any of this ever posted. Do you have the story where I posted.

Kasaris: I clicked on the link and to it, of course this is months later, but I noticed, you don't take your stories off, you may erase some comments but you don't take the stories off. I could not find that posted.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: So it was never posted.

Bryan: Well, I don't even know what she was talking about. Believe me, if I had a transcript of Markus saying, "Oh, I have prior knowledge and approval of the sexual degradation of women and children" yeah, you bet I would love to put it up there. Just like any other, you know, someone, any other advocate for accountability of the government.

Kasaris: But you never had, be sure _____ voices next week, is actual court documents proving Richard, don't call me Dick, Markus' prior knowledge of

Bryan: I don't know what she is talking about.

Kasaris: You know where she got that from?

Kasaris: She made it up?

Bryan: Well, I don't know if she made it up. In her mind, she probably has

Kasaris: But did she ever approach you about putting that on Erie Voices?

Bryan: No. I have sold editorial control over that sight.

Kasaris: Right. What's her control on it?

Bryan: She has no control. This is one of the things that always bothered me that she believed that she did have control of the _____.

Kasaris: She is what, she call herself the publisher and you are the editor? That's the labels you've attached to things.

Bryan: Kinda but not really, I mean, I have control of that site.

Kasaris: Did she fund it?

Bryan: I was being paid money for a certain period of time

Kasaris: \$850.00 roughly.

Bryan: That's pretty good. Where did you get that?

Kasaris: In the bank records.

Bryan: Okay. Yeah, I was very, not a very, I mean I wasn't

Kasaris: Every two weeks or so?

Bryan: Yeah, very modest. Yeah, Yeah.

Kasaris: I think that the last check that I saw was \$1,000.00 check _____.

Bryan: A \$1,000.00?

Kasaris: I think it was \$1,000.00?

Bryan: Oh, _____ deposit

Kasaris: Buy, so when she made the comment this weekend that \$70,000.00 has been spent to keep your voices going, where is she getting that from?

Bryan: Oh, that, she is saying, that because she paid me the money she is adding everything that she ever paid me, you know, everything, and saying that was her

Kasaris: She hasn't paid you \$70,000.00?

Bryan: I don't know, add it up? I don't know. I'm not sure if she has or not. I doubt it.

Kasaris: What was her part, uh

Bryan: She's adding in like everything, bonds, anything that she ever contributed, she's adding that in.

Kasaris: And this would be, if you click on that, this would be a link to that story. Am I correct.

Bryan: No. that not. That's not. If memory serves, that is a story about Mulligan was called into as a special prosecutor on the Ray Cast in _____.

Kasaris: Who is Ray Cast?

Bryan: Ray Cast is the Lucas County Treasurer who was run out of office.

Kasaris: What was he doing?

Bryan: For abusing public funds.

Kasaris: Okay. And Mulligan was a special prosecutor on that

Bryan: Mulligan was a special prosecutor

Kasaris: And what happened in Ray Cast?

Bryan: Well, I have a whole bunch of different people telling me what happened. Based on what was written in the Toledo Blade, Cast abused his office to pay for college classes at Case Western, I believe, and after that became public, I think he got in trouble, he was drunk driving in a county car and then the Blade started asking questions about

Kasaris: Okay. I remember that.

Bryan: Okay

Kasaris: I remember that. And then what ended up happening to him?

Bryan: What end up happening was Mulligan got called in as a special prosecutor and they worked out a deal where he would leave office in the Lucas County Treasurer's Office.

Kasaris: So, he pleaded misdemeanors, did he plead anything.

Bryan: I don't think he was ever even indicted. I don't think so

Kasaris: So the deal was, we won't indict you if you resign.

Bryan: Leave office, get out of here

_____ Was Markus on that case? Because that is the link to Markus. _____ just talking about.

Bryan: No, no, no.

Kasaris: No.

Bryan: I am talking about this link, I put that link in.

Kasaris: The link at the bottom.

Bryan: No, no, no, she did. She put this

_____ Right, but the email itself says Judge Markus will be revealed. Markus wasn't involved.

Bryan: Markus has no

Kasaris: No knowledge of that.

Bryan: From what I know

Kasaris: It says, in the meantime read this interesting story on how courthouse insiders protect theft to public resources, sex crimes and case fixing.

Bryan: I _____ don't know all about that?

Kasaris: Then she puts this here.

Bryan: But she is probably saying that she is probably making that connection. But see the connection was never made on that story. I wouldn't do that because it is to mu, too broad, its not, uh, you can't make that connection. She's made that connection because she knows Mulligan personally. She knows other things that he has done. Okay. So to her this is just a pattern for Mulligan.

Kasaris: Okay. But you and her never talked about.

Bryan: No, no, no, I disapproved with that crap. To me, that's poor writing, its

Kasaris: You and her, just to be clear, you and her never talked about the first paragraph, "Be sure to read Erie Voice next week

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: _____ court documents." You had no actual court documents proving that Judge Markus approved, had prior knowledge and approval,

Bryan: You have to ask her.

Kasaris: You had no knowledge of that? So, would it be fair to say that is something that she just made up?

Bryan: I don't know. I mean, if she had it, I was never asked to put it up. So I don't know.

Kasaris: If she was going to put it up, she would have to

Bryan: We never spoke about it. That, I don't know. I can't speak for her mind.

Kasaris: You saw what happened in there today. When you, uh

Bryan: Which is way I am done.

Kasaris: When you read this email, when you received it, and opened it, you said you had it out. What happened? Did you pick up the phone and call her? Did you go see her? What happened?

Bryan: Oh, this right here, I probably rolled my eyes and probably clinched my teeth and probably cursed her name a few times. But, there were other times where she did this and I don't know, I don't know.

Kasaris: The only emails I have are the emails she sent to Judge Markus.

Bryan: Okay, then you don't have them. There were other instances where they got sent out and they upset me and I let her have it. I let her hear

Kasaris: And when you say let her have it, wh

Bryan: I just told her I don't want to be associated with this, with the way you do this. This is just not, this is not me.

Kasaris: She didn't send you that.

Bryan: No. She didn't send me that.

Kasaris: Have you ever seen that.

Bryan: Yeah, I wrote that.

Kasaris: Oh, you wrote that for her.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: So

Bryan: In my opinion, and I am allowed to have this opinion, and if he's got a problem with that, he can sue me, my opinion was that man did some unjust things. I can have that opinion.

Kasaris: I am not debating that. This might surprise you but I was a TV radio major.

Bryan: I know that.

Kasaris: From Youngstown State.

Bryan: I know.

Kasaris: I mean, I was on the debate team.

Bryan: Sure

Kasaris: I mean, I believe in free speech.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: When she was

Bryan: We might be a little bit closer mentally than you think. Is what I think.

Kasaris: _____

Bryan: But I just, you know,

Kasaris: Now

Bryan: There are certain things I approve of, certain things I don't approve of. That's not one of them.

Kasaris: When she wrote this, she was, on 11-13 of 04, she was still in Florida?

Bryan: This is the same one as before, right?

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: When did she move to Michigan.

Bryan: That was right when that hurricane hit. I don't know the exact day it was.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: She was fleeing the hurricane.

Kasaris: In 04 or 05?

Bryan: It was 04, wasn't it? Yeah.

Kasaris: Do you know what hurricane it was?

Bryan: It was

_____ It couldn't be 05 because

Bryan: No, it was 04, it was 04. I believe it was August of 04.

Kasaris: They did have a few bad hurricanes down there last year.

Bryan: It was, I remember, she was fleeing the hurricane. She was asking Markus for a continuance on some hearing or something and he denied it.

Kasaris: Where did she stay in Michigan?

Bryan: At her, she had a townhouse in Lam_____ville.

Kasaris: That's in, is that in Monroe County?

Bryan: Yeah, I believe.

Kasaris: All right. Now she would not come back into Ohio because she had the warrant out for her.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Did she ever tell you that?

Bryan: Well it was common knowledge why she wouldn't come back. She did not want to go back to jail. She believed it was a bogus warrant. I agree with her that it was a bogus warrant.

Kasaris: Did she ask you to sit in on the Kellen Smith trial?

Bryan: No. I did that voluntarily. I, at that point, I was really upset with what was going on. I did not agree with what was going on.

Kasaris: And what part didn't you agree with?

Bryan: Well, the way, uh, that it just didn't seem to matter what she said. No argument that she made mattered. Whether right or wrong, it didn't matter. It was just dismissed. Just ignored. Ignored.

Kasaris: Here she writes an email on 11-23 of 04 to Steve Mosier, where she indicates that she's, her legal address is in Palm Beach, Florida.

Bryan: And that was in 11-23-04. Okay. Okay. Okay.

Kasaris: All right, she would have been in Florida then at this time?

Bryan: No, no, I don't know. She's saying that's the legal address.

Kasaris: That's not saying that where she, I

Bryan: That is not saying where she lives, that just saying

_____ I have a temporary office in Michigan.

Bryan: All right, that is what she considers.

Kasaris: How many times did she file bankruptcy?

Bryan: I know she did in Florida. I don't know whether she did in Michigan. I am not sure how many times.

FLIP SIDE OF TAPE

Bryan: _____

Kasaris: How would you communicate with her while she was in Florida?

Bryan: Mostly, email, telephone sometimes, not often. Instant message

Kasaris: How many times had you actually met her face to face between June of 04 and November of 04.

Bryan: Probably twice.

Kasaris: She was in Ohio?

Bryan: I don't remember. It was in Ohio. It was after she moved back from Florida.

Kasaris: So, she would have been in Ohio during the time that this warrant was out for her prior to _____

Bryan: No, I am sorry. Michigan, it was in Michigan.

Kasaris: So you met her in Michigan.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: And then we get to the Kellen Smith trial. Did she talk to you about filing, uh, federal lawsuits in Ohio, prior to filing them, just before the Kellen Smith trial started.

Bryan: No, I have no idea about _____.

Kasaris: Then you sent the email, the hello bias Judge email, to Judge Markus?

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: Did she know you were sending that?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: You didn't tell her. You didn't

Bryan: No. No. I didn't care if she knew or not. That right there, to me, I couldn't believe that the guy was ignoring it.

Kasaris: All right, and then that was sent on the 29th of November.

Bryan: 29th, yeah, correct.

Papers shuffling

Bryan: I know what I wrote.

Kasaris: And then, did. . .How was this put together. I, I

Bryan: Okay, I wrote this email, and then I sent this part, all of this, to show him what happened in Ottawa County.

Kasaris: Was that an attachment or was that. . .?

Bryan: No, I cut and pasted right into the body of the email.

Kasaris: Okay, so that was actually

Bryan: I was letting him know what happened on that day.

Kasaris: With Royster.

Bryan: With Royster. I wanted him to know what happened in Ottawa County, I mean, he's a judge, he should know that that was not allowed. And then later, he filed a judgment and a journal entry ordering them to accept to filings, after they kicked me out. You know, so I disagree with the whole thing, I though it was just disorderly.

Kasaris: When you called his house, I think you talked to his wife?

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: How many times did you call his house?

Bryan: I called him once and then he called me back. I called him, talked to his wife, and the next day he called me back. We had a nice conversation.

Kasaris: And at one time, I think he called left a voice mail.

Bryan: Yeah, left a voice mail letting him know, I sent you an email.

Kasaris: All right.

Bryan: He didn't look at it.

Kasaris: Where you indicate you can take the following steps where I will begin my investigation on you and write about the stonewalling I get from you recuse yourself or dismiss the civil suit on the basis it is not a good idea to encourage or express your opinion regarding Krista _____

Bryan: Wrap it all up, what was I doing, I was telling him to follow the law.

_____ Was that the email or the voice mail?

Kasaris: This is the email.

Bryan: This is the email.

Bryan: I believe, I was telling him to follow the law. Whether or not he does that, so

Kasaris: I know you know who Judge Markus is.

Bryan: Sure, we've met. We've spoke.

Kasaris: I know you have.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: I know you have.

Bryan: Very polite conversation.

Kasaris: He's a very . . . He's one of the

Bryan: He's a

Kasaris: He's one of the top lawyers

Bryan: Sure, he's an incredible speaker, he

Kasaris: Touch judges.

Bryan: Kind of going down hill right now, but that's just my opinion, but he

Kasaris: I mean he's

Bryan: He wrote the book.

Kasaris: Your right, he wrote the book. He's a professor at, I think its Case or Cleveland State.

Bryan: It doesn't make him honest, but yeah.

Kasaris: Okay.

Bryan: I was very impressed with the man.

Kasaris: Well, he's a very impressive person.

Bryan: He is.

Kasaris: I think we can agree on that.

Bryan: Richard Markus is

Kasaris: Where we disagree is that you think that he, uh, is stealing money.

Bryan: No, I don't think he's stealing money.

Kasaris: What do you believe he's doing?

Bryan: I believe that he, for whatever reason, I don't know, I can't speak for what's in his mind, I believe that his actions, the way he handled that case, he did it with a predetermined outcome in mind, before he even started. That is what I believe.

Kasaris: Do you know that he gave her the of, going back to _____, going back to the _____ litigator case, where they had a telephone, actually it was set for March 22, 2004, she doesn't show up, with a court reporter present

Bryan: Okay, let me just say something

Kasaris: Go ahead.

Bryan: I saw what happened here. I was here the whole time. Not just today but other days. Okay. I saw how that relationship went between us, not meaning her singularly with the Judge. Okay. I have the transcripts. I saw how it all happened. Now, if there are other things that I am unaware of that happened with Judge Markus that I don't know about, please show me so I can

Kasaris: Are you, so that is what I was doing, are you aware that

Bryan: Sure. Right, but that is just want to tell you I know what

Kasaris: Well, you saw what happened.

Bryan: I am telling you, I am telling you that I am aware that this is very possible, its very possible

_____ - What is very possible?

Bryan: That I am, that I have been mistaken about this guy and maybe it's just, maybe its just timing. What do you do with a person you just can't deal with.

Kasaris: You know your bond is higher than Baumgartner's bond.

Bryan: Yeah. Sure. What are you implying by that?

Kasaris: Just saying, I mean, you just said earlier your relationship with this judge.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: I mean, this Judge released her on a \$25,000.00 bond

Bryan: And she put mine at \$40,000.00.

Kasaris: And your is at \$40,000.00. What did you think about that?

Bryan: Well, that could be attributed to, uh, just the order of interactions between the attorneys and the Judge. I mean, there are a lot of reasons things happen the way they do in _____, I understand that.

_____ Let me ask you this so I understand, tell me I'm wrong if I am wrong, if what you are saying just now is that you now understand how people might be dealing with Baumgartner because of her irrational behavior, _____?

Bryan: It could be. It could be.

_____ And that is as much as a plausible theory as everybody is a criminal.

Bryan: Oh yeah, yeah, sure. But, um, I go on what I know. I go on what people show me and what people tell me. Now I called Markus, myself, and I wanted to talk to him about this. And he spoke to me, and at that point, it just didn't make sense to me, didn't satisfy me.

_____ When you did _____ Markus, were you doing that for you, as a journalist, as somebody seeking the truth or were you doing _____

Bryan: No. I did that on my own. I did it because I wanted to understand the situation.

_____ And then the email that you sent for him to recuse himself, was that for as an advocate for what's right

Bryan: Yes

_____ Or was that for _____.

Bryan: I was trying to be an advocate for what, I believe, was right.

_____ But it was only for her case?

Bryan: Well, her case to me represented everything or a lot of the things that went wrong with the system. Okay, if someone else, I mean a lot of people approach me and they say, "look what happened to me in this case, look what happened to me in that case," and I give them an email and I say, "look, I understand what you are saying, and I agree with you, yes, there are a lot of things in government that are screwed up, but I've got my hands full." If what you are asking me is, do I just advocate for her because of some kind of relationship with her. No. I don't have a relationship with her. If she does nutty things, I have nothing to do with that. I am just saying objectively, when I look at the case, there are a lot of things that trouble me about how they were treated. In my opinion, guys, _____,

Kasaris: Go ahead.

Bryan: What they are doing is they are charging crimes over and over and over again, trying to litigate her to death. Why spend tax dollars to do that. Why do it. Why not just let her explode, let her implode, in public. In other words, discredit her. Let, why spend the tax dollars.

Kasaris: She being, the Erie County crimes that she's being charged with, she lead police on a chase, and you were present

Bryan: And I understand that. We don't need to talk about that because, all right, because I am involved with that case. You don't want to

Kasaris: You were there. You were there! I mean I wasn't, you were. You saw what happened. I mean I have seen the tape and I've seen the CD and I have seen the chase, and I have heard

Bryan: Why didn't you talk to me. Why didn't you talk to me.

Kasaris: At the time, sir, you were a

Bryan: Don't have to call me sir.

Kasaris: At the time you were a, I was presenting your case to the Erie County Grand Jury.

Bryan: I know that.

Kasaris: And we typically don't talk

Bryan: All right, okay, okay.

Kasaris: First of all, I can't.

Bryan: Okay, look at

_____ You guy shouldn't. You shouldn't be challenging.

_____ I'm not challenging. Give me

_____ The real question that nobody understands is (a) if _____, you can disagree with this if you want. Disagree with me Bryan if you want, but what I see nobody can understand is if _____ so irrational with what she is doing, why did you pick her case to back?

Bryan: Because she was so anxious to give me the information. I didn't have to work to get the information.

_____ She handed it to you.

Bryan: She handed it to me. It was a fascinating story. I mean, that woman, she probably more well known in Erie County than the prosecutor. More people recognize her name than

Kasaris: Did she tell you why she was labeled a vexatious litigator. Did she tell you what happened about that part, that case.

Bryan: Yeah, it was brought against her by Mulligan.

Kasaris: But did she tell you about the trial. About what actually happened at the trial.

Bryan: She wasn't there.

Kasaris: Did she tell you why?

Bryan: Uh, I don't know why. Why, because of the warrant?

Kasaris: What happened was, well that may be, but what happened was on, the trial was set for

Mumbling

Kasaris: The trial was set for March 22, 2004. _____ case.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Markus is there with the court reporter. I have the transcript of it. They are waiting for Elsebeth, she doesn't show up. So he calls her. Puts her on speaker phone. Says where are you?

Bryan: I don't know anything about that.

Kasaris: Well I am just letting you know. Where are you? She said, "I don't recognize the court. I don't recognize your jurisdiction. I'm suing you." He say, "well, this is your trial date." I'm suing you, she says, "I'm suing you." Okay, thank you. Markus. They hang up and they proceed to trial and she sued him. That is the first federal lawsuit. She was found to be a vexatious litigator and then Judge Markus issues an order telling her, okay, now you have been labeled a vexatious litigator. In order to continue with these cases that you brought as a plaintiff, the Baumgartner v. Drunkenmiller, Baumgartner v. Kellen Smith (which was the assault), in order for you

to proceed as a plaintiff, you have to file a document telling me or showing me why the assault is a good faith belief that the assault happened.

_____ Wasn't there more than _____ wrong, didn't she file the lawsuit, _____, and then not serve it?

Kasaris: No, that is the lawsuit. That's different. That is a different thing. What I am talking about is under the vexatious litigator case. See once she is labeled a vexatious litigator

_____ before, how she got labeled a vexatious litigator.

Kasaris: Well, no, now, the vexatious litigator happened while she was filing that lawsuit. I will explain the lawsuit but what happened with vexatious litigator case is she is labeled a vexatious litigator, Markus then tells her in order to continue these two other lawsuits that you filed, you have to, uh, you have to show me what good faith belief you have that you were assaulted or whatever other stuff happened. She never responded. She never filed a document that he asked her to file. When she was labeled a vexatious litigator, she tried to appeal it and instead of following the right procedures to appeal it, in other words, filing a motion with Judge Markus, as was done with her license, her pharmacy license, filing the paperwork with him asking for the appeal, okay, she doesn't do that. What she does, she files a Notice of Appeal. Judge Markus says wait a minute, she's a vexatious litigator, she can't file a Notice of Appeal by herself. You got to have a lawyer do it or she has to ask to do it. So he told the Clerk's office, hold it and tell her she has to ask for leave or get a lawyer to . . . she never does it. She, her problem is that she can't follow the rules.

Bryan: Nobody here does. If you are trying convince me that she doesn't follow the rules. What's the point?

Kasaris: What I am trying to show you is that, what I am trying to talk to you about is with the Judge Markus incident, one of the reasons she get into the bind she gets into in November of 04, why the assault case is thrown out, why the charges she had on Baumgartner v. Drunkenmiller, I think it is 02 CVC 223, why that is thrown out is because she doesn't follow the rules.

Bryan: I think it is thrown out because _____ mumbled.

Kasaris: That's probably true. But all she had to do was simply put something in writing asking Judge Markus for a leave to file, leave to continue and here is why and he would have granted it.

Bryan: Just like in,

Kasaris: just like he

Bryan: Just like in, just this past couple of weeks, she moved for a continuance in Erie Ottawa County _____

Kasaris: She moved for it.

Bryan: Oh, she did?

Kasaris: she moved for it.

Bryan: Okay, and she complaining that, she is complaining to me that she didn't know about it until the day before the scheduled trial, which was what? The 7th, it was suppose to go forward on the 7th, right?

Kasaris: Yeah.

Bryan: Okay, but the Court didn't grant the continuance. According to her

_____ Yeah, but there is the big operative fact, according to her . . . because I keep hearing you've got bad information.

Kasaris: Here's the, here's the

_____ Filed for that continuance.

Bryan: No, because we can never figure out

Kasaris: here's what happened. On November 7,

Bryan: Kasaris, here, if you don't know, pick up the phone. That is what believe she should have done?

Kasaris: And she didn't do it?

Bryan: Right. It's like she's

Kasaris: November 7th, we have a pretrial in front of Judge Knepper in Ottawa County or in Erie County. She drove down to Columbus and filed her affidavit of disqualification. She was late for the pretrial. The Judge Knepper said to me, Kasaris, go ahead and go. So, I left. I don't know if you ended up being present on that day or not.

Bryan: Yeah, I walked _____

Kasaris: Never set the trial date there. He asked me, he said, Kasaris . .

Bryan: So you didn't know it?

Kasaris: No I knew it, he said to me, Kasaris, when do you want to go to trial. I said, how about December 5th. He said, well, no, how about the 7th, I said okay. I then leave. She then shows up to my understanding from talking to Tom McGowan (the bailiff) that she was informed of the trial date which was set for the 7th. She filed a motion to continue the trial, a week before trial, claimed she had mental problems and that she needs to hire a lawyer. Tom McGowan calls me and tells me that motion was filed. Well, I said I am going to oppose it. I am ready to go. Tom McGowan calls me, I think two days later, and says the Judge granted it. So that is how trial got moved to February 1st. Is that how you understood it was moved?

Bryan: To tell you the honest to god truth, I don't care.

_____ Yah, but you should care because it sounds like you are getting false information.

Bryan: Right, and I want to get away from it all because what I believe is happening here is she disagrees with what is happening to her, so she's gaming.

Kasaris: But on the Erie County case, do you understand how now that it was moved? Do you understand that she asked for it, she wanted the continuance and the Judge granted it.

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: Did she tell you that was the way it went down?

Bryan: Okay, what I am saying is she didn't know it was granted until the last minute. So

Kasaris: Well that could be.

Bryan: So to me it was almost like, I want to complain, this is what I want to complain about today. Um, instead of just picking up the phone and calling the court and finding out if it was continued or not, instead of rushing around like, you know, I've got to get this filed, I got to get that filed, uh,

Kasaris: What is in her head? I mean

Bryan: I don't know. I don't know. Like I said, it was just, she tells me something. It looks kind of wacky, so I look into it. If I agree with it, then I'll write about. If I agree with it. A lot of the things she said, I don't agree with.

Kasaris: It's kind of hard, you had made the comment before, that we should just let her, she should just be let to implode in public and meltdown publicly. She led the, getting back to that chase, that chase, we don't ignore fleeing from police officers.

Bryan: I understand that.

Kasaris: You, you were there. How is it that you got to be at Terry's Tavern that night?

Bryan: She was lonely and she wanted to hang out and I said, sure, okay, went over to Terry's and sat down.

Kasaris: She called you and

Bryan: I can't remember how it happened, but

Kasaris: Was she staying with you?

Bryan: No, hell no, I'm married. She's married.

Kasaris: At the time, though, I think you and your wife were

Bryan: Yeah, we were having a rough time.

Kasaris: I know. I know. Your wife had an apartment that she was staying in?

Bryan: Which we now live in, together.

Kasaris: oh, you don't live on Ging Street anymore?

Bryan: No, _____

Kasaris: So you, at the time back in May, you were, Baumgartner wasn't living with you?

Bryan: Absolutely not.

Kasaris: She wasn't staying with you at all?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: Okay, who, the Kia comes back to you?

Bryan: On paper.

Kasaris: Who paid for the Kia?

Bryan: She put the down payment.

Kasaris: And who made the payments for the Kia?

Bryan: She made some of them, I made some of them.

Kasaris: But the car, is it currently titled to you? Do you still own it?

Bryan: yes, its titled to me.

Kasaris: And that night, who drove the car?

Bryan: I drove it over there. She drove it out.

Kasaris: When you went over there, did you leave the keys in the ignition?

Bryan: No, I left them on the table.

Kasaris: In the

Bryan: She was going out to sit in the car. I said fine, and

Kasaris: You went to the bathroom. When you came out that is when you

Bryan: I looked out the window and

Kasaris: What did you see when you looked out the window?

Bryan: You know, the car was surrounded.

Kasaris: When you walked out of the bathroom, did you

Bryan: I walked out of the bathroom, peeked over the counter. If you go in there, you probably have, look over see out the window. So I walked back out to pay for the

Kasaris: Right, right.

Bryan: Then one of the officers

Kasaris: Jeff Wagner

Bryan: I thought it was Captain Wagner.

Kasaris: Well, no he is not a captain.

Bryan: Well, he told me that he was a captain.

Kasaris: There was a captain there, Blotsky.

Bryan: Blotsky, I'm sorry. Wagner, yeah he comes in and he starts yelling, "get out here, get out here." You know, I looked over to make knowledge that it was my car and said that I will be out there. He said, "No you get out here now." So

Kasaris: So you went out.

Bryan: So I went out.

Kasaris: And when

Bryan: I told Blotsky, I said I tried to talk to her and meanwhile Brandy Adkins whipped out her ASP and she was going to break the window. At that point I was like, don't break my window. I mean, I am going to have to pay anyway \$500.00 to have that window fixed, you moron. Then, you know, they go back and forth.

Kasaris: They were asking her to get out of the car?

Bryan: Yeah, they were asking her to

Kasaris: Were you asking her to get out of the car?

Bryan: Uh, I wanted to calm the whole thing down and say. You know I was going to try to tell her don't go anywhere. Have Prosowski (Helen Prosowski, part-time Bay View police chief) come over and have a rational discussion about what was happening and then

Kasaris: Then what happened?

Bryan: Then Adkins, what I did was I told Prosowksi, why don't you calm your officer down, that's your officer. You're in charge. Calm her down a little. I'll tell her not to go anywhere if she will listen to me and Prosowksi said, "I don't think she is doing anything wrong." You know, I looked back over at robocop and she's got her ASP out, like the whole thing is like she's going after a convicted murder or something. And, then I just kind of shook my head and moved back a little bit. I mean I was out of, I mean I didn't have control over it. She jumps into the passenger, into the driver's seat, started backing her up and takes off.

Kasaris: And takes off. Where are you standing when she took off?

Bryan: Almost in front of the vehicle, probably about 30 feet, right in front of the sign there. Terry's Tavern sticks out _____

Kasaris: I think the captain was standing with you, by you.

Bryan: They had their vehicles surrounding.

Kasaris: Did she, uh, I know she didn't squeal her tires or peal out, I know, when she left. Did she, uh, did she

Bryan: Muhudsky pealed out.

Kasaris: Right, well he went looking for her.

Bryan: Yeah, in his own car.

Kasaris: yeah, in his own car. I know that.

Bryan: Which she lied to me, by the way. Prosowski lies to me and then I called her out on it, later on, and I got her on tape, you know, don't trick me. You lied to the News Herald about me. Don't lie to me. I know, I was there, I know what. She's like well, she tried to pay it off. But anyways.

Kasaris: No, he got into his own car and I asked, "what are you doing getting in your own car, following him." He said, "well I was, I wanted to see what was going on." So he get into his

Bryan: typical bar fights.

Kasaris: He gets into his private car and he, I mean, and follows. I mean, he's not, their not right behind him but he follows at a distance to see what's going on with this chase.

_____ She knew she had a warrant, right?

Bryan: What was to be?

_____ But you

Bryan: Sure, I knew, right.

_____ I'm just having a hard time with the whole thing.

Bryan: Yes, I understood that.

Kasaris: Did you know that the police told her that she was under arrest?

Bryan: I don't believe they ever said that to her. When I was standing they never said it.

Kasaris: So you

Bryan: If they said that to her while I was still in the restaurant, that's a different story.

Kasaris: Did you know that Helen walked out and said "Elsebeth". Did you know that Helen knows Elsebeth?

Bryan: I don't know.

Kasaris: When Elsebeth made her complaint about.....Elsebeth actually went to the Sandusky Police Department regarding Krista Harris.

Bryan: Okay

Kasaris: And the allegations

Bryan: Well, she even addressed the City Council.

Kasaris: But the police officer that Elsebeth and Krista talked to, was Helen Prosowski, because Helen is

Bryan: She was a detective.

Kasaris: She still is a detective.

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: Sandusky Police Department. So Helen knew Elsebeth and saw her sitting in the car she knew who she was. And Helen walks up and says, "Elsebeth, I have a warrant for your arrest. You are under arrest.

Bryan: It's a bench warrant.

Kasaris: It's a bench warrant but it's still a warrant. I have a warrant for your arrest

Bryan: Okay

Kasaris: You're under arrest, get out of the car. We don't want to break the windows, get out of the car. That occurred prior to you going outside. Did Elsebeth ever talk to you about that? About what happened?

Bryan: Yep, she told me that

Kasaris: What did she tell you?

Bryan: Prosowski came up and questioned if it was Elsebeth. She said, Elsebeth, like _____ . See if it was her because she didn't have any ID or she didn't know that that was her.

Kasaris: Okay. Did she say anything else?

Bryan: Um.

Kasaris: About when Helen

Bryan: She said that on a bench warrant, a police officer can. A police officer, she called it at Terry's Stop.

Kasaris: Bal_____, called it a Terry Stop.

Bryan: Because, didn't it come out of Cuyahoga

Kasaris: Terry stop is a patted frisk.

Bryan: Right. You can't stop somebody just for no reason. You have to have a valid reason to stop.

Kasaris: Reasonable suspicion.

Bryan: Right. Something like that, right.

Kasaris: To pat them down, stop them.

Bryan: A cop just can't walk up to somebody and say

Kasaris: And pat you down.

Bryan: Right

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Or arrest you _____

Kasaris: But in this case, actually, they were informed by the Ottawa County Sheriff's Dept.

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: Ottawa County calls Erie County. Erie County calls Bayview and they say we have a warrant for Elsebeth Baumgartner and they run her and they see there's a warrant out for her. With a _____ brace of 2. Which means the entire state. 4 is adjoining counties. I think 3 is a little bit larger and 2 is the entire state. 1 is everywhere.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: So when they go

Bryan: So Bratton raised the limit, right?

Kasaris: It is my understanding, your right, it was raised from, you can hear it on the CD, from 4 to 2

Bryan: Bratton, the coward, he knows, he knew there was question. He's the one who told me, we don't know if that thing is legit.

_____ yeah, but what you're missing in this whole thing. It's pure editorial. If a citizen thinks a court document is baseless, you still can't question it until you go to court?

Bryan: That is what I told my wife this morning. I said, I don't care who you are, you can't just make that decision on your own because then that opens up the

Kasaris: And you can't get into a car and flee from the police like she did.

Bryan: I disagree with her. I don't believe she did the right thing, Kasaris.

Kasaris: Have you seen the

_____ can't understand. Speaking far away.

Bryan: Oh, they all know me because my Dad is a

Kasaris: Juvenile Court

Bryan: Probation officer here in _____. He's been there for 30 years.

_____ I'm just kind of sitting here like that your talking about being a witness to this whole thing is no big deal but you knew she had a warrant, there is a ton of cops around and then she drives off.

Bryan: yeah.

Kasaris: But you would tell her don't go. Don't go.

Bryan: that is what I told her, Don't go. Don't go. Whatever they are going to do they're going to charge you.

Marty: Plus there's people in the street and you're running from the cops, I mean, do you realize that

Bryan: I looked at the tape. Marty, I disagree with her.

Marty: Okay.

Bryan: Okay, so don't think. You don't do that

Marty: _____ figure out.

Bryan: You just don't do that. You just don't do it.

Marty: Okay, I'm sorry, I just

Bryan: When you are talking

Marty: I understand you have some beefs with_____. They know Elsebeth and _____

Bryan: It doesn't give you cause.

Marty: Okay.

Bryan: It doesn't give you cause to just disregard everything and

Kasaris: Go through the intersection at State Route 113

Bryan: Whatever she did, I disagree with it.

Kasaris: All right, then when, getting back to the lawsuit, the Kellen Smith matter, when did you know or when did you learn that she had filed that lawsuit in the Northern District of Ohio, actually 2 of them.

Bryan: I don't know. I knew very little about those lawsuits

Mumble

_____ If he says something you don't like, you have to wait and then I will be right back.

Bryan: All right.

Bryan: Just take this shit to ABC

Kasaris: Take what happened today to ABC.

Bryan: Yeah.

Bryan: Do you still have your contacts over there?

Kasaris: (Laughs) Yeh, I do. Yes, I do. ABC, CBS. This was an email that she sent on December 1st to Judge Markus and that you were courtesy copied on. I think that is the one that advises that the lawsuits were filed.

Bryan: _____

Kasaris: Right

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Did she ever, she never talked about the lawsuits being filed before she did, did she?

Bryan: I had no input on it.

Kasaris: Did she show them to you.

Bryan: I don't think I ever read them all the way. It's all the same litany, you know.

Kasaris: It's the same stuff she filed actually in

Bryan: there might be some truths to it. There might be some untruths to it but the bottom line is

Kasaris: What happened Jay was that she files the 1st and 2nd lawsuits in Florida. I might have the numbers off but one of them is a \$55,000,000.00 lawsuit and one is a \$38,000,000.00 lawsuit. One of them basically rehashes her disciplinary process and the other goes back to the school board, this school board thing. Now, she doesn't serve anybody but she does by email, emails them to the newspapers and they are printed in the newspapers. The court says to her in Florida, you got to serve these. You haven't attempted to serve them or we are going to dismiss your, dismiss it. One they dismissed in August of 04 and one was in January or February of 05. In the meantime, she turns around and files basically the same lawsuits in the Northern District here. They get assigned to Chris Boyko and the same thing happens. She doesn't try to serve anybody. She tells everybody about it. It's published. Chris Boyko, when he gets the lawsuits,

Bryan: I never published those, by the way.

Kasaris: I couldn't find them on your website.

Bryan: All right.

Kasaris: When Boyko gets them, Boyko said I am going to decide those cases on the merits. What Boyko says is that you've made these allegations before. They have been determined to be false before. They are false again and not only am I going to dismiss these cases, I am going to label you a vexatious litigator in Federal Court so you can't file in the Northern District without approval of the Administrative Judge and Boyko tosses them, I think, in February of 05. Did she ever talk to you about those lawsuits.

Bryan: Not substantially.

Kasaris: Did she tell you she filed them, other than this email?

Bryan: I can't remember, probably, yeah.

Kasaris: All right, all right. Uh, you were in attendance obviously at the Kellen Smith trial. What happened to cause you to walk up to the, I think it was Burns, and hand him that note.

Bryan: _____ he perjured himself.

Kasaris: How did he do that?

Bryan: He perjured himself because he said all the allegations she made against him were false. I knew they were not false.

Kasaris: And

Bryan: I saw documents

Kasaris: What specific ones weren't false.

Bryan: Well that he padded his resume, you know this stuff. Just for the purposes of this, I mean, I wrote about this and I made it very clear to everybody.

_____ Lay it out.

Bryan: Those, that is the allegation that I looked at, I said there's merits in this allegation. I looked at it, mathematically _____ checked with other people and they said, yeah, it looked great to me. So I published it.

Kasaris: So you handed him the note as he walks off the witness stand.

Bryan: Right, after he came off the witness stand

Kasaris: And then

Bryan: Because I am not going to do it before because that is witness intimidation.

Kasaris: And then you get, but he is still a witness.

Bryan: He was off the witness stand.

_____ So what happens.

Kasaris: So you then, you then get called back into the Courtroom.

Bryan: Yeah, Markus yells

Kasaris: Calls you back into the courtroom and he mochas you

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: And the Bob Lynch tells you not to say anything.

Bryan: Right. And I was very polite to Judge Markus.

Kasaris: Yeah, I don't think he's ever said anything otherwise about it. When did you find out that Markus rendered his decision in the Kellen Smith case?

Bryan: I think that was in mid December, wasn't it?

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: And did you go to the courthouse and find out?

Bryan: No. No.

Kasaris: Baumgartner called you? How did you find?

Bryan: I can't remember how I found out. Probably an email or something.

Kasaris: All right. And then you, Judge Markus, 32 counts contempt for you, Ms. Baumgartner, you will not _____.

Bryan: Yeah, that is what it looked like to me. It was like, about, a control scheme. Like you do what I say or

Kasaris: You will share my reality, Ms. Baumgartner.

Bryan: In my opinion that is what was happening.

Kasaris: Did you

Bryan: Like it was a heavy handed approach when, it was heavy handed.

Kasaris: Did she have any input in any of these emails going on, or the websites?

Bryan: No, that was all my opinion

Kasaris: That was all your opinion?

Bryan: Yeah.

_____ Heavy handed by Judge Markus.

Bryan: Yeah, absolutely. 34 counts of contempt and then, of course, this matter.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Judge Markus is the complaining witness. Seems heavy handed.

Kasaris: I don't know if you knew, what he did was, when he announced the judgment, when he rendered the judgment, he also added a lengthy opinion. I don't know how long it is.

_____ - Cited her for 32 or 34 counts of contempt and those charges are pending in Ottawa County.

Kasaris: For criminal contempt. What he did was the criminal contempt was for actions that occurred in the Ottawa County Common Pleas Court during the proceedings whether

it was something she filed in the proceeding, whether it was by fax, or however. What he did here was the emails he received at his house. That is where you have the 2 different things.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Any other way do you believe he acted heavy handedly?

Bryan: No that would be it.

Kasaris: Do you think he was wrong

Bryan: Charges against. . .yeah, I think she should be sued for _____. Litigate her to death. She is going to burn out soon. Why spend the tax dollars? I just don't believe that you can criminalize the _____ that way. I mean, look, if she is a nut case, everybody knows she's a nut case, who gives a dam what she's saying anyway. That is what I believe.

_____ The people from the Lutheran Ministries of Notre Dame don't know her. You didn't send your email to them

Bryan: No I didn't

_____ Because you thought you were doing something right between you and Judge Markus. Right? I mean you were exposing something or _____

Bryan: I wanted Markus to follow the law?

_____ And you didn't copy him.

Bryan: No, why would I.

_____ Right. But all these other emails that you said that she was elaborating, using the wrong words, improper English, she was copying all _____. You don't know her and now you are saying, I mean, this waste of taxpayers dollars, I mean, what we are doing here today, you think is a waste? I mean you have read these emails, you know who's received them,

Bryan: Right, but to me it would seem a more appropriate _____ of speech, to sue her for liable. Okay, that my opinion.

_____ Okay, that is your position.

Bryan: That's my position.

_____ You have read these emails and these allegations

Bryan: It sounds nutty. She sounds like a nut so who cares what she is saying. I mean, who cares. I mean, all Judge Markus has to do, in my opinion, is let those people know, he's on boards with them. If they respect him well _____. Just let them know. Let them know this woman, you know, is doing this and if it is all false,

_____ that is something you should have to do? I mean,

Bryan: Okay, maybe she's a pain in the ass. She's a pain in the ass.

_____ So now you guys are agreeing. He's saying sue her. He's say

Bryan: I'm saying don't charge her with criminal

_____ He may be wrong, but Mr. Dubois what I am saying here is that she shouldn't have some pain for this, she just saying the civil case,

Kasaris: And your opinion with regards to the criminal system has doesn't related to fleeing and eluding case, its this case here.

Bryan: Rephrase, what do you mean?

Kasaris: Do you have a problem in your mind with the fleeing and eluding case being brought against her? The fleeing and eluding

Bryan: As you know, the GTA, I disagree with that. Fleeing and eluding, okay. _____

Kasaris: Other than grand theft of a motor vehicle. The fleeing and eluding and resisting, maybe escape, something like that. You don't think that's a waste of taxpayer money.

Bryan: No. If you can't publish a story about some women fleeing the police without some kind of repercussion, what would happen there, You can't do that, so I agree with.

Kasaris: Where you disagree rightfully or wrongfully is with the intimidation statute

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Which is

Bryan: Gudiaris even told me you can't charge

Mumbling

Bryan: Gudiaris told me (ha, ha, ha) for 20 minutes we had a phone conversation about the intimidation statute. He told me that it was used to combat the _____ because of these phony court documents. They are filing false indictments. False, you know using the UCC filing to screen people. I agree, you have stop that. You have to prevent that.

Kasaris: Have you read the, I'm sure you've read, you are not charged but have you read it?

Bryan: yeah, I am charged with intimidation.

Kasaris: Not under this specific one.

Bryan: Okay which one did you charge me under?

Kasaris: You charged under the basic threat intimidation. She's charged under the portion _____ statute that deals with using materially false writings in a reckless manner. You are not charged under that statute.

Bryan: Okay.

Mumbling

Kasaris: That's Bryan's charge. But Elsebeth

Mumbling

Kasaris: Elsebeth is the statute that Gudiaries is talking about.

Bryan: When I read I thought they were the same.

Kasaris: They are the same statute but

Bryan: Are you talking about version A and version B?

Kasaris: Yeah. You are charged "did unlawfully and knowingly in by force or lawful threat of harm attempt to influence". That the classic, "I'm going to break your legs" Okay. That's like what I call the classic intimidation. She's charged under, "Using materially false or fraudulent writing with malicious purpose and bad faith or unwanton or reckless mannership." You see the difference?

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: She's being charged with using the materially false or fraudulent writing.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: So if we believe that these items are materially false or fraudulent, these writings, these emails, uh, and we have a victim that comes to us and says, "I think that

Bryan: A judge. Okay.

Kasaris: I've had judges as victims. I have had, you know I have _____ Allen, I have had oodles in the past.

Mumbling

Kasaris: But typically with this statute, your correct, we do get judges as victims, whether its been Judge

Bryan: Sure, _____

Kasaris: Richard McMonagle,

Bryan: I know. Shooting peoples houses _____

Kasaris: Well, we've had the Lux case, the Lux case which you know about. We've had the people who were associated with him, Jim Rivers, Bridge, all those people. We used that statute for them. Your right, that is why the statute was enacted.

Bryan: So

Kasaris: But when we have writings, we have a judge that comes to us, a victim, whether its a judge or Jay Milano or Jane Doe, its says listen, I am a witness in a case and the, the this person has used this materially false writing I believe in a reckless manner trying to hinder my ability to be a witness or public servant. We take it to the grand jury and we indict it. If you were a witness in a case, okay, and somebody did that to you, you would want something done with that as well, wouldn't you?

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: And just by the nature of the statute, the only people that can be victims in this case, are public servants or witnesses. So they have to be involved in the processes.

Bryan: In other words, those people, pubic servants are more important than regular people, because, hang on

_____ No, don't, you're making a bad argument. Its a specific crime fits a specific _____. If you got the militia filings, that Gudiaras might get a kick out of this _____

Kasaris: You know who did this. He did one, I did the rest of them.

_____ Well that's okay. But that just happens to be _____ but my point is that it is not worth getting involved in these arguments about what fits what. Some statutes fit some people like we _____ society that if you shoot a policeman as well as you shoot a citizen.

Bryan: I don't agree with that.

_____ Theoretically

Bryan: Sure

_____ Theoretically, but that a _____ we make.

Kasaris: Had she run you over with the car, that a felonious assault. Had she run a cop over, that elevated higher.

Bryan: What I was saying, what I was going to finish saying was that there are instances, just in the paper in the last couple of weeks, where some kid got charged with a misdemeanor, was it menacing?

Kasaris: I read that on your website.

Bryan: Okay, so that, I mean it's like, that's a felony. The Judge makes it a felony and this over there is a misdemeanor. That's a death threat. That's a death threat and he got a misdemeanor. But

_____ By the same token, I bet all of you _____ that I could not possibly _____ because that would be improper that if, in fact, it was presented to Judge Markus that you were going to apologize to him, he'd say I have had enough of this case. But none of that makes any difference now. You guys are arguing about stuff that doesn't fit what we're here

Bryan: okay

_____ Offer all the facts that you can offer.

Bryan: Well go ahead then.

_____ We'll sit her forever.

Bryan: Yeah, you're right.

Kasaris: We will.

Bryan: Believe me, I can talk about this case forever.

Mumbling

Kasaris: Now when she posted bond, Elsebeth was released on bond on August of this year,

Bryan: I know where you're going.

Kasaris: She sent the email to Judge Markus

Bryan: That was just a _____

Kasaris: Kids, grown kids in their 40's. Did she talk to you about that before she did it? How did you find out she did it? Oh, she courtesy copied you.

Bryan: Oh, right, right, I chewed her out for this as soon as I saw it.

Kasaris: And why did you

Bryan: Because it was stupid. Why would you do that?

Kasaris: Why would you, and why is it stupid? Because she send it to his kids? Because of what's in it? Or

Bryan: Well, its stupid because, I mean, no, no, no. It a criminal, I mean, what are you asking me? It's ill advised. In my opinion, its ill advised.

Kasaris: And why is it ill advised in your opinion?

Bryan: Don't you think she got enough problems as it is. Do you think that it is wise to

Kasaris: She was just released on bond.

Bryan: Uh ha.

Kasaris: And, but she did tell you she sent that email. You did talk to her about sending that email

Bryan: After she sent it.

Kasaris: After she sent it?

Bryan: Sure. I was copied. I saw this, as soon as I saw this.

Kasaris: Did you meet with her, or did you

Bryan: No. I threw up my hands at that point. You know there is a series of things that happened.

Kasaris: In May of this year you formed, _____, but you filed with the Secretary of State's Office, a paper for Erie Voices.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Which it actually was formed in Michigan.

Bryan: Uh ha.

Kasaris: Michigan Company.

Bryan: Oh yeah.

Kasaris: What is, uh, I know you said you were the editor and she has contributed some money to Erie Voices. Other than that, other than, and she labels herself as the publisher of Erie Voices. Other than that, what role did she have or what role did you, what role did she have in Erie Voices.

Bryan: The financial backing. That's it.

Kasaris: Does the Arbor Group own anything else?

Bryan: No. Never got off the ground and its _____

Kasaris: What was the Arbor Group suppose to be?

Bryan: A mechanism for her to move capital out of _____.

Kasaris: Was it a way for her to avoid the people trying to collect the money off of her?

Bryan: She already filed bankruptcy so it didn't matter. I don't see. I'm not real clear on all of that financial stuff. To tell you the truth, _____

Kasaris: All right. I mean when you needed money for Erie Voice, would you call her and say I need money and she would write the check.

Bryan: It didn't take any money to run that site.

Kasaris: To buy the equipment?

Bryan: No equipment. I mean, I already had the

Kasaris: The computers. All right, the scanner

Bryan: Yeah, oh she paid for the scanner.

Kasaris: Digital camera?

Bryan: Oh, I paid for that. I already had it.

Kasaris: You were on, for a lack of better term, you were on her payroll or receiving money from her from at least, lets say April of

Bryan: After she got out of jail, it was over.

Kasaris: April of 05 to August of 05.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: From Cleveland Genomics.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Did you receive any money from her before April of 05?

Bryan: I may have. I can't remember. I would have to go back

Kasaris: This is an affidavit that you filed in Sandusky

Bryan: Yeah, right. That was in relation to the

Kasaris: To the domestic case. And that was on, in January, January 25th, and you indicate that you are employed by Cleveland Genomics. So would you have been receiving money then?

Bryan: Well, yeah, I guess so. I don't, that was an affidavit.

Kasaris: All right.

Bryan: I can't remember how much but

Kasaris: It was something

Bryan: Because here's what happened. I was, I was, I left the railroad, this is when everything just went to shit. I left the railroad in mid December, I think,

Kasaris: Anyway, we are back on after a little break, when we switched tapes, and Bryan, with regards to Elsebeth, when I met your wife up in Erie County Prosecutor's Office, in Sandusky in May or early June, prior to going in to the grand jury, I asked her, I said, "What is Bryan thing with Baumgartner. Why? I mean is there a relationship between him and her?" And your wife said, "I really don't know. I really don't know." Did you guys have some sort of a romantic relationship or anything like that?

Bryan: No. Absolutely not.

Kasaris: Why get, why get enthralled with her cause? Or why did you, pretty much

Bryan: Because if I could, if you can isolate certain things about what she was saying, there is some merit to it. If you could isolate it.

Kasaris: You, you, again this goes back to what your wife told me, you are a great husband, you are a great father. Your mother-in-law said you are a great son-in-law

Bryan: I am trying to get back

Kasaris: And, and, I mean, they were both, they were both crying to me. They were both, I'm not just saying whining crying, I mean they were in tears. I mean your mother-in-law's eyes were watering. There were tears coming down her face. She described when your wife brought you around the house and how great you guys got along and then your wife said, "You know he gets involved with Baumgartner. He forgets all of that. He doesn't pay attention to us. He loses, he in trouble with his job. I mean, why did you, just, there is nothing more than, I mean you jump into this thing and abandon pretty much everything else. Is it just because of the, I mean

Bryan: My own desire, I was firmly, I believed that she was being abused and I believed there was going to be some kind of, I don't know she was very maternal. She, anything that I needed, she gave to me. Took care of me. This is nothing insulting to my wife, because my wife is the same person she always was, but, you know, women are women, get emotional, I mean, . . . trying to stick up for her. That is all it was.

Kasaris: Trying to stick up for?

Bryan: I was trying to stick up for Elsebeth Bau

Kasaris: Baumgartner.

Bryan: Yeah. I felt sorry for her.

Kasaris: When you had the, when Brad Green and I talked to Judge Saffold about severing the cases,

Bryan: My wife said that. You know that, right? My wife was the one who said that. Sever the case.

Kasaris: She did.

Bryan: She said withdraw the motion. My wife said that.

Kasaris: Oh, I thought it was Elsebeth

Bryan: My wife said that.

Kasaris: All right

Bryan: And so that is, I turned back

Kasaris: You never talk to Elsebeth about that at all?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: Ah, I thought it was, _____

Bryan: Mandy's been going back and forth because she just, all she wants is her family back.

Kasaris: Did Elsebeth had Mandy record anything?

Bryan: Not that I know of.

Kasaris: One of the court reporters told me that Elsebeth handed Mandy a recorder. Do you know if Mandy was recording any

Bryan: I don't know anything about that. When was that?

Kasaris: In October.

Bryan: Handed her a recorder?

Kasaris: That is what a court reporter told me.

Bryan: Elsebeth handed my wife a recorder?

Kasaris: That is what the court reporter told me. That's why in one of the subpoenas your wife got, it asked

Bryan: No, I don't believe Mandy ever, ever, ever, misstated something to me and I never, I don't know anything about that.

Kasaris: that is why one of the subpoenas you wife would have received, it would have asked for tape recordings.

Bryan: Well she didn't understand that. She asked me about that.

Kasaris: That is where that came from. I was told that. So as far as you know, your wife never recorded any Elsebeth's...

Bryan: Not that I know of.

Kasaris: Conversations or anything like that. She. . not only in the courtroom but outside the courtroom, did she

Bryan: Not that I know of.

Kasaris: Did Elsebeth talk to your wife at all?

Bryan: Yeah, it was like hot/cold, on and off, kind of like at each other throats, I mean, they don't like each other but, yeah, they hate each other. I'm not going to sugar coat it

Kasaris: Be straight.

Bryan: but they hate each other.

Kasaris: Your wife hates her, and she, because of what happened with you and your family.

Bryan: Sure. Like I said my wife just wants her family back.

Kasaris: Did Elsebeth ever, uh, what did Elsebeth tell you about her falsification conviction and her escape conviction?

Bryan: Um, falsification,

Kasaris: that's the...

Bryan: That's related to her making the statement gets Kevin Baxter. January 2, 2002, she made her statement against _____. Mulligan brings in a special prosecutor because he was already having problems with Elsebeth in Ottawa County and everybody knew that Mulligan couldn't do it himself so he brings in Tim Braun from Lucas County. Tim Braun prosecutes the falsification. She is convicted by a jury. I read that transcript. Didn't sound quite right to me. But whatever. She is convicted of falsification and the sentence, I believe, was 180 days, suspended. She was out

on probation. She keeps stirring up the pot, as you know, that's what she does. Right or wrong, that is what she did. Wise or unwise that is what she did.

Kasaris: Um.

Bryan: So I know the facts of that case.

Kasaris: You know the falsification statute, and again it goes back to speech, false speech made with purpose to incriminate another. That is one of the things she is charged with here also. False speech about Judge Markus.

Bryan: Okay, we have a disagreement of how to handle her but

Kasaris: _____ that is what the statute is.

Bryan: Sure, I understand. Fine. You're an attorney. He's an attorney, He's an attorney,

Kasaris: No he's not, he's a cop.

Bryan: Oh you're a cop, okay. You say its legally permissible. The judge allows it. You prosecute the case. The outcome, uh, outcome is achieved. That's where we are at.

Kasaris: Did, I know you have heard Elsebeth Baumgartner talk a lot about that Garrison case in

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: In Louisiana. Have you ever read it?

Bryan: No, I have not read the entire thing, no. I have read some of it. I believe I understand what

Kasaris: Louisiana has a statute that criminalized

Bryan: _____

Kasaris: Right

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Supreme Court said was that you can't criminalize _____, however, you can criminalize speech that is false. False speech has never been protected and, uh, you understand that when she uses Garrison v. Louisiana, when Baumgartner, she misuses it. Because with

Bryan: Okay. I mean, you're an attorney and that is your legal interpretation. I am not an attorney so it doesn't matter what I think about it.

Kasaris: Can we accept that, uh, there are laws that, that, that regulate false or materially false speech? Can we accept that?

Bryan: Sure.

Kasaris: We can agree on, we can. And

Bryan: You can't shout fire . . .

Kasaris: That is what I said. That is correct. That is what I said. And, uh, what we are doing here is we received a complaint from a witness, victim, judge, somebody who falls within the statute, to protect the person within the statute, and we respond to that allegation. And that is what we are doing.

Bryan: Very well.

Kasaris: Did she talk to you about the escape conviction at all.

Bryan: As I understand it, she was indicted for felony escape. Judge moved to dismiss that. Remanded her and they moved it over to misdemeanor court. And it was downgraded from felony to

Kasaris: And she pled to that.

Bryan: And she pled to that.

Kasaris: Now when

_____ Bryan, I know that you are not a lawyer. When we just went over the statute
_____ This statute wasn't written for Elsebeth Baumgartner.

Bryan: I know that.

_____ And there is not a perfect set of fact to fit into every perfect, every statute that is passed by legislation.

Bryan: Sure.

_____ So, and then you know that Krista Harris _____ you have interviewed them and talked to them.

Bryan: Not Krista Harris. I have spoken to her briefly but not substantially.

_____ Uh ha. And the other information that was provided to you about these two cases was from Elsebeth?

Bryan: And Kasarisiel Kay

_____ And Kasarisiel Kay. Right.

Bryan: Sure.

_____ And, what I am saying, then you see what she is putting in these emails to the judge _____ and was that consistent with the information that you had from Kasarisiel Kay or from Elsebeth, the pedophilia, the sex slaves. And I know, again, I am not going to get into a war of words, you as somebody who is trained in writing,

Bryan: I am not trained in writing.

_____ You like to correct her words

Bryan: Yes

_____ And her language. So you take pride in your ability to speak

Bryan: Absolutely.

_____ And that's commendable. But what I am saying, I don't want to get into the war of words, just because I probably use the wrong words all the time, but you know from talking to Kasarisiel Kay and talking to Elsebeth, and then you know what is in those emails, are those consistent? I mean, that is what I want to know? Are you

Bryan: No. She

_____ You are not going to back her up, and I don't expect you to back her up.

Bryan: No. There are embellishments in some of her things that she says.

_____ With your personal knowledge either from her and from talking to Kasarisiel Kay?

Bryan: Not only that but other peripheral things. Yes.
_____ Your investigation?

Bryan: Yes.

Kasaris: Where are the embellishments?

Bryan: Do we want to get into all these?

Kasaris: yeah.

Bryan: That's what I want to know.

Mumbling

Bryan: There was something on the record a few weeks ago involving Larry Zuckerman.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Okay. I believe, I disagree with everything that was said there. I do not believe Zuckerman did, or tried to, do, do you

_____ - Flush it out because this story I never

Bryan: Okay, I'll just go through the whole thing.

_____ Flush it out.

Kasaris: I was at the hearing and I did not

Bryan: Okay. Olivito knows Zuckerman. Zuckerman. Olivito says, hey, why don't you give Larry a call. We'll see if he's interested in taking the case. So, there's like a discussion there. Olivito says, yeah give him a call. So, they set up a meeting and I accompanied Baumgartner to this meeting at Larry's office. We go in there. We sit down. Larry, initially he's interested in the case because it's fascinating, probably the same reason it fascinated me. And, oh, he puts one of his guys on developing a case file for this case. We go through and line up the discovery with all the counts in the indictment, blah, blah, blah. And Larry took exception to a couple of the things she, Baumgartner, was saying in the courtroom, trying to straighten it out, trying to make sure he, she was representing things the way they actually happened and he quotes \$50,000.00 fee. Okay, so then we walk out.

_____ Okay so he. . .I'm sorry to interrupt, he got his assistant, so there is four people in the room

Bryan: Right. The reason I mention that is because Larry showed interest in the case but one of his guys had developed a case, so to me, I interpreted that as yeah okay the guy's interested in the case.

_____ Right.

_____ Then we bounced to the hearing?

Bryan: Then we bounced, no, no, things happened between that. Um, for some reason, and I don't quite understand this, this is why I said I disagree with it, she interpreted that the \$50,000.00 fee as some kind of

_____ Bribe

Bryan: Bribe, or an attempt to bribe and we were aware and Saffold made it, it was no secret that Mr. _____ was a personal friend of Saffold's. They went out to lunch that day. They were celebrating the Jewish holiday, you know, and so, somehow, like you read that the Motion for Continuance, somehow in there it get ratcheted up to, you know, and she didn't actually say it. She didn't actually say it was a bribe or something, it was like, kind of a misleading statement and right there, I saw that and I though "Oh my god." You know, I had a serious problem with it. You understand?

Kasaris: I understand.

Bryan: Okay. Because an attorneys reputation is how he sells his practice. A judge's reputation is how that person is viewed in the public. And when you get in a situation where somebody of that intellect is able to just kind of smear a judge, kind of not really smearing, but smear or drag them into this alleg. . .this really complicated sounding allegation, its Kasarisgerous. It's not fair. It's not fair.

_____ Again, getting back to the original question,

Bryan: I'm sorry.

_____ No, no, that perfect

Kasaris: That's an example of an embellishment.

_____ Is that what she did with the information that she would provide to you and what you know from Kasarisiel Kay into the emails

Bryan: I really tried to prevent that. But as I said in the hallway, I am not, its not something I want to be involved with anymore because I see this, Okay?

_____ Yes.

Kasaris: But in these specific emails, I guess Marty's question is, where are the embellishments in these email.

Marty: Yeah, you now know and we know,

Bryan: Pause. I have to use the restroom.

Kasaris: All right, we're back. If you can, here are some of the emails, the charged emails, the first one being the 6-16-04 email, what do you know that is embellished in that email.

Bryan: Kasaris, I don't.

Kasaris: That's fine.

Bryan: I mean, I can't speak for what's in her mind.

Kasaris: But based upon conversations you had with Krista Harris or with Kasarisiel Kay, I mean

_____ Or with Elsebeth?

Kasaris: She changes _____

Bryan: Okay, let me explain something. This is very strange. When you look at the transcript. Do you have that transcript?

Kasaris: Which one?

Bryan: Uh, it happened with Zuckerman, brought Zuckerman in,

_____ Yeah.

Bryan: Okay, let me look at that.

Kasaris: Zuckerman was actually cross-examining Elsebeth. That's August. That's 11-14. I mean, did she have conversations with you prior to coming in here that she can bribe the judges, subject to being bribed of \$50,000.00.

Bryan: I don't know where that shit came from? I have no idea where that whole thing came from.

_____ That was the unsaid words _____

Many talking at the same time

Bryan: This is the other thing, like Cursel, he wouldn't name names. Why? I don't know.

Kasaris: Did you talk to Clay?

Bryan: Hell no.

Kasaris: If you ever talk to him make sure there is a wall between you two because whatever you have on you, he will probably steal.

Bryan: I read that.

Kasaris: Did you read the con man of the year from the Scene Magazine. Con Man of the year. This guy took \$480,000 from 12 families.

Bryan: Okay, why did you open. Is there something

Kasaris: That _____ starts talking.

_____ Hal Pollick was involved in that. Your buddy, Hal Pollick. He represented the victims.

Discussion about Scene Magazine. Had his head above a trophy. He was stealing from the yearbook staff when he was in high school. He worked for a company that sold footballs to schools. What he would do, he go get the footballs that were thrown out and he started his own little side business.

Ha - Ha - Ha

Bryan: Here we go. Zuckerman, "May I address each point, you honor?" The court, "Okay, can I just, I have to in my mind, Zuckerman wants to be clear about this." First, I am not your lawyer, (he speaking to Saffold), I was your lawyer. I represented you during your divorce. Our divorce has been over for about a year now. That's correct. So I did represent you but I presently do not represent you. Also it says something

_____ But this. . . Zuckerman doesn't make and difference _____

Bryan: Yeah it does, I giving them an example

_____ No, but here is there question. Stop, because obviously he _____. But the real question is that there is a bunch of realities working here. There is what you believe to be true at the time. There is to what you now know to be true about

Elsebeth. This is all based on what you said, some of the stuff I know is true, but other stuff I know is not. So I suggest what they are looking for is not Zuckerman,

Kasaris: Emails

_____- It's in that stuff. What in that stuff now, looking back, or from what you know, or

Bryan: What I say or is an embellishment.

Kasaris: Right.

_____ Right. And that comes down to, _____.

Bryan: Well you know what, just as an honorable person, I think that Zuckerman, I would like to talk to Zuckerman just because I feel bad

_____ - That's fine.

Bryan: But okay, all right.

_____ Now, so that all the pedophiles stuff you already talked about Bozer _____.

Bryan: You are in violation of several criminal statutes. She doesn't name them so I don't know what she's talking about, I don't know. That could be an embellishment, could not be, I don't know.

Kasaris: Did she ever talk to you about what criminal statute Judge Markus violated?

Bryan: Well, probably witness intimidation and things like that because she classified herself as a witness in these cases.

_____ Let me ask you this, did you guys ever have these types of heated conversations over dinner, over drinks? About look what they are doing to me? Look at what he's doing to you? Look what's going on here.

Bryan: No it was usually I was trying to change her perspective and offer a different perspective.

_____ So you were sucked up in this though

Bryan: I was trying to help a human being see that maybe

Kasaris: Like, for instance, you had dinner with her at Cameo's a couple of weeks ago

Bryan: Right, right, okay.

Kasaris: You had dinner with her at Cameo's

Bryan: My wife was there. That doesn't fit

Kasaris: But you still are with her? During this time were you trying to get away from her, you're having dinner with her on a Saturday night at Cameo's.

Bryan: Right. It's like.. Jesus Christ

Kasaris: How, how do you reconcile both of these

Bryan: It's a very difficult past. Very difficult. I can tell you that from experience. Okay.

_____ I want to get back to the dinner. I am not cross-examining you but I want to get some of this stuff out, if it doesn't exist, it doesn't exist. She's lonely. You're having dinner the night she's running away. Right?

Bryan: Right.

_____ Are you guys at that point talking about who's out to get who? In general. That's my general terms. You know what I mean?

Bryan: Yeah.

_____ So those conversations going on and your pumped up about it? You know. Is there

Bryan: You just, no it was, My take was always a very sober approach. What you should do. This is how you should handle it or something like that. Okay. I was not, I am not into this, you know

_____ Well when did you catch on to a good portion of what she said. Tell if this is not true. I'm not trying to _____ That a good portion of what she told you wasn't necessarily accurate. You said some of it is true, and I bought into it, and some of it wasn't.

Bryan: Right.

_____ Because these guys are suggest, you _____, are looking for what's not accurate.

Kasaris: What's not accurate in the emails. Now we you, she didn't talk to you before she sent the emails out.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: You didn't get with her and she didn't say, "Bryan, I am sending this email and this is what it is going to say."

Bryan: that's true.

Kasaris: You never talked before they went out.

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: It was after the fact.

Bryan: Right.

Kasaris: So since you didn't, for a lack of better word, conspire with her to send these emails out?

Bryan: No. No.

Kasaris: You didn't.

Bryan: If anything, I said, "don't let me look at it first." To help her with the way that she

Kasaris: But what part of these emails in the past has she told you herself were not true?

Bryan: Oh nothing. She believes that they are true.

Kasaris: Even though she's been disbarred and into this Barmgartner proceedings, the court found as a matter of law, that a lot of these things aren't true.

Bryan: But she believe are true. She doesn't give a damn what the Ohio Supreme Court says. She believes Tom Moyer is hand picking judges to take her out which who knows. I don't know. I don't, I mean if I can, I don't know. And I don't care any more. All I am saying is that in her mind she believes what she's saying. And it is very strange because I am looking at the same set of facts. I am there during the same conversations and I don't see it.

Kasaris: What do you see in this first email that you know is embellished or isn't true?

Kasaris: Don't speculate.

Bryan: No. I know, I know. I am trying not to. It's like that is why I wanted to go to this because I wanted to show you how its a very sophisticated way of saying something when you're not really it.

Kasaris: _____ I know what you're taking about.

Bryan: That is what _____, you know that is how he was made famous. You know.

Kasaris: Uh ha.

Bryan: Manipulating speech, okay.

Kasaris: And she consciously manipulated speech.

Bryan: I don't know. I don't know what her purpose is. This is why I have. I don't know.

Kasaris: She never told you what her purpose is.

Bryan: I came into it as a Christian trying to help somebody and I don't know what she stands for. I don't know why she does the things that she does because, I just don't know. I mean, I'm just one guy, and now is the time, and I am just done with it.

Kasaris: Did she ever tell you about Pastor Ernie Sanders.

Bryan: I have spoken with Ernie Sanders. I know that those two know each other.

Kasaris: Right. Yeah, she's been on his radio show a couple of times. Okay. But as far as these, this first email, is there anything in there that you can point your finger to and say that you know that's, that she embellished it.

Bryan: No, no. A cursory review, its a conditional state, its a conditional word, okay, so even if that was an embellishment, she puts the conditional

Come in

Kasaris: It locked.

_____ Then you can't come in.

Bryan: See what I'm saying, she puts a conditional word in there so it doesn't

Deputy Sheriff _____

Kasaris: Marty, keep it going.

??

_____ Whatever you guys want to do.
RECORDING SHUT OFF

Kasaris: Remember, we are not worried about Elsebeth anymore, Bryan.

_____ As long as you can provide where they came from

_____ Lot numbers?

Kasaris: Getting back to the emails. She is a human being, that's correct, but if she's continuing to commit crimes,

Bryan: Okay, okay, what do you want to know?

Kasaris: The embellishments in the 6, uh

Bryan: Okay. You have to understand that I do not,

_____ All right, if there's any problem, call me.

_____ I will. I will.

Bryan: I can't speak for what's in her mind. So I don't know. I mean, you, I can show you embellishments. I don't know if you've charged her for them.

Kasaris: If you don't see any in any of them, then

Bryan: Okay, okay.

Kasaris: Turn to the next one.

Bryan: Okay, okay. Let me just look this over again

Kasaris: Sure

Bryan: See, I don't know.

Kasaris: All right, then go to the

Bryan: Next one

Kasaris: The next charged on is this one.

Bryan: Okay, how do I know of their charged?

Kasaris: I am looking at, I am looking at the charged ones.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Get the next one for you after that. There's on here.
_____ The next two are right here, back to back.

_____ And again, Bryan, this is directly correlated _____. You were there

Bryan: That's what I'm saying.

_____ You heard what she said on the record there. Now all we're looking for is, in your investigation, in your conversations with Elsebeth, and what's now in writing, how you know how she's wording these things. It doesn't add up to what you know

Kasaris: Reality.

_____ That's what we are interested in. Plain and simple.

Bryan: Okay. Okay. For example, Richard Markus had advanced and protected the rape of a male mentally disadvantaged juvenile client of mine in the hands of a brother, Ohio House Minority Chris Redfern. Advanced and protected?

Kasaris: that's what she wrote.

Bryan: Okay.

_____ _____ Is this the kid you interviewed? The person

Kasaris: Who are you talking about.

Bryan: That's irrelevant.

_____ Well I don't know if its irrelevant, I am just curious if its the same person.

Kasaris: It's Kasarisiel Kay.

Bryan: Kasarisiel Kay.

_____ That's Kasarisiel Kay.

Bryan: What's relevant is her language. Advanced and protected.

_____ I understand that.

Bryan: Yeah, Yeah.

Kasaris: Did Richard Markus

Bryan: I'm sorry. I'm just trying to

Kasaris: Did Judge Markus advance and protect his rape?

Bryan: I don't know that. I don't, I mean, if Markus stood in front of you and didn't say a word to you and you told him something and then later on, could you say, he advanced and protected?

_____ Was Elsebeth there when you _____

Bryan: In my judgment, no. In my judgment, no.

_____ Was Elsebeth there when you interviewed this kid?

Bryan: No. This was when I was in jail. I was in jail.

_____ Okay.

Bryan: It was just coincidental.

Bryan: I told her that I met him but that's all I said.

_____ But again, that's not consistent with what you know and what you know from Kasarisiel Kay and what you know from Allison Baumgartner, that's not consistent.

Kasaris: How can he advance the rape, when the rape happened

Bryan: Right.

Kasaris: 10 years ago.

Bryan: Right.

Kasaris: Whenever it was.

_____ But what I mean, that's what we're looking for is based on what you know, its not consistent with any conversation you had with her, Kasarisiel Kay, any of your other informants

Bryan: As it pertains to Richard Markus, that's correct.

Kasaris: Kasarisiel Kay didn't tell you that Richard Markus was involved in his rape.

Bryan: No. No. This is why it is so complicated. So sophisticated for somebody to do this because you have to get right into the language, you know it difficult, its just very frustrating to see this happen, and

Kasaris: When you talked to Kasarisiel Kay about what happened, when you were in jail and you talked to Kasarisiel Kay about his

Bryan: Yes

Kasaris: About him being raped. And how long ago was that?

Bryan: That was when I was incarcerated.

Kasaris: No, his rape?

Bryan: Oh, I don't know. That was in, I mean, that was in 2001, I believe.

_____ Okay.

Bryan: Redfern is closely aligned with Mulligan. That's true.

Kasaris: Uh ha.

Bryan: I mean, okay, so

Kasaris: Well I now his brother is, I did

Bryan: Mulligan is Redfern's treasurer. His campaign treasurer. Drug trafficking, sex abuse_____. According to what she has, according to her clients, she believes that true.

Kasaris: How many clients do you know of her to actually have when she was doing criminal defense work?

Bryan: I don't think she ever did criminal defense work. I think it was all civil rights.

Kasaris: Well, Krista Harris

Bryan: Civil Rights, and it was civil rights and it was employment.

Kasaris: Well, Krista Harris, she represented in a criminal defense case in Erie County.

Bryan: I didn't, I don't believe that.

Kasaris: Yeah she did.

Bryan: Okay, as a criminal defense attorney? Okay, I didn't know that.

Kasaris: And she represented Kasarisiel Kay

Bryan: The way that I, from the way I understood it, it was in a civil rights capacity.

Kasaris: Okay.

Bryan: That was it.

Kasaris: She actually because

Bryan: _____ Notice of Appearance of behalf of Krista Harris in her criminal case

Kasaris: She was removed, Judge Gray removed her from the case as they were picking the jury or about to pick a jury.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: And she also represented Kasarisiel Kay in juvenile court as a criminal lawyer.

Bryan: Okay. She was kept as a sex slave. Okay. Who has repeatedly sworn under oath that she was kept as a sex slave by Erie County Prosecutor _____. So with that sentence construction, that means that Krista Harris signed an affidavit that said, "I was kept as a sex slave by.

Kasaris: Exactly.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: Exactly.

Bryan: End of story. That's, that

Kasaris: Is it true?

Bryan: That's embellishment. In my opinion, that is an embellishment.

Kasaris: And why is that your opinion?

Bryan: Because that is not the correct wording to convey what happened?

Kasaris: What happened? What would have been correct to say?

Bryan: Well, do you want me to write it, I mean, re-write it I would say, "Richard Markus _____ Krista Harris, an African American women who alleged under oath that she was kept in an improper relationship, sexual relationship, with the county prosecutor."

Kasaris: Now Baumgartner is a smart woman.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: And if Baumgartner wanted to write that, she could have written that.

Bryan: That's correct.

Kasaris: But she chose to write it the way she wrote it.

Bryan: that's correct.

Kasaris: And then sent it to two people who are on boards with Judge Markus. Herbeck and

Bryan: that's correct.

Kasaris: What is more alarming when these people read this, the sex slave part, the way she wrote it or the way that you would have written it?

Bryan: What's more alarming to the peo, to the

Kasaris: To these people

Bryan: To the audience.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: What's more alarming

Kasaris: Yeah, that's an easy qu, that's an easy answer.

Bryan: Well, what is alarming to me is that

_____ I don't think you understand the question.

Bryan: No I don't.

Kasaris: What gets your attention. What would get the attention of her backing Sutton more.

Bryan: Sex slave.

Kasaris: And the attention these newspapers and judges, sex slave.

Bryan: Sure. And what if, I know this is not relevant to what you want to know, but what if its true?

Kasaris: Well

_____ _____ based on your investigations and your talking

Bryan: Base on what

_____ Talking to Elsebeth, sex slave

Bryan: Sure, that's an embellishment.

_____ That's never come up. Has it? The word. The picture,

Bryan: Sure, I told her. Said you don't use the words sex slave

Kasaris: Krista Harris didn't say she was a sex slave to Kevin Baxter.

Bryan: To my knowledge, she never said that. She said they had sex.

_____ You told Elsebeth, don't use the word sex slave. Why would you do that. Is that what you were just going to say?

Bryan: Yeah.

_____ What did she say?

Bryan: She agreed with me. It's defensible. Okay, its defensible, okay, defend it then. I'm not going

Kasaris: And she say that before the email or after?

Bryan: Well, obviously it would be after because I was privy to no emails before they got sent out. And I was

Kasaris: But what about, I, you didn't even know Elsebeth when this email was sent out, right, June 16th?

Bryan: No, like I said, I think that I was, I think, wait a minute, no, no, I met her at the end of June, I believe. I would have to confirm that with her first emails. I don't even know if I have them anymore, but it was at the end of June, I believe.

Kasaris: Did you ever ask her about Krista Harris being a sex slave and she said to you, no, she wasn't on.

Bryan: No. No, she believes what she says. Krista Harris said that she had sex with Baxter.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: I mean, so

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: I mean if she is to be believed, if Harris can be believed by the prosecutor to put two - three blacks away, then

Kasaris: Didn't she also say that Baxter _____ a kid prior to Krista Harris.

Bryan: I don't believe that.

Kasaris: Yeah, I think that was said also.

Bryan: I never hear that.

Kasaris: you never heard that?

Bryan: No. No.

Kasaris: Now in the, you know in the, and I know Baumgartner knows this, the Supreme Court in disbaring her, said that that is a false statement.

Bryan: That she made false and misleading statements. That is what they said.

Kasaris: That is a false statements. One of the counts

Bryan: No not this, because this was sent after she was disbarred.

Kasaris: One of the counts in the disbarment proceedings, I think its Count 6 or whatever count it is, deals with Baumgartner claiming that Krista Harris was a sex slave.

Bryan: Okay, you tell me how the Supreme Court can verify that Krista Harris did not have sex. . Wait a minute, what are we talking about, sex slave?

Kasaris: Sex slave.

Bryan: She used that phrase. She got disbarred for it.

_____ Then she couldn't defend it. Apparently _____

Bryan: Now, I don't know, I mean, what are we talking about here. Are we talking about,

Kasaris: She accused them without any evidence of fixes case. Them being Kevin Baxter and Dean Holman. Without any evidence of fixing cases and bringing false charges for the purpose of silencing Harris. Respondent also accused Baxter of suborning perjury. Respondent being Baumgartner. Of suborning perjury by threatening criminal prosecution in order to obtain convictions, abusing his office by forcing women to submit to sex or be prosecuted in illegal drug abuse as all is attacked in her defense of Harris. By _____, they used the term sex slave.

Bryan: Okay, here is the situation

Kasaris: Just letting you know where I read this from. This if from the finds and facts in conclusion of law of

Bryan: Of the Ohio Supreme Court.

Kasaris: No, of the Board, then from there it went to complaint to Disciplinary Counsel filed. In the complaint that the disciplinary Counsel filed

_____ Is this after, a subsequent procedure because she was screwing up on her.

Kasaris: It was after, right, right. This is in March of 02. So the complaint to disbar her.

Bryan: Of course she was suspended, then they filed a subsequent complaint

Kasaris: She was suspended. To be honest with you I have never seen it. She was suspended like now.

Bryan: Oh. Okay.

Kasaris: It's not like the decision came out and then they suspended . . .they did it right then and there. Let me get to the specific count in the, that the Supreme Court had before them when they. . .that they found to be improper. All right.

Bryan: Here is where it gets out _____. You're asking me if she embellishes things? And I am telling you, that I have seen instances in the past couple of weeks and I can go through these and tell you what I believe are embellishments.

Kasaris: And you be believe that was an embellishment?

Bryan: Sex slave is not an appropriate terminology I would use to describe that relationship, as I was told, how the relationship came to be and how it was carried out. That is not the appropriate terminology.

Kasaris: Count 7 is the count that the Supreme Court found

Bryan Now.

Kasaris: Was correct. In Count 7, count 7 was Kevin Baxter abuses office by coercing sex under threat of false criminal charges and engaged in illegal sex. When, in, that's the Complaint. When the court disbarred her, they found that count 7 of the Complaint with respect to count 7, they concluded she had violated various disciplinary rules and one of them was making false statement.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: So what they said was the Supreme Court is saying that its a false statement to say that Kevin Baxter, you know.

Bryan: Okay. They can say whatever they want. That's what they said. Elsebeth can say whatever she wants

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: What is it that we are trying

_____ In the middle is you know, from your knowledge

Bryan: And I will tell you. I will tell you what her embellishment. To me that is an embellishment. All right lets move on.

_____ Did she say it for the purpose of inflaming.

Bryan: I don't know. I don't know what she said it for. Why she said

_____ That's the effect of it.

Kasaris: That's the effect of it.

Bryan: Okay.

_____ But you said you confronted her about it. You said, sex thing, what are you doing. You know, how are you going to say sex slave when we both know damn well what happened between Baxter and Krista. She said, Oh it defensible. So you knew something was wrong with it the minute you read it.

Bryan: Marty, I've always had a problem with how she words things, yes,

_____ Because you know more than any of us about Elsebeth and what she knows. I mean, that

Bryan: Pretty much

_____ That's why we are here today, is to find out what the heck she's saying in these emails and what she's backing it up with. You're telling us it a play on words.

Bryan: Its a play on words.

_____ You know why she's doing it because you were enflamed by it, you said, "you can't do this."

Bryan: Right.

_____ That's what we need to know. That she is putting in writing, sending them to Markus and everybody else, that you know darn well that she is doing it for one purpose and one purpose only and that is to make people mad or to make people think less of Judge

Several people talking

_____ Can you remember a pattern of things that she did or a number of things where she stretched the facts by either double words or otherwise, out of the normal, what you believe to be the truth and had the effect of enflaming. Not even knowing what was in her head. That it.

Kasaris: Is there any more in that particular email?

Bryan: Erie County has asked Kevin Baxter _____ drug dealers in order to gain control over lucrative drug trafficking in North Central Ohio. People were coming to Elsebeth and telling her these allegations about Kevin Baxter.

Kasaris: Uh ha.

Bryan: Okay, Kevin's own brother, which this prosecutor's office prosecuted

Kasaris: E.J.

Bryan: E.J., he said the same thing. Okay. So there. I mean that's where she is getting that.

Kasaris: Right, right.

Bryan: Two investigators _____ cover up (reading). Okay. What? Wait a minute? When in the hell did this get sent?

Kasaris: 6-16

Bryan: I'm not copied on this.

Kasaris: Right, your not.

Bryan: This happened, okay. Beat me twice. Poisoned with chlorine gas. Exposed to raw hepatitis C sewage, she ran the test on that, I suppose. Exposed to exhaust fumes, denied _____, kept in isolation for weeks. All on a feudal attempt for force me to recant my belief in Jesus Christ.

Kasaris: Talking about the 231 days in jail.

Bryan: Okay, how, okay, in my opinion, how could she make that statement if she didn't actually get someone saying, "This is all in an effort to get you to recant your belief in Jesus Christ." Are we in agree.

Kasaris: We agree.

Bryan: So I believe that that is an embellishment, at best. Okay. I have considerable evidence that Richard Markus _____ (reading) Okay. (reading)

Kasaris: Has she shared any of that evidence with you? That he has violated the, any of those statutes? Income tax evasion?

Bryan: It's going to hurt your case?

Kasaris: Tell me,

Bryan: Well, he sealed the records over in Ottawa County which were related to Helen Smith's

Kasaris: Yeah. Go ahead

Bryan: His defense of the, or his prosecution of the liable case.

Kasaris: Judge Markus sealed

Bryan: Judge Markus sealed those records.

Kasaris: Okay. And how does that indicate that he's involved with income tax evasion?

Bryan: Well because she is saying that, it could be, uh, he could some, Markus could somehow have an arrangement with Callen Smith or attorneys that represented Callen Smith or Baumgartner and O'Toole who represented BCS in order to kick back money to Markus for favorable

Kasaris: And where is she getting that at?

Bryan: While she saying there is an appearance there because there was really no reason to seal those records. And Markus specifically said you are not to share those with Allison Baumgartner.

Kasaris: What records were sealed?

Bryan: They were, the records that were sealed were Baumgartner and O'Toole and also Kellen Smith's insurance company, his company, C. Nelson

Kasaris: Baumgartner and O'Toole represented the school board

Bryan: Right

Kasaris: And school employees.

Bryan: So they were involved with this case early on.

Kasaris: they were involved with the case early on, right.

Bryan: Okay

Kasaris: That's Charles Baumgartner (no relation)

Bryan: And Dennis O'Toole.

Kasaris: And Dennis O'Toole, right.

Bryan: So she is saying that Markus sealed the records so that she would not be able to see how Kellen Smith was using his company, the company's insurance company, to further a liable prosecution.

Kasaris: She doesn't know why Judge Mar, did Judge Markus state a reason why?

Bryan: No. No.

Kasaris: She doesn't know why?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: She's speculating.

Bryan: Sure.

_____ So it considerable evidence, I mean, your knowledge, that all because Judge Markus sealed these records, that considerable evidence that Elsebeth _____

Bryan: We don't know. I don't

_____ To your knowledge?

Bryan: to my knowledge, I would say that that doesn't look right.

_____ Yeah, but what is the basic considerable evidence?

Bryan: I don't know. I don't know.

_____ I'm sorry.

Bryan: That's okay, I don't know. She's got it somewhere in the house?

Kasaris: She never shared with you what the considerable evidence was?

Bryan: No.

Kasaris: Okay.

Bryan: Pull, if you sit her down right here and ask her she could probably tell you.

_____ That is the last thing I want to do. (ha ha)

Bryan: Okay that was her promoting insurance fraud. That was her. Okay. Next.

Kasaris: Anything else in there?

Bryan: not that I can see.

Kasaris: The next one is here and then back up to there.

Bryan: It is asserted

_____ Before we get into this let me know once you get into these, where we are. So far you haven't been copied.

Kasaris: He's on that one.

Bryan: I'm on this one. No wait a minute. No, I'm not on this one. Yes, I am. _____ complaint for a Writ of prohibition preventing Richard Markus from going forward today in Case No. _____ pursuant to a bribery or kickback arrangement with the law firm of Baumgartner and O'Toole. Did she have any first hand proof, no. Probably not.

Kasaris: Why do you say that?

Bryan: Because it was never shared with me so I don't

Kasaris: She never told you that she had any proof of a kickback scheme
Bryan: Other than the fact that the appearance was there, no.

Kasaris: While in her mind, the appearance was there.

Bryan: Sure. Right. In her mind the appearance was there.

Kasaris: _____

_____ I thought you said before, in her mind, if you don't agree with her your as guilty as the perpetrator? That was the _____ So go ahead.

Bryan: Okay, nothing in there.

Kasaris: Okay. The next one is a reminder email. I call it a reminder email because she emails Barb Sutton again,

Bryan: Oh, okay.

Kasaris: Just to remind you.

Bryan: Just to remind you of the serious allegations ag

Kasaris: And then she threatens in the last line.

Bryan: How's that.

Kasaris: Read the last line.

Bryan: You can count on being named in the lawsuit as well. (reading) Okay. Um, look there is a typo that's an embellishment. What's that \$500,000,000.00. \$500,000,000.00. That's a. Oh yeah, I did ask her about that. She said its a typo.

Kasaris: It was really \$50,000,000.00.

Bryan: \$50,000,000.00. I now have overwhelming evidence that the judicial branch of Ohio stealing excessive \$50,000,000.00 except that it reads \$500,000,000.00 a year from Ohioans to sham public contracts and law office of Dennis O'Toole firm and to retire visiting judges, Richard Markus, are both associated with the

_____ What's the substantial evidence she has that they were stealing.

Kasaris: Right. Did she ever share with you?

Bryan: Other than she believes that.

Kasaris: But she never told you what the evidence was. Like when it came to you talking about,

Bryan: You can sit her down and she can go through the whole Ohio _____ and tell you how, _____, Bill Conley, former U.S. Attorney, and talk about how Tom knew the whole thing and her past experience with the, uh, the Geonomics, or not the Geonomics, but the DNA analysis. You read in the disbarment where they brought that guy in, what's his name, Peter

Kasaris: Yeah, I know what you are talking about.

Bryan: _____

Kasaris: There in with the company she was suppose to be representing. Where she tried to extort the guy for thousands of dollars.

Bryan: Yeah, that was his story. She gave me another version. I can't remember what it was but. Layman

Kasaris: Layman, that's it, yeah.

Bryan: I actually met Layman once. He wouldn't even look at me. He walked by and he wouldn't look at me. That's interesting. So she can go back and show you how, you know, how higher ups in the Ohio government tried to cover this up, blah, blah, blah.

_____ Can't understand - talking in the distance.

Bryan: Well, let me, I can't remember. You got to understand, she sent so much stuff out that I didn't bother going through unless there was something in there that really, really bothered me or involved, in like once she sent an email to everybody on the Ohio Supreme Court and I think it was like every prosecutor's office in Ohio.

Kasaris: Every state, every site,

Bryan: Oh my god, don't put my name on that.

Kasaris: It on there.

Bryan: it is, so there you go. That was the biggest chewing of them all.

_____ But you read this one because you said _____

Bryan: Yeah, I said that was a typo, she says. Giving you a _____ warning

Kasaris: Paul Layman.

Bryan: Right, Paul Layman. (he's reading) To protect the pedophilia among the powerful organization go to address my concerns with the fiduciary of a non-profit, I think you can anticipate... Okay. She talking about a catholic church. She's saying there is enough evidence to say that they protected pedophilia for years and years among the powerful and she is using the evidence to back that claim up. _____ Toledo Blade and how there was just like story after story about how in Toledo you went to the Catholic Diocese and told them and they just ignored you. Then you went to the police and the police told you, forget about it, you're never gonna get any. . .We are not going to investigate it, you know that stuff.

_____ This is all that 4-01

Bryan: No. Since that, I mean, I know, I've read plenty of stuff.

_____ Right, but what was going on in August of 04 with the media, like Toledo Blade, it was the Catholic Church.

Bryan: Yeah, there was stuff in there about pedophilia, yeah.

_____ Now, with your conversations with Elsebeth and what you know, I mean is there a correlation there.

Bryan: Correlation, how?

_____ Are they related, O'Toole, Markus, any of these people with NIDA or the Catholic Church? Is there support for their

Bryan: Well she was always talking about how this Tom Pletz, you know, what is his firm, SLK, Shumaker, L

Kasaris: Shumaker, Lu_____

Bryan: Yeah. How they always protected anyone from the Catholic Church who was brought up on charges and they would do what they had to do to suppress that information or to make it go away. Okay.

Kasaris: They were the people who represented

Bryan: Tom Pletz represented E.J. When E.J. was up on a charge of what was it, no, if I remember it correctly, E.J. was brought up before Scrigliano, Gudiarez was prosecuting him, and Pletz basically tells him, Look your going to jail unless you sign this confidentiality agreement that you are not allowed to talk about your brother anymore. This is the way it was told to me by E.J. Which I have no reason to believe that E.J. would lie about

Kasaris: I think that's what happened.

Bryan: Okay. So, he says I can't believe you are letting them do this to me. And E.J., and Pletz says, goes like this and E.J. says, you son of a bitch, you know, give it to me, I'll sign it. So he signs it under duress and gets out of the situation. And she is

saying Pletz there is a connection there with Pletz and Pletz's name keeps getting brought up in this Catholic stuff in Toledo and then I had somebody from Snap, you aware of Snap, you know who Snap is right?

Kasaris: No.

Bryan: Its an organization that helps people bring allegations against the church.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: I had somebody from Snap tell me that Bob Bratton interrupted one of their meetings, one of the Snap meetings, with allegations that Elsebeth was hiding in the meeting. Okay so they break this meeting up. Scared the shit out of all these people in the Snap meeting. All right.

_____ Why would Elsebeth be involved with the Catholic stuff.

Bryan: Well they were saying, somebody offered an opinion that they were trying to prevent Elsebeth from interacting with Snap because she had information that tied together some law firms with the Catholic church and, okay.

_____ Okay.

Bryan: So, I am told Bratton personally went over there, broke the Snap meeting up. I asked Bratton who the tipster was? Who gave him the tip that Elsebeth was in this meeting and Bratton won't answer my question. I asked him it Tom Blass. He won't answer my question. So.

_____ Was there any, is this somehow related to Judge Markus?

Bryan: No. No. That doesn't relate to Judge Markus. No.

_____ This email about now. This is _____ This _____ she is going through this with Judge Markus so she sends NITA and Ms. Sutton this email.

Bryan: Right. She is citing the history of the Catholic Church protecting _____ among the powerful. If your organization failure to address my serious concerns with _____ of you non-profit.

Kasaris: That's NITA.

Bryan: Right. That NITA. What she is doing is she's tying all of this together and its her opinion the Catholic church is

Kasaris: She's saying the Catholic church protected the

Bryan: She's saying that because

Kasaris: mumbling

Bryan: Wait a minute. Hang on for a second. Jesus Christ. She's saying that because they didn't respond to her first email. She's saying they're also not going to anything about what she said about Markus.

Kasaris: She would go after them.

Bryan: Yeah. She's going to file a lawsuit against them. That's what it says.

Kasaris: And I think we already went over the least. I just going over the charged emails. There are other emails I think we can go over but I just wanted to go over the charged ones. She's charged with offenses on. I think we already went over the November, the infamy one. Right there.

Bryan: Okay.

Kasaris: The November 13th one where she says . . .

Bryan: I don't agree with anything on there. I can't speak for. I don't.

Kasaris: Did she share with you any evidence she had that Judge Markus was protecting pedophiles?

Bryan: Other than the fact that she told him about it.

Kasaris: About Kasarisiel Kay.

Bryan: She is saying she told him about it and he didn't act. That was her evidence.

Kasaris: She told Judge Markus that Kasarisiel Kay was raped by

Bryan: Sexually abused by the brother of Chris Redfern. She didn't do anything about it so that means protect. That somehow is warped into, okay, this isn't the one where she said advanced and protect. It's not in that one. It's in a different one.

Kasaris: This is with prior knowledge and approval of sexual abuse of children. Did she ever

Bryan: Approval. Yeah, Okay, okay, that's

Kasaris: Did she ever share with you any evidence that Judge Markus had prior knowledge and approval of sexual abuse of children?

Bryan: Prior knowledge, but approval?

Kasaris: Of sexual abused children.

Bryan: Saying that somebody approves something because they don't act on the allegation, I don't know, is that how it works? I don't know.

Kasaris: She could have said in there, in an email, Erie Voices is going to do a story how Judge Markus doesn't act on allegations.

Bryan: She could have. Yeah.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: She could have said a lot of things. She can't say a lot of things. She didn't say it there.

Kasaris: She didn't say it there.

Bryan: And I didn't post any

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Okay

Kasaris: And why didn't you post anything?

Bryan: Because I didn't have anything.

Kasaris: Right. If you had it, you w

Bryan: I would have posted it.

Kasaris: You would have posted it.

Bryan: If it was credible and I believed it myself.

Kasaris: Because, I know, I know you don't post everything that comes into your website?

Bryan: No. Hell no. I mean, if did that, yeah,

Kasaris: I mean I se, I mean, yeah,

Bryan: I yank stuff down if it

Kasaris: Oh, I've seen it. Some stuff I have that was yanked down. Some stuff I missed. Um. You were in Ottawa County, I think

_____ e-bay. (mumbling) Talking, etc.

Kasaris: What I did do, I did create a specific folder

Bryan: I know. I saw, I tracked you on stagnotes. There like . . .

Kasaris: Oh, there's ways. I didn't have to, I mean

_____ Both gone _____ insane.

Kasaris: There are ways to go on the website without them knowing you're on a website?

Bryan: You can block your refer. Yeah, I know. But you didn't do that.

Kasaris: I chose not to.

Bryan: Sure, you wanted to let me know that you were starting _____ and I saw it.

_____ Inspector _____, pink panther.

Bryan: It is.

Kasaris: Well, I was getting information from the

A LOT OF PEOPLE TALKING

Kasaris: You were in Ottawa County, I think, at the Ottawa County Municipal Court when you find out that you had been indicted, if I remember?

Bryan: Yeah, by you. Right.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: Sure. The second, right.

Kasaris: The first one.

Bryan: Right, right.

Kasaris: You were trying to file something or

Bryan: No, I was trying to pick up public records.

Kasaris: Right.

Bryan: The sons of bitches say to me on the phone, when are you coming over. I said I will be there in 15 minutes and they snag me when I walked through the door.

Kasaris: Jody Reiser.

Bryan: Yeah, it was Jody Reiser and then the police officer tells me, oh that wasn't, its like an organized strike against you. Oh well.

Kasaris: Now, she was, Elsebeth, was arrested in her office.

Bryan: Yeah.

Kasaris: Right?

Bryan: Yeah, to my knowledge.

Kasaris: To your knowledge. When Elsebeth sits down on a computer and prepares a comment, an Erie Voices story, or something to write on Erie Voices.

Bryan: I very rarely approve of them.

Kasaris: But where does she do them at?

Bryan: On her own. Wherever she's at. I don't know

Kasaris: Where does she have, where does she keep her computers at?

Bryan: I don't know where she keeps them.

Kasaris: Does she have them at her house?

Bryan: Wherever. Could be. Could be at her office, I don't know.

Kasaris: And her office is on

Bryan: Water Street

Kasaris: Water Street. All right. When you came up for your Rule 4 hearing I think in Ottawa County, did you, ah, was that the first time you had a chance to speak with her about the indictment?

Bryan: When I was in the van.

Kasaris: When you were in the van. Well, what did she say to you about the indictment.

Bryan: Nothing. She hadn't seen it. We hadn't seen the indictment.

Kasaris: When was the first time you had a conversation with her about the indictment.

Bryan: I think it was after we got out.

Kasaris: So before you got out, you hadn't, while your in Ottawa County together before she came back her, you didn't have any conversations with her about the indictment?

Bryan: No. Not with her, no.

Kasaris: All right. So what happened when you got out. What types of conversations did you have about the indictment?

Bryan: Other than the fact that it was not on Court forms and all this bizarre

Kasaris: Right, right.

Bryan: Seemingly improper procedures?

Kasaris: No actually.

Bryan: Other than that,

Kasaris: Did you take a look at the

Bryan: There is a lot to say about a lot of things.

Kasaris: Did you take a look at the David Roth indictment?

Bryan: I know, I am aware that you've done this before.

Kasaris: I've done this numerous times.

Bryan: Sure. And I am also aware that if you read the Ohio Revised Code, what you did is okay to do. It says, You didn't expect me to say that?

Kasaris: I didn't hear what you said.

Bryan: Oh, okay.

Kasaris: Four hours, ha Hank. (Ha ha ha)

____ It's 2:00, two hours on each tape.

END OF TAPE.